Activity: Ecological Services
Subactivity: Endangered Species

•					2013		
		2011 Actual	2012 Enacted	Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	Change From 2012 Enacted (+/-)
Candidate							
Conservation	(\$000)	11,448	11,337	+126	0	11,463	+126
	FTE	73	73	0	0	73	0
Listing	(\$000)	20,902	20,869	+62	+1,500	22,431	+1,562
	FTE	129	129	0	+4	133	+4
Consultation/ HCP	(\$000) FTE	61,877 454	60,943 450	+352	+2,800	64,095 454	+3,152 +4
Recovery	(\$000) FTE	81,219 470	82,806 470	+496 0	-1,593 -5	81,709 465	-1,097 -5
Total, Endangered Species	(\$000) FTE	175,446 1,126	175,955 1,122	+1,036 0	+2,707 +3	179,698 1,125	+3,743 +3

Program Overview

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Endangered Species program implements the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), in coordination with numerous partners. The program provides expertise to accomplish key purposes of the Act, which are to provide a means for conserving the ecosystems upon which endangered and threatened species depend and to provide a program for the conservation of such species.

"For more than three decades, the Endangered Species Act has successfully protected our nation's most threatened wildlife, and we should be looking for ways to improve it -- not weaken it. Throughout our history, there's been a tension between those who've sought to conserve our natural resources for the benefit of future generations, and those who have sought to profit from these resources. But I'm here to tell you this is a false choice. With smart, sustainable policies, we can grow our economy today and preserve the environment for ourselves, our children, and our grandchildren."

-- President Barack Obama, Remarks By The President To Commemorate The 160th Anniversary of The Department of the Interior Washington, D.C. March 3, 2009

The program's strategic framework is based on two over-arching goals to achieve the ESA's purposes: 1) recovery of endangered or threatened (federally-listed) species, and 2) conservation of species-at-risk, so that listing them may be unnecessary. The program achieves these goals through the minimization or

abatement of threats that are the basis for listing a species. The ESA categorizes threats into the following five factors:

- The present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of a listed species' habitat or range;
- Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes;
- Disease or predation;
- The inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and
- Other natural or manmade factors affecting a species' continued existence.

The key factor identified for many species is related to habitat alteration. The scope and severity of habitat-based threats and the number of species involved increases substantially with the complexity of threats. By minimizing or removing threats, which may include supporting species' capacity to respond adequately or increase their resilience to changing conditions, a species may be conserved, eliminating the need for protection under the ESA.

Conservation of listed, candidate, or other at-risk species is a challenging task, because many species face more than one kind of threat, and some threats are not easily removed. Threats such as habitat degradation and invasive species proliferation do not have simple solutions. Because identifying and removing threats takes time and resources, species often continue to decline following listing. As knowledge of species and their requirements increases through the development and implementation of recovery plans, the status of species will often stabilize and show improvement, but it takes time. For more than 35 years, the ESA has prevented the probable extinctions of hundreds of species across the

Nation and contributed to the recovery of many others.



Poweshiek skipperling / photo by Dave Cuthrell, Michigan State

The key role of the Candidate Conservation program is to provide technical assistance and work with numerous partners on proactive conservation to remove or reduce threats so that listing species may be unnecessary. This begins with a rigorous assessment using the best scientific information available to determine whether a species faces threats such that it is a candidate for listing under the ESA. For U.S. species, this entails close cooperation with states and other appropriate parties. For foreign species, it includes working with wildlife agencies and species experts in other countries. In addition to identifying new candidates for listing, the Candidate Conservation program annually reviews all existing candidate species to update information regarding threats and This information is used to target conservation efforts. conservation at specific known threats that may make listing unnecessary.

For U.S. candidate species for listing or species that are likely to become candidates, the Service uses a proactive, strategic, and collaborative approach for conservation planning that is designed to reduce or remove identified threats. Service biologists continuously coordinate with a diversity of partners to design, implement, and monitor conservation strategies and agreements, and update them to incorporate new information on threats and conservation, and to apply adaptive management. This approach provides the foundation for a recovery plan and expedites the recovery process for listed species, even if threats cannot be reduced or removed so that listing is unnecessary.

The **Listing** program provides protection under the ESA for foreign and domestic plants and animals when a species is determined to be threatened or endangered on the basis of the best available scientific information concerning threats. This determination includes information crucial for recovery planning and implementation, and helps to identify and address the conservation needs of the species, including the designation of critical habitat. Without the legal protections afforded under Section 9 of the ESA that become effective upon listing, many species would continue to decline and become extinct.

Endangered Species Program Mission: We will lead in recovering and conserving our Nation's imperiled species by fostering partnerships, employing scientific excellence, and developing a workforce of conservation leaders.

The ESA contains a suite of tools that provide the flexibility needed to guide land development and aid species' recovery. The **Consultation** program leads a collaborative process between the Service and other federal agencies to identify opportunities to conserve listed species. Working in partnership with other agencies and organizations is foundational for the Endangered Species program, because the conservation of the Nation's biological heritage cannot be achieved by any single agency or organization. Essential partners include other federal agencies, states, tribes, non-governmental organizations, industry, academia, private landowners, and other Service programs or partners. Other federal agencies consult with the Service to balance adverse impacts of their development actions with conservation actions that contribute toward species survival and also often to their recovery. Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) provide the conservation benefits of proactive landscape planning, combining private land development planning with species and ecosystem conservation planning. Research conducted by recovery partners using scientific permits issued under Section 10 is also vital to species' recovery. This research often provides current information about threats and their associated impacts on a listed species.

Interagency (often called Section 7) consultations and Habitat Conservation Planning (HCP) constitute a significant workload for the Service. The Service is continuously looking for efficiencies to improve the Section 7 consultation and Section 10 HCP processes. Considering the complex effects of environmental changes in these processes, the Service must have readily available tools to plan and implement conservation on a landscape or ecosystem scale while ensuring that listed species with very restricted ranges are managed appropriately. An internet-based "Information, Planning, and Consultation" system (IPaC) is being developed to provide the Service and project proponents with interactive, online tools to spatially link data for quick analyses of resource threats and the effectiveness of various conservation actions. This function allows for rapid identification of potential projects that will not affect specific categories of natural resources and expedites completion of requirements involving ESA Section 7 consultations, Section 10 HCPs, and other environmental review processes.

The California Habitat Conservation Planning Coalition recently estimated that regional HCPs in California will conserve almost 1.5 million acres of land, while permitting projects with a cumulative value of \$1.6 trillion. This illustrates that resource development and species conservation need not be an "either-or" choice.

The **Recovery** program oversees development and implementation of strategic recovery plans that identify, prioritize, and guide actions designed to reverse the threats that were responsible for species' listing. This allows the species to improve, recover, and ultimately be removed from the ESA's protection (*i.e.*, delisted). Similar to the Candidate Conservation program, the Recovery program plays a crucial conservation role by working with various Service programs, other DOI bureaus, federal agencies, states (*e.g.*, through State Wildlife Action Plans), tribes, and other partners and stakeholders to develop and implement conservation actions.

The Service's Directorate has identified species recovery as a priority for all Service programs. The Endangered Species program provides leadership in the conservation of listed and candidate species, but

the contribution of others is necessary to recovery. Other Service programs and partners are key players in species conservation. Some examples of recovery implementation are:

- conducting nest box surveys;
- restoring habitat;
- providing technical guidance to partners on biological aspects of recovery projects;
- researching or monitoring threats to a species;
- participating in landscape planning;
- assisting with grant writing to fund land acquisition or research activities; and
- working with partners to maintain or restore habitat and ensure habitat connectivity.

One of the first steps in recovering listed species is strategically planning the implementation of individually-tailored recovery programs. Listed species that were under proactive, partnership-based candidate conservation agreements or strategies have a head-start on recovery planning and associated actions to address threats. Most of the existing agreements or strategies, however, need to be updated. In these situations, the Recovery program relies on diverse partner and stakeholder involvement to develop innovative recovery approaches to address threats, make use of existing flexible conservation tools, broaden support for current and future on-the-ground actions and monitoring, and implement necessary recovery actions. Without the Service's partners and stakeholders, the recovery of 1,300 currently-listed domestic species to the point where they no longer need ESA protections could not occur. This large and diverse coalition can greatly improve a species' recovery potential but requires the continued coordination and oversight of Service Recovery program staff to ensure effectiveness.

The Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund (CESCF) provides grant funding to states and territories for species and habitat conservation actions on non-federal lands. Habitat loss is one of the most significant threats for many listed and candidate species. Because most listed species depend on habitat found on state and private lands, the grant assistance available under the CESCF for land acquisition related to HCPs or recovery needs is crucial to listed species conservation and recovery. States and territories have been extremely effective in garnering participation by private landowners. Section 6 grants assist states and territories in building partnerships that achieve meaningful on-the-ground conservation to address or minimize threats.

In addition, Traditional or Conservation Grants available under the CESCF provide funding to states to assist with monitoring and basic research on listed and candidate species. Monitoring species populations and evaluating the results of conservation actions are essential to recovery success. Periodic review of all available information concerning a species' status ensures that species are properly classified, recovery funds are appropriately prioritized, and recovery plan recommendations remain up to date. Delisting and reclassification are the long term results of recovery success.



Moving Forward

In order to meet the goals of the ESA and the Service's strategic plan, the Service is conducting a comprehensive review of its processes to strengthen tools, find efficiencies in processes, tackle the large conservation challenges, and create innovative opportunities to recover listed and at-risk species' ecosystems. The program's commitment to excellence in carrying Service's out the responsibilities under the ESA will guide the Service's efforts to do better and be better in achieving its goals. The Service will integrate the following principles into its implementation of the Act:

- Focus on Recovery
- Provide Conservation Incentives
- Increase Public Participation
- Ensure Clear and Consistent Policies and Implementation
- Make Decisions Based on Sound Science
- Resolve Conflicts

Consistent with Executive Order 13563, "Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review" and the Service's vision for endangered and threatened species recovery, the Service and NOAA Fisheries have identified key regulations and associated policies where there is both a need and opportunity for improving administration of the ESA. Regulatory improvements will reduce burdens, redundancy, and conflicts between conservation and other land use, and at the same time promote predictability, certainty, and innovation. Through the Service's combined efforts, the Service will accelerate recovery of imperiled species, enhance on-the-ground conservation delivery, and better engage the resources and expertise of partners to meet the goals of the ESA and the Nation.

Endangered Species - Performance Overview Table

		nance Ove					Change	
Performance Goal	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Plan	2013 PB	from 2012 Plan to 2013 PB	Long Term Target 2016
CSF 7.30 Percent of recovery actions for listed Spotlight species implemented	n/a	n/a	60% (762 of 1,261)	66% (829 of 1,249)	62% (781 of 1,269)	65% (829 of 1,269)	4%	40% (484 of 1,219)
Comments		•	to be level wi al appropriation			t was based on	a conservati	ve estimate
7.30.8 Percent of threatened and endangered species recovery actions implemented (GPRA)	n/a	n/a	n/a	63% (24,072 of 38,316)	65% (21,699 of 33,616)	63% (24,024 of 38,316)	-2%	n/a
Comments			to be level wi al appropriation			t was based on	a conservati	ve estimate
CSF 7.31 Percent of formal/informal "other non-resource-use specific" consultations addressed in a timely manner	86% (11,746 of 13,711)	84%	87% (8,399 of 9,723)	85% (7,827 of 9,188)	81% (6,327 of 7,774)	82% (6,377 of 7,774)	1%	74% (7,584 of 10,209)
Comments	funding req	Performance increase reflects an increase in general program funding requested in FY 2013. Additional funding requested to conduct the science needed in support of pesticide consultations will help the Service conduct section 7 consultations on pesticide registrations in a timely manner.						
			Consultation	s on pesticide	registrations	in a timely mar	nner.	
CSF 7.32 Percent/ final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner	0%	17%	20% (1 of 5)	0% (0 of 9)	21% (8 of 38)	100% (88 of 88)	79%	42% (5 of 12)
listing determinations promulgated in a timely		17% rease will be	20% (1 of 5)	0% (0 of 9)	21% (8 of 38)	100%	79%	42% (5 of 12)
listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner	Funding inc	17% rease will be	20% (1 of 5)	0% (0 of 9)	21% (8 of 38)	100% (88 of 88)	79%	42% (5 of 12)
listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner Comments CSF 8.3 Percent of Spotlight species-at-risk (species that do not meet the T&E definition) where listing is unnecessary as a result of conservation actions	Funding inc completed i	17% rease will be n FY 2013. n/a	20% (1 of 5) reflected thro	0% (0 of 9) ugh more fina 0% (0 of 34)	21% (8 of 38) al listing detern 2% (1 of 40)	100% (88 of 88) minations (cou	79% Inted by spec	42% (5 of 12) Lies)
listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner Comments CSF 8.3 Percent of Spotlight species-at-risk (species that do not meet the T&E definition) where listing is unnecessary as a result of conservation actions or agreements	Funding inc completed i	17% rease will be n FY 2013. n/a	20% (1 of 5) reflected thro 5% (2 of 38)	0% (0 of 9) ugh more fina 0% (0 of 34)	21% (8 of 38) al listing detern 2% (1 of 40)	100% (88 of 88) minations (cou	79% Inted by spec	42% (5 of 12) Lies)

Program Element: Candidate Conservation

					2013		
		2011 Actual	2012 Enacted	Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	Change From 2012 Enacted (+/-)
Candidate Conservation	(\$000)	11,448	11,337	+126	0	11,463	+126
	FTE	73	73	0	0	73	0

Justification of Changes for Listing and Critical Habitat

The 2013 budget request for Candidate Conservation is \$11,463,000 and 73 FTE, with no net program change from the 2012 Enacted.

Program Overview

The Candidate Conservation program plays a crucial role in identifying species that warrant listing through a scientifically rigorous assessment process and by guiding, facilitating, supporting, and monitoring the implementation of partnership-based conservation agreements and activities by the Service, other DOI bureaus and federal agencies, states (*e.g.*, through State Wildlife Action Plans), tribes, and other partners and stakeholders.

The most recent Candidate Notice of Review (76 Federal Register 66370, October 26, 2011) identified 254 species as candidates for listing. For candidate species, the program uses a proactive, strategic, and collaborative approach for conservation planning that is designed to reduce or remove identified threats. This often results in a conservation agreement or strategy covering the entire range of one or more candidate species, or a landscape scale plan targeting threats in a particular area that supports multiple species-at-risk. In September 2011 the second Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances (CCAAs) for the eastern massasauga (rattlesnake) was signed with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; the first CCAA with the Rome State Nature Preserve in Ohio was completed in 2006. Over 13,700 acres of habitat are now being managed for this candidate species. The New Hampshire Department of Wildlife and Fisheries anticipates enrolling landowners in the recently completed programmatic CCAA for the New England cottontail; this CCAA is serving as a model for similar state wide agreements such as the one nearing completion for Maine. A diversity of landowners are making voluntary conservation efforts and receiving the assurances that if the species covered by their CCAA is listed they will be not be asked to do more and will not be subject to additional land use restrictions.

2013 Program Performance

In 2013, the Candidate Conservation program will continue providing technical assistance for developing Candidate Conservation Agreements (CCA) and Candidate Conservation Agreements with Assurances (CCAA), and facilitating voluntary conservation efforts by private landowners, states, Tribes, territories, federal agencies (especially the Natural Resource Conservation Service), and partners for priority candidate and other species-at-risk for which potential listing is a concern such as greater sage-grouse and lesser prairie chicken. The Service will focus conservation efforts on reducing or eliminating threats to spotlight species identified using the criteria in the program's Strategic Plan and anticipates implementing 115 conservation actions for spotlight species-at-risk in FY 2013.

The Service's cross-program approach to candidate conservation will also continue. This includes sharing information, resources and expertise, and coordinating conservation work for candidate species

and geographic focal areas to increase efficiency and maximize benefits to target species. To meet the program's goal to reduce the number of species that meet the definition of threatened or endangered by one in FY 2013, the Service will continue to work with partners to design and prepare collaborative conservation activities, begin implementation, and determine effectiveness on a scale that is meaningful to the species.

The Service also will provide information and training to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of candidate conservation efforts. This includes continuing our close partnership with states to design and implement new conservation agreements, strategies, and management actions for candidate and potential candidate species identified in State Wildlife Action Plans. It also includes continuing strong coordination with the Service's Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program to help private landowners implement habitat restoration projects that are likely to be effective in addressing threats that help to make listing unnecessary for certain candidate and other species-at-risk.

Program Element: Listing and Critical Habitat

		2011 Actual	2012 Enacted	Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	Change From 2012 Enacted (+/-)
Critical Habitat							
	(\$000)	9,472	7,460	+20	-2,932	4,548	-2,912
	FTE	51	51	0	-10	41	-10
Listing							
Lioung	(\$000)	11,430	10,413	+42	+4,432	14,887	+4,474
	FTE	78	66	0	+14	80	+14
Foreign Listing	(\$000)	0	1,498	0	0	1,498	0
	FTE	0	6	0	0	6	0
Petitions							
rennons	(\$000)	0	1,498	0	0	1,498	0
	FTE	0	6	0	0	6	0
Total, Listing							
and Critical	(\$000)	20,902	20,869	+62	+1,500	22,431	+1,562
Habitat	FTE	129	129	0	+4	133	+4

Summary of 2012 Program Changes for Listing and Critical Habitat

Request Component		(\$000)	FTE
Listing		+4,432	+14
Critical Habitat		-2,932	-10
	Program Changes	1,500	+4

Justification of Changes for Listing and Critical Habitat

The 2013 budget request for Listing and Critical Habitat is \$22,431,000 and 133 FTE, a net program change of +\$1,500,000 and +4 FTE from the 2012 Enacted.

Listing (+\$4,432,000/+14 FTE)

In addition to the \$2,932,000 that would be shifted to Listing from within the subcap for critical habitat designation for already listed species, the Service is requesting an increase of \$1,500,000. Settlement agreements and a multi-year work plan approved by a Federal District Court in 2011 have allowed the Service to address our backlog of listing determinations for candidate species, including critical habitat designations concurrent with the listing. This redistribution and increase of funding for Listing will be used to meet the terms and conditions of these settlements and allow the Service to address the highest biological priorities of the Listing program for the years ahead. The funding increase in Listing will allow the Service to publish approximately 13 additional proposed or final rules in FY 2013.

Critical Habitat (-\$2,932,000/-10 FTE)

The Service has made progress in recent years towards addressing the critical habitat backlog for species listed a year or more, allowing the Service to shift resources to address other statutory and court-ordered deadlines. In particular, the Service must focus resources in the Listing program towards making listing determinations for current candidate species, some of which have been identified as a candidate over a

decade ago. In comparison to the FY 2012 enacted level, approximately 11 fewer final critical habitat designations will be completed in FY 2013 at this funding level.

Program Overview

Listing a species and designating critical habitat provides species with the protections of the ESA, and focuses resources and efforts by the Service and its partners on the recovery of the species. The Listing program works to determine whether species meet the definition of threatened or endangered under the ESA. Species can be selected for evaluation based on Service priorities or they can be petitioned by the public under the ESA. When the Service receives a petition, the ESA requires a response within set timeframes. The Listing program also is responsible for designating critical habitat as required under the ESA. These determinations must be made on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available.

ESA DEFINITIONS				
Endangered	Threatened			
a species is in danger of extinction	a species is likely to become an endangered species			
throughout all or a significant portion of its	within the foreseeable future throughout all or a			
range.	significant portion of its range.			

The Service conducts the listing process for species it identifies as needing the protections of the ESA, candidate species, or species for which it determines listing is warranted upon review of petitions. The Service also receives petitions for amendments to critical habitat and other actions.

Listing determinations, critical habitat designations, and their associated processes support the program's goal to recover species. This support stems in large part from the information developed when conducting the analysis of whether a species meets the definition of threatened or endangered. Using the best scientific and commercial data available, the listing rule provides information on the species (taxonomy, historic and current range, population information, habitat requirements, etc.), an analysis of the threats faced by the species, designation of critical habitat if appropriate, examples of available conservation measures, and a preview of actions that would be prohibited if the species were to be listed. Recovery efforts for species also are initially identified based on information to address threats identified within the listing rules. In this way, listing packages are a crucial step on the road to recovery.

The Endangered Species Program also works to accomplish many of the pending actions related to listing of foreign species. However, the Service believes the conservation benefit of listing domestic species is generally much higher than that of listing foreign species. There are a broad range of management tools for domestic species include several ESA and other conservation tools, including: recovery planning and implementation under section 4, cooperation with states under section 6, coordination with other federal agencies under section 7, full take prohibitions of section 9, management agreements and permits under section 10, and other laws/treaties such as Marine Mammal Protection Act or Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Foreign species' management tools are very limited. Generally few ESA or other conservation tools apply. The chief tools are trade restrictions through section 10 and/or CITES trade prohibitions, education and public awareness, and grant monies. Direct recovery actions are not practicable. The continuation of a budget sub-cap for listing and petition findings related to foreign species will allow the Service to balance its duty to protect both foreign and domestic species in a way that will not detract from its efforts to protect imperiled domestic species, while working with existing resources.

2013 Program Performance

The Service anticipates the following accomplishments and activities:

Critical Habitat for Already Listed Species

The Service anticipates publishing 10 final critical habitat rules (for 108 species) and 2 proposed critical habitat rules (for 4 species) in FY 2013.

Listing Determinations for U.S. Species*

During the 2013 Fiscal Year, we project the following determinations:

- 22 Final listings/critical habitat determinations for 88 species.
- 31 Proposed listings/critical habitat determinations* for 47 species.
- Emergency listings as necessary.

Petition Findings*

The Service intends to address 6 petition findings, 90-day and 12-month, for 8 species in FY 2013 with current resources.

Listing Determinations for Foreign Species

During the 2013 Fiscal Year, we project completion of the following determinations for foreign species:

- 1 Final listing determination for 5 species.
- 2 Proposed listing determinations for 9 species.
- 3 90-day petition findings for 27 species.
- 2 12-month petition findings for 3 species.

Endangered Species Listing - Performance Change Table

Performance Goal	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Plan	2013 PB	Change from 2012 Plan to 2013 PB	Program Change Accruing in Out- years
7.32.1 % of final listing determinations promulgated in a timely manner	n/a	17%	20% (1/5)	0% (0 / 9)	21% (8 / 38)	100% (88 / 88)	79%	n/a
Comments		ncrease will b d in FY 2013.		rough more f	inal listing det	erminations (c	ounted by spec	ies)
7.32.2 % of petition findings made within one fiscal year of petition receipt	n/a	n/a	12% (9 / 77)	17% (13 / 77)	59% (38 / 64)	100% (6 / 6)	41%	n/a
Comments			•		ne Service to d candidate spec		ources towards	its
7.32.3 % of critical habitat rules promulgated in a timely manner	n/a	60%	57% (4 / 7)	23% (3 / 13)	13% (19 / 145)	100% (10 / 10)	87%	n/a
Comments	make pro	gress toward	s addressing t	the critical ha		or species liste	will allow the Sed a year or mo	

^{*}Note: Assumes petition sub-cap continues in FY 2013.

Program Element: Consultation and HCPs

					2013		
		2011 Actual	2012 Enacted	Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	Change From 2012 Enacted (+/-)
Consultation and HCPs							
I HCPS	(\$000)	61,877	60,943	+352	+2,800	64,095	+3,152
	FTE	454	450	0	+4	454	+4

Summary of 2012 Program Changes for ESA Consultations and HCPs

Reques	st Component	(\$000)	FTE
•	ESA Consultation – Renewable Energy Projects	+1,500	+2
•	ESA Consultation – Pesticide Consultations	+ 1,000	+2
•	General Program Activities	+300	0
	Program Changes	+2,800	+4

Justification of Program Changes for ESA Consultations and HCPs

The 2013 budget request for Consultation and HCPs is \$64,095,000 and 454 FTE, a net program change of +\$2.800,000 and +4 FTE from the 2012 Enacted.

ESA Consultations for Renewable Energy Projects (+\$1,500,000/+2 FTE)

The Service faces an increased workload for expeditious processing of permits for new renewable energy facilities. This funding will ensure energy projects are planned, developed, operated, permitted, and monitored in ways that are compatible with conservation of federal trust resources. Developing these renewable resources and the corresponding transmission capabilities requires effective coordination with permitting entities and appropriate environmental review of transmission rights-of-way applications and facilities sites. It also requires a balanced and mindful approach that addresses the impacts of development on land, wildlife, and water resources. The Department of Energy, State Fish and Game agencies, Bureau of Land Management, and State Energy Commissions have expressed a need for expedited multi-species conservation strategies accompanied by appropriate permits to comply with ESA. The additional resources will provide better customer service to the energy industry including:

- o Increased technical assistance;
- o More timely responses;
- o Environmentally sound solutions to energy project-wildlife/habitat conflicts; and,
- o Well-coordinated project reviews, working with federal agency priorities.

As a result of this increase, the Service will complete an additional 21 consultations for renewable energy development on DOI lands, and an additional 69 consultations for renewable energy development on non-DOI lands. The construction and operation of these energy projects provide important economic benefits to the small communities where they are located.

Science Support for Pesticide Consultations (+\$1,000,000/+2 FTE)

The Service will use the additional funding to begin developing and implementing scientifically rigorous protocols for national consultations with EPA that are protective of threatened and endangered species. These protocols will include development of safe levels of exposure relevant to pesticide effects on listed species, which will greatly improve how the Service conducts section 7 consultations on pesticide registrations. Increasing the scientific and technical capacity of the Service will help ensure ESA

compliance for pesticides early in the registration process, minimize the threat of lawsuits, and provide more certainty and guidance to applicants to allow those chemicals to continue to be available for production of food and fiber in this country. The Endangered Species program will rely on the expertise and collaboration from biologists in the Environmental Contaminants program to facilitate this workload.

General Program Activities (+\$300,000/+0 FTE)

The complexity of landscape management to support the recovery of endangered and threatened species while balancing the needs of other land use requirements continues to increase. This balance challenges the Service to work closely with action agencies and project proponents to design and complete interagency consultations and habitat conservation planning in an effective and comprehensive manner for the benefit of affected agencies, landowners, species, and other interested parties. Additional resources will be used to better integrate various environmental reviews and ecological information to assist federal agencies and project proponents with resource management decisions. Such decisions have a direct impact on fish, wildlife, plants, and their habitats and to support the Service's efforts to provide more regulatory certainty that will reduce burdens, redundancy, and conflicts between conservation and other land uses.

Program Overview

The Consultation program is the primary customer service component of the Endangered Species program and makes an important contribution to addressing threats and moving species towards recovery. The Consultation program includes two primary components, the Section 10 Habitat Conservation Planning (HCP) program and the Section 7 Consultation program.

The Consultation program uses the tools of sections 7 and 10 of the ESA in partnership with other Service programs, other agencies, and members of the public to solve conservation challenges and create opportunities to recover listed and at-risk species' ecosystems. The Service will support delivery of the consultation and HCP programs through: 1) coordination and collaboration; 2) consistent application and interpretation; 3) programmatic and landscape-level approaches to conservation management; and 4) strategic workload management.

Section 7 - Interagency Consultation

Section 7 of the ESA requires federal agencies to use their authorities to conserve endangered and threatened species, including an obligation to ensure that activities they authorize, fund, or conduct are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species, or destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. For example, U.S. Forest Service (USFS) or Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approval of livestock grazing on federal lands or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers approval of discharge of fill material into waters of the U.S. requires section 7 consultations when these activities may affect listed species. Through section 7 consultations, the Service attempts to identify and remove threats to endangered and threatened species. Coordination between the Service, other federal agencies, and their applicants during consultation is critical to ensure that the actions are designed in ways that reduce threats to species, minimize effects that cannot be avoided, and incorporate conservation measures to offset unavoidable impacts in a way that promotes species recovery.

Non-federal applicants play a large role in the consultation process. Many of the federal actions subject to section 7 consultations, such as grazing allotments or timber sales on federal lands and permits issued under the Clean Water Act, involve non-federal applicants. Section 7 of the ESA and its implementing regulations provide non-federal applicants a role in all phases of the interagency consultation process.

Interagency consultations between federal project proponents and the Service, required by section 7 of the ESA, take time. An investment in encouraging federal partners to initiate and better prepare for consultations lessens the time needed for Service review. Efficiencies also can be attained through

automated data entry and retrieval, web-based access to spatial resource data and consultation planning, and customer education. Service staff have begun to educate and provide techniques to federal partners so that the federal project proponents and non-federal applicants can become more self-sufficient in fulfilling section 7 requirements.

Section 10(a)(1)(B) - Habitat Conservation Planning

The Service works with private landowners and local and state governments through the Habitat Conservation Planning program to develop HCPs and their associated Incidental Take Permits. Private land development is one of the most common threats to listed species. By working with states, cities, and private individuals to develop and implement HCPs, the Service is able to facilitate private lands development in a way that addresses threats and fulfills recovery needs of endangered and threatened species and species at-risk.

The HCP program emphasizes landscape-level conservation in order to preserve large blocks of habitat for threatened and endangered species, as well as the ecosystem function and values upon which these species depend. For example, recently developed policy, such as the General Conservation Plan policy, provides for large-scale regional conservation planning that allows individuals or non-federal entities to receive Incidental Take Permits in an expedited manner.

2013 Program Performance

The Service anticipates the following accomplishments and activities.

- Continue to work with all federal customers to design projects that will not have adverse impacts
 on listed species. In FY 2013, the Service anticipates completing an additional 1,278 renewable
 energy consultations.
- Continue to develop and expand the internet-based Information, Planning, and Consultation system (IPaC) that can be used to obtain information regarding all Service trust resources, screen out projects that will not affect ESA listed species or designated critical habitat, complete or expedite the requirements of section 7 consultation, better integrate section 7 consultation with action agencies' other environmental review processes, including NEPA, and better coordinate the Service's various programs toward unified objectives in accordance with the goals of the Strategic Habitat Conservation initiative.
- ensure that the Consultation and HCP program's regulations, policies, and guidance effectively address the conservation challenges of today by carrying out a public participation process that engages a broad spectrum of interests affected by or concerned with the ESA. The Service, in partnership with the National Marine Fisheries Service, is focused on: 1) developing a regulatory definition for "destruction or adverse modification" of critical habitat that will guide consultations on projects affecting listed species, and explains the relationship of this threshold to that established by the definition of "jeopardizing the continued existence" of a species; 2) revising and updating the existing regulation governing incidental take of protected species to improve implementation and clarify criteria for incidental take permits; 3) identifying incentives to encourage greater participation in Habitat Conservation Plans and other tools and reduce the transaction time and costs of participation in these programs; and 4) identifying ways for federal agencies to meet their obligations under Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA by using their existing authorities to conserve and recover listed species.

Endangered Species Consultations - Performance Change Table

Performance Goal	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Plan	2013 PB	Change from 2012 Plan to 2013 PB	Program Change Accruing in Out- years
CSF 7.31 Percent of formal/informal "other non-resource-use specific" consultations addressed in a timely manner	86% (11,746/ 13,711)	84% (9,263/ 11,056)	87% (8,399/ 9,723)	85% (7,827/ 9,188)	81% (6,327/ 7,774)	82% (6,377 of 7,774)	1%	n/a
Comments	funding req	Performance increase reflects an increase in general program funding requested in FY 2013. Additional funding requested to conduct the science needed in support of pesticide consultations will help the Service conduct section 7 consultations on pesticide registrations in a timely manner.						
14.1.2 % of formal/informal energy (non-hydropower) consultation addressed in a timely manner	87% (1,582/ 1,828)	87% (1,192/ 1,372)	78% (1,122/ 1,433)	72% (1,073/ 1,488)	69% (751/ 1,092)	72% (915/ 1,278)	3%	n/a
Comments	Performance 2013.	e increase ret	flects increase	e in funding f	or renewable e	nergy consulta	tions reques	ted in FY

Program Element: Recovery of Listed Species

					2013		
		2011 Actual	2012 Enacted	Fixed Costs & Related Changes (+/-)	Program Changes (+/-)	Budget Request	Change From 2012 Enacted (+/-)
Recovery							
	(\$000)	81,219	82,806	+496	-1,593	81,709	-1,097
	FTE	470	470	0	-5	465	-5

Summary of 2012 Program Changes for Recovery of Listed Species

Request Component	(\$000)	FTE
Cooperative Recovery Initiative	+400	0
State of the Birds Activities	-995	-5
Wolf Livestock Loss Demonstration Program	-998	0
Program Changes	-1,593	-5

Justification of Program Changes for Recovery of Listed Species

The 2013 budget request for Recovery of Listed Species is \$81,709,000 and 465 FTE, a net program change of -\$1,593,000 and -5 FTE from the 2012 Enacted.

Cooperative Recovery Initiative (+400,000/+0 FTE)

This funding will support a cross-programmatic partnership approach to complete planning, restoration, and management actions addressing current threats to endangered species on and around National Wildlife Refuges. The focus will be on implementing recovery actions for species near delisting or reclassification from endangered to threatened and actions that are urgently needed for critically endangered species. The Endangered Species Program will participate in this Cooperative Recovery Initiative by combining our resources with those of the National Wildlife Refuge System, the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, the Fisheries Program, the Science Program and the Migratory Bird Program through a national, proposal-driven process to identify and implement the highest priority projects. Actual performance results will be identified when the Service selects proposals; the Service anticipates being able to support 5-10 recovery actions with its contribution.

State of the Birds Activities (-\$995,000/-5 FTE)

The urgent need for increased action to recover endangered Hawaiian birds was a centerpiece of the 2009 State of the Birds Report issued by Interior Secretary Salazar in March. Funding provided since FY 2010 has been used to augment the recovery program for Hawaii's many endangered bird species. The augmentation includes but is not limited to strategic planning for species recovery and increased coordination with partners; and the development and implementation of landscape-scale conservation projects such as:

- o fencing and alien species control, including predators;
- o translocation and reintroduction to establish or enhance populations of rare and rangerestricted species; and
- o expanded surveying and monitoring efforts of listed bird species to improve understanding of threats and response to management.

These efforts benefit not only endangered birds but also their habitats and help to maintain non-listed bird populations, other critical wildlife, and plant resources. With the proposed reduction, there will be less recovery work in support of Hawaiian birds and other birds listed under the Act in need of recovery funding (e.g., condors, masked bobwhite, etc.). We anticipate that 96 fewer recovery actions will be implemented as a result of this decreased funding.

Wolf Livestock Loss Demonstration Program (-\$998,000/+0 FTE)

In FY 2012, Congress provided \$998,000 to fund a demonstration program that gives grants to states and tribes for livestock producers conducting proactive, non-lethal activities to reduce the risk of livestock loss due to predation by wolves and to compensate livestock producers, as appropriate, for livestock losses due to such predation. The Service proposes to discontinue funding this in FY 2013 in order to fund higher priority conservation activities elsewhere in the budget request.

Program Overview

Coordinating, developing, implementing, and managing all of the recovery tools and partner activities in a cohesive and effective manner for species' recovery requires significant commitment and resources. The Recovery program plays a vital role in leading or guiding the recovery planning process, in addition to facilitating, supporting, and monitoring the implementation of recovery actions by the Service, other DOI bureaus, federal agencies, states, and other partners and stakeholders.

Three examples of successful multi-party partnerships, all awarded the Service's 2010 Recovery Champions Award, include:

Yamashina Institute for Ornithology (Chiba, Japan) – For nearly 20 years, Kiyoaki Ozaki, Tomohiro Deguchi, Fumio Sato and others at the Yamashina Institute have helped recover the short-tailed albatross, a seabird that spends time in Alaska and migrates throughout the North Pacific. Pioneering methods for establishing colonies, staff members have raised chicks, fledging every single one that they captured and moved—without information on husbandry of the endangered species. The Yamashina Institute created a safe haven away from the unpredictable conditions of the main colony on volcanic Torishima Island and established a nesting colony using decoys and recorded colony sounds with such success that the decoys and sounds are no longer needed. Further, the Institute initiated satellite tracking to determine migration routes and year-round distribution, providing critical information to managers working to prevent harm from

interactions with commercial fisheries. Thus a successful collaboration between geographically disparate partners such as the Yamashina Institute, the Kilauea Point NWR that hosted a chick-rearing experiment with Laysan albatrosses, and staff from the FWS Regional office in Alaska has set the short-tailed albatross squarely on the road to recovery.

Heidi Holman and Lindsay M. Webb (New Hampshire Fish and Game Department), and Steven Fuller (Wildlife Management Institute) – Heidi Holman, Lindsay Webb, and Steven Fuller have brought the endangered Karner blue butterfly from the point of



extirpation in New Hampshire to thousands of members Karner blue butterfly / photo by Joel Trick (USFWS) of the species in wild populations. While restoring 125 acres of Concord pine barrens—especially at the Concord Municipal Airport and around it—the team created a captive-breeding program, releasing 5000 Karner blues within the State capital, directly supporting the recovery plan. In 2009 and 2010, the program produced 17,000 Karner blue butterfly eggs, almost 10,000

caterpillars, and 6,000 adults and returned 2550 Karner blue pupae to New York to supplement small populations. Among partners are the New Hampshire Army Reserve National Guard, the Roger Williams Park Zoo, the City of Concord, and Parker River National Wildlife Refuge. These efforts were guided by the Service recovery plan for the Karner blue butterfly as supplemented by a more recent 5-year spotlight species action plan.

Duckwater Shoshone Tribe (Duckwater, Nevada) – Translating funding into a conservation legacy, the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe has restored the Railroad Valley springfish in the two thermal springs on the Reservation, establishing self-sustaining populations of the threatened species, a tiny desert fish. After restoring 90 acres of wetlands and 2 miles of a stream through a \$450,000 project, the Tribe reintroduced the springfish through a Safe Harbor Agreement that ensures that the Tribe has the continued use of its historic water rights and that the reintroduced population exceeds the recovery goal. Then the Tribe restored Little Warm Spring, adding 25 more acres for recovery. The projects required removing an irrigation infrastructure and an old aquaculture facility, reconstructing the spring head, rebuilding the historical stream channel, and installing a public education boardwalk where people can view the springfish in its natural habitat. These efforts have been guided by the Service's Railroad Valley springfish recovery plan, and have been implemented both on the ground and through funding provided by the Service's Nevada Fish and Wildlife Service Office, a Safe Harbor agreement, the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe, the Nevada Department of Wildlife, Natural Resources Conservation Service's Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, and the Tribal Landowner Incentives Grant Program.

The Recovery program uses the flexibility in the implementation of the ESA whenever advantageous, feasible, and practical. Special rules developed for threatened species under section 4(d) of the ESA allow the Service to tailor protections to the needs of the species while enabling human activities to continue, consistent with the conservation of the species. Special rules have been developed recently for both the California tiger salamander and the California red-legged frog to ensure that ranchers on whose land these species occur can continue their normal ranching practices while continuing to provide habitat hosting these rare species. Recently an experimental population was established under section 10(j) of the ESA in southern Arizona to facilitate expansion of the Sonoran pronghorn. This rule provided for flexibility in management by considering the population as threatened, regardless of its status elsewhere in its range, and allowing for the development of a special rule to provide flexibility in management of the species. In this manner provisions were included to allow the Department of Defense Yuma Proving Grounds, multiple Native American Tribes, Customs and Border Protection and other involves land owners to pursue their normal activities as usual.

Other successful and flexible conservation tools include Safe Harbor agreements and recovery management agreements. Safe Harbor Agreements build positive relationships with landowners to preserve needed habitat. Recovery management agreements implement actions that manage remaining threats so that a species may be delisted and transferred to the management authority of another appropriate agency, such as a state partner.

In FY 2013, the Service continues to encourage other Service programs to take a more active leadership role in implementing the ESA and leading recovery of listed terrestrial and aquatic species. The Service proposes an initiative to foster and facilitate the focused and strategic approach to implementing recovery plan actions on our National Wildlife Refuge System and the National Fish Hatchery System. With nearly 300 listed species in or around units of the National Wildlife Refuge System and 59 refuges founded for the purpose of recovering threatened and endangered species and the National Fish Hatchery System's unique expertise in recovering aquatic listed species, the National Wildlife Refuge System and National Fish Hatchery System have important roles to play in recovering listed species. Implementing

this Cooperative Recovery Initiative will help ensure that all our available Service skills resources will provide a model for integrated landscape conservation (see those program sections for additional details).

The goal of the Recovery program is to minimize or remove the threats that led to the species listing so that it can be delisted or reclassified from endangered to threatened status. This requires decades of constant monitoring, adaptive management, and holistic planning, together with close coordination and technical leadership to our partners to assist their recovery efforts.

2013 Program Performance

The Service anticipates the following accomplishments and activities:

- Continue to complete 5-year reviews for species listed five years or more, resulting in over 1,037 listed species with a completed 5-year review.
- Build partnerships to help the Service implement 5,751 recovery actions (including habitat restoration, captive propagation, and reintroduction) for all listed species to reach a cumulative total of 63% of the total number of threatened and endangered species recovery actions being implemented.
- Provide final recovery plans for 1,104 listed species.
- Implement more than 829 recovery actions for Spotlight species, or 65% of the actions identified in Spotlight species action plans.

Endangered Species Recovery - Performance Change Table

Performance Goal	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Plan	2013 PB	Change from 2012 Plan to 2013 PB	Program Change Accruing in Out- years
CSF 7.30 Percent of recovery actions for listed Spotlight species implemented	n/a	n/a	60% (762/ 1,261)	66% (829/ 1,249)	62% (781/ 1,269)	65% (829/ 1,269)	4%	n/a
Comments	Performance anticipated to be level with FY 2011. FY 2012 target was based on a conservative estimate prior to the Congressional appropriation for FY 2012.							
7.30.8 Percent of threatened and endangered species recovery actions implemented (GPRA)	n/a	n/a	n/a	63% (24,072/ 38,316)	65% (21,699/ 3,616)	63% (24,024/ 38,316)	-2%	n/a
Comments	Performance anticipated to be level with FY 2011. FY 2012 target was based on a conservative estimate prior to the Congressional appropriation for FY 2012.							

This page intentionally left blank