

# Three-Year Summary of Federal and State Endangered and Threatened Species Expenditures

*Fiscal Years 1998-2000*



## **Three-Year Summary of *Federal and State Endangered and Threatened Species Expenditures Reports (FY 1998-2000)***

### **Background**

Section 18 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973 requires the Secretary of the Interior (working through the Fish and Wildlife Service) to annually report certain expenditures for the conservation of threatened and endangered species. The following summary is a side-by-side comparison of three annual reports: ***Federal and State Endangered and Threatened Species Expenditures*** for Fiscal Years 1998, 1999, and 2000. Details of how the data were obtained are located in each annual report.

In the past and for these reports, only those expenditures that are reasonably identifiable for a specific listed species have been reported. All Federal agencies and those States receiving section 6 grant-in-aid funds pursuant to the Act are asked to report. Since only a few foreign species are receiving funding from U.S. governmental agencies, we restrict these annual reports to a discussion concerning listed U.S. species. Beginning with the FY 2001 report, we will include expenditures that can be reasonably assigned to other Act-related work, but not to individual species.

### **Contents of the annual reports**

Expenditures are identified by species as they appear in 50 CFR Part 17 and reported separately for the Service, the States, and in aggregate for all other reporting Federal agencies. The Service and 19 other Federal agencies identified expenditures for the conservation of individual threatened and endangered species. Two additional Federal agencies responded that their expenditures were not reasonably identifiable to species. The raw data from the non-Service Federal agencies are found in Appendix A. The guidance for the agencies to determine how to calculate expenditures is located in Appendix B.

Each annual report has three tables. The first table reports the reasonably identifiable expenditures for each species by the Service, other Federal agencies, and the States (except for land acquisitions). The second table ranks each species in descending order of general (non-land) expenditures for each species; a cumulative (running) total, and percentage of the total general (non-land) expenditures is also provided for the comparison. Land acquisition expenditures are included only in the third table.

### **Summary of expenditures reported for FY 1998-2000**

Expenditures increased every year for the three fiscal years (Table 1). Each year, approximately 97 percent of species that were listed received some type of funding. Land acquisition comprised roughly 15 percent of the total expenditures over the three years.

**Table 1. Summary of expenditures reported for FY 1998-2000**

	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>
<b>Total expenditures reported</b>	<b>\$454,324,309</b>	<b>\$514,061,461</b>	<b>\$610,285,971</b>
general (non-land)	\$382,654,177	\$437,082,457	\$524,176,679
land acquisition	\$71,670,132	\$76,979,004	\$86,109,292
General expenditures reported for:			
FWS	\$54,122,700	\$52,748,740	\$66,535,650
Other Federal Agencies	\$312,193,521	\$292,426,310	\$357,329,895
States	\$16,337,956	\$91,907,407	\$100,311,134
Percent of threatened and endangered species with expenditures reported	97.6	96.8	96.6
Median general (non-land) expenditure (species with at least \$100 reported)	\$14,200	\$16,150	\$19,350
Range of general (non-land) expenditures	\$0-34,950,000	\$0-57,050,000	\$0-\$87,640,000
Number of species with general (non-land) expenditures exceeding \$1 million	55	56	55
Number of species with 50 percent of expenditures (percent of listed species)	9 (0.8)	8 (0.7)	7 (0.6)
Number of species with 90 percent of expenditures (percent of listed species)	86 (7.4)	82 (6.8)	91 (7.4)

**Comparison of FY 1998-2000 expenditure reports to other years**

Comparisons with other reports may be difficult. Although a good faith effort was made to develop species-by-species expenditures for these reports, the information presented each year does not reflect the total governmental (Federal and State) effort toward threatened and endangered species conservation because not all actions can be easily identified or funding directly calculated per species. Therefore, the reader is cautioned against making comparisons with other reports on threatened and endangered species expenditures beyond those which are provided below. A significant portion of threatened and endangered species conservation activities at all levels includes law enforcement, consultation, recovery coordination, and other actions that are not easily or reasonably funded in a species-by-species manner. Accounting procedures for staff salaries and operational, maintenance, and other support services are not normally creditable toward individual species totals. In addition, as the Service, other Federal agencies, and the States move to actions and planning efforts that benefit multi-species, dividing costs by the species benefitting also becomes more difficult.

The data in these reports are more precise than previous reports on estimated allocations, since land acquisition costs are separated from general expenditures. However, they still do not accurately reflect the total cost of conserving listed species, since they only include expenditures reasonably identifiable for individual species.

Also, significant variability exists among Federal and State agency reports that are compiled to produce this report. Some agencies reported gross totals for other expenditures that could not be identified to species; however, those data are not included within the summary tables in this document because they cannot be itemized by species and because not all agencies reported them. This information is available on the individual agency reports under Appendix A (Reports Provided by Other Federal Agencies) of each annual report and will be provided in the summary tables for future reports.

Until the 1999 and 2000 reports, the salmon and steelhead were reported by Evolutionarily Significant Units (ESUs). Since the amount of money spent on these two species is large, the effect on the top 10 ranked species is profound (Table 4). Resuming in 2001, the salmon and steelhead will be reported by ESUs.

The amendment to the Act requiring the annual reports was passed in the first quarter of FY 1989. The Service, other Federal agencies, and State agencies gathered the best available data with little opportunity for advance planning and coordination in that year. Subsequent reports have greatly benefited by the FY 1989 experience in planning and coordination with the reporting agencies to track such expenditures. Therefore, due to differences in reporting methods, these reports cannot be easily compared to the 1989 or subsequent expenditure reports prior to this one. These year-to-year differences include changes in the States' reporting, changes in how expenditures are calculated, and changes in the agencies' ability to track expenditures. Thus, real dollar increases or decreases cannot be accurately calculated or inferred from the overall or individual totals.

Table 2 compares all fiscal years since the reporting began. Since 1989, the number of listed species increased every year, by 123 percent for the 12 years, and the value of the expenditures increased almost every year, for a total of 1,298 percent. A general trend shows a decreasing number of the top species receive the bulk of the funding. In 1999, the total expenditures (including land acquisitions) surpassed the half-billion dollar mark for the first time.

**Table 2: Summary of expenditures and associated statistics from FY 1989-2000**

<b>SUMMARY OF FIGURES (Amounts \$000)</b>												
	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Federal Total	39,638.7	96,642.5	112,684.8	160,060.3	204,501.8	234,933.9	286,445	268,778.5	288,661.5	434,669.1	411,727.1	495,270
State Total	4,086.1	5,701.2	64,126.7	131,450.7	17,698.5	9,643.6	11,231	16,935.2	12,269.8	19,655.2	102,334.3	115,016
Grand Total	43,724.8	102,343.7	176,811.5	291,510.9	222,200.3	244,577.5	297,676	285,713.7	300,931.3	454,324.3	514,061.5	610,286
Change from previous year	*****	58,618.9	74,467.8	114,699.4	-69,310.6	22,377.2	53,098.5	-11,962.3	15,217.6	153,393	59,737.2	96,224.5
No. listed species	554	591	639	728	809	914	957	963	1,111	1,166	1,202	1,235
No. reporting expenditures	347	477	570	679	749	819	925	895	1,060	1,137	1,163	1,193
Max. reported amount	3,108.6	9,687.2	24,651.3	73,578.6	18,518.7	24,280.6	35,942.5	40,777.3	28,545.3	34,945	57,050.3	87,644.2
Median for species equal to or greater than \$100	11.8	13.2	12.2	16	12.9	23	30	15	13.8	14.2	16.2	19.4
No. with 50% of expenditures (percentage of no. listed)	12 (2.2%)	10 (1.7%)	7 (1.1%)	5 (0.7%)	10 (1.2%)	9 (1.1%)	6 (0.6%)	5 (0.5%)	10 (0.9%)	9 (0.8%)	7 (0.6%)	7 (0.6%)
No. with 90% of expenditures (percentage of no. listed)	63 (11.4%)	58 (9.8%)	54 (8.5%)	59 (8.1%)	79 (9.8%)	103 (11%)	131 (14%)	77 (8%)	101 (9.1%)	86 (7.4%)	82 (6.8%)	91 (7.4%)

NOTES:  
 All figures include land acquisition expenditures, except those that are shaded. In 1993 the Service began to tabulate these costs separately.  
 The Federal and Grand Totals for 1993 differ from those published in the 1993 report due to an error made in the 1993 report for the desert tortoise.  
 Due to an error, the Federal and Grand Totals shown for 1995 differ from those published in the 1995 report by \$32,002.5 less than what was reported for the FWS total.

## Comparison among species for FY 1998-2000

Accounting for the limits of this reporting system, less than 1 percent of all listed species received approximately half of the reasonably identifiable funding each year. This conclusion was expected. The Congress and some State legislatures identify specific appropriations for most of these species, and State and Federal natural resource managers use the public interest in these high-profile species to help protect other species in the same habitats or imperiled by the same threats. The species identified by Congress as deserving of specific appropriations are the same species that drive interest and participation in the considerable State and private sector efforts on behalf of all listed species.

### FY 1998:

Accounting for the limits of this reporting system and excluding land acquisition expenditures, the 1998 reported expenditures increased by approximately \$116.7 million from the FY 1997 report, an increase of 44 percent. Of the increase in reported expenditures since FY 1997, more than \$60 million is attributable to three steelhead stocks added to the list in FY 1998.

### FY 1999:

Accounting for the limits of this reporting system and excluding land acquisition expenditures, the 1999 reported expenditures increased by approximately \$54.43 million from the FY 1998 report, an increase of 14 percent. Of the increase in reported expenditures since FY 1998, the States reported \$75.57 million more than the previous year, while the Federal agencies reported a decrease of \$21.14 million.

### FY 2000:

Accounting for the limits of this reporting system and excluding land acquisition expenditures, the 2000 reported expenditures increased by approximately \$87.09 million from the FY 1999 report, an increase of 19.9 percent. Of the increase in reported expenditures since FY 1999, the States reported \$8.4 million more than the previous year, while the Federal agencies reported an increase of \$78.69 million.

From the annual report tables, we can derive some information about the amount of money spent on each species. Table 3 compares the highest ranking species for each year, according to the general (non-land) expenditures for those species.

As mentioned earlier, the salmon and the steelhead, both species under the jurisdiction of NOAA-Fisheries, were split into ESUs in 1998, but not in 1999 or 2000. The bull trout Distinct Population Segments were also split in 1998, but not in the subsequent years.

Aside from one plant, the top 60 ranking species by expenditures were vertebrates in all three years.

**Table 3. The 10 species (rank shown in bold) with the highest reported expenditures for Fiscal Years 1998-2000**

SPECIES (50 CFR Part 17)	STATUS	1998 RANK	1999 RANK	2000 RANK
Salmon, chinook	E,T	<b>2,3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Steelhead	E,T	<b>5,6,&amp;7</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
Salmon, coho	T	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
Salmon, chum	T	Not listed	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Salmon, sockeye	E,T	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
Woodpecker, red-cockaded	E	<b>8</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>
Trout, bull	T	14,152, &187	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Owl, northern spotted	T	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	14
Sea-lion, Steller	E,T	23	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>
Crane, whooping	E	19	<b>10</b>	11
Flycatcher, southwestern willow	E	<b>10</b>	19	12
Sparrow, Cape Sable seaside	E	62	104	<b>9</b>
Manatee, West Indian	E	39	23	<b>10</b>

### Land Acquisition Costs

The Service did not report land acquisition funds in the expenditure tables for FY 1989. However, other Federal agencies reported land acquisition costs in that report, and even more were reported in the 1990, 1991, and, most noticeably, 1992 tabulations. Beginning with the FY 1993 report, the Service has tabulated the known expenditures for land acquisition separately from all other expenditures. The Service's land acquisitions expenditures have been included in these reports when they were identifiable to a species (see Table 3 in each annual report). The States' reported land acquisition expenditures are also reported in Table 3 of each annual report. No species had only land acquisition costs without any general costs reported, except for one in 2000 (when a refuge added land for multiple species). Land expenditures are shown in Table 4 for the three-year period. (Some discrepancies may occur due to rounding.)

**Table 4. Land acquisition expenditures for 1998-2000 (\$ millions)**

<b>Reporting Group</b>	<b>1998</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>
States	3.32	10.43	14.70
Fish and Wildlife Service	35.66	48.29	53.68
Other Federal Agencies	32.69	18.27	17.72
Total	71.67	76.99	86.10



**Species on Cover (clockwise from top right corner):**

*Plymouth Redbelly Turtle (Pseudemys rubrivtrix bangsi)*, photo by T.E. Graham

*Jaguar (Panthera onca)*, photo by Corel Corp.

*Chapman Rhododendron (Rhododendron chapmanii)*, photo by USFWS/E. LaVerne Smith

*Spectacled Eider (Somateria fischeri)*, photo by USFWS/Glen Smart

*Borax Lake Chub (Gila boraxobius)*, photo by Jack Williams

*Lange's Metalmark Butterfly (Apodemia mormo langei)*, photo by Jerry Powell

**U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service  
Endangered Species Program  
1849 C Street, NW (MS-420 ARLSQ)  
Washington, DC 20240  
<http://www.fws.gov/endangered>**

**November 2003**

