

Fisheries

Program Code 10003733

Program Title Fish and Wildlife Service - Fisheries

Department Name Department of the Interior

Agency/Bureau Name United States Fish and Wildlife Service

Program Type(s) Competitive Grant Program
Regulatory-based Program
Research and Development Program

Assessment Year 2006

Assessment Rating Effective

Assessment Section Scores	Section	Score
	Program Purpose & Design	80%
	Strategic Planning	81%
	Program Management	90%
	Program Results/Accountability	87%

Program Funding Level (in millions)	FY2007	\$118
	FY2008	\$126
	FY2009	\$117

- Ongoing Program Improvement Plans
- Completed Program Improvement Plans
- Program Performance Measures
- Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)

Ongoing Program Improvement Plans

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
------------	------------------	--------	----------

2006	By September 30, 2007, DOI/FWS will reach a final an agreement between the Corps of Engineers and the Fish and Wildlife Service regarding full reimbursement for mitigation activities, products, and services provided by the Fisheries program.	Action taken, but not completed	Initial attempts to contact COE personnel were not eventful. To address 2008 OMB Passback mandates, the COE contacted DOI in late 2007 and agreed to meet in 2008 to discuss a reimbursement initiative package for FY 2010.
------	---	---------------------------------	--

Completed Program Improvement Plans

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
2006	Aggressively seek full reimbursement from Corps of Engineers for hatchery operations and maintenance expenses associated with Federal water projects where the FWS provides fish, eggs, or Fisheries program products and services. By Feb. 28, 2007, the FWS, in conjunction with the Department, will approach the Army Corps of Engineers to obtain full reimbursement.	Completed	'08 House Interior and E&W reports direct the relevant agencies to seek reimbursement. Contact has been made with Corps of Engineers' (COE) External Affairs Office concerning mitigation reimbursement. The Department of Interior has facilitated the identification of appropriate COE personnel to work with.
2006	Draft legislation to authorize FWS to open, close, change, move, and consolidate hatcheries as GAO recommended by September 1, 2007.	Completed	DRAFT FISHERIES ORGANIC LEGISLATION INCLUDES LANGUAGE PERTAINING TO THIS ISSUE AND HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY FWS CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS (CLA). FISHERIES IS ACTIVELY WORKING WITH ITS PARTNERS TO IMPROVE THE DRAFT. THE DRAFT LEGISLATION HAS NOT BEEN SUBMITTED TO FWS DIRECTOR'S OFFICE FOR ACTION.
2006	Develop schematic and explanation of the relationship between the specific annual goals and the long term goals (including targets) by January 15, 2007.	Completed	The Fisheries Performance Schematic Diagram was E-mailed to OMB on 4/11/2007. The Fisheries Program was to modify the schematic to reflect the 2007-2012 Department of Interior Strategic Plan and revised FWS Operational Plan; however since there were no major changes in the DOI Strategic Plan or the FWS Ops Plan that affected the Fisheries PART measures, we decided not to revise the schematic diagram nor re-send it to Mike Hickey. We consider this Action Plan completed. (July 31, 2007).
2006	Develop budget narratives that more explicitly link requested funding to annual	Completed	Bureau considers OMB Follow-Up Action 4.0 completed. The FY2008 President's Request included the Fisheries Program budget restructuring proposal.

	<p>and long-term performance targets.</p> <p>Include in budget request narratives an explanation defining the relationship between requested funding and performance. Include in performance tables: 1) previous fiscal year goals. 2) how requested funding will ensure achievement of long-term goals (February 2007).</p>	
2006	<p>Assess Fish Technology Center (FTC) program efforts in relation to other programs that have similar goals. The assessment should, by October 2006, increase level of external participation in evaluation process by October 2006 and the protocols should be revised by December 2006 to include a comparison of FTC activities with outside entities.</p>	<p>Completed FISH TECHNOLOGY CENTER (FTC) PROTOCOLS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO INCLUDE EXTERNAL PARTICIPANTS AND THE FISHERIES AGENCY REVIEWED THE DRAFT PROTOCOLS IN MARCH 2007.</p>
2006	<p>Seventy-five percent (75) of all Project Leaders, program-wide, will have specific, measurable program performance measures in their FY 2007 individual performance plans that cascade from program goals (including specific targets) by June 30, 2007.</p>	<p>Completed Regional examples have been compiled. Representative samples were provided to OMB Examiner Mike Hickey on Monday July 23, 2007. Bureau considers this Action Plan completed.</p>
2006	<p>Draft legislation to authorize FWS to obtain full reimbursement from agencies for hatchery operations and maintenance expenses associated with federal water projects by September 1, 2007.</p>	<p>Completed DRAFT FISHERIES ORGANIC LEGISLATION INCLUDES MITIGATION LANGUAGE THAT HAS BEEN REVIEWED BY FWS CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS (CLA). FISHERIES IS ACTIVELY WORKING WITH ITS PARTNERS TO IMPROVE THE DRAFT. THE DRAFT LEGISLATION HAS NOT BEEN SUBMITTED TO FWS DIRECTOR'S OFFICE FOR ACTION.</p>

2006	FY 2009 budget request and justifications will be based on the needs to achieve self-sustaining population and other outcome goals.	Completed	The FY09 Fisheries Program Budget Request (May 2007) prioritizes activities based on FWS Focal Areas that will maximize total self-sustaining populations. Funding is proposed for assessment activities to evaluate projects and develop more accurate scientific data on populations (i.e., condition, trend) that will allow the program to prioritize management of populations that are on the verge of attaining a self-sustaining biological status.
2006	Initiate a pilot project (within existing funds in Service Region 6) that complies with OMB Circular A-11 guidance to demonstrate Performance Budgeting that explicitly ties accomplishments of annual and long-term goals with the budget request.	Completed	The pilot project has been initiated in Region 6 and is ongoing.
2006	Report comparison of Fish Technology Center benefits with other similar efforts by October 31, 2007.	Completed	FISH TECHNOLOGY CENTER (FTC) PROTOCOLS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO INCLUDE EXTERNAL PARTICIPANTS AND THE FISHERIES ARDS REVIEWED THE PROTOCOLS IN MARCH 2007. THE WARM SPRINGS FTC REVIEW WAS ACCOMPLISHED AND THE REPORT HAS BEEN COMPLETED. AN ELECTRONIC COPY WAS TRANSMITTED TO THE WO DIVISION OF THE NATIONAL FISH HATCHERY SYSTEM ON DEC. 18, 2007 AND WAS TRANSMITTED TO OMB ON DEC. 19, 2007.
2006	Provide program-wide templates for performance and accountability in Performance Plans for Fisheries Managers down to the Project Leader level for FY 2007 by October 1, 2006.	Completed	Bureau considers OMB Follow-Up Action 12.0 completed. Examples have been compiled and WO staff did lead the discussions at the March 2007 ARD meeting.
2006	Provide final FY 2007 performance targets to ARDs when Regional funding allocations are made (Approximately January 2007).	Completed	Performance metric targets were provided to the Regions on May 1, 2007.

Program Performance Measures

Term	Type
------	------

Long-term

Outcome

Measure: % of populations of aquatic threatened and endangered species (T&E) that are self-sustaining in the wild.

Explanation: Numerator: # of aquatic T&E species populations that are self-sustaining in the wild, as prescribed in Recovery plans. (self-sustaining = capable of maintaining itself independently, no augmentation of hatchery or out-of-basin fish; the genetic complement is sufficient; and habitat requirements are met without further human intervention). Denominator: # of aquatic T&E aquatic species populations for which the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility. The large increase in performance from the 2004 Actual (67/451) to 2008 Target (142/516) is an informational change, and not the apparent doubling of self-sustaining T&E populations over the time period. Data were updated in the Fisheries Information System (FIS) to reflect information obtained from field population assessments, changes in listing status, revisions to management plans, etc. As a result of the new information, populations in the 2004 FIS were split into more appropriate refined sub-groups and new populations were added. For example, in 2004, one population of greenback cutthroat trout was described in FIS as the "Rocky Mountain National Park" population. Two additional entries of greenback cutthroat were included in the 2005 FIS to report the Arkansas River and South Platte River populations. To improve management of cutthroat trout throughout the Region, they were subsequently split into 40 new populations that described specific locations in the National Park or distinct segments of the river. Many T&E populations with an "unknown" biological "self-sustaining" status in 2004 were determined to be self-sustaining in 2005 and 2006 using updated field assessments. The Program continues to make progress on this long-term outcome measure as additional population assessment information is obtained, and management strategies are appropriately developed in response.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	n/a	15%
2007	10%	10%
2008	10%	
2009		

Long-term

Outcome

Measure: % of populations of aquatic threatened and endangered species (T&E) with known biological status that are self-sustaining in the wild.

Explanation: Numerator: # of aquatic T&E species populations that are self-sustaining in the wild, as prescribed in Recovery plans. (self-sustaining = capable of maintaining itself independently, no

augmentation of hatchery or out-of-basin fish; the genetic complement is sufficient; and habitat requirements are met without further human intervention). Denominator: # of aquatic T&E aquatic species populations for which the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility, and for which biological status is known. Data begins with a 2005 Target (110/138). The Program did not collect information on "self-sustaining" status in FIS until 2005. Data was obtained in 2004 directly from the Regions on the status of T&E populations (refer to previous outcome measure), however, only self-sustaining populations were indicated. The information did not include populations that were "NOT" self-sustaining, nor did it include those populations with an "UNKNOWN" status. The increase in performance over time results from the addition of populations into the denominator of "KNOWN" status (either 'YES' self-sustaining, or 'NO' not self-sustaining) . Actual values in 2005 (113/150) reflect an additional 12 populations that became of "KNOWN" status, 3 of those were determined to be self-"sustaining". Targets set for 2006 (142/185), 2007 (142/185), and 2008 (142/185), reflect the addition of 37 populations of Greenback Cutthroat Trout to the database in 2006, 35 of those determined to be "self-sustaining". This intermediate long-term outcome measure is a subset of the previous outcome measure for T&E populations, and was established to track the progress of only those populations in which biological status is known.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	49%	75%
2006	77%	31%
2007	31%	34%
2008	31%	
2009		

Annual Output

Measure: % of aquatic T&E populations managed or influenced by the Fisheries Program for which current status (e.g., quantity and quality) and trend is known.

Explanation: Numerator: # of aquatic T&E populations for which current biological status and trend is known, due in whole or in part to Fisheries involvement. Current is within the last five years or as specified in an approved plan. Trend refers to changes in abundance over time. Populations with unknown biological status or trend are not included. Denominator: # of aquatic T&E populations where the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility. Denominator increase from 2005 Actual (62/479) to 2006 Target (62/516) can be attributed to the addition of 37 Greenback Cutthroat Trout populations in Region 6. Splitting these populations will improve management and

contribute additional data to long-term assessment of the species.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	n/a	13%
2006	12%	51%
2007	48%	50%
2008	48%	
2009		

Annual Output

Measure: % of aquatic T&E populations managed or influenced by the Fisheries Program with approved Recovery plans.

Explanation: Numerator: # of aquatic T&E populations with Recovery plans, due in whole or in part to Fisheries Program involvement. Denominator: # of aquatic T&E populations where the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility. As in the previous measure, the addition of 37 Greenback Cutthroat Trout populations to the FIS database change the denominator in 2005 (228/479) to a value of (228/516). No additional Recovery Plans are anticipated to be approved at this time.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	n/a	48%
2006	44%	81%
2007	81%	81%
2008	81%	
2009		

Annual Output

Measure: % of tasks implemented as prescribed in Recovery plans.

Explanation: Numerator: Total number of Recovery plan tasks implemented by the Fisheries Program. Denominator: Total # of tasks for which the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility and that are prescribed in Recovery plans. Performance values are: 2004 Actual (116/195), 2005 Target (120/195), 2005 Actual (155/202), 2006 Target (180/270), 2007

Target (197/270), and 2008 Target (197/270). The Program plans to implement an additional 17 Recovery plan tasks in the next fiscal year.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	n/a	59%
2005	62%	77%
2006	67%	54%
2007	54%	49%
2008	54%	
2009		

Long-term Outcome **Measure:** % of populations of native aquatic non-T&E species that are self-sustaining in the wild, as prescribed in management plans.

Explanation: Numerator - # of populations of native aquatic non-T&E and non-candidate species that are self-sustaining in the wild, as prescribed in management plans (self-sustaining = capable of maintaining itself independently, no augmentation of hatchery or out-of-basin fish; the genetic complement is sufficient; and habitat requirements are met without further human intervention. Management plans = fishery management plans, restoration plans, cooperative agreements, memoranda of understanding, etc.) Denominator - Total # of native aquatic non-T&E and non-candidate populations for which the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility. Performance values are as follows: 2004 Actual (258/1165), 2005 Target (258/1165), 2005 Actual (266/1165), 2006 Target (276/1165), 2007 Target (276/1165), 2008 Target (276/1165). Increase in performance from 2005 to 2006 reflects an increase in knowledge on the biological status of non-listed populations ('unknown' status to 'self-sustaining'), and also the change in status of populations from 'Depleted' to 'self-sustaining'. The Program anticipates continued progress toward self-sustaining non-T&E populations.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	n/a	22%
2005	22%	23%
2006	24%	16%

2007	11%	25%
2008	11%	
2009		

Annual Output

Measure: % of populations of native aquatic non-T&E species managed or influenced by the Fisheries Program for which current status (e.g., quantity and quality) and trend is known.

Explanation: Numerator: # of native aquatic non-T&E and non-candidate populations for which current biological status and trend is known, due in whole or in part to Fisheries involvement. Current is within the last five years or as specified in an approved plan. Trend refers to changes in abundance over time. Do not include populations with unknown biological status or trend. Denominator: Total # of native aquatic non-T&E and non-candidate populations where the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility. Performance values are as follows: 2004 Actual (392/1165), 2005 Target (392/1165), 2005 Actual (394/1165), 2006 Target (394/1165), 2007 Target (394/1165), 2008 Target (394/1165). The Program does not anticipate this measure to fluctuate due to the fact that it relates directly to the number of assessments completed.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	n/a	34%
2005	34%	34%
2006	34%	31%
2007	32%	34%
2008	32%	
2009		

Annual Output

Measure: % of populations of native aquatic non T&E species with approved management plans.

Explanation: Numerator: # of native aquatic non T&E and non-candidate populations with approved management plans (management plans = fishery management plans, restoration plans, cooperative agreements, memoranda of understanding, etc). Denominator: Total # of native aquatic non T&E and non-candidate populations for which the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility. The Program anticipates approving management plans to support and additional 126 populations over the next two years. Performance is as follows: 2004 Actual (538/1165), 2005

Target (538/1165), 2005 Actual (543/1165), 2006 Target (602/1165), 2007 Target(634/1165), 2008 Target(727/1165).

Year	Target	Actual
2004	n/a	46%
2005	46%	47%
2006	52%	51%
2007	51%	58%
2008	51%	
2009		

Annual Output **Measure:** % of tasks implemented as prescribed in management plans.

Explanation: Numerator: Total # of management plan tasks that are implemented by the Fisheries Program (management plans = fishery management plans, restoration plans, cooperative agreements, memoranda of understanding, etc.). Denominator: Total # of tasks for which the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility and that are prescribed in management plans. Performance described as follows: 2004 Actual (495/748), 2005 Target (505/748), 2005 Actual (413/572), 2006 Target (459/1080), 2007 Target (488/1080), 2008 Target (488/1080). Inflation in the denominator of this measure and apparent decrease in targeted performance reflect the revision of the measure to also include 'other' tasks implemented under Fishery Management Plans that differ from post-stocking survival tasks and marking and tagging tasks.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	n/a	66%
2005	68%	72%
2006	43%	47%
2007	47%	46%
2008	47%	

2009

Annual Output

Measure: # of activities conducted to support the management/control of aquatic invasive species.

Explanation: Includes discrete and separate activities to develop an invasive species management plan, activities to implement such a plan, and other activities which support the management and control of aquatic invasive species (e.g. an individual workshop on control). Unlike the extermination objective of rapid response, the objective for control and management is to prevent further spread of or reduce the population of an established species. Education/ outreach activities specifically focused on the control of a certain species would be counted here instead of the general education/outreach measure.

Year	Target	Actual
2004	n/a	40
2005	41	41
2006	42	42
2007	43	43
2008	43	
2009		

Long-term

Outcome

Measure: % of fish populations at levels sufficient to provide quality recreational fishing opportunities.

Explanation: Numerator: # of fish populations for which the Fisheries Program has a defined statutory or programmatic responsibility, that currently provide recreational fishing opportunities. (Populations is defined as self-sustaining populations of recreational fish species. Populations that are depleted (below management goals) would not be counted). (Programmatic responsibility is defined for those populations under specific agreements or MOUs with State and Tribal authorities). Denominator: Total # fish populations, representing recreational fish species for which the Fisheries Program has a defined statutory or programmatic responsibility, that potentially provide recreational fishing opportunities. This measure was established with the approval from partners and stakeholders, and responds directly to the strategic goals of the Program, specifically to support recreational fishing. Performance for this measure is as follows: 2005 Actual (201/990), 2006 Target

(201/990), 2007 Target (201/990), 2008 Target (201/990).

Year	Target	Actual
2005	n/a	20%
2006	20%	26%
2007	26%	25%
2008	26%	
2009		

Long-term Outcome **Measure:** # of waters where the Fisheries Program provides recreational fishing opportunities to mitigate the impacts of Federal water development projects.

Explanation:

Year	Target	Actual
2005	n/a	221
2006	241	221
2007	221	221
2008	221	
2009		

Annual Efficiency **Measure:** Pounds/dollar (lbs/\$) of healthy rainbow trout produced for recreation.

Explanation : Numerator: Total pounds of healthy rainbow trout produced by the major rainbow trout national fish hatcheries within the Fisheries Program. Healthy fish are defined as trout of good overall quality that contribute significantly to recreational fishing. Denominator: Total cost to produce rainbow trout at the major rainbow trout national fish hatcheries within the Fisheries Program. All direct and indirect costs (including maintenance) are included. Reporting year (05) \$/lb compared to base years (01/02/03) avg.; reason for reduced efficiency: labor up 19%, utilities up 58% even after adjmt. to CY04 \$; total expenses increased 12% from \$5.2 M to \$5.8 M. Measure should be \$/lb.

Year	Target	Actual
------	--------	--------

2005	.37lb/\$1	.33lb/\$1
2006	.35lb/\$1	.33lb/\$1
2007	.35lb/\$1	.33lb/\$1
2008	.35lb/\$1	
2009		

Annual Output **Measure:** % of mitigation tasks implemented as prescribed in approved management plans.

Explanation : Numerator: Total # of mitigation tasks that are implemented by the Fisheries Program as prescribed in approved management plans. (Management plans = mitigation plans, fishery management plans, restoration plans, cooperative agreements, memoranda of understanding, etc. (does not include Recovery plans)). Denominator: Total # of mitigation tasks for which the Fisheries Program has a statutory or programmatic responsibility and that are prescribed in approved plans.

Year	Target	Actual
2005	42%	90%
2006	54%	67%
2007	67%	73%
2008	67%	
2009		

Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design			
Number	Question	Answer	Score
1.1	<p>Is the program purpose clear?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The purpose of the Fisheries Program (Program) is to conserve, maintain, restore, and recover native aquatic species and help ensure opportunities for their sustainable use and enjoyment by the American public. The Program's mission is "Working with partners to restore and maintain fish and other aquatic resources at self-sustaining</p>	YES	20%

levels and to support federal mitigation programs for the benefit of the American public," as stated in the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan. The Program has primary responsibility for conserving freshwater populations while the Department of Commerce-National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has the lead for conserving marine populations.

Evidence: The Fisheries Program Vision for the Future (March 2004), the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 (January 2006), and FWS Regional Strategic Plans all describe the Fisheries Program purpose. The split jurisdiction between DOI and DOC is authorized and clarified in a number of documents including the Reorganization Plan Numbered 4 of 1970, Memorandum of Understanding between DOI and DOC on Jurisdictional Responsibilities and Listing Procedures Under the Endangered Species Act (1974).

1.2

Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest, or need?

YES 20%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program helps to recover and restore native aquatic species populations and their aquatic habitat. Native aquatic species and their habitat have been under increasing pressure from harvest, habitat destruction, and invasive species for many years resulting in severe declines. Since 1900, 123 aquatic freshwater species have become extinct in North America. Of the 822 native freshwater fish species in the U.S., 39% are at risk of extinction. Of the 115 fish species and populations listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), none have ever been removed from the ESA list through recovery. Freshwater aquatic species declines are linked to habitat loss or alteration and the impacts of harmful exotic or transplanted aquatic species. Healthy stream and riparian habitats are critical to the sustainability of all aquatic resources. Nationwide, 53% of all wetlands and 66% of riparian (streamside) habitat has been lost. Today, 185 species of fish and 91 species of mollusks found in the U.S. have been introduced from every continent except Antarctica.

Evidence: The following literature documents are a sample of information discussing the existing problem of aquatic species decline in the United States: Stein, B.A. and S.R. Flack. 1997. 1997 Species Report Card: The Status of U.S. Plants and Animals. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, Virginia; Ricciardi, A. and J. B. Rasmussen. 1999. Extinction Rates of North American Freshwater Fauna. Conservation Biology 13(5):1220-1222; Status and

Trends of Wetlands in the Conterminous US 1986-1997; National Academy of Sciences
2002 Report on Riparian Areas; Fuller, P.L., L.G. Nico, and J.D. Williams. 1999.
Nonindigenous fishes introduced into inland waters of the United States. American Fisheries
Society, Special Publication 27, Bethesda, Maryland; and the U.S. Congress, Office of
Technology Assessment, Harmful Non-Indigenous Species in the United States, OTA-F-565
(Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1993).

1.3

**Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other
Federal, state, local or private effort?**

YES 20%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) is designed to complement, rather than duplicate, the roles of State, Tribal, private, and other Federal fisheries conservation efforts. The Program is the only Federal fish propagation program that fulfills responsibilities at a national level for recovery of threatened and endangered aquatic species and restoration of self-sustaining native aquatic populations. Private hatcheries primarily raise fish for stocking in privately owned waters and for commercial food markets. State hatcheries generally culture fish for recreational fishing and commercial harvest within their jurisdictions. State programs stock and manage fish only within their jurisdictions, whereas the Program is responsible for co-managing species and populations that cross state and international boundaries. The Program does not duplicate the work of Tribal fishery managers. The Program supports Tribal self-determination and the development of Tribal capabilities to manage fishery resources. Tribal hatcheries generally culture fish species for commercial harvest and recreational fishing for the benefit of Tribal communities. As part of its Federal Trust responsibility, the Program provides cultured fish where tribes do not have their own propagation capabilities. The Program is also the only Federal entity that regulates importation and interstate transport of nonnative vertebrate species listed as injurious wildlife in order to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive species through human movement. The Program works pursuant to Congressional authorization with the Department of Commerce-National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to fulfill complementary roles for managing anadromous populations such as Atlantic salmon and striped bass. Fish passage activities conducted by NOAA, the U.S. Forest Service, the U.S. FWS Partners program and the Fisheries Program are complementary to fish conservation. NOAA confines fish passage projects to a grant process, USFS fish passage projects are limited to FS lands, and the Partners program fish passage projects are limited to private lands. National fish passage needs are so great that a complementary effort by

more than one agency is appropriate. The Program implements on-the-ground recovery actions identified in Recovery Plans for aquatic species and populations listed as candidate, threatened, and endangered under the Endangered Species Act. The Recovery plans are written by the Service's Endangered Species program.

Evidence: Although several trout species are reared in private hatcheries for sportfishing, the culture of trout for food is restricted largely to the rainbow trout. (North Carolina Cooperative Extension web site; <http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/copubs/ag/aqua/trout/001/>). Federal hatcheries are the primary broodstock and production facilities for lake trout in the Great Lakes. The Program is the only entity stocking lake trout on historic offshore spawning reefs. State stocking occurs near shore where the fish are more susceptible to predation and fishing pressure. Lake trout represent a small portion of the fish reared and stocked by States since most of their hatchery space is dedicated to rearing Pacific salmon for recreational fishing ("Federal Hatcheries and the Restoration of the Great Lakes Fishery", Statement of Gerald A. Barnhart, Chairman of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, before the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans, May 24, 2006; and "Genetic Evaluation of the Great Lakes Lake Trout Hatchery Program", Page et al 2005, Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 134: 872-89). The Program is the only Federal entity managing interjurisdictional salmon stocks and contributing funding to activities managing salmon stocks (harvest and returns) originating from the Yukon River in Canada (Yukon River Salmon Treaty Outlining the Responsibilities between the U.S. and Canada, December 2002). The Program also manages the Atlantic coast-wide striped bass tagging program, the Mississippi River paddlefish tagging database, and the Great Lakes stocking database (<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/marylandfisheries/cruise.htm>, http://www.fws.gov/midwest/columbiainfisheries/reports/1998_MICRA_Paddlefish_Report.pdf, <http://www.glf.org/fishstocking/index.htm>). State and Tribal efforts are complementary, and not duplicative of Program activities. For example, a Memorandum of Understanding, dated April 28, 2006, between the FWS, the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapahoe tribes, and the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (with reference to an original memorandum dated Aug. 25, 1941, still in effect), documents how the Program provides management expertise and works collaboratively with the tribes to carry out conservation activities. Injurious wildlife provisions of the Lacey Act of 1900 (18 U.S.C. 42) demonstrate that the Program is the sole authority to regulate wildlife species determined to be injurious. Recovery activities for species at the San Marcos/Comal Springs Complex and for Gulf Sturgeon show the unique contributions of the Program and are documented in respective recovery plans (Gulf

Sturgeon Recovery/Management Plan Implementation Schedule, Sept. 22, 1995 and San Marcos Comal (Revised) Recovery Plan Implementation Schedule, Feb. 14, 1996).

1.4

Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

NO 0%

Explanation: Over the years, many specific legislative authorities have created mechanisms and responsibilities for establishing, funding, and operating national fish hatcheries as part of the Fisheries Program. The Government Accounting Office (GAO) found numerous legal mandates that require the Service to meet a multitude of goals that sometimes conflict. GAO recommended legislative changes to the design of the Program's National Fish Hatchery System (NFHS) so that the Service would have the flexibility to open, close, change, move, and consolidate hatcheries to help target resources. In some instances, these mandates required establishing and maintaining hatcheries that are in locations that are no longer suitable to achieve production goals, and according to GAO, have resulted in compromised fish quality. Recognizing that the numerous legal mandates have led to inefficiencies and a decline in performance, GAO recommended legislative changes to the design of the NFHS so that the Services would have the flexibility to open, close, change, move, and consolidate hatcheries to help target resources. The inability to open and move hatcheries has been cited as a major design flaw by the NFHS in the past two PART assessments of the NFHS. Congress continues to control the opening and transferring of hatcheries as evidenced by two recent hatchery transfer bills (H.R. 5061 Paint Bank and Wytheville National Fish Hatcheries Conveyance Act and H.R. 4957 Tylersville Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act) which the Service supported in testimony. GAO also identified another design flaw related to the Service's inability, in some instances, to receive funds from federal water development agencies or project beneficiaries for hatchery operations and maintenance expenses associated with federal water projects. GAO recommended that the Service be provided the authority to obtain reimbursement from the agencies or beneficiaries to support these costs. These cost-sharing recommendations have been repeatedly called for in various reports since 1985. The SFBPC recommended that Program complete negotiations to receive cost recovery from responsible parties, seek costs to cover infrastructure needs as well as operations, and reconcile differences in mitigation costs. While the Service and the Bureau of Reclamation have worked to have full cost-recovery, discussions with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are still in their infancy.

Evidence: GAO's GAO/RCED-00-151, June 2000, NATIONAL FISH HATCHERIES: Authority Needed to Better Align Operations With Priorities, p. 16-17; '... to allow the Service to more efficiently and effectively align its operations with congressional directed priorities, we recommend that the Congress authorize the Service to open, close, change, move, and consolidate hatcheries. . . we recommend that the Congress provide the Service with clear authority to seek reimbursement from federal water development agencies and/or project beneficiaries for all hatchery operation and maintenance expenses associated with such projects.' See also pages 4-5. Also, Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report Programmatic Evaluation of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Fisheries Program, FY 2004, pp. 4-5,45-48; A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation: Report of the Fisheries Program Strategic Plan Steering Committee to the SFBPC, January 2002. Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council Report (SFBPC), Saving A System in Peril: A special Report on the National Fish Hatchery System, September 2000. FY 2000 House Appropriations Report. Recommendations from FWS Stakeholders Meetings, 1996-1997. Report of the National Fish Hatchery Review Panel, December, 1994. FWS review of its Fishery Resources Program in 1985, cited in "Saving A System in Peril". H.R. 4957 and H.R. 5061 are two hatchery transfer bills introduced on March 14 and March 30, 2006, respectively, that direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey three Program hatchery facilities to the states of Pennsylvania and Virginia. Testimony from the Assistant Director-Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, on June 15, 2006, also supports the facility transfers. The Report on the Status of the Department of the Interior's Efforts to Convert Fish and Wildlife Service Mitigation Fisheries into Full Cost Recovery Operations (July 2005) indicates that the Department believes it has resolved mitigation cost recovery issues between Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

1.5

Is the program design effectively targeted so that resources will address the program's purpose directly and will reach intended beneficiaries?

YES 20%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) is designed to conserve, restore, enhance, manage, and protect the Nation's aquatic resources for the benefit of all Americans, including the angling community and others that value our natural heritage. The Program uses the Fisheries Information System, including the Fisheries Operational Needs System database to target resources toward specific projects and programs. The Program is implemented by over 150 facilities strategically distributed nationwide that enable effective targeting of aquatic resource conservation at a local scale. These facilities comprise a

network that is unique in its geographic coverage, its array of technical and managerial capabilities, and its ability to work across political boundaries to embrace a national and international perspective. The Program is also the Service's primary contributor to the National Fish Habitat Action Plan, which utilizes regional Fish Habitat Partnerships to prioritize conservation actions and measure results.

Evidence: The National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 (January 2006), Regional Strategic Plans, and the National Fish Habitat Action Plan (2006) all illustrate how the Program uses defined focus areas and goals to set annual and long-term targets. A Director's Memorandum, dated February 27, 2006 provides guidance for targeting resources using the National Fish Habitat Initiative funds. The Report from the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (SFBPC), A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation provides a map of Program facilities that illustrates the geographic coverage of the Program. The large geographic scope allows the Program to effectively target resources through coordination across state boundaries and cooperation across major fisheries management and conservation initiatives (pp. 7,13, and pp. 10-11, January 2002). Examples of funded FY 2004-2007 Fisheries Operational Needs System projects show how Program activities are linked to National Fisheries Strategic Plan goals and objectives. The Aquatic Nuisance Species (ANS) Program guidance (1994) provides a comprehensive framework for an effective, National effort to reduce introductions of ANS and ensure prompt detection and control of ANS. The annual ANS Allocation Memorandum provides similar guidance to the Regional ANS coordinators (example ANS Allocation Memorandum). The 2005 Memorandum of Agreement between FWS, USGS, and IAFWA establishes the FWS involvement in partnership drug approval efforts targeted at public and private aquaculture in the United States. The partner-based Aquatic Animal Drug Approval Partnership Program is designed to target and maximize the effectiveness of the Program's National Fish Hatchery System's Fish Health Centers and U.S. Drug Administration partnership in both the drug research and development process and the dissemination of the results of these efforts. Cooperative Agreements between the Service and principal Federal and State stakeholders outline individual responsibilities to investigate and approve priority drugs for use in public and private aquaculture throughout the United States.

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design Score 80%

Section 2 - Strategic Planning

Number	Question	Answer	Score
2.1	<p data-bbox="337 289 1214 363">Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?</p> <p data-bbox="337 436 1214 646"><i>Explanation:</i> The Fisheries Program (Program) has specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and reflect the primary goals of the program emphasizing native aquatic species recovery and restoration. The Program has also collaborated with partners to establish an appropriate outcome measure for the recreation-oriented work performed.</p> <p data-bbox="337 720 1214 940"><i>Evidence:</i> Program Budget Justifications FY 2004-2007, Regional Strategic Plans from Service Regions 1-7, and the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 illustrate the Program's annual measures and long-term goals. The Program's annual and long-term goals are linked to the Department of the Interior Strategic Plan FY 2003-2008 (http://www.doi.gov/gpra/strat_plan_fy2003_2008.pdf).</p>	YES	9%
2.2	<p data-bbox="337 1018 1214 1045">Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?</p> <p data-bbox="337 1119 1214 1381"><i>Explanation:</i> The program has developed ambitious targets as a result of extensive coordination at the local, regional, and National levels with State, Tribal and non-governmental stakeholders and partners. Targets are set for key Program focus areas in the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan (Plan) and reflect the effort required to meet regional priorities and to fulfill the Program's mission. Baseline data and targets for most of the long-term outcome measures were set for fiscal years 2004-2008 in the Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="337 1455 1214 1669"><i>Evidence:</i> Program Budget Justifications FY 2004-2007, Regional Strategic Plans from Service Regions 1-7, and the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 illustrate the Program's annual measures and long-term goals. The Program's annual and long-term goals are linked to the Department of the Interior Strategic Plan FY 2003-2008 (http://www.doi.gov/gpra/strat_plan_fy2003_2008.pdf).</p>	YES	9%
2.3	<p data-bbox="337 1747 1214 1820">Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?</p>	YES	9%

Explanation: The program's long-term outcome goals will be achieved by the successful completion of many activities, only some of which the Program directly undertakes or influences (e.g., water quality). The program's annual performance measures look at those activities that the Program has control or direct influence over a one year period which help to achieve the long-term outcome goals. For example, to achieve the long-term outcome goal of increasing the number of aquatic species listed on the Endangered Species list, the program has identified specific activities in Recovery plans for those species that the program can implement. The annual measure is the number of those activities that are achieved in one year. As these are completed, in conjunction with other activities that are undertaken by other programs and favorable conditions for the species, a species may recover and the threats to the species be managed to a point where the species becomes self-sustaining in the wild and eventually no longer need to be listed under the ESA as it would have "recovered."

Evidence: Fisheries Program (Program) Budget Justifications FY 2004-2007 and the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 illustrate the Program's annual measures and long-term goals. The Program's annual and long-term goals are linked to the Department of the Interior Strategic Plan FY 2003-2008 (http://www.doi.gov/gpra/strat_plan_fy2003_2008.pdf).

2.4

Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?

YES 9%

Explanation: Baseline data and targets for annual performance measures evaluated in Question 2.3 were set for fiscal years 2004-2008 in the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan. The Service Regions work closely with partners and stakeholders to set ambitious targets to meet Regional priorities and to fulfill the Fisheries Program (Program) mission. Annual targets are developed and baseline data collected via information submitted to the Fisheries Information System by the Service Regions. In light of increasing uncontrollable costs and static budgets, Program performance targets remain level and therefore ambitious. Program efficiencies are gained by working with partners to leverage funds.

Evidence: Annual performance targets are set for key Fisheries Program (Program) focus areas described in the seven Regional Strategic Plans and the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008. Program Budget Justifications FY 2004-2007 display tables

that illustrate linkages between annual performance targets and funding.

2.5

YES 9%

Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) develops common goals cooperatively through its partnerships with States and other government authorities at the local and Tribal levels, universities, other Federal agencies, and private partners. These common goals are the basis for the Program's goals and associated outcome and output performance measures. Projects implemented by the Service and its partners accomplish tasks that contribute to achieving the goals of the Program.

Evidence: Examples of successful partner agreements include, the National Fish Habitat Initiative and National Fish Habitat Action Plan (Action Plan), the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF) and associated Strategic Plan, the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act (NANPCA, p. 282), and the Aquatic Animal Drug Approval Partnership Program (AADAP). The Action Plan provides guidance for FWS and partners in joint efforts to protect, restore, and enhance fish and aquatic communities through partnerships that foster fish habitat conservation (http://www.fishhabitat.org/plan/NFHI_Action_Plan_3-3-2006.pdf). The primary work units of the Action Plan are Fish Habitat Partnerships formed around important aquatic habitats and distinct geographic areas, fish species, or system types (p. 7). One of five pilot Fish Habitat Partnerships is the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture (EBTJV, Action Plan p. 10-11), a regional-scale partnership with a goal of species conservation and restoration through strategically-focused habitat management. Formed in 2004, the partnership includes 18 states, 4 federal agencies, universities, non-governmental organizations and industry. The EBTJV has drafted a range-wide conservation strategy (Draft Eastern Brook Trout Conservation Strategy, December 2005) and a range-wide status assessment report (<http://www.tu.org/site/pp.asp?c=7dJEKTNuFmG&b=1370155>). The EBTJV used these products to prioritize and select habitat projects supported by FY 2006 Fisheries Program funds (memorandum dated February 27, 2006 from FWS Director to Regional Directors with table of funded projects attached). Activities and tasks accomplished via the 2006 projects will contribute to achieving the Program's annual and long-term goals for aquatic species conservation (FIS Reports #2006-004 and #2006-012). The Fisheries Program also works

with many partners that support its ANS goals and activities. The core elements of the ANS Program Guidance (July 1994 Q1.2 evidence) - Prevention, Detection and Monitoring, and Control - have been embraced by all the ANSTF partners at the Federal, Regional and State levels. The ANSTF Strategic Plan serves as a commitment by ANSTF members to implement the ANS Program Guidance. At the Regional and local levels, the same core elements are implemented through the Regional ANS Panels and State ANS Management Plans. These core elements are also incorporated into partner grant agreements and contracts (State of Montana Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan, pp. 24-38). AADAP joins into 100+ agreements with various Federal, State, Tribal, university, and private partners to develop, implement, manage, and maintain national investigational new animal drug (INAD) exemptions required for the use of drugs and therapeutants that are needed for disease control and product quality in aquaculture programs throughout the United States. These exemptions support progress toward the Program's long-term outcome goal of self-sustaining native populations by promoting propagation of healthy aquatic organisms.

2.6

Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

YES 9%

Explanation: In 2003, the Fish and Wildlife Service Director requested the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (SFBPC) to develop evaluation protocols and to perform annual evaluations of the Service's Fisheries Program. Comprehensive protocols were developed by a workgroup comprising a broad spectrum of natural resource interests and were approved by the full SFBPC in May 2004. To ensure a quality evaluation, the protocols were based on an evaluation process developed by the Ecosystem Management Institute at the University of Michigan. The first evaluation of the Fisheries Program (Program) was completed in August 2005 and examined how effectively the program meets its mission and long-term goals. The SFBPC recommended that future evaluations should occur at three-year intervals to allow the Program time to implement and measure progress towards recommendations.

Evidence: Executive Order 12962, "Recreational Fisheries", expanded the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council's (SFBPC) authority to monitor and evaluate Federal activities affecting aquatic systems and associated recreational fisheries

(<http://www.fws.gov/laws/lawsdigest/eoindex.html#eo12962>

<http://www.fws.gov/sfbpc/1st96eval.html>

<http://www.fws.gov/sfbpc/executiveorderrecreationalfisheries.pdf>). The FWS Director requested the SFBPC to develop evaluation protocols and undertake regular external reviews of the Fisheries Program (letter from FWS Director dated August 26, 2003). An Evaluation Workgroup was established by the SFBPC (see member list) and protocols were based on an evaluation template developed at the University of Michigan's School of Natural Resources ("Measuring Progress: A Guide to the Development, Implementation and Interpretation of an Evaluation Plan", Ecosystem Management Initiative, School of Natural Resources, the University of Michigan;

<http://www.snre.umich.edu/ecomgt/evaluation/Measuring%20Progress.pdf>). The SFBPC submitted its Programmatic Evaluation of the Fisheries Program to the FWS Director in August 2005. The report (p. 6) concluded that the Program is effectively delivering its mission consistent with the nine elements of the USFWS National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 (January 2006), and provided additional recommendations for improvement. The Fisheries Program is developing an Action Plan to address the SFBPC recommendations to improve Program performance.

2.7

Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

NO 0%

Explanation: The FY 2007 Fisheries Program (Program) Budget Justification generally links the funding request to performance measures and targets that contribute to the Department's and the Program's Strategic Plan annual and long-term goals. There is no explanation defining the relationship between the annual and long-term performance targets and the funding requested. The performance tables do not show what the FY2007 goal was previously or how the FY2007 requested amount will ensure the long-term goal is achieved.

Evidence: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FY 2004 - FY 2007 Budget Justifications provide tables illustrating actual and planned performance of annual and long-term goals against budget requests. Where there is a request for funding increases, the budget justification lists specific Fisheries Operational Needs System projects (FONS - from the Fisheries Information System database) with projected performance. A FWS spreadsheet shows FONS projects identified in the FY 2007 budget request with associated performance

information.

2.8

Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?

YES 9%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) developed and is implementing the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan (Plan), the Fisheries Vision, and seven Service Regional Strategic Plans. These documents were developed in close collaboration with partners and stakeholders and satisfy the Program's strategic planning needs. The Plan includes long-term and annual performance goals that demonstrate progress toward achieving the Program's mission. The Program is working to improve both long-term and annual performance measures in preparation for the next strategic planning cycle (2009-2013). The Program communicates closely with the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council and other external partners to monitor Strategic Plan implementation.

Evidence: The Program received strategic planning recommendations from the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (SFBPC) in A Partnership Agenda for Fisheries Conservation (Jan 2002). Strategic planning efforts are described in detail in Conserving America's Fisheries: Fisheries Program Vision for the Future (March 2004), Regional Strategic Plans, and the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan (Plan) FY 2004-2008 (January 2006). A letter to Secretary Norton (see Q 1.2), written on behalf of ESPN and B.A.S.S., supports and commends the Program's strategic planning efforts. Performance Measure Workgroup meeting notes (March 2005) and an official proposal to change a DOI performance measure (filed December 15, 2005) reporting sustainable populations reflect the efforts of the Program to improve long-term and annual performance outcome measures. The SFBPC Programmatic Evaluation of the Fisheries Program (August 2005), p. 6, concludes that the Program is raising its performance consistent with the nine elements of the Plan and provides additional recommendations for improvement. The Program has completed a draft Action Plan (pp. 1-10, January 27, 2006) to address the recommendations of the SFBPC. Ongoing efforts to improve Program performance measures are described in the Fisheries Program Performance Measures Review Work Plan and Fisheries Assistant Regional Directors Meeting Notes, Portland, OR (November 30-December 1, 2005).

2.RD1

If applicable, does the program assess and compare the potential benefits of efforts within the program and (if relevant) to other efforts in other programs that have

NO 0%

similar goals?

Explanation: An Evaluation Program for the Fisheries Program's seven Fish Technology Centers (FTC) was established in 1995 to determine continued relevance of the program with National Fish Hatchery System priorities and aquatic resource conservation goals of the FWS, and to ensure the quality, integration, and productivity of FTC activities. The Evaluation Team is led by the FWS Research Coordinator and comprised of representatives of several FWS program areas as well as representatives of aquatic research laboratories or outside FWS partners. Evaluation recommendations are used to improve FTC program performance, quality and relevance. The Evaluation process reports on FTC coordination with internal and external partners. The Evaluation protocol is currently being revised to increase the level of external participation and to specifically compare FTC laboratories with similar research facilities, referencing benchmark Standard Operating Procedures. This will help in future efforts to compare program benefits to other efforts that have similar goals.

Evidence: Examples of Fisheries Program assessment are documented in the FTC Evaluation Protocol document and FTC Evaluation Reports (San Marcos FTC, Dexter FTC, Abernathy FTC, Mora FTC). FTC Director meeting notes also state an action item to revise FTC evaluation protocol and to expand the external review component of the process.

2.RD2

Does the program use a prioritization process to guide budget requests and funding decisions?

YES 9%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) has established advisory groups that include personnel from the Service's Refuge and Endangered Species Programs to prioritize technology development projects. Fish Technology Center (FTC) priorities are established by the Assistant Regional Director Science Advisory Committee and reviewed annually to ensure continued relevance. All new Fish Technology Center (FTC) project proposals are entered into the Fisheries Operational Needs database, where they are ranked at the Regional level, based on their contribution to Fisheries Strategic Plan goals. In some Regions, other FWS Programs are invited to submit project proposals for work to be conducted by an FTC. Projects are prioritized by a cross-Program team (FTC Advisory Committee). Resulting high priority projects are then selected from the Fisheries Operational Needs System database for inclusion in Federal budget justifications.

Evidence: The Fisheries Information System Business Rules (April 2006) provide guidance to field, regional, and Washington Offices on how to prioritize and rank projects in a consistent and accurate way that ensures management review at all levels (pp. 2, 22, 28). Examples of ranked Fisheries Operational Needs System projects (FTC project) show Regional priority ranking and the project as it appears in the FY 2007 Budget Justification. Fish Technology Center (FTC) Priority Work Area List, FTC Advisory Committee Project Request Form, and FTC Grant Proposal are all used to guide budget requests. The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Region 4 FTC Advisory Committee conducts an annual call for projects that extend to all FWS Programs (see Question 3.RD1). The Committee then reviews submitted projects based on Regional conservation needs and recommends projects for funding accordingly.

2.RG1

Are all regulations issued by the program/agency necessary to meet the stated goals of the program, and do all regulations clearly indicate how the rules contribute to achievement of the goals?

YES 9%

Explanation: Regulations issued by the Fisheries Program (Program) are promulgated to fulfill its mission of "working with partners to restore and maintain fish and other aquatic resources at self-sustaining levels and to support federal mitigation programs for the benefit of the American public" and its responsibility to meet statutory requirements of the injurious wildlife provisions of the Lacey Act. The number of threatened and endangered species has tripled in the last twenty years due in part to the establishment of aquatic nuisance species. Regulations considered or promulgated clearly state their purpose and need in order to prevent future introduction or further spread of wildlife deemed injurious to the welfare and survival of wildlife or wildlife resources, the health and welfare of humans, or the interests of agriculture, horticulture and forestry.

Evidence: The Fisheries Program Vision for the Future and the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 (January 2006) show the mission and goals of the Program, of which the regulations issued by the Program under the Lacey Act support. The Lacey Act directs the Secretary of the Interior (designated to the Service) to prohibit the importation into the United States, any territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or any shipment between the continental United States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States of species (mammals, birds, fish

(including mollusks and Crustacea), amphibians, and reptiles, and the eggs or offspring injurious to human beings, to the interests of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, or to wildlife or the wildlife resources of the United States

(<http://www.fws.gov/invasives/Index.LaceyAct.html>). The Lacey Act is codified in the Code of Federal Regulations at 50 CFR 16 (<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/index.html>). The proposed and final injurious wildlife rule for Snakeheads (family Channidae) is one example of a regulation issued under the Lacey Act and in support of the Program's goals: 1) Proposed rule, July 26, 2002 (Vol. 67, Number 144) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr48855.html>; 2) Final Rule, October 4, 2002 (Vol. 67, Number 193) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr62193.html>. The proposed rule to list black carp as injurious wildlife (July 30, 2002, Vol. 67, Number 146, <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr49280.html>) is an example of a potential regulation (no final determination to date) in support of the Program's mission and goals.

Section 2 - Strategic Planning Score 81%

Section 3 - Program Management

Number	Question	Answer	Score
--------	----------	--------	-------

3.1	Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?	YES	10%
-----	--	-----	-----

Explanation: Fisheries Program (Program) collects performance information through the Fisheries Information System from Regional and field offices annually. Baseline information was set for some performance measures in FY 2004. The Program collects performance information from key Program partners, for example, by requiring submission of accomplishment reports for fish passage projects when partners are involved in delivering the project. The Program uses performance information to track outcomes, evaluate progress and reallocate effort to implement additional projects with outcomes that can be linked to the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan and the DOI Strategic Plan.

Evidence: A Memorandum dated December 24, 2002, from the Deputy Director to the Regional Directors and Assistant Regional Directors for Fisheries documents the Program's annual collection of performance information through the Fisheries Information System (FIS). The regions are required to submit performance information for projects to be

accomplished in a particular fiscal year (accomplishment reports for Gila trout recovery activities in region 2 and tribal assistance in region 6). The FIS also includes instructions for reporting performance data in each module. Business rules developed in conjunction with an improved web-based version of the FIS also document how performance information is collected. A completion report from the Fairbanks, AK Soil and Water Conservation District (#701813G207) for a fish passage project on the Chena River demonstrates how the Program collects timely and credible performance information from our partners. The FY 2007 budget justification performance overview table illustrates the establishment of baseline performance for the Program. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the FWS and the Department of Energy (DOE) includes performance information that is collected to establish a basis for evaluating the Lower Snake River Compensation Plan Program and providing Performance Incentives for the Service (MOA between the DOE and FWS for Direct Funding of Power-related Operations and Maintenance Costs of the LSRCP, October 1 2001, Exhibit D: FY 2002 LSRCP Hatchery Performance Indicator Program, p. 18). We work collaboratively with other Federal agencies, States, and a variety of partners to share data through partnerships under the National Fish Habitat Initiative (National Fish Habitat Action Plan, April 2006). The Program also works with States to implement State Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plans (see Montana Plan, pp. 39-47) and evaluates the expenditure of funds and the accomplishments to ensure that joint objectives meet the Program's performance targets (State ANS Management Plan accomplishment report). An April 21, 2004 news release documents how the FWS discontinued stocking shad in the Potomac River in 2002 (after stocking for seven years) in response to data showing that 15% of shad captured at upstream sites were hatchery reared fish, an indication of reproductive success. Data was collected by the FWS and Program partners involved in shad restoration (<http://news.fws.gov/NewsReleases/showNews.cfm?newsId=3430BC3B-CEEE-4180-8FA053259101F8D4>). As an example of reallocation of funds based on performance information, Region 7 (Alaska) discontinued FY 2006 operation of the Rampart Rapids mark-recapture project (FIS Accomplishment reporting for FY2005, Orgcode 71470 Project A-120), conducted since 1997, and shifted the \$324,000 to other AK subsistence fisheries projects. These projects are prioritized by a State/Federal Technical Review Committee, reviewed by the public and Regional Advisory Councils, and ultimately approved by the Federal Subsistence Board. This change is clearly linked to the strategy identified in the U.S./Canada Joint Technical Committee Plan (p. 7). The Program has collected genetics information on Yukon River fall chum salmon in the lower Yukon River and combined this information with abundance data collected by the State using Sonar technology to generate

stock specific abundance estimates. This technique provides results that are similar to on-site monitoring projects, but it is more timely and accurate than current monitoring capabilities (Highlights article, Searching for a New Management Tool for Yukon River Chum Salmon, <http://alaska.fws.gov/asm/pdf/fisheries/highlights/high3.pdf>).

3.2

NO 0%

Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) generally holds its Federal managers and partners accountable for results although the measures used and results obtained are not always directly tied to program performance goals. Performance standards, including quantitative performance goals, are not always clearly defined in Senior Executive Service (SES) Performance Plans and field-level supervisor performance plans. The Program's partners and grantees are held accountable through cooperative agreements and grants that define cost, period of performance, and performance results, although the linkage to program performance goals is not always obvious. Performance is monitored annually to ensure accountability in accordance with the terms and conditions of partner agreements. The Program also shares costs through documented voluntary partnerships that specify partner responsibilities.

Evidence: The Program has used performance information to hold partners accountable in agreements for fish isolation at hatchery facilities, ballast water demonstration projects, and screening irrigation diversions. For example, the Memorandum of Understanding between the FWS and the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community (Tribe) spells out detailed responsibilities and procedures that the Tribe must follow in rearing future broodstock for transfer to the National Fish Hatchery System. Under an agreement with the University of North Carolina (UNC) at Wilmington for a ballast water demonstration project, the Program denied payment of invoices until all requirements of the agreement were met (email to UNC dated October 25, 2004). Partner agreements under the Fisheries Restoration and Irrigation Mitigation Act (FRIMA) establish accountability through performance reporting requirements, such as, number of barriers removed or fish screens installed, number of miles of stream opened for fish passage, or number of inventories completed (Partner agreement between the FWS and Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks under the FRIMA, 2006). Examples of standard partner agreement documents stipulating terms and conditions of obligated funds

include the more than 100 agreements the Aquatic Animal Drug Approval Partnership has established with various Federal, State, Tribal, university, and private partners to develop, implement, and manage investigational new animal drug (INAD) exemptions required for the FDA-approval of drugs needed for management activities in aquaculture programs throughout the United States. Two memoranda (September 2005 and April 2006) from the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission (GLIFWC) document annual cooperative work plans for assessment of walleye populations in the ceded territories of northern Wisconsin. The memoranda list lakes to be surveyed by GLIFWC and the FWS in cooperation with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to measure abundance of adult walleye in the spring and juvenile walleye in the fall. A Memorandum from the FWS Director to Regional Directors assigns accountability for meeting performance targets down to the Project Leader level (August 2003). Performance goals for the Program that link to SES plans are defined in the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan (Plan) FY 2004-2008 (January 2006). Program goals are written into the Assistant Director and each Regional Director's performance plan (Draft, Assistant Director-Fisheries and Habitat Conservation Senior Executive Service (SES) Performance Plan, Assistant Regional Director - Fisheries Performance Plan). A table from Region 2 illustrates how performance targets are stepped down from the SES level to the field level.

3.3

Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner, spent for the intended purpose and accurately reported?

YES 10%

Explanation: All appropriated FY 2005 funds were obligated in an appropriate and timely manner and spent for the intended purpose. Congress appropriates funds in the Resource Management Account for a two-year period in recognition of uncontrolled environmental conditions that affect fish and wildlife management. The Fisheries Program (Program) develops Work Activity Guidance documents and allocation memos to establish how allocated funds will be used. The Program tracks the expenditure of funds to ensure funds are used for the intended purpose.

Evidence: The FY 2006 Budget Allocation System Report, FY 2005 End of Year Obligation Report, and Allocation Procedures and Timeline, and the KPMG Independent Auditor's Report (November 2005), illustrate the timely obligation and appropriate allocation of Fisheries Program funds (Program). Work Activity Guidance (WAG) documents for the Program are also developed to direct how allocated funds are used (2006 Fisheries Program

WAG). Accomplishment reports from the Assistant Regional Directors citing aquatic nuisance species (ANS) management projects describe how funds are obligated in accordance with ANS Plans. An example of a grant agreement demonstrating sound obligation of funds is the FWS grant with Missouri Department of Conservation (Department), which requires the Department to follow accomplishment reporting procedures established in the grant prior to payment of invoices (Snail Population Control Methods for Missouri Aquaculture Ponds, March 2005). The Service Manual 261-FW3 for Cash Management (April 7, 1995, p.3) and the position description for the Administrative Officer illustrate how expenditures are tracked and monitored on a regular basis through the Federal Financial System.

3.4

YES 10%

Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) has numerous procedures in place to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness. The Program developed an efficiency measure for rainbow trout production and has collected baseline data for the past four years. The FWS started using Activity-Based Costing (ABC) in 2004 as a means to measure the effort needed to achieve goals, and redirect resources as needed. Since 2004, the Program has participated in competitive sourcing studies to determine if the Program could improve its efficiencies. The Program has engaged in ongoing procedures to achieve efficiencies in space acquisition for Program facilities. The Program has also implemented several IT improvements to increase efficiency in Program execution.

Evidence: The following documents describe the Program's efficiency measure for rainbow trout production: "A Cost Comparison Analysis for the National Fish Hatchery System Rainbow Trout Production", pg. 3 (December 2005) and "An Efficiency Measure for the National Fish Hatchery System Rainbow Trout Production," pg. 3 (September 2005). A January 2004 Memorandum from the FWS Director illustrates how the FWS uses Activity Based Costing as a procedure to measure the cost of activities as a basis for determining the cost of achieving a unit of performance. A February 2005 Memorandum from the FWS Director informed staff on the status of competitive sourcing studies, and on plans for future studies. The Program established a workgroup to analyze the potential of grouping facilities to achieve administrative cost savings. The workgroup issued a report titled, Complexing

and Collocating U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Fisheries Program Field Stations (August 2002) that found 80% of the Program field stations are co-located. A Memorandum, dated December 27, 2005, from the Assistant Director of Fisheries and Habitat Conservation to the FWS Regions describes the process for implementing the SAMMS at FWMA offices in 2006 in order to improve efficiency of asset management. The Program is also implementing a web-based Fisheries Information System that will improve efficiency and reduce personnel costs associated with data management and facilitates data sharing across FWS programs (FIS Training Manual, February 2006, Introduction, p.1.2). The Program has improved collection and accessibility of comprehensive fish barrier data through the development of the Fish Passage Decision Support System (<http://fpdss.fws.gov/index.jsp>).

3.5

Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

YES 10%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) collaborates and coordinates extensively with Federal and State agencies, Tribal Councils, and private entities to conserve our Nation's aquatic resources. The Program coordinates with other FWS programs to restore native fish populations, provide fishing opportunities, and support Recovery Plan strategies. Through the National Fish Habitat Action Plan, the Program collaborates with states and other partners to focus aquatic habitat restoration on high priority species and locations. The Program's Aquatic Animal Drug Approval Partnership coordinates multi-agency efforts to obtain approval for new aquatic animal drugs. The Program worked closely with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies to complete step-down plans for four pilot States to implement the Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers! campaign at the state level. The Program also collaborates with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Sea Grant program and the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council to implement activities under the Habitattitude?? national public awareness campaign. The Program also administers the Ballast Water Management Demonstration Program in cooperation with NOAA and the Maritime Administration to develop technology to assist the maritime industry to comply with Coast Guard regulations.

Evidence: The Program's work with the National Wildlife Refuge System is illustrated by coaster brook trout restoration on the Whittlesey Creek National Wildlife Refuge. Fish and Wildlife News, page 28 of the spring 2003 special issue on the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial, accessible at http://library.fws.gov/fwnews/fwnews_spring03_special.pdf describes how the Fisheries Program uses the Refuge System as a tool to identify aquatic

habitat for protection and to restore aquatic species, focusing on the Whittlesey Creek National Wildlife Refuge. The plan to restore coaster brook trout on the Whittlesey Creek NWR is described in detail at http://www.fws.gov/midwest/ashland/whitt-crk/Glenn_PP.html. Close collaboration with the USFWS Endangered Species program and our Native American partners include Endangered Gila and Apache Trout Recovery activities with the White Mountain and Jicarilla Apache Tribes and the State of New Mexico (Around 505 article, "Back from the Brink", December-January 2003). The National Fish Habitat Action Plan (Action Plan) provides guidance for FWS and partners in joint efforts to protect, restore, and enhance fish and aquatic communities through partnerships that foster fish habitat conservation (http://www.fishhabitat.org/plan/NFHL_Action_Plan_3-3-2006.pdf). The primary work units of the Action Plan are Fish Habitat Partnerships formed around important aquatic habitats and distinct geographic areas, fish species, or system types (p. 7). One of five pilot Fish Habitat Partnerships is the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture (EBTJV, Action Plan p. 10-11), a regional-scale partnership comprised of 18 states, 4 federal agencies, universities, non-governmental organizations and industry. The EBTJV has drafted a range-wide conservation strategy (Draft Eastern Brook Trout Conservation Strategy, December 2005) and a range-wide status assessment report (<http://www.tu.org/site/pp.asp?c=7dJEKTNuFmG&b=1370155>). The EBTJV used these products to prioritize and select habitat projects supported by FY 2006 Fisheries Program funds (memo dated February 27, 2006 from FWS Director to Regional Directors; table of funded projects attached). Participation in the Aquatic Animal Drug Approval Partnership (AADAP) -Investigational New Animal Drug (INAD) Program has allowed the State of Wisconsin to retain genetic "uniqueness" in a remnant lake sturgeon population and meet the stocking goal of the management plan (AADAP Newsletter, Volume 2-2, March 2006, p.4). The Program collaborates with four pilot States, the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, and multiple partners to implement the Stop Aquatic Hitchhikers! (www.protectyourwaters.net) campaign to stop the spread of aquatic nuisance species. Outreach and education materials for the Habitattitude?? campaign are distributed by partner organizations to change consumer behavior and prevent the release of unwanted plants and pets (Habitattitude?? press release from the American Nursery and Landscape Association: www.anla.org/application/PressReleases/releases/0185.htm). Requests for proposals for ballast water demonstration projects can be found at "Ballast Water Grant Competition Announcements" (www.grants.gov) <http://grants.gov/search/search.do?oppld=1414&mode=VIEW>

3.6

Does the program use strong financial management practices?

YES 10%

Explanation: The FWS employs sound financial management practices to administer the Fisheries Program (Program). The FWS as an agency received an unqualified audit opinion in the most recent independent auditor's report. Material weaknesses identified during prior audits related to security and controls over financial systems have been resolved. The Program has specific system controls in place to minimize erroneous payments. Auditors found no significant problems with improper, duplicate, or erroneous payments by the FWS during any of the past three audits. Program managers routinely review financial activities (invoices, etc.) to ensure fiscal oversight and responsibility. Grant agreements with partners also demonstrate the Program's sound financial management by requiring internal monitoring and reporting controls prior to obligation of funds.

Evidence: In the Independent Auditor's Report, KPMG illustrates the FWS and Program's strong financial management practices (November 2005). The agency's Prompt Payment Policy and Credit Card Use Policy reinforce the practice of responsible financial management for the Program (Travel and Purchase Credit Card Memorandum from Deputy Assistant Director of Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, February 2006). The Service Manual 260-FW1 for Administrative Control of Funds (September 30, 2002, p.1) provides an example of how the Program has established guidelines for financial management and the administrative control of funds. An example of a grant agreement demonstrating sound obligation of funds is the FWS grant with Missouri Department of Conservation (Department), which requires the Department to follow accomplishment reporting procedures established in the grant prior to payment of invoices (Snail Population Control Methods for Missouri Aquaculture Ponds, March 2005).

3.7

Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

YES 10%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) has a system in place for identifying and correcting management deficiencies. The Fisheries Program Management Team (Team) consists of Assistant Regional Directors from each region and the Washington Office Division Chiefs. The Team meets by conference call monthly and more frequently as required and in person at least three times a year. The Team identifies and addresses management issues, and assigns responsibility for follow-through in a systematic manner. The Assistant Director - Fisheries and Habitat Conservation also convenes a monthly

meeting of Division Chiefs to address management issues in the national headquarters. The Assistant Director is required to review the Program and its components annually to prioritize the need for a Management Control Review that identifies and corrects management deficiencies. The Program has also sought external review through the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council and has begun to address management recommendations resulting from that review. The Program's management system includes an automated database of property assets to identify and track maintenance and replacement needs. The Program also implements standard procedures for animal health inspections at hatchery facilities to prevent management deficiencies related to fish health.

Evidence: The Fisheries Program Management Team (Team; Fisheries ARDs and Washington Office Fisheries and Habitat Conservation) met on October 9, 2003 to discuss various management issues, including the method of allocating fish passage funds to the Regions. The Team found that the method of allocating funds based on Washington Office selection of projects hampered partnership development, and recommended revised allocation methods (Meeting Notes, October 9, 2003, Fisheries ARDs and Washington Office Fisheries and Habitat Conservation, pages 31-32). The recommendation was implemented through Director's Order 169, dated March 29, 2004 (<http://www.fws.gov/policy/archivedo.cfm>). The Fish Passage Program policy 710 FW 1 was subsequently modified to incorporate the Director's Order (<http://www.fws.gov/policy/710fw1.html>). The modified procedure is found in Section 1.14 (B) on page 5-6 of the Policy. Senior Management Retreat notes from March and April 2006 provide additional examples of how the Program identifies management issues and corrects them as follow-up actions. In a Memorandum to the Assistant Director - Business Operations, dated April 19, 2006, the Assistant Director - Fisheries and Habitat Conservation assures compliance with the provisions of the revised OMB Circular A-123, Management's Responsibility for Internal Control. An evaluation conducted by the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (SFBPC), SFBPC Programmatic Evaluation of the Fisheries Program FY2004 (August 2005), p. 6, concludes that the Program is raising its performance consistent with the nine elements of the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008 (January 2006), and provides additional recommendations for developing recreational fishing measures and Work Activity Guidance for the Program, among others. The Program is developing an Action Plan (January 27, 2006 version included) in response to the recommendations of the SFBPC. Evaluations of the Program will be conducted by the SFBPC every three years. A Memorandum, dated December 27, 2005, from the Assistant

Director of Fisheries and Habitat Conservation to the FWS Regions describes the process for implementing the Service Asset and Maintenance Management System (SAMMS) at Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance offices in 2006. The Program's Five-Year Deferred Maintenance Plan identifies maintenance deficiencies for high priority Hatchery assets in SAMMS that require repair or rehabilitation to facilitate meeting fishery management plans or restoration and recovery plans. The "Handbook of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Aquatic Animal Health Procedures and Protocols", p. 10, ensures a stringent set of procedure and protocols to be followed when carrying out health inspections and allows Program managers to better compare data and make better management decisions (http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/fh_handbook/Volume_1/Chapter_1.pdf).

3.CO2

Does the program have oversight practices that provide sufficient knowledge of grantee activities?

YES 10%

Explanation: The Fisheries Program has a limited number of grants that it provides for research related to native aquatic species and their habitat. The Program oversees grantee activities through the National Partnership for the Management of Wild and Native Coldwater Fishes steering committee, which provides coordination, establishes research priorities and supervises a peer review process to select funded projects. Partnership and Whirling Disease Foundation contracts stipulate that annual financial and accomplishment reports be remitted to the Service, and the Partnership reports its activities to the Congress annually and presents accomplishments at an annual Whirling Disease symposium. The Service's Contracting Officer Technical Representative (COTR) is in constant communication with the principals of each of these groups and attends annual meetings at various locales to ensure oversight and coordination.

Evidence: The Charter for the National Partnership for the Management of Wild and Native Coldwater Fishes and the 2003 Partnership Annual Report demonstrate oversight practices of the Fisheries Program. An Interagency Agreement with the US Geologic Service requires annual financial and accomplishment reporting and quarterly invoicing. Regular communication occurs between the FWS Fish Health Coordinator and the National Partnership. Examples are documented in electronic mail dated March 6, April 14, and April 19, 2006.

3.RD1

For R&D programs other than competitive grants programs, does the program

YES 10%

allocate funds and use management processes that maintain program quality?

Explanation: The Fisheries Program allocates funds to the Whirling Disease National Partnership, a consortium that emphasizes fish health, fishery productivity, fisheries ecology, and adaptive fishery management. The National Fish Hatchery System provides funds (matched by sponsoring agencies and private organizations) to pursue research and management activities consistent with the Partnership's charter. The Warm Springs Advisory Committee solicits project requests from state and federal project leaders, for assistance from the Warm Springs (GA) Regional Fisheries Center. Potential projects are evaluated using standardized protocols and ranked by the Advisory Committee for possible implementation. Fisheries Operational Needs System projects related to research and development (Fish Technology Center projects) are prioritized by each Service Region on its relevance to the Fisheries Program's mission and its contribution to accomplishment of Regional and National Fisheries Strategic Plan goals. Annual accomplishment reports are submitted annually via the Fisheries Information System by each field station/Regional office.

Evidence: Warm Springs Advisory Committee Research Request memorandum and examples of FONS projects with Regional rankings demonstrate how the Fisheries Program (Program) maintains quality through appropriate management procedures and allocation of funds. The Charter for the National Partnership for the Management of Wild and Native Coldwater Fishes also documents how the Program uses quality management processes.

3.RG1

Did the program seek and take into account the views of all affected parties (e.g., consumers; large and small businesses; State, local and tribal governments; beneficiaries; and the general public) when developing significant regulations?

YES 10%

Explanation: The Program has a regulatory component that focuses in on listing species as "injurious" under the Lacey Act. The Program publishes notices of inquiry for its evaluations, provides public comment periods during the proposed rule stage, and reopens comment periods, both in response to specific requests by industry or states and of its own volition when considered necessary. In addition, the Program faxes notices of comment periods to potentially affected parties, States, and other organizations, makes phone calls to solicit information, and hires contractors, when able, to visit and obtain information for analysis. The Program addresses all substantive comments received by the public, States and federal

agencies in its evaluation and in making its final determination. Responses to comments provided are included in all final rules. Press releases are drafted for every notice of inquiry, proposed rule or final rule.

Evidence: The Snakehead (family Channidae) and Brushtail possum proposed and final rules also illustrate the Service's efforts to seek and take into account the views of all affected parties: 1) Snakehead Proposed rule, July 26, 2002 (Vol. 67, Number 144) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr48855.html>; 2) Snakehead Final Rule, October 4, 2002 (Vol. 67, Number 193) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr62193.html>; 3) Brushtail possum Proposed rule, November 2, 1999 (Vol. 64, Number 211) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/99fr59149.html>; 4) Brushtail possum Final rule, June 11, 2002 (Vol. 67, Number 112) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr39865.html>. The Black carp injurious wildlife evaluation regulatory notices demonstrates the Service's efforts to seek and take into account the views of all affected parties and reopening comment periods repeatedly in order to gather additional information or respond to information obtained in previous comment periods: 1) Advance notice of proposed rulemaking, June 2, 2000 (Vol. 65, Number 107) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/00fr35314.html>; 2) Proposed rule, July 30, 2002 (Vol. 67, Number 146) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/02fr49280.html>; 3) Proposed rule; reopening of comment period, June 4, 2003 (Vol. 68, Number 107) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/03-13996.html>; 4) Proposed rule; reopening of comment period and availability of supplemental information, August 30, 2005 (Vol. 70, Number 167) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/05-17173.html>; 5) Extension of comment period <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/05-21440.html>, October 27, 2005. The Boiga snakes, Bighead and Silver carp Notices of Inquiry also demonstrates the Service's efforts to seek and take into account the views of all affected parties, even before beginning an evaluation of a species: 1) Boiga Notice of Inquiry, September 12, 2003 (Vol. 68, Number 177) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/03-23286.html>; 2) Bighead carp Notice of Inquiry, September 17, 2003 (Vol. 68, Number 180) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/03-23745.html>; 3) Silver carp Notice of Inquiry, July 23, 2003 (Vol. 68, Number 141) <http://www.fws.gov/policy/library/03-18654.html>.

Section 3 - Program Management Score 90%

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability

Number	Question	Answer	Score
--------	----------	--------	-------

4.1	<p>Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?</p>	LARGE EXTENT	13%
<p><i>Explanation:</i> The Fisheries Program (Program) long-term performance goals are listed as 5-year objectives in the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan. Based on 2005 accomplishments reported in the Fisheries Information System, the Program met most of its annual targets and is on track to meet long-term goals. Performance targets set for FY 2006 are ambitious and will contribute to progress toward meeting long-term goals.</p>			
<p><i>Evidence:</i> Long-term performance goals are defined in the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan, FY 2004-2008 (January 2006). The FY 2006 Budget Justification (pp. 281-284 and pp. 311-314) shows Program performance targets for outyears. The Fisheries Information System Populations Module provides baseline information and tracks progress toward long-term population goals. The independent evaluation by the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council concluded that the Program is effectively delivering its mission (see Q 2.6, p.6).</p>			
4.2	<p>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</p>	LARGE EXTENT	13%
<p><i>Explanation:</i> Annual performance targets are achieved for nearly all measures.</p>			
<p><i>Evidence:</i> Budget justifications for FY 2006 and FY 2007 show that the Program is meeting most of its annual performance goals. The Fisheries Program (Program) is committed to setting goals, measuring performance, and communicating results in terms that are meaningful and understood by Program partners, policy-makers, and the public. To achieve annual goals, the Program addresses a variety of external factors that affect target-setting and performance assessment (environmental conditions, temporal variability, etc).</p>			
4.3	<p>Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?</p>	YES	20%
<p><i>Explanation:</i> The Fisheries Program (Program) gains efficiencies and cost effectiveness through cooperation with partners to leverage funds. The Program works with partners to</p>			

implement cost-shared restoration projects that focus on high priority species and habitats to achieve maximum effectiveness. Innovative applied research from the Program's Fish Technology and Fish Health Centers has resulted in improved efficiencies that facilitate accomplishment of program goals. Because population monitoring projects in Alaska are expensive and limited in number, the Fisheries Program has developed genetic techniques to estimate population size. This has resulted in cost savings and allows monitoring of additional populations with fewer people at a reduced cost per unit. The Program is implementing a web-based version of the Fisheries Information System that will serve as a more efficient strategic planning and accomplishment reporting tool. The Program has also developed an efficiency measure for rainbow trout production.

Evidence: The National Fish Habitat Action Plan and the Program's 100th Meridian Initiative's web site (100thmeridian.org) demonstrate the wide variety of partners and activities leveraged through U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service support. A Highlights article titled, "Searching for a New Management Tool for Yukon River Chum Salmon" documents how the Program is improving monitoring efficiencies and cost effectiveness for Yukon River chum salmon management in Region 7 (Alaska). Program managers are using genetic analysis techniques to improve current monitoring capabilities and replace costly labor-intensive techniques (<http://alaska.fws.gov/asm/pdf/fisheries/highlights/high3.pdf>). The Program has demonstrated that collecting genetics information in conjunction with sonar monitoring produces results similar to current monitoring projects, but is accurate and more timely. (See summary report from the Program's fishery manager in Fairbanks, comparing abundance estimates, p.3). Given these results, the Region has decided to discontinue the operation of the Rampart-Rapids mark-recapture project (FIS Accomplishment report for Project A-120) conducted since 1997, saving \$324,000. Improved sonar technology has also increased the efficiency of monitoring in the Yukon River (FIS Accomplishment reports #A-066, #A-110, and #A-511) by reducing personnel costs required for interpretation. The following two documents demonstrate how the Program's National Fish Hatchery System is the most efficient at producing rainbow trout and has highly favorable socioeconomic impacts on recreational fishing: "A Cost Comparison Analysis for the National Fish Hatchery System Rainbow Trout Production", pg. 3 (December 2005) and "An Efficiency Measure for the National Fish Hatchery System Rainbow Trout Production," pg. 3 (September 2005). The Program is also implementing a web-based Fisheries Information System that will improve efficiency and reduce personnel costs associated with data management and facilitates data sharing across FWS programs

(FIS Training Manual, February 2006, Introduction, p.1.2).

4.4

YES 20%

Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

Explanation: The Fisheries Program (Program) formed an Efficiency Measure Workgroup consisting of experts from across the nation. A cost comparison analysis was conducted to identify the potential for the Program to competitively source the production of rainbow trout. The analysis concluded that Program hatchery facilities produce rainbow trout as efficiently, and as cost-effectively as private hatcheries. In comparison to private zoos, the Saratoga National Fish Hatchery provides superior refugia and propagation expertise to support the recovery of the endangered Wyoming toad. Of the 2,125 total mortalities documented from 1997 to 2004 at all participating toad propagation facilities, Saratoga accounted for only 85. The Lamar Fish Health Center coordinated with multiple agencies to develop research and management strategies to prevent the spread of the Infectious Salmon Anemia Virus.

Evidence: The following two documents demonstrate how the Program's National Fish Hatchery System is the most efficient at producing rainbow trout and has highly favorable socioeconomic impacts on recreational fishing: "A Cost Comparison Analysis for the National Fish Hatchery System Rainbow Trout Production", pg. 3 (December 2005) and "An Efficiency Measure for the National Fish Hatchery System Rainbow Trout Production," pg. 3 (September 2005). A letter from the U.S. Army-Fort Hood to FWS Region 2, dated September 2001, stated that the quality of privately stocked recreational fish was poor compared to recreational fish provided by the Program's National Fish Hatchery System. A summary on the Wyoming toad, provided by the Wyoming Toad Recovery Coordinator, describes the propagation success at Saratoga National Fish Hatchery. The Summary states that the hatchery has reared the most of any single facility and contributed to the least mortality of the Wyoming Toad Captive Breeding Program (Saratoga National Fish Hatchery's Contribution to the Recovery of the Wyoming Toad, Bufo baxteri, 2004). The Excellence in Science fact sheet, p. 2, states that the Lamar Fish Health Center (FHC) provided the most sensitive viral detection method of all laboratories tested. The report published in the Journal of Veterinary Diagnostic Investigation, March 2005 (Vol17, No. 2, p 151-157), titled "Combined use of the ASK and SHK-1 cell lines can enhance the detection of infectious salmon anemia virus" is an example of the Lamar FHC's diagnostic

assay work being compared with Federal and private laboratories.

4.5

Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

YES 20%

Explanation: The Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (SFBPC) conducted an independent evaluation of the Fisheries Program (Program) activities in FY 2004. In its report, completed in August 2005, the SFBPC found the Program to be "effective" in conducting its overall aquatic resource management activities. The evaluation focused on Program performance under each of the nine elements common to both the Fisheries Vision and the National Fisheries Program Strategic Plan. The report provides additional recommendations for improvement, including a recommendation that the evaluation be repeated on a three year cycle. To address the recommendations made by the SFBPC, the Program has drafted an Action Plan to further improve Program management and responsiveness to resource issues.

Evidence: The Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (SFBPC) was requested by the FWS Director in 2003 to evaluate the Fisheries Program (Letter from FWS Director to SFBPC Chair, Dr. William W. Taylor, August 26, 2003). The evaluation conducted by the SFBPC, titled SFBPC Programmatic Evaluation of the Fisheries Program FY2004 (August 2005), p. 6, concludes that the Program is effective. The report was formally transmitted to the FWS on August 17, 2005 (Evaluation Transmittal Letter (Final) from SFBPC Chairman William W. Taylor, August 17, 2005). The Program has drafted an Action Plan (January 2006) to address the recommendations of the SFBPC.

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability

Score 87%