

Conservation Economy in America: A Snapshot of Total Fish and Wildlife- Associated Direct Investments and Economic Contributions

Produced for:



Produced by:



September 2025

Executive Summary

Our nation’s fish and wildlife-associated natural resources are supported by an expansive cross-section of society, with individuals, private sector organizations, and government at all levels making significant contributions toward natural resource management, restoration, and conservation. These stakeholders bring with them wide-ranging conservation goals; achieved through activities, programs, and projects that encompass everything from ensuring the survival of a single endangered species to expanding opportunities for all wildlife-related outdoor recreation. In its broadest sense, fish and wildlife-associated natural resource conservation includes actions designed to sustainably maintain fish and wildlife populations, restoration and stewardship of lands and habitats, and management of its associated recreation. Each of these ventures generates impacts felt throughout the larger economy.

This study focuses on spending made to conserve, restore, and manage fish and wildlife species, including land acquisitions to protect and enhance habitat plus efforts to provide public recreational access to fish and wildlife. It also updates fish and wildlife conservation’s economic contributions at the state level as generated by federal, state, and local governmental agencies and the non-profit sector. These economic contributions were measured using economic models in terms of directly invested dollars and the resulting jobs and income, contributions to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and the resulting local, state, and federal tax revenues.

Careful attention was given to include only those program expenditures that fit within the definition of fish and wildlife-conservation as used in this study. In cases of uncertainty, decisions were made in favor of excluding expenditures that were not clearly identified as related to fish and wildlife conservation. As a result, the numbers in this study can be considered a conservative estimate of the conservation economy. Altogether, an estimated \$55.3 billion was spent over an annual timeframe on fish and wildlife-associated conservation in the United States.¹ The federal government was the leading source of conservation investments, accounting for approximately 48% of all spending. During the same period, state and local governments combined accounted for 45% of spending and the nonprofit organizations contributed 7% (Table E1).

Table E1. Total U.S. investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation (annual investments adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

Source of Investment	Dollars Invested (\$ million)	Percent of Total
Federal government ²	\$26,356	47.7%
State government	\$21,354	38.6%
Local government ³	\$3,519	6.4%
Non-profit organizations ⁴	\$4,041	7.3%
Total	\$55,272	100%

¹ The annual timeframe period differs by information source, from 2023 fiscal year for federal, state, and local to 2022 calendar year for

² Includes federal dollars disseminated in all states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories.

³ Local government spending includes only inter-governmental transfers provided for local conservation programs from state and/or Federal agencies.

⁴ These investments reflect those of active tax-exempt organizations, which in turn includes donations by individuals to these organizations.

Considering the multiplier effects throughout the national economy, the \$55.3 billion of direct spending generated \$115.8 billion of total economic activity. Conservation’s economic contributions included supporting over 575,000 jobs with \$48.8 billion of income (salaries and wages), while adding \$76.6 billion to the U.S. Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The resulting economic activity returned \$16.3 billion in the form of tax revenues to 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. U.S. economic contributions of investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation (annual investments adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

State	Direct Economic Contribution	Multiplier Effects	Total Economic Contribution
Economic Output (<i>\$ millions</i>)	\$55,272	\$60,510	\$115,784
Employment (FTE equivalents)	261,506	273,406	534,912
Salaries and Wages (<i>\$ millions</i>)	\$27,672	\$21,079	\$48,751
Contribution to GDP (<i>\$ millions</i>)	\$39,170	\$37,442	\$76,612
State & Local Tax Revenues (<i>\$ millions</i>)	\$1,514	\$3,404	\$4,918
Federal Tax Revenues (<i>\$ millions</i>)	\$6,365	\$5,116	\$11,480

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Methods	6
Study Definitions.....	6
Sources of Investment	7
Geographic Areas of Study	7
Data Sources	7
Federal Investments:.....	7
State Investments:.....	8
Local Investments:.....	10
Non-profit organizations:	10
Total Direct Investments in the Fish and Wildlife-Associated Conservation Economy	12
Economic Contributions of Fish and Wildlife-Associated Conservation Investments	14
Direct effects of conservation investment	14
Total effects of conservation investment	16
Appendices	19
Appendix A: Aggregated sector inputs to the national economic model	20
Appendix B: Methodology to distribute total national investments across the 50 states.....	21

Tables

Table 1. Federal investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by OMB subfunction... 8

Table 2. State government investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by functional area 10

Table 3. Local government investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by functional area 10

Table 4. Fish and Wildlife-associated Conservation-related NTEE codes and titles 11

Table 5. Non-profit organization investment in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by NTEE code..... 11

Table 6. Total direct investment in fish and wildlife-associated conservation by source of investment 13

Table 7. Direct economic contributions of all spending for fish and wildlife-related conservation by state..... 15

Table 8. Total economic contributions of all spending for natural resources conservation by state, including multiplier effects 17

Table 9. Total economic contributions of all spending for fish and wildlife-associated conservation by industry 18

Introduction

Governments at all levels, along with private organizations, make significant contributions toward preserving, protecting, restoring, and managing our nation's fish and wildlife-associated natural resources. Conservation goals range from solely ensuring the survival of a threatened or endangered species to ensuring sustainable wildlife populations for future generations and providing public recreation opportunities. Similarly, the specific activities undertaken in the name of conservation can encompass a variety of programs and projects, including efforts to restore habitat, manage wildlife populations, or even connect fragmented wildlife corridors.

Two prior studies quantified direct investments made to protect, restore, and manage native fish and wildlife species, wildlife-associated recreation (fishing, hunting and wildlife viewing) and/or acquisitions to protect and enhance habitat.⁵ This current study provides an estimate of the direct fish and wildlife-associated conservation spending in current dollar values. Excluded from this and the prior studies are activities related to historic preservation, pollution control and abatement, municipal parks, outdoor recreation not connected to fish or wildlife, mine reclamation, timber marketing, environmental education, exotic animals, or natural resource conservation outside the United States.

The value of investments made to conserve and protect the natural environment can be measured in several ways. This study solely measured the economic contributions that come from the direct expenditure of dollars toward conservation in each of the 50 states by federal, state, and local government agencies, and by the non-profit sector. Economic contributions that result from conservation spending were reported in terms of dollars spent, the jobs and associated income directly related to conservation spending, contributions to economic growth (GDP) and the state/local and federal tax revenues that arise from that economic activity.

The conservation expenditures represent the annual investments made to maintain the quality of fish and wildlife resources and their habitats. Those investments often result in long-term and non-market benefits (e.g. future returns to today's investments and ecosystem services) that are not measured in this study. In that regard, this study underestimates the total value of conservation spending. Besides the direct spending included in this study, the economic values associated with conservation can also include:

- recreational activity and associated spending, present and future, where conservation investments enhance the attractiveness of sites as locations for non-fish and wildlife associated recreation,
- lower taxpayer dollars expended for air and water quality, water quantity, waste management, and energy generation associated with healthy natural systems (e.g. ecosystem services), and
- economic value that people assign to the existence of healthy ecosystems regardless of whether they directly utilize those resources (existence value).

⁵ Southwick Associates. (2013). The conservation economy in America: Direct investments and economic contributions. Prepared for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.
 Southwick Associates. (2017). The conservation economy in America: Direct investments and economic contributions: 2016 Update. Prepared for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

These are all legitimate measures of the value of a healthy and sustainable fish and wildlife natural resource base including habitat. However, since this study focuses only on the simplest and most direct measure of economic activity tied to conservation expenditures, the annual investments contained herein represent a conservative estimate. And, in that sense, only a small portion of the significantly greater economic returns that result from human use and enjoyment of the Nation's fish and wildlife resources and habitat.

Methods

This effort relied on existing sources of data to document and measure the fish and wildlife-related conservation investments made by all government and non-profit organizations. At the national level, dollar figures for direct investment were derived from published government reports. As outlined below, state-level estimates of spending by the federal government and non-profit sector are the result of allocating the national-level totals to states based on federal government spending in selected conservation-related programs (see Table B1).

Careful attention was given to include only those program expenditures that fit within the definition of fish and wildlife-conservation as used in this study. In cases of uncertainty, decisions were made in favor of excluding expenditures that were not clearly identified as related to fish and wildlife conservation. 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 non-profit sectors. Therefore, the results of this study can be considered a conservative estimate of the conservation economy.

Study Definitions

- **Fish and wildlife-associated conservation:** the acquisition, enhancement, protection, or management of native fish and wildlife habitat and species. It specifically excludes activities related to historic preservation, outdoor recreation not related to fish and wildlife, pollution control and abatement, municipal parks and recreation programs, mine reclamation, timber marketing, environmental education, exotic animals, and natural resource conservation outside the United States.
- **Federal investments:** expenditures on fish and wildlife-associated 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 fish and wildlife-associated conservation by state governments and state entities.
- **Local investments:** direct expenditures of state government dollars by local governments for fish and wildlife-associated conservation purposes.⁶ This definition specifically excludes own-source funds expended by local governments. As a result, this underestimates local government conservation spending by an unknown amount.
- **Nonprofit organizations:** direct expenditures on fish and wildlife-associated conservation by non-profit organizations from contributed funds.⁷

⁶ 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.

⁷ It should be noted that contributions toward fish and wildlife-associated conservation made independently by individuals, businesses, and corporations are not included in this analysis.

Sources of Investment

Four broad sources of investment were considered in this report – federal, state, and local governments as well as the non-profit organizations. All investments in this report comply with the definition of “fish and wildlife-associated conservation” presented in the Methodology Section, above – namely, the conservation, management and restoration of native fish and wildlife habitat and species. To avoid double counting of investments, state government expenditures exclude federal funds distributed to the states, as well as state funds distributed to local municipalities (the former are captured as federal investments and the latter are counted as local investments).

Geographic Areas of Study

Estimates of fish and wildlife-associated conservation investment and their economic contributions were made for the United States as a whole, and for each of the 50 states.⁸ Likewise, separate economic models were used for the national economy and each of the state economies to estimate multiplier effects of this conservation spending. Each state estimate reflects the economic contributions to the respective state’s economy. Any multiplier effects that spread beyond state borders are captured in the national estimates.

Data Sources

All estimates of government investment were based on existing data sources, including the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), U.S. Census Bureau, and state government agencies. Estimates of similar non-profit organizational investments are derived from Internal Revenue Service filings and obtained through a secondary source, National Center for Charitable Statistics (<https://nccs.urban.org/nccs/>). Only investments directly related to fish and wildlife-related conservation as defined elsewhere in this report were 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 fish and wildlife-associated conservation. To avoid double counting, local government dollars are excluded from estimates of state government investment toward conservation. As a result, spending by local governments in this report is underestimated by an unknown amount.

Federal Investments:

The data used to estimate federal conservation investments were taken from the Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 as found on the GovInfo website (<https://www.govinfo.gov/app/collection/budget>).

The budget can be tabulated by function and subfunction. This allows annual federal investment in conservation to be quantified by sorting and filtering the data to include only subfunctions

⁸ 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 (\$26.4 billion) does include funds distributed to Washington, D.C. and the U.S. territories. Those distributions equal 1.96% 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.

related to fish and wildlife-related conservation activities (i.e., Function group 3xx) and then summing the budget allocation for the relevant line items within those subfunctions (Table 1). Only conservation outlays during fiscal year 2023 were included in the summation. For instance, subfunction 304 (Pollution Control and Abatement) did not meet the definition of conservation used in this report and was not included in its entirety in the summation. A complete review of accounts included in the summation of subfunctions was undertaken with the project team prior to finalization.

Table 1. Federal investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by OMB subfunction, (Fiscal year 2023 dollars adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

Subfunction Number	Title	Mandatory Investments (\$ millions)	Discretionary Investments (\$millions)	Total
301	Water Resources	\$325	\$2,934	\$3,259
302	Conservation and Land Mgmt	\$6,756	\$13,065	\$19,821
303	Recreational Resources*	\$1,633	\$81	\$1,714
306	Other Natural Resources	\$27	\$1,377	\$1,402
	Other**	na	na	\$159
Total		\$8,740	\$17,456	\$26,355

*Subfunction includes acquisition, improvement, and operation of recreational lands and facilities (e.g. parks and historical sites). It does not include the economic activities generated by the act of outdoor recreation itself. Efforts were taken to exclude conservation investments toward parks and historic site preservation as they are outside the defined scope.

**Two specific accounts meet the definition of conservation established for this effort and are included in the summation. Those are: 1) specific to the Gulf Coast ecosystem, which falls within the Pollution control and abatement function 304, and 2) specific to wildlife corridors for the Federal highway system, which falls within the Ground transportation function 401.

Federal spending in the subfunction categories is available only as a national estimate. Federal budget documents do not indicate in which state these expenditures took place. Allocating the total federal investments to individual states was based on the distribution of dollars in several key conservation programs as found in publicly-available reports, including the US Fish and Wildlife Service's Sport Fish Restoration and Wildlife Restoration programs, the US Department of Agriculture Environmental Quality Incentives and Wetlands Reserve programs, a variety of US Forest Service programs, and the US Bureau of Land Management payments to states in lieu of taxes, among others. 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 investments in Table 1 to estimate total federal expenditures for conservation in each state.

State Investments:

The data used to estimate fish and wildlife-associated conservation investments by state governments were taken from the US Census Bureau's FY2023 Annual Survey of State Government Finances (<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/state/data/datasets.html>). Similar to the federal budget data, the state government investments were systematically

categorized by function.⁹ 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 “fish and wildlife conservation” as used in this report. However, the data source does not break down each state’s budget by subfunction or line item. Adjustments were made to ensure only relevant expenditures were included in the analysis. These modifications included:

- Forestry function: Conservation, development, management, and protection of forests and forest resources is included within this function. Utilizing historical data from the National Association of State Foresters’ 2020 and 2008 Statistics Survey, a proportional adjustment was applied as a means to exclude expenditures used for “the regulation and inspection of timber producers and the industry” and “the promotion of use and marketing of forest products.”¹⁰
- Parks and Recreation function: This function is described as the provision and support of recreational and cultural-scientific facilities maintained for the benefit of residents and visitors. Detailed utilization of and expenditures associated with state park facilities are available through the Statistical Report of State Park Operations through the National Association of State Park Directors. State-specific ratios were developed to exclude spending attributable to historical sites, general recreation pools, and concessions, for example.
- Natural Resources-Other function: This function includes water resources, mineral resources, agriculture, and the regulation of industries which develop, utilize or affect natural resources, as well as the regulation and agricultural products and establishments. Some of these budget items are outside the scope of this project which necessitated the development of an adjustment coefficient. To do so, 23 individual state budgets were examined. Of these, budgets for six states (Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Nevada, New Jersey and Tennessee) provided adequate detail to identify the percentage of ‘Natural Resources-Other’ spending for each state that were outside of this project’s scope.¹¹ The results for each state were then combined using a weighted average based on each state’s total budget. This proportion was then applied across all remaining state budgets to isolate and quantify targeted investments.

⁹ Within each function, expenditures are further divided into usage types (i.e., current operations, capital expenditures, 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.

¹⁰ These specific expenditure amounts are separate from fish and wildlife-conservation activities and were easily isolated. It is uncertain if the balance of forestry function expenditures is conservation specific and to that end, investments may be overstated. The extent to which is unknown.

¹¹State of Florida Legislative Action. Fiscal year 2023. Available: <https://legiscan.com/FL/text/S2500/id/2803566/Florida-2023-S2500-Enrolled.html>; State of Indiana List of Appropriations. Biennium 2023-2025. Available: <https://www.in.gov/sba/files/2023-IntroductionHeading.pdf> The Governor’s Budget Report: State of Kansas. Fiscal Year 2023. Available: https://budget.kansas.gov/wp-content/uploads/FY2026_GBR_Vol_1-UPDATED-01.23.2025.pdf; The State of New Jersey Governor’s Budget. Fiscal Year 2023. Available: <https://www.nj.gov/treasury/omb/publications/23bib/BIB.pdf>; State of Nevada Executive Budget. 2023-2025. Available: https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Session/82nd2023/Budgets/Official%20Executive%20Budget_2023-25.pdf; The State of Tennessee Recommended Budget. Fiscal year 2023-2024. Available: <https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/finance/budget/documents/2024BudgetDocumentVol3.pdf>.

The sum of state government spending for conservation across all 50 states in fiscal year 2023, with the adjustments listed above, is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. State government investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by functional area (Fiscal year 2023 dollars adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

Function	Investments (\$millions)
Fish and Game	\$5,325
Forestry	\$5,791
Parks and Recreation	\$4,648
Natural Resources, Other	\$5,589
Total	\$21,353

Local Investments:

No consistent, comprehensive sources for data on local government investment toward fish and wildlife-associated conservation are available. Instead, estimates of local government investments include only those dollars that flow to local governments from the state level for the express purpose of fish and wildlife-associated 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 US Census Bureau's FY2023 Annual Survey of State Government Finances. (<https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/state/data/datasets.html>) – 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 investments by local governments in all 50 states (less any modifications made when estimating state conservation expenditures) during fiscal year 2023 were totaled in Table 3.

Table 3. Local government investments in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by functional area (Fiscal year 2023 dollars adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

Function	Investments (\$millions)
Fish and Game	\$626
Forestry	\$374
Parks and Recreation	\$1,182
Natural Resources, Other	\$1,336
Total	\$3,518

Non-profit organizations:

This study includes non-profit organizational investments made by 501(c)3 public charities that, in turn, receive their funds from private individuals, businesses, and private foundations (also 501(c)3 organizations) in 2022. As a result, this estimate necessarily ignores any contributions by individuals to organizations that are not registered non-profit organizations. The extent of this underestimation is not known. Federal or state grants to non-profits and funds provided in match of these dollars were excluded from estimates of non-profit 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. It is available to others through the National Center for Charitable Statistics (<https://nccs.urban.org/nccs/>).

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. Fish and Wildlife-associated Conservation-related NTEE codes and titles

NTEE Code	Title
C	Environment
C30	Natural Resources Conservation and Protection
C32	Water Resources, Wetlands Conservation and Management
C34	Land Resources Conservation
C36	Forest Conservation
D	Animal-related
D30	Wildlife Preservation and Protection
D31	Protection of Endangered Species
D32	Bird Sanctuaries
D33	Fisheries Resources
D34	Wildlife Sanctuaries
N	Recreation and Sports
N61	Hunting and Fishing

The estimate of non-profit investments in conservation for the United States is based on 2022 data obtained from the National Center for Charitable Statistics. Similar to the federal government investments derived from the Budget of the United States, the estimate of non-profit sector investment is available only at the national level. Assuming that these dollars follow a similar distribution to the states as federal dollars, the total non-profit investments were allocated to the individual states using the same method as used to allocate federal investments to the individual states. Estimated total non-profit investment in conservation in the U.S. is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Non-profit organization investment in fish and wildlife-associated conservation, by NTEE code (Calendar year 2022 adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

NTEE Category	Investments (\$ millions)
C30 Natural Resources Conservation and Protection	\$3,733
D30 Wildlife Preservation and Protection	\$91
N61 Amateur Sports: Hunting and Fishing	\$216
Total	\$4,040

Attempts were made to include only conservation non-profits that invest their revenues in the U.S.. Non-profits whose primary mission is to invest in conservation in other countries were excluded. Many U.S.-oriented non-profits invest a small 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.

Total Direct Investments in the Fish and Wildlife-Associated Conservation Economy

When all sources of conservation investment are combined, approximately \$55.3 billion was spent each year directly to acquire, enhance, restore, conserve, 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 was the federal government, accounting for \$26.4 billion or 47.7% of the total.¹² State governments provided just over one third of the total (\$21.4 billion) followed by the non-profit sector (\$4.0 billion – 7.3%) and local governments (\$3.5 billion – 6.4%). Based in part on the state distributions in Appendix Table B1, the amounts invested in individual states ranged from \$10.5 billion in California to \$189 million in Rhode Island.

¹² This estimate includes federal funds that were disbursed to Washington, D.C. and the U.S. territories but allocated in the analysis across the fifty states. Therefore, D.C. does not appear as a separate entry.

Table 6. Total direct investment in fish and wildlife-associated conservation by source of investment (annual investments adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

State	Federal Government*	State Government	Local Government**	Non-profit Sector	Total Spending
(\$ millions)					
Alabama	\$448	\$130	\$26	\$69	\$673
Alaska	\$871	\$392	\$20	\$133	\$1,416
Arizona	\$765	\$236	\$90	\$117	\$1,208
Arkansas	\$607	\$227	\$16	\$93	\$942
California	\$1,741	\$7,066	\$1,458	\$267	\$10,532
Colorado	\$923	\$351	\$15	\$141	\$1,431
Connecticut	\$132	\$111	\$25	\$20	\$288
Delaware	\$158	\$87	\$9	\$24	\$278
Florida	\$765	\$1,122	\$140	\$117	\$2,144
Georgia	\$712	\$283	\$10	\$109	\$1,115
Hawaii	\$132	\$91	\$19	\$20	\$262
Idaho	\$686	\$300	\$6	\$105	\$1,098
Illinois	\$369	\$229	\$29	\$57	\$685
Indiana	\$396	\$166	\$11	\$61	\$634
Iowa	\$396	\$121	\$13	\$61	\$590
Kansas	\$448	\$69	\$1	\$69	\$588
Kentucky	\$343	\$245	\$63	\$53	\$703
Louisiana	\$448	\$513	\$60	\$69	\$1,091
Maine	\$264	\$136	\$0	\$40	\$441
Maryland	\$237	\$487	\$132	\$36	\$893
Massachusetts	\$158	\$301	\$72	\$24	\$556
Michigan	\$580	\$314	\$32	\$89	\$1,015
Minnesota	\$633	\$612	\$137	\$97	\$1,479
Mississippi	\$554	\$139	\$33	\$85	\$811
Missouri	\$633	\$230	\$17	\$97	\$977
Montana	\$897	\$262	\$2	\$137	\$1,298
Nebraska	\$396	\$99	\$20	\$61	\$576
Nevada	\$528	\$112	\$0	\$81	\$721
New Hampshire	\$185	\$93	\$12	\$28	\$318
New Jersey	\$132	\$438	\$70	\$20	\$660
New Mexico	\$791	\$153	\$11	\$121	\$1,077
New York	\$422	\$702	\$160	\$65	\$1,349
North Carolina	\$607	\$373	\$49	\$93	\$1,122
North Dakota	\$317	\$90	\$5	\$48	\$460
Ohio	\$448	\$296	\$63	\$69	\$877
Oklahoma	\$501	\$145	\$5	\$77	\$728
Oregon	\$712	\$664	\$48	\$109	\$1,533
Pennsylvania	\$554	\$467	\$73	\$85	\$1,180
Rhode Island	\$106	\$67	\$0	\$16	\$189
South Carolina	\$448	\$164	\$4	\$69	\$685
South Dakota	\$369	\$124	\$46	\$57	\$595
Tennessee	\$607	\$449	\$12	\$93	\$1,160
Texas	\$1,425	\$557	\$137	\$218	\$2,337
Utah	\$765	\$302	\$0	\$117	\$1,185
Vermont	\$185	\$81	\$2	\$28	\$296
Virginia	\$475	\$266	\$38	\$73	\$851
Washington	\$580	\$943	\$221	\$89	\$1,833
West Virginia	\$237	\$175	\$24	\$36	\$473
Wisconsin	\$660	\$235	\$43	\$101	\$1,039
Wyoming	\$607	\$142	\$38	\$93	\$880
Total US	\$26,355	\$21,357	\$3,521	\$4,041	\$55,272

*State estimates based on percentage distribution of dollars for a selected set of conservation programs.

**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 Fish and Wildlife-Associated Conservation Investments

This study used IMPLAN 2024 Input-output models to quantify and report two types of economic contributions, direct and total contributions. Direct contributions are defined as the economic activity attributable to the direct investments by government entities at all levels (federal, state, and local) and non-profit organizations. The level of economic activity varies depending on the specific uses of the money that is invested and the amount spent. Total contributions (also known as the economic multiplier effects) are defined as the additional economic activity spurred by direct investments toward fish and wildlife-associated conservation.

This study presents several metrics to represent the economic contributions from conservation investments:

- **Output:** This measure reports the overall volume of economic activity associated with these conservation investments. The sum of the direct, indirect and induced shows the total volume of activity and because it does not discount the value of raw materials as they move through the production of goods or services, this measure double-counts a portion of the output of the industries in the value chain.
- **Jobs:** This figure reports the total jobs in all sectors of the economy as a result of the activity under study. The full-time and part-time jobs directly reported by IMPLAN were converted to full-time equivalents using conversion factors provided by IMPLAN based on industry specific employment data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).
- **Salaries & Wages:** This figure reports the total salaries and wages paid in all sectors of the economy as a result of the investments under study.
- **GDP Contribution (Gross Domestic Product):** This represents the total “value added” contribution of economic output made by the industries directly associated with these investments. For a given industry, value added equals the difference between gross output (sales and other income) and intermediate inputs (goods and services imported or purchased from other industries). It represents the contribution to GDP in a given industry and unlike the measure of output, this metric accounts for the flow of materials through the value chain to avoid the potential for double-counting.
- **Federal, State, and Local Tax Revenues:** Using standardized tax tables that consider the typical taxes paid by companies and individuals in all economic sectors or industries in each state, the IMPLAN model also projects the tax revenues earned by the state and federal government as a result of the initial conservation investments under study.

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 \$55.3 billion for conservation directly supported 262,000 jobs in the public and non-profit sectors. Those jobs provided \$27.7 billion in wages and salaries. The economic activity associated with the spending generated \$39.2 billion to the national GDP, \$1.5 billion in state and local tax revenues and \$6.4 billion in federal tax revenues.

Table 7. *Direct* economic contributions of all spending for fish and wildlife-related conservation by state (annual investments adjusted to a calendary year 2024 basis) (Total economic contributions are presented in Table 8)

	Total Direct Investment*	Employment (FTE equivalents)	Salaries and Wages	Contribution to GDP	State & Local Tax Revenues	Federal Tax Revenues
	<i>\$millions</i>				<i>\$millions</i>	
Alabama	\$673	3,294	\$302	\$472	\$17	\$68
Alaska	\$1,416	6,913	\$728	\$965	\$14	\$145
Arizona	\$1,208	6,366	\$621	\$881	\$25	\$142
Arkansas	\$942	5,082	\$428	\$647	\$24	\$100
California	\$10,532	50,001	\$5,989	\$8,193	\$379	\$1,397
Colorado	\$1,431	6,229	\$691	\$1,023	\$34	\$159
Connecticut	\$288	1,150	\$134	\$188	\$9	\$33
Delaware	\$278	1,133	\$109	\$162	\$5	\$23
Florida	\$2,144	11,576	\$1,009	\$1,401	\$25	\$249
Georgia	\$1,115	5,655	\$525	\$747	\$25	\$116
Hawaii	\$262	1,249	\$126	\$167	\$9	\$26
Idaho	\$1,098	6,339	\$554	\$815	\$32	\$131
Illinois	\$685	2,923	\$318	\$442	\$18	\$70
Indiana	\$634	2,868	\$258	\$395	\$20	\$57
Iowa	\$590	2,510	\$214	\$334	\$12	\$47
Kansas	\$588	2,433	\$227	\$348	\$14	\$52
Kentucky	\$703	3,682	\$301	\$424	\$17	\$61
Louisiana	\$1,091	5,253	\$451	\$651	\$17	\$96
Maine	\$441	1,984	\$177	\$246	\$11	\$40
Maryland	\$893	3,520	\$378	\$521	\$23	\$82
Massachusetts	\$556	2,064	\$243	\$351	\$13	\$57
Michigan	\$1,015	4,623	\$446	\$621	\$23	\$101
Minnesota	\$1,479	7,819	\$797	\$1,105	\$54	\$173
Mississippi	\$811	4,409	\$341	\$526	\$19	\$76
Missouri	\$977	4,562	\$411	\$611	\$21	\$90
Montana	\$1,298	6,813	\$602	\$813	\$33	\$141
Nebraska	\$576	2,521	\$227	\$359	\$13	\$51
Nevada	\$721	3,437	\$327	\$473	\$10	\$82
New Hampshire	\$318	1,354	\$135	\$200	\$6	\$32
New Jersey	\$660	2,875	\$334	\$446	\$20	\$76
New Mexico	\$1,077	5,199	\$446	\$848	\$55	\$106
New York	\$1,349	4,471	\$615	\$827	\$51	\$139
North Carolina	\$1,122	5,195	\$471	\$692	\$23	\$105
North Dakota	\$460	2,120	\$184	\$268	\$5	\$40
Ohio	\$877	4,084	\$386	\$537	\$20	\$83
Oklahoma	\$728	3,411	\$292	\$449	\$14	\$62
Oregon	\$1,533	10,736	\$1,126	\$1,584	\$90	\$262
Pennsylvania	\$1,180	8,156	\$835	\$1,207	\$49	\$187
Rhode Island	\$189	819	\$85	\$117	\$5	\$19
South Carolina	\$685	3,143	\$278	\$416	\$13	\$65
South Dakota	\$595	3,200	\$263	\$377	\$12	\$57
Tennessee	\$1,160	5,359	\$517	\$727	\$17	\$114
Texas	\$2,337	10,445	\$1,030	\$1,498	\$27	\$221
Utah	\$1,185	5,226	\$506	\$865	\$29	\$121
Vermont	\$296	1,251	\$128	\$173	\$8	\$28
Virginia	\$851	4,170	\$447	\$602	\$23	\$98
Washington	\$1,833	7,954	\$929	\$1,379	\$39	\$227
West Virginia	\$473	2,613	\$212	\$289	\$12	\$43
Wisconsin	\$1,039	4,551	\$406	\$644	\$28	\$94
Wyoming	\$880	4,217	\$369	\$526	\$13	\$91
United States**	\$55,272	261,506	\$27,672	\$39,170	\$1,514	\$6,365

*Total fish and wildlife-associated conservation-related expenditures by federal, state, and local governments and non-profit organizations.

**Separate economic models are run for each state and the nation as a whole. As a result, the sum of the states will differ slightly from the nationwide results.

Total effects of conservation investment

The IMPLAN economic models used in this study describe how sales in one industry impact other industries. To apply the model, conservation expenditures are assigned to appropriate industry sectors where the spending occurs. Table A1 in the appendix shows an aggregated version of the sectoring methodology used in this study.

Table 8 shows the total economic contributions of conservation investments including the multiplier effects. At the national level, the \$55.3 billion of conservation spending during the annual timeframe led to \$115.8 billion in economic output throughout the economy (this translates into an output multiplier of 2.1). That economic activity supported almost 535,000 jobs with \$48.8 billion in collective wages and salaries as well as contributing \$76.6 billion to national GDP. The total economic activity also had tax implications, leading to \$4.9 billion of state and local tax revenues and \$11.5 billion of federal tax revenues.

Not surprisingly, the economic contributions at the state level vary considerably. At the upper end, conservation investments were associated with over 85,100 jobs in California, 19,800 jobs in Florida, and 18,400 jobs in Texas. Even in the smallest states like Vermont, direct investments in conservation supported more than 2,000 jobs and approximately \$180 million in wages and salaries.

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. Total economic contributions of all spending for natural resources conservation by state, including multiplier effects (annual investments adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

	Total Direct Investment*	Total Output	Output multiplier**	Employment (FTE equivalents)	Salaries and Wages	Contribution to GDP	State & Local Tax Revenues	Federal Tax Revenues
	\$millions				\$millions			
Alabama	\$673	\$991	1.5	5,217	\$410	\$674	\$37	\$94
Alaska	\$1,416	\$2,045	1.4	10,487	\$977	\$1,408	\$44	\$198
Arizona	\$1,208	\$2,203	1.8	11,213	\$960	\$1,479	\$76	\$224
Arkansas	\$942	\$1,398	1.5	7,903	\$583	\$937	\$53	\$138
California	\$10,532	\$18,793	1.8	85,117	\$8,964	\$13,519	\$917	\$2,136
Colorado	\$1,431	\$2,320	1.6	10,801	\$1,038	\$1,627	\$85	\$242
Connecticut	\$288	\$403	1.4	1,872	\$194	\$293	\$19	\$48
Delaware	\$278	\$327	1.2	1,693	\$146	\$233	\$11	\$31
Florida	\$2,144	\$3,524	1.6	19,810	\$1,541	\$2,354	\$106	\$387
Georgia	\$1,115	\$1,841	1.7	9,782	\$794	\$1,244	\$67	\$181
Hawaii	\$262	\$377	1.4	1,968	\$174	\$260	\$20	\$37
Idaho	\$1,098	\$1,878	1.7	10,150	\$789	\$1,228	\$70	\$187
Illinois	\$685	\$1,056	1.5	5,128	\$487	\$734	\$48	\$110
Indiana	\$634	\$845	1.3	4,500	\$367	\$583	\$38	\$81
Iowa	\$590	\$704	1.2	3,780	\$291	\$475	\$26	\$64
Kansas	\$588	\$745	1.3	3,828	\$317	\$507	\$29	\$73
Kentucky	\$703	\$959	1.4	5,646	\$425	\$634	\$37	\$87
Louisiana	\$1,091	\$1,424	1.3	8,158	\$615	\$961	\$37	\$133
Maine	\$441	\$585	1.3	3,216	\$258	\$393	\$27	\$59
Maryland	\$893	\$1,075	1.2	5,473	\$514	\$773	\$52	\$114
Massachusetts	\$556	\$739	1.3	3,360	\$361	\$546	\$29	\$85
Michigan	\$1,015	\$1,526	1.5	7,995	\$674	\$1,010	\$58	\$155
Minnesota	\$1,479	\$2,641	1.8	13,293	\$1,213	\$1,806	\$124	\$267
Mississippi	\$811	\$1,139	1.4	6,664	\$449	\$738	\$43	\$101
Missouri	\$977	\$1,377	1.4	7,386	\$597	\$936	\$47	\$132
Montana	\$1,298	\$1,938	1.5	11,032	\$864	\$1,246	\$68	\$204
Nebraska	\$576	\$770	1.3	3,954	\$318	\$529	\$26	\$72
Nevada	\$721	\$1,082	1.5	5,552	\$465	\$735	\$33	\$119
New Hampshire	\$318	\$433	1.4	2,133	\$198	\$307	\$13	\$47
New Jersey	\$660	\$955	1.4	4,650	\$479	\$695	\$47	\$111
New Mexico	\$1,077	\$1,675	1.6	7,928	\$604	\$1,144	\$88	\$143
New York	\$1,349	\$1,741	1.3	7,337	\$875	\$1,291	\$106	\$202
North Carolina	\$1,122	\$1,604	1.4	8,503	\$697	\$1,087	\$57	\$158
North Dakota	\$460	\$560	1.2	3,097	\$246	\$369	\$10	\$53
Ohio	\$877	\$1,294	1.5	6,920	\$569	\$869	\$50	\$126
Oklahoma	\$728	\$997	1.4	5,417	\$409	\$660	\$33	\$88
Oregon	\$1,533	\$3,618	2.4	18,071	\$1,657	\$2,475	\$172	\$389
Pennsylvania	\$1,180	\$2,762	2.3	13,818	\$1,254	\$1,915	\$114	\$284
Rhode Island	\$189	\$261	1.4	1,333	\$121	\$181	\$11	\$28
South Carolina	\$685	\$926	1.4	5,055	\$389	\$622	\$34	\$92
South Dakota	\$595	\$830	1.4	4,780	\$363	\$549	\$23	\$80
Tennessee	\$1,160	\$1,723	1.5	8,826	\$773	\$1,161	\$56	\$173
Texas	\$2,337	\$3,687	1.6	18,447	\$1,588	\$2,479	\$102	\$347
Utah	\$1,185	\$1,828	1.5	8,756	\$729	\$1,295	\$66	\$176
Vermont	\$296	\$389	1.3	2,037	\$180	\$265	\$18	\$40
Virginia	\$851	\$1,245	1.5	6,493	\$612	\$904	\$53	\$137
Washington	\$1,833	\$2,844	1.6	12,302	\$1,317	\$2,100	\$107	\$327
West Virginia	\$473	\$619	1.3	3,787	\$282	\$412	\$25	\$58
Wisconsin	\$1,039	\$1,431	1.4	7,343	\$591	\$974	\$58	\$138
Wyoming	\$880	\$1,048	1.2	5,957	\$457	\$693	\$28	\$114
United States***	\$55,272	\$115,784	2.1	534,912	\$48,751	\$76,612	\$4,918	\$11,480

*Total fish and wildlife-associated conservation expenditures by federal, state, and local governments and non-profit organizations.

**This measures the total output generated as a result of total fish and wildlife-associated conservation. These should not be viewed as a performance metric. The results will vary greatly, impacted by a variety of factors, such as economic leakages to other parts of the nation or outside the U.S. when manufactured goods are not produced in a particular state.

***Separate economic models are run for each state and the nation as a whole. As a result, the sum of the states will differ slightly from the nationwide results.

Due to the broad reach of the multiplier effects, the economic contributions of conservation spending swept across most parts of the economy. Table 9 shows how economic activity and the related jobs and income were found in nearly all industry sectors. The single largest sector to be impacted by conservation spending was Services. This broad category includes sectors such as scientific and research services, public relations services, environmental and technical consulting services, and design services, for example. An estimated 343,000 jobs generating \$26.9 billion of income in this sector were supported by fish and wildlife-associated conservation spending.

Table 9. Total economic contributions of all spending for fish and wildlife-associated conservation by industry (annual investments adjusted to a calendar year 2024 basis)

Sector	Output	Employment	Income	Contribution To GDP
	(\$ millions)		(\$ millions)	
Ag, Forestry, Fish & Hunting	\$653	3,929	\$181	\$432
Mining	\$631	761	\$145	\$417
Utilities	\$2,167	1,521	\$349	\$1,434
Construction	\$3,476	18,067	\$1,341	\$2,300
Manufacturing	\$8,556	14,429	\$1,332	\$5,661
Wholesale and retail	\$7,955	43,245	\$2,772	\$5,264
Transportation related	\$3,915	29,277	\$1,543	\$2,591
Services	\$69,579	343,131	\$26,928	\$46,039
Government enterprises (e.g. postal services)	\$993	4,454	\$486	\$657
Payroll	\$17,859	116,109	\$13,675	\$11,817
Total	\$115,784	574,922	\$48,752	\$76,612

Appendices

Appendix A: Aggregated sector inputs to the national economic model

Appendix B: Methodology to distribute total national investments across the 50 states

Appendix A: Aggregated sector inputs to the national economic model

Table A1 provides an aggregated view of the sectors where direct investment toward fish and wildlife-associated conservation were allocated. These estimates were established through a secondary source of data, USASpending.gov, that provides a general breakdown of conservation-related government spending by budget subfunction. These data informed the detailed expenditure patterns within the IMPLAN models for state and federal government operations, capital acquisition, and construction.

Table A1. Aggregated allocation of spending by program activity and object class name

Sector	Percent of total allocated to sector
Payroll related	35%
Grants, subsidies, and contributions	22%
Other services from non-Federal sources	10%
Advisory and assistance services	8%
Other goods and services from Federal sources	7%
Land and structures	5%
Travel and transportation of persons	2%
Supplies and materials	2%
Equipment	2%
Operation and maintenance of facilities	2%
Communications, utilities, and miscellaneous charges	1%
Rental payments to GSA	1%
Operation and maintenance of equipment	0.6%
Rental payments to others	0.6%
Financial transfers, investments, or insurance	0.4%
Research and development contracts	0.2%
Transportation of things	0.1%
Printing and reproduction	0.05%
Total	100%

Appendix B: Methodology to distribute total national investments across the 50 states

Spending for both federal government and non-profit 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. Note, these reported spending amounts remain as their nominal monetary values.

The programs selected were chosen for their focus on fish and wildlife-associated 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 non-profit 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 non-profit sector investment are as follows:

USDA (United States Department of Agriculture)

- Forest Service
 - FLP (Forest Legacy Program)
 - FLP works to mitigate loss of privately owned forested lands and fragmented habitat through the use of conservation easements or land purchases
- NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service)
 - EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentives Program)
 - 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)
 - 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.
 - WHIP (Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program)
 - The Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP) is a voluntary program for conservation-minded landowners who wanted to develop and improve wildlife habitat on agricultural land, nonindustrial private forest land, and Native American land.

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 (PILT)
 - Under federal law, local governments are compensated through various programs for reductions to their property tax base as the result of federal lands. Funds are distributed based on local tax demands on a mandatory basis.
- US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) – all FWS program funding described here is 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 Restoration Program (WR)
 - The program 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.
 - Sport Fish Restoration (SFR)
 - 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.

Table B1. Selected fish and wildlife-associated conservation-related programs used to estimate percentage distribution of all federal and non-profit conservation spending in each state (Nominal \$ millions)

(in millions)	US Dept of Agriculture				US Fish and Wildlife Service		US Bur. of Land Mgmt	US Coast Guard	TOTAL	% of U.S. Total
	EQIP	WRP	WHIP	Forest Legacy	WR	SFR	PILT	USCG		
	2017-'22	2017	2017	2022-2024	2023	2024	2024	2023		
Alabama	\$22.3	\$1.4	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$27.5	\$6.3	\$1.8	\$1.9	\$61.3	2%
Alaska	\$6.9	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$50.5	\$19.1	\$37.5	\$1.0	\$115.0	3%
Arizona	\$12.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.6	\$34.2	\$7.6	\$46.9	\$1.6	\$102.9	3%
Arkansas	\$40.6	\$2.9	\$0.4	\$0.8	\$19.6	\$5.9	\$9.3	\$1.7	\$81.2	2%
California	\$91.9	\$0.8	\$0.4	\$11.4	\$38.9	\$18.1	\$64.3	\$6.5	\$232.3	7%
Colorado	\$32.2	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$32.3	\$10.7	\$47.8	\$1.1	\$124.7	3%
Connecticut	\$3.0	\$0.1	\$0.2	\$0.3	\$8.6	\$3.8	\$0.0	\$1.5	\$17.5	0%
Delaware	\$7.5	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7.2	\$3.8	\$0.0	\$1.1	\$19.8	1%
Florida	\$17.6	\$26.0	\$0.2	\$11.6	\$22.1	\$14.2	\$7.5	\$9.6	\$108.8	3%
Georgia	\$40.1	\$1.0	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$37.9	\$9.9	\$3.7	\$2.8	\$95.4	3%
Hawaii	\$5.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7.2	\$3.8	\$0.6	\$0.9	\$17.8	0%
Idaho	\$16.2	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$3.1	\$23.5	\$7.2	\$41.2	\$1.7	\$93.1	3%
Illinois	\$12.3	\$1.4	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$23.8	\$6.6	\$1.6	\$1.7	\$47.5	1%
Indiana	\$24.1	\$0.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$20.3	\$5.3	\$0.8	\$1.6	\$52.7	1%
Iowa	\$26.4	\$2.0	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$17.1	\$4.8	\$0.6	\$1.7	\$53.6	2%
Kansas	\$28.0	\$0.4	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$22.0	\$5.4	\$1.5	\$1.2	\$58.6	2%
Kentucky	\$15.1	\$3.6	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$20.0	\$5.4	\$3.5	\$1.6	\$49.2	1%
Louisiana	\$19.8	\$5.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$24.7	\$7.1	\$1.8	\$2.5	\$61.7	2%
Maine	\$10.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$3.5	\$13.3	\$3.9	\$0.7	\$1.5	\$33.8	1%
Maryland	\$9.9	\$1.9	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$11.4	\$3.8	\$0.2	\$6.1	\$33.4	1%
Massachusetts	\$3.1	\$0.6	\$0.1	\$0.7	\$11.9	\$3.8	\$0.1	\$2.2	\$22.6	1%
Michigan	\$15.7	\$0.8	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$34.7	\$11.8	\$6.5	\$6.5	\$75.9	2%
Minnesota	\$23.8	\$3.5	\$0.1	\$0.3	\$34.4	\$13.1	\$6.0	\$3.8	\$84.9	2%
Mississippi	\$46.7	\$4.3	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$17.6	\$4.2	\$3.1	\$1.3	\$77.2	2%
Missouri	\$31.4	\$4.8	\$0.1	\$3.6	\$31.5	\$8.0	\$5.6	\$2.9	\$87.8	2%
Montana	\$21.7	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$13.6	\$31.1	\$9.3	\$43.3	\$1.2	\$120.6	3%
Nebraska	\$25.6	\$0.7	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$19.3	\$4.9	\$1.6	\$1.1	\$53.2	1%
Nevada	\$6.3	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$22.0	\$6.0	\$33.0	\$1.2	\$68.6	2%
New Hampshire	\$3.4	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$1.6	\$11.9	\$3.8	\$2.5	\$1.6	\$25.2	1%
New Jersey	\$3.3	\$0.4	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$7.2	\$3.8	\$0.1	\$2.5	\$17.6	0%
New Mexico	\$22.6	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$1.8	\$24.7	\$6.9	\$49.8	\$1.0	\$106.8	3%
New York	\$12.0	\$1.5	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$30.5	\$8.2	\$0.2	\$3.0	\$55.8	2%
North Carolina	\$21.1	\$17.4	\$0.1	\$2.2	\$33.6	\$11.6	\$5.7	\$2.8	\$94.4	3%
North Dakota	\$16.9	\$0.1	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$17.3	\$4.4	\$2.0	\$1.0	\$41.8	1%
Ohio	\$22.8	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$1.0	\$23.6	\$7.5	\$0.8	\$4.2	\$59.9	2%
Oklahoma	\$21.9	\$3.4	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$28.9	\$7.2	\$4.4	\$1.9	\$67.8	2%
Oregon	\$21.7	\$3.2	\$0.0	\$2.7	\$28.5	\$8.4	\$30.1	\$2.2	\$96.9	3%
Pennsylvania	\$19.3	\$0.9	\$0.1	\$0.5	\$41.1	\$9.3	\$1.5	\$3.0	\$75.8	2%
Rhode Island	\$1.7	\$0.4	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$7.2	\$3.8	\$0.0	\$1.1	\$14.4	0%
South Carolina	\$23.5	\$1.1	\$0.3	\$10.3	\$16.3	\$5.2	\$1.7	\$2.6	\$61.0	2%
South Dakota	\$15.2	\$2.0	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$19.9	\$4.9	\$8.7	\$1.1	\$51.9	1%
Tennessee	\$28.5	\$2.0	\$0.0	\$1.9	\$34.2	\$8.3	\$3.4	\$2.2	\$80.4	2%
Texas	\$100.2	\$3.1	\$1.0	\$0.0	\$55.2	\$19.1	\$6.8	\$5.0	\$190.3	5%
Utah	\$22.5	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$22.8	\$7.1	\$49.5	\$1.8	\$103.7	3%
Vermont	\$8.7	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$2.7	\$7.2	\$3.8	\$1.3	\$1.0	\$24.9	1%
Virginia	\$20.3	\$0.3	\$0.1	\$6.9	\$20.5	\$5.5	\$6.9	\$2.2	\$62.6	2%
Washington	\$14.5	\$2.8	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$22.6	\$7.8	\$29.7	\$2.4	\$79.9	2%
West Virginia	\$7.6	\$0.2	\$0.6	\$0.0	\$13.2	\$3.8	\$4.2	\$1.0	\$30.5	1%
Wisconsin	\$29.4	\$2.3	\$0.0	\$3.6	\$33.8	\$11.8	\$4.5	\$3.5	\$88.8	2%
Wyoming	\$12.2	\$0.7	\$0.1	\$5.3	\$21.0	\$5.8	\$36.9	\$0.9	\$82.9	2%
Total	\$1,065.6	\$106.4	\$6.3	\$91.0	\$1,185.4	\$371.9	\$621.1	\$116.9	\$3,564.5	100%

