

## Resource Protection - Protect the Nation’s Natural, Cultural, and Heritage Resources

Performance Summary

FIGURE 2-4

End Outcome Goal	Measures Met (Including estimates)			Measures Not Met (Including estimates)			Measures Containing Preliminary Data			Measures Containing No Reports			Costs (in millions)		
	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY04	FY05	FY06
Goal #1 - Improve health of watersheds, landscapes, and marine resources that are DOI managed or influenced in a manner consistent with obligations regarding the allocation and use of water	19	23	20	6	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	\$911	\$1,957	\$2,351
Goal #2 - Sustain biological communities on DOI managed and influenced lands and waters in a manner consistent with obligations regarding the allocation and use of water	8	10	11	3	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	\$1,670	\$1,471	\$1,258
Goal #3 - Protect cultural and natural heritage resources	8	7	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	\$466	\$300	\$338
Total	35	40	38	10	7	9	0	0	0	3	1	1	\$3,047	\$3,728	\$3,947
% of Total Resource Protection Measures	73%	83%	79%	21%	15%	19%	0%	0%	0%	6%	2%	2%			

## Selected Trends and Items of Note

**Ref #17, 25, 37, 124** – In FY 2006, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) evaluated its performance across two mission areas (Resource Protection and Serving Communities) using satisfaction measures. Although the previous fiscal year results were greater than 90%, USGS established its annual target for these measures at 80% due to the following statistical rationale:

The customer satisfaction targets are a form of statistical quality control. The process (provision of science products) is found to be under control if the sample statistic meets or exceeds the target. The appropriate target level needs to be adjusted on the basis of sampling variability. Sampling variability increases as sample sizes decrease. A broad measure, one that includes measured customer satisfaction for many different science products, will have low sampling variability. A target of 90% or greater is appropriate for a broad measure. In this case, a sample finding of satisfaction less than 90% would be a good sign that there is a problem and that remedial action is needed. A more narrow measure, one that includes measured customer satisfaction for relatively few science products, will have high sampling variability. A target of 80% or greater is appropriate for a more narrow measure. In terms of their impact on management decisions, target levels of 90% or greater for broad measures and 80% or greater for narrow measures are equivalent. A target level of 90% or greater for narrow measures would be inappropriately and disproportionately strict. That's why customer satisfaction measures are targeted differently regardless of actual performance.

**Ref #46** – FY 2006 saw a sharp decrease, from 89% to 74%, in the percent of acres designated wilderness that achieve wilderness character objectives as specified by statute. This decrease is due to the inclusion of the National Park Service, which now comprises most of the wilderness acres in this measure, 44 million acres of wilderness with 28 million acres meeting the character objectives specified by statute or 65%. Also factoring into the FY 2006 decrease was the addition of an 11,176-acre Wilderness Area designated in October 2005 and a 101,400-acre area in January 2006. This measure may fluctuate year to year as Congress

designates subsequent Wilderness Areas or makes changes to existing wilderness at a rate greater than that at which Interior can assess character objectives. At this time, results for FY 2006 are believed to be more representative of this measure going forward.

FIGURE 2-5

MISSION: RESOURCE PROTECTION - Protect the Nation's Natural, Cultural, and Heritage Resources						
END OUTCOME GOAL: Improve health of watersheds, landscapes, and marine resources that are DOI managed or influenced in a manner consistent with obligations regarding the allocation and use of water						
1	DESCRIPTION: Wetland areas - Percent of acres achieving desired conditions where condition is known and as specified in management plans consistent with applicable substantive and procedural requirements of State and Federal water law	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	98%	91%	93%	84% (E)
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. Estimated Data. The goal was not met due to constraints resulting from hurricane impacts and response in the Southeast. Also, lower reported numbers are a result of more accurate values from better vegetation mapping.				
	Steps to Improve:					
	Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
2	DESCRIPTION: Riparian areas - Percent of stream-miles achieving desired conditions where condition is known and as specified in management plans consistent with applicable substantive and procedural requirements of State and Federal water law	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	91%	88%	84%	86% (E)
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
	Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
3	DESCRIPTION: Upland areas - Percent of acres achieving desired conditions where condition is known and as specified in management plans consistent with applicable substantive and procedural requirements of State and Federal water law	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	55%	57%	70%	73% (E)
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
	Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
4	DESCRIPTION: Marine and coastal areas - Percent of acres achieving desired marine and coastal conditions where condition is known and as specified in management plans	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	Baseline Not Established	68%	48%	54% (E)
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data.				
	Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
5	DESCRIPTION: Number of land acres reclaimed or mitigated from the effects of degradation from past mining	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	No Report	7,584 acres	7,392 acres	8,168 acres (E)
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data. The goal was exceeded because one of the contributing bureaus determined through the use of enhanced data verification procedures that it had been under-reporting results. Outyear targets will be adjusted accordingly. Trend Data: FY03 = 6,539 acres; FY02 = 8,606 acres; FY01 = 13,808 acres				
	Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS)				
6	DESCRIPTION: Number of stream-miles for which degradation from past surface coal mining has been improved	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	33 miles	28 miles	35 miles	69 miles
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. The goal was exceeded because of the inherent difficulties in setting precise goals for this measure. In this case the results reported are based on 44 projects ranging from 0.02 miles to 5 miles, and 1 project accounting for 35 miles. The Audenreid Mine Drainage Tunnel AML Treatment Project in Pennsylvania attributed to the clean-up of 35 miles of aquatic stream habitat. Project size varies and while we estimate the number of projects per year, the size is variable as evidenced by the data reported this year. The Department is proposing to combine this target with the number of land acres reclaimed in FY 2007 to better represent all reclamation accomplishments from the abandoned mine land appropriation funding.				
	Data Source:	Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS)				
7	DESCRIPTION: Number of surface of acres of water for which degradation from past surface coal mining has been improved	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	36 acres	35 acres	35 acres	32 acres
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. The goal was not met because of the inherent difficulties in setting precise goals for this measure. In this case the results are based on 12 projects ranging from 1 to 17 acres. As with stream miles, projects vary and the size is not always a known factor. The Department is proposing to combine this target with the number of land acres reclaimed in FY 2007 to better represent all reclamation accomplishments from the abandoned mine land appropriation funding. Accomplishments will be better represented as a whole rather than based on a population of relatively few numbers.				
	Steps to Improve:	This measure proposed to be merged with others into a single, more predictable measure that presents an aggregate (i.e., lands and waters) assessment of abandoned mine land reclamation efforts.				
	Data Source:	Abandoned Mine Land Inventory System (AMLIS)				
8	DESCRIPTION: Percent of surface water (MILES) managed by DOI that meet State (EPA approved) water quality standards	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?
		Totals:	89%	95%	95%	95% (E)
	Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
	Data Source:	Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Storage and Retrieval (STORET) national water quality database				

FIGURE 2-5

		FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?	
9	DESCRIPTION: Percent of surface water (ACRES) managed by DOI that meet State (EPA approved) water quality standards	Totals:	Baseline Established	82%	82%	70% (E)	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. Estimated Data. The goal was not met because more accurate data are now being reporting than was reported in prior years. As a result, less data was reported in 2006 than in prior years.				
		Steps to Improve:					
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Storage and Retrieval (STORET) national water quality database				
10	DESCRIPTION: Protect and/or restore X number of surface and ground water systems directly managed or influenced by DOI, as specified in management plans and consistent with applicable Federal and State law, by working with State and local resource managers, as appropriate	Totals:	5 water systems	21,145 water systems	21,155 water systems	21,174 water systems (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
11	DESCRIPTION: Percent of reporting Class I DOI lands that meet ambient air quality standards (NAAQS)	Totals:	80%	83%	82%	85% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); Air Resources Information System (ARIS)				
12	DESCRIPTION: Percent of reporting Class I DOI lands that meet visibility objectives	Totals:	73%	87%	77%	77% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); Air Resources Information System (ARIS)				
<b>INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Restore and maintain proper function to watersheds and landscapes</b>							
13	DESCRIPTION: Percent of acres degraded by wildland fire with post-fire rehabilitation treatments underway, completed, and monitored	Totals:	17%	16%	20%	51% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data. Targets for this measure must be set before the number of acres burned annually can be known. Also unknown is the severity with which those fires burn. Seasonal weather, fuel conditions, geographic factors, and burn severity influence the number of acres needing rehabilitation treatment. More acres were rehabilitated than planned owing to these conditions.				
		Data Source:	National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS)				
14	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres in fire regimes 1, 2, or 3 moved to a better condition class that were identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the 10-Year Implementation Plan - in total	Totals:	294,000 acres	271,551 acres	230,000 acres	217,000 acres (E)	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. Estimated Data. Fire activity and fire-related on-the-ground conditions did not permit DOI to treat as many non-WUI acres as planned, hence, not as many acres were moved to a better condition class.				
		Steps to Improve:	Returning to projected plans for area treatments will be significantly affected by the severity of future fire seasons and the costs involved with addressing the next priority areas to be treated.				
		Data Source:	National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS)				
15	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres in fire regimes 1, 2, or 3 moved to a better condition class that were identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the 10-Year Implementation Plan - as a percent of total acres treated	Totals:	38%	37%	38%	40% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS)				
16	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres in prior measure moved to a better condition class per million dollars of gross investment	Totals:	3,671 acres	3,607 acres	2,973 acres	2,905 acres (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS)				
17	DESCRIPTION: Satisfaction with science information and products	Totals:	100%	100%	> or = 80%	96%	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met.				
		Data Source:	Survey results				

FIGURE 2-5

		FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?	
18	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres treated that are in condition classes 2 or 3 in fire regimes 1 - 3 outside of the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI), and are identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the 10-Year Implementation Plan in total	Totals:	494,000 acres	477,742 acres	373,000 acres	347,000 acres	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. Because of the extreme fire season experienced in 2006, resources were fully committed to fighting fires and were not available to meet all prescribed treatment objectives in areas outside of the Wildland Urban Interface.				
		Steps to Improve:	Returning to projected plans for area treatments will be significantly affected by the severity of future fire seasons and the costs involved with addressing the next priority areas to be treated.				
		Data Source:	National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS).				
19	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres treated that are in condition classes 2 or 3 in fire regimes 1 through 3 outside of Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI), and are identified as high priority through collaboration consistent with the 10-Year Implementation Plan as a percent of all acres treated	Totals:	64%	66%	61%	64% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS).				
20	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres treated outside the WUI per million dollars gross investment	Totals:	9,628 acres	9,655 acres	7,911 acres	7,270 acres	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. The cost effectiveness projected for fire treatments outside of the Wildland Urban Interface were affected by the extreme fire season encountered again in 2006. Resources were fully committed to fighting fires and were not available to address all prescribed treatment objectives in areas outside of the Wildland Urban Interface.				
		Steps to Improve:	Returning to projected plans and efficiencies for area fire treatments will continue to be affected by the severity of future fire seasons and the costs involved with addressing the next priority areas to be treated.				
		Data Source:	National Fire Plan Operating and Reporting System (NFPORS) and Actual Obligation Reports.				
21	DESCRIPTION: Tons of salt loading prevented	Totals:	26,680 tons	22,200 tons	21,000 tons	22,000 tons	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Trend Data: FY03 = 30,393 tons; FY02 = 36,500 tons; FY01 = 36,437 tons				
		Data Source:	Cooperative Agreements				
22	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres achieving watershed and landscape goals through voluntary partnerships	Totals:	770,065 acres	1,004,596 acres	651,087 acres	670,620 acres (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); Habitat Information Tracking System (HabITS)				
23	DESCRIPTION: Number of stream/shoreline miles achieving watershed and landscape goals through voluntary partnerships	Totals:	596 miles	888 miles	658 miles	677 miles (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Habitat Information Tracking System (HabITS)				
24	DESCRIPTION: Percent of known contaminated sites remediated on DOI managed land	Totals:	11%	20%	16%	21% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data. The goal was exceeded because more than the expected number of site remediation projects supported by pre-2006 funding were completed during FY 2006.				
		Data Source:	Environmental Cleanup Liability (ECL) Report; Site Cleanup System; Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Improve information base, information management and technical assistance [Healthy Lands]							
25	DESCRIPTION: Satisfaction scores on resource protection partnerships	Totals:	97%	94%	81%	88%	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. A different set of products is sampled each year, one year's aggregate measurement is not directly linked to the previous year. The intent is to maintain at least an 80% satisfaction level (i.e., 80% or greater is the goal).				
		Data Source:	Survey results				
26	DESCRIPTION: Percent of studies validated through appropriate peer or independent review	Totals:	100%	100%	100%	100%	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met.				
		Data Source:	Survey results; Lists of publication titles maintained				

FIGURE 2-5

END OUTCOME GOAL: Sustain biological communities on DOI managed and influenced lands and waters in a manner consistent with obligations regarding the allocation and use of water							
ID	DESCRIPTION	FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?	
		27	DESCRIPTION: Percent of species of management concern that are managed to self-sustaining levels, in cooperation with affected States and others, as defined in approved management documents	Totals:	No Report	50%	47%
Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. Estimated Data. The goal was not met because of targeting errors. One of the contributing programs (i.e., Fisheries) implemented a new measure-related database in 2006 that prompted a thorough review of the existing fish populations database. Database adjustments were needed to correct errors, and these adjustments rendered the planned goal erroneous, relative to the estimated results.						
Steps to Improve:							
Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Fisheries Information System						
28	DESCRIPTION: Percent of threatened or endangered species listed a decade or more that are stabilized or improved	Totals:	38%	37%	38%	43%	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Trend Data: FY03 = 42%; FY02 = 45%; FY01 = 52%				
		Data Source:	NPS Endangered Species Database; Environmental Conservation Online System; Threatened and Endangered Species database				
29	DESCRIPTION: Percent of candidate species where listing is unnecessary as a result of conservation actions or agreements	Totals:	1%	1%	1%	1%	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met.				
		Data Source:	Environmental Conservation Online System; Threatened and Endangered Species database				
30	DESCRIPTION: Percent of baseline area infested with invasive plant species that is controlled	Totals:	9%	2%	1%	2% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
31	DESCRIPTION: Percent of invasive animal species populations that are controlled	Totals:	No Report	Baseline Established	5.30%	7.9% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); NPS Species database and individual park records				
INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Create habitat conditions for biological communities to flourish							
32	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres restored or enhanced to achieve habitat conditions to support species conservation consistent with management documents, program objectives, and consistent with substantive and procedural requirements of State and Federal water law	Totals:	3,590,005 acres	383,478 acres	473,757 acres	487,670 acres (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Fisheries Information System; North American Wetlands Conservation Fund database; MIS: Rollup of Program Element JA, JD, JE, JF, JL, JM, JN, JQ, JR, JS, JT, JU, and JW (for all sub-activities)				
33	DESCRIPTION: Number of stream/shoreline miles restored or enhanced to achieve habitat conditions to support species conservation consistent with management documents, program objectives, and consistent with substantive and procedural requirements of State and Federal water law	Totals:	1,145 miles	1,313 miles	1,666 miles	1,685 miles (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Fisheries Information Management System; MIS: Rollup of Program Element JG (for all sub-activities)				
34	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres of landscapes and watersheds managed through partnerships and networked lands that achieve habitat protection	Totals:	9,374,196 acres	11,401,772 acres	14,371,034 acres	14,802,165 acres (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Federal Assistance Information Management System (FAIMS); North American Wetlands Conservation Fund database				
35	DESCRIPTION: Number of acres achieving habitat/biological community goals through voluntary agreements	Totals:	77,140 acres	89,556 acres	81,251 acres	83,689 acres (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Habitat Information Tracking System (HabiTS)				

FIGURE 2-5

		FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?	
36	DESCRIPTION: Number of stream/shoreline miles achieving habitat/biological community goals through voluntary agreements	<b>Totals:</b>	Baseline Not Established	Baseline Not Established	9 stream-shoreline miles	5 stream-shoreline miles (E)	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. Estimated Data. It is likely that the goal was not met because of a difference between the number of stream/shoreline miles restored/enhanced that were reported and the actual work accomplished by some restoration grant recipients. The resulting under-report of accomplishments is due in part to DOI inability to accurately extract stream/shoreline mile restoration/enhancement information from the data that grant cooperators report to us (i.e., restoration site data). Another factor that may have contributed to under-reporting of results is a technical weakness in the database that is used to manage the results data.				
		Steps to Improve:	The database issue is now being resolved.				
		Data Source:	Federal Assistance Information Management System (FAIMS)				
<b>INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Improve information base, information management and technical assistance [Sustain Biology]</b>							
37	DESCRIPTION: Satisfaction scores on resource protection partnerships	<b>Totals:</b>	98%	100%	> or = 80%	83%	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met.				
		Data Source:	Survey results				
38	DESCRIPTION: Percent of studies validated through appropriate peer review or independent review	<b>Totals:</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met.				
		Data Source:	Lists of publication titles maintained				
39	DESCRIPTION: Conservation and biological research facilities are in fair to good condition as measured by the Facilities Condition Index	<b>Totals:</b>	0.063	0.087	0.100	0.063 (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); Fisheries Information Management System; Condition Assessment Data				
<b>END OUTCOME GOAL: Protect cultural and natural heritage resources</b>							
40	DESCRIPTION: Percent of cultural properties on DOI inventory in good condition	<b>Totals:</b>	65%	57%	58%	59% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); Fisheries Information Management System; Condition Assessment Data; List of Classified Structures (LCS), Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI), and Archeological Sites Management Information System (ASMIS)				
41	DESCRIPTION: Percent of collections in DOI inventory in good condition	<b>Totals:</b>	43%	49%	36%	33% (E)	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Not Met. Estimated Data. The reason the goal was not met is that updated programmatic guidance issued by one of the contributing bureaus to its contributing programs included better explanations and metrics for the field to determine the condition of its collections. This information was not considered fully when the goal for this measure was established, and the result was unrealistically high expectations.				
		Steps to Improve:					
		Data Source:	Automated National Catalog System (ANCS database), Collections Management Report; Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP), Fisheries Information System, Condition Assessment Data, 411 DM Checklists				
42	DESCRIPTION: Percent of participating cultural properties owned by others in good condition	<b>Totals:</b>	5%	5%	5%	5% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	National Historic Landmarks Database				
43	DESCRIPTION: Percent of paleontologic localities in DOI inventory in good condition	<b>Totals:</b>	41%	57%	52%	85% (E)	✓
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data. The goal was exceeded because one of the reporting bureaus acquired from non-Federal repositories additional data about paleontological resources on DOI lands. Trend Data: FY03 = 48%; FY02 = 45%; FY01 = 23%				
		Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				

FIGURE 2-5

		FY2004 Actual	FY2005 Actual	FY2006 Plan	FY2006 Actual	Goal Met?	
44	DESCRIPTION: Percent of Special Management Areas meeting their heritage resource objectives under the authorizing legislation	Totals:	29%	73%	60%	65% (E)	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Exceeded. Estimated Data. The goal was exceeded because a greater than expected number of Herd Management Areas and wild and scenic rivers segments achieved their legislative objectives during FY 2006.				
		Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
<b>INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Manage special management areas for natural heritage resource objectives</b>							
45	DESCRIPTION: Percent of Indian and Alaska Native students demonstrating knowledge of native language, history and customs	Totals:	Baseline Established	76%	88%	No Report	
		Performance Explanation:	No Report. No Data.				
		Data Source:	OIEP Center for School Improvement; Annual Consolidated School Report Form				
<b>INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Reduce degradation and protect cultural and natural heritage resources</b>							
46	DESCRIPTION: Percent of acres of designated wilderness achieving wilderness character objectives as specified by statute	Totals:	85%	89%	74%	74% (E)	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Performance Management Data System (PMDS); Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP)				
<b>INTERMEDIATE GOAL: Increase partnerships, volunteer opportunities, and stakeholder satisfaction</b>							
47	DESCRIPTION: Facilities are in fair to good condition as measured by the Facilities Condition Index	Totals:	0.118	0.202	0.208	0.202 (E)	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met. Estimated Data.				
		Data Source:	Refuges Annual Performance Plan (RAPP); Facility Management Software System (FMSS)				
48	DESCRIPTION: Partner satisfaction scores with DOI on cultural and heritage resource partnerships	Totals:	Baseline Established	No Report	82%	84%	
		Performance Explanation:	Goal Met.				
		Data Source:	WO 830 Survey results				