

The Conservation Economy in America: Direct investments and economic contributions

Prepared for:

**The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Washington, D.C.**

February 18, 2013



SOUTHWICK
A S S O C I A T E S

FISH AND WILDLIFE ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

PO Box 6435

Fernandina Beach, FL 32035

Tel (904) 277-9765

The Conservation Economy in America:

Direct investments and economic contributions

Executive Summary

In the broadest sense, natural resources conservation refers to a wide range of activities designed to protect wildlife, restore habitats, reduce use of limited resources or encourage recycling of consumer waste, among others. For the purposes of this study, however, “natural resource conservation” refers specifically to steps intended to support the protection or management of native fish and wildlife species and/or land and water acquisitions to protect their habitats. All forms of public and private conservation investments are accounted for, including mitigation dollars and legal settlements when the funds are directed towards habitat. Not included are activities related to historic preservation, outdoor recreation, pollution control and abatement, municipal parks and recreation programs, mine reclamation, timber marketing, scientific research, environmental education, care and rehabilitation of exotic animals, or natural resource conservation outside the United States.

The economic implications of the activities covered in this study are limited only to the direct spending by governments and the private sector to support conservation. It does not include the indirect outcomes of those investments such as spending associated with outdoor recreation, the value of ecosystem services or the economic value that people might assign to the existence of healthy natural environments. All of these are acknowledged as legitimate economic values associated with a healthy and sustainable natural resource base, but they are more properly recognized as the result of the ongoing direct investments that are made to protect and restore the resource base. In that sense, the annual investments that are the subject of this study represent the historical and future investments that are the basis for significantly greater economic returns that result from human use and enjoyment of the natural environment.

Government entities at all levels, as well as private interests (businesses, individuals, foundations, and non-profits), are the primary sources of investment in natural resources conservation. This current analysis includes an estimate of the dollar value of direct conservation spending in each of the 50 states by federal, state, and local government agencies and by the private sector. Economic contributions that result from conservation spending are measured in terms of dollars directly invested, the jobs and associated income directly related to conservation spending, and the state/local and federal tax revenues that arise from that economic activity. In addition, the direct investments were analyzed with state-level input-output models to determine the multiplier effects of those investments and their total contributions to each state’s economy.

Steps were taken throughout the analysis to avoid double-counting any of the dollars that flow between the different levels of government and between the public and private sectors. As a result, the results of this study can be considered a conservative estimate of the conservation economy. Altogether, an estimated \$38.8 billion is spent annually on conservation in the United States. The federal government is the leading source of conservation investments, accounting for approximately 60 percent of all spending. State and local governments accounted for 29 percent of spending and the private sector provided eleven percent (Table E1).

Table E1. Total investments in natural resources conservation in the U.S.

Source of Investment	Dollars Invested (\$ million)	Percent of Total
Federal Government ¹	\$23,219.0	60%
State Government	\$9,490.6	24%
Local Government ²	\$1,733.0	5%
Private Sector	\$4,374.5	11%
Total	\$38,817.1	100.0%

Including multiplier effects in the national economy, the \$38.8 billion of direct spending generates \$93.2 billion of total economic activity. In other words, if conservation investments in the U.S. were no longer made and these dollars were not invested elsewhere, U.S. economic activity would fall by \$93 billion. Conservation's economic contributions include supporting over 660,000 jobs with \$41.6 billion of income (salaries and wages) while adding \$59.7 billion to the U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The resulting economic activity returns \$12.9 billion in the form of tax revenues to the state, local and federal governments which in effect can be considered a "conservation rebate" related to the public's original conservation investment (Table E2).

Table E2. Economic contributions of investments in natural resources conservation in the U.S.

State	Direct Economic Contribution	Multiplier Effects	Total Economic Contribution
Economic Output (\$ millions)	\$38,817.1	\$54,375.2	\$93,192.3
Employment	277,389	383,142	660,531
Salaries and Wages (\$ millions)	\$23,102.2	\$18,460.7	\$41,562.9
Contribution to GDP (\$ millions)	\$27,288.0	\$32,428.8	\$59,716.8
State & Local Tax Revenues (\$ millions)	\$1,252.9	\$3,007.6	\$4,260.5
Federal Tax Revenues (\$ millions)	\$4,342.9	\$4,262.3	\$8,605.2

¹ Includes federal dollars disseminated in all states, the District of Columbia and U.S. territories.

² Local government spending includes only inter-governmental transfers provided for local conservation programs.

Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Introduction.....	1
Methodology	2
Definitions	2
Sources of Investment.....	4
Geographic Areas of Study	4
Data Sources.....	4
<i>Federal Investments:</i>	5
<i>State Investments:</i>	6
<i>Local Investments:</i>	7
<i>Private Investments:</i>	8
Total Direct Investments in the Conservation Economy.....	9
Economic Contributions of Conservation Investments.....	11
Direct effects of conservation investment.....	11
Total effects of conservation investment	13
Appendix.....	16

Introduction

In the broadest sense, natural resources conservation refers to a wide range of activities designed to protect wildlife, restore habitats, reduce use of limited resources or encourage recycling of consumer waste, among others. For the purposes of this study, however, “natural resource conservation” refers specifically to steps intended to support the protection, restoration or management of native fish and wildlife species and/or acquisitions to protect and enhance habitat. It does not include activities related to historic preservation, outdoor recreation, pollution control and abatement, municipal parks and recreation programs, mine reclamation, timber marketing, environmental education, exotic animals, or natural resource conservation outside the United States.

Both the restoration and maintenance of the quality of the natural environment depends on monetary investments by government agencies as well as individuals and organizations in the private sector. The economic benefits that emanate from those conservation investments can be valued in several ways.

1. the economic activity associated with direct spending of public and private dollars for conservation-related improvements on the ground
2. the recreational activity at places where conservation investments enhance the attractiveness of sites as recreation locations
3. the lower taxpayer dollars expended for air and water quality, water quantity, waste management, and energy generation among other benefits associated with healthy natural systems (so-called ecosystem services)
4. the economic value that people might assign to the social and cultural benefits of maintaining healthy ecosystems.

All of these are acknowledged as legitimate economic values associated with a healthy and sustainable natural resource base. However, this study is focused only on the first point: measuring the economic contributions associated with direct spending for conservation. The remaining points list economic benefits that are more properly recognized as the result of the direct investments made to protect and restore the resource base. In that sense, the annual investments that are the subject of this study represent a conservative estimate and only represent a small portion of the significantly greater economic returns that result from human use and enjoyment of the natural environment.

This current study includes an estimate of the dollar value of direct conservation spending in each of the 50 states by federal, state, and local government agencies and by the private sector. Economic contributions that result from conservation spending are measured in terms of dollars directly invested, the jobs and associated income directly related to conservation spending, and the state/local and federal tax revenues that arise from that economic activity. In addition, the direct investments were analyzed with state-level input-output models to determine the multiplier effects of those investments and their total contributions to each state’s economy.

Methodology

The study relies on existing sources of data to document and measure the conservation investments by public- and private-sector agencies and organizations. At the national level, all dollar figures of direct investment were derived from published government reports. As outlined below, state-level estimates of spending by the federal government and private sector are the result of allocating the national-level estimates to the states on the basis of federal government spending for selected conservation-related programs.

Careful attention was given to include only those program expenditures that fit within the definition of conservation as used in this study. In cases of uncertainty, decisions were always made in favor of excluding expenditures that were not clearly identified as conservation-related. Also, steps were taken throughout the study to avoid double-counting any of the dollars that flow between the different levels of government and between the public and private sectors. As a result, the results of this study can be considered a conservative estimate of the conservation economy.

Definitions—(for the purposes of this study)

- Conservation: “Conservation” refers to the acquisition, enhancement, protection, or management of native fish and wildlife habitat and species. It specifically excludes activities related to historic preservation, outdoor recreation, pollution control and abatement, municipal parks and recreation programs, mine reclamation, timber marketing, environmental education, exotic animals, or natural resource conservation outside the United States.
- Direct Economic Contributions: Expenditures by government entities at all levels (federal, state and local) and private interests (businesses, individuals, foundations, and non-profit organizations) that generate economic activity. The level of economic activity varies depending on the specific uses of the money that is invested and the amount spent.
- Economic Multiplier Effects: The economic activity beyond the direct expenditures for conservation that are the result of the direct expenditures. It includes the output, jobs, and income in businesses and employees that are part of the extended supply chain for those businesses that receive the initial, direct conservation expenditures.
- Indirect Returns: Preventive efforts such as natural buffers to reduce erosion, maintaining species at risk before becoming endangered, and similar efforts can help reduce or prevent greater taxpayer expenditures required in the future to mitigate damage or to restore habitat and species. This report does not attempt to estimate the value of indirect returns, but does acknowledge they exist.

- Federal Investments: Expenditures on conservation by the federal government for use by federal, state, and local government entities and non-profit organizations.
- State Investments: Direct own source expenditures for conservation by state governments and state entities.
- Local Investments: Direct expenditures of state government dollars by local governments for conservation purposes³. This definition specifically excludes own-source funds expended by local governments. As a result, this underestimates local government conservation spending by an unknown amount.
- Private Investments: Direct expenditures on conservation by non-profit organizations from funds contributed by individuals, businesses, and corporations.

³ Consistent and comprehensive data for local government spending was not identified for this study. This category consists of inter-governmental transfers of state government dollars to local governments for conservation purposes.

Sources of Investment

Four broad sources of investment are considered in this report – federal, state and local governments and the private sector. All investments in this report comply with the definition of “conservation” presented in the Methodology Section, above – namely, the protection, management, restoration and acquisition of native fish and wildlife habitat and species. To avoid double counting of expenditures, state government expenditures exclude federal funds distributed to the states, as well as state funds distributed to local municipalities.

Geographic Areas of Study

Estimates of conservation investment, and their economic contributions, are made for the United States, as a whole, and for each of the 50 states⁴. Separate economic models were used for the national economy and each of the state economies to estimate multiplier effects of conservation spending. Each state estimate reflects the economic contributions to the respective state’s economy. Any multiplier effects that spread beyond the states’ borders are captured in the national estimates.

Data Sources

All estimates of government spending derive from existing data sources, including the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), U.S. Census Bureau, and state government agencies. Estimates of private sector spending for conservation are derived from filings to the Internal Revenue Service and obtained through a third-party vendor, GuideStar (<http://www.guidestar.org/>). Only expenditures directly related to natural resource conservation as defined elsewhere in this report are included in the estimates.

Consistent and comprehensive estimates of local government expenditures for conservation are not available for all jurisdictions. Instead, the estimates in this report include only inter-governmental transfers of dollars from state governments to local governments for the specific purpose of conservation. To avoid double-counting, the local government dollars are excluded from estimates of state government spending for conservation. As a result, spending by local governments in this report is underestimated by an unknown amount.

⁴ The geographic focus of this study does not include Washington, D.C. or the U.S. territories. It also does not include direct expenditures by Native American tribes, except for what is provided by the federal government for tribal conservation. However, the estimated federal investment in conservation (\$23.2 billion) does include funds distributed to Washington, D.C. and the U.S. territories. Those distributions equal 1.22% of the federal total investment in conservation that subsequently was spread across the fifty states. As a result, the analysis overestimates, very slightly, the estimated distribution of federal funds to each state and its respective economic impacts.

Federal Investments:

The data used to estimate federal conservation investments were taken from the Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2012 as found on the Government Printing Office website (found by going to: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/browse/collectionGPO.action?collectionCode=BUDGET>; and then choosing “Fiscal Year”, then “Public Budget Database”, then “Outlays”).

The budget is broken down by function and sub-function. The federal investment in conservation was estimated by sorting the data to focus only on sub-functions related to natural resource activities (i.e., Function group 3xx) and then summing the budget allocation for the relevant line items within those sub-functions. Only outlays were included in the summation. For instance, sub-function 304 (Pollution Control and Abatement) was not included in the summation as it did not meet the definition of conservation used in this report.

Table 1. Federal investments in natural resources conservation, by OMB sub-function.

Sub-function Number	Title	Mandatory Investments (\$ millions)	Discretionary Investments (\$millions)	Total
301	Water Resources	\$ 138	\$ 2,311	\$ 2,449
302	Conservation and Land Mgt	\$ 6,127	\$ 10,854	\$ 16,981
303 ⁵	Recreational Resources	\$ 952	\$ 2,333	\$ 3,285
306	Other Natural Resources	\$ 163	\$ 341	\$ 504
Total		\$ 7,380	\$ 15,839	\$ 23,219

Federal spending in the sub-function categories in Table 1 is available only as a national estimate. Federal budget documents do not indicate in which state these expenditures took place. Allocating these federal expenditures to individual states was accomplished by using a number of publicly-available data sets, including the U.S. Census Bureau’s Federal Aid to States for Fiscal Year 2010. These reports provide information about the distribution to the states of federal dollars in key programs. Expenditures in selected conservation programs were compiled and their percentage distribution across the states were calculated (Appendix B). This percentage distribution was then applied to the total federal expenditures in Table 1 to estimate total federal expenditures for conservation in each state.

⁵ These are recreation resources that directly apply to natural resource conservation and exclude things such as recreation facilities, parking lots and other non-recreation items and services.

State Investments:

The data used to estimate conservation investments by state governments were taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's Survey of State Government Finances 2010. (<http://www.census.gov/govs/state/>). Similar to the federal budget data, the state government expenditures were systematically categorized by function⁶. This study includes only the four functions that are consistent with the definition of "conservation" as used in this report. These include:

- Fish and Game
- Forestry
- Parks and Recreation
- Natural Resources – Other.

Detailed descriptions of each function have varying degrees of alignment with the definition of "conservation" as used in this report. Adjustments were made to the U.S. Census data to ensure only relevant expenditures were included in the analysis. These modifications included:

- Forestry function: excludes expenditures used for "the regulation and inspection of timber producers and the industry" and "the promotion of use and marketing of forest products"
- Parks and Recreation function: includes only the conservation-related expenditures for state parks.
 - The following items were not included in the estimation of Parks and Recreation expenditures: golf courses, playgrounds, tennis courts, public beaches, swimming pools, play fields, recreational piers and marinas, including support of private facilities. Also not included were expenditures for galleries, museums, zoos, botanical gardens, memorials, auditoriums, stadiums, recreational centers, convention centers and exhibition halls, as well as expenditures in support of cultural activities such as community music, drama, and celebrations.
- Natural Resources-Other function: includes only expenditures related to "soil conservation and reclamation including prevention of soil erosion"⁷ and "purchase of land for open space and conservation programs." The category does not include expenditures for "wetlands protection and management" due to lack of relevant data.
 - The following activities were explicitly excluded: surveying, development and regulation of water resources; regulation of mineral resources and related

⁶ Within each function, expenditures are further divided into usage types (i.e., current operations, construction, other capital outlay, and intergovernmental-to-local, NEC – not elsewhere categorized). Usage information was used to inform the design of the state-level economic models. Dollars denoted as "intergovernmental to local" were excluded from the state government estimates.

⁷ These are direct expenditures for conservation activities as opposed to the value of incurred ecosystem services derived from such conservation activities.

industries including land reclamation; geological surveying and mapping; regulation of gas and oil drilling and production; dam and reservoir safety; and public education programs related to the above.

The sum of state government spending for conservation across all 50 states, with the adjustments listed above, is shown in

Table 2.

Table 2. State government investments in natural resources conservation, by functional area.

Function	Investments (\$ millions)
Fish and Game	\$ 3,589
Forestry	\$ 1,833
Parks and Recreation	\$ 2,332
Natural Resources, Other	\$ 1,736
Total	\$ 9,490

Local Investments:

No consistent, comprehensive sources for data on local government spending for conservation are available. Instead, estimates of local government spending include only those dollars that flow to local governments from the state level for the express purpose of natural resources conservation. As a result, this estimate of local investment is likely a small portion of the actual local investment as it only includes contributions by state governments.

This information comes from the U.S. Census Bureau's Survey of State Government Finances 2010 (<http://www.census.gov/govs/state/>) – the same data source as used for estimating state investment. The census data specify the amount of state funds transferred to local governments in each of the four conservation functions and their usage types. The total of these expenditures for local governments in all 50 states (less any modifications made when estimating state conservation expenditures) are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Local government investments in natural resources conservation, by functional area.

Function	Investments (\$ millions)
Fish and Game	\$ 110
Forestry	\$ 447
Parks and Recreation	\$ 741
Natural Resources, Other	\$ 435
Total	\$ 1,733

Private Investments:

Private individuals, businesses and organizations make investments in conservation for a variety of reasons. Although some of these individuals, businesses and organizations may make direct investments on their own, conservation spending in the private sector is generally funneled through charitable organizations. For that reason, this study assumes that private investments in conservation consist only of investments by 501(c)3 public charities that, in turn, receive their funds from private individuals, businesses and private foundations (also 501(c)3 organizations). As a result, this estimate of the private sector investment necessarily ignores any contributions by individuals to organizations that are not registered charities. The extent of this under-estimation is not known. The final conservation investment, though, is assumed made by the 501(c)3 public charities (from here on referred to as “non-profits”). Federal or state grants to non-profits were excluded from estimates of private investment in conservation as these were already included as part of the public investments.

All non-profits are required by law to submit an annual return (Form 990) to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS). That information is made available by the IRS to the public, including businesses and other organizations that aggregate and process the information for sale to others. GuideStar is one such organization (<http://www.guidestar.org/>). The estimates of private sector investments in conservation are based on a database that was purchased from GuideStar expressly for this study.

All entities, when they apply for non-profit status, are asked to self-identify, using the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) system to designate the field of operation of their non-profit (<http://nccs.urban.org/classification/NTEE.cfm>). Table 4 contains a list of the NTEE codes used in this study.

Table 4. Conservation-related NTEE codes and titles.

C30	Natural Resources Conservation and Protection
C32	Water Resources, Wetlands Conservation and Mgmt
C34	Land Resources Conservation
C36	Forest Conservation
D30	Wildlife Preservation and Protection
D31	Protection of Endangered Species
D32	Bird Sanctuaries
D33	Fisheries Resources
D34	Wildlife Sanctuaries
N61	Amateur Sports: Hunting and Fishing

The estimate of private investments in conservation for the United States is based on data purchased from GuideStar plus publicly-available data from the National Center for Charitable Statistics (<http://www.nccs.urban.org/statistics/index.cfm>). Similar to the

federal government investments derived from the Budget of the United States, the estimate of private sector investment is available only at the national level. Assuming that private dollars follow a similar distribution to the states as federal dollars, the total private investments were allocated to the individual states using the same method as used to allocate federal investments to the individual states.

Attempts were made to only include conservation non-profits who invest their revenues in the U.S. Non-profits whose primary mission was to invest in conservation in other countries were excluded. Many U.S.-oriented non-profits invest a minority portion of their funds to worthwhile efforts in other countries. It was not possible to identify the percentage of funds sent overseas. To the extent the inclusion of these funds overestimates U.S. conservation investments, these are to some uncertain extent offset by private conservation dollars not channeled through established conservation non-profits, and therefore not counted in this report, as described earlier.

Estimated total private investment in conservation in the U.S. is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Private sector investment in natural resources conservation, by NTEE code.

NTEE Category	Investments (\$ millions)
C30 Natural Resources Conservation and Protection	\$ 3,943
D30 Wildlife Preservation and Protection	\$ 410
N61 Amateur Sports: Hunting and Fishing	\$ 22
Total	\$ 4,375

Total Direct Investments in the Conservation Economy

When all sources of conservation investment are combined, approximately \$38.8 billion is spent each year directly to acquire, enhance, restore, protect or manage fish and wildlife species and habitat. Table 6 shows the estimated direct expenditures for conservation in each state, by source of the investments. The largest source is the federal government, accounting for \$23.2 billion or 60% of the total⁸. State governments provide one quarter of the total (\$9.5 billion) followed by the private sector (\$4.4 billion – 11%) and local governments (\$1.7 billion – 4%). Based in part on the distribution-to-states breakdown in Appendix Table B1, the amounts invested in individual states range from \$4.3 billion in California to \$108 million in Rhode Island.

⁸ This estimate includes \$48.9 million of federal funds that were disbursed to Washington, D.C. and the U.S. territories but allocated in the analysis across the fifty states.

Table 6. Total direct investment in natural resources conservation, by source of investment.

State	Federal Government	State Government	Local Government*	Private Sector	Total Spending
<i>(\$ millions)</i>					
Alabama	\$373.1	\$89.8	\$9.2	\$70.3	\$542.4
Alaska	\$619.5	\$314.3	\$3.3	\$116.7	\$1,053.8
Arizona	\$610.9	\$167.9	\$16.0	\$115.1	\$909.9
Arkansas	\$472.1	\$91.7	\$5.7	\$88.9	\$658.4
California	\$2,101.1	\$1,380.8	\$431.9	\$395.8	\$4,309.5
Colorado	\$570.6	\$224.0	\$69.4	\$107.5	\$971.5
Connecticut	\$84.1	\$61.9	\$15.8	\$15.8	\$177.6
Delaware	\$78.3	\$57.7	\$1.9	\$14.8	\$152.7
Florida	\$1,377.9	\$574.5	\$21.2	\$259.6	\$2,233.2
Georgia	\$343.9	\$191.9	\$8.4	\$64.8	\$608.9
Hawaii	\$150.5	\$33.1	\$0.2	\$28.4	\$212.1
Idaho	\$604.3	\$153.0	\$12.7	\$113.8	\$883.9
Illinois	\$261.2	\$233.3	\$185.0	\$49.2	\$728.8
Indiana	\$233.8	\$85.7	\$14.3	\$44.1	\$377.9
Iowa	\$369.7	\$76.5	\$18.7	\$69.7	\$534.6
Kansas	\$269.9	\$44.9	\$3.0	\$50.9	\$368.7
Kentucky	\$312.4	\$111.9	\$3.3	\$58.9	\$486.5
Louisiana	\$683.3	\$194.3	\$31.2	\$128.7	\$1,037.6
Maine	\$170.0	\$73.2	\$1.0	\$32.0	\$276.4
Maryland	\$206.8	\$276.0	\$23.8	\$39.0	\$545.5
Massachusetts	\$151.8	\$188.0	\$48.6	\$28.6	\$417.0
Michigan	\$412.2	\$149.6	\$13.7	\$77.7	\$653.2
Minnesota	\$724.6	\$294.9	\$44.7	\$136.5	\$1,200.7
Mississippi	\$526.5	\$109.2	\$4.0	\$99.2	\$738.9
Missouri	\$576.5	\$100.5	\$2.1	\$108.6	\$787.7
Montana	\$635.5	\$166.2	\$12.2	\$119.7	\$933.7
Nebraska	\$376.5	\$59.4	\$13.3	\$70.9	\$520.1
Nevada	\$320.9	\$70.0	\$1.7	\$60.5	\$453.1
New	\$159.1	\$44.0	\$3.0	\$30.0	\$236.0
New Jersey	\$110.4	\$233.8	\$47.2	\$20.8	\$412.1
New Mexico	\$658.4	\$125.6	\$3.8	\$124.0	\$911.9
New York	\$286.7	\$398.3	\$48.3	\$54.0	\$787.3
North Carolina	\$389.0	\$242.0	\$75.2	\$73.3	\$779.5
North Dakota	\$384.2	\$46.4	\$4.8	\$72.4	\$507.9
Ohio	\$340.4	\$152.0	\$34.8	\$64.1	\$591.3
Oklahoma	\$395.4	\$51.1	\$4.8	\$74.5	\$525.7
Oregon	\$1,120.3	\$277.1	\$17.0	\$211.1	\$1,625.5
Pennsylvania	\$857.9	\$379.2	\$61.3	\$161.6	\$1,460.0
Rhode Island	\$69.7	\$25.5	\$0.0	\$13.1	\$108.4
South Carolina	\$262.0	\$123.5	\$19.5	\$49.4	\$454.3
South Dakota	\$329.9	\$76.2	\$5.6	\$62.2	\$473.9
Tennessee	\$406.4	\$144.6	\$4.9	\$76.6	\$632.4
Texas	\$1,231.6	\$326.6	\$69.6	\$232.0	\$1,859.8
Utah	\$470.4	\$141.8	\$3.1	\$88.6	\$703.9
Vermont	\$117.3	\$28.9	\$0.2	\$22.1	\$168.5
Virginia	\$415.2	\$173.2	\$24.0	\$78.2	\$690.7
Washington	\$716.5	\$368.5	\$103.2	\$135.0	\$1,323.1
West Virginia	\$126.4	\$107.3	\$21.1	\$23.8	\$278.7
Wisconsin	\$391.8	\$256.0	\$36.9	\$73.8	\$758.6
Wyoming	\$362.1	\$195.0	\$127.9	\$68.2	\$753.1
Total US	\$23,219.0	\$9,490.6	\$1,733.0	\$4,374.5	\$38,817.1

**Includes only funds transferred from state government for selected conservation purposes and not included in state government investments. Locally generated revenues spent on conservation are not included.*

Economic Contributions of Conservation Investments

In addition to the environmental benefits, direct expenditures by government agencies at all levels and the private sector (businesses, individuals, foundations, and non-profit organizations) generate business activity and economic benefits. The economic activity can be measured in terms of employment, income and tax revenues. These have been estimated through the use of separate economic models for each of the 50 states.

The extent of the economic contributions associated with conservation spending can be estimated in two ways:

- **Direct effects:** These include the jobs, income and tax revenues that are tied directly to the spending for conservation. No ancillary or multiplier effects are included.
- **Total effects:** These include the jobs, income and tax revenues that are tied directly to the spending for conservation plus the jobs, income and tax revenues that result from the multiplier effects of conservation spending. The multiplier effect occurs when a direct purchase from a business leads to increased demand for goods and services from other businesses along their supply chain. Also included is economic activity associated with household spending of incomes earned in the affected businesses.

The economic contributions of conservation investments, both the direct effects and the total effects, were estimated with IMPLAN input-output models of the national and state economies. The IMPLAN model was developed by MIG, Inc. originally for use by the U.S. Forest Service. Inherent in each IMPLAN model is the relationship between the economic output of each industry (i.e. sales) and the jobs, income and taxes associated with a given level of output. Through those models, it is possible to determine the jobs, income and taxes supported directly by conservation investments with and without the multiplier effects.

Direct effects of conservation investment

The direct economic contributions (without multiplier effects) are shown in Table 7 for each state and the nation. The total spending of \$38.8 billion for conservation directly supports 277,389 jobs⁹ in the public and private sectors. Those jobs provide \$23.1 billion of income. The economic activity associated with the spending generates \$1.3 billion in state and local tax revenues and \$4.3 billion in federal tax revenues.

⁹ “Jobs” in the context of IMPLAN include full-time, part-time, and temporary jobs.

Table 7. Direct economic contributions of all spending for natural resources conservation, by state.

State	Total Direct Investment (\$ millions)*	Employment	Salaries and Wages	Contribution to GDP	State & Local Tax Revenues	Federal Tax Revenues
				(\$ millions)		
Alabama	\$542.4	3,214	\$251.0	\$288.5	\$12.9	\$44.6
Alaska	\$1,053.8	6,083	\$541.8	\$644.7	\$25.3	\$98.5
Arizona	\$909.9	6,414	\$513.9	\$606.1	\$25.1	\$98.5
Arkansas	\$658.4	4,901	\$358.1	\$409.4	\$15.8	\$65.6
California	\$4,309.5	28,950	\$2,533.2	\$2,995.8	\$164.3	\$479.0
Colorado	\$971.5	5,908	\$502.3	\$586.4	\$25.7	\$94.7
Connecticut	\$177.6	1,250	\$105.6	\$123.5	\$5.7	\$21.9
Delaware	\$152.7	1,056	\$78.9	\$92.6	\$4.3	\$14.4
Florida	\$2,233.2	16,167	\$1,247.3	\$1,482.1	\$33.8	\$245.7
Georgia	\$608.9	4,262	\$334.1	\$396.5	\$15.9	\$60.6
Hawaii	\$212.1	1,063	\$97.2	\$114.5	\$4.6	\$16.6
Idaho	\$883.9	6,131	\$448.0	\$519.7	\$21.7	\$84.7
Illinois	\$728.8	5,183	\$438.1	\$514.9	\$20.8	\$83.7
Indiana	\$377.9	2,766	\$202.6	\$236.0	\$10.8	\$38.2
Iowa	\$534.6	3,980	\$262.3	\$307.3	\$13.4	\$48.6
Kansas	\$368.7	2,358	\$193.1	\$222.8	\$9.6	\$36.0
Kentucky	\$486.5	3,609	\$258.3	\$302.3	\$12.7	\$45.7
Louisiana	\$1,037.6	7,005	\$519.2	\$611.0	\$20.1	\$87.1
Maine	\$276.4	2,100	\$144.4	\$167.6	\$8.0	\$26.6
Maryland	\$545.5	3,377	\$313.3	\$366.2	\$20.4	\$61.0
Massachusetts	\$417.0	2,825	\$242.5	\$286.7	\$14.5	\$47.6
Michigan	\$653.2	4,499	\$367.7	\$428.3	\$19.6	\$70.7
Minnesota	\$1,200.7	8,575	\$637.0	\$750.8	\$40.3	\$125.6
Mississippi	\$738.9	5,062	\$347.2	\$402.3	\$15.6	\$61.3
Missouri	\$787.7	5,730	\$448.9	\$517.3	\$20.2	\$81.5
Montana	\$933.7	6,535	\$444.1	\$520.7	\$26.0	\$89.0
Nebraska	\$520.1	3,826	\$280.5	\$321.6	\$11.8	\$51.4
Nevada	\$453.1	3,207	\$256.1	\$300.1	\$8.1	\$49.4
New Hampshire	\$236.0	1,559	\$129.8	\$150.8	\$4.6	\$25.6
New Jersey	\$412.1	2,680	\$236.3	\$280.9	\$12.9	\$49.4
New Mexico	\$911.9	5,986	\$474.8	\$550.2	\$19.6	\$87.4
New York	\$787.3	5,244	\$429.1	\$510.7	\$32.0	\$84.2
North Carolina	\$779.5	5,782	\$372.4	\$441.7	\$21.7	\$68.1
North Dakota	\$507.9	3,266	\$219.2	\$257.4	\$17.7	\$42.7
Ohio	\$591.3	3,818	\$281.4	\$329.1	\$15.8	\$50.9
Oklahoma	\$525.7	3,263	\$245.1	\$287.9	\$10.9	\$44.8
Oregon	\$1,625.5	12,222	\$917.9	\$1,068.3	\$59.8	\$179.3
Pennsylvania	\$1,460.0	10,205	\$837.0	\$972.7	\$43.8	\$163.3
Rhode Island	\$108.4	639	\$57.7	\$66.3	\$3.0	\$11.5
South Carolina	\$454.3	3,396	\$238.0	\$280.0	\$8.9	\$44.2
South Dakota	\$473.9	2,906	\$208.2	\$240.5	\$6.2	\$39.7
Tennessee	\$632.4	4,530	\$360.3	\$416.9	\$10.1	\$66.1
Texas	\$1,859.8	6,936	\$743.4	\$817.6	\$7.4	\$131.2
Utah	\$703.9	5,297	\$385.5	\$453.9	\$20.2	\$70.9
Vermont	\$168.5	1,207	\$91.9	\$105.1	\$4.3	\$17.6
Virginia	\$690.7	4,170	\$413.5	\$476.2	\$20.2	\$78.8
Washington	\$1,323.1	8,131	\$657.9	\$780.3	\$21.0	\$133.8
West Virginia	\$278.7	1,866	\$143.4	\$166.2	\$7.1	\$26.4
Wisconsin	\$758.6	5,887	\$383.9	\$453.2	\$22.5	\$74.8
Wyoming	\$753.1	5,221	\$365.2	\$424.4	\$9.5	\$76.3
United States	\$38,817.1	277,389	\$23,102.2	\$27,288.0	\$1,252.9	\$4,342.9

*Total conservation-related expenditures by federal, state and local governments and private individuals and organizations.

Total effects of conservation investment

The IMPLAN economic models used in this study describe how sales in one industry impact other industries. For example, once a consumer (whether it is an individual, business or government agency) makes a purchase, the business involved in that transaction buys more merchandise from wholesalers, who buy more from manufacturers, who, in turn, purchase new inputs and supplies. That business must also pay its cost of operations including payroll, utilities, rent/mortgage, business services, etc. The salaries and wages also stimulate economic activity as the money enters the economy through household spending. Simply, the first purchases made with the investment dollars create numerous additional rounds of purchasing. Input-output models track how the various rounds of purchasing benefit other industries and generate economic benefits.

To apply the IMPLAN model, conservation expenditures are assigned to the appropriate industry sectors where the expenditures occur. Table A1 in the appendix shows an aggregated version of the sectoring methodology used in this study.

The level of economic activity and the extent of the multiplier effect vary depending on the dollar amount of the direct investment, the specific uses of the money that is invested and size of the economy where the investment occurs. These factors explain the small relative variations in direct and multiplier effects between states, and the large difference in the multiplier effect between the state and national levels. The national multipliers are larger because impacts and multiplier effects that leak beyond the borders of any individual state are mostly captured within the national economy.

Table 8 shows the total economic contributions of conservation investments including the multiplier effects. At the national level, the \$38.8 billion of conservation spending leads to \$93.2 billion of economic output throughout the economy (this translates into an output multiplier of 2.4). That economic activity supports over 660,500 jobs and \$41.6 billion of income, and contributes \$59.7 billion to national GDP. The total economic activity also has tax implications, leading to \$4.3 billion of state and local tax revenues and \$8.6 billion of federal tax revenues.

Not surprisingly, the economic contributions at the state level vary considerably. At the upper end, conservation investments are associated with over 57,000 jobs in California, 31,700 jobs in Florida and 22,200 jobs in Oregon. Even in the smallest states, direct investments in conservation support more than 1,000 jobs and approximately \$100 million of income.

Table 8. Total economic contributions of all spending for natural resources conservation, by state, including multiplier effects.

State	Total Direct Investment (\$ millions)*	Total Output (\$ millions)*	Employment	Salaries and Wages	Contribution to GDP	State & Local Tax Revenues	Federal Tax Revenues
(\$ millions)							
Alabama	\$542.4	\$636.2	5,675	\$340.7	\$447.4	\$27.9	\$64.7
Alaska	\$1,053.8	\$1,284.5	9,685	\$701.7	\$941.6	\$63.0	\$133.4
Arizona	\$909.9	\$1,424.9	12,014	\$749.1	\$1,030.6	\$66.2	\$94.3
Arkansas	\$658.4	\$813.6	7,925	\$462.5	\$596.8	\$34.9	\$89.7
California	\$4,309.5	\$8,244.3	57,256	\$3,987.3	\$5,585.8	\$430.3	\$820.2
Colorado	\$971.5	\$1,311.0	10,334	\$692.1	\$946.0	\$60.0	\$142.2
Connecticut	\$177.6	\$284.7	2,141	\$154.0	\$209.0	\$14.0	\$34.2
Delaware	\$152.7	\$184.6	1,643	\$103.7	\$137.6	\$9.0	\$20.1
Florida	\$2,233.2	\$3,767.9	31,733	\$1,888.6	\$2,635.0	\$127.2	\$403.1
Georgia	\$608.9	\$957.4	7,985	\$491.2	\$680.0	\$40.1	\$98.4
Hawaii	\$212.1	\$218.6	1,707	\$122.4	\$163.8	\$9.8	\$22.3
Idaho	\$883.9	\$1,016.0	9,966	\$571.3	\$744.7	\$44.8	\$113.8
Illinois	\$728.8	\$1,312.3	9,960	\$670.4	\$924.3	\$59.3	\$138.4
Indiana	\$377.9	\$527.7	4,838	\$279.7	\$372.6	\$24.6	\$56.2
Iowa	\$534.6	\$689.0	6,578	\$356.7	\$472.0	\$29.7	\$70.2
Kansas	\$368.7	\$445.0	3,973	\$251.4	\$328.4	\$20.5	\$49.7
Kentucky	\$486.5	\$622.9	5,903	\$342.8	\$451.0	\$27.1	\$65.0
Louisiana	\$1,037.6	\$1,386.9	12,027	\$716.2	\$954.3	\$53.0	\$127.9
Maine	\$276.4	\$361.8	3,539	\$197.4	\$259.3	\$17.5	\$38.4
Maryland	\$545.5	\$812.9	6,153	\$439.4	\$593.9	\$44.1	\$92.0
Massachusetts	\$417.0	\$691.5	5,046	\$364.5	\$498.8	\$35.0	\$77.3
Michigan	\$653.2	\$1,049.4	8,810	\$541.9	\$742.9	\$50.5	\$112.0
Minnesota	\$1,200.7	\$1,862.5	15,650	\$943.6	\$1,297.9	\$93.9	\$201.2
Mississippi	\$738.9	\$827.4	8,082	\$448.7	\$584.0	\$34.6	\$83.5
Missouri	\$787.7	\$1,200.9	10,462	\$637.4	\$848.3	\$50.9	\$125.3
Montana	\$933.7	\$1,021.5	10,356	\$568.1	\$755.3	\$50.7	\$120.3
Nebraska	\$520.1	\$686.3	6,501	\$378.1	\$489.9	\$27.6	\$73.4
Nevada	\$453.1	\$624.8	5,359	\$344.9	\$464.6	\$23.1	\$70.8
New	\$236.0	\$346.9	2,835	\$184.4	\$246.3	\$14.0	\$38.9
New Jersey	\$412.1	\$689.0	4,862	\$353.2	\$489.1	\$33.5	\$78.9
New Mexico	\$911.9	\$1,132.1	10,123	\$621.9	\$815.5	\$47.4	\$120.6
New York	\$787.3	\$1,274.3	8,931	\$649.0	\$891.8	\$74.7	\$136.3
North Carolina	\$779.5	\$1,153.3	10,257	\$550.9	\$753.0	\$51.9	\$109.2
North Dakota	\$507.9	\$577.0	5,236	\$291.6	\$380.6	\$34.5	\$58.9
Ohio	\$591.3	\$851.6	7,250	\$417.3	\$564.5	\$39.4	\$81.3
Oklahoma	\$525.7	\$600.3	5,442	\$324.6	\$432.2	\$24.5	\$63.4
Oregon	\$1,625.5	\$2,474.8	22,245	\$1,311.6	\$1,765.8	\$130.3	\$275.8
Pennsylvania	\$1,460.0	\$2,415.2	19,100	\$1,243.5	\$1,678.5	\$112.6	\$260.5
Rhode Island	\$108.4	\$143.1	1,146	\$79.8	\$105.1	\$6.9	\$16.7
South Carolina	\$454.3	\$619.4	5,975	\$325.7	\$439.0	\$22.2	\$66.0
South Dakota	\$473.9	\$442.6	4,356	\$257.8	\$331.3	\$15.0	\$51.6
Tennessee	\$632.4	\$974.2	8,332	\$522.7	\$699.1	\$33.5	\$102.2
Texas	\$1,859.8	\$1,630.1	12,958	\$1,004.6	\$1,299.8	\$49.1	\$192.1
Utah	\$703.9	\$1,042.7	9,758	\$541.8	\$735.7	\$48.2	\$107.1
Vermont	\$168.5	\$215.5	2,043	\$122.4	\$158.7	\$9.7	\$24.7
Virginia	\$690.7	\$1,033.5	7,683	\$568.3	\$761.4	\$47.7	\$116.9
Washington	\$1,323.1	\$1,913.0	14,584	\$951.3	\$1,311.0	\$65.3	\$205.4
West Virginia	\$278.7	\$318.0	2,963	\$181.9	\$235.1	\$14.5	\$35.3
Wisconsin	\$758.6	\$1,143.4	10,552	\$562.6	\$760.2	\$53.2	\$116.8
Wyoming	\$753.1	\$738.6	7,271	\$434.7	\$560.1	\$22.8	\$94.1
United States	\$38,817.1	\$93,192.3	660,531	\$41,562.9	\$59,716.8	\$4,260.5	\$8,605.2

*Total conservation-related expenditures by federal, state and local governments and private individuals and organizations.

Due to the broad reach of the multiplier effects, the economic contributions of conservation spending sweep across most parts of the economy. Table 9 shows how economic activity and the related jobs and income are found in nearly all industry sectors. Most of the investment dollars are expended by government agencies to support conservation programs, therefore it is not surprising that the single largest sector to be impacted by conservation spending is government. Approximately 138,000 jobs and \$41.6 million of income in the government sector are supported by conservation spending. Other sectors with significant employment impacts include retail trade, professional, scientific and technical services, administrative services, and health and social services.

Table 9. Total economic contributions of all spending for natural resources conservation, by industry.

Sector	Output	Employment	Income	Contribution To GDP
	(\$ millions)			
Ag, Forestry, Fish & Hunting	\$1,050.4	9,376	\$339.4	\$459.2
Mining	\$885.4	3,081	\$310.8	\$587.3
Utilities	\$1,391.3	2,201	\$284.9	\$1,023.3
Construction	\$5,599.7	41,333	\$2,131.5	\$2,619.1
Manufacturing	\$12,589.3	26,884	\$1,992.8	\$3,699.2
Wholesale Trade	\$2,667.6	15,744	\$1,212.6	\$2,153.4
Retail trade	\$4,437.8	67,957	\$2,050.7	\$2,973.8
Transportation & Warehousing	\$1,982.0	14,842	\$823.3	\$1,125.3
Information	\$4,321.3	11,656	\$961.7	\$2,497.2
Finance & insurance	\$7,319.1	33,388	\$2,263.3	\$3,927.3
Real estate & rental	\$7,949.9	26,924	\$566.0	\$6,724.3
Professional- scientific & tech svcs	\$8,579.7	62,643	\$5,300.4	\$5,768.3
Management of companies	\$849.6	4,187	\$478.3	\$548.7
Administrative & waste services	\$3,347.5	53,259	\$1,597.2	\$1,991.8
Educational services	\$1,135.2	14,240	\$646.8	\$624.2
Health & social services	\$5,015.3	52,909	\$2,849.1	\$3,076.1
Arts- entertainment & recreation	\$667.8	10,752	\$258.4	\$389.0
Accommodation & food services	\$2,652.4	42,426	\$907.4	\$1,456.9
Other services	\$2,022.0	28,498	\$992.1	\$1,062.9
Government & non NAICs	\$18,729.0	138,231	\$15,596.4	\$17,009.6
Total	\$93,192.3	660,531	\$41,562.9	\$59,716.8

Appendix A

Table A1 provides an aggregated view of the sectors where direct spending on conservation occurs. These estimates were established through secondary sources of data that provide a general breakdown of conservation-related government spending, and detailed expenditure patterns within the IMPLAN models for state and federal government operations, capital acquisition and construction.

The largest sectors for direct spending include governments (local, state and federal), construction and professional, scientific and technical services.

Table A1. Aggregated sector inputs to the national economic model for estimating economic contributions of conservation investments.

Sector	Direct Expenditure
Ag, Forestry, Fish & Hunting	\$183,290,976
Mining (gas and oil, minerals, etc.)	\$14,215,212
Utilities	\$325,015,965
Construction	\$5,306,755,576
Manufacturing	\$1,722,399,882
Wholesale Trade	\$708,153,997
Retail trade	\$1,201,826,597
Transportation & Warehousing	\$367,163,548
Information	\$1,430,479,555
Finance & insurance	\$353,213,387
Real estate & rental	\$817,768,643
Professional- scientific & tech svcs	\$5,038,111,403
Administrative & waste services	\$1,592,587,457
Educational svcs	\$453,477,419
Accommodation & food services	\$517,555,309
Government & non NAICs (payroll)	\$18,785,035,286
Total	\$38,817,050,21

Appendix B

Spending for both federal government and private sector conservation investments are available only as a national total. To estimate the economic contributions for each state, it was necessary to allocate the national totals to the states. Table B1 illustrates the approach that was used. Existing data are available that show the distribution of federal dollars for a broad range of federal conservation-related programs. The programs selected were chosen for their focus on conservation activities, their use in most states, their relatively consistent funding from year to year, and the publicly available data detailing the distribution of their funds to the states. This study assumes that all conservation spending follows the pattern of these aggregated programs, and therefore the national totals for federal government and private sector investment were allocated to the states in the proportions in Table B1. The details of the selected conservation programs used to estimate the *distribution* of federal government and private sector investment are as follows:

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture)

- Forest Service
 - Payments to States and Local Governments
 - Under federal law, local governments are compensated through various programs for reductions to their property tax base as the result of federal lands.¹⁰ An example of such a program is the National Forest Fund Payments to States. These programs are generally funded under a mandatory basis based on the inventory of lands requiring support.
 - Rural Community and Emergency Firefighting
 - These programs are part of the Forest Service's strategy for effective and cost-efficient wildfire control while ensuring America's forests and communities remain healthy and resilient. Funding demands vary based on local needs, with funding distributed in most cases via grants.
 - State and Private Forestry
 - These programs strive to provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners, state agencies, Tribes, and community resource managers to help sustain the Nation's urban and rural forests and to protect communities and the environment from wildland fires, insects, disease, and invasive species. These programs are generally funded under a discretionary based on immediate and highest priority needs.
 - Other
 - Smaller programs focused on capital and construction projects. These programs are generally funded under a discretionary basis on immediate and highest priority needs.

¹⁰ "PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes)" by Lynne M. Corn, Congressional Research Service, July 25, 2012.

- NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service)
 - EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentives Program)¹¹
 - EQIP is a voluntary program that provides financial and technical assistance to agricultural producers through contracts up to a maximum term of ten years in length. Funding is distributed on a discretionary basis based on grant applications submitted by landowners.
 - WRP (Wetlands Reserve Program)¹²
 - The WRP is an easement program that protects, restores, and enhances wetlands. Like EQIP, funding is distributed on a discretionary basis based on grant applications submitted by landowners.
 - Watershed Programs – funding for these programs are distributed to areas of highest need on a discretionary basis:
 - Watershed and Flood Prevention Operations (WFPO)
 - The WFPO Program provides technical and financial assistance to States, local governments and Tribes (project sponsors) to plan and implement authorized watershed project plans.
 - Watershed Rehabilitation Program, Recovery Act
 - The Watershed Rehabilitation Program, through Recovery Act legislation, provides technical and financial assistance to rehabilitate dams originally constructed with USDA Watershed Programs.
 - Emergency Watershed Protection Program, Recovery Act
 - The Program is designed to help people and conserve natural resources by relieving imminent hazards to life and property caused by floods, fires, windstorms and other natural occurrences.

Department of Commerce – funding for these programs is distributed on a discretionary basis by NOAA based on greatest needs and return:

- NOAA (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration)

The programs for which there is data cover a range of activities, with the majority of funds distributed by the following four programs:

 - Coastal Zone Management Administration Awards and Coastal Zone Management Estuarine Research Reserves
 - The Coastal Zone Management Program is a voluntary partnership between the federal government and U.S. coastal and Great Lakes states to address some of today's most pressing national coastal issues.

¹¹ Figures are from 2010 data collected by Southwick Associates.

¹² Ibid.

- Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery – Pacific Salmon Treaty Program
 - This is a cooperative program that assists the States in salmon restoration and in fulfilling responsibilities under the Pacific Salmon Treaty.
- Unallied Industry Projects
 - This program provides grants and cooperative agreements for biological, economic, sociological, public policy, and other research and administration projects to benefit U.S. fisheries industries.

Department of Homeland Security

- US Coast Guard
 - Recreational Boating Safety
 - The mission of this program is to minimize the loss of life, personal injury, property damage, and environmental impact associated with the use of recreational boats, through preventive means, in order to maximize safe use and enjoyment of U.S. waterways by the public. Funds are distributed to states and to NGOs to a smaller degree according to mandatory formulas and guidelines.

Department of the Interior

- Bureau of Land Management
 - Payment in Lieu of Taxes
 - Under federal law, local governments are compensated through various programs for reductions to their property tax base as the result of federal lands.¹³ Funds are distributed based on local tax demands on a mandatory basis.
- Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) – all of the FWS program funding described here are distributed across states using established, mandatory formulas based on criteria such as land and water area, number of licensed sportsmen and more. The exception is endangered species funding where funds are often distributed based on local need and through discretionary competitive grant programs:
 - Wildlife Conservation and Restoration

The programs for which there is data cover a range of activities, with the vast majority of funds distributed by the following five programs:

 - North American Wetlands Fund
 - The Fund is designed to help federal, state, local and private partners acquire, protect, restore, and enhance wetland habitat across the continent.
 - State Wildlife Grants
 - The program provides federal grants funds for developing and implementing programs that benefit wildlife and their habitats,

¹³ “PILT (Payments in Lieu of Taxes)” by Lynne M. Corn, Congressional Research Service, July 25, 2012.

including species not hunted or fished, with priority given to projects that benefit species of greatest conservation need.

- Endangered Species Program
 - The program works in partnership with others to achieve two major goals: 1) Protect endangered and threatened species, and then pursue their recovery; and 2) Conserve candidate species and species-at-risk, so that listing under the Endangered Species Act is not necessary.
- Wildlife Restoration Program
 - The programs provides grants funds to the states and insular areas fish and wildlife agencies for projects to restore, conserve, manage, and enhance wild birds and mammals and their habitat
- Coastal Wetlands
 - This competitive grants program provides funding for long-term conservation of coastal wetland ecosystems by helping States and Territories to protect, restore, and enhance coastal habitats.
- Sport Fish Restoration
 - The mission of the program is to work through partnerships to conserve and manage fish and their habitats for the use and enjoyment of current and future generations.
- National Park Service¹⁴
 - Other
 - Outdoor Recreation – Acquisition, Development and Planning
 - This program provides financial assistance to the States and their political subdivisions for the preparation of Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans and acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas and facilities for the general public, to meet current and future needs. According to the National Park Service, these funds are largely distributed using a mandatory formula that “includes a factor for equal distribution of a portion of the funds among the States, as well as factors for distribution on the basis of population and need.”

¹⁴ Does NOT include Historic Preservation

Table B1. Selected conservation-related programs used to estimate percentage distribution of all federal and private conservation spending in each state.

	USDA				Commerce	Homeland Security	Department of the Interior				Percent Distribution that was Applied to All Federal & Private Conservation Investments		
	NRCS (2)							Fish and Wildlife Service			Bureau of Land Mgt		
			Watershed Programs					Forest Service (3)	Wildlife Conservation and Restoration (6)		Sport Fish Restoration (7)		
	EQIP	WRP			NOAA (4)	US Coast Guard (5)							
----- Thousands of Dollars -----													
Alabama	\$12,706	\$15,059	\$2,833	\$12,093	\$2,895	\$2,297	\$9,465	\$4,882	\$587	\$605	\$63,422	1.6%	
Alaska	\$8,090	\$42	\$1,978	\$18,980	\$15,465	\$978	\$17,292	\$16,947	\$618	\$24,905	\$105,295	2.7%	
Arizona	\$17,985	\$65	\$2,860	\$31,411	\$5	\$1,451	\$12,300	\$8,741	\$1,193	\$27,824	\$103,835	2.6%	
Arkansas	\$19,036	\$18,842	\$4,810	\$15,691	\$92	\$1,722	\$8,418	\$6,888	\$274	\$4,463	\$80,236	2.0%	
California	\$75,167	\$28,782	\$11,976	\$114,979	\$3,064	\$21,980	\$49,127	\$12,367	\$2,903	\$36,766	\$357,111	9.0%	
Colorado	\$28,108	\$1,528	\$1,476	\$17,606		\$753	\$11,051	\$11,926	\$265	\$24,268	\$96,981	2.5%	
Connecticut	\$6,401	\$74	–	–	\$1,627	\$472	\$2,865	\$2,826	–	\$29	\$14,294	0.4%	
Delaware	\$5,962	\$1,230	–	–	\$1,393	\$664	\$1,874	\$2,006	\$162	\$18	\$13,309	0.3%	
Florida	\$17,602	\$147,968	\$14,419	\$12,230	\$4,955	\$8,701	\$11,311	\$10,887	\$1,599	\$4,525	\$234,197	5.9%	
Georgia	\$16,609	\$5,636	\$88	\$12,384	\$2,844	\$2,965	\$7,762	\$7,249	\$969	\$1,939	\$58,444	1.5%	
Hawaii	\$6,938	\$92	\$3,392	\$2,689	\$2,325	\$1,220	\$5,077	\$2,785	\$732	\$326	\$25,576	0.6%	
Idaho	\$12,464	\$5,120	\$145	\$35,869	\$2,345	\$1,903	\$11,612	\$7,692	\$274	\$25,281	\$102,704	2.6%	
Illinois	\$11,495	\$10,326	\$877	\$114	\$124	\$2,185	\$9,976	\$7,717	\$476	\$1,100	\$44,391	1.1%	
Indiana	\$11,659	\$13,414	\$1,490	\$337	\$1,046	\$1,231	\$5,821	\$3,739	\$592	\$413	\$39,742	1.0%	
Iowa	\$21,146	\$13,388	\$10,732	\$11		\$385	\$10,428	\$5,816	\$479	\$451	\$62,836	1.6%	
Kansas	\$22,837	\$5,609	\$1,765	\$4		–	\$8,816	\$5,327	\$423	\$1,099	\$45,879	1.2%	
Kentucky	\$10,556	\$6,649	\$12,312	\$5,468		\$1,336	\$9,038	\$5,725	\$533	\$1,480	\$53,097	1.3%	
Louisiana	\$23,932	\$38,430	\$5,722	\$5,392	\$26,384	\$2,362	\$7,778	\$5,220	\$380	\$547	\$116,147	2.9%	
Maine	\$10,286	\$346	\$92	\$99	\$4,751	\$1,401	\$7,890	\$3,416	\$326	\$296	\$28,903	0.7%	
Maryland	\$6,597	\$7,359	–	–	\$7,514	\$3,332	\$4,930	\$5,306	–	\$104	\$35,142	0.9%	
Massachusetts	\$6,703	\$2,928	\$611	–	\$4,021	–	\$6,872	\$3,702	\$871	\$101	\$25,809	0.7%	
Michigan	\$15,232	\$4,554	\$164	\$4,351	\$1,365	\$6,792	\$20,843	\$11,668	\$1,264	\$3,831	\$70,063	1.8%	
Minnesota	\$28,234	\$15,355	\$751	\$38,140	\$869	\$3,094	\$19,716	\$14,374	\$90	\$2,538	\$123,161	3.1%	
Mississippi	\$18,837	\$26,062	\$8,674	\$11,892	\$2,233	\$1,598	\$14,456	\$3,685	\$561	\$1,488	\$89,487	2.3%	

Missouri	\$26,905	\$22,550	\$19,331	\$4,682		\$2,503	\$10,296	\$7,938	\$1,080	\$2,695	\$97,980	2.5%
Montana	\$22,108	\$3,367	\$572	\$24,664		\$404	\$25,573	\$7,554	\$267	\$23,513	\$108,022	2.7%
Nebraska	\$23,993	\$24,183	\$1,769	\$1,227		\$185	\$7,091	\$4,272	\$292	\$981	\$63,993	1.6%
Nevada	\$7,546	\$44	–	\$8,834		\$1,635	\$8,011	\$5,052	\$663	\$22,753	\$54,538	1.4%
New Hampshire	\$4,866	\$9,895	\$67	\$628	\$1,594	\$1,244	\$3,317	\$3,556	\$153	\$1,727	\$27,047	0.7%
New Jersey	\$5,184	\$1,260	\$86	–	\$2,400	\$1,794	\$3,789	\$2,530	\$1,624	\$97	\$18,765	0.5%
New Mexico	\$19,639	\$1,000	\$2,818	\$43,340		\$1,150	\$5,772	\$5,952	\$31	\$32,206	\$111,908	2.8%
New York	\$13,264	\$6,500	\$668	\$29	\$2,625	\$2,901	\$13,190	\$8,299	\$1,137	\$123	\$48,735	1.2%
North Carolina	\$13,546	\$10,096	\$3,981	\$8,110	\$2,854	\$2,037	\$10,848	\$8,494	\$2,287	\$3,858	\$66,111	1.7%
North Dakota	\$16,263	\$35,304	\$595	\$6		\$214	\$7,400	\$3,671	\$488	\$1,368	\$65,308	1.7%
Ohio	\$18,572	\$9,528	\$591	\$363	\$2,319	\$4,690	\$9,514	\$10,084	\$1,707	\$486	\$57,854	1.5%
Oklahoma	\$22,062	\$8,720	\$12,268	\$3,213		\$1,425	\$9,442	\$6,922	\$567	\$2,582	\$67,201	1.7%
Oregon	\$13,319	\$12,404	–	\$121,603	\$9,282	\$2,564	\$10,580	\$7,878	\$139	\$12,652	\$190,421	4.8%
Pennsylvania	\$12,919	\$4,300	\$3,629	\$88,518	\$1,294	\$2,821	\$20,642	\$9,282	\$1,879	\$527	\$145,811	3.7%
Rhode Island	\$3,625	\$552	\$241	–	\$1,770	\$1,105	\$1,538	\$2,307	\$714	\$–	\$11,852	0.3%
South Carolina	\$6,768	\$5,421	\$241	\$10,735	\$5,421	\$2,116	\$6,993	\$5,866	\$578	\$389	\$44,528	1.1%
South Dakota	\$14,781	\$20,089	–	\$2,940		\$363	\$8,551	\$4,122	\$453	\$4,779	\$56,078	1.4%
Tennessee	\$11,016	\$17,297	\$5,006	\$8,559		\$2,547	\$13,350	\$8,935	\$742	\$1,615	\$69,067	1.8%
Texas	\$75,950	\$38,728	\$18,240	\$13,355	\$2,309	\$4,128	\$27,705	\$20,641	\$3,776	\$4,502	\$209,334	5.3%
Utah	\$15,491	\$1,677	\$543	\$14,581		\$1,272	\$6,843	\$5,196	\$89	\$34,265	\$79,957	2.0%
Vermont	\$8,683	\$1,449	\$34	\$401	\$7	\$593	\$3,651	\$3,721	\$496	\$896	\$19,932	0.5%
Virginia	\$8,683	\$538	\$2,022	\$9,854	\$9,347	\$2,008	\$28,558	\$6,661	\$368	\$2,532	\$70,571	1.8%
Washington	\$15,867	\$1,460	–	\$34,084	\$15,381	\$3,180	\$30,815	\$7,583	\$584	\$12,821	\$121,776	3.1%
West Virginia	\$5,811	\$597	\$1,813	\$2,499	\$105	\$405	\$3,787	\$3,394	\$282	\$2,799	\$21,492	0.5%
Wisconsin	\$15,508	\$11,344	\$980	\$3,412	\$2,574	\$3,281	\$15,270	\$12,784	\$705	\$741	\$66,599	1.7%
Wyoming	\$13,924	\$2,603	\$483	\$4,890		\$368	\$9,242	\$7,160	\$167	\$22,705	\$61,543	1.6%
United States	\$830,874	\$619,764	\$163,145	\$750,267	\$144,599	\$115,755	\$576,486	\$350,745	\$36,839	\$358,009	\$3,946,483	100.0%