

Activity: Ecological Services
Subactivity: Environmental Contaminants

	2007 Actual	2008 Enacted	2009			Change From 2008 (+/-)
			Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	
Environmental Contaminants (\$000)	11,046	11,982	+260	-702	11,540	-442
FTE	84	84		-4	80	-4

Summary of 2009 Program Changes for Environmental Contaminants

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
• General Program Activities – Technical Assistance and Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration (NRDAR)	-665	-4
• Travel Reduction	-29	0
• Contract Reduction	-8	0
TOTAL Program Changes	-702	-4

Justification of 2009 Program Changes

The 2009 budget request for Environmental Contaminants (EC) is \$11,540,000 and 80 FTEs, a program change of -\$702,000 and -4 FTEs from the 2008 Enacted.

General Program Activities – Technical Assistance and NRDAR (-\$665,000/-4 FTE)

In order to maintain the Service's involvement in the NRDAR program and to restore injured natural resources, ECD will direct our resources to investigations and restoration actions; integrating NRDAR activities with other Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) programs, our co-trustees, and other partners inside DOI and with industry. Our intention is to focus on restoration and to continue to establish cooperative assessments to the greatest extent possible.

Despite a reduction in staff and base funds, we will continue to provide technical assistance to other Service programs. This technical assistance will include conducting on and off-refuge investigations, providing analytical support through the Analytical Control Facility (ACF), consulting on national water quality criteria and pesticides, and providing technical assistance requested by all other FWS programs. In 2009, technical assistance to our external partners (e.g., other DOI Bureaus, federal agencies, tribes, states, and NGOs) will be provided mostly on a reimbursable basis. This includes technical reviews of environmental risk assessments and assistance on toxicological and biological studies.

Program Performance Change

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2009 Base Budget (2008 Plan + Fixed Costs)	2009 President's Budget	Program Change Accruing in 2009	Program Change Accruing in Outyears
Resource Protection - Landscapes and Watersheds								
2.9.3 # of completed contaminant investigations, cleanups, and restoration on Refuges	30	0	108	39	39	30	-9 (-23.1%)	
Comments:	Investigations are multi-year projects with differing timelines for completion.							
3.1.3 # of non-FWS riparian (stream/shoreline) miles restored through technical assistance, including partnerships (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	7	20	20	10	-10 (-50.0%)	
Comments:	These are not regularly occurring activities, but occur opportunistically							
3.1.4 # of non-FWS riparian (stream/shoreline) miles restored through NRDA (GPRA)(PART)	12	42	171	65	65	55	-10 (-14.7%)	
Comments:	These are not regularly occurring activities, but occur opportunistically							
3.2.2 # of non-FWS riparian (stream/shoreline) miles managed or protected through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	1	40	1,077	152	152	40	-112 (-73.7%)	
Comments:	These are not regularly occurring activities, but occur opportunistically							
4.1.2 # of wetlands enhanced/restored through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	2,011	591	591	500	-91 (-15.4%)	
4.1.3 # of wetlands enhanced/restored through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	2,000	10,506	4,967	1,206	1,206	1,000	-206 (-17.1%)	

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2009 Base Budget (2008 Plan + Fixed Costs)	2009 President's Budget	Program Change Accruing in 2009	Program Change Accruing in Outyears
4.2.2 # of non-FWS upland acres enhanced/restored through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	86	1,172	1,172	1,200	28 (2.4%)	
4.2.3 # of non-FWS upland acres enhanced/restored through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	2,897	5,962	3,234	3,234	3,000	-234 (-7.2%)	
4.4.4 # of non-FWS wetland acres managed or protected through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	30,042,521	3,770	3,770	3,700	-70 (-1.9%)	
Comments:	FY 2007 actual data from two of the Service's off-refuge contaminant investigations were used to provide the scientific basis leading to a lead shot ban for all bird hunting in Game Management Unit (GMU) 26, which covers a large portion of northern Alaska. These contaminant investigation results, along with many years of outreach and education by Service staff, have given local communities the necessary data to request the State of Alaska ban lead shot for bird hunting in the 89,000 square mile North Slope Borough, which includes Barrow, the only known significant breeding location for threatened stellers eiders in the United States. Acres within GMU were allocated to lands within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (11,960,500 acres) and off-refuge lands (40,039,500 acres).							
4.4.5 # of non-FWS wetland acres managed or protected through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	11,477	2,400	1,652	1,652	1,600	-52 (-3.2%)	
4.5.1 # of non-FWS upland acres managed or protected through technical assistance or land management actions, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	13,011	10,025,539	10,795	10,795	10,000	-795 (-7.4%)	
Comments:	FY 2007 actual data from two of the Service's off-refuge contaminant investigations were used to provide the scientific basis leading to a lead shot ban for all bird hunting in Game Management Unit (GMU) 26, which covers a large portion of northern Alaska. These contaminant investigation results, along with many years of outreach and education by Service staff, have given local communities the necessary data to request the State of Alaska ban lead shot for bird hunting in the 89,000 square mile North Slope Borough, which includes Barrow, the only known significant breeding location for threatened stellers eiders in the United States. Acres within GMU were allocated to lands within the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (11,960,500 acres) and off-refuge lands (40,039,500 acres).							

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2009 Base Budget (2008 Plan + Fixed Costs)	2009 President's Budget	Program Change Accruing in 2009	Program Change Accruing in Outyears
4.5.2 # of non-FWS upland acres managed or protected through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	11,250	2,116	7,696	4,809	4,809	4,500	-309 (-6.4%)	
CSF 4.7 Number of other environmental technical assistance efforts to protect habitat	1,596	59,431	145,282	54,637	54,637	54,250	-387 (-0.7%)	
CSF Total Actual/Projected Cost(\$000)	unk	\$31,705	\$22,868	\$8,806	\$8,806	\$8,954	\$147	
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Cost(\$000)	unk	\$15,298	\$14,231	\$14,573	\$14,573	\$14,922	\$350	
Actual/Projected Cost Per N/A (whole dollars)	unk	\$533	\$157	\$161	\$161	\$165	\$4	
4.7.2 # of spill prevention activities and spill responses involving a field visit	392	unk	40,756	672	672	600	-72 (-10.7%)	
4.7.4 # of ongoing NRDA cases, final settlements, and other environmental assessments (including BTAG, CERCLA, & RCRA activities)	175	unk	1,002	291	291	250	-41 (-14.1%)	
Resource Protection - Sustaining Biological Communities								
7.15.4 # of completed contaminant investigations -- Off Service lands	13	unk	40	58	58	20	-38 (-65.5%)	
Comments:	Investigations are multi-year projects with differing timelines for completion.							
7.15.5 # of Clean Water Act activities (NPDES, TMDLs, Triennial Reviews)	5,424	unk	6,038	1,585	1,585	1,500	-85 (-5.4%)	
7.15.6 # of Section 7 Consultations Pesticides -- Off Service lands - State and EPA consultations and technical assistance	231	unk	398	181	181	185	4 (2.2%)	

Performance Goal	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2009 Base Budget (2008 Plan + Fixed Costs)	2009 President's Budget	Program Change Accruing in 2009	Program Change Accruing in Outyears
7.15.7 # of Section 7 Consultations CWA -- Off Service lands - State and EPA consultations and technical assistance	918	unk	1,088	337	337	340	3 (0.9%)	
Recreation								
15.8.9 # of non-FWS acres of recreational opportunities made available through NRDA restorations (GPRA)	unk	unk	4	771	771	12	-759 (-98.4%)	
Comments:	This is a function of how restoration activities are counted, not a function of individual recreational activities. We are counting entire restoration plans, not individual activities within a plan.							

Unk – Unknown – The Environmental Contaminants program does not have data for these items or it was not available in the past.

Program Overview

The EC/NRDAR Program recently completed a Strategic Plan that defines our long-term goals and describes the breadth and integration of our activities with other programs in the FWS and other DOI Bureaus. Our Program continues to contribute directly to the DOI's Strategic Plan and Resource Protection Goal of *"Improving the Health of Watersheds and Landscapes under DOI Management or Influence"* by implementing strategies to restore and maintain the proper function of watersheds and landscapes. We also contribute directly to the DOI Resource Protection End Outcome Goal of *"Sustaining Biological Communities on DOI Managed and Influenced Lands and Waters."* EC specialists monitor the impacts of contaminants on fish and wildlife through special studies on and off FWS Lands. These investigations provide management with heretofore unknown information regarding contaminants impacts on fish and wildlife to aid in making appropriate long-term conservation management decisions.

DOI trust resources may be exposed to and affected by many chemical compounds, including over 70,000 chemicals in commerce (e.g., pesticides, personal care products, pharmaceuticals, and industrial chemicals), legacy pollutants (e.g., PCBs, DDT, and dioxins), naturally-occurring elements that may become enriched to toxic levels in the environment due to human activity (e.g., mercury and selenium), and common pollutants such as ammonia. EC staff works with internal and external partners under several legislative authorities to: (1) help prevent DOI trust resources from being exposed to hazardous levels of contaminants; (2) assess the effects of contaminants on species and habitats; and (3) remediate and restore contaminated habitats that support trust resources.

Below are just a few examples of the type of services EC/NRDAR staff provide to all other FWS programs and our many collaborators inside and outside DOI every year. They include:

- Assisted with the development of a candidate conservation plan to preclude the need to list the robust redbreasted sunfish in the Altamaha River and Savanna River watersheds;

- Provided technical assistance to the Partners for Fish and Wildlife program by assessing the contaminant risk and impacts associated with the restoration of agricultural lands; and
- Provided technical and consultation assistance on national water quality criteria for pollutants that may impact aquatic and aquatic-dependent species to ensure the levels are protective at a watershed scale.
- Provides technical support to EPA on hazardous waste site remediation under the authority of CERCLA (“Superfund”). EC also works with other federal agencies that actively remediate hazardous waste sites they own (e.g., Department of Defense, Department of Energy).
- Provide technical leadership and assistance to other DOI bureaus, Federal, State and Tribal co-trustees to assess injuries to natural resources from released oil or hazardous substances, settle dam claims and restore those injured resources

Technical Assistance

The EC program uses a collaborative approach with other Federal agencies, States, Tribes, local governments, foreign governments and private citizens to identify and minimize contaminant-related risks to fish and wildlife and to restore natural resources injured by contamination. Our technical expertise also provides information to managers that allow them to make informed decisions that eliminate or minimize these risks. EC personnel are integrated into spill-prevention activities and actively participate in local and regional responses and planning for oil spills and hazardous material releases, as well as actual oil spills and hazardous material drills. Within this context, EC focuses on four priority areas:

- Identifying contaminant sources and the appropriate management actions to minimize impacts
- Restoring habitats and communities impacted by contaminants
- Providing technical services to others
- Pre-planning to reduce contamination during spills and maximize spill response effectiveness.

Analytical Control Facility (ACF)

The Analytical Control Facility (ACF), a branch of the EC/NRDAR program, provides high quality environmental chemistry analysis to support EC/NRDAR staff field investigations. ACF and the contract labs they oversee quantify environmental pollutant concentrations in samples collected by field staff and work with those staff to interpret the results and develop new analysis methodologies as needed. ACF staff play a critical role in ensuring the data obtained from the contract labs is of very high quality. Since its inception (1985), the ACF database now contains over 2 million data records involving over 100,000 field collected samples. In FY 2007, the ACF processed approximately \$1 million in analytical requests.

Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration (NRDAR)

The FWS is a key member of the DOI’s Restoration Program and participates in 99.5% of all damage assessment cases funded by the Restoration Program. EC/NRDAR staff investigate injuries to fish, wildlife, and habitat that result from releases of hazardous material and oil spills; determine the extent of injury and damages; play a key role in settlement negotiations; and carry out subsequent restoration projects. Usually a portion of a settlement is used to repay the cost of the injury investigation work, with most of the funds being applied to on-the-ground restoration projects.

Since 1993, EC/NRDAR staff has obtained about \$56 million in appropriated funding from the DOI Restoration Program for natural resource damage assessment case work. That investment has resulted in settlements well in excess of \$400 million for restoration of injured natural resources, mostly fish, wildlife, and habitat, a 7 to 1 return on the investment. Often the FWS is able to increase the amount of habitat restored or speed-up the pace of restoration by leveraging settlement funds with other sources, obtaining matching funds, or obtaining in-kind work from the companies responsible for the spill or hazardous material release. The North Cape oil spill (Rhode Island) in 1996 is a typical example of the EC/NRDAR programs leveraging of funds and developing partnerships with local communities and others to enhance restoration activities . In this they received:

- \$114 million in contributions from the New England Forestry Foundation, Downeast Lakes Land Trust, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), International Paper, Passamaquoddy Tribe and others,

was leveraged with \$3 million from the NRDA settlement to protect 1.5 million acres of loon nesting habitat.

- \$600,000 from the Maine Coastal Heritage Trust, TNC, and others was leveraged with \$400,000 from the settlement to protect, manage, and monitor 42 acres of common eider nesting habitat.
- \$155,000 from Rhode Island, TNC, U.S. Coast Guard and local communities groups was leveraged with \$195,000 from the settlement to manage and monitor piping plover habitat which resulted in 3 new beaches being colonized and the population growing by 20 pairs.

As evidenced by the table below, benefits to fish, wildlife, and habitat from NRDAR activities have accrued rapidly since the EC/NRDAR Program began to focus more on damage assessment and restoration activities in FY 2007. The Program plans to continue this successful strategy in FY 2008 and has numerous active NRDA cases that are likely to result in a settlement and the implementation of significant additional restoration projects. The potential future workload is also substantial given that there are 1,243 sites on EPA's National Priorities List, 61 more that are proposed for listing, more than 10,000 sites listed in EPA's database of contaminated sites, and over 12,000 oil spills that are reported annually in the U.S. In many instances the releases of oil or hazardous materials from these sites has negatively impacted fish and wildlife and aquatic ecosystems.

FY 2007 NRDAR Program Highlights

94%	Percent of cases where the Service is the lead departmental bureau
98%	Percent of all dollars obtained and deposited into the NRDAR fund for restoration (\$196 million)
>400	Number of cases in which the Service uses base funds, recovered assessment funds, or cooperative assessment funds to fund a case
4,967	Wetland acres restored or enhanced using funds from the NRDAR program in 2007
5,962	Upland acres restored or enhanced using funds from the NRDAR Program in 2007
171	Stream miles restored or enhanced using funds from the NRDAR Program in 2007
\$400 million	Amount available for restoration (more than \$300 M in NRDAR account and more than 100 million in court accounts)

Supporting the Service and Departmental Priorities

Restorations associated with NRDAR cases directly benefit Service and Department trust resources by:

- (1) Restoring clean high-quality habitat to the National Wildlife Refuge System. Over 10,000 acres have been added or restored to the National Wildlife Refuge System.
- (2) Restoring listed Threatened and Endangered Species. Recent settlements resulted in the acquisition of hundreds of acres of older growth forest habitat for marbled murrelets, enhancement of stream quality for several listed mussels, and provided nesting habitat and management for bald eagles.
- (3) Increasing migratory bird populations. More than a dozen seabird breeding colonies along the U.S. coast and internationally have been protected and enhanced.
- (4) Providing habitat and clean water for fish. Numerous stream habitat enhancements, migration barrier removal projects, and long-term restoration actions to increase spawning output and survival of young fish and provide for long-term health of fish populations have been funded.
- (5) Connecting people of all ages, especially children, with nature. NRDAR settlement funds have been used to develop and enhance outdoor recreational opportunities – fishing, bird watching, and waterfowl hunting and they regularly include an educational component and habitat improvement projects that engage the local community in physically restoring their local environment.

Use of Cost and Performance Information

The Environmental Contaminants/Natural Resource Damage Assessment Program has been using performance based information for several years in its resource allocation process.

- EC/NRDAR provides informational support to other divisions and agencies such as: toxicological reports to the Endangered Species Program on Water Quality Criteria and pesticide registration; promoting Integrated Pest Management and conducting contaminant investigations and refuge cleanup projects on National Wildlife Refuge lands; assisting the U.S. Coast Guard and U.S. EPA during hazardous material and/or oil spill responses to ensure they remain in compliance with various statutes, address environmental concerns in a timely manner, and are prepared to minimize the impact of oil and chemicals on fish, wildlife, and habitat. Our efficiency will continue to improve as we implement our Strategic Plan and increase our coordination and communication efforts within the FWS and agencies and groups inside and outside of DOI.
- EC/NRDAR uses contract services through the ACF for chemical analysis because they are a more cost effective means to obtain necessary information. We maintain the highest quality data by working closely with the contractors before, during and after analysis through strict QA/QC protocols.
- Performance information is used to allocate resources in the Off-Refuge Investigations part of the program. Proposals are evaluated based on scientific merit, management outcomes, trust resource impacts and a score based on the performance of a Region over the past five years. If Regions do not complete investigations in a timely fashion, their future allocations are reduced. Through the Peer Review process, we prioritize the on and off Service land investigations, refuge cleanups and contaminant assessments. This process ensures that the work being performed meets the needs of the FWS and maintains the high quality and scientific integrity of the data for effective management decisions.
- The use of Activity Based Costing provides an avenue to report our accomplishments and accurately document our efforts while further aiding our identification, prioritization, and utilization of our widely needed and unique technical expertise.

2009 Program Performance

The FWS has shifted the focus of the EC/NRDAR program to prioritize NRDAR activities. The FWS has begun to accelerate restoration activities by emphasizing and directing field staff to concentrate more effort on restoration activities. Even with the re-prioritization of the Program, our restoration activities may decrease due to a reduction in staff and base funds.

Despite a reduction in staff and base funds, we will continue to conduct Off-Refuge Investigations and provide technical assistance and consult on national water quality criteria, which is critical in setting aquatic life criteria for pollutants that are protective of aquatic and aquatic-dependent species and other wildlife. We will continue to structure our role in traditional EC activities that provide for efficient use of our staff. For example, the Division of Realty will conduct level I pre-acquisition surveys and the National Wildlife Refuge System will have greater oversight in pesticide use proposal reviews, while EC field staff will limit their activities to technical assistance. These efficiencies will allow us to maintain our performance goals in FY 2009, as reflected in the Program Performance Overview Table.

EC biologists will reduce but continue to provide technical assistance to EPA, tribes, states, and local entities on the development and evaluation of National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permits and Total Maximum Daily Load requirements of the Clean Water Act by fulfilling data needs regarding contaminant-related impacts to Service lands and other habitats associated with trust resources. These activities support the conservation of trust resources by reducing, preventing, or eliminating the impacts of contaminants on and off Service lands. The EC program also collaborates with other federal, state, and local agencies to review and formulate management plans for watersheds which encompass Service lands. This directly supports the efforts of the National Fish Habitat Initiative by helping to ensure sufficiently high water quality to support aquatic species.

Technical assistance to other FWS programs using EC base funds will be continued for specific projects such as dredging, Corps of Engineer permits, Endangered Species consultations, Refuge and Migratory Birds, and Law Enforcement requests and other traditional Ecological Services activities. Technical Assistance to external partners (e.g., other DOI Bureaus, federal agencies, tribes, states, and NGOs) will be provided primarily on a reimbursable basis. This includes technical reviews of environmental risk assessments and assistance on toxicological and biological studies.

A reduction in base funds may impact our ability to provide analytical support through the ACF to the field and the regions. While several cost-saving strategies (e.g., centralized contract procurement and 5-year analytical contracts), have been implemented, Program funding likely will be insufficient to replace outdated analytical chemistry equipment.

Restoration of contaminated habitats and subsequent monitoring to document the effectiveness of such efforts will continue to be priorities for the EC/NRDAR program as will prevention-related activities which help protect healthy habitats. Our newest public awareness campaign with the American Pharmacists Association, *SMART DISPOSAL*, is one example of how the EC program works with partners to help prevent pollution and protect fish and wildlife resources. With *SMART DISPOSAL*, people are encouraged to properly dispose of unwanted medications to reduce the impact these chemicals on our nation's waters and the fish and wildlife that depend upon sufficient clean water to thrive

Program Performance Overview

Performance Goal / Measure	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Plan	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2009 President's Budget	Change from 2008 Plan to 2009	Long-term 2012 Target
Resource Protection - Landscapes and Watersheds								
CSF 2.5 Number of FWS upland acres managed or protected to maintain desired condition as specified in management plans - annual (GPRA)	2,502,152	52,791,511	52,901,557	52,689,376	51,750,305	52,817,437	1,067,132 (2.1%)	52,817,437
CSF Total Actual/Projected Cost(\$000)	unk	\$58,652	unk	\$47,712	\$47,986	\$50,151	\$2,165	\$50,151
CSF Program Total Actual/Projected Cost(\$000)	unk	\$55	unk	\$48	\$49	\$50	\$1	\$50
Actual/Projected Cost Per Acre (whole dollars)	unk	\$1	unk	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$0	\$1
2.9.3 # of completed contaminant investigations, cleanups, and restoration on Refuges	30	0	18	108	39	30	-9 (-23.1%)	30
Comments:	Investigations are multi-year projects with differing timelines for completion.							
3.1.3 # of non-FWS riparian (stream/shoreline) miles restored through technical assistance, including partnerships (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	unk	7	20	10	-10 (-50.0%)	10
Comments:	These are not regularly occurring activities, but occur opportunistically							
3.1.4 # of non-FWS riparian (stream/shoreline) miles restored through NRDA (GPRA)(PART)	12	42	164	171	65	55	-10 (-14.7%)	55
Comments:	These are not regularly occurring activities, but occur opportunistically							
3.2.2 # of non-FWS riparian (stream/shoreline) miles managed or protected through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	1	40	11	1,077	152	40	-112 (-73.7%)	40
Comments:	These are not regularly occurring activities, but occur opportunistically							
3.2.3 # of non-FWS riparian (stream/shoreline) miles managed or protected through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	5,837	2,095	3	157	45	45	0 (1.1%)	45

Performance Goal / Measure	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Plan	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2009 President's Budget	Change from 2008 Plan to 2009	Long-term 2012 Target
4.1.2 # of wetlands enhanced/restored through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	unk	2,011	591	500	-91 (-15.4%)	500
4.1.3 # of wetlands enhanced/restored through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	2,000	10,506	7,600	4,967	1,206	1,000	-206 (-17.1%)	1,000
4.2.2 # of non-FWS upland acres enhanced/restored through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	unk	86	1,172	1,200	+28 (+ 2.4%)	1,200
4.2.3 # of non-FWS upland acres enhanced/restored through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	2,897	1,067	5,962	3,234	3,000	-234 (- 7.2%)	3,000
4.4.4 # of non-FWS wetland acres managed or protected through technical assistance, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	unk	unk	30,042,521	3,770	3,700	-70 (- 1.9%)	3,700
4.4.5 # of non-FWS wetland acres managed or protected through NRDA - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	11,477	676	2,400	1,652	1,600	-52 (- 3.2%)	1,600
4.5.1 # of non-FWS upland acres managed or protected through technical assistance or land management actions, including partnerships - annual (GPRA)(PART)	unk	13,011	10,952	10,025,539	10,795	10,000	-795 (- 7.4%)	10,000
Comment:	The high 2007 actual is due to the one-time contribution of 10,025,539 acres by the Environmental Contaminants program.							
4.7.1 # of pesticide use proposals and integrated pest management plans reviewed	1,029	unk	317	1,594	400	400	0	400
4.7.2 # of spill prevention activities and spill responses involving a field visit	392	unk	1,067	40,756	672	600	-72 (-10.7%)	600
4.7.4 # of ongoing NRDA cases, final settlements, and other environmental assessments (including BTAG, CERCLA, & RCRA activities)	175	unk	169	1,002	291	250	-41 (-14.1%)	250

Performance Goal / Measure	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Plan	2007 Actual	2008 Plan	2009 President's Budget	Change from 2008 Plan to 2009	Long-term 2012 Target
7.15.4 # of completed contaminant investigations -- Off Service lands	13	unk	unk	40	58	20	-38 (-65.5%)	20
Comments:	Investigations are multi-year projects with differing timelines for completion.							
7.15.5 # of Clean Water Act activities (NPDES, TMDLs, Triennial Reviews)	5,424	unk	826	6,038	1,585	1,500	-85 (-5.4%)	1,500
7.15.6 # of Section 7 Consultations Pesticides -- Off Service lands - State and EPA consultations and technical assistance	231	unk	unk	398	181	185	4 (2.2%)	185
7.15.7 # of Section 7 Consultations CWA -- Off Service lands - State and EPA consultations and technical assistance	918	unk	295	1,088	337	340	3 (0.9%)	340
Recreation								
15.8.4 # of non-FWS river, trail and shoreline miles for recreational opportunities made available through NRDA restorations (GPRA)	unk	unk	unk	3	11	11	0	11
15.8.9 # of non-FWS acres of recreational opportunities made available through NRDA restorations (GPRA)	unk	unk	7	4	771	12	-759 (-98.4%)	12
Comments:	This is a function of how restoration activities are counted, not a function of individual recreational activities. We are counting entire restoration plans, not individual activities within a plan.							
Serving Communities								
18.1.13 # of technical assistance support activities to Tribes for NRDAR, Restoration, CWA, Pesticides	unk	unk	22	46	25	20	-5 (-20.0%)	20

Unk – Unknown – The Environmental Contaminants program does not have data for these items or it was not available in the past.