

1 **Appendix D**

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

4  
5 We reviewed state AIS management plans, where available, and assessed how they consider  
6 climate change specifically, as well as how they provide generally for adaptation of strategies  
7 and actions under changing conditions. In total, 25 state plans, including 23 AIS-specific plans  
8 and 2 general invasive species management plans with a significant AIS focus were reviewed.

9 Categories of assessment include:

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

16  
17 The sections below correspond to each assessment category, followed by a section presenting  
18 each state plan’s summary score and rank among assessed states.

1 **D.1. How the Plan Addresses Potential Impacts Resulting from Climate Change**  
 2

**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*

	<i>Plan specifically mentions climate change</i>	<i>Plan acknowledges climatic boundaries of species</i>	<i>Plan demonstrates understanding of species and/or ecosystem sensitivity to changing conditions</i>	<i>Plan identifies research on the potential effects of species responding to changing conditions</i>	<i>Plan acknowledges regional differences in expected climate changes</i>
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

3

**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*

	<i>Plan accounts for changing conditions in its goals and strategies for ...</i>							
	<i>... leadership and coordination</i>	<i>...prevention</i>	<i>...EDRR</i>	<i>...control and management</i>	<i>...restoration</i>	<i>...research</i>	<i>...information management</i>	<i>...education and public awareness</i>
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.**

<b>Table D3. Monitoring strategies.</b>			
<i>SCORING:</i> 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			
	<i>Plan includes strategy to monitor for changing conditions</i>	<i>Plan includes strategy to utilize monitoring data</i>	<i>Plan includes strategy for managing/updating monitoring data</i>
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**

<b>Table D.4. Revision.</b>	
<i>SCORING:</i> 0 = no; 1 = yes, in passing; 2 = yes, and includes qualitative description; 3 = yes, and includes timeline and/or benchmarks for doing so	
	<i>Plan includes strategy for updating and incorporating new information</i>
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**

<b>Table D.5. Funding.</b>	
<i>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</i>	
	<i>Plan identifies dedicated funding source for implementation</i>
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.

<b>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.</b>							
	<i>D1. Understanding and incorporating potential impacts resulting from climate change</i>	<i>D2. Capacity to adapt to changing conditions</i>	<i>D3. Monitoring strategies</i>	<i>D4. Plan includes strategy for updating and incorporating new information</i>	<i>D5. Plan identifies dedicated funding source for implementation</i>	<i>Total Score (D1 through D5)</i>	<i>Rank among 25 states</i>
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