



CHANGE THE FORECAST FOR WILDLIFE
SOLUTIONS TO GLOBAL WARMING

Wildlife Conservation Funding: An Essential Part of Global Warming Policy

Scientists have been pointing to wildlife as providing hard evidence that human activities are disrupting the natural climate cycle. As conveyed by the Bush Administration to Congress in 2004, "Analyses based on a large number of studies of plants and animals across a wide range of natural systems worldwide have found that many species have shifted their own geographic ranges or changed temperature-sensitive behaviors-such as migration, flowering, or egg-laying, in ways consistent with reacting to global warming."

But for families that have shared wildlife experiences across generations, wildlife have been providing early warnings for years. As far back as 1950 Rachel Carson wrote that "the world is warming up." Pointing to "birds appearing in far northern lands for the first time in our records," melting glaciers and other signs in nature, she warned that "the pendulum is swinging."

Scientists fear that, without a concerted strategy to confront global warming, wildlife will face a mounting threat as the pace of climate changes continues to accelerate in the coming decades. The threat to some wildlife

populations in the United States is particularly acute due to the limited ability to adapt as suitable habitat has dwindled in the face of development, invasive species and other threats.

In November 2004, The Wildlife Society published "Global Climate Change and Wildlife in North

America," a comprehensive assessment of global warming's likely consequences for North American wildlife. The report concludes that "the effects of global climate change and variability on wildlife simply cannot be ignored."

The report stresses the importance of improving the resiliency of wildlife to respond to climate change by improving wildlife habitat and maintaining healthy, connected, genetically diverse populations. According to the report, "healthier or more robust species and habitats should be better able to adapt to climate change as an additional stress."

A permanent, stable and new funding source to enhance annual appropriations is essential to help the

Global warming is already adding new wildlife management burdens on states. It is essential that Congress include guaranteed funding for State Wildlife Grants as part of efforts to address the issue.

The two leading proposals in Congress to reduce global warming pollution each contain provisions that would provide more than \$500 million annually to support State Wildlife Grants.



TEAMING WITH WILDLIFE
a natural investment

state agencies manage fish and wildlife as they are affected by global warming, and help continue the long tradition of fish and wildlife-associated recreation, which supports millions of jobs across the country. The FY05 federal appropriation of \$61 million to the states through the State Wildlife Grants program is far short of state needs to conserve our rich fish and wildlife heritage.

For years, sportsmen have been paying license fees to help sustain wildlife populations. But industrial pollution is threatening to undermine our conservation success throughout the nation. Polluters should contribute their fair share to sustaining wildlife populations.

	Jobs Created By Wildlife Recreation	FY05 State Wildlife Grants (millions)	Potential Annual Funding from Global Warming Policy (millions)
Alabama	53,817	\$0.9	\$7.5
Alaska	28,583	\$3.1	\$24.2
Arizona	31,654	\$1.4	\$11.5
Arkansas	25,609	\$0.7	\$5.7
California	113,422	\$3.1	\$24.2
Colorado	41,109	\$1.3	\$10.1
Connecticut	7,983	\$0.6	\$4.8
Delaware	2,255	\$0.6	\$4.8
Florida	122,518	\$2.6	\$20.5
Georgia	33,458	\$1.5	\$12.0
Hawaii	4,873	\$0.6	\$4.8
Idaho	19,908	\$0.7	\$5.7
Illinois	34,492	\$2.1	\$16.5
Indiana	37,839	\$1.1	\$8.5
Iowa	16,782	\$0.8	\$6.1
Kansas	13,559	\$0.9	\$7.1
Kentucky	40,285	\$0.8	\$6.5
Louisiana	29,306	\$0.9	\$7.4
Maine	23,390	\$0.6	\$4.8
Maryland	38,304	\$0.8	\$6.3
Massachusetts	19,134	\$0.9	\$7.4
Michigan	50,795	\$1.8	\$13.9
Minnesota	53,570	\$1.2	\$9.7
Mississippi	18,732	\$0.7	\$5.6
Missouri	34,261	\$1.2	\$9.7
Montana	22,923	\$1.1	\$8.5
Nebraska	12,051	\$0.7	\$5.9
Nevada	9,415	\$1.0	\$7.9
New Hampshire	12,791	\$0.6	\$4.8
New Jersey	35,305	\$1.2	\$9.6
New Mexico	23,052	\$1.0	\$8.2
New York	60,505	\$2.9	\$23.3
North Carolina	55,500	\$1.5	\$11.5
North Dakota	6,158	\$0.6	\$4.8
Ohio	48,730	\$1.8	\$14.6
Oklahoma	24,299	\$0.9	\$7.4
Oregon	42,590	\$1.1	\$8.7
Pennsylvania	56,113	\$2.0	\$15.8
Rhode Island	4,809	\$0.6	\$4.8
South Carolina	27,613	\$0.8	\$6.0
South Dakota	12,716	\$0.6	\$4.8
Tennessee	35,875	\$1.1	\$8.4
Texas	101,401	\$3.1	\$24.2
Utah	33,805	\$0.9	\$6.8
Vermont	9,833	\$0.6	\$4.8
Virginia	43,014	\$1.2	\$9.9
Washington	45,205	\$1.3	\$10.0
West Virginia	9,802	\$0.6	\$4.8
Wisconsin	79,450	\$1.1	\$8.8
Wyoming	13,064	\$0.6	\$4.8
United States	2,671,247	\$61.0	\$500.0*

* Expected revenue between \$500 million-\$1.8 billion

Where Does the Wildlife Conservation Funding Come From?

* The leading proposals in Congress for controlling global warming pollution create a new system of global warming pollution permits for major emitters. Every year, the government would issue a certain number of global warming pollution permits, each of which allows industry to emit one ton of carbon dioxide (or comparable amounts of other greenhouse gases). At the end of the year, each industrial source must hold sufficient permits to cover its emissions for the year.

* Companies are allowed to buy and sell permits from each other (referred to as "emissions trading"). Sources that increase their pollution levels will need to buy excess pollution permits from the government or from other companies. Sources that curb their pollution may be in a position to make a profit by selling excess pollution permits to others.

* The bulk of the pollution permits would be given for free to industry. However, each year, the federal government would hold back a limited number of global warming pollution permits and auction them off to emitters. The proposals set aside a portion of the proceeds from the sale of these permits to fund the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program of the Pittman-Robertson Act. States could use the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Program money to develop restoration and adaptation strategies to make ecosystems stronger and to help wildlife adapt to global warming.

Jeremy Symons

Director, Global Warming Campaign
202-939-3311
symons@nwf.org

Sarah Gannon Nagle

Manager, State Wildlife Action Project
202-797-6891
gannonnagles@nwf.org