Objective Today

► Bridge HHC concept to key stakeholders
► Combine best perspectives
► Make a proposed Bill better

Healthy Habitats Coalition Committee Structure

Executive Board
Roger Batt, Executive Director
John Cantlon, Chair
Dr. George Beck, Vice Chair
Mark Truax, Secretary

Steering Committee
8 current members

Historical Milestones
1946 – WSWS, Reno (new chemistry, policy issues)
1987 – Intermountain Noxious Weed Advisory Council (Adds Section 2814)
1990 – A.N.S.T.F. formed
1993 – F.I.C.M.N.E.W. formed
1999 – E.O. 13112 > NISC > NIWAW > NISAW
2002 – GAO Invasives Report

The 2008 “Epiphany”

• At the February NIWAW meeting:
  ▪ Why is legislation (Craig/Hefley) unfunded
  ▪ Managing earmarks or “rob Peter to pay Paul”
  ▪ Appropriations asked, where is the money going
  ▪ Spent $2,000 x 200 people x 12 years = $4.8M
  ▪ How do we bridge an all taxa issue

What is the “solution” to the invasive problem

Tactic: Build with Governors

• Rocky Mountain Weed Summit (8 states)
• Champion State Initiative (MT, CO, WY)
  ▪ HHC initiated as a 501(c)(4)
• WGA: Governor Otter (ID)...
• WASDA: deYong (MT), Blackham (UT), Fearneyhough (WY)
• Key Congressional members want a new plan
Healthy Habitats Coalition

Funding Refocus
Rationale & Reasoning

Federal FY09 NISC Budget
($1.5B to $2.2B FY12)

Invasive Weed Mgt Status

I invasive Weed Mgt Assessment

All Taxa Issue...

HHC as a Change Vehicle

August 7, 2013

Through state and federal leadership, HHC seeks to develop a framework for natural resources managers with on-the-ground control and management resources which benefits commerce, enhances habitat, and protects assets that are good for the whole.
This HHC Proposed Act
► would improve structure, coordination and spending effectiveness of Federal agency actions...

while creating a state structure to control and manage invasive species harming land and water ecosystems on all states and territories of the USA thus reducing invasive threats or management gaps.

As a first
► the proposal will uniformly support Federal, State and local government partnerships in landscape scale.

► Borderless collaborations are written for pest target reduction goals, economic assessment and contracting aspects for all taxa.

► University, industry and other expertise becomes integral part of the solution.

Line Items
► As a first, HHC suggests line-items for each agency carving out dedicated invasive species budgets.

► Control, management, prevention and research categories are pin-pointed to the state or region’s priority problem(s).

Line Items
► As a first, HHC suggests line-items for each agency carving out dedicated invasive species budgets.

Funding
► based on the 2012 ($2.2 billion) inter-agency crosscut budget as reported by the National Invasive Species Council (NISC).

1. Refocus discretionary funds, no new money
2. Balanced and prioritized funding
3. Strive for measurable efficiency
4. Get it on the ground

Proposed Funding to Fed Land Agencies = $1.345B
► BLM $496M
► USFS $386M
► Refuge $198M
► BOR $100M
► DOD $100M
► NPS $50M
► BIA $15M

Prevention
► APHIS receives and manages $700M for prevention efforts and can divide strategically with other agencies.
States

- States receive $200 million in block grants. (Reference HHC’s State Allocation Table)
  - A minimum of $1 million and maximum of $11
  - Governors oversee funding and authorize an entity driven by a strategic management plan.

This Act amends, by Title

  - may include other appropriate authorizations.

As a Performance Formula

- funds appropriated by Congress shall be directed by the Dept.’s Secretary based on a strategic plan (Ex: Restore New Mexico).
  - 75 percent – Not less than; for on-the-ground activities for control and management.
  - 10 percent – Not more than; for administrative costs to implement programs.
  - 15 percent – Not more than; for research and/or education.

Performance goals

- shall reduce targeted pest population at an annual net rate of 5 percent.
  - Expenditures shall be prudent and implemented with the least costly means designed to lower cost per acre.

Research

- based on prioritized and coordinated targets for faster control and management implementation for program success.
- Research focused up to 15% of $2.2B or $330M.

Categorical Exclusions

implemented in risk areas within 1,000 feet of land or water sites; including utility right-of-ways, roadsides, heritage sites, recreation sites, schools or other valued sites to provide control or management so long as the project is conducted consistently within agency and departmental procedures under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).
HHC’s Next Steps

• At oversight hearing, “a paradigm shift”...

• Proof final proposed draft by September 15:
  • House & Senate Bills being refined
  • Need to make it better/best

• Congress, WGA, WASDA inputting...