

**Funding for National Invasive Species Programs**  
(\$ in millions)

<b>Program</b>	<b>Fiscal 1999</b>	<b>Fiscal 2000</b>	<b>President's Request</b>	<b>National letter</b>	<b>House Floor</b>	<b>Senate Floor</b>	<b>Conference</b>
<b>Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies</b>							
Agriculture Research Service Invasive Species Program	68.77	74.72	78.35	78.35	0.3* <sup>3</sup>	0.3* <sup>4</sup>	No Mention
Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (Integrated Activities)	10.471	12.191	13.725	--	?		--
- Invasive species research grants	0	0	1.5	10.0	0	0	0
Economic Research Service study of economics of invasive species introductions	0.03	65.36 0.03	55.42 0.03	-- 0.03	66.419 0.03?	67.038 0.03?	67.038 0.03?
Animal and Plant Health Inspections Service	448	307	434	480	470	371* <sup>1</sup>	531
Natural Resources Conservation Service - invasive species efforts	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	?	0?	--
Office of the Chief Economist, Invasive Species Risk Assessment,	-- 0.249	6.408 0.258	8.612 0.488	-- 0.488	6.408 0.26?	7.462* <sup>2</sup> 0.26?	7.462 0.26?
<p>*1 Administration Budget request of \$8.805 million for Invasive Species was not included in the Senate Committee mark. "The Committee does not provide the funding increases in support of the Presidential Executive Order on Invasive Alien Species proposed in the budget."</p> <p>*2 Increases targeted to "pay costs, to continue modernization of weather and economic data systems, and to enhance the Office of Risk Assessment and Cost-Benefit Analysis."</p> <p>*3 Report language provides a \$300,000 increase above FY 2000 to support the Department's efforts to detect and eradicate incipient weed populations and manage established species "through foreign exploration and host testing of new biocontrol agents for weeds."</p> <p>*4 Report language provides a \$300,000 increase above FY 2000 to "strengthen the ARS current weed management program on crop lands and rangelands in Colorado and the Central Great Plains."</p>							
<b>Program</b>	<b>Fiscal 1999</b>	<b>Fiscal 2000</b>	<b>President's Request</b>	<b>National letter</b>	<b>House Floor</b>	<b>Senate Full Committee</b>	<b>Conference</b>

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary							
NOAA Ballast Water Demonstration Program	0.85	0.85	0	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
NOAA ANS Task Force	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.8
GLERL - ANS Research	6.825 0	6.825 0	6.025 0	-- +1.0	7.125 +0	7.0 Language on 'fishhook flea'	7.0
Sea Grant ANS Research (Section 1202 Grants)	2.8	2.8	3.0	--	3.0	3.0	3.0
State Department Environmental Diplomacy Fund - U.S. share to create an international invasive species Secretariat	NA	4.0	5.0	5.0 +0.1	4.0? ?	?	At State Department Discretion
Great Lakes Fishery Commission, sea lamprey control	8.353	9.353	12.353	12.353	9.353	12.353	12.353
Program	Fiscal 1999	Fiscal 2000	President's Request	National letter	House Floor	Senate Floor	Conference
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development							
Army Corps of Engineers Public Facility Research and Development	0.75	1.0	0	1.0	0.7	0.7	0.7
ANS Dispersal Barrier Construction	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Army Corps of Engineers Research and Control of Aquatic Nuisance Plants	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0
Bureau of Reclamation Control of Aquatic Weeds			2.0	2.0	No Mention	No Mention	No Mention
Program	Fiscal 1999	Fiscal 2000	President's Request	National letter	House Floor	Senate Floor	Conference
Subcommittee on Interior							

Forest Service Research and Development program - invasive species	8.6	8.6	8.6	25.0	Probably level	Probably level	Probably level* <sup>13</sup>
Forest Service Forest Health Program	7.6	15.6	16.6	22.0	Probably level	Probably level	Probably slight increase * <sup>16</sup>
Forest Service Cooperative Forestry Program, public education and incentives	0.55	0.55	0.55	10.0	Probably level	Probably level	Probably slight increase * <sup>15</sup>
Forest Service International Program	NA	1.5?or 3.5?	5.0	5.0	~\$2.0* <sup>2</sup>	5.0	Probably Administration request* <sup>17</sup>
Forest Service National Forest Systems, invasive species in grassland and range areas	5.0	5.0	8.0	10.0	Probably level	Probably level	Probably Level * <sup>14</sup>
Bureau of Land Management Invasive Weeds Management Program	3.7	7.2	9.45	11.0	Probably level	11.0* <sup>3</sup>	~10* <sup>18</sup>
USGS/BRD Invasive Species Program	5	5	5.5	5.5	Probably level	Probably level	Slight Increase * <sup>11</sup> +0.5 ballast water research
USGS/BRD DOI Science, Invasive Species on BLM land	0	0	0.35	0.35	Probably 0	Probably 0	Probably 0* <sup>12</sup>
USGS Species and Habitats Program, Invasive Species Initiative	0.25	0	0	1.0	Probably 0	Probably 0	Probably 0* <sup>12</sup>
FWS Partners for Fish and Wildlife Invasive Species initiative	0	0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	Probably 2.0* <sup>8</sup>
FWS Invasive Species Control on Refuge Lands	0	2.7	3.0	3.0	Probably level	3.0* <sup>4</sup>	* <sup>7</sup>
FWS Fisheries Fish and Wildlife Assistance Office, including ANS State Management Plans	2.192	4.692	4.674	7.0	Probably Level	Probably Level	Probably Level * <sup>6</sup>
FWS International Affairs	0	0.199	0.199	0.199	Probably level	Probably level	Probably level * <sup>9</sup>

National Park Service, Invasive Species	0	2.3	4.581	4.77	Parent account (Natural Resource Initiatives) increased to \$9.393	>2.3* <sup>5</sup>	>2.3* <sup>10</sup>
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Noxious Weed Eradication	1.964	1.987	1.987	3.0	Probably level	Probably level	Probably level* <sup>13</sup>
Office of Insular Affairs, Brown Tree Snake Control	2.1	2.35	2.35	2.35	2.35	2.35	2.35

\*1 “Although a funding allocation lower than fiscal year 2000 enacted level precludes the Committee from recommending expensive new initiatives, the Committee does recognize that controlling invasive exotics is important for natural resources management throughout the country. The Committee is pleased with the efforts of the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the U.S. Geological Service and the Forest Service to address the issues of invasive non-native plants in their strategic plans and to eradicate or control these species. The Committee urges the land managing bureaus to be pro-active in providing their field managers and the public with information on acceptable native alternatives to non-native plant material, to increase public awareness of these issues, and to emphasize partnerships in the eradication of invasive non-native plants. Successful efforts to manage lands to protect native fauna should likewise be continued and expanded where possible. The Committee also urges all other entities that receive funding for facilities under this bill to increase their use of native plants in landscaping.

\*2 The \$1 million increase to the International Forestry Program is directed to invasive species control and management and migratory species habitat conservation.

\*3 \$1.5 million above enacted level for “noxious weed control and eradication.”

\*4 An increase of \$314,000 above enacted level for “addressing the alien species problems within the refuge system.”

\*5 The Committee report provides an increase of \$3.4 million for “native and exotic species management”

\*6 The Conference provides an increase of \$10.776 million for the fish and wildlife management account. However, \$12.659 million are earmarked for specific increases above FY 2000. Therefore, a \$1.8 million cut (6%) will have to be borne by the remaining (unearmarked) programs in the account -- which includes the aquatic nuisance species program.

\*7 “While there is no specific increase for alien species control in the refuge operations and maintenance account, the Service is encouraged to place a priority on these activities in the refuge operating needs system.”

\*8 This program is not mentioned in the Conference report. In most cases, the report appears to be using the House mark as the baseline.

\*9 This program is not mentioned in any of the reports. Interpretation falls to the Administration, and is likely to be at the Administration request (level funding).

\*10 This program is not mentioned in the conference report. Senate direction of an increase of \$3.4 million for native and exotic species management and House direction of an increase for the parent account both stand. The final allocation is likely to be greater than level funding but below the Administration requested increase.

\*11 “Increases above the House for Science support include \$1,791,000 for uncontrollable costs.” “The managers have earmarked \$3.4 million for mission-critical science support for the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). The managers reiterate that these funds are for research needs solely identified by FWS and, as such, are provided to establish a parallel program similar to the Natural Resources Preservation program in the National Park Service.” The Conference report also includes an earmark (within Science Support, but separate from the \$3.4 million) of \$500,000 for ballast water research - “The managers have provided \$500,000 to the Western Fisheries Research Center to conduct a pilot project on the pre- and post-treatment of ballast water for biological activity. The center should develop a protocol for sampling/monitoring of discharge of exchanged ballast water; develop an attainable standard for treated ballast water that can be effectively monitored; evaluate the treatment effectiveness; and develop and publish a report of the projected results.”

\*12 This program is not mentioned in any of the reports and is unlikely to be funded.

\*13 This program is not mentioned in any of the reports and is likely to be level funded.

\*14 “The managers direct the Forest Service to provide total operational funding of \$750,000 to the Rapid City, SD lab; the funds and the funding increase above the fiscal year 2000 level should come out of the national allocation and should be used to hire a range scientist to work on invasive plants and other range ecology and management issues.”

\*15 The conference agreement provides \$250,955,000 for State and private forestry instead of \$197,337,000 as proposed by the Senate...These funds should assist efforts to combat a variety of pests, including southern pine beetle, gypsy moth, bark beetle, Douglas-fir tussock moth, and several fungal pests.

\*16 The agreement provides non-emergency funding of \$41,383,000 for Federal lands forest health management and \$22,561,000 for cooperative lands forest health management. The managers have agreed to the House proposal on Asian long-horn beetle work in urban areas...the managers direct the Forest Service to keep the insect and disease maps up to date and publicly available, such as on the agency website...”

\*17 This program is not mentioned in the Conference report. Both House and Senate report language stand. There appears to be sufficient unearmarked funding in the parent account to accommodate the Administration request.

\*18 “Increases above the House for land resources include \$1,500,000 for noxious weeds,...\$500,000 for Montana State University weed program, \$750,000 for Idaho weed control...”

Program	Fiscal 1999	Fiscal 2000	President's Request	National letter	House Floor	Senate Floor	Conference
---------	-------------	-------------	---------------------	-----------------	-------------	--------------	------------

<b>Subcommittee on Transportation</b>							
Coast Guard Research and Implementation of National Ballast Water Guidelines	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.5	3.5	4.5	4.0
<b>Program</b>	<b>Fiscal 1999</b>	<b>Fiscal 2000</b>	<b>President's Request</b>	<b>National letter</b>	<b>House Floor</b>	<b>Senate Full Committee</b>	<b>Conference</b>
<b>Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies</b>							
EPA Office of Research and Development, Invasive Species Programs	0.045	2.925	0.635	1.0	<0.635 At or below Administration Request*	President's Request	At EPA Discretion
EPA Office of Water, Invasive Species	1.035	1.16	0.91	0.91	<0.91 At or below Administration Request*	President's Request	At EPA Discretion
* Both programs are within the EPA Science and Technology account, which is cut 24,348,000 below the Administration request. Neither program is given a specific mark in the Committee report, leaving final structuring of the budget at this level of detail to the Administration.							