

APPENDIX B

Past Studies by Species and Affected Land Type

Table B1
Past Studies by Species and Affected Land Type

Study ID	Noxious Weed Names						
	A. Rangeland Infestation						
	(2) Yellow Starthistle (Centaurea solstitialis)	(3) Distaff Thistle (Carthamus lanatus)	Diffuse (Centaurea diffusa)	Spotted (Centaurea maculosa)	Russian (Centaurea repens)	Knapweeds (Centaurea virgata)	(7) Leafy Spurge (Euphorbia esula)
10-11							
10-17							X
10-19	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-20	X		X	X	X	X	
10-21	X						
10-24	X						
10-25	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-26	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-27	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-28		X					
10-29	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-30	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-31		X					
10-32			X	X	X	X	
10-33			X	X	X	X	
10-34			X	X	X	X	
10-35			X	X	X	X	
10-36							
10-37							
10-38							
10-40							X
10-41							X
10-42							
10-44							
10-46							
10-47							
10-48							
10-49							
10-50							
10-51							
10-60	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-61							
10-62							
10-64			X	X	X	X	
10-65							
10-66							X
10-67							X
10-68							X
10-69							X
10-70							X
10-71							X
10-72							
10-73							
10-74							
10-75							
10-76							
10-77							
10-78							
10-79							
10-81							
10-82							
10-90							
10-91							
OSU (10-1)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table B1 (continued)

Study ID	Noxious Weed Names							
	A. Rangeland Infestation				B. Rangeland and Farmland			
	(11) Scotch Thistle (<i>Onopordum acanthium</i>)	(12) Mediterranean Sage (<i>Salvia aethiopis</i>)	(13) Purple Starthistle (<i>Centaurea calcitrapa</i>)	(14) Hawkweeds (<i>Hieracium aurantiacum</i>)	(1) Orange (<i>Hieracium floribundum</i>)	Yellow (<i>Hieracium floribundum</i>)	Tansy Ragwort (<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>)	Rush Skeletonweed (<i>Chondrilla juncea</i>)
10-11								
10-17								
10-19	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-20			X					
10-21								
10-24								
10-25	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-26	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-27	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-28			X					
10-29	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
10-30	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-31								
10-32								
10-33								
10-34								
10-35								
10-36	X							
10-37								
10-38		X						
10-40								
10-41								
10-42				X	X	X		
10-44								X
10-46								
10-47								
10-48								
10-49								
10-50								
10-51								
10-60	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-61								
10-62			X					
10-64								
10-65								
10-66								
10-67								
10-68								
10-69								
10-70								
10-71								
10-72				X	X			
10-73								X
10-74								X
10-75								
10-76								
10-77								
10-78								
10-79								
10-81								
10-82								
10-90								
10-91								
OSU (10-1)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table B1 (continued)

Study ID	Noxious Weed Names					
	C. Forestland		D. Wetlands			
	(4) Scotch Broom (<i>Cytisus scoparius</i>)	(6) Gorse (<i>Ulex europaeus</i>)	(9) Purple Loosestrife (<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>)	(10) White Top and Perennial Pepperweed (<i>Cardaria draba</i> and <i>Lepidium latifolium</i>)	(15) Spartina (<i>Spartina patens</i>)	(16) Brazilian Elodea (<i>Egeria densa</i>)
10-11		X				
10-17						
10-19	X		X		X	X
10-20				X		
10-21						
10-24				X		
10-25	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-26	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-27	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-28						
10-29						
10-30	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-31						
10-32						
10-33						
10-34						
10-35						
10-36						
10-37				X		
10-38						
10-40						
10-41						
10-42						
10-44						
10-46	X	X				
10-47					X	
10-48					X	
10-49					X	
10-50			X		X	X
10-51						X
10-60	X	X	X	X	X	X
10-61						
10-62						
10-64						
10-65				X		
10-66						
10-67						
10-68						
10-69						
10-70						
10-71						
10-72						
10-73						
10-74						
10-75	X	X				
10-76	X					
10-77	X					
10-78		X				
10-79		X				
10-81					X	
10-82					X	
10-90			X			X
10-91						X
OSU (10-1)	X	X	X	X	X	X

Table B.2
Bibliography for Appendix C

Study ID	Source
10-60	Angle, Brad et al. <u>Northwest Oregon State Forest Management Plan: An Economic Overview</u> . Oregon Department of Forestry. September 1996.
100-14	Annual Shellfish Growers Conference. Kah-Nee-Ta, Oregon. September 27-29, 2000.
10-8	Armstrong, S. "Rare Plants Protect Cape's Water Supplies." <u>New Scientist</u> . Vol. (11 Feb):8. February 1995.
10-400	Bain, J.F. "The Biology of Canadian Weeds, 96. <i>Senecio jacobaea L.</i> " <u>Canadian Journal of Plant Science</u> . Vol. 71:127-40. 1991.
10-39	Bangsund, Dean A., F. Larry Leistritz, and Jay A. Leitch. <u>Predicted Future Economic Impacts of Biological Control of Leafy Spurge in the Upper Midwest</u> . Agricultural Economics Report No. 382-S. December 1997
10-17	Bangsund, Dean A., Jay A. Leitch, and F. Larry Leistritz. "Economics of Herbicide Control of Leafy Spurge (<i>Euphorbia esula L.</i>)." <u>Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics</u> . Vol. 21(2):381-395. 1996.
10-72	Bangsund, Dean, Dan J. Nudell, Randall S. Sell, and F. Larry Leistritz. <u>Economic Analysis of Controlling Leafy Spurge with Sheep</u> . Agricultural Economics Report No. 431-S. January 2000.
10-36	Beck, George K. <u>Biennial Thistles</u> . Pp 145-161. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-12	Bedell, T.E., R.E. Whitesides, and R.B. Hawkes. <u>Pasture Management for Control of Tansy Ragwort</u> . Pacific Northwest Cooperative Extension Bulletin. PNW 210. Oregon State University. Extension Services. Corvallis, Oregon. 1981.
10-405	Best, K. F., G.G. Bowes, A.G. Thomas and M.G. Maw. "The biology of Canadian weeds, 39. <i>Euphorbia esula L.</i> " <u>Canadian Journal of Plant Science</u> . Vol. 60:651-653. 1980.
10-73	Boerboom, Chris. <u>Rush Skeletonweed</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 465. October 1993.
10-31	Burrill, Larry C. <u>Distaff Thistle</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 420. June 1992.
10-401	Burrill, L.C., R.H. Callihan, R. Parker, E. Coombs and H. Radtke. <u>Tansy Ragwort, <i>Senecio jacobaea L.</i></u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 175. Oregon State University. 1994.
10-81	Callaway, John C. et al. "The Introduction and Spread of Smooth Cordgrass (<i>Spartina alterniflora</i>) in South San Francisco Bay." <u>Estuaries</u> . June 1992.
10-66	Callihan, Robert H., Joseph P. McCaffrey, and Vickie J. Parger-Clark. <u>Leafy Spurge Biology and Management</u> . University of Idaho College of Agriculture. Cooperative Extension System Agricultural Experiment Station. Current Information Series No. 877. July 1995.
10-92	Callihan, Robert H., Linda M. Wilson, Joseph P. McCaffrey, and Timothy W. Miller. <u>Hawkweeds</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 499. September 1997.
10-408	Catling, P.M. and W. Wojtas. "The Waterweeds (<i>Elodea</i> and <i>Egeria</i> , Hydrocharitaceae) in Canada." <u>Canadian Journal of Botany</u> . Vol. 64: 1525-1541. 1986.
10-42	Combs, Eric M., Peter B. McErory, and Charles E. Turner. <u>Tansy Ragwort</u> . In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-61	Coombs, E., et al. <u>Tansy Ragwort</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 175. Revised. July 1997.
10-82	Daehler, Curtis C. and Donald R. Strong. <u>Status, Prediction, and Prevention of Introduced Cordgrass (<i>Spartina spp.</i>) Invasions in Pacific Estuaries</u> . Bodega Marine Laboratory. University of California. 1994.
10-30	Feather, Peter, Daniel Hellerstein, and LeRoy Hansen. <u>Economic Valuation of Environmental Benefits and the Targeting of Conservation Programs - The Case of the CRP</u> . Agricultural Economic Report No. 778. April 1999.
10-11	Federal Interagency Weed Committee. <u>Pulling Together: National Strategy For Invasive Plant Management</u> . 1999. <http://bluegoose.awr.r9.fws.gov/ficmnewfiles/NatlweedStrategytoc.html>. March 10, 1999.
10-408	Gibbons, M.V., H.L. Gibbons, Jr., and M.D. Sytsma. <u>A Citizen's Manual for Developing Integrated Aquatic Vegetation Management Plans, First Edition</u> . Washington State Department of Ecology. Olympia, Washington. 1994.
100-6	Greer, Glen and R.L. Sheppard. <u>An Economic Evaluation of the Benefits of Research into Biological Control of Clematis Vitalba</u> . Research Report No. 203. Agribusiness & Economics Research Unit. Lincoln College. Canterbury, New Zealand. 1990.
100-5	Grundy, T.P. <u>An Economic Evaluation of Biological Control of Hieracium</u> . Research Report No. 202. Agribusiness & Economics Research Unit. Lincoln College. Canterbury, New Zealand. 1989.
100-7	Grundy, T.P. <u>An Economic Evaluation of Biological Control of Sweet Briar</u> . Report No. 201. Agribusiness & Economics Research Unit. Lincoln College. Canterbury, New Zealand. 1989.
100-8	Hill, Richard L. <u>Biological Control of Gorse: Implications for the Natural Environment and for Primary Production</u> . Entomology Division report No. 6. DSIR, Private Bag, Christchurch. 1986.
10-19	Hirsch, Steven A. and Jay A. Leitch. <u>The Impact of Knapweed on Montana's Economy</u> . Agricultural Economics Report No. 355. Department of Agricultural Economics. North Dakota University. Fargo, ND. July 1996.
10-402	Hosking, J.M.B. Smith and A.W. Sheppard. "The Biology of Australian Weeds." 28. <i>Cytisus scoparius</i> (L.) LINK SUBSP. SCOPARIUS. <u>Plant Protection Quarterly</u> . Vol. 11(3):102-108. 1996.
10-20	<u>Identification of Knapweeds and Starthistles in the Pacific Northwest</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 432. January 1993.
10-93	IMPLAN - State of Oregon. 1997 Version. Minnesota IMPLAN group, Inc. St. Paul, Minnesota.
10-76	Isaacson, Dennis L. <u>Impacts of Scotch Broom</u> . Unpublished Manuscript. Oregon Department of Agriculture. Salem, Oregon.
10-76b	Isaacson, Dennis L. "Impacts of Broom (<i>Cytisus scoparius</i>), in Western North America." In press in: <u>Plant Protection Quarterly</u> . 2000.

Table B.2 (continued)

Study ID	Source
10-41	Lajeunesse, Sherry, Roger Sheley, Celestine Duncan, and Rodney Lym. <u>Leafy Spurge</u> . Pp 249-260. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-200	Lajeunesse, Sherry, Roger Sheley, Rodney Lym, Diana Coodsey, Celestine Duncan, John Lacey, Norman Rees, and Mark Ferrell. <u>Leafy Spurge Biology, Ecology and Management</u> . Montana State University Extension Service. EB 134. July 1995.
10-220	Leafy Spurge News. <u>Leafy Spurge Impact Assessment in Manitoba</u> . Agricultural Experiment Station. NDSU Extension Services. North Dakota State University. Fargo, ND. Volume XXII, Issue 3. September 2000.
10-40	Leistritz, F. Larry, Flint Thompson, and Jay A. Leitch. "Economic Impact of Leafy Spurge (<i>Euphorbia esula</i>) in North Dakota." <u>Weed Science</u> . 1992.
10-67	Leitch, Jay A., F. Larry Leistritz, and Dean A. Bangsund. <u>Economic Effect of Leafy Spurge in the Upper Great Plains: Methods, Models, and Results</u> . Agricultural Resource Economics Report No. 316. March 1994.
10-406	Malecki, R.A., B. Bossey, S.D. Hight, J.J. Drea and J.R. Coulson. "Biological Control of Purple Loosestrife." <u>Bioscience</u> . Vol. 43:680-686. 1993.
10-74	McCaffrey, Joseph P., Gary L. Piper, Robert L. Callihan, and Eric M. Coombs. <u>Collection and Redistribution of Biological Control Agents of Rush Skeletonweed</u> . BUL 782. December 1996.
10-65	Miller, Timothy W. and Robert H. Callihan. <u>Hoary Cress and Related Whitetops</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 359. November 1991.
10-29	Mullin, Barbara, et al. <u>Invasive Plant Species</u> . Issue Paper. Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST). Number 13. February 2000.
10-80	Mullin, Barbara. <u>Purple Loosestrife</u> . Pp 298-307. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-3	Office of Technology Assessment. <u>Harmful Non-indigenous Species in the United States</u> . Washington DC: Office of Technology Assessment. U.S. Congress. 1993.
10-90	Oregon Coastal Zone Management Association. Oregon Ports Economic Contribution Study. June 1997.
100-13	Oregon Department of Agriculture. <u>Lake Lytle - Milfoil Control</u> . Exhibit A. ODA 715 gR. 2000-01-49 Grant Agreement Between Oregon Department of Agriculture and Portland State Universities. 4/6/2000.
10-201	Oregon Department of Agriculture. <u>Noxious Weed Policy and Classification System</u> . Noxious Weed Control Program. 2000.
10-79	Oregon Department of Agriculture. <u>Purple Loosestrife, a Weed From Europe, is Invading Our State</u> . Pamphlet with Mail-in Report Form.
10-47	Oregon Department of Agriculture. <u>Restoration of Estuarine Wetlands in the Pacific Flyway: Preventing the Establishment of Spartina spp. In Oregon</u> . March 29, 2000.
10-210	Oregon State University. Enterprise Budgets. Extension Service. Corvallis, Oregon. Various Years.
10-78	Pacific Northwest Cooperative Extension. <u>Purple Loosestrife (<i>Lythrum salicaria</i> L.)</u> . PNW 380. June 1992.
10-75	Parker, B. G. Miller, and L.C. Burrill. <u>Scotch Broom</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 103. Revised. July 1994.
10-94	Parker, Robert and Larry Burrill. <u>Gorse</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 379. December 1991.
10-49	Pfauth, Mary and Mark Sytsma. <u>Key to West Coast Spartina Species Based on Vegetative Characters</u> . January 1998.
10-2	Pimentel, David, Lori Lach, Rodolfo Zuniga, and Doug Morrison. "Environmental and Economic Costs of Nonindigenous Species in the United States." <u>Bioscience</u> . Vol 50, No 1. January 2000.
10-51	Portland State University. <u>Lake Lytle Milfoil Control Grant Application</u> . Portland State University. January 2000.
10-25	Radtke, Hans D. <u>An Economic Evaluation of Biological Control of Tansy Ragwort</u> . Prepared for Oregon Department of Agriculture. February 1993.
10-77	Radtke, Hans D. and Shannon W. Davis. <u>Economic Considerations of Municipal Watershed Use: To Grow Timber or Water</u> . Prepared for Oregon Natural Resources Council. April 1996.
10-26	Radtke, Hans D. <u>Economic Study of Implementing the Proposed Oregon High Desert Protection Act</u> . Prepared for Oregon Natural Desert Association. Oregon Natural Resources Council. Portland Audubon Society. August 1998.
10-5	Raven PH, Johnson GB. <u>Biology</u> , 3rd ed. St. Louis, MO: Mosby Year Book. 1992.
100-3	Richter, P.O. <u>Biological Control of Insects and Weeds in Oregon</u> . Agricultural Experiment Station. Technical Bulletin No. 90. Oregon State University. Corvallis, Oregon. 1996.
10-404	Roché, C.T. "Costs of Knapweed on Rangelands in Eastern Washington." <u>Knapweed Newsletter</u> . Vol. 2, No. 4:4. Washington State University. Cooperative Extension. Pullman, Washington. 1998.
10-32	Roché, Ben F. Jr. and Cindy Talbott Roché. <u>Diffuse Knapweed</u> . Pp 217-230. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-64	Roché, C. and L.C. Burrill. <u>Squarrose Knapweed</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 422. June 1992.
10-27	Roché, Cindy T. and Ben F. Roché Jr. <u>Purple Starthistle and Iberian Starthistle</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 350. March 1990.
10-38	Roché, Cindy Talbott and Linda M. Wilson. <u>Mediterranean Sage</u> . Pp 261-270. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-35	Roché, Cindy Talbott. <u>Squarrose Knapweed</u> . In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.

Table B.2 (continued)

Study ID	Source
10-63	Roché, Cindy. <u>Mediterranean Sage</u> . Pacific Northwest Extension Publication. PNW 381. November 1991.
10-69	Sell, Randall S., Dean A. Bangsund, and F. Larry Leistritz. "Euphorbia esula: Perceptions by Ranchers and Land Managers." <u>Weed Science</u> . 1999.
10-71	Sell, Randall S., Dean A. Bangsund, and F. Larry Leistritz. <u>Impediments to Controlling Leafy Spurge in the Northern Great Plains</u> . Agricultural Economics Miscellaneous Report No. 185. May 2000.
10-70	Sell, Randall S., Dan J. Nudell, Dean A. Bangsund, F. Larry Leistritz, and Tim Faller. <u>Feasibility of a Sheep Cooperative for Grazing Leafy Spurge</u> . Agricultural Economics Report No. 435-S. January 2000.
10-68	Sell, Randall S., Dean A. Bangsund, F. Larry Leistritz, and , Dan J. Nudell. <u>Perceptions of Leafy Spurge by Public Land Managers, Local Decision Makers, and Ranch Operators</u> . Agricultural Economics Report No. 406-S. September 1998.
10-1	Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-33	Sheley, Roger L., James S. Jacobs, and Michael L. Carpinelli. <u>Spotted Knapweed</u> . Pp 350-361. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-44	Sheley, Roger L., Joseph M. Hudak, and Robert R. Grubb. <u>Rush Skeletonweed</u> . In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-24	Sheley, Roger L., Larry L. Johnson, and James S Jacobs. <u>Yellow Starthistle</u> . Pp 261-270. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-37	Sheley, Roger, and Jack Stevens. <u>Whitetop</u> . Pp 401-407. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
10-28	Smith, H. Arlen, Wayne S. Johnson, J. Scott Shonkwiler, and Sherm R. Swanson. "The Implications of Variable or Constant Expansion Rates in Invasive Weed Infestations." <u>Weed Science</u> . Vol. 47. January-February 1999.
10-403	The Nature Conservancy. <u>Element Stewardship Abstract: Scotch, French and Spanish brooms</u> . TNC 1815 N. Lynn St., Arlington, VA. 1995.
10-6	The Nature Conservancy. <u>America's Least Wanted: Alien Species Invasions of U.S. Ecosystems</u> . Arlington, VA. 1996.
10-50	The Research Group. <u>Economic Impacts From Potential Management Plan Actions</u> . Lower Columbia River Estuary Program. April 1999.
10-407	Thompson, L.Q., R.L. Stuckey and E.B. Thompson. <u>Spread, Impact and Control of Purple Loosestrife (<i>Lythrum salicaria</i>) in North American Wetlands</u> . U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fish and Wildlife Research 2. 1987.
10-4	U.S. Bureau of the Census. <u>Statistical Abstract of the United States 1996, 200th ed.</u> Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1998.
10-34	Whitson, Tom D. Russian. <u>Knapweed</u> . Pp 315-322. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.
100-11	Wilcove DS, Rothstein D, Dubow J, Phillips A, Losos E. "Quantifying Threats to Imperiled Species in the United States." <u>Bioscience</u> . Vol. 48: 607-615. 1998.
10-96	Wilson, M. Linda and Robert H. Callihan. <u>Meadow and Orange Hawkweed</u> . Pp 238-248. In: Sheley, Roger L. and Janet K. Petroff (eds.). <u>Biology and Management of Noxious Rangeland Weeds</u> . Oregon State University Press. Corvallis, Oregon. 1999.

APPENDIX C

Economic Evaluation Models

Definitions

- Sales = Total Output Affected.
- Personal Income = Personal Income (direct, indirect, and induced) Affected.
- Jobs = Estimated full time equivalent jobs, at \$25,000 per year, affected.
- Economic Value = Total loss to society by affected lands. This may be value of goods produced for the market or for non-traded goods.

Table C.1
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 1 - Tansy Ragwort	Date: December 26, 2000	Agricultural Production												Economic Impacts			
		Cattle			Cattle Losses			Ag			Timber Production			Wildlife			
Acres Affected		Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value		
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																Jobs at \$25,000 Per FTE	Economic Value
1. Cattle	% of Sales Forgone																
	Sales per Gross Acre																
	Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient																
2. Agriculture Production	Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																
	Est. Net Affected Acres																
	Est. at Net Acres per ALU																
	AULs																
	Sales per ALU																
	Grazing Fee per ALU																
	Ag. Production Coefficient																
	% of Ag. Production Income)																
	% of Forgone production (sales)																
	Bushels per Acre																
	Sales per Bushel																
	Sales per Acre																
	Oyster Production (approximate acres)																
	Percent of Oyster Production Affected																
	Oyster Production per Acre																
3. Timber	Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																
	Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																
	Sales at per MBF																
	Est. Timber Acres Affected																
	Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient																
	Rent																
4. Wildlife	Grazing Fee per ALU																
	Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																
	Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																
	Est. at Net Acres per ALU																
	AULs																
	Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																
	Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre																
	Wildlife View Value Per Day																
	Impacts Per Day																
	Ratio of Value to Imp.																
	Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																
	Boat Days Per Acre																
	Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																
	Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																
Total Estimated Current Impact	3,260,000	163,000	\$4,233,618	\$2,286,154	\$4,233,618	\$2,239,435	\$78,880	\$592,833	\$391,270	\$378,797	\$250,006	\$322,870	\$7,537,796	\$4,186,865	167	\$5,826,638	
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																	
Potential Spreading Factor																	
Total Estimated Potential Impact																	
	--	391,200															
Notes: 1. Cattle losses - sales - Sales per acre document is 1025, 2% of 1999 Western Cow Herd Production plus Horses.																	
2. Economic Impact - Sales: Potential to spread in Eastern Oregon. Cow herd is 2.4 times of W. Oregon herd.																	
Source: Study.																	

Table C.3
Economic Evaluation Models

Economic Evaluation Models											Jobs at \$25,000 Per FTE	
Species: 3 - Distaff Thistle	Agricultural Production										Jobs at \$25,000 Per FTE	
	Component A					Component B						
	Acres Affected	Personal Economic Value	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Economic Value	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value		
	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income		Sales	Income	Sales	Income	Value		
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS												
1. Cattle												
% Sales Forgone												
Sales per Gross Acre												
Range Cattle OR IO Coefficient												
2. Agriculture Production												
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres												
Est. Net Affected Acres												
Est. at Net Acres per AUM												
AUMs												
Sales per AUM												
Grazing Fee per AUM												
Ag. Production Coefficient												
% Ag. Production (Income)												
% of Forgone production (Sales)												
Bushels per Acre												
Sales per Bushel												
Sales per Acre												
Oyster Production (approximate, acres)												
Percent of Oyster Production Affected												
Oyster Production Affected												
Oyster Production per Acre												
3. Timber												
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres												
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre												
Sales at per MBF												
Est. Timber Acres Affected												
Timber Industry MP/AN coefficient												
Rent												
4. Wildlife												
Grazing Fee per AUM												
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)												
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres												
Est. at Net Acres per AUM												
AUMs												
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres												
Restoring of Wetlands: \$ per Acre												
Wildlife View Value Per Day												
Impacts Per Day												
Ratio of Value to Imp.												
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day												
Boat Days Per Acre												
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day												
Bay and Lake User per Boat Day												
Total Estimated Current Impact	2,174	10										
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING												
Potential Spreading Factor												
Total Estimated Potential Impact	---	2,500,000										
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
	\$7,842,581	\$4,247,398									\$6,150,328	

Notes: 1. Cattle Losses-Sales: Similar to yellow starthistle present status exponential threat (10-28)
 2. Economic Impacts-Sales: Exponential expansion possibility. Evaluated at Yellow Starthistle acres. But at 4 acres per AUM. This species may cover both range and meadows. 7.2 / 4 = 1.8 times Yellow Starthistle
 Source: Study

Table C.4
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 4 - Scorch Burn	Date: December 26, 2000	Agricultural Production												Wildlife						Economic Impacts									
		Cattle Losses			Component A			Component B			Timber Production			Personal Income			Sales			Personal Income			Sales						
		Gross	Acres Affected	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value				
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																													
1. Cattle																													
% of Sales Forgone																													
Sales per Gross Acre																													
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient																													
2. Agriculture Production																													
Est. % of Net of Affected Acres																													
Est. Net Affected Acres																													
Est. at Net Acres per ALU																													
ALUs																													
Sales per ALU																													
Grazing Fee per ALU																													
Ag. Production Coefficient																													
% of Ag. Production Income)																													
% of forgone production (sales)																													
Bushels per Acre																													
Sales per Bushel																													
Oyster Production (approximate acres)																													
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																													
Oyster Production per Acre																													
3. Timber																													
Est. % of Net of Affected Acres																													
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																													
Sales at per MBF																													
Est. Timber Acres Affected																													
Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient																													
Rent																													
4. Wildlife																													
Grazing Fee per ALU																													
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																													
Est. % of Net of Affected Acres																													
Est. at Net Acres per ALU																													
ALUs																													
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																													
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre																													
Impacts Per Day																													
Ratio of Value to Imp.																													
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																													
Boat Days Per Acre																													
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																													
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																													
Total Estimated Current Impact		16,000,000		1,500,000		\$9,952,500		\$5,373,750		\$3,750,000		\$46,875,000		\$41,250,000		\$7,500,000		\$1,616,250		\$2,971,200		\$58,443,750		\$47,690,475		1,908		\$14,221,200	
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																													
Potential Spreading Factor																													
Total Estimated Potential Impact																													

Notes: 1. Timber Production-Sales: Assumes tree growing ability reduced by 50%.

Source: Study.

Table C.5
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 5 - Knapweeds	Date: December 26, 2000	Agricultural Production												Economic Impacts				
		Cattle Losses			Component A			Component B			Timber Production			Wildlife		Personal Income		Economic Value
		Acre's Affected	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																		
1. Cattle																		
% of Sales Forgone																		
Sales per Gross Acre																		
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient																		
2. Agriculture Production																		
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																		
Est. Net Affected Acres																		
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																		
AUMs																		
Sales per AUM																		
Grazing Fee per AUM																		
Ag. Production Coefficient																		
% of Ag. Production (income)																		
% of forgone production (sales)																		
Bushels per Acre																		
Sales per Bushel																		
Sales per Acre																		
Oyster Production (approximate acres)																		
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																		
Oyster Production per Acre																		
3. Timber																		
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																		
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																		
Sales at per MBF																		
Est. Timber Acres Affected																		
Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient																		
Rent																		
4. Wildlife																		
Grazing Fee per AUM																		
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																		
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																		
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																		
AUMs																		
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																		
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre																		
Wildlife View Value Per Day																		
Impacts Per Day																		
Ratio of Value to Imp.																		
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																		
Boat Days Per Acre																		
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																		
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																		
Total Estimated Current Impact																		
3,622,380	1,815,591	\$6,600,792	\$2,564,030	\$2,487,111														
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																		
Potential Spreading Factor																		
Total Estimated Potential Impact																		
Source: Study																		

\$1,071,945 \$707,484 \$3,596,323 \$2,487,111 \$7,672,737 \$4,271,514 171 \$6,083,434

Table C.6
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 6 - Gorse	Date: December 26, 2000	Economic Impacts											
		Agricultural Production				Component A				Component B			
		Acres Affected	Cattle Losses		Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Wildlife Sales	
		Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income								
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS													
1. Cattle													
% of Sales Forgone													
Sales per Gross Acre													
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient													
2. Agriculture Production													
Est. at % of Net Affected Acres													
Est. Net Affected Acres													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM													
AUMs													
Sales per AUM													
Grazing Fee per AUM													
Ag. Production Coefficient													
% of Ag. Production Income)													
% of forgone production (sales)													
Bushels per Acre													
Sales per Bushel													
Oyster Production (approximate acres)													
Percent of Oyster Production Affected													
Oyster Production per Acre													
3. Timber													
Est. at % of Net Affected Acres													
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre													
Sales at per MBF													
Est. Timber Acres Affected													
Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient													
Rent													
4. Wildlife													
Grazing Fee per AUM													
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)													
Est. at % of Net Affected Acres													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM													
AUMs													
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres													
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre													
Wildlife View Value Per Day													
Impacts Per Day													
Ratio of Value to Imp.													
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day													
Boat Days Per Acre													
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day													
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day													
Total Estimated Current Impact	300,000	31,354		\$208,034	\$12,326	\$76,385	\$979,813	\$62,235	\$156,770	\$33,784	\$22,297	\$62,106	\$1,221,630
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING													
Potential Spreading Factor													
Total Estimated Potential Impact													

Notes: 1. Timber Production-Sales: Assumes tree growing ability reduced by 50%.

Source: Study.

Table C.7
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 7 - Leafy Spurge									Economic Impacts						
Date: December 26, 2000	Acres Affected			Cattle Losses			Timber Production			Wildlife			Jobs at \$25,000 Per FTE		
	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS															
1. Cattle															
% of Sales Forgone															
Sales per Gross Acre															
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient															
2. Agriculture Production															
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres															
Est. Net Affected Acres															
Est. at Net Acres per AUM															
AUMs															
Sales per AUM															
Grazing Fee per AUM															
Ag. Production Coefficient															
% of Ag. Production (Income)															
% of Forgone production (sales)															
Bushels per Acre															
Sales per Bushel															
Sales per Acre															
Oyster Production (approximate; acres)															
Percent of Oyster Production Affected															
Oyster Production Affected															
Oyster Production per Acre															
3. Timber															
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres															
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre															
Sales at per MBF															
Est. Timber Acres Affected															
Timber Industry IMPACT coefficient															
Rent															
4. Wildlife															
Grazing Fee per AUM															
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)															
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres															
Est. at Net Acres per AUM															
AUMs															
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres															
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre															
Wildlife View Value Per Day															
Impacts Per Day															
Ratio of Value to Imp.															
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day															
Boat Days Per Acre															
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day															
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day															
Total Estimated Current Impact	12,700	7,324	\$1,651	\$392	\$1,651	\$74,761	\$40,367	\$28,169	\$12,141	\$8,013	\$14,507	\$88,553	\$49,271	2	\$4,328
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING															
Potential Spreading Factor															
Total Estimated Potential Impact															
	3,600,000	---													

Notes: 1. Cattle Losses-Sales: Estimated at 10% Tansy Ragwort Losses of \$0.13 per gross acre

2. Cattle Losses-Personal Income: Rangeland cattle Oregon I/O coefficient X-54

3. Between 1950 and 2000, the infestation in parts of the mountain west grew from 100,000 acres to 2,000,000 acres; a 20 fold increase.

Source: Study.

Table C.8
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 8 - Rush Skeletonweed	Agricultural Production											Wildlife				Economic Impacts					
	Acres Affected		Cattle Losses			Cattle			Ag		Timber Production		Personal Income		Sales		Personal Income		Economic Value		Jobs at \$25,000 Per FTE
	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																					
1. Cattle																					
% of Sales Forgone																					
Sales per Gross Acre																					
Range Cattle O/I/O Coefficient																					
2. Agriculture Production																					
Est. % of Net of Affected Acres																					
Est. Net Affected Acres																					
A/UMs																					
Sales per AUM																					
Grazing Fee per AUM																					
Ag. Production Coefficient																					
% of Ag. Production Income)																					
% of forgone production (sales)																					
Bushels per Acre																					
Sales per Bushel																					
Sales per Acre																					
Oyster Production (approximate acres)																					
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																					
Oyster Production per Acre																					
3. Timber																					
Est. % of Net of Affected Acres																					
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																					
Sales at per MBF																					
Est. Timber Acres Affected																					
Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient																					
Rent																					
4. Wildlife																					
Grazing Fee per AUM																					
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																					
Est. % of Net of Affected Acres																					
Est. % Net Acres per AUM																					
A/UMs																					
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																					
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre																					
Wildlife View Value Per Day																					
Impacts Per Day																					
Ratio of Value to Imp.																					
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																					
Boat Days Per Acre																					
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																					
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																					
Total Estimated Current Impact																					
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																					
Potential Spreading Factor																					
Total Estimated Potential Impact																					

Source: Study

Table C.9
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 9 - Purple Loosestrife	Date: December 26, 2000	Economic Impacts											
		Agricultural Production				Component A				Component B			
	Acres Affected	Cattle Losses		Personal Income		Economic Value		Sales		Personal Income		Economic Value	
	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Economic Value
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS													
1. Cattle													
% of Sales Forgone													
Sales per Gross Acre													
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient													
2. Agriculture Production													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres													
Est. Net Affected Acres													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM													
AUMs													
Sales per AUM													
Grazing Fee per AUM													
Ag. Production Coefficient													
% of Ag. Production Income)													
% of forgone production (sales)													
Bushels per Acre													
Sales per Bushel													
Sales per Acre													
Oyster Production (approximate acres)													
Percent of Oyster Production Affected													
Oyster Production per Acre													
3. Timber													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres													
Growth of NBF per Year per Acre													
Sales at per NBF													
Est. Timber Acres Affected													
Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient													
Rent													
4. Wildlife													
Grazing Fee per AUM													
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM													
AUMs													
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres													
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre													
Wildlife View Value Per Day													
Impacts Per Day													
Ratio of Value to Imp.													
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day													
Boat Days Per Acre													
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day													
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day													
Total Estimated Current Impact	3,646	2,230											
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING													
Potential Spreading Factor													
Total Estimated Potential Impact	--	--											

Source: Study

Table C.10
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 10 - White Top and Perennial Pepperweed	Date: December 26, 2000	Agricultural Production										Timber Production						Wildlife			Economic Impacts		
		Acres Affected		Cattle Losses		Component A		Component B		Personal Economic Value		Sales		Sales		Personal Income		Sales		Personal Income		Jobs at \$25,000 Per FTE	
		Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value		
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																							
1. Cattle																							
% of Sales Forgone																							
Sales per Gross Acre																							
Range Cattle OI/O Coefficient																							
2. Agriculture Production																							
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																							
Est. Net Affected Acres																							
AUMs																							
Sales per AUM																							
Grazing Fee per AUM																							
Ag. Production Coefficient																							
% of Ag. Production Income)																							
% of forgone production (sales)																							
Bushels per Bushel																							
Sales per Bushel																							
Sales per Acre																							
Oyster Production (approximate acres)																							
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																							
Oyster Production per Acre																							
3. Timber																							
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																							
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																							
Sales at per MBF																							
Est. Timber Acres Affected																							
Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient																							
Rent																							
4. Wildlife																							
Grazing Fee per AUM																							
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																							
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																							
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																							
AUMs																							
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																							
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre																							
Impacts Per Day																							
Ratio of Value to Imp.																							
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																							
Boat Days Per Acre																							
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																							
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																							
Total Estimated Current Impact	2,322,167	1,184,326	\$301,884	\$163,018	\$301,884	\$14,930,206	\$8,061,411	\$5,625,549	\$3,143,201	\$1,697,139	\$1,184,326	\$2,562,223	\$1,684,467	\$2,345,913	\$20,927,544	\$11,606,035	\$464	\$9,457,672					
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																							
Potential Spreading Factor																							
Total Estimated Potential Impact																							

Notes: 1. Cattle Losses-Sales: Estimated at a 10% Tansy Ragwort Losses or \$0.13 per gross acre
 2. Cattle Losses-Personal Income: Range and cattle Oregon I/O coefficient 0.54
 3. 95% pasture and 5% meadow Hay: Meadow Hay is evaluated at 0.5 acres per AUM.
 Source: Study.

Table C.11
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 11 - Scotch Thistle	Date: December 26, 2000	Agricultural Production												Timber Production				Wildlife				Economic Impacts							
		Cattle Losses				Component A				Component B				Personal Income		Economic Value		Sales		Personal Income		Economic Value		Sales		Personal Income		Economic Value	
		Acres Affected	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Income	Value	Sales	Income	Value	Sales	Income	Value	Sales	Income	Value	Sales	Income	Value				
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																													
1. Cattle																													
% Sales Forgone																													
Range Cattle OR/IO Coefficient																													
2. Agriculture Production																													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																													
Est. Net Affected Acres																													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																													
AUMs																													
Sales per AUM																													
Grazing Fee per AUM																													
Ag. Production Coefficient																													
% Ag. Production (Income)																													
% of Forgone production (Sales)																													
Bushels per Acre																													
Sales per Bushel																													
Sales per Acre																													
Oyster Production (approximate, acres)																													
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																													
Oyster Production Affected																													
Oyster Production per Acre																													
3. Timber																													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																													
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																													
Sales at per MBF																													
Est. Timber Acres Affected																													
Timber Industry MP/AN coefficient																													
Rent																													
4. Wildlife																													
Grazing Fee per AUM																													
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																													
AUMs																													
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																													
Restoring of Wetlands: \$ per Acre																													
Wildlife View Value per Day																													
Impacts Per Day																													
Ratio of Value to Imp.																													
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																													
Boat Days Per Acre																													
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																													
Bay and Lake User per Boat Day																													
Total Estimated Current Impact	1,011,134	526,800	\$131,447	\$70,982	\$131,447	\$1,915,243	\$1,034,116	\$721,644																					
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																													
Potential Spreading Factor																													
Total Estimated Potential Impact																													

Notes: 1. Cattle Losses-Sales: Estimated at 10% Tansy Ragwort Losses or \$0.13 per gross acre

2. Cattle Losses-Personal Income: Rangeland cattle Oregon I/O coefficient 0.54

Source: Study

Table C.12
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 12 - Mediterranean Sage										Economic Impacts															
Date: December 26, 2000	Agricultural Production			Cattle Losses			Component A			Timber Production			Wildlife			Personal Economic Income			Jobs at \$25,000 Per FTE			Economic Value			
	Acres Affected	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																									
1. Cattle																									
% of Sales Forgone																									
Sales per Gross Acre																									
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient																									
2. Agriculture Production																									
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																									
Est. Net Affected Acres																									
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																									
AUMs																									
Sales per AUM																									
Grazing Fee per AUM																									
Ag. Production Coefficient																									
% of Ag. Production (Income)																									
% of Forgone production (sales)																									
Bushels per Acre																									
Sales per Bushel																									
Sales per Acre																									
Oyster Production (approximate; acres)																									
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																									
Oyster Production Affected																									
Oyster Production per Acre																									
3. Timber																									
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																									
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																									
Sales at per MBF																									
Est. Timber Acres Affected																									
Timber Industry IMPLAN coefficient																									
Rent																									
4. Wildlife																									
Grazing Fee per AUM																									
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																									
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																									
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																									
AUMs																									
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																									
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre																									
Wildlife View Value Per Day																									
Impacts Per Day																									
Ratio of Value to Imp.																									
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																									
Boat Days Per Acre																									
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																									
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																									
Total Estimated Current Impact	1,275,077	250,000									\$9,05,904	\$490,753	\$342,466												
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																									
Potential Spreading Factor																									
Total Estimated Potential Impact																									
Source: Study.																									

Table C.13
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 13 - Purple Starthistle	Date: December 26, 2000	Economic Impacts											
		Agricultural Production				Component A				Component B			
		Acres Affected	Cattle Losses	Personal Income	Economic Value	Personal Income	Economic Value	Personal Income	Economic Value	Timber Production	Personal Economic Income	Personal Economic Income	Wildlife Personal Income
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS		Gross	Net	Sales		Sales		Sales		Personal Income	Sales	Sales	Personal Income
1. Cattle													
% of Sales Forgone													
Sales per Gross Acre													
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient													
2. Agriculture Production													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres													
Est. Net Affected Acres													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM													
AUMs													
Sales per AUM													
Grazing Fee per AUM													
Ag. Production Coefficient													
% of Ag. Production Income)													
% of forgone production (sales)													
Bushels per Acre													
Sales per Bushel													
Sales per Acre													
Oyster Production (approximate acres)													
Percent of Oyster Production Affected													
Oyster Production per Acre													
3. Timber													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres													
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre													
Sales at per MBF													
Est. Timber Acres Affected													
Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient													
Rent													
4. Wildlife													
Grazing Fee per AUM													
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)													
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres													
Est. at Net Acres per AUM													
AUMs													
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres													
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre													
Wildlife View Value Per Day													
Impacts Per Day													
Ratio of Value to Imp.													
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day													
Boat Days Per Acre													
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day													
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day													
Total Estimated Current Impact	80	1								N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING													
Potential Spreading Factor													
Total Estimated Potential Impact	--	2,000,000								\$15,285,162	\$8,494,797	340	\$12,300,655

Notes: 1. Cattle Losses-Sales: Similar to yellow starthistle present status exponential threat (10-28)
 2. Economic Impact-Sales: Exponential expansion possibility. Evaluated at Yellow Starthistle acres. But at 2 acres per AUM. This species may cover both range and meadows. 7.2 / 2 = 3.6 times Yellow Starthistle.
 Source: Study.

Table C.14
Economic Evaluation Models

Agricultural Production										Timber Production							Wildlife		
Species:	Cattle Losses			Component A			Personal Economic Income			Sales			Personal Economic Income			Jobs at			
	Gross	Acre Affected	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Per FTE	Value		
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																	\$25,000	Economic Value	
1. Cattle																			
% of Sales Forgone																			
Sales per Gross Acre																			
Range Cattle OR/IO Coefficient																			
2. Agriculture Production																			
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																			
Est. Net Affected Acres																			
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																			
AUMs																			
Sales per AUM																			
Grazing Fee per AUM																			
Ag. Production Coefficient																			
% of Ag. Production (Income)																			
% of Forgone production (sales)																			
Bushels per Acre																			
Sales per Bushel																			
Sales per Acre																			
Oyster Production (approximate; acres)																			
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																			
Oyster Production Affected																			
3. Timber																			
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																			
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																			
Sales at per MBF																			
Est. Timber Acres Affected																			
Timber Industry IMPLAN coefficient																			
Rent																			
4. Wildlife																			
Grazing Fee per AUM																			
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																			
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																			
Est. at Net Acres per AUM																			
AUMs																			
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																			
Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre																			
Wildlife View Value Per Day																			
Impacts Per Day																			
Ratio of Value to Imp.																			
Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day																			
Boat Days Per Acre																			
Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day																			
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																			
Total Estimated Current Impact																			
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																			
Potential Spreading Factor																			
Total Estimated Potential Impact																			

Notes: 1. Economic Impact Sales: An infestation with 1,500,000 net acres is possible. Based on infestation in neighboring states.

2. 95% pasture and 5% meadow Hay. Meadow Hay is evaluated at 0.5 acres per AUM.

Source: Study.

Table C.15
Economic Evaluation Models

Species:	15 - Spartina	Agricultural Production						Wildlife (Potential)						Economic Impacts		
		Cattle Losses			Component A (Oyster) Potential			Timber Production			Personal Economic Value			Jobs at \$25,000+ Value		
Date:	December 26, 2000	Acres Affected	Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Sales	Personal Income	Per FTE	Economic Value
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																
1. Cattle		% of Sales Forgone														
		Sales per Gross Acre														
		Range Cattle OR/I/O Coefficient														
2. Agriculture Production																
		Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres														
		Est. Net Affected Acres														
		Est. at Net Acres per ALU														
		AULs														
		Sales per ALU														
		Grazing Fee per ALU														
		Ag. Production Coefficient														
		% of Ag. Production Income)														
		% of forgone production (sales)														
		Bushels per Acre														
		Sales per Bushel														
		Sales per Acre														
		Oyster Production (approximate, acres)														
		Percent of Oyster Production Affected														
		Oyster Production per Acre														
3. Timber																
		Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres														
		Growth of MBF per Year per Acre														
		Sales at per MBF														
		Est. Timber Acres Affected														
		Timber Industry IMP/LAN coefficient														
		Rent														
4. Wildlife																
		Grazing Fee per ALU														
		Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)														
		Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres														
		Est. at Net Acres per ALU														
		AULs														
		Est. Wildlife Affected Acres														
		Restoring of Wetlands - \$ per Acre														
		Wildlife View Value Per Day														
		Impacts Per Day														
		Ratio of Value to Imp.														
		Bay and Lake Exp. per Boat Day														
		Boat Days Per Acre														
		Bay and Lake Income Imp. per Boat Day														
		Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day														
Total Estimated Current Impact		5	0													
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																
Potential Spreading Factor																
Total Estimated Potential Impact		64,000	12,800													
		\$770,000	\$1,139,600													

Notes: 1. Economic Impact-Sales: In Washington infestations have grown from 4-5 acres in 1945 to 3,600 acres in 1999. The potential net infestation in Oregon is estimated to be 20 percent of the total gross acre potential infestation. Changes from mudflats to salt marshes.

2. At present there are about 7,000 acres in oyster production in Oregon. This includes leased state, county, and port leased lands. Average production is about \$220 per acre per year for these lands. The potential is for 50 percent of these lands to be infested by spartina (i.e. 3,500 acres). The base rate on state lands is \$40 per acre. This is used as the economic value per acre for oyster production. The sales per acre are \$220 per acre. Personal income is 1.48 times the sales value.

Source: Study.

Table C.16
Economic Evaluation Models

Species: 16 - Brazilian Eelodea	Date: December 26, 2000	Agricultural Production									Wildlife (Potential)						Economic Impacts		
		Cattle Losses			Component A			Timber Production			Personal Income			Sales			Personal Income		
		Gross	Net	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	Sales	Personal Income	Economic Value	
A: CURRENT CONDITIONS																			
1. Cattle																			
% of Sales Forgone																			
Sales per Gross Acre																			
Range Cattle OR I/O Coefficient																			
2. Agriculture Production																			
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																			
Est. Net Affected Acres																			
AUMs																			
Sales per AUM																			
Grazing Fee per AUM																			
Ag. Production Coefficient																			
% of Ag. Production (Income)																			
Bushels per Acre																			
Sales per Bushel																			
Sales per Acre																			
Oyster Production (approximate; acres)																			
Percent of Oyster Production Affected																			
Oyster Production Affected																			
Oyster Production per Acre																			
3. Timber																			
Est. % of Net of Affected Acres																			
Growth of MBF per Year per Acre																			
Sales at per MBF																			
Est. Timber Acres Affected																			
Timber Industry IMPACT coefficient																			
Rent																			
4. Wildlife																			
Grazing Fee per AUM																			
Recreation Coefficient (% of sales)																			
Est. at % of Net of Affected Acres																			
Est. Net Acres per AUM																			
AUMs																			
Est. Wildlife Affected Acres																			
Restoring of Wetlands \$ per Acre																			
Wildlife View Value Per Day																			
Impacts Per Day																			
Rainin of Value to imp.																			
Bay and Lake Epx. per Boat Day																			
Boat Days Per Acre																			
Bay and Lake Income imp. per Boat Day																			
Bay and Lake Use per Boat Day																			
Total Estimated Current Impact		90,000	9,074																
B: POTENTIAL SPREADING																			
Potential Spreading Factor																			
Total Estimated Potential Impact																			

Notes: 1. Economic Impact-Sales: Oregon lake (Lake Lyle) is approximately 200 acres. It has lost 3000 boating days due to infestation. The potential is for 60 additional lakes to be infested to the same degree at a loss of 15 boating days per acre.
Source: Study.