

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants

Appropriations Language

For wildlife conservation grants to States and to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and federally-recognized Indian Tribes under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for the development and implementation of programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished, \$95,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount provided herein, \$8,000,000 is for a competitive grant program for federally recognized Indian Tribes not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That \$20,000,000 is for a competitive grant program for States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That the Secretary shall, after deducting \$28,000,000 and administrative expenses, apportion the amount provided herein in the following manner: (1) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof; and (2) to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent thereof: Provided further, That the Secretary shall apportion the remaining amount in the following manner: (1) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and (2) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States: Provided further, That the amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount: Provided further, That the Federal share of planning grants shall not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of such projects and the Federal share of implementation grants shall not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of such projects: Provided further, That the non-Federal share of such projects may not be derived from Federal grant programs: Provided further, That no State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall receive a grant if its comprehensive wildlife conservation plan is disapproved and such funds that would have been distributed to such State, territory, or other jurisdiction shall be distributed equitably to States, territories, and other jurisdictions with approved plans: Provided further, That any amount apportioned in 2012 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, 2013, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in 2014, in the manner provided herein.

Note.—A full-year 2011 appropriation for this account was not enacted at the time the budget was prepared; therefore, this account is operating under a continuing resolution (P.L. 111-242, as amended). The amounts included for 2011 reflect the annualized level provided by the continuing resolution.

Authorizing Statutes

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544). Prohibits the import, export, or taking of fish and wildlife and plants that are listed as threatened or endangered species; provides for adding species to or removing them from the list of threatened and endangered species, and for preparing and implementing plans for their recovery; provides for interagency cooperation to avoid take of listed species and for issuing permits for otherwise prohibited activities; provides for cooperation with states, including authorization of financial assistance; and implements the provisions of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES).

Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 742(a)-754). Establishes a comprehensive national fish and wildlife policy and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to take steps required for the development, management, advancement, conservation, and protection of fisheries resources and wildlife resources through research, acquisition of refuge lands, development of existing facilities, and other means.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 661). The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to provide assistance to, and cooperate with, federal, state, and public or private agencies and organizations in the development, protection, rearing, and stocking of all species of wildlife, resources thereof, and their habitat, in controlling losses of the same from disease or other causes, in minimizing damages from overabundant species, and in providing public shooting and fishing areas, including easements across public lands for access thereto.

Appropriation: State and Tribal Wildlife Grants

	2010 Actual	2010 Enacted / 2011 CR	2012			Change from 2011 CR (+/-)
			Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
State Wildlife Grants (Formula) (\$000)	78,000	78,000	0	-11,000	67,000	-11,000
State Wildlife Grants (Competitive) (\$000)	5,000	5,000	0	+15,000	20,000	+15,000
Tribal Wildlife Grants (\$000)	7,000	7,000	0	+1,000	8,000	+1,000
Estimated User-Pay Cost Share (\$000)	[298]	[299]	-	[-14]	[285]	[-14]
Total, State and Tribal Wildlife Grants (\$000)	90,000	90,000	0	+5,000	95,000	+5,000
FTE	23	23	0	0	23	0

Summary of 2012 Program Changes for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
▪ State Wildlife Grants (Formula)	-11,000	0
▪ State Wildlife Grants (Competitive)	+15,000	0
▪ Tribal Wildlife Grants	+1,000	0
Program Changes	+5,000	0

Justification of 2012 Program Changes

The 2012 budget request for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants is \$95,000,000 and 23 FTE; a net program change of +\$5,000,000 and 0 FTE from the 2010 Enacted/annualized 2011 Continuing Resolution.

State Wildlife Grants (Formula) (-\$11,000,000/+0 FTE)

Due to shifting funding allocation to award projects competitively in FY 2012, formula-driven grants will be decreased by \$11,000,000.

State Wildlife Grants (Competitive) (+\$15,000,000/+0 FTE)

For the 2012 budget request, competitive grant allocation will increase by \$15,000,000. This increase in competitive allocation allows states to tailor projects in support of national resource management goals such as regional collaboration and partnership development, cost efficiencies and landscape scale management. With a changing environment, this effort builds upon other FWS initiatives, like Landscape Conservation Cooperatives, to envision management beyond previous jurisdictions. The work conducted with competitive grant funding will be focused on projects with the most significant conservation benefits such as:

1. State fish and wildlife agencies' ability to work collaboratively in implementing the Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs);
2. Baseline surveys on species, such as sea turtles (Green turtles, hawksbills, loggerheads, Kemp's ridleys, olive ridleys, and leatherbacks), and assessments impacted by climate change and other environmental stressors across state boundaries;

3. State responsiveness to emerging species population declines such as white-nose syndrome in cave-dwelling bats caused by emerging threats;
4. Protection of species' habitat across state boundaries or Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) habitat areas, thereby increasing the ability for multiple states to mutually protect habitats through cooperative projects between state fish and wildlife agencies that support viable populations of SGCN at the broader ecological scale; and
5. Increased national capability and strategic decision making that gathers state fish and wildlife agencies survey and project data, technical expertise and best management practices into a cohesive approach to address common resource management issues. This would foster projects similar to those funded in FY 2010 that built upon traditional State Wildlife Grant (SWG) projects and enhanced native prairies, wetlands, and woodlands on public and private lands across the boundaries of Nebraska, Wyoming, Montana, Idaho and Washington. These projects will benefit various SGCN such as the Bell's vireo, greater prairie chicken, sage grouse, swift fox, and the northern red belly dace.

Tribal Wildlife Grants (+\$1,000,000/+0 FTE)

For the 2012 budget request, the tribal component of this grant program will be increased by \$1,000,000; increasing the number of grants awarded to federally-recognized tribal governments. This funding will help in the conservation of wildlife and their habitat, including species of Native American cultural or traditional importance and species that are not hunted or fished. In FY 2010, the program awarded 42 of 137 grant proposals (about 31%) with total available funding. An increase of funding in FY 2012 will allow more applicants to receive grant funding.

Program Overview

The State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program (STWG) provides states, the District of Columbia, commonwealths, territories (states), and tribes, federal grant funds to develop and implement programs for the benefit of fish and wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished. The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for FY 2002 (Public Law 107-63) provides funding for STWG and this fund continues in the annual appropriations legislation. For the past ten years, this grant program has provided state fish and wildlife agencies a stable federal funding source in excess of \$735 million. All funded activities must link with species, actions, or strategies included in each state's Wildlife Action Plan. These state Wildlife Action Plans collectively form a nationwide strategy to prevent wildlife from becoming endangered, and are unique from many prior conservation plans because of broad participation and an open planning process. By working with stakeholders and other members of the community, state fish and wildlife agencies translate pressing conservation needs into practical actions and on-the-ground results.

Since the program's inception, it has enhanced 1.41 million acres of species habitat and protected nearly 108,000 acres of critical habitat through land acquisition or conservation easements.

Goals of the Program - The long-term goal of STWG is to stabilize, restore, enhance, and protect species of greatest conservation need (SGCN) and their habitat. By addressing SGCN and related habitats, the nation avoids the costly and time-consuming process that occurs when habitat is degraded or destroyed and species' populations plummet; therefore requiring additional protection through the Endangered Species Act or other regulatory processes. The program accomplishes its protection goals by 1) focusing projects on SGCN and their habitats, and 2) leveraging federal funding through cost-sharing provisions with state fish and wildlife agencies.

State Wildlife Action Plan - In 2005, as directed by Congress, each state submitted a comprehensive wildlife conservation strategy to identify and address the state's fisheries and wildlife resource concerns.

As part of this major planning effort, state fish and wildlife agencies worked with a wide range of constituent groups, including federal agencies, other state agencies, tribes and the public, to identify natural resource needs, concerns and issues, develop a SGCN list, and compile strategies to address the state's individual circumstances. The resulting state strategies, including the identified SGCN and associated habitats, are now known as state Wildlife Action Plans. Each state must have a Wildlife Action Plan, approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) Director, for the conservation of fish and wildlife. Each Wildlife Action Plan must consider the broad range of fish and wildlife and associated habitats, with priority on those species with the greatest conservation need, and take into consideration the relative level of funding available for the conservation of those species. The states must review and, if necessary, revise their Wildlife Action Plan by October 1, 2015, and every ten years afterwards, unless completed more frequently at each state's discretion. Revisions to state Wildlife Action Plans must follow the guidance issued in the July 12, 2007 letter from the Service's Director and the President of the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

Tribal Wildlife Grants - The Tribal Wildlife Grant (TWG) program provides funds to federally recognized tribal governments to develop and implement programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species of Native American cultural or traditional importance and species that are not hunted or fished. Although tribes are exempt from the requirement to develop wildlife plans, individual tribes are eager to continue their conservation work using resources from the national tribal competitive program.

Types of State Wildlife Grant Program (SWG) Projects - All 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealths of Puerto Rico and the Northern Mariana Islands, and the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands participate in this program through their respective fish and wildlife agencies. Each state, Commonwealth, and territory develops and select projects for funding based on the agencies' assessment of problems and needs associated with their Wildlife Action Plan. The following are eligible activities under the SWG:

- A. Conservation actions, such as research, surveys, species, and habitat management, acquisition of real property, facilities development, and monitoring.
- B. Coordination and administrative activities, such as data management systems development and maintenance, developing strategic and operational plans, and coordinating implementation meetings with partners. Partners are entities that participate in the planning or implementation of a state's plan. These entities include, but are not limited to, federal, state, and local agencies, tribes, nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, industry groups, and private individuals.
- C. Education and law enforcement activities under the following conditions:
 1. The education activities are actions intended to increase the public's knowledge or understanding of wildlife or wildlife conservation through instruction or distribution of materials.
 2. The law enforcement activities are efforts intended to compel the observance of laws or regulations.
 3. The activities are critical to achieving the project's objectives.
 4. The activities are no more than 10 percent of the respective project cost.
 5. The activities specifically benefit SGCN or their habitats.

- D. Providing technical guidance to a specific agency, organization, or person that monitors or manages SGCN or their habitats. Technical guidance is expert advice provided to governmental agencies, landowners, land managers, and organizations responsible for implementing land planning and management.
- E. Addressing nuisance wildlife or damage caused by wildlife, but only if the objective is to contribute to the conservation of SGCN or their habitats, as indicated in a state's Wildlife Action Plan.
- F. Conducting environmental reviews, site evaluations, permit reviews, or similar functions intended to protect SGCN or their habitats.
- G. Responding to emerging issues.
- H. Planning activities, including those associated with planning, coordinating and developing alternatives to compensate for unavoidable adverse effects to other resources.

Funding Planning and Implementation Grants – In 2007, the Service introduced new SWG guidance that narrowed the scope of work that may be conducted under planning grants. The guidance also restricted the content of state planning grants to 1) conducting internal evaluation of Wildlife Action Plans, and 2) obtaining input from partners and the public on how to improve those plans. Because of the restrictions on the content of work that can be carried out under planning grants, the Service expects the states will shift most of their SWG financial resources away from planning activities and toward conducting “implementation” work for more on-the-ground activities.

After deducting administrative costs for the Service's Washington and Regional Offices, the Service distributes SWG funds to states in the following manner:

- A. The District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico each receive a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent. The territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the U. S. Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands each receive a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent.
- B. The Service divides the remaining amount among the 50 states by a formula where one-third of the amount for each state is based on the ratio of the state land area to the total land area of the 50 states, with the other two-thirds based on the ratio of the state population to the total population of the 50 states. However, each of the 50 states must receive no less than 1 percent of the total amount available and no more than 5 percent.

The federal share of planning grants must not exceed 75 percent of the total cost, and the federal share of implementation grants must not exceed 50 percent of the total cost. These percentages are subject to change in the annual Appropriations Acts that both reauthorize and fund the SWG. The Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Program (WSFR) can waive the 25 percent non-federal matching requirement of the total grant cost for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the territories of Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, and American Samoa up to \$200,000 (48 U.S.C. 1469a (d)). The non-federal share may not include any federal funds or federal in-kind contributions unless legislation specifically allows it. Again, Tribal Wildlife Grants are competitive and are not required to provide a share of project costs; however, many do, and some quite substantially.

Obligation Requirements – States must obligate SWG funds to a grant by September 30 of the second federal fiscal year after their apportionment, or the remaining unobligated dollars revert to the Service. Reverted SWG funds lose their original fiscal year and state identity, and all states will receive them as an addition to the next year's national appropriation. If a state obligates SWG funds to an approved grant but

does not expend the funds in the grant period, WSFR will deobligate the unexpended balance. If WSFR deobligates the funds during the two-year period of availability, WSFR will reobligate these funds to an existing or new grant to the same state. SWG funds deobligated after their two-year period of availability revert to the Service and lose their original fiscal year identity. These reverted funds will go into next year’s SWG appropriation for apportionment to all states.

Performance Measurement – In September 2008, after a two-year effort, the Service, in cooperation with states, developed a Conservation Heritage Strategic Plan, which includes goals, and, in a companion document, Conservation Heritage Measures laid out performance measures. Data collection to assess progress on the Conservation Heritage Strategic Plan began in FY 2009. The Conservation Heritage Measures are designed to demonstrate long-term national outcomes as well as annual output performance goals through data provided by the individual states and collected in national surveys. Below are the targeted measures for FY 2012 under the State Wildlife Grant program.

CONSERVATION HERITAGE MEASURES	FY 2012 TARGETS
4.5.6 # of Acres of terrestrial habitat acquired and protected through fee title	14,787
7.19.4 # of Acres achieving habitat/biological community goals through voluntary agreements	225,330
15.8.17 # of Days of participation in wildlife watching (away from home)	352,070,000
15.8.18 # of Around-the-home wildlife watching participants	67,756,000

Use of Cost and Performance Information

Activity Based Costing (ABC) data will be used to monitor the overall production costs of achieving the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program’s primary performance measures, which may include acres and stream miles developed, improved, or maintained. However, cost data is not yet available for the program performance measures.

2012 Program Performance

With the FY 2012 budget of approximately \$95 million in payments to states and tribes, the Service expects program grantees to continue to stabilize, restore, enhance, and protect SGCN, as well as their habitat. In addition, the Service will continue working cooperatively with them to find ways to more consistently and comprehensively report accomplishments.

The STWG has proved a stable federal funding source for state and tribal fish and wildlife agencies for the past 11 years. This funding stability is critical to the recovery and continued resilience of many species that are in the greatest need of conservation. Some examples of activities planned by state fish and wildlife agencies in FY 2012 include:

- **Georgia:** The state agency will acquire 1,144 acres to become part of the Altamaha River Wildlife Management Area to protect wildlife habitat and provide outdoor recreational opportunities to the public.
- **Indiana:** The state agency will raise Allegheny woodrats, a state-endangered species, in captivity and begin releasing them in a suitable habitat in an attempt to augment and restore their population, thereby aiding the recovery of the species.

- **Iowa:** Selected in 2010 for a SWG competitive award, the state agency will restore and enhance 2,500 acres of grassland habitats to benefit species such as the greater prairie chicken and the regal fritillary butterfly.
- **Kansas:** The state agency will identify the biological and environmental factors that influence recruitment in the Kansas River. This will help determine if year class strength of selected fishes is related to river flows, and if year class strength is consistent throughout the Kansas River. This will aid the agency in providing hydrological recommendations regarding suitable flow conditions to recruit large river fish.
- **Northern Mariana Islands:** The state agency will monitor the Rota fruit bat population and forest bird populations. These species of concern (including forest birds and fruit bats) will benefit through increased knowledge of their biology and populations.
- **Pennsylvania:** The state agency will collect information on the distribution, relative abundance, and recruitment of the yellow lampmussel and other native mussels through targeted sampling within tributaries of the Susquehanna River system. These tasks will allow educated management decisions for permitting and conservation actions in this watershed.
- **Texas:** The state agency will provide technical assistance to citizens, land managers, and communities to preserve habitat and urban wildlife and provide for cost effective public use. They will also assist homeowners, community leaders and educators with urban habitat management and enhancement (wildscaping) through seminars and demonstrations of proven wildlife management. The agency will utilize volunteer programs to multiply staff investment. The project will provide better management of urban streams and wetlands and increase the amount of landscaping with native plants by homeowners, corporations, and other land managers. It will also enhance space management that provides for habitat for urban wildlife.
- **Wyoming (Shoshone and Arapho Tribes):** The tribes will develop methods and plans for the grizzly bear, sage grouse, and gray wolf programs, in order to develop Management Plans for the species.

In 2012, the Service will continue to integrate cost and performance information for the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant Program. This program has a long history of conservation successes, with ongoing support provided by the Tracking and Reporting on Actions for Conservation Species (TRACS) database system. With this database system, the Service expects to continue improving its accomplishment reporting. This will result in more refined performance numbers and better documentation of the progress in meeting performance goals identified in the Conservation Heritage Strategic Plan.

Table 1
 U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
 ESTIMATED STATE WILDLIFE GRANTS APPORTIONMENT - 2011
 CFDA: 15.634

<u>STATE</u>	<u>FY 2011 Apportionment Estimate</u>
ALABAMA	\$1,193,056.00
ALASKA	\$3,900,000.00
AMERICAN SAMOA	\$195,000.00
ARIZONA	\$2,009,922.00
ARKANSAS	\$908,544.00
CALIFORNIA	\$3,900,000.00
COLORADO	\$1,671,698.00
CONNECTICUT	\$780,000.00
DELAWARE	\$780,000.00
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	\$390,000.00
FLORIDA	\$3,494,859.00
GEORGIA	\$2,077,939.00
GUAM	\$195,000.00
HAWAII	\$780,000.00
IDAHO	\$941,025.00
ILLINOIS	\$2,584,813.00
INDIANA	\$1,346,483.00
IOWA	\$958,281.00
KANSAS	\$1,140,308.00
KENTUCKY	\$1,035,237.00
LOUISIANA	\$1,118,882.00
MAINE	\$780,000.00
MARYLAND	\$1,011,752.00
MASSACHUSETTS	\$1,135,620.00
MICHIGAN	\$2,125,929.00
MINNESOTA	\$1,555,008.00
MISSISSIPPI	\$876,871.00
MISSOURI	\$1,547,134.00
MONTANA	\$1,374,252.00
N. MARIANA ISLANDS	\$195,000.00
NEBRASKA	\$932,283.00
NEVADA	\$1,340,909.00
NEW HAMPSHIRE	\$780,000.00
NEW JERSEY	\$1,490,747.00
NEW MEXICO	\$1,330,917.00
NEW YORK	\$3,607,278.00
NORTH CAROLINA	\$1,950,169.00
NORTH DAKOTA	\$780,000.00
OHIO	\$2,228,189.00
OKLAHOMA	\$1,176,003.00
OREGON	\$1,424,658.00
PENNSYLVANIA	\$2,419,167.00
PUERTO RICO	\$390,000.00
RHODE ISLAND	\$780,000.00
SOUTH CAROLINA	\$993,029.00
SOUTH DAKOTA	\$780,000.00
TENNESSEE	\$1,369,151.00
TEXAS	\$3,900,000.00
UTAH	\$1,151,186.00
VERMONT	\$780,000.00
VIRGIN ISLANDS	\$195,000.00
VIRGINIA	\$1,611,682.00
WASHINGTON	\$1,638,584.00
WEST VIRGINIA	\$780,000.00
WISCONSIN	\$1,388,435.00
WYOMING	\$780,000.00
TOTAL	\$78,000,000.00

Standard Form 300			
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE STATE and TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS FUND			
Program and Financing (in millions of dollars)	2010	2011	2012
Identification code 14-1694-0-302	Actual	Estimate	Estimate
Obligations by program activity:			
0001 State Wildlife Grants	60	73	75
0002 State Competitive Grants	6	6	12
0003 Administration	4	4	4
0004 Tribal Wildlife Grants	9	9	9
1000 Total obligations	79	92	100
Budgetary resources available for obligation:			
<u>Unobligated Balance:</u>			
1000 Unobligated balance brought forward, Oct 1	52	66	66
1021 Recoveries of prior year unpaid obligations	3	2	2
1050 Total budgetary resources available for obligation	55	68	68
<u>New budget authority (Discretionary):</u>			
1201 Appropriation	90	90	95
1930 Total Budgetary Resources Available	145	158	163
Change in Obligated Balance:			
3000 Obligated balance, start of year	143	148	139
3030 New obligations	79	92	100
3040 Total outlays, gross (-)	-71	-99	-102
3080 Recoveries of prior year unpaid obligations	-3	-2	-2
3100 Obligated balance, end of year	148	139	135
Outlays (gross), detail:			
4010 Outlays from new discretionary authority	10	20	21
4011 Outlays from discretionary balances	61	79	81
4110 Total Outlays (gross)	71	99	102
Net budget authority and outlays:			
4180 Budget authority	90	90	95
4190 Outlays	71	99	102
Object Classification (in millions of dollars)			
Direct Obligations:			
<u>Personnel compensation:</u>			
11.11 Personnel compensation: Full-time permanent	2	2	2
11.21 Civilian personnel benefits	1	1	1
12.51 Advisory and assistance services	1		
14.10 Grants, subsidies and contributions	75	88	96
19.90 Subtotal, Direct Obligations	79	91	99
99.95 Below Threshold		1	1
99.99 Total obligations	79	92	100
Personnel Summary			
Direct:			
<u>Total compensable workyears:</u>			
1001 Full-time equivalent employment	23	23	23