Committee on Resources,

Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, & Public Lands

parks - - Rep. Joel Hefley, Chairman
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515-6207 - - (202) 226-7736

Witness Statement

Statement of
John M. Randall, Ph. D.
Wildland Invasive Species Program Director
THE NATURE CONSERVANCY
Before the
National Parks, Recreation & Public Lands Subcommittee
of the
House Resource Committee
June 19, 2001

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to submit this testimony for the record on H.R. 1462, the Harmful Nonnative Weed Control Act of 2001. In particular, I would like to thank the Chairman for holding this hearing which is bringing needed attention to the importance of the noxious weeds issue and the vital role that H.R. 1462 may play in abating this pernicious threat to both our heritage of native species and natural communities and the economic livelihood of our nation's farmers, ranchers, and foresters.

The Nature Conservancy is dedicated to preserving the plants, animals and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. The Conservancy has more than 1.1 million individual members and over 1,900 corporate sponsors. We currently have programs in all 50 states and in 27 nations. To date our organization has protected more than 12 million acres in the 50 states and abroad, and has helped local partner organizations preserve millions of acres in other nations. The Conservancy itself owns more than 1,340 preserves - the largest private system of nature sanctuaries in the world. Our conservation work is grounded on sound science, strong partnerships with other landowners, and tangible results at local places.

The Conservancy determines where and how to do its work through a planning process that identifies areas in the country containing the most viable and important examples of plant and animal communities. This process further identifies the principal threats to the integrity of the sites such as land conversion, non-point source runoff, or repression of natural fire regimes. An overwhelming 94% of our sites have identified invasive species as the most significant threat to the integrity of biodiversity. The next most important threat, development of roads or utilities, was identified by 62% of reporting sites.

HARMFUL NON-NATIVE WEED PROBLEM

Non-native weeds cause severe economic and environmental losses. Generally, non-native weeds damage ranch, farming, and natural lands by out-competing and replacing indigenous vegetation. Loss of this vegetation can transform the physical characteristics of the affected landscape as well as eliminate the animal species that depend on the native vegetation. Invasive plants and animals are now widely recognized

as second only to habitat loss as threat to biological diversity. Unlike pollution, invasive organisms continue to spread on their own and do not degrade with time. Once introduced, invasive weeds can spread from site to site, region to region, without further human assistance. Rare species appear to be particularly vulnerable to the changes wrought by non-native invaders, but even relatively common plants or animals can be driven to near extinction by particularly disruptive invaders.

Conservative estimates are that non-native harmful weeds exact a price of hundreds of millions of dollars each year in losses and control costs to the nation's farmers and ranchers. In particular, the Federal Interagency Weed Committee attributed a $20 billion annual loss in the productivity of our nation's agricultural sector to damages caused by noxious weeds. The Idaho Department of Agriculture has estimated the cost of noxious weed damage on all Idaho lands to be $300 million annually. A study of the damage caused by leafy spurge in Montana, Wyoming, and North and South Dakota showed a reduction of $129 million annually to the regional economy and to ranchers' net income. Although we are not aware of any study documenting this issue, losses of this magnitude logically translate to higher costs for consumers for agricultural products.

Non-native harmful weeds also cause severe damage to America's public and private natural areas and wildlands. These are lands set aside for the stated purpose of protecting our natural heritage of plants, animals, and biological communities. Just as farms and ranches are managed for a specific crop or valuable forage, natural areas are managed for certain plants, animals, and other organisms. Weeds prevent achievement of these goals, and ruin the values for which these lands have been dedicated.

H.R. 1462: THE HARMFUL NONNATIVE WEED CONTROL ACT OF 2001

Organizations and people who have an interest in land, whether an economic interest and/or an interest in natural values, recognize the seriousness of the threat posed by invasive weeds and are eager to take effective action to fight weeds. For this reason, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association and The Nature Conservancy are natural partners in this fight. Together with a number of Senate and House offices and our partners, we have worked to create the Harmful Nonnative Weed Control Act of 2001.

Members of Congress from both parties understand the practical nature of the need to take immediate, effective action. In the Senate, S. 198, the companion bill to H.R. 1462, was introduced by Senators Craig, Daschle, Conrad, Crapo, Smith, Burns, Johnson, and Dorgan. Since its introduction, it has been co-sponsored by Senators Wyden, Akaka, and Inouye.

H.R. 1462 employs the right approach to fighting weeds. It promotes cooperation and control by local public and private stakeholders; it makes funds available to public and private entities; it seeks to stimulate the creation of additional cooperative efforts; and, it funds all activities related to the management of weeds.

1. Weed Management Entities

Harmful weeds pay no heed to property lines and can only be controlled when neighbors work together. For this reason, The Nature Conservancy strongly believes the structural heart of H.R. 1462 is the weed management entities. These entities consist of local public and private landowners who voluntarily come together to fight weeds affecting all their lands. Only these entities are eligible to receive funding under the program. It is anticipated that federal land managing agencies will participate on the entities as good neighbors working to fight a common scourge. All stakeholders participating in an entity will come to agreement about a proposal to submit to a state government for approval. The proposals will address

harmful weeds on either private or public land, or some combination of the two. States will then submit packages of approved proposals to the Department of Interior which will make broad allocations of available funds to the states based on criteria set forth in the statute. Depending on the availability of funds, all projects approved by states may not be funded under the allocation made by the Department.

Weed management entities are not a creation of this bill. They have a demonstrated track record of success in leveraging cooperation on the ground. California has more than 30 such entities. Other states with entities include Arizona, Hawaii, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Florida, Utah, Delaware, and Pennsylvania among others. Cooperative efforts to fight weeds take place in Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, and other states. Descriptions of the activities of five of these entities are attached to this statement as Appendix A. H.R. 1462 builds on what is already successful. It does not seek to impose a different order on those engaged in the states in fighting weeds.

The bill addresses the fact that some states may not be as organized as others to fight weeds. For this reason, incentive payments are made available to stimulate the formation of entities. Additionally, funds are explicitly made available for Indian tribes in recognition of the large land areas they control and the important role tribes play in the fight.

A final point about local cooperation is that it also occurs across state lines. For example, the Tri-State Demonstration Weed Management Area is composed of local stakeholders from Idaho, Oregon, and Washington who have banded together to fight weeds in Hells Canyon. The Senate version of H.R. 1462 recognized multi-state weed management entities and authorized funding for them. H.R. 1462 does not include this provision. The Conservancy urges the Committee to include recognition of multi-state weed management entities in its bill out of deference to the judgment of people leading the fight on the ground.

2. Funding

A. Scope of Funded Activities

The Harmful Nonnative Weed Control Act provides funding for education, inventories and mapping, management, and monitoring related to the control or eradication of weeds. The Senate bill also provides funding for innovative practices and we urge this Committee to include a similar provision in its bill. More work needs to be done by experts to determine the most effective methods for controlling weeds, and this bill should support these efforts. Additionally, it would be helpful for the bill to explicitly authorize payment for restoration of vegetation on land damaged by weeds since proper restoration is one of the more important steps that can be taken to suppress future infestations.

The bill bars payments for projects related to submerged or floating aquatic noxious weeds or animal pests. As indicated above, invasive species are an issue of the highest concern to The Nature Conservancy. We want Congress to enact legislation that effectively addresses all invasives, including aquatic weeds and animal pests. We also believe that progress on complex issues often occurs incrementally. This is the first major piece of legislation to emerge since the issue of invasives received a boost in attention with the issuance of the Executive Order in February, 1999. We urge Congress to seize this opportunity to take effective action against a problem ruining the economic and natural value of our lands. Aquatic weeds and animal pests will be addressed during reauthorization of the National Invasive Species Act in the next session of Congress. The Nature Conservancy anticipates being fully engaged and supportive of efforts to strengthen that legislation when its time arrives for attention from this body.

B. Amount of Funding

There is no existing independent federal account to address the issues presented by non-native harmful weeds across private and public lands. The case for an enhanced federal role in providing funding is that existing sources of funds do not come close to addressing the need for management of noxious weeds on public and private lands and across state borders.

In connection with preparing this testimony, the Conservancy attempted to conduct a survey of states to determine what their funding needs are to fight weeds. The collected information presents at least a ballpark estimate of the kind of funding twelve states have determined their agencies are capable of using to fight weeds. The information does not address the larger question of how much funding is needed to address the underlying resource issue. In conducting this survey, we also learned that many states have made slow progress in determining the scope and cost of weed infestation and damages in their states.

The twelve surveyed states reported an unmet need for funding in excess of $219 million annually.[(1)] This works out to be an average of $18.25 million per state. Multiplying this figure by 50 states yields a total of $912.5 million. We recognize that the need for funding may not be distributed equally across all the states, and so each state may not need $18.25 million to address noxious weeds. On the other hand, the $219 million figure is based on very incomplete information about the degree of infestation in the responding states, and so the required national figure is very likely considerably higher than $912.5 million. Furthermore, we know this figure does not address what the actual resource need may be, or what the need is for funding on federal lands. In short, the $912.5 million estimate of national need is very likely a conservative guess; but it is a guess with some basis in fact.[(2)]

In light of this information, the Nature Conservancy asks Congress to authorize the expenditure of $300 million through the Harmful Nonnative Weed Control Act. An authorization of this amount acknowledges the scope and severity of the problem posed by harmful nonnative weeds as a matter of policy, even though the amount is still far short of what is needed in the country. Should the time come to appropriate funds for the legislation, we understand the Appropriations Committee may make an amount smaller than $300 million available for the bill.

Appropriations for the bill should not be drawn from existing accounts, but rather should be drawn from uncommitted funds. Federal land managers need secure sources of funding for managing weeds on their own land. Appropriations for this legislation will be available for those situations in which weeds on federal land also adversely affects neighboring private land, when a weed management entity decides to submit a proposal involving exclusively federal land, and of course situations in which no federal land is involved.

Again, The Nature Conservancy thanks the Committee for holding this hearing and bringing needed attention to this important problem. We urge this Committee to report H.R. 1462 to the floor of the House with the minor amendments and authorization level we have identified today. We would be pleased to answer any questions you have about our testimony.

APPENDIX A

WEED MANAGEMENT AREAS

The Tri-State Demonstration Weed Management Area, ID/OR/WA

The Tri-State Weed Management Area (DWMA) includes roughly 250,000 acres in the Hells Canyon Area of Idaho, Oregon and Washington, with most of the acreage in Idaho. Within the DWMA area there is a mix of state lands, BLM lands, and National Forest lands with some private lands. Grasslands and sagebrush steppe are the predominant vegetation, with some mixed coniferous forest at higher elevations. The terrain is steep, rugged and inaccessible. The Snake River runs through the middle of the DWMA. The Tri-State DWMA got its start as an initiative of the Bureau of Land Management, but now includes 16 other federal and state land management agencies, county weed programs, private landowners, non-profit organizations and the Nez Perce Tribe.

Treatment of some weed infestations has produced results. For example, the group has successfully treated every known occurrence of rush skeletonweed, contained spotted knapweed, and contained leafy spurge with two of five spurge sites remaining. Additional needs of the DWMA include hiring additional seasonal workers to inventory and treat additional acreage, release bio-control agents in critical areas, engage more private landowners. There is also a need to greatly increase the supply of native seed for restoration.

Red Rock Watershed Weed Project, Centennial Valley, MT

Centennial Valley is a remote area in southwest Montana that provides habitat for more than 230 bird species (including trumpeter swan, sandhill cranes, and peregrine falcons), mammals such as pronghorn, badgers, wolverines, bears, and wolves, and native fish such as arctic grayling and westslope cutthroat trout. Small populations of invasives occur in the Valley, and large populations of weeds occur nearby. The high quality of Centennial Valley habitat is clearly threatened.

In 1999, a coalition of landowners and groups including representatives from The Nature Conservancy, Beaverhead County, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Partners for Fish and Wildlife program, the Red Rock Lakes National Wildlife Refuge, the Bureau of Land Management, the Greater Yellowstone Coalition, the Montana Audubon Society, and the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation formed the Red Rock Watershed Weed Project (RRWWP). The RRWWP is a joint effort to help private landowners of the lower Centennial Valley deal with noxious weed control. Twenty-five of the thirty-four landowners within the 400,000 acre project area, controlling 88% of the land, have agreed to participate in the program. Educational brochures and workshops have been made available. At least 2500 acres of weeds have been sprayed. An increasing amount of the project area has been mapped, and weed inventories are being made. The RRWWP is far from finished in its work, and sustained vigilance will be required to protect the Valley.

North Fork Cache la Poudre Watershed Cooperative Integrated Weed Management Area, CO

The North Fork of the Cache la Poudre is rich in biological and cultural diversity but is under grave threat from a suite of weeds including leafy spurge, Russian and Spotted knapweed, Dalmatian toadflax, yellow toadflax, Canada thistle, and cheat grass. In 1998, a cooperative weed management area was formed by area landowners and it now includes: Phantom Canyon Ranches Landowners Association (PCR LOA), Colorado Division of Wildlife, North Poudre Irrigation Company, Glade Ranch, Colorado State University's Maxwell Ranch, Colorado Lien (mining company), The Nature Conservancy, Abbey of St. Walburga, U.S. Forest Service, Colorado State Forest Service and several other private landowners including both ranches and ranchettes. This group owns or manages approximately 40,000 acres. All other landowners within the

watershed have been invited to participate. Other partners include Western Governors' Association, State Weed Coordinator (Dept. of Agriculture), Colorado State University Departments of Fishery and Wildlife Biology, Recreation, Natural Resources and Tourism, Sociology, Integrated Pest Management, and the Society For Conservation Biology student chapter at Colorado State University. Western Governors' Association adopted this project as a possible "pilot" community-driven initiative focusing on managing alien species cooperatively.

Digital mapping has already been carried out for part of the project area illustrating the extent of the problem, and helping to set management priorities. Selective spraying and mowing of priority patches and roadsides on PCR LOA lands has begun to reduce the spread of weeds along these corridors. Biological control insects were released on leafy spurge patches on PCR LOA land. Some cooperating ranchers have changed grazing patterns to intensely graze weedy patches and reduce seed production. Prescribed fire is being used to reduce density of cheat grass on Conservancy lands. Restoration efforts have also begun with several landowners collecting and planting native seed into treatment areas. The Conservancy conducted 65 volunteer weed management and restoration workdays.

Critical next steps and resources needed to move this project forward include project-wide mapping of weed populations; setting priorities and strategies through integrated management plans; training in plant identification, best management practices, and safe use of herbicides and equipment; applying integrated methods including cutting, pulling, spraying, grazing, biocontrol releases, and burning; and producing a newsletter to help disseminate information to landowners. Many of the weed species are not yet widespread, and can be contained and with an intensive 3-year effort.

Berkshire Taconic Landscape, CT/MA/NY

The Berkshire Taconic Landscape is a 36,000 acre area of the Berkshire Taconic range in western Massachusetts and adjacent Connecticut and New York. Most of the land in the area is forested and owned by private landowners, or the state with some small TNC holdings. Mapping indicated that the core 16,000 of the area has few invasive weeds now but that weeds have begun to penetrate the area. To combat this, TNC and area landowners combined to produce a cooperative project (Weed It Now) for expanding the uninvaded core to 24,000 acres.

The Florida Keys Invasive Exotics Task Force (Task Force) was organized in early 1996 to address invasive exotic plants in the Florida Keys. These biological pollutants beset the Keys' subtropical ecosystem and the flora and fauna supported by it. The Task Force is composed of biologists, planners and natural resource managers from 25 local, state and federal agencies, non-profits and public utilities (see list below). Goals of the Task Force include documentation of weed populations, prioritization and control of infestations, and public education and promotion of interagency cooperation. Members also put their muscles where their mouths are while toiling together on invasive exotic plant control workdays.

Region-wide identification and mapping of invasive exotic plant populations enabled the group to prioritize control projects. An educational brochure, the "Keys' Invasive Exotic Removal Guide," was produced and distributed to thousands of interested property owners. And a highly visible exotic removal and native species restoration demonstration project was carried out to prove the efficiency of the interagency cooperative approach on a 50 acre island. Since 1997 the West Summerland Key Demonstration Project has involved 780 volunteers including Boy and Girl Scouts, AmeriCorps members, Alternative Spring Breakers

and local residents. As the project nears completion, the island is 99% exotics free and native plants are being restored to their rightful place.

The GreenSweep initiative will also strive to address the "missing link" in exotics control efforts up to this point, the private residential landscape. By teaming up with the Monroe County Cooperative Extension Service and its highly successful Florida Yards and Neighborhoods Program (FYN), The Nature Conservancy and other Task Force members will step up public education and outreach.

Task Force members are confident that the group's comprehensive interagency approach and sheer determination, will result in an early and lasting victory in the war on invasive exotic plants in the Keys. It is estimated that an annual budget of $400,000 would enable the Task Force to reach a maintenance level of control in the Keys by the year 2010. After this time the cost of maintaining control would be significantly reduced.

Florida Keys Invasive Exotics Task Force Members

- Private:

Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council, Clean Florida Keys, Inc, Florida Keys Environmental Restoration Trust Fund, Key Deer Protection Alliance, The Nature Conservancy, City Electric System, Florida Keys Electric Cooperative, and Friends and Volunteers of Refuges.

- Local governments:

City of Key West, Village of Islamorada, Monroe County Division of Environmental Resources, Monroe County Cooperative Extension Service, Monroe County Grants Department, Monroe County Public Works, and, Monroe County Land Authority;

- State of Florida:

Division of Parks and Recreation, Bureau of Invasive Plant Management, Division of Coastal and Aquatic Managed Areas, Environmental Resources Permitting Office, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Florida Department of Transportation, Florida Department of Community Affairs, and, South Florida Water Management District.

- Federal Government:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Navy.

APPENDIX B

AVAILABLE STATE DATA

ARIZONA

Acres infested: 8,520.5, (based on voluntary not systematic reporting)

Acres currently being treated: No current estimates available

Estimated funds spent solely on invasive plant species annually: $85,000

CALIFORNIA

Current annual budget for

only administration of Weed Management Areas: $1,400,000.00

Estimated annual need: $5,000,000.00

HAWAII

Estimated total annual funding need (all islands): $16,300,000

By sector:

Prevention - $3,100,000.00

Early Detection - $4,200,000.00

Control - $7,300,000.00

Public Outreach - $600,000.00

Requested portion from federal sources: $8,150,000

Requested portion from island-level sources: $8,150,000

IDAHO

Current and Required Budgets for Integrated Weed Management Activities in Idaho - April 2001

IWM Activity	Current Budget	%	Req'd Budget	%
Public Educ & Awareness	$1,430,460.00	9	$5,006,610.00	9
Prevention	$317,880.00	2	$5,562,900.00	10
Inventory & mapping (early detection)	$2,225,160.00	14	$7,788,060.00	14
Rapid Response (eradication/early intervention)	$1,271,520.00	8	$4,450,320.00	8
Control/Mgmt.	$7,788,060.00	49	$16,887,700.00	30
Rehabilitation	$158,940.00	1	$5,562,900.00	10
Research/Tech Transfer	$1,271,520.00	8	$5,562,900.00	10
Administration (county, state & fed)	$1,430,460.00	9	$5,006,610.00	9
TOTALS	**$ 15,894,000.00**		**$ 55,629,000.00**	

KANSAS

Acres infested: 3,827,408

Acres currently being treated: Approximately 50% of total infested acres can be treated annually

Funds spent to combat noxious weeds: $19,050,000.00

Estimated annual loss to noxious weeds: $75,000,000.00 in crop/forage production

Total additional budgetary needs: **Minimum of twice the current funding and expenditures, or $38,100,000.00,**

would be needed to treat existing noxious weeds.

MONTANA

Acres infested: 8,000,000

Average noxious weed spread rate per year: 10%

Minimum management cost per acre: $20/acre

FROM the MONTANA WEED MANAGEMENT PLAN, JANUARY 2001

(Estimates are based on a total infestation of 7 million acres at $20/acre min. management cost.)

ENTITY	CURRENT ANNUAL BUDGET	REQUESTED OR REQUIRED ANNUAL BUDGET
County Weed District (mills)	$3,300,000.00	$9,400,000.00
Bureau of Land Management	$1,530,000.00	$4,500,000.00
US Forest Service	$931,000.00	$5,000,000.00
Montana Dept. of Trans.	$1,100,000.00	$1,300,000.00
DNRC Trust Lands (includes on-ground management costs)	$35,000.00	$1,700,000.00
Fish Wildlife and Parks	$186,316.00	$500,000.00
Dept. of Corrections	$5,000.00	$5,000.00
State Water Division	$14,000.00	$38,000.00
University Lands (UM, MSU)	$110,140.00	$120,000.00
Fish and Wildlife Service	$75,000.00	$600,000.00
Yellowstone Park	$19,000.00	$41,400.00
Glacier Park	$150,000.00	$320,000.00
Other NPS lands	$17,600.00	$111,000.00
Bureau of Rec	$65,000.00	$120,000.00
Tribal	$400,000.00	$2,300,000.00
Private landowners	$1,300,000.00	$10,000,000.00

University Extension	$400,000.00	$800,000.00
University Research	$2,000,000.00	$4,000,000.00 (Requested)
USDA ARS Research	$500,000.00	$2,000,000.00 (Requested)
Research Budget		$5,200,000.00
MDA (includes weed free forage)	$277,000.00	$277,000.00
State Weed Education Program	$82,500.00	$2,500,000.00
Noxious Weed Trust Fund	$1,800,000.00	$1,800,000.00
Total	**$14,297,556.00**	**$52,632,400.00**

NEVADA

ENTITY	ACRES MANAGED	ACRES INFESTED	CURRENT ANNUAL BUDGET	Requested or Required ANNUAL BUDGET
State/Private				
Douglas Weed Dist.	144,769	15,000	$180,000.00	$195,000.00
Churchill Weed Dist.	640,000	6,400	$125,000.00	$250,000.00
NV Div. Wildlife	142,959	17,955	$1,585.00	$185,000.00
NV Dept. Parks	132,500	1,000	$11,200.00	$20,000.00
NV Dept. of Transport.	133,000	12,000	$150,000.00	$240,000.00
University Lands	( )	( )	( )	( )
Tribal Lands	1,218,651	12,000		
NV Cons. Districts	11,000,000	( )	$70,000.00	$320,000.00
Federal				
Bureau of Land Mgmt.	46,500,000	195,750	$313,000.00	$1,500,000.00
US Forest Service	6,500,000	16,000	$250,000.00	$350,000.00
US Fish & Wildlife	( )	( )	( )	( )
Total Acres/	66,268,920	258,150	**$1,099,200.00**	**$2,875,000.00**
Expenditures	w/o USFWS	w/o Univ. Cons.	w/o Univ.	w/o Univ. or USFWS
	or Univ.	Dist. Or USFWS	Or USFWS	

NEW MEXICO

County Weed Supervisors $1,440,000.00

Currently, only one county in New Mexico has a full-time person dedicated to managing noxious weeds. Two other counties have part-time employees. In all three instances, the funding is provided by the Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) with assistance from federal land management agencies--principally the Bureau of Land Management.

Based on estimates from the Socorro Weed Management Area an FTE for a county was estimated at $45,000. Multiplying this by the number of counties in the state results in a total need of $1,440,000.

Rapid Response $146,000.00

Management $2,560,000.00

New Mexico is in the process of compiling a statewide inventory in order to more accurately estimate the level of infestation and consequent level of funding necessary for effective management. A rough estimate based on counties that have completed noxious weed inventories is approximately 2,000 infested acres/county. Management costs are estimated at $40/acre.

Awareness $500,000.00

Due to the relative newness of New Mexico's noxious weed program, developing public awareness is one of the highest priorities.

Total Need $4,464,000.00

OREGON

Acres infested by the 21 noxious weed species: 31,773,390 total acres

Acres in which the 21 noxious weeds have damaged

rangeland, farmland, forestland, or wetlands: 6,496,878 acres

Estimated foregone economic benefits of the infested acreage:

> $118,884,183 in sales were foregone by affected sectors due to lost productivity. This decrease in cattle, wheat, and timber sales as well as a decrease in tourist expenditures would result in an estimated decrease of $83,221,050 in total personal income or 3,329 in annual jobs lost.

Noxious weeds have the potential to infest an estimated 10,004,000 additional acres. If this were to occur, the estimated potential forgone economic benefits would be a further decrease of affected industry sales by approximately $91,128,664 and an impact on total personal income by $53,569,717, or 2,143 in annual jobs lost.

Total additional budgetary needs: $12.4 million

TENNESSEE

Acres infested: No current estimates available

Acres currently being treated: No current estimates available

Estimated funds spent solely on invasive plant species annually:

> 2001 Approximate TN Government Spending: $225,000.00
>
> 2001 Approximate TN Non-Government Spending: $225,000.00
>
> 2001 Total Expenditures: $480,000.00

Estimated annual need:

> TN Government: $12,270,000.00
>
> TN Non-Government: $10,950,000.00

Total: $23,220,000.00

SOUTH DAKOTA

ENTITY	ACRES MANAGED	ACRES INFESTED	CURRENT ANNUAL BUDGET	REQUESTED OR REQUIRED ANNUAL BUDGET
County Weed Boards	48,600,000	5,685,629	$5,554,205.00	$7,259,893.00
Bureau of Land Mgmt.	279,000	1,294	$10,000.00	$25,000.00
SD Dept. of Transport.	9136 miles		$2,595,325.00	$3,375,000.00
SD School and Public Lands	808,000	16,000	$150,000.00	$350,000.00
Game Fish and Parks	205,658	13,555	$677,750.00	$677,750.00
US Forest Service National Grasslands	940,491	82,000	$750,000.00	$1,600,000.00
US Army Corps of Engineers	205,648	100,000	$185,000.00	$700,000.00
SDDA			$150,000.00	$375,000.00
Fish and Wildlife Services	225,118	68,100	$473,000.00	$850,000.00
National Parks	273,602	78,735	$220,000.00	$500,000.00
Bureau of Reclamation	74,500	24,000	$80,000.00	$150,000.00
Tribal Lands	5,022,399	350,000	$380,000.00	$16,000,000.00
Private Landowners	42,400,000	4,700,000	$12,000,000.00	$15,600,000.00
US Air Force	7,939	2400	$5,000.00	$10,000.00
Army National Guard	583	100	$900.00	$1,500.00
USDA APHIS Research			$100,000.00	$200,000.00
Western Area Power Administration	700		$25,000.00	$50,000.00
South Dakota Weed & Pest Commission Grant Fund			$202,000.00	$500,000.00
Total Expenditures			**$23,558,180.00**	**$48,224,143.00**

WASHINGTON

ESTIMATED ANNUAL BUDGET FOR

NOXIOUS WEED CONTROL IN WASHINGTON STATE

ENTITY	ACRES MANAGED	ACRES INFESTED	CURRENT ANNUAL BUDGET	REQUESTED OR REQUIRED ANNUAL BUDGET
County Weed Boards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$4,400,000.00	$5,200,000.00
Bureau of Land Mgmt.	300,000	75,000	$160,000.00	$450,000.00
US Forest Service	9,171,108	458,555	$748,300.00	$4,600,000.00
WA Dept. of Transport.	100,000	3,500	$2,150,000.00	$3,000,000.00
WA Dept. of Natural Resources	5,000,000	449,000	$354,000.00	$4,500,000.00
WA Dept. of Fish & Wildlife	794,446	124,940	$1,282,607.00	$2,500,000.00
WA State Parks	262,000	12,000	$55,000.00	$250,000.00
US Fish & Wildlife Service	674,733	101,210	$202,900.00	$1,000,000.00
National Parks	1,933,253	19,332	?	$200,000.00
Tribal Lands	2,504,716	375,707	?	$3,800,000.00
Private Landowners	23,614,068	1,180,703	?	$5,900,000.00
Research Budget	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	?	$1,600,000.00
WA Dept of Agriculture	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$520,000.00	$1,400,000.00
WA State Noxious Weed Control Board	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	$183,000.00	$300,000.00
Total Expenditures			**$10,055,807.00**	**$34,700,000.00**

WYOMING

Estimated current annual spending: $10 to $11 million

Total estimated annual need: $20 million

---

1. The reporting states and the amount they reported are as follows: California, $5 million; Hawaii, $16.3 million; Idaho, $39.7 million; Kansas, $19 million; Montana, $38.3 million; New Mexico, $4.5 million; Nevada, $1.8 million; Oregon, $12.4 million; South Dakota, $24.7 million; Tennessee, $22.7 million; Washington, $24.6 million; and Wyoming, $10 million. Additional background information on many of these states is set forth in Appendix B.

2. The Conservancy was not able to systematically collect information about the independent federal need for weed funding. The information for Montana, South Dakota, and Washington includes amounts needed to address weed needs on public lands in those states. See Appendix B. We understand that the refuge system in the Fish and Wildlife Service has a backlog of 300 projects requiring funding of approximately $120 million.

3. This is amount is based on 1 full-time, 1 part-time salary, and annual supply and publication costs.

4. This estimate is based upon a half-time salary for each existing Weed Management Area, plus program funds for each of the state's fifty counties to administer Weed Management Areas.

5. Please note that this is the documented infested area in Nevada. It is estimated that 1% of all lands or 700,000 acres are infested in NV.

6. Although there are 33 counties in New Mexico, Los Alamos County was left out of calculations because of its small size in relation to other New Mexico counties

7. This amount illustrates funding needed to treat noxious weed populations with limited distribution in the state that should be considered top priority for management to prevent further spread.

# # #