

Appropriation 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, ~~[\$75,000,000]~~\$73,830,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to remain available until expended: Provided, That of the amount provided herein, ~~[\$6,282,000]~~\$6,184,000 is for a competitive grant program for Indian tribes not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: Provided further, That ~~[\$5,000,000]~~\$4,922,000 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 said ~~[\$11,282,000]~~\$11,106,000 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 ~~[2008]~~2009 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, ~~[2009]~~2010, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in ~~[2010]~~2011, in the manner provided herein. (*Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008.*)

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 and 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). Authorization of Appropriations: Expired September 30, 1992.

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 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, in providing public shooting and fishing areas, including easements across public lands for access thereto.

Activity: State and Tribal Wildlife Grants

		2007 Actual	2008 Enacted	2009			
				Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	Change from 2008 (+/-)
State Wildlife Grants	(\$000)	61,492	62,724	0	0	62,724	0
	FTE	19	19	-	-	19	-
Competitive Grants	(\$000)	0	4,922	0	0	4,922	0
Tribal Grants	(\$000)	6,000	6,184	0	0	6,184	0
TOTAL, State & Tribal Wildlife Grants	(\$000)	67,492	73,830	0	0	73,830	0
	FTE	19	19	-	-	19	-

The 2009 budget request for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants is \$73,830,000 and 19 FTE, a net program change of \$0 and 0 FTE from the 2008 Enacted.

Program Overview

The State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program provides grants to States, Commonwealths and Territories through a formula-based distribution, and to Tribes through a national competitive award process. There is also a competitive program that uses a merit-based process to fund the best outcome-oriented, results based projects. Congress initiated this grant program in FY 2002 and funded it from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Since the program's inception, Congress has provided over \$474 million for conservation work in States and on Tribal lands.

Goals of the Program - The long-term goal of the State Grant program is to stabilize, restore, enhance, and protect species and their habitat that are of conservation concern. By doing so, the Nation avoids the costly and time-consuming process that occurs when habitat is degraded or destroyed and species' populations plummet, therefore needing additional protection through the Endangered Species Act or other regulatory processes. The program accomplishes its protection goals by, 1) focusing projects on species and their habitats that are in most need of conservation, 2) leveraging Federal funding through cost-sharing provisions with State and Territorial fish and wildlife agencies and 3) rewarding exemplary examples of outcome-oriented, results driven cooperative conservation.

The long-term goal of the Tribal Grant Program is to provide funds to Federally recognized Tribal governments to develop and implement programs for the benefit of the wildlife and their habitat, including species of native American cultural or traditional importance and species that are not hunted or fished.

State Wildlife Action Plans - The goal of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in FY 2007 and 2008 was to ensure all 56 States and Territories (States) implement their State Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (or Wildlife Action Plan). States use their Wildlife Action Plans to improve their strategic conservation planning, enabling them to focus their Federal and State financial resources on habitats and species in ways that will provide the most effective and efficient conservation. With the States on track to engage in well-planned and managed conservation, Federal, State, private, and other resources will more quickly and efficiently work for the benefit of species of the greatest conservation need and their habitat. The U.S. Fish and

Wildlife Service and the Department are eager to explore how to use the State Wildlife Action Plans in order to prioritize landscape-scale conservation activities.

Indian Tribes are exempt from the requirement to develop wildlife plans, but individual Tribes continue their conservation work using resources from this nationally competitive program.

Funding Planning and Implementation Grants -The Service developed new program guidance for State Wildlife Grants in 2007 that narrowed the scope of work that may be conducted under planning grants. This change restricts the content of State planning grants to conducting internal evaluation of the Wildlife Action Plans and to obtaining input from partners and the public on how to improve the Plans. Through this restriction, the Service expects States will shift most of their SWG financial resources from spending on planning activities to conducting “implementation” work for more on-the-ground activities.

The State Grant program leverages Federal funds through cost-sharing provisions. States and Territories provide a 25 percent match of total project costs for planning grants and 50 percent for implementation grants. Tribes are not required to provide a share of project costs, but many do, and some quite substantially.

Tribal Wildlife Grants - These grants are used to provide technical and financial assistance to Tribes for the development and implementation of programs that benefit fish and wildlife resources and their habitat. Activities may include planning for wildlife and habitat conservation, fish and wildlife conservation and management actions, fish and wildlife related laboratory and field research, natural history studies, habitat mapping, field surveys and population monitoring, habitat preservation, conservation easements, and public education. The funds may be used for salaries, equipment, consultant services, subcontracts, acquisitions and travel.

Grant recipients are selected through a nationally competitive process. Proposals are evaluated according to resource benefit, performance measures, work plan, budget, capacity building and their partnerships and contributions.

State Competitive Grants – These grants are awarded to the highest ranking cooperative conservation projects that are in State Wildlife Conservation Plans (State Wildlife Action plans). Priority will be given to cooperative conservation projects with an emphasis on performance results and outcomes. The competitive grants are designed to incentivizes States and other partners to integrate the principles of cooperation and performance into conservation projects.

Performance Measurement - The Service currently lacks performance measures for State and Tribal Wildlife Grants. As a result, data is not available to demonstrate program performance. However, the Service is making progress in developing substantial and reliable performance measures through the Strategic Plan. The US Fish and Wildlife Service expects the Strategic Plan to be completed in calendar year 2008 and will work with cooperators to achieve long-term outcomes and annual performance goals identified in the planning documents.

Cost Information - Cost data is not yet available for this program. Once performance measures are documented in the Strategic Plan and activity-based costing goals and procedures can be refined for this program, cost information will be reported and used for evaluation of program performance.

Use of Cost and Performance Information

- A new strategic plan with revised and improved performance measures will be implemented in FY 2009. This will allow for substantial improvements in accomplishment reporting towards program goals by Service cooperators.
- The new strategic plan will allow the Service to work with cooperators, as appropriate, and revise project goals to be consistent with overall program goals.
- The Service is working to create the grant selection processes used with the competitive grant programs funded through the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program.
- The Service is working to improve the accuracy of internal databases that are used to compile accomplishment information, which will improve the Service's ability to administer its grant programs. For example, an automated database of lands acquired with Service grant programs has been completed which will allow grant managers to monitor these areas to ensure they are being used in compliance with their original intended purposes.
- Federal Aid is working with the states to improve the obligation rates for the formula grant funds.

2009 Program Performance

As mentioned, the STWG program currently does not have performance measures. To correct this deficiency, the Service is engaged in discussions with its partners to identify proper measures that will reflect the overall conservation goals of the program. We expect to have measures in place by fiscal year 2009 or 2010. As States report their performance and as the Service translates this data into the Federal Assistance Information Management system, we will be able to demonstrate how this program contributes to the Department's Strategic Plan and the Service's Operational Plan.

In FY 2009, the State and Tribal Wildlife Grant program anticipates accomplishing similar kinds and levels of activities and grants as has taken place in prior years. Due to the nature of the program (formula-based and competitive grants), it is impossible to anticipate what kind of requests will come in and be approved. Therefore, the program presents prior year performance information as an example of what might take place in FY 2009.

2008 Planned Program Performance - State Wildlife Grants - The State Wildlife Grant program has proved a stable Federal funding source for State Fish and Wildlife Agencies for the past five years. This funding stability is critical to the recovery and continued resilience of many species in greatest need of conservation. Examples of activities planned by State Fish and Wildlife agencies in FY 2008 include:

- Colorado – Protect 560 acres of land in Gunnison County for the protection and conservation of Gunnison sage-grouse and its habitat. The Colorado Division of Wildlife will acquire the conservation easement with Great Outdoors Colorado and State Wildlife Grants program funds. The land will be managed for Gunnison sage-grouse, while allowing the landowner's ongoing cattle grazing operation to continue.
- Hawaii - Partner with community members and landowners to use fencing, goat control, weed control and planting of native species to restore forests on the island of Maui which support dozens of rare and endangered plants and animals such as the wild alala and native Maui Parrotbill birds.

- Pennsylvania - Provide technical assistance to private landowners to improve habitat for species of concern on private lands in Pennsylvania. Specifically the State expects to provide technical assistance on how to protect and restore 50 acres of wetlands and 15,000 acres of upland habitat for species of conservation concern; as well as to develop 150 conservation management recommendations.
- California – Assess heavy metal contamination in wildlife, tracing wildlife heavy metal intoxications to their sources, and evaluating state regulatory efforts aimed at mitigating ammunition-based source of lead in California condors. The results of the study will provide data to conserve the endangered species including the California condor.
- Montana - Protect terrestrial and riparian/wetland habitat in the Missouri Coteau and glaciated plains of the Milk and Missouri Rivers by working with landowners to initiate managed livestock grazing systems that will enhance riparian and shrub-grassland habitats. (20,000 acres)
- Wisconsin - Restore 500 acres of habitat for nesting and migratory neotropical birds within a 3,500 acre wetland complex called the Scuppernone River Habitat Area. This effort will likely result in avoiding the need to categorize some of these species as Threatened or Endangered in the future.
- Vermont – Research information on the site and landscape characteristics of Indiana bat maternity roosting and foraging habitat in the Champlain Valley, Vermont. Such findings will be instrumental in refining Indiana bat conservation planning efforts and programs within the State.

State Wildlife Grants Apportionment FY 2007

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number 15.634

State	Amount
Alabama	\$943,908
Alaska	\$3,037,742
American Samoa	\$151,887
Arizona	\$1,438,901
<u>Arkansas</u>	<u>\$709,703</u>
California	\$3,037,742
Colorado	\$1,261,171
Connecticut	\$607,549
Delaware	\$607,549
<u>District of Columbia</u>	<u>\$303,774</u>
Florida	\$2,573,362
Georgia	\$1,504,219
Guam	\$151,887
Hawaii	\$607,549
<u>Idaho</u>	<u>\$715,817</u>
Illinois	\$2,069,216
Indiana	\$1,068,451
Iowa	\$764,369
Kansas	\$899,104
<u>Kentucky</u>	<u>\$815,521</u>
Louisiana	\$921,265
Maine	\$607,549
Maryland	\$795,081
Massachusetts	\$925,613
<u>Michigan</u>	<u>\$1,741,693</u>
Minnesota	\$1,219,285
Mississippi	\$697,916
Missouri	\$1,217,576
Montana	\$1,070,615
<u>N. Mariana Islands</u>	<u>\$151,887</u>
Nebraska	\$733,134
Nevada	\$986,354
New Hampshire	\$607,549
New Jersey	\$1,206,498
<u>New Mexico</u>	<u>\$1,032,733</u>
New York	\$2,923,676
North Carolina	\$1,445,132
North Dakota	\$607,549
Ohio	\$1,826,065
<u>Oklahoma</u>	<u>\$924,146</u>
Oregon	\$1,094,903
Pennsylvania	\$1,979,191
Puerto Rico	\$303,774
Rhode Island	\$607,549
<u>South Carolina</u>	<u>\$751,611</u>
South Dakota	\$607,549
Tennessee	\$1,053,066
Texas	\$3,037,742
Utah	\$853,423
<u>Vermont</u>	<u>\$607,549</u>
Virgin Islands	\$151,887
Virginia	\$1,234,024
Washington	\$1,248,303
West Virginia	\$607,549
Wisconsin	\$1,098,437
<u>Wyoming</u>	<u>\$607,549</u>
Total	\$60,754,843

Standard Form 300

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

STATE and TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS FUND

Identification code 14-1694-0-1-302	2007 Actual	2008 Estimate	2009 Estimate
Obligations by program activity:			
00.01 State Wildlife Grants	66	64	64
00.02 State Competitive Grants	0	1	1
00.03 Administration	2	2	2
00.04 Tribal Wildlife Grants	8	7	7
10.00 Total obligations	76	74	74
Budgetary resources available for obligation:			
21.40 Unobligated balance available, start of year Recoveries	53	46	46
22.00 New Budget authority (gross)	67	74	74
22.10 Recoveries	2		
23.90 Total budgetary resources available for obligation	122	120	120
23.95 New obligations (-)	-76	-74	-74
24.40 Unobligated balance available, end of year	46	46	46
New budget authority (gross), detail:			
Discretionary			
40.00 Appropriation	0	75	0
40.20 Appropriation (Special Fund) LWCF	67	0	74
40.76 Reduction pursuant to P.L. 110-161	0	-1	0
43.00 Appropriation (total discretionary)	67	74	74
Change in unpaid obligations:			
Unpaid obligations, start of year:			
72.40 Obligated balance, start of year	134	141	108
73.10 New obligations	76	74	74
73.20 Total outlays, gross (-)	-67	-107	-99
73.45 Recoveries of Prior Year Obligations	-2	0	0
Unpaid obligations, end of year:			
74.40 Obligated balance, end of year	141	108	83
Outlays, (gross) detail:			
86.97 Outlays from new discretionary authority	11	22	22
86.98 Outlays from discretionary balances	56	85	77
87.00 Total outlays (gross)	67	107	99
Net budget authority and outlays:			
89.00 Budget authority	67	74	74
90.00 Outlays	67	107	99
Direct obligations:			
11.9 Total personnel compensation	2	2	2
41.0 Grants, subsidies and contributions	74	72	72
99.9 Total obligations	76	74	74
Direct:			
Total compensable work years:			
1001 Full-time equivalent employment	19	19	19