Towards cost-effective restoration: Scaling up restoration in ecosystems degraded by nonnative invasive grass and ungulates

By Kelly B. Powell, Lisa M. Ellsworth, Creighton M. Litton, Kirsten L.L. Oleson, and Selita A. Ammondt

Abstract

Nonnative, invasive grasses displace native plant communities and challenge ecological restoration globally. Ecological monitoring of restoration is typically short-term and rarely re-assessed to determine if initial findings are indicative of multi-year outcomes, and the economic costs of restoration are seldom quantified. To address these knowledge gaps, we resampled a restoration experiment in an invasive *Megathyrsus maximus*-dominated ecosystem in Hawaii to compare success of restoration treatments at eight and 36 months. We calculated the cost to establish and maintain (for three years) experimental field trials (0.13 ha) and management-scale (1 ha and 10 ha) units, estimated 30-year costs for management-scale units, and determined key drivers of costs. Survival of native outplant species did not differ between eight- (56%) and 36-month (51%) monitoring periods, and *M. maximus* cover was lower in restoration treatments than control plots at both time periods. The cost to establish and maintain the experimental trial was \$14,299 (Present Value at 2% annual discount rate, 2015 USD; \$109,993 ha^{-1}). Scaling up restoration to 1 and 10 ha units produced economies of scale with three-year costs declining with increasing area (\$149,918 ha^{-1} for 1 ha; \$124,139 ha^{-1} for 10 ha). The total Present Value to restore and maintain a 1 ha site for 30-years ranged from \$153,195 to \$302,917 ha^{-1}, varying primarily based on labor and seedling costs. This study demonstrates that early restoration results can be indicative of longer-term results, establishment expenses drive long-term costs, and restoration efforts are most cost-effective when maintained over large spatial scales and long time periods. Importantly, this study allows other projects in the region to estimate restoration costs based on site-specific criteria.

*Corresponding Author E-mail: litton@hawaii.edu

Introduction

Non-native invasive species are a major challenge to ecological restoration. Invasive species can alter disturbance regimes (Veldman *et al.* 2009), modify biotic interactions (Vitousek 1990, Mitchel *et al.* 2006), and cause substantial loss of native biodiversity (Vitousek *et al.* 1997, Mack *et al.* 2000, Cabin *et al.* 2002b, Ammondt *et al.* 2013). While preserving or returning native biological diversity is often a primary objective of ecological restoration, most restoration projects likely require active and long-term management of invasive species to meet native biodiversity goals (Cabin *et al.* 2002b, Falk *et al.* 2006, Ammondt *et al.* 2013, Ellsworth *et al.* 2015). This is particularly true where non-native invasive grasses displace native communities due to superior competition for limiting resources (D'Antonio & Vitousek 1992, Ammondt *et al.* 2013), high tolerance of disturbances (Nepstad *et al.*1990, Bryson & Carter 2004, Litton *et al.* 2006), and contribution to feedback cycles that result in a perpetually degraded state (Thaxton *et al.* 2012).

Throughout the main Hawaiian Islands and much of the tropics, the African pasture grass *Megathyrsus maximus* [Jacq.] (guinea grass) dominates many lowland areas where its competitive superiority and capacity for rapid recovery following fire and grazing make it a major threat to dry and mesic forest conservation and restoration (Breugmann 1996, Ammondt & Litton 2012, Ammondt *et al.* 2013, Ellsworth *et al.* 2014). To promote native species in ecological restoration projects in these areas, there is an urgent need to find cost-effective methods to control *M. maximus* and promote native vegetation (Cabin *et al.* 2002b, Naidoo *et al.* 2006, Ammondt *et al.* 2013, Duke *et al.* 2013).

Examples of restoration projects can be found throughout the literature where success is defined and based on results from very early stages of management, with very few studies examining whether the initial results of restoration activities are indicative of longer term success

(Cabin *et al.* 2000, Daehler and Goergen 2005, Ellsworth *et al.* 2015), despite the fact that

invasive non-native grasses such as *M. maximus* often require aggressive and ongoing

monitoring and maintenance (Ammondt *et al.* 2013, Ellsworth *et al.* 2015). Ongoing

management can require large monetary commitments that may affect project feasibility

(D'Antonio & Meyerson 2002, D'Antonio & Chambers 2006, Naidoo *et al.* 2006), yet the costs

of ecological restoration are often not quantified for larger scale projects or over the lifetime of

the project. Understanding the costs of a restoration project (both preparation and establishment

costs occurring in the first year of restoration, as well as ongoing maintenance costs) is required

for successful and sustainable restoration planning over large spatial and long temporal scales

(Holl *et al.* 2000, Naidoo *et al.* 2006, Watzold *et al.* 2006, Dorrough *et al.* 2008). Cost

information can help to ensure that adequate funding is secured, limited resources are allocated

most efficiently, and decision makers are better informed of cost-effective, sustainable long-term

restoration strategies (Dorrough *et al.* 2008, Goldstein *et al.* 2008), especially when scaling up

experimental restoration efforts to management scales.

The objectives of this research were to: (*i*) determine if restoration results for native

species outplant treatments (i.e., suites of species planted in the field) in a dry lowland ecosystem

in Hawaii at eight months (Ammondt *et al.* 2013) accurately predict outcomes at 36 months by

comparing survival of native species outplant treatments and relative differences in percent cover

of native species and invasive *M. maximus* at these two time periods; (*ii*) assess the costs

associated with ecological restoration in this system over different spatial scales; and (*iii*)

evaluate how restoration costs in this system differ under a variety of restoration scenarios and

over longer temporal scales.

Specific hypotheses included: (*i*) native outplant survival rates at eight months would be

indicative of results at 36 months in outplant treatments due to expected low mortality following

3

establishment (Ammondt *et al.* 2013); (*ii*) native species cover at 36 months would be higher than at eight months in the outplant treatments as growth of natives would suppress non-native plants (Ammondt *et al.* 2013; Ellsworth *et al.* 2015), but that relative differences across treatments would remain unchanged; (*iii*) economies of scale (i.e., cost per unit area declines with increasing size) would exist in restoration costs with increased size of restoration, and the effect would increase over time; and (*iv*) restoration costs would increase with the degree of difficulty to restore the site.

To test these hypotheses we quantified native species survival and cover at eight- and 36-months after outplanting; calculated the restoration costs associated with the three-year experimental field trial (all costs are Present Value calculated at 2% annual discount rate and expressed in 2015 USD); estimated the cost of scaling up the three-year experimental restoration site to 1 ha and 10 ha management units; and estimated long-term management costs over a representative 30-year period for hypothetical 1 ha and 10 ha management units with varying degrees of difficulty using various restoration scenarios. The 30-year time period for the long-term restoration cost analysis was selected to account for stand development and canopy closure. Overall this study provides an example of early ecological benefits that can be gained from restoration activities, as well as the monetary commitments required for establishing and maintaining restoration projects at management scales.

Methods

Study Site

This study was conducted from 2010 to 2013 in a Hawaiian dry lowland ecosystem within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve on leeward Oahu, Hawaii, USA (300 m a.s.l., 158°9'181"W, 21°28'53"N). The study area is highly degraded and dominated by the invasive non-native grass

M. maximus. Soils are of the Ewa series, and are characterized as well-drained reddish silty clay loams (fine, kaolinitic, isohyperthermic Aridic Haplustolls) formed from alluvium weathered from upland basalt (Soil Survey Staff 2006). Mean annual precipitation and mean annual temperature are estimated at 1,258 mm (Giambelluca *et al.* 2011), and 22°C (Giambelluca *et al.* 2014). From 2010-2013, annual precipitation ranged from 437 mm in 2012 to 905 mm in 2013 and averaged 716 mm/yr, well below the long term average annual precipitation.

Restoration Treatments

This study builds upon work describing initial survival and response of native species eight months after outplanting (Ammondt *et al.* 2013) by re-measuring native species survival and native and invasive grass cover 36 months after outplanting at an experimental field trial located in the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve. In July 2009, the study area was mowed, in September 2009 herbicide was applied to the entire study area except control plots, and in October 2009 a 0.13 ha fence (62 m long and 21 m wide) was erected to exclude feral and domesticated ungulates common in the area. Four blocks each consisting of five 9 m^2 square treatment plots (twenty plots total) were established along a ~10 m elevation gradient. On January 7, 2010, three different suites of native species were planted in three of the 9 m^2 square treatment plots of each block (twelve treatment plots total, totaling 108 m^2). All three outplant treatments included *Dodonaea viscosa* (L.) (Jacq.) (a'ali'i), a shrub species; *Plumbago zeylanica* (L.) (ilie'e), a ground cover; and one of three canopy trees, either *Thespesia populnea* (L.) Sol. (milo), *Cordia subcordata* Lam. (kou), or *Myoporum sandwincense* (A. DC.) A. Gray (naio). In addition, herbicide control (herbicide without native outplants) and untreated control (no herbicide or native outplants) plots were assigned to plots within each block. Twenty-five plants were hand planted in each treatment plot (12 ground cover (*P. zeylanica*), 9 shrub (*D. viscosa*), and 4

5

canopy trees). Each plant was given 1 L of supplemental water immediately following planting and once per week for the three weeks following outplanting. Plants that died within one month of outplanting (*P. zeylanica* 15% mortality; *D. viscosa* 29% mortality; *T. populnea* 13% mortality; *M. sandwicense* 6% mortality; *C. subcordata* 38% mortality) were replaced.

Clearing and herbicide maintenance was performed during the three-year experimental field trial. On April 12, 2010, November 30, 2010, May 21, 2011, and May 3, 2012, the post-emergent, grass-specific herbicide fluazifop p-butyl (Fusilade DX, EPA reg. no. 100-1070) was applied to all plots, with the exception of the four untreated control plots, for continued suppression of *M. maximus* regrowth. On November 30, 2010, cut stumps of scattered *Leucaena leucocephala* (Lam.) de Wit individuals were treated with an application of triclopyr (Pathfinder II, Dow AgroSciences, Indianapolis, IN, US, EPA reg. no 62719-176). On May 3, 2012 secondary weeds, corridors, and fencelines were treated with glyphosate (KleenUp, Loveland Products, Inc., Greeley, CO, US, EPA reg. no 34704-890). Surveys to ensure the integrity of the perimeter fence (i.e., fence maintenance) were completed in the second and third years.

Vegetation Sampling

Survival and cover of outplants were estimated on August 24, 2010, eight months after outplanting (Ammondt *et al.* 2013), and again on January 12-13, 2013, 36 months after outplanting. Identical procedures were used at both time periods, with one exception: survival of *P. zeylanica* was not reassessed at 36 months because individual plants could no longer be distinguished. Percent cover of native species and *M. maximus* was measured using a point-intercept method (81 point frame overlaid on each 9 m^2 treatment plot).

Cost Analysis

6

Data for the cost analysis was derived from actual unit costs (i.e., labor and material costs), material needs, and required labor for the establishment, preparation, and maintenance of the three-year experimental field trial at the 0.13 ha Waianae Kai Forest Reserve site. To determine costs, we documented the time, labor and material requirements to establish, prepare and maintain the three-year experimental field trial and conducted interviews with land managers and contractors involved in the field experiment. Specifically, we complied data (i.e., baseline parameters) on: labor time rates (dependent upon planting rate, water delivery rate, invasive species clearing rate, fence construction rate, and fence maintenance rate), labor costs, and material costs (fencing materials, plants, water, and equipment) to conduct the 0.13 ha experimental field trial for three years. The baseline parameters used to estimate the three-year cost of conducting the 0.13 ha experimental field trial are outlined in the results section.

We then used the outplant composition, density, and mortality data, and baseline parameters derived from the three-year experimental field trial, as well as information from the literature and expert interviews with scientists, land managers, government employees, and other professionals knowledgeable about restoration of Hawaiian dry lowland ecosystems to extrapolate three year costs across various spatial scales (0.13 ha, 1 ha, and 10 ha management units [1 ha and 10 ha management units are assumed to be square sites]) to investigate economies of scale. For the larger 1 and 10 ha management units we assumed that a water truck would be rented (at a rate of $3,550/month) to supply the sites with the needed water (i.e., 1 L of water per plant once per week for four weeks following outplanting) during the establishment phase.

To provide managers with an idea of the long-term costs of restoration we compared the three-year costs of restoring1 ha and 10 ha management units over a longer time horizon. We chose a 30-year time period for the long-term restoration cost analysis to reflect a reasonable restoration project time horizon. Of course, cost savings can be achieved in restoration projects

(e.g., employing volunteer labor, utilizing onsite propagation and seed banks, etc.); therefore, we modeled cost-reduction strategies to estimate reduced unit costs. We individually varied labor costs, planting costs, planting speeds, and watering method for the 1 ha and 10 ha management units over the three- and 30-year periods to evaluate the benefits of utilizing volunteer labor, developing nurseries, and upgrading equipment in the initial phase of restoration. An additional cost-reduction strategy was applied to the 30-year restoration cost estimate for the 1 ha and 10 ha management units to account for the discontinuing of invasive plant removal (i.e., herbicide application and tree clearing maintenance) at five and 10 years after restoration, assuming success of the restoration project and no need for ongoing invasive grass and/or tree suppression.

Finally, the experimental site within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve is very accessible, is gently sloping, has a fairly rough and rocky terrain, and is occupied primarily by invasive grass with a moderate number of invasive trees. Compared to remote sites with more arduous restoration conditions (i.e., less accessible, steeper, moderate rough and rocky terrain, dominated by invasive grass and dense invasive trees) the experimental site is considered to be on the easy end of the spectrum, thus the estimates of labor and material needs may be too optimistic for all restoration scenarios. To better understand the costs for more arduous restoration scenarios, we compared a hypothetical "Easy" 1 ha site (modeled after our baseline conditions at the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve study site) to two 1 ha hypothetical sites of greater difficulty that would have more labor and material needs (i.e., Moderate and Difficult sites, see details in SI). We ran these more arduous conditions for the longer 30-year time horizon.

In all cases, we give the Present Value of the costs. Present Value represents the current value of all costs over time, and is calculated by discounting future costs by a specified rate to reflect the time value of money. We applied an annual discount rate of 2%, and report costs in 2015 USD. For more details of the parameters used to extrapolate costs for varying restoration

8

site conditions and strategies see the Supplementary Information (details are provided in Tables SI-1 to SI-7). While other regional restoration projects will have different costs for some or all aspects as that assumed here, we provide estimated costs from an individual study to exemplify the need to include economic analyses in restoration projects generally, and to highlight a methodology for doing so. The SI files provided with this study facilitate the fine-tuning of values for other restoration projects in the region.

Statistical Analyses

Mixed effects models were used to test for differences in percent survival for each woody plant outplant species and *D. viscosa* by treatment and time, and percent cover of *M. maximus*, *D. viscosa, P. zeylanica* by treatment and time. Where data did not meet the assumptions of ANOVA (outplanted native tree cover), a square root-transformation was used before analysis. Tukey's multiple comparison *post-hoc* analyses were used to determine which treatments had significantly different means following significant F-tests. Block was treated as a random factor, and treatment and time were fixed factors. IBM SPSS *v.*20 (IBM SPSS, Inc., Chicago, IL) was used for all statistical analyses, and results were considered significant at α   0.05.

Results

Ecological Results

Across all native canopy and shrub species, survival did not differ significantly at eight (56%) and 36 months (51%) following outplanting ($P \geq 0.13$). A small increase in survival of the canopy species *T. populnea* after 36 months resulted from the recovery of two individuals that were determined to be dead at eight months (Table 1). Cover of *M. maximus* was significantly reduced in all native outplant treatments when compared to herbicide control and untreated control (*P*

9

$\leq$ 0.01), and invasive grass cover did not differ with time since restoration (*P*=0.20). Cover of all native species, with the exception of *C. subcordata*, increased significantly between eight and 36 month time periods (*P*$\leq$0.01), but remained significantly higher over time in all native outplant treatment plots when compared to herbicide control and untreated control (*P*$\leq$0.01) (Table 2).

<<Table 1 and Table 2 near here>>

Economic Results

Baseline parameters were identified for labor time rates, labor costs, and material costs for the establishment, preparation, and maintenance of the 0.13 ha experimental field trial within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve, with the following site conditions: fully accessible by road, ~10 m elevation gradient, fairly rough and rocky terrain, dominated by an invasive grass with few scattered invasive trees, and requiring exclusion of ungulates via fence construction were identified (Table 3). The total estimated cost of the three-year restoration experiment was $14,299. Establishment and site preparation costs during the first year accounted for 97.6% ($13,962) of the total three-year costs, while maintenance costs in years two and three accounted for just 2.4% ($337). Cost of fence construction ($11,197, accounting for 78.3% of the overall costs) dominated the three-year overall costs, followed by outplanting and replanting due to mortality (i.e., labor, water, plants, equipment) ($1,403, 9.9%), clearing ($752, 5.3%), and herbicide application ($611, 4.3%).

<<Table 3 near here>>

10

We found evidence of economies of scale (Table 4). Scaling from the experimental plots to the full 0.13 (i.e., entire area within fence treated rather than just small experimental plots within the fence), 1, and 10 ha sites increased the total costs to $27,154 (+90% from experiment), $149,918 (+452% from the 0.13 ha management unit), and $1.2 million (+728% from the 1 ha management unit), although the cost per unit area declined from $208,883 ha^{-1} (0.13 ha) to $149,918 ha^{-1} (1 ha) to $124,139 ha^{-1} (10 ha). The general trend of establishment costs dominating maintenance costs held for all spatial scenarios. For the scaled-up management units, the establishment costs were ~98.7% of the total cost, with costs of outplanting and replanting due to mortality driving costs particularly for the larger areas (52.4% for 0.13 ha, 76.7% for 1 ha, 87.2% for 10 ha). Notably, the importance of the cost of fencing declined with increasing area (41.2% for 0.13 ha to 17.9% for 1 ha to 6.9% for 10 ha), reflecting the benefit of larger area to perimeter ratios. To provide insight on how a longer time period affects the scaling results, we also analyzed how 1 ha and 10 ha costs compared over 30 years. Unsurprisingly, the proportion of costs due to maintenance were higher in both cases compared to the 3-year analysis (20.7% [1 ha] and 16.3% [10 ha] of 30 year costs, compared to 1.2% [1 ha] and 1.3% [10 ha] of three year costs, respectively), but the economies of scale persist and get stronger over the longer term (cost per hectare for a 10 ha site is 17.2% less than a 1 ha site over three years, and 21.6% less over 30-years.

<<Table 4 near here>>

We evaluated cost-reduction strategies over the three- and 30-year periods for the 1 ha and 10 ha management units to estimate the benefits of using volunteer labor, developing nurseries, and upgrading equipment in the initial phase of restoration, and to account for the

11

discontinuing of invasive plant removal for the longer time period (Table 5). Reducing planting costs by 50% reduced overall costs the most (-22.4% for 1 ha and -27.0% for 10 ha over three years; and -18.0% for 1 ha and -22.9% for 10 ha over 30 years). Interestingly, for the 10 ha site, installation of an irrigation system (at a flat rate of $25,000 to provide water infrastructure to the site) and drip system (at a rate of $2,000 ha^{-1}) became cost effective. While installation of an irrigation and a drip system have a large up-front cost to supply water to the site, it eliminates significant labor (i.e., hand watering) and equipment (i.e., backpack sprayer and water truck rental) for watering ($130,043 for the 10 ha site), which was assumed to continue once per week for four weeks after outplanting/replanting. Overall, the actual cost of municipal water did not change. When evaluating the cost-reduction strategies applicable to long-term management of 1 and 10 ha management units where invasive removal was discontinued after five or ten years, overall project costs for the 1 ha management unit decreased by 8.4% and 6.6%, and 9.4% and 7.4% for the 10 ha management unit (Table 5).

<<Table 5 near here>>

We evaluated costs for restoration projects that reflect conditions that may be significantly more difficult than our experimental site (i.e., less accessible, steep gradients, rough terrain, and dense invasive trees and grass at the outset), and over the 30-year time frame. We identified these sites as Moderate and Difficult and compared assessed costs to our experimental "Easy" site (Table 6). Costs to restore and maintain 1 ha for 30 years rose with the level of difficulty (from $186,716 for Easy, to $220,497 [+15.3% from Easy] for Moderate, to $302,917 [+38.4% from Easy] for Difficult), and establishment costs (clearing, fence construction,

12

herbicide application, outplanting, watering, and replanting) accounted for a larger proportion overall under the Difficult scenario (79.3% for Easy and Moderate; 81.5% for Difficult).

Discussion

Results from this study showed trends of persistent survival of native species and constant relative differences in cover across treatments at eight and 36 months after initial outplanting. Overall, restoration treatments successfully suppressed *M. maximus* relative to controls, while native species cover increased through time. As originally hypothesized, native survival rates were similar between the eight and 36 month time periods. These results suggest that initial success immediately following restoration can be maintained through the early years of restoration, given adequate maintenance (removal of invasive trees, weeding, herbicide, etc.), and that native species, once established, are able to continue to grow and suppress invasive grass over time.

Consistent with our second hypothesis, invasive *M. maximus* cover in the native outplant treatment plots did not differ between the eight and 36-month time periods, suggesting that after 36 months suppression rates of *M. maximus* were similar to those observed eight months after restoration. This indicates that a significant increase in cover of native species at the 36-month time period had no additional suppression effect on invasive cover, that invasive cover continues to be present in the restored community, and that continued maintenance will be needed.

Cover of invasive *M. maximus* in native outplant plots was significantly reduced compared to herbicide control and untreated control plots at both eight and 36 months, possibly because maintenance activities helped native plants become established. However, there was

13

additional grass suppression provided by the native outplant treatments compared to that seen in herbicide control plots, suggesting that natives are successfully competing with this invasive grass. We expect that establishment success is dependent on maintaining conditions that enable native species to successfully compete for limited resources, particularly early in the restoration project. These findings are consistent with those from other studies (Engel and Parrotta 2001, Dorrough *et al.* 2008, Goldstein *et al.* 2008), and indicate that maintenance may be critical to help native plants become established and to compete with early-successional invasive species. Ongoing nonnative grass control and maintenance activities incur costs that should be considered when planning a restoration project.

The costs of ecological restoration are rarely reported in the literature, despite widespread calls for cost-effective conservation (Naidoo *et al.* 2006, Duke *et al.* 2013). While the cost estimates in this study were primarily based on management unit costs conducted at an individual, experimental restoration site, our analysis altering key assumptions confirms that the general findings hold true: establishment costs drive medium- and long-term costs, and restoration costs per ha decline with economies of scale.

Our results demonstrate that costs in the first year for site preparation, fence construction, and outplanting dominate the budget at all spatial and temporal scales (97.6-98.8% of all costs over the three-year time horizon, and 74.8-92.4% for the thirty-year budget). Maintenance costs during subsequent years were a small portion of total costs (1.2-2.4% for the three-year period and 7.6-25.2% for the thirty-year budget), but can be critical to restoration success (Dorrough *et al.* 2008, Vieira and Scariot 2006). These results suggest that ecological restoration projects should consider ways to reduce establishment costs (e.g., utilizing new plant propagation and broadcast seeding techniques [Friday *et al.* 2015]; domestic livestock grazing to reduce invasive

grass cover [Evans *et al.* 2015]; reducing fencing costs), and to prioritize long-term maintenance of expensive initial investments.

One way to reduce establishment costs is to minimize labor costs. Estimates of cost savings from volunteer labor presented here are consistent with other studies (Goldstein *et al.* 2008), but do not consider the potential for reduced seedling survival with unskilled labor, nor the requirements for recruiting, transporting, and training replacement volunteers over time. As a restoration project is scaled up, much more labor is required, and reliance entirely on voluntary labor is difficult. Plant costs were another major driver of the overall three-year cost, and one whose reduction had the greatest impact on overall cost (Table 5). Reducing plant costs through establishing a nursery and/or having volunteers propagate native plants could be a practicable option as this could take place in a controlled environment that is accessible and easy for managers to oversee.

Another way to decrease establishment costs is to reduce fencing costs. Because fencing drives establishment costs, particularly for smaller areas, the shape of the restoration site can be important, as the perimeter to area ratio has a major impact on fencing cost per hectare restored. Moving from a square to a circle shape with the same area protected can save 11.4% of the fencing costs. In smaller scale projects, the savings can be a significant portion of overall project costs, while at the larger scale, the absolute cost difference is more significant (replacing a 10 ha square with a circle saves $6,188). Of course, considerable savings could be gained from placing restoration projects within already existing fenced areas. In contrast, additional costs may need to be considered for some projects for items such as control of ingress of both feral and domesticated ungulates, which was a cost we did not consider here.

Watering (during the outplanting and replanting phase as well as the maintenance phase) constitutes a considerable cost. We considered whether irrigation would be a cost-effective

intervention. Irrigation was not cost-effective, compared to hand-watering, at the smaller 1 ha scale management unit, but was cost effective at the larger 10 ha management unit. Where possible, consideration could also be given to timing outplanting with the rainy season, which would be a cost savings if it eliminated the need for watering.

Given the ecological result that establishment success is dependent on maintaining conditions that enable native species to successfully compete for limited resources, particularly early in the restoration project, and the economic result that establishment costs dominate overall costs, land managers need to allocate funds for initial establishment (Dorrough *et al.* 2008, Goldstein *et al.* 2008). That said, maintenance can greatly increase the overall ecological success of the project (Dorrough *et al.* 2008, Vieira and Scariot 2006). A conservative investment in maintenance (i.e., materials to replace fencing after 20 years and herbicide, and labor to inspect fencing and perform herbicide and clearing maintenance) could constitute upwards of 25% of the overall 30-year project budget. However, if invasive removal after five or ten years could be stopped while still ensuring success of the project, a cost savings to the 30-year budget at the 1 ha and 10 ha sites could be obtained (-8.4% for 1 ha, and -9.4% for 10 ha if discontinued after five years; and, -6.6% for 1 ha, and -7.4% for 10 ha if discontinued after ten years.

Our hypothesis that larger restoration sites would show economies of scale was supported, with cost per unit area declining as the area restored increased. The major drivers of cost differences between the three scales were costs of outplanting, replanting, and fencing. As the restoration area increases, outplanting and replanting costs comprised a larger proportion of establishment costs (and site preparation and fencing costs much less). Establishment costs for outplanting and replanting due to mortality (plants, labor, water, equipment) made up a larger percentage of overall project costs as scale increased over the three-year time horizon (52.4% at 0.13 ha, 76.7% at 1 ha, and 87.2% at 10 ha). Costs in the first year still far surpassed those in

later years, suggesting that cost savings, particularly in outplanting and replanting costs, are critical for larger projects, while smaller projects should focus on minimizing fencing costs, if possible. Across all conditions, larger sites demonstrated to be more economical on a per unit area basis than smaller sites. These results suggest that larger restoration projects are more economical, on a per area basis, and increasingly so as the time horizon extends.

While results from this study suggest that the costs of ecological restoration are substantial, it also highlights how costs can vary depending on actual site conditions, accessibility, and restoration methods. Consistent with our final hypothesis, costs of restoration indeed increased with the degree of site difficulty. The results suggest a 30-year cost could be between $186,716 (Easy) to $302,917 (Difficult) to restore, fence, and maintain 1 ha of degraded tropical dry lowland ecosystem. These representative scenarios demonstrate that actual costs will vary depending on location (e.g., restoration sites requiring helicopters will incur significantly higher costs), fencing needs and configuration, site-specific characteristics (e.g., density and type of outplants and invasive vegetation), and access to in-house resources (e.g., labor and equipment). This study focused on a cost analysis using an individual study and does not, therefore, attempt to precisely estimate costs for every restoration project in the region. Rather, this study highlights the need to include economic analyses in restoration projects generally, and highlights a methodology for doing so. The supplementary spreadsheets provided allow individual projects to vary project-specific costs for more accurate, site-level estimates of economic costs associated with ecological restoration in the region.

Conclusions

Non-native grass invasion degrades dry forest ecosystems globally (D'Antonio & Vitousek 1992, Litton *et al.* 2006). However, ecological restoration of Hawaiian dry lowland ecosystems can be

achieved (D'Antonio *et al.* 1998, Cabin *et al.* 2000, Cabin *et al.*2002b, Ammondt *et al.* 2013, Ellsworth 2015), albeit at a high economic cost. This study utilized actual restoration costs from a 0.13 ha experimental site to estimate larger-scale and longer-term budgetary needs, and in doing so it demonstrates that establishment costs – particularly fencing and outplanting – drive medium- and long-term costs, and that restoration costs per ha decline with economies of scale. This suggests that restoration should be directed at larger scale sites and long-term objectives, and target techniques to reduce site-preparation costs.

Literature Cited

Ammondt, S. A., and C. M. Litton. 2012. Competition between native Hawaiian plants and the invasive grass *Megathyrsus maximus:* Implications of functional diversity for ecological restoration. Restor. Ecol. 20:638-646.

Ammondt, S. A., C. M. Litton, L. M. Ellsworth, and J. K. Leary. 2013. Restoration of native plant communities in a Hawaiian dry lowland ecosystem dominated by the invasive grass *Megathyrsus maximus.* Appl. Veg. Sci. 16:29-39.

Blackmore, M., and P. M. Vitousek. 2000. Cattle grazing, forest loss, and fuel loading in a dry forest ecosystem at Pu'u Wa'a Wa'a Ranch, Hawai'i. Biotropica 32:625-632.

Bruegmann, M. M. 1996. Hawaii's dry forests. Endanger. Species Bull. 21:26-27.

Bryson, C. T., and R. Carter. 2004. Biology of pathways for invasive weeds. Weed Tech. 18:1216-1220.

Cabin, R. J., S. G. Weller, D. H. Lorence, S. Cordell, and L. J. Hadway. 2002*a*. Effects of microsite, water, weeding, and direct seeding on the regeneration of native and alien species within a Hawaiian dry forest preserve. Biol. Conserv. 104:181-190.

Cabin, R. J., S. G. Weller, D. H. Lorence, S. Cordell, L. J. Hadway, R. Montgomery, D. Goo, and A. Urakami. 2002*b*. Effects of light, alien grass, and native species additions on Hawaiian dry forest restoration. Ecol. Appl. 12:1595-1610.

Cabin, R. J., S. G. Weller, D. H. Lorence, T. W. Flynn, A. K. Sakai, D. Sandquist, and L. J. Hadway. 2000. Effects of long-term ungulate exclusion and recent alien species control on the preservation and restoration of a Hawaiian tropical dry forest. Conserv. Biol. 14:439-453.

Cullen, R., E. Moran, and K. F. D. Hughey. 2005. Measuring the success and cost effectiveness of New Zealand multiple species projects to the conservation of threatened species. Ecol. Econ. 53:311-323.

Daehler, C. C., and E. M. Goergen. 2005. Experimental restoration of an indigenous Hawaiian grassland after invasion by buffel grass (*Cenchrus ciliaris*). Restor. Ecol. 13:380-389.

D'Antonio, C. M., and J. C. Chambers. 2006. Using ecological theory to manage or restore ecosystems affected by invasive plant species. Pages 260-279. *in* Falk, D.A., Palmer, M. A., and Zedler, J. B., eds. Foundations of restoration ecology. Island Press, Washington, DC.

D'Antonio, C. M., R. F. Hughes, M. Mack, D. Hitchcock, and P. M. Vitousek. 1998. The response of native species to removal of invasive exotic grasses in a seasonally dry Hawaiian woodland. J. Veg. Sci. 9:699-712.

D'Antonio, C. M., and L. A. Meyerson. 2002. Exotic plant species as problems and solutions in ecological restoration: a synthesis. Restor. Ecol. 10:703-713.

Dorrough, J., P. A. Vesk, and J. Moll. 2008. Integrating ecological uncertainty and farm-scale economics when planning restoration. J. Appl. Ecol. 45:288-295.

Duke, J. M., S. J. Dundas, and K. D. Messer. 2013. Cost-effective conservation planning: Lessons from economics. J. Environ. Manage.125:126-133.

Ellsworth, L. M, C. M. Litton, A. P. Dale, and T. Miura. 2014. Invasive grasses change landscape structure and fire behavior in Hawaii. Appl. Veg. Sci. 17 (4):680-689.

Ellsworth, L. M., C. M. Litton, and J. J. K. Leary. 2015. Restoration impacts on fuels and fire potential in a dryland tropical ecosystem dominated by the invasive grass *Megathyrsus maximus*. Restor. Ecol. 23 (6):955-963.

Engel, V. L., and J. A. Parrotta. 2001. An evaluation of direct seeding for reforestation of

    degraded lands in central Sao Paulo state, Brazil. For. Ecol. and Manage. 152:169-181.

Evans, E. W., L. M. Ellsworth, and C. M. Litton. 2015. Impact of grazing on fine fuels and

    potential wildfire behavior in a non-native tropical grassland. Pac. Conserv. Biol. 21:126-

    132.

Falk, D. A., M. A. Palmer, and J. B. Zedler. 2006. Integrating restoration ecology and ecological

    theory: a synthesis. Pages 341-344 *in* Falk, D.A., M. A. Palmer, and J. B. Zedler, eds.

    Foundations of restoration ecology. Island Press, Washington, DC.

Fonseca, M. S., B. E. Julius, and W. J. Kenworthy. 2000. Integrating biology and economics in

    seagrass restoration: How much is enough and why? Ecol. Eng. 15:227-237.

Friday, J., S. Cordell, C. Giardina, F. Inman-Narahari, N. Koch, J. K. Leary, C. Litton, and C.

    Trauernicht. 2015. Future directions for forest restoration in Hawai'i. New For. 46:733-

    746.

Giambelluca, T. W., Q. Chen, A. G. Frazier, J. P. Price, Y. L. Chen, P. S. Chu, J. K. Eischeid, and

    D. M. Delparte. 2013. Online Rainfall Atlas of Hawai'i. Bull. Am. Meteorol. Soc. 94:313-

    316.

Giambelluca, T.W., X. Shuai, M. L. Barnes, R. J. Alliss, R. J. Longman, T. Miura, Q. Chen, A. G.

    Frazier, R. G. Mudd, L. Cuo, and A. D. Businger. 2014. Evapotranspiration of Hawaii.

    Final report submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Honolulu District, and the

    Commission on Water Resource Management, State of Hawai'i, Fort Shafter.

Goldstein, J. H., G. C. Daily, J. B. Friday, P. A. Matson, R. L. Naylor, and P. Vitousek. 2006.

    Business strategies for conservation on private lands: Koa forestry as a case study. Proc.

    Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 103:10140-10145.

Goldstein, J. H., L. Pejchar, and G. C. Daily. 2008. Using return-on-investment to guide restoration: a case study from Hawaii. Conserv. Lett. 1:236-243.

Holl, K. D., and R. B. Howarth. 2000. Paying for restoration. Restor. Ecol. 8:260-267.

Holl, K. D., M. E. Loik, E. H. V. Lin, and I. A. Samuels. 2000. Tropical montane forest restoration in Costa Rica: Overcoming barriers to dispersal and establishment. Restor. Ecol. 8:339-349.

Litton, C. M., D. R. Sandquist, and S. Cordell. 2006. Effects of non-native grass invasion on aboveground carbon pools and tree population structure in a tropical dry forest of Hawaii. For. Ecol. and Manage. 231:105-113.

Loo, S. E., R. M. Nally, D. J. O'Dowd, and P. S. Lake. 2009. Secondary invasions: implications of riparian restoration for in-stream invasion by an aquatic grass. Restor. Ecol. 17:378-385.

Mack, R. N., D. Simberloff, W. M. Lonsdale, H. Evans, M. Clout, and F. A. Bazzaz. 2000. Biotic invasions: causes, epidemiology, global consequences, and control. Ecol. Appl. 10:689-710.

Macmillan, D. C., D. Harley, and R. Morrison. 1998. Cost-effectiveness analysis of woodland ecosystem restoration. Ecol. Econ. 27:313-324.

Malcolm, L. R., J.P. Makeham, and V. Wright. 2005. The farming game. Agricultural Management and Marketing. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Medeiros, A. C., and E. Von Allmen. 2006. Restoration of native Hawaiian dryland forest at Auwahi, Maui. U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2006-3035.

Miles, L., A. C. Newton, R. S. DeFries, C. Ravilious, I. May, S. Blyth, V. Kapos, and J. E. Gordon. 2006. A global overview of the conservation status of tropical dry forests. J. Biogeogr. 33:491-505.

Mitchel, C. E., A. A. Agrawal, J. D. Bever, G. S. Gilbert, R. A. Hufbauer, J. N. Klironomos, J. L. Maron, W. F. Morris, I. M. Parker, A. G. Power, E. W. Seabloom, M. E. Torchin, and D. P. Vazquez. 2006. Biotic interactions and species invasions. Ecol. Lett. 9:726-740.

Motooka, P., L. Castro, and N. Duane. 2003. Weeds of Hawaii's pastures and natural areas: an identification and management guide. College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Honolulu.

Naidoo, R., A. Balmford, P. J. Farraro, S. Polasky, T. H. Ricketts, and M. Rouget. 2006. Integrating economic costs into conservation planning. Trends Ecol. Evol. 21:681-687.

Nepstad, D., C. Uhl, and A. E. Serrao. 1990. Surmounting barriers to forest regeneration in abandoned highly degraded pastures: a case study from Paragominas, Para' Brazil. Pages 15-229 *in* Anderson, A. B., ed. Alternatives to deforestation steps toward sustainable use of the Amazonas. Columbia University Press, New York.

Portela, R. C. S. Q., D. M. S. Matos, L. P. S. Siqueira, M. I. G. Braz, L. Silva-Lima, and R. H. Marrs. 2009. Variation in aboveground biomass and neocromass of two invasive species in the Atlantic rainforest, southeast Brazil. Acta Bot. Bras. 23:571-577.

Sakai, A. K., W. L. Wagner, and L. A. Mehrhoff. 2002. Patterns of endangerment in the Hawaiian flora. Systematic Biology 51: 276-302.

Soil Survey Staff. 2006. Natural Resource Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/Survey.aspx.

Thaxton, J. M., S. Cordell, R. J. Cabin, and D. R. Sandquist. 2012. Non-native grass removal and shade increase soil moisture and seedling performance during Hawaiian dry forest restoration. Restor. Ecol. 20:475-482.

Veldman, J. W., B. Mostacedo, M. Pena-Claros, and F. E. Putz. 2009. Selective logging and fire

    as drivers of alien grass invasion in a Bolivian tropical dry forest. For. Ecol. Manage.

    258:1643-1649.

Vieira, D. L. M., and A. Scariot. 2006. Principles of natural regeneration of tropical dry forests

    for restoration. Restor. Ecol. 14:11-20.

Vitousek, P. M. 1990. Biological invasions and ecosystem processes: towards an integration of

    population biology and ecosystem studies. Oikos 57:7-13.

Vitousek, P. M., C. M. D'Antonio, L. L. Loope, G. Rejmanek, and R. Westerbrooks. 1997.

    Introduced species: a significant component of human-cause global change. N. Z. J. Ecol.

    21:1-16.

Watzold, F., M. Drechsler, C. W. Armstrong, S. Baumgartner, V. Grimm, A. Huth, C. Perrings, H.

    P. Possingham, J. F. Shogren, A. Skonhoft, J. Verboom-Vasiljev, and C. Wissel. 2006.

    Ecological economic modeling for biodiversity management: potential, pitfalls, and

    prospects. Conserv. Biol. 20:1034-1041.

Wilcove, D. S., and L. Y. Chen. 1998. Management costs for endangered species. Conserv. Biol.

    12:1405-1407.

Table 1. Native woody outplant species survival at 36-months in a restoration field experiment at Waianae Kai Forest Reserve, Oahu, Hawaii, USA.

Species	% survival (Mean plants surviving, SE)
Dodonaea viscosa	56% (5.10, 0.61)
Thespesia populnea	69% (2.80, 0.48)
Myoporum sandwicense	31% (1.30, 0.25)
Cordia subcordata	13% (0.50, 0.50)

Note: Plants that died within one month of outplanting were replaced (*D. viscosa* 29% mortality; *T. populnea* 13% mortality; *M. sandwicense* 6% mortality; *C. subcordata* 38% mortality; *P. zeylanica* 15% mortality). Survival of *P. zeylanica* was not reassessed at 36 months because individual plants could no longer be distinguished.

Table 2. *M. maximus* and native outplant cover (%) at Waianae Kai Forest Reserve, Oahu, Hawaii, USA.

Parameter	Sample Month	*Thespesia populnea* Treatment	*Myoporum sandwicense* Treatment	*Cordia subcordata* Treatment	Herbicide Control	Untreated Control	Block p (df$_{Hs}$, df$_{error}$, F-statistic)	Time -p (df$_{Hs}$, df$_{error}$, F-statistic)	Treatment p (df$_{Hs}$, df$_{error}$, F-statistic)	Time*Treatment p (df$_{Hs}$, df$_{error}$, F-statistic)
M. maximus	8	26.9(14.0)	6.8(3.2)	11.7(5.7)	69.8(12.5)	84.0(12.0)	0.49 (3, 12, 0.86)	0.20 (1, 15, 1.80)	<0.01 (4, 12, 43.50)	**0.01** (4, 15, 4.61)
	36	35.2(9.4)	21.0(7.4)	9.6(5.9	92.9(3.9)	99.1(0.6)				
P. zeylanica	8	36.1(6.1)	44.1(5.6)	59.9(3.6)	0(0)	0(0)	0.13 (3, 12, 2.33)	<0.01 (1, 15, 10.85)	<0.01 (4, 12, 78.10)	0.15 (4, 15, 1.96)
	36	53.7(9.8)	59.9(10.2)	83.3(6.0)	0(0)	0(0)				
D. viscosa	8	6.2(2.8)	13.6(4.5)	8.0(3.0)	0(0)	0(0)	0.31 (3, 12, 1.35)	<0.01 (1, 15, 52.36)	<0.01 (4, 12, 7.97)	**<0.01** (4, 15, 8.80)
	36	50.9(12.4)	57.7(14.0)	58.3(15.3)	0(0)	0(0)				
Native trees	8	0.6(0.4)	1.9(1.9)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	0.51 (3, 12, 0.82)	**0.01** (1, 15, 8.70)	0.10 (4, 12, 2.52)	**<0.01** (4, 15, 6.33)
	36	1.2(0.9)	9.6(7.5)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)				

Table 3. Baseline parameters for labor time rates, labor costs, and material costs used to estimate the three-year cost of conducting the 0.13 ha experimental field trial within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve, Oahu, Hawaii, USA, with the following site conditions: Fully accessible by road, ~10 m elevation gradient, fairly rough and rocky terrain, dominated by an invasive grass with few scattered invasive trees, and requiring exclusion of ungulates via fence construction.

Restoration Activity	Labor time rate	Labor costs	Material costs
Fence construction	2.7 m/hr/4-person crew	Project manager $25/hr, crew leader $15/hr, and two crew $13/hr	$43/m for fencing materials
Fence maintenance[1]	100 m/hr/person	$35/hr/person	Assumed to be included in labor costs
Initial site clearing and clearing maintenance of invasive trees	120 hrs/ha/person for initial site clearing; 10 hrs/ha/person for maintenance clearing	$20/hr/person for clearing and clearing maintenance[2]	Clearing: $200/chainsaw and $120/weedwacker
Herbicide application	52.5 hrs/ha/person (year 1); 11.5 hrs/ha/person (year 2); and 7 hrs/ha/person (year 3)	$16.50/hr/person for herbicide application and herbicide maintenance	Herbicide: $65/backpack sprayer and approximate herbicide rates[3] of $2,349/ha (year 1), $962/ha (year 2), and $137/ha (year 3)
Outplanting/Replanting during first month[4]	20 plants/hr/person	$16.50/hr/person	$2/plant and $45/planting bar/bag
Water delivery[5]	132 L/hr/person	$16.50/hr/person	$0.0005/L water (municipal) and, $65/backpack sprayer

[1] Fence maintenance is assumed to take place twice per year during the second and third years to ensure the integrity of the fence; a key consideration in areas with ungulates where ingress can rapidly degrade ecosystems.

[2] Clearing maintenance includes clearing of invasive trees and application of herbicide to cut stumps and is assumed to occur in year 2.

[3] See Table SI-2 for the calculated herbicide amounts per ha and unit costs for each herbicide used.

[4] Plants that died within one month of outplanting were replaced (*D. viscosa* 29% mortality; *T. populnea* 13% mortality; *M. sandwicense* 6% mortality; *C. subcordata* 38% mortality; *P. zeylanica* 15% mortality).

[5] Water delivery occurs four times with one L per plant each time; assumes first watering included at initial planting time, followed by watering once per week for three subsequent weeks then discontinuing thereafter; water is transported to site in work vehicles via plastic tanks.

Table 4. Summary of present value and cost per ha of restoration costs for scaled up restoration, modeled after a 0.13 ha experimental site within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve, Oahu, Hawaii, USA, for 3- and 30-year periods. All costs are in present value, calculated at a 2% annual discount rate. The proportion of total costs is in parentheses.

	Restoration Costs USD 2015 (% Total)					
	3-year				30-year[1]	
	Experiment (Table SI-3)	0.13 (Table SI-4)	1 ha (Table SI-6)	10 ha (Table SI-7)	1 ha	10 ha
Establishment	97.6%	98.7%	98.8%	98.7%	79.3%	83.7%
Clearing	$752 (5.3%)	$752 (2.8%)	$2,840 (1.9%)	$24,880 (2.0%)	$2,840 (1.5%)	$24,880 (1.7%)
Fence	$11,197 (78.3%)	$11,197 (41.2%)	$26,803 (17.9%)	$85,316 (6.9%)	$26,803 (14.4%)	$85,316 (5.8%)
Herbicide	$611 (4.3%)	$620 (2.3%)	$3,346 (2.2%)	$32,568 (2.6%)	$3,346 (1.8%)	$32,568 (2.2%)
Outplanting	$1,180 (8.3%)	$11,744 (43.2%)	$93,141 (62.1%)	$894,868 (72.1%)	$93,141 (49.9%)	$894,868 (61.1%)
Replanting	$222 (1.6%)	$2,501 (9.2%)	$21,950 (14.6%)	$187,488 (15.1%)	$21,950 (11.8%)	$187,488 (12.8%)
Maintenance	$337 (2.4%)	$342 (1.3%)	$1,839 (1.2%)	$16,274 (1.3%)	$38,636 (20.7%)	$238,295 (16.3%)
Present Value	$14,299	$27,154	$149,918	$1,241,395	$186,716	$1,463,415
Cost per hectare	$109,993 ha⁻¹	$208,883 ha⁻¹	$149,918 ha⁻¹	$124,139 ha⁻¹	$186,716 ha⁻¹	$146,341 ha⁻¹

[*] Costs were calculated using the baseline parameters in Table 3. Additional cost of $3,550/mo for water truck rental during planting/replanting applied at 1 ha and 10 ha sites (not used to estimate cost of experimental or 0.13 ha site).

[1] Based on expert interviews, a number of variables were adapted to account for the longer time horizon (30-years): clearing maintenance frequency (once every other year); replacement period for fencing (20 years); and time period and frequency for herbicide application (Table SI-2), clearing and fence maintenance (30 years).

Table 5. Overall effect of cost-reduction strategies on total management costs and cost per hectare for 1 ha and 10 ha management units over three- and 30-year periods in an invasive grass-dominated lowland ecosystem on Oahu, Hawaii, USA. Present value is calculated at a 2% annual discount rate.

	Restoration Costs USD 2015 (% Change from 1 and 10 ha baselines [1] over three and 30 years)			
	3-year		**30-year [3]**	
Baseline Values:	*1 ha ($149,918)*	*10 ha ($1,241,395)*	*1 ha ($186,716)*	*10 ha ($1,463,415)*
Cost-reduction strategies				
(1) Volunteer labor [a]	$118,306	$920,205	$155,103	$1,142,226
	$118,306 ha^{-1} (-21.1%)	$92,021 ha^{-1} (-25.9%)	$155,103 ha^{-1} (-16.9%)	$114,223ha^{-1} (-21.9%)
(2) Plant costs reduced by 50% [b]	$116,398	$906,172	$153,195	$1,128,193
	$116,398 ha^{-1} (-22.4%)	$90,617 ha^{-1} (-27.0%)	$153,195 ha^{-1} (-18.0%)	$112,819 ha^{-1} (-22.9%)
(3) Planting speed doubled [c]	$136,613	$1,101,182	$173,428	$1,327,387
	$136,613 ha^{-1} (-8.9%)	$110,182 ha^{-1} (-11.2%)	$173,428 ha^{-1} (-7.1%)	$132,739 ha^{-1} (-9.3%)
(4) Irrigation [d]	$156,855	$1,152,801	$193,652	$1,374,822
	$156,855 ha^{-1} (+4.6%)	$115,280 ha^{-1} (-7.1%)	$193,652 ha^{-1} (+3.7%)	$137,482 ha^{-1} (-6.1%)

| (5) Discontinue invasive removal after year five/ten [e] | NA[2]/NA | NA/NA | $170,959/$174,415 $170,959 ha⁻¹ (-8.4%)/ $174,415 ha⁻¹ (-6.6%) | $1,325,707/$1,355,471 $137,571 ha⁻¹ (-9.4%)/ $135,547 ha⁻¹ (-7.4%) |

[1] Baseline values calculated in Table 4 are shown in parentheses next to hectare sizes for both the three and 30-year time periods.

[2] NA: not applicable, goes beyond the 3-year timeframe.

[3] Based on expert interviews, a number of variables were adapted to account for the longer time horizon (30-years): clearing maintenance frequency (once every other year); and time period and frequency for herbicide application (Table SI-2), clearing and fence maintenance (30 years) (with the exception of cost-reduction strategy number five); replacement period for fencing (20 years).

[a] Assumes a labor rate of $25/hr for one person to supervise 10 volunteers during planting, replanting, and watering; assumes planting activities would take 1.5 times longer (i.e., 13 plants/hr/person) when employing volunteer labor versus trained land managers and watering would be completed at the same speed (132 L/hr). While survival can be reduced when employing volunteers, increased mortality beyond the baseline is not accounted for in replanting costs.

[b] Assumes plant costs are $1/plant, or half the cost assumed under the baseline ($2/plant). See Table SI-8 for propagation labor/equipment cost breakdown per plant.

[c] Assumes planting speed is 40 plants/hr/person, or two times as fast as the baseline (20 plants/hr/person) through use of improved and more costly equipment (e.g., $135/Hatfield Transplanter®, or equivalent).

[d] Installation (i.e., labor and materials) of an irrigation system (i.e., getting water infrastructure to the site) at a flat rate of $25,000 and $2,000 ha^{-1} for installation of a drip system at the site, eliminating labor and equipment for hand watering. Cost of water (municipal) still applies.

[e] Assumes maintenance herbicide application and clearing are discontinued after five and ten years.

Table 6. Summary of present value of restoration costs for 30-year period for three classes of 1 ha sites (easy, moderate, difficult) in an invasive grass-dominated lowland ecosystem on Oahu, Hawaii, USA. Maintenance is assumed to continue for 30 years. Present value is calculated at a 2% annual discount rate.

	Restoration Costs USD 2015 (% Total)		
	1 ha Easy [1]	*1 ha Moderate* [2]	*1 ha Difficult* [3]
Establishment	**79.3%**	**79.3%**	**81.5%**
Clearing	$2,840 (1.5%)	$5,240 (2.4%) [M1]	$5,240 (1.7%) [D1]
Fence	$26,803 (14.4%)	$30,400 (13.8%) [M2]	$35,110 (11.6%) [D2]
Herbicide	$3,346 (1.8%)	$3,783 (1.7%) [M3]	$5,078 (1.7%) [D3]
Outplanting	$93,141 (49.9%)	$110,084 (49.9%) [M4]	$164,718 (54.4%) [D4]
Replanting	$21,950 (11.8%)	$25,444 (11.5%) [M4]	$36,742 (12.1%) [D4]
Maintenance	$38,636 (20.7%)	$45,546 (20.7%) [M6]	$56,028 (18.5%) [D6]
Present Value	$186,716	$220,497	$302,917
Cost per hectare	$166,716 ha⁻¹	$220,497 ha⁻¹	$302,917 ha⁻¹

[1] Values for the 1 ha Easy site are from the 30 year 1 ha cost analysis in Table 4. The Easy site is fully accessible by road, ~10 m elevation gradient, fairly rough and rocky terrain, dominated by an invasive grass with few scattered invasive trees, and requiring exclusion of ungulates via fence construction.

[2] Moderate: ~0.8 km from nearest road, ~20 m elevation gradient, moderate rough and rocky terrain, dominated by dense populations of invasive grass and trees, and requiring exclusion of ungulates. Due to more arduous conditions at the Moderate site the following baseline parameters identified in Table 3 were affected:

[M1] Clearing: The labor time rate for initial clearing slowed to 240 hrs/ha/person.

[M2] Fence: fence construction labor time rate slowed to 2 m/hr/4-person crew.

[M3] Herbicide: The labor time rate for initial herbicide slowed to 79 hrs/ha/person.

[M4] Outplant/Replant: The labor time rate for outplanting/replanting slowed to 15 plants/hr/person; and watering delivery slowed to 88 L/hr/person.

[M5] Maintenance: The labor time rate for fence maintenance slowed to 75 m/hr/person; clearing maintenance slowed to 20 hrs/ha/person; and herbicide maintenance slowed to 17.5 hrs/ha/person (even years) and 10 hrs/ha/person (odd years).

[3] Difficult: ~3.2 km from nearest road and consisting of rough, rocky and uneven terrain, dominated by dense populations of invasive grass and trees, and requiring exclusion of ungulates. Due to more arduous conditions at the Difficult site the following baseline parameters identified in Table 3 were affected:

[D1] Clearing: The labor time rate for initial clearing slowed to 240 hrs/ha/person.

[D2] Fence: The labor time rete for fence construction rate slowed to 1.7 m/hr/4-person crew; and fence material costs increased to $49/m with higher probability of uneven terrain requiring additional materials to accommodate the contour and secure ground pinning.

[D3] Herbicide: The labor time rate for initial herbicide slowed to 157.5 hrs/ha/person.

[D4] Outplant/Replant: The labor time rate for outplanting/replanting slowed to 7 plants/hr/person; and watering delivery slowed to 44 L/hr/person.

[D5] Maintenance: The labor time rate for fence maintenance slowed to 50 m/hr/person; clearing maintenance slowed to 20 hrs/ha/person; and herbicide maintenance slowed to 34.5 hrs/ha/person (even years) and 20 hrs/ha/person (odd years).

Methods

Cost Analysis

Methods for estimating baseline costs for the 0.13 ha experimental field trial. The entire 0.13 ha experimental study site was cleared, fenced, and treated with herbicide the first year. Twenty test plots (four blocks consisting of five 9m^2 test plots) were established and maintained as described above. Twelve of the 9 m^2 test plots (three test plots per block; 108 m^2 total) were planted with 25 native species each, and those plants dying in the first month were replaced. During the second year, herbicide maintenance was performed on all twelve test plots and along corridors, and herbicide applied to the four herbicide control plots; untreated control plots did not receive maintenance. In the third year, only herbicide maintenance was done on all plots save the untreated control plots. Surveys to ensure the integrity of the perimeter fence were completed in the second and third years. The experimental restoration site was enclosed with a 0.13 ha rectangular fence (62 m long and 21 m wide) to exclude invasive ungulates from the project site. The fence was constructed by a contractor (Pono Pacific) and completed by four people (project manager estimated hourly wage of $25/hr, crew leader $15/hr, and two crew $13/hr). Based on interviews, we estimated this fence contracting team could build the fence at a rate of 2.7 m/hr, thus the 166 m long fence required 61.5 hours. Using the unit costs at the experimental site we estimated an overall rate of $43/m for fencing materials. Fence maintenance was assumed to take place twice per year during the second and third years to ensure the integrity of the fence; a key consideration in areas with ungulates where ingress can rapidly degrade ecosystems. Fence maintenance was assumed to be completed by one person (contractor rate of $35/hr) at a rate of

100 m/hr. Table SI-1 summarizes the baseline parameters for the 0.13 ha experimental site within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve, while Table SI-3 shows the calculated establishment and maintenance costs when applying the baseline parameters.

While in actuality, many restoration activities were performed by University of Hawaii graduate students, we estimated their labor time and rates based on contractor rates. Initial invasive vegetation clearing was estimated at a rate of 120 hrs/ha and maintenance clearing estimated at a rate of 10 hrs/ha/person; herbicide was estimated at 52.5 hrs/ha/person (year 1), 11.5 hrs/ha/person (year 2), and 7 hrs/ha/person (year 3); planting at a rate of 20 plants/hr/person; and water delivery at a rate of 132 L/hr (water each plant four times with one L each time; assumes first watering included at initial planting, followed by watering once per week for three subsequent weeks then discontinuing thereafter). Using these rates, we estimated the cost of performing the restoration activities by applying the following contractor labor rates: $16.50/hr/person for herbicide application, watering and planting, and $20/hr/person for clearing and clearing maintenance (clearing maintenance includes clearing of invasive trees and application of herbicide to cut stumps) (Table SI-1). Unit costs were applied for materials (i.e., herbicide, water, plants) and equipment (i.e., chainsaw, weedwacker, backpack sprayer, planting bar and planting bag) (Table SI-3).

Methods for identifying costs of scaling to a full 0.13-, 1- and 10-ha management units. Costs were evaluated to scale up the restoration experiment, assuming that the entire 0.13 ha (1,300 m^2) experimental site within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve would be restored (rather than just within the smaller experimental plots). We assumed the establishment costs calculated for fencing, initial herbicide treatment and clearing of the experimental site would not change as

they covered the entire 0.13 ha site, and accounted for additional herbicide and clearing costs for the four 9 m² control sites (untreated and herbicide-only controls) over years two and three (Table SI-4 and Table SI-5). We then used these same costs to scale up to 1 ha and 10 ha management units (Table SI-6 and Table SI-7).

Assumptions common to all sites were outplant composition (modeled after the experimental test plots), density (modeled after the experimental test plots plant density), and cost ($2/plant); outplanting mortality rates (21% overall mortality - replaced only within one month after outplanting); amount of water applied (1 L/plant each week for first four weeks to improve survival and establishment), cost ($0.0005/L), and method (backpack sprayers) of application; method (backpack sprayers) of herbicide application (see Table SI-2 for an example of the calculated herbicide amounts for the 1 ha site); labor rates based on contractors used ($16.50/hr/person for herbicide application, watering, and planting; project manager $25/hr, crew leader $15/hr, and two crew $13/hr for fence construction; $20.00/hr/person for clearing maintenance; and $35/hr/person fence maintenance); cost of equipment used for clearing, watering, and outplanting; cost of herbicides, frequency, and rate (averaged 0.15 to 1 L/min); and fence maintenance frequency (twice per year) (Table SI-1).

Methods for long-term cost analysis: As land managers move toward scaled-up, long-term restoration, information on the associated costs can improve budgeting and planning. Therefore, we projected long-term costs (30-years) for 1 ha and 10 ha hypothetical sites to illustrate the costs of longer-term restoration efforts. The 30-year time period for the long-term restoration cost analysis was selected to reflect a reasonable project time horizon. Based on expert interviews, a number of variables were adapted to account for the longer time horizon: clearing

38

maintenance frequency (once every other year); replacement period for fencing (20 years); and time period and frequency for herbicide application (Table SI-2), clearing and fence maintenance (30 years).

Methods for cost-reduction strategies cost analysis. To better understand the impact on overall cost through the use of cost reduction strategies, we modeled costs under: (1) reduced labor costs to account for use of volunteer labor (assumed a labor rate of $25/hr for one person to supervise 10 volunteers during planting, replanting, and watering activities), though planting activities are estimated to take 1.5 times longer (i.e., 13 plants/hr/person) when employing volunteer labor versus trained land managers and watering would be completed at the same speed (132 L/hr); (2) reduced plant costs (50% cost reduction) to account for application of more cost effective production of seedlings (e.g., onsite propagation and seed banks [Table SI-8]); (3) doubled planting speed to account for better and more expensive equipment; (4) installation of irrigation system infrastructure (at a cost of $27,000 ha^{-1}); and, (5) discontinuing herbicide application and clearing after five and ten years for the longer 30 year timeframe.

Methods for distinguishing labor and material needs. The experimental site within the Waianae Kai Forest Reserve is considered to be on the easy end of the spectrum compared to more remote sites with more arduous restoration conditions, thus the estimates of labor and material needs may be too optimistic for all conditions. To better understand the costs for more arduous restoration scenarios we compared costs for a 1 ha "Easy" site (modeled after our Waianae Kai Forest Reserve study site) to two 1 ha hypothetical sites that would have more labor and material needs (i.e., "Moderate" and "Difficult" sites). The "Easy" site is fully accessible by road, ~10 m

elevation gradient, fairly rough and rocky terrain, dominated by an invasive grass with few

scattered invasive trees, and requiring exclusion of ungulates via fence construction. To estimate

cost for more arduous restoration sites we assumed a "Moderate" scenario (more arduous

restoration conditions, e.g., located ~0.8 km from nearest road, ~20 m elevation gradient,

moderate rough and rocky terrain, dominated by dense populations of invasive grass and trees,

and requiring exclusion of ungulates); and "Difficult" scenario (~3.2 km from nearest road and

consisting of rough, rocky and uneven terrain, dominated by dense populations of invasive grass

and trees, and requiring exclusion of ungulates). These differences mainly affected: (1) labor

inputs (hours required for fence construction, invasive removal [clearing and herbicide

application], outplanting, water delivery, maintenance [clearing, herbicide application, and fence

maintenance]); and (2) fencing material costs (from $43/m for Easy and Moderate sites to $49/m

for Difficult sites with higher probability of uneven terrain requiring additional materials to

accommodate the contour of a particular site and secure ground pinning to reduce the potential

for disturbance by ungulates). Labor inputs were themselves a function of: (1) planting rate (20

plants/hr/person in Easy, 15 plants/hr/person in Moderate, and 7 plants/hr/person in Difficult);

(2) water delivery rate (132 L/hr/person in Easy, 88 L/hr/person in Moderate, and 44 L/hr/person

in Difficult); (3) initial invasive vegetation clearing rate (120 hrs/ha/person in Easy and 240

hrs/ha/person for Moderate and Difficult) and maintenance clearing rate (10 hrs/ha/person in

Easy and 20 hrs/ha/person for Moderate and Difficult); (4) herbicide application rate (52.5

hrs/ha/person (year 1), 11.5 hrs/ha/person (year 2), and 7 hrs/ha/person (year 3) in Easy; 79

hrs/ha/person (year 1), 17.5 hrs/ha/person (year 2), and 10 hrs/ha/person (year 3) in Moderate;

157.5 hrs/ha/person (year 1), 34.5 hrs/ha/person (year 2), and 20 hrs/ha/person (year 3) in

Difficult); (5) fence construction rate (2.7 m/hr/4-person crew for Easy, 2 m/hr/4-person crew for

Moderate, and 1.7 m/hr/4-person crew for Difficult); and (6) fence maintenance rate (100 m/hr/person for Easy, 75 m/hr/person for Moderate, and 50 m/hr/person for Difficult) (Table SI-1).

*Microsoft Excel file for Tables SI-1 through SI-8 will be available upon final publication of this work.