

Agency: 477 Department of Fish and Wildlife
Decision Package Code/Title: XP Eliminate Ballast Mgmt Columbia River
Budget Period: 2011-13
Budget Level: PL - Performance Level

Recommendation Summary Text:

This initial 5% GF-S reduction option will eliminate the WDFW ballast water monitoring capacity in the Columbia River. WDFW monitors commercial vessels entering Washington ports that have the highest risk of transporting aquatic invasive species in their ballast water. As a result, the risk of not intercepting vessels with ballast water containing aquatic invasive species will increase. This proposed reduction increases the potential for catastrophic impacts to Washington's economy, including hydropower, agriculture, and other water dependent activities.

Fiscal Detail

Operating Expenditures	<u>FY 2012</u>	<u>FY 2013</u>	<u>Total</u>
001-1 General Fund - Basic Account-State	(87,935)	(87,936)	(175,871)
Total Cost	(87,935)	(87,936)	(175,871)
 Staffing	 <u>FY 2012</u>	 <u>FY 2013</u>	 <u>Annual Average</u>
FTEs	-1.0	-1.0	-1.0

Package Description:

WDFW inspects the ballast water of commercial vessels entering the state to prevent the introduction of aquatic invasive species into Washington waterways. These inspections occur on approximately 5% of the commercial vessels entering state waters and on vessels with the highest level of identified risk.

WDFW would eliminate ballast water inspections on commercial vessels entering the Columbia River under this option. This budget reduction will be accomplished by eliminating one of two statewide ballast water inspector positions in WDFW.

If implemented, WDFW would pursue federal funding from the U.S. Corps of Engineers to attempt to maintain this essential function.

Name and Phone Number of Subject Matter Expert:

Craig Burley, Fish Management Division Manager (360) 902-2784

Narrative Justification and Impact Statement

What specific performance outcomes does the agency expect?

Ballast water inspections conducted by WDFW would be eliminated on the Columbia River.

Is there a specific legislative district that will be impacted?

All legislative districts adjacent to the Columbia River would be impacted. The hydropower responsible for the majority of power production in the state would be at greater risk.

Performance Measure Detail

Activity: A044 Monitor and Control Aquatic Invasive Species

Incremental Changes

No measures submitted for package

Is this decision package essential to implement a strategy identified in the agency's strategic plan?

This reduction option impacts the agency's ability to achieve in the 2011-17 Strategic Plan Goal 1; Objective A -1) Promote and improve compliance with natural resource laws, and B) Increase protection and restoration of ecosystem functions.

Does this decision package provide essential support to one of the Governor's priorities?

This reduction option decreases the Department's contribution towards the goals in the "Transforming Washington's Budget" report:

"We must protect natural resources and cultural and recreational opportunities."

"We must promote economic development in a growing competitive environment."

Does this decision package make key contributions to statewide results? Would it rate as a high priority in the Priorities of Government process?

This reduction option decreases the Department's contribution towards the following natural resource POG goals:

Preserve, Maintain and restore natural systems and landscapes; and

Establish safeguards and standards to protect natural resources.

This Activity ranked 45 of 148 activities in the 2010 POG result area "Protect Natural Resources and Cultural and Recreational Opportunities".

What are the other important connections or impacts related to this proposal?

The introduction of aquatic invasive species into Washington's waterways, such as zebra or quagga mussels, has a high potential to adversely impact hydropower, agriculture, and other water-dependent commercial industries in the state. In turn, there would be significant negative infrastructure and economic impacts to those industries and local economies.

What alternatives were explored by the agency, and why was this alternative chosen?

The Department first identified opportunities for savings or fund shifts and partnerships and looked for reductions that would have the least impact toward accomplishing our core functions. While the Department can no longer preserve its primary functions without relief from the current economic climate and funding limitations, the recommendations seek to minimize impacts to its core, while at the same time emphasizing our conservation mission.

If implemented, WDFW would pursue federal funding from the U.S. Corps of Engineers to attempt to maintain this essential function.

Another alternative to eliminating this work is to fund it through the Aquatic Lands Enhancement Account (ALEA), which would require additional ALEA expenditure authority. Preventing infestations of aquatic invasive species is an allowable use of ALEA funds under current law.

What are the consequences of not funding this package?

Discontinuing commercial ballast water inspections in the Columbia River increases the risk of an aquatic invasive species introduction. Washington is home to extensive hydropower and agriculture activities and any detrimental introductions could have devastating economic consequences that would require billions of dollars to control. Once an aquatic invasive species is established, the ability to eradicate it completely is very low.

"The Independent Economic Advisory Board estimates the hydroelectric infrastructure on the Columbia River would incur an annual cost of \$250-\$300 million from the introduction of zebra/quagga mussels. This cost estimate does not include economic damages to the irrigation infrastructure nor fish losses."*

*Source - "Economic Risk Associated with Potential Establishment of Zebra and Quagga Mussels in the Columbia River Basin" July 2010, Northwest Power and Conservation Council - Independent Economic Advisory Board.

What is the relationship, if any, to the state's capital budget?

Introductions of invasive species could cause increased capital budget requests to maintain state facilities that are water dependent such as hatcheries and irrigation facilities.

What changes would be required to existing statutes, rules, or contracts, in order to implement the change?

None.

Expenditure and revenue calculations and assumptions

Environmental Specialist 4:
 Salary = \$4,600/mo. x 12 months = -\$55,000
 Benefits = \$1,600/mo. x 12 months = -\$19,000
 Total Annual Cost = -\$74,000 x 2 = -\$148,000

\$27,871 included in object E of this package represents the infrastructure and support costs associated with this program reduction. Recent administrative cuts have been deeper than program cuts, and administrative services reflect skeletal staffing levels. Future administrative cuts will therefore be proportionate to program reductions, and administrative functions will generally comply with state and federal laws.

Which costs and functions are one-time? Which are ongoing? What are the budget impacts in future biennia?

Given the potential economic losses associated with this package the Department prefers this reduction to be one-time.

<u>Object Detail</u>	<u>FY 2012</u>	<u>FY 2013</u>	<u>Total</u>
A Salaries And Wages	(55,000)	(55,000)	(110,000)
B Employee Benefits	(19,000)	(19,000)	(38,000)
E Goods And Services	(13,935)	(13,936)	(27,871)
Total Objects	(87,935)	(87,936)	(175,871)