Appendix D

Complete Criteria and Scoring for State Plan Consideration of Climate Change and/or Changing Conditions

We reviewed state AIS management plans, where available, and assessed how they consider climate change specifically, as well as how they provide generally for adaptation of strategies and actions under changing conditions. In total, 25 state plans, including 23 AIS-specific plans and 2 general invasive species management plans with a significant AIS focus were reviewed. Categories of assessment include:

(1) How the plan addresses potential impacts resulting from climate change;
(2) How the plan demonstrates capacity to adapt to changing conditions;
(3) How the plan provides monitoring strategies;
(4) Whether and to what extent the plan provides for periodic revision and update; and
(5) Whether and to what extent the plan describes funding sources/strategies for plan implementation.

The sections below correspond to each assessment category, followed by a section presenting each state plan's summary score and rank among assessed states.

D.1. How the Plan Addresses Potential Impacts Resulting from Climate Change

Table D.1. Understanding and incorporating potential impacts resulting from climate change.					
SCORING: *0 = no; 1 = briefly mentions; 2 = includes general discussion; 3 = includes quantitative info and/or specific examples*					
	Plan specifically mentions climate change	*Plan acknowledges climatic boundaries of species*	*Plan demonstrates understanding of species and/or ecosystem sensitivity to changing conditions*	*Plan identifies research on the potential effects of species responding to changing conditions*	*Plan acknowledges regional differences in expected climate changes*
Alaska	0	2	2	0	0
Arizona	0	1	0	0	0
Connecticut	1	1	1	0	0
Hawaii	0	2	2	0	0
Idaho	0	1	0	0	0
Illinois	0	1	1	0	0
Indiana	0	3	0	0	0
Iowa	0	1	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	0	3	3	0	0
Maine	1	2	2	0	0
Massachusetts	1	3	1	0	0
Michigan	0	1	0	0	0
Missouri	0	3	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	1	0	0
New York	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	0	2	1	0	0
Ohio	0	1	0	0	0
Oregon	0	3	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	2	1	1	0	0
Washington	0	3	0	0	0
Wisconsin	0	1	0	0	0

D.2. How the Plan Demonstrates Capacity to Adapt to Changing Conditions.

Table D.2. Capacity to adapt to changing conditions.

SCORING:
0 = no; 1 = implicitly (i.e. includes goals and strategies that can be used to account for changing conditions, but does not specify changing conditions as part of their purpose); 2 = yes, explicitly, in passing; 3 = yes, explicitly, and specifies associated goals and/or action items

	Plan accounts for changing conditions in its goals and strategies for …							
	… leadership and coordination	*…prevention*	*…EDRR*	*…control and management*	*…restoration*	*…research*	*…information management*	*…education and public awareness*
Alaska	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Arizona	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Connecticut	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1
Idaho	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Indiana	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Iowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Louisiana	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Ohio	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

D.3. How the Plan Provides Monitoring Strategies.

Table D3. Monitoring strategies.			
SCORING: *0 = no; 1 = yes, briefly mentions; 2 = yes, but unclear how information will be used; 3 = yes, and specifies associated goals and/or action items*			
	Plan includes strategy to monitor for changing conditions	*Plan includes strategy to utilize monitoring data*	*Plan includes strategy for managing/updating monitoring data*
Alaska	0	2	3
Arizona	0	3	0
Connecticut	0	1	1
Hawaii	0	3	3
Idaho	0	0	0
Illinois	0	1	1
Indiana	0	3	0
Iowa	0	3	0
Kansas	0	3	3
Louisiana	0	3	0
Maine	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	3	0
Michigan	0	3	0
Missouri	0	3	3
Montana	0	0	0
New York	0	3	0
North Dakota	0	1	1
Ohio	0	1	0
Oregon	0	0	0
Pennsylvania	0	0	0
South Carolina	0	0	1
Texas	0	2	3
Virginia	0	0	0
Washington	0	3	3
Wisconsin	0	3	0

D.4. Whether and To What Extent the Plan Provides for Periodic Revision and Update

Table D.4. Revision.	
SCORING: *0 = no; 1 = yes, in passing; 2 = yes, and includes qualitative description;* *3 = yes, and includes timeline and/or benchmarks for doing so*	
	Plan includes strategy for updating and incorporating new information
Alaska	2
Arizona	0
Connecticut	1
Hawaii	1
Idaho	0
Illinois	0
Indiana	3
Iowa	2
Kansas	3
Louisiana	0
Maine	3
Massachusetts	0
Michigan	0
Missouri	0
Montana	3
New York	0
North Dakota	1
Ohio	1
Oregon	3
Pennsylvania	2
South Carolina	2
Texas	0
Virginia	3
Washington	3
Wisconsin	1

D.5. Whether and To What Extent the Plan Describes Funding Sources/Strategies for Plan Implementation

Table D.5. Funding.	
SCORING: *0 = no; 1 = a source is specified for a portion of the required funding; 2 = a source is specified for a portion of the required funding along with strategies for obtaining remaining funding; 3 = a source is specified for 100% of required funding*	
	Plan identifies dedicated funding source for implementation
Alaska	1
Arizona	0
Connecticut	2
Hawaii	0
Idaho	0
Illinois	0
Indiana	1
Iowa	2
Kansas	2
Louisiana	2
Maine	0
Massachusetts	2
Michigan	0
Missouri	3
Montana	2
New York	1
North Dakota	2
Ohio	0
Oregon	3
Pennsylvania	1
South Carolina	3
Texas	0
Virginia	0
Washington	2
Wisconsin	3

D.6. Total Scoring

The table below sums each state plan's total score for the 5 assessment categories and presents the plan's rank among the 25 states.

Table D6. Total score and ranking for 25 state plans' consideration of climate change and/or provisions for adaptation of strategies and actions under changing conditions.

	D1. Understanding and incorporating potential impacts resulting from climate change	*D2. Capacity to adapt to changing conditions*	*D3. Monitoring strategies*	*D4. Plan includes strategy for updating and incorporating new information*	*D5. Plan identifies dedicated funding source for implementation*	*Total Score (D1 through D5)*	*Rank among 25 states*
Alaska	4	4	5	2	1	16	2
Arizona	1	2	3	0	0	6	9
Connecticut	3	4	2	1	2	12	4
Hawaii	4	3	6	1	0	14	3
Idaho	1	0	0	0	0	1	13
Illinois	2	2	2	0	0	6	9
Indiana	3	2	3	3	1	12	4
Iowa	1	0	3	2	2	8	7
Kansas	0	3	6	3	2	14	3
Louisiana	6	1	3	0	2	12	4
Maine	5	0	0	3	0	8	7
Massachusetts	5	0	3	0	2	10	5
Michigan	1	0	3	0	0	4	11
Missouri	3	0	6	0	3	12	4
Montana	1	3	0	3	2	9	6
New York	0	0	3	0	1	4	11
North Dakota	3	1	2	1	2	9	6
Ohio	1	2	1	1	0	5	10
Oregon	3	0	0	3	3	9	6
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	2	1	3	12
South Carolina	0	0	1	2	3	6	9
Texas	0	0	5	0	0	5	10
Virginia	4	0	0	3	0	7	8
Washington	3	3	6	3	2	17	1
Wisconsin	1	0	3	1	3	8	7