

---

# WASHINGTON DREISSENID MUSSEL RAPID RESPONSE PLAN



---

# WASHINGTON DREISSENID MUSSEL RAPID RESPONSE PLAN

Prepared by: Lisa A. DeBruyckere, Creative Resource Strategies, LLC  
Wendy Brown, Washington Recreation and Conservation Office  
Justin Bush, Washington Recreation and Conservation Office  
Bill Tweit, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

April 2014 (Amended June 2017)

Cover photo credit: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	5
Objectives.....	6
Background .....	7
The Threat .....	8
The Columbia River Basin Interagency Invasive Species Response Plan.....	11
Aquatic Invasive Species Regulations in Washington.....	12
Washington AIS Management and Response.....	14
Quarantine Establishment and Enforcement.....	19
Environmental Regulatory Compliance .....	19
Pre-Planning.....	21
Streamlining a Response to an Introduction of Dreissenids .....	21
Early Detection and Rapid Response.....	24
Early Detection Efforts .....	24
High Risk Water Bodies .....	25
Verification and Initial Response to Dreissenids and Other AIS Reports .....	27
Verify Reported Introduction.....	27
Status Levels and Corresponding Actions.....	31
Initial Response.....	32
Reporting .....	32
Notification.....	33
Washington Multi-Agency Coordination Group (WA MAC).....	35
Defining the Extent of Colonization .....	37
Preventing Further Spread.....	38
Initiating Available/relevant Control Actions .....	39
Extended Response .....	42
Long-term Monitoring.....	42
Other Aquatic Invasive Species .....	42

Appendices.....43

Appendix I. Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6040 - 2014 Regular Session - 63<sup>rd</sup> Legislature ....45

Appendix II. List of State Resources for *Dreissena* response.....50

Appendix III. Quarantine Authority.....54

Appendix IV. Washington Environmental Regulatory Compliance Framework.....55

Appendix V. Flow Chart of Permitting Alternatives and Associated Contacts .....60

Appendix VI. Interim List of Interim At-Risk Water Bodies in Washington.....60

Appendix VII. Details for Top Five High-Risk Water Bodies in Washington .....62

Appendix VIII. Veliger Analysis Documentation.....64

Appendix IX. Notification list for reports of Dreissenids in Washington .....65

Appendix X. Sample Press Release .....66

Appendix XI. Outline for Draft Management Plan.....67

## INTRODUCTION

In 2007, both zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*) and quagga mussels (*Dreissena rostriformis bugensis*) were found to have established populations west of the Rocky Mountains, and in 2016, the perimeter of the Pacific Northwest was breached when dreissenid veligers were detected in two Montana reservoirs.

The risk posed to the Pacific Northwest by the proximity of these new infestations is significant. This plan was developed in response to the increasing likelihood of the successful transport and introduction of these species into the State of Washington and Pacific Northwest. Although prevention remains the most cost-effective means of addressing potential infestations of aquatic invasive species, if prevention efforts fail, the State of Washington must be prepared to respond rapidly and effectively to minimize environmental and economic impacts and reduce the risk of spread.

The purpose of this plan is to identify prevention and contingency efforts to protect Washington's waters, outdoor recreational resources, aquatic resources, and facilities from the deleterious effects of dreissenid mussel establishment. This plan serves as a guidance document for natural resource managers to plan for and provide a rapid response effort to a dreissenid mussel infestation in Washington waters. This plan is intended to complement the *Columbia River Basin Interagency Invasive Species Response Plan: Zebra Mussels and Other Dreissena Species* drafted by the Columbia River Basin 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian Team as well as provide stand-alone guidance should mussels be found in Washington, but outside of the Columbia River Basin. This plan applies to all dreissenid mussels, although the current focus is on zebra and quagga mussels. Many of the strategies listed herein can be applied to rapid response efforts for other aquatic invasive species (AIS) of concern.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although devised specifically to respond to dreissenid mussels, this plan should be useful for responding to any invasive freshwater animal. Freshwater plants fall under the purview of the Washington Department of Ecology (Water Quality Program) and are governed by different rules and regulations regarding response. Marine plants and animals will require unique considerations not included in this plan.

## OBJECTIVES

This plan is designed to align with a comprehensive regional effort to protect aquatic resources in the Pacific Northwest by preventing the introduction of AIS, including dreissenid mussels, and employing detection strategies to discover incipient infestations early enough to facilitate successful eradication or control efforts.

Although eradication should always be the foremost goal of any rapid response plan, eradication may not always be feasible, especially in aquatic systems where removal and/or treatment can be challenging, if not impossible. In these cases, responders must determine which goals are attainable and cost-effective. The final response may have one of several possible goals, such as containing the invasion to a given area, suppressing population densities to reduce the rate of spread, prohibiting high-risk transport vectors, or in the worst-case scenario, developing adaptive strategies to co-exist with the invader.

There is a limited window of opportunity to respond once an introduction is suspected, or a population identified, thus it is imperative that the State of Washington have a plan outlining tasks, actions and responsibilities to increase response effectiveness. Such a plan is considered a “working” document, updated and/or revised to reflect new information and emerging technologies. The foundation for the response plan is the Incident Command System (ICS) (<https://www.fema.gov/national-incident-management-system>), a standardized protocol for cooperation and coordination among state and federal agencies as well as industry and others (visit the FEMA website to access the latest ICS forms: <https://www.fema.gov/media-library/assets/documents/33584>). It addresses:

- Responsibilities and authorities for rapid response beginning with the discovery of an introduction and continuing through containment and response.
- Long-term monitoring and control of infestations should eradication be deemed unfeasible.

Objectives include responding to and minimizing impacts of infestations of dreissenid mussels; providing timely and accurate information to managers, stakeholders and the general public; and providing for the safety of the public as well as all personnel involved at any stage of a response.

The response plan is divided into the following functional sections: pre-planning, initial response (incident action plan), and extended response.

## BACKGROUND

Developing a state response to an AIS introduction, such as dreissenid mussels, requires an understanding of the threat, the existing AIS response framework, and the management and response capacity of the state. Although eradication should always be the foremost goal of any AIS rapid response plan, eradication is not always feasible, especially in aquatic systems in which removal and/or treatment can be challenging, if not impossible. In these cases, responders must identify attainable and cost-effective goals. The final response may have one of several possible outcomes, such as containing the invasion to a given area, suppressing population densities to reduce the rate of spread, prohibiting high-risk transport vectors, or in the least desirable scenario, developing adaptive strategies to co-exist with the invader.

In addition to the numerous options that can be considered as part of any rapid response, there are key steps integral to any such effort, including: (1) responding to and minimizing impacts of infestations; (2) providing timely and accurate information to managers, stakeholders and the general public; (3) providing for the safety of the public as well as all personnel involved at any stage of a response; and (4) coordinating with neighboring and regional jurisdictions on immediate response and long-term management, as appropriate. Developing a shared understanding of these important steps prior to a response is critical to effective prevention efforts, and greatly enhances the ability of jurisdictions to coordinate and cooperate.

Time is of the essence once a dreissenid introduction is suspected, or a population identified, thus it is imperative that Washington have a plan outlining tasks, actions and responsibilities to increase response effectiveness. Such a plan is considered a “working” document, updated and/or revised routinely to reflect new information and emerging technologies.

The foundation for the response plan is based on the Incident Command System (ICS), a standardized protocol for cooperation and coordination among federal, state, and local governments, and other entities.

## THE THREAT<sup>2</sup>

Zebra and quagga mussels are closely related filter-feeding freshwater mussels in the genus *Dreissena*. These bivalves produce free-swimming planktonic larvae that eventually settle out of the water column and attach to hard surfaces using byssal threads. First discovered in Lake Erie in 1988, dreissenid mussels have spread rapidly throughout North America and are found in all of the Great Lakes and many drainages in the Midwest, North Atlantic and Southwestern United States.

Dreissenid mussels are introduced into new water bodies through both natural and human-mediated transport. Natural dispersal occurs through larval drift, or by the transport of adults attached to floating objects. Human-mediated dispersal occurs through the movement of larvae in the ballast water tanks of vessels, via internal water stored in engine compartments of trailered boats, or via the movement of adults attached to the hulls of conveyances. Also, mussels may be introduced to new water bodies in contaminated bait livewells and fishery stocking programs.<sup>3, 4</sup>

Adult mussels may survive out of water up to five days in dry environments and for several weeks in wet areas and compartments of boats, motors, trailers, and other conveyances, making overland transport by recreational boaters a high-risk pathway for the introduction of zebra and quagga mussels into Washington waters.<sup>5, 6</sup> The chance of establishment of aquatic invasive species by overland transport increases by a factor of the square of the distance from existing populations.<sup>7</sup>

Many factors contribute to the risk of dreissenid introduction and establishment, including environmental parameters (e.g., dissolved calcium, pH), and the extent and types of public usage (e.g., total day use, presence of boat ramps and marinas, proximity to transportation corridors, motorized boating, fishing). Boat transport from contaminated waters is the most likely pathway of introduction

---

<sup>2</sup> Excerpted and revised from the OISC Zebra Quagga Mussel Risk Assessment  
[http://www.oregon.gov/OISC/calendar\\_may10.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/OISC/calendar_may10.shtml)

<sup>3</sup> Johnson L.E, A. Ricciardi, and J.T. Carlton. 2001. Overland dispersal of aquatic invasive species: a risk assessment of transient recreational boating. *Ecological Applications* 11(6):1789–1799.

<sup>4</sup> Karatayev, A. Y., D.K. Padilla, D. Minchin, D. Boltovskoy, and L.E. Burlakova. 2007. Changes in global economies and trade: the potential spread of exotic freshwater bivalves. *Biological Invasions* 9:161–180.

<sup>5</sup> Johnson L.E, A. Ricciardi, and J.T. Carlton. 2001. Overland dispersal of aquatic invasive species: a risk assessment of transient recreational boating. *Ecological Applications* 11(6): 1789–1799.

<sup>6</sup> Timar, L., and D.J. Phaneuf, 2009. Modeling the human-induced spread of an aquatic invasive: The case of the zebra mussel. *Ecological Economics* 68(12):3060–3071.

<sup>7</sup> Leung, B., J.M. Bossenbroek, and D.M. Lodge. 2004. Boats, Pathways, and Aquatic Biological Invasions: Estimating Dispersal Potential with Gravity Models. *Biological Invasions* 8(2): 241–254.



to new water bodies in Washington.<sup>8, 9, 10, 11</sup> Once introduced, pH and calcium concentrations are likely to determine the success of the introduction. These factors are considered critical environmental parameters for dreissenid mussel survival and growth.<sup>12, 13</sup>

Once established, dreissenid mussels can dramatically alter the ecology of a water body and associated fish and wildlife populations. As filter feeders, they remove phytoplankton and other particles from the water column, reducing the availability of important food resources to other species.<sup>14</sup> Native mussels are significantly threatened by the presence of invasive mussels. By attaching themselves to the surfaces of other bivalves, dreissenid mussels can starve freshwater mussels and drive indigenous populations to local extinction. Dreissenid mussels can also reduce dissolved oxygen through respiration<sup>15</sup>—which affects the ability of other species to survive in those water bodies—and dissolved calcium carbonate concentrations through shell building<sup>16</sup>—which causes a water body to become more alkaline, stressing aquatic organisms who require a certain pH range for optimal growth and survival.<sup>17</sup>

Dreissenid mussels can cause substantial economic damage by infesting municipal, industrial, and agricultural water systems and attaching themselves to the hard substrates of pipes, dams, and diversion pathways. This restricts the flow of water through the systems impacting component service life, system performance, and maintenance activities. The annual cost to power plants and municipal

---

<sup>8</sup> Lucy, A., J. Buchan, and D.K. Padilla, 1999. Estimating the Probability of Long Distance Overland Dispersal of Invading Aquatic Species. *Ecological Applications* 9(1):254–265.

<sup>9</sup> Frischer, M.E., B.R. McGrath, A.S. Hansen, P.A. Vescio, J.A. Wyllie, J. Wimbush and S.A. Nierzwicki-Bauer, 2005. Introduction Pathways, Differential Survival of Adult and Larval Zebra Mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*), and Possible Management Strategies, in an Adirondack Lake, Lake George, NY. *Lake and Reservoir Management* 21(4):391–402.

<sup>10</sup> Johnson L.E, A. Ricciardi, and J.T. Carlton. 2001. Overland dispersal of aquatic invasive species: a risk assessment of transient recreational boating. *Ecological Applications* 11(6): 1789–1799.

<sup>11</sup> Karatayev, A. Y., D.K. Padilla, D. Minchin, D. Boltovskoy, and L.E. Burlakova. 2007. Changes in global economies and trade: the potential spread of exotic freshwater bivalves. *Biological Invasions* 9:161–180.

<sup>12</sup> Hincks, S.S. and G.L. Mackie. 1997. Effects of pH, calcium, alkalinity, hardness, and chlorophyll on the survival, growth, and reproductive success of zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) in Ontario lakes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 54:2049–2057.

<sup>13</sup> McMahon, R.F., 1996. The Physiological Ecology of the Zebra Mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, In *North America and Europe. Amer. Zool.* 36:339–363.

<sup>14</sup> Sousa, R., J.L. Gutiérrez, and D.C. Aldridge, 2009. Non-indigenous invasive bivalves as ecosystem engineers. *Biological Invasions* 11(10):2367–2385.

<sup>15</sup> Strayer, D.L., 2009. Twenty years of zebra mussels: lessons from the mollusk that made headlines. *Front Ecol. Environ.* 7(3): 135–141.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.uri.edu/ce/wq/ww/Publications/pH&alkalinity.pdf>

drinking water systems in North America has been estimated between \$267 million and \$1 billion dollars.<sup>18, 19</sup>

Establishment of dreissenid mussels in the Columbia River Basin (CRB) would be expensive, requiring extensive maintenance to the nuclear power plant and hydroelectric dams, fish ladders, fish bypass facilities, navigation locks, and irrigation pumping. In an economic impact report prepared for Bonneville Power Administration, the one-time cost to install mussel treatment systems was estimated at more than \$23 million dollars and annual costs were estimated at \$1.5 million.<sup>20</sup> Because of the high value of fishery and aquatic resources in the CRB, and because no controls exist for mussels in open natural systems, the ecological costs of a CRB invasion could be much larger than other costs.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Connelly N., C.R. O'Neill, B.A. Knuth, and T.L. Brown. 2007. Economic Impacts of Zebra Mussels on Drinking Water Treatment and Electric Power Generation Facilities. *Environmental Management* **40**(1): 105–112.

<sup>19</sup> Pimentel, D., 2005. Aquatic Nuisance Species in the New York State Canal and Hudson River Systems and the Great Lakes Basin: An Economic and Environmental Assessment. *Environmental Management* **35**(5):692–701.

<sup>20</sup> [Independent Economic Analysis Board. 2010. Economic Risk Associated with the Potential Establishment of Zebra and Quagga Mussels in the Columbia River Basin. Task Number 159. Document IEAB 2010-1. 79pp.](#) (See next citation, also).

<sup>21</sup> [Independent Economic Analysis Board. 2013. Invasive Mussels Update: Economic Risk of Zebra and Quagga Mussels in the Columbia River Basin. Task Number 201. Document IEAB 2013-2. 42pp.](#)

## THE COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN INTERAGENCY INVASIVE SPECIES RESPONSE PLAN

In 2008, the 100th Meridian Initiative's Columbia River Basin Team drafted a *Columbia River Basin Interagency Invasive Species Response Plan: Zebra Mussels and Other Dreissenid Species* (CRB RRP).<sup>22</sup> The purpose of the CRB RRP is to coordinate a rapid, effective, and efficient interagency response to delineate, contain, and when feasible, eradicate zebra, quagga, and other dreissenid mussel populations if they are introduced into CRB waters. The plan is updated on a continual basis to ensure the information, particularly notification lists, is current.

The CRB RRP includes 10 response objectives to delineate and control zebra, quagga, and other dreissenid mussel populations if detected in the CRB.

### Rapid Response Objectives:

1. Make initial notifications (Appendix C of the CRB RRP)—Priority 1 contacts are notified when a report is received of live *dreissenids* within the CRB.
2. Activate appropriate organizational elements of the CRB RRP
3. Verify reported introduction
4. Define extent of colonization
5. Establish external communications system
6. Obtain and organize resources
7. Prevent further spread via quarantine and pathway management
8. Initiate available/relevant control actions
9. Institute long-term monitoring
10. Evaluate the response and the plan

Of the 10 objectives presented, six of them rely on action or planning and response by the state invasive species coordinator or the lead agency with response authority as determined by the location of the infestation.

---

<sup>22</sup><http://100thmeridian.org/ActionTeams/Columbia/CRB%20Dreissenid%20Rapid%20Response%20Plan%20OCTOBER%201%202008.pdf>

## AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES REGULATIONS IN WASHINGTON

In 2002, the Washington State Legislature began addressing the issue of interstate travel of aquatic invasive species (AIS)-contaminated watercraft by passing Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 6553. The legislation in ESSB 6553 required WDFW and the Washington State Patrol (WSP) to develop a cooperative plan for inspecting watercraft entering the state in an effort to interdict AIS. This resulted in the development of a “Cooperative Boat Inspection Plan” which began to provide a framework for the effort of interdicting AIS entering Washington State.

In 2005, the AIS Prevention and Enforcement Programs were established by the Washington Legislature. The program, co-managed by WDFW and WSP and funded through dedicated fees on residential watercraft (ESSB 5699), has produced many outcomes since 2005, including outreach and education, watercraft inspection stations, monitoring for the presence of dreissenids, and response to incidents of watercraft entering the state. However, the program has also faced significant challenges, including budget reductions and the jurisdictional uncertainty associated with regulation of invasive species as a result of the numerous scattered state laws throughout Title 77 RCW.

In 2014, legislation (Appendix I) passed that amends existing regulations, adds new authorities, and prescribes penalties associated with the management of invasive species. Much of this legislation helps to address the challenges faced by the AIS Prevention and Enforcement Programs since their inception. Specifically, the law:

- Creates a unified single invasive species chapter and fill management authority gaps;
- Provides greater authority to implement the invasive species program through rules;
- Clarifies WDFW’s role and responsibilities in providing a rapid response to infestations by animal invasive species;
- Allows WDFW to close or limit activities on infested waters; and
- Provides WDFW with clear authority to decontaminate, seize, or quarantine watercraft or other property suspected of containing invasive species.

In the 2014 legislation, the State of Washington established a new AIS classification system framework (interim classifications listed below exist until new rules are adopted by WDFW):

- *Prohibited Species.* Prohibited species are a priority for prevention and management actions. There are three categories of prohibited species: level 1 species pose a high invasive risk and are a priority for prevention and rapid response actions; level 2 species pose a high invasive risk and are a priority for infested site management; and level 3 species pose a moderate to high invasive risk and may be appropriate for prevention or management action; and
- *Regulated Species.* There are three classifications for regulated species. Type A species pose a low to moderate invasive risk and have a beneficial use; type B species pose a low or

unknown risk and are used for personal or commercial uses, such as aquariums; and type C species pose a low or unknown risk and do not qualify as a type B species.

# WASHINGTON AIS MANAGEMENT AND RESPONSE

## AUTHORITY, LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATION

Agencies and entities authorized to respond to a discovery of dreissenid mussels will largely depend on the location of the initial discovery. The six state natural resource agencies with key WA RRP roles and responsibilities are noted below. Other local, state, tribal, and federal entities and agencies that may have WA RRP roles and responsibilities, though not intended to be a full representation, are listed in Table 1.

### WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE (WDFW)

Charged with managing wildlife by preventing the depletion of indigenous species while providing optimum recreational benefits, WDFW is the lead state agency tasked with managing invasive species, excluding pests, domesticated animals, livestock managed by the Department of Agriculture, forest invasive insect and disease species managed by the Department of Natural Resources, and mosquito and algae control and shellfish sanitation managed by the Department of Health. Primary lead agency responsibilities include developing and implementing invasive species programs, establishing and maintaining outreach and education programs, managing invasive species, providing technical assistance, and researching and developing management tools and standards to decontaminate aquatic conveyances and controlling or eradicating invasive species. WDFW classifies prohibited species according to three levels:

- Level 1: High invasive risk and a priority for prevention and expedited rapid response management actions.
- Level 2: High invasive risk and a priority for long-term infested site management actions.
- Level 3: Moderate to high invasive risk and may be appropriate for prevention, rapid response, or other prohibited species management plan actions.

Dreissenids are classified as a prohibited Level 1 species in the State of Washington. These species may not be possessed, introduced on or into a water body or property, or trafficked, without WDFW authorization, a permit, or as otherwise provided by rule.

### WASHINGTON STATE PATROL (WSP)

The Washington State Patrol, through its enforcement liaison in the Commercial Vehicles Division, co-manages the Aquatic Invasive Species Prevention and Enforcement Programs in Washington. Agency staff is trained to inspect commercially-hauled conveyances at state Port of Entry weigh stations.

#### WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY (ECOLOGY)

The Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) is the delegated authority for National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting in Washington, which provides for the use of chemical treatments of waters of the state for managing aquatic invasive species. Ecology has issued the Aquatic Invasive Species Management NPDES General Permit (<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/pesticides/invasive.html>) for the control of aquatic invasive animals, which includes dreissenid mussels. This permit does not apply to Federal lands where a federal agency provided funding, made the decision to apply chemicals, or is the entity applying chemicals. This permit does not apply to Indian Country and trust or restricted lands. If an infestation is found on federally managed lands where the federal agency is the decision maker or on tribal lands then the pesticide application would have to occur under the EPA Pesticide General Permit.

#### WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES (WDNR)

The Department of Natural Resources manages an Invasive Species Program to preserve and protect the value and ecological integrity of unaffected and minimally-affected state-owned aquatic lands by eliminating small noxious weed infestations, and eradicating or reducing large-scale infestations so that they no longer threaten native fish and wildlife and their habitats as well as industry and other public interests.

#### WASHINGTON INVASIVE SPECIES COUNCIL (WISC)

The Washington Invasive Species Council (WISC), created in 2006 by the Legislature is administered by the Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The Council is tasked with policy-level direction, planning, and coordination for combating harmful invasive species throughout the state and preventing the introduction of others that may be potentially harmful. The Council is comprised of twenty-one members representing federal, state, and local agencies, Eastern and Western Washington Tribes, and nonprofit organizations.

WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (WSDA)

The Pesticide Management Division of the Washington Department of Agriculture (WSDA) is responsible for ensuring that pesticides are used safely and legally. To accomplish this responsibility, WSDA performs a number of activities including registering pesticides, licensing pesticide applicators, and investigating complaints of possible misuse. These duties are performed under the authority of the Washington Pesticide Control Act (15.58 RCW), the Washington Pesticide Application Act (17.21 RCW), the General Pesticide Rules (WAC 16-228). WSDA is the lead authority for regulating pesticides in the State of Washington.

**Table 1. Agencies and entities with AIS management and coordination responsibilities or interests in Washington and/or regionally (entities listed in bold have primary responsibility for dreissenid mussel management and response in Washington).**

Bureau of Land Management (BLM)	Washington Invasive Species Council (WISC)
Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)	Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)	Washington Sea Grant (WSG)
City and County Governments	Washington State Patrol (WSP)
Columbia River Basin 100 <sup>th</sup> Meridian Team	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC)
Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission (CRITFC)	Ports
Individual Tribes in Washington	Upper Columbia United Tribes
National Park Service (NPS)	US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
NOAA Fisheries	US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC)	US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Northwest Power and Conservation Council (NWPCC)	US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Washington Department of Agriculture (WSDA)	US Geological Survey (USGS)
Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology)	USDA Forest Service (USFS)
<b>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)</b>	Western Regional Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species (WRP)
Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)	



## INDIVIDUAL TRIBES IN WASHINGTON

Many Indian tribes in Washington hold Sovereign authority to govern their people and their resources. Certain tribes are authorized to develop regulations under the Clean Water Act and other federal statutes. The Columbia River Basin benefits from the existence of the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), which coordinates management policy and provides fisheries technical services for the Yakama Nation, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, Confederation Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, and Nez Perce tribe. The CRITFC Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator collaborates with federal, state, and local government partners on a variety of invasive species issues through forums, such as the Western Regional Panel, state invasive species councils, Pacific Northwest Economic Region, and the 100<sup>th</sup> Meridian Initiative CRB Team. The Upper Columbia United Tribes (UCUT) are comprised of the Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Colville Confederated Tribes, Kalispel Tribe of Indians, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho, and Spokane Tribe of Indians and are actively involved with regulating the water and land under a variety of congressional acts, including the Clean Water Act, Northwest Power Act, Endangered Species Act, and renegotiation of the Columbia River Treaty. One of the UCUT member tribes (Kalispel Tribe) is a member of the Washington Invasive Species Council (WISC). Currently the UCUT lack an Dreissenid AIS Coordinator and funds to implement a rapid response. Despite the lack of funding for direct involvement in the immediate response mechanisms developed by the state of Washington, the UCUT continue to be proactive members of the community addressing preventative actions aimed at dreissenid invasion. Any introduction of dreissenids in the CRB on tribal land would launch the Quagga-Zebra Mussel Action Plan and the involvement of the CRITFC AIS Coordinator. On tribal lands within the State of Washington but outside the CRB, the CRITFC AIS Coordinator would play a liaison role with CRB partners and the affected sovereign Tribe.

Similar to CRITFC in the Columbia Basin is the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC), which serves as a coordinating body for tribes in the Puget Sound and coastal areas. The NWIFC has monthly meetings and provides a forum for tribes to address harvest, hatchery, and habitat management issues in their respective tribal Usual and Accustomed areas. The NWIFC could play a crucial role in coordinating a multi-tribal response to any introduction of dreissenids in the Puget Sound and coastal areas of concern. Working with CRITFC, the NWIFC could form a statewide tribal response, ensuring all member tribes are alerted, funded, and able to respond to a dreissenid introduction.

## FUNDING AND RESOURCES

[ESSB 6040](#) establishes an aquatic invasive species management account and aquatic invasive species enforcement account within the Washington State Treasury, however the legislation passed without any funding mechanisms. The bill passed without any funding mechanism, creating a significant gap

in the ability of the State of Washington to prepare for and rapidly response to a dreissenid introduction.

The CRB RRP charges that all signatories to the plan develop and maintain a list of resources in the event of a dreissenid introduction.

## QUARANTINE ESTABLISHMENT AND ENFORCEMENT

To prevent or slow the spread of dreissenid mussels, it may be necessary to mobilize a quarantine or emergency closure of the affected water body immediately upon the detection and verification of an introduction. This may be difficult, if not impossible, in large open water bodies, or flowing systems, such as rivers, and water bodies that span multiple jurisdictions. Various management actions may require quarantine authority to protect other areas from infestation or to slow spread in a regional context.

Although closure may be impractical for larger water bodies, there may be isolated water bodies or unique infestation scenarios that provide for the ability to quarantine an area. The ability to close or limit ingress and/or egress to all vehicles and equipment capable of carrying dreissenid mussels and to maintain closures or limited (controlled) access until an acceptable management plan has been developed and implemented is critically important.

The legislation that passed in 2014 includes Section 107, which provides authority to WDFW to declare a quarantine against a water body, property, or region within the state, and prohibit or condition the movement of aquatic conveyances and waters from such a quarantined place or area likely to contain a prohibited level 1 or level 2 species. If a dreissenid infestation is found in Washington and incident management capability or technical expertise to conduct quarantine and pathway management tasks does not exist or is insufficient to address the situation, WDFW may formally delegate that responsibility to the CRB Interagency Rapid Response Team.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>[http://www.100thmeridian.org/ActionTeams/Columbia/CRB Dreissenid Rapid Response Plan September 19 2011.pdf](http://www.100thmeridian.org/ActionTeams/Columbia/CRB_Dreissenid_Rapid_Response_Plan_September_19_2011.pdf)

## ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY COMPLIANCE

The success of any eradication effort aimed at dreissenid mussels will depend on the availability of tools for rapid response. A combination of pre-planning efforts and adaptability to advances in control technology and efforts by other entities will be needed. Contingency planning exercises will allow managers to determine what tools will be appropriate to which areas, whether or not environmental compliance standards have been met (Appendix IV), and what regulatory compliance and permitting actions are required prior, during, and following control tactic operations.

If (in accordance with integrated pest management (IPM) principles) it is determined that pesticides will be required to meet the eradication or control objectives, then applications must comply with regulatory processes as outlined in Appendices III and IV. In particular, pesticide applications to waters of the state must meet the terms and timelines identified by both the state Clean Water Act (CWA)/National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) pesticide general permit (administered by Ecology), as well as product label directions and restrictions identified under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) as administered by the EPA and Washington Department of Agriculture. For new uses of currently registered pesticides a registrant may prepare and submit a complete application for a Special Local Need (SLN) registration to WSDA for review (see WSDA SLN Guidance at <http://agr.wa.gov/PestFert/Pesticides/docs/SLNGuide.pdf>). WDFW, researchers, consultants or the CRB Interagency Rapid Response Team may prepare and submit a complete application for emergency exemption from registration (Section 18) application to WSDA

If an infestation occurs in habitats that support endangered species, migratory birds, or bald and golden eagles, or other regulated species of conservation concern, coordination and consultation will be required with the appropriate state and federal fish and wildlife management agencies prior to implementing any control measures.

## PRE-PLANNING

### STREAMLINING A RESPONSE TO AN INTRODUCTION OF DREISSENIDS

Preparing for an eventual introduction of dreissenids is critical to ensuring the appropriate permits and protocols are in place to allow for rapid response actions. Ecology and WSDA are key agencies involved in the permitting and protocol processes. See Table IV1 in the Appendix for the *Pesticide Use Matrix For an Isolated Zebra Mussel Infestation in Washington's Columbia River Basin*. The table includes details on the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and other regulatory regimes.

The following provides information about required permits and registration of pesticides likely to be used in a rapid response scenario for dreissenids, including a set of recommendations to best position the State of Washington for such an occurrence.

- Discharges of pesticides to waters of the states requires a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) authorizes the State of Washington to administer NPDES permits through the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology).
- If the State is the lead agency in a response and is operating under Washington's Aquatic Invasive Species Management NPDES General Permit (Permit), then all treatments throughout the State, occurring on private, or state managed lands, would be included within that permit. This permit does not apply to Federal lands where a federal agency provided funding, made the decision to apply chemicals, or is the entity applying chemicals. This permit does not apply to Indian County and trust, or restricted, lands. If an infestation is found on federally managed lands where the federal agency is the lead decision maker, or on tribal lands, then the pesticide application would have to occur under the EPA Pesticide General Permit. Applications of pesticide to federal lands where the federal agency was the lead or decision maker for the response would need to be covered by the EPA Pesticide General Permit.
- Applications made on Tribal sovereign nation lands would require an EPA Pesticide General Permit.

Options exist for how Columbia River Basin states could navigate through permitting requirements to respond to an introduction of invasive mussels, from the development of a Habitat Conservation Plan (a multi-year process) or programmatic Environment Impact Statement (already in place as part of the SEPA process to support the NPDES permit for invasive species -

<https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1010010.html>) to using existing procedures, such as currently registered Section 3 aquatic pesticides (see below). The EPA registers all pesticides under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), which assures pesticides are properly labeled and "will not generally cause unreasonable adverse effects to the environment" if used in accordance with label.

- Section 3 FIFRA – EPA has reviewed and approved information and uses on product label. As of the date of this amended publication, Zequanox (EPA Reg. No. 84059-15) and Zequanox SC (EPA Reg. No. 84059-15) are the only Section 3 products labeled for use in open water on dreissenids – (Labels at <http://cru66.cahe.wsu.edu/~picol/pdf/WA/58813.pdf> and <http://cru66.cahe.wsu.edu/~picol/pdf/WA/62886.pdf>).
- Section 24(c) FIFRA – allows states to grant registrations for additional uses of a product to meet local needs – for sites already listed on the label. Section 3 registrations for the most commonly used pesticides that could be used to control invasive mussels are very limited. Special Local Needs maybe applied for on a state-by-state basis.
- Section 18 may be an option if WDFW or other experts identify the introduction of an invasive pest species not previously known to occur in the United States and cannot identify a candidate section 3 pesticide to address the urgent problem. Emergency exemptions are based on the need to prevent the introduction or spread of an invasive species. Section 18 of FIFRA allows EPA to exempt a state or federal agency from the requirements of FIFRA when an emergency exists. WSDA is the State Lead Agency (SLA) for pesticides in Washington and should be contacted to determine possible solutions to the pest problem. This provision means a SLA can request EPA to authorize an emergency exemption to temporarily use a pesticide that is not registered for the proposed use when WDFW or scientists identify an urgent and non-routine situation where there are no registered pesticides or alternative practices that will effectively address the problem..

A joint programmatic opinion from NOAA and the USFWS is likely not the best approach for the region because of the potential number of locations where an introduction of dreissenids may occur and the complex issues associated with numerous sensitive, threatened, and endangered species that are known to exist in the State of Washington. To facilitate a more streamlined, realistic approach to working with key federal partners to address a dreissenid introduction, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, in concert with NOAA and the USFWS, is exploring other models that have similar elements to a mussel response, e.g., oil spill response, to identify best options for how CRB states could navigate through permitting requirements, especially those associated with threatened and endangered species (e.g., salmonids) to quickly respond to an introduction of invasive mussels. Likely options would require:

- Best management practices for the mainstem Columbia River and tributary watersheds.
- Inclusion of terrestrial species in terms of potential effects of a control action.
- Identification of pesticides that would most likely be used in a control action.
- Identification of sensitive, threatened, and endangered species in the control area (and downstream of the control area, if applicable).

- Addressing downstream habitats and how they might be affected by control actions.
- Setting goals and geographic scope to any likely control action.

### Recommendations

- Pesticide Registration— To discharge a pesticide to waters of the state to control invasive mussels in Washington, the pesticide product must be registered by the state (WSDA), have a legal use in Washington, and be included in the states' NPDES General Permit. In addition, the applicator has to be covered under the NPDES permit.
  - WDFW staff have reviewed the list of products registered by WSDA, and should take steps to assist in registering new and emerging products designed to control invasive mussels with minimal impacts to non-target species.
  - Washington should maintain an updated list of its impaired waterbodies (303d listings)- <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/> - and be aware of additional constraints on pesticide products that may be used if the waterbody being treated is on the list. Currently, copper is the only currently listed pesticide that would overlap with the 303(d) list.
  - At the time of this publication, Zequanox (*Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain CL145A; ATCC55799) is the only EPA registered Section 3 molluscicide that would most likely be used to control an introduction of invasive mussels in the CRB. Zequanox is labeled for control of invasive zebra and quagga mussels (*Dreissena* species) at all life stages in both enclosed or semi-enclosed systems and open water. Christmas Lake in Minnesota tested the use of Zequanox for control of zebra mussel in 2014 (see <http://www.startribune.com/minnesota-lake-first-to-use-new-product-to-kill-zebra-mussels/274420131/>). Other pesticides that have been used for zebra mussel control in Minnesota include copper sulfate<sup>24</sup> and potassium chloride ([http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/natural\\_resources/invasives/aquaticanimals/zebramussel/fact\\_sheet-zebra\\_mussels.pdf](http://files.dnr.state.mn.us/natural_resources/invasives/aquaticanimals/zebramussel/fact_sheet-zebra_mussels.pdf)). In 2006, the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries led an effort to eradicate a zebra mussel population located on a 12-acre quarry site using a potassium chloride solution. State authorities have

---

<sup>24</sup> The use of copper based pesticides have long term adverse impacts to non-target organisms, and may not be the first pesticide of choice for use in waters with ESA listed species. Formal Section 7 ESA consultation or an approved Habitat Conservation Plan (ESA Sec 10) would most likely be needed before using copper based chemicals in waters containing or supporting ESA species. Unless prepared up front, such consultation/planning activities could significantly delay any proposed rapid response.

described critical habitat areas or times of the year when specific pesticides cannot be applied:

[http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/pesticides/final\\_pesticide\\_permits/aquatic\\_plants/permitdocs/wdfwtiming.pdf](http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/pesticides/final_pesticide_permits/aquatic_plants/permitdocs/wdfwtiming.pdf). This list of recommended treatment windows should be maintained.

- PDMP—Ensure that Washington’s Pesticide Discharge Management Plan is created and maintained and includes the types of pesticides and control options that would likely occur upon an introduction of invasive mussels.
- Funding—It is imperative to identify sources of funding to initiate control and monitoring actions in advance of an introduction.

## EARLY DETECTION AND RAPID RESPONSE

Early detection is the key to successful rapid response. Early detection often provides the only chance at eradication, especially for aquatic invasive species, which are notoriously difficult to eradicate, successfully control or manage. The cost to respond to a population that was not detected during early stages of an invasion increases exponentially over time.

### EARLY DETECTION EFFORTS

Early detection of dreissenid mussels relies upon the discovery of either veligers in the water column or juveniles and adults colonizing hard substrates. Washington has thousands of lakes—there are limited resources available for early detection. Efforts must be focused on high-risk water bodies—those with both high risk of introduction and risk of establishment should receive the highest monitoring priority.



## HIGH RISK WATER BODIES<sup>25</sup>

Recreational boating is the primary vector for overland transport of mussels and increases the risk of inter-basin dreissenid introduction.<sup>26, 27, 28</sup> The ongoing discovery of recreational trailered-watercraft with attached mussels in the CRB, and throughout the western United States, corroborates the importance of this vector. Total day use of a water body, presence of boat ramps and marinas, water body size and access, and the presence of motorized boating and fishing activities, including angling tournaments that attract boats from outside the Pacific Northwest, are important risk determinants.

The risk of dreissenid establishment is also influenced by environmental parameters, such as dissolved calcium, pH, water temperature, salinity, dissolved oxygen, and substrate. Veliger survivorship increases from 3% at 12 mg Ca<sup>2+</sup>/L to 20–25% at 47 mg Ca<sup>2+</sup>/L.<sup>29</sup> North American dreissenid juveniles show initial growth at calcium concentrations between 8.5 and 11 mg Ca<sup>2+</sup>/L<sup>30, 31</sup> and moderate shell growth between 25 and 26 mg Ca<sup>2+</sup>/L.<sup>32</sup> In general, dreissenid adults inhabit waters with calcium concentrations greater than or equal to 15 mg Ca<sup>2+</sup>/L, and populations become dense at concentrations greater than or equal to 21 mg Ca<sup>2+</sup>/L.<sup>33</sup> Dissolved calcium concentrations and pH are likely the most limiting environmental parameters to dreissenid establishment in the CRB and greater Northwest.<sup>34, 35</sup> Water temperature is not expected to limit growth, as dreissenids inhabit a

- 
- <sup>25</sup> Wells, S., T.D. Counihan, A. Puls, M. Sytsma and B. Adair. 2010. Prioritizing Zebra and Quagga Mussel Monitoring in the Columbia River Basin Prepared for Bonneville Power Administration and the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission BPA Contract Number: 00003373 TI Project Number: 152.
- <sup>26</sup> Lucy, A., J. Buchan, and D.K. Padilla, 1999. Estimating the Probability of Long Distance Overland Dispersal of Invading Aquatic Species. *Ecological Applications* 9(1):254–265.
- <sup>27</sup> Johnson L.E, A. Ricciardi, and J.T. Carlton. 2001. Overland dispersal of aquatic invasive species: a risk assessment of transient recreational boating. *Ecological Applications* 11(6): 1789–1799.
- <sup>28</sup> Karatayev, A. Y., D.K. Padilla, D. Minchin, D. Boltovskoy, L.E. Burlakova. 2007. Changes in global economies and trade: the potential spread of exotic freshwater bivalves. *Biological Invasions* 9:161–180.
- <sup>29</sup> Sprung, M. 1987. Ecological requirements of developing *Dreissena polymorpha* eggs. *Archiv für Hydrobiologie Supplement* 79:69–86.
- <sup>30</sup> Hincks, S.S. and G.L. Mackie. 1997. Effects of pH, calcium, alkalinity, hardness, and chlorophyll on the survival, growth, and reproductive success of zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) in Ontario lakes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 54:2049–2057.
- <sup>31</sup> McMahon, R.F., 1996. The Physiological Ecology of the Zebra Mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, in North America and Europe. *Amer. Zool.* 36:339–363.
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>33</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>34</sup> Hincks, S.S. and G.L. Mackie. 1997. Effects of pH, calcium, alkalinity, hardness, and chlorophyll on the survival, growth, and reproductive success of zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) in Ontario lakes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* 54:2049–2057.
- <sup>35</sup> McMahon, R.F., 1996. The Physiological Ecology of the Zebra Mussel, *Dreissena polymorpha*, in North America and Europe. *Amer. Zool.* 36:339–363.

wide range of temperatures in North America. They are found in the Great Lakes at temperatures less than 5°C, and in the lower Mississippi where temperatures reach and exceed 30°C.<sup>36</sup>

Table 2 is a prioritized partial listing of water bodies for dreissenid monitoring in Washington (for complete table, see Appendix VI). The prioritization is based on an assessment of the relative risk of introduction and establishment of dreissenids into individual lakes, reservoirs, and rivers.

Dreissenid mussel surveys of water bodies with the greatest risk of introduction and establishment should employ standardized protocols for the examination of solid surfaces and sediment samples for adult mussel detection, plankton samples for veliger analysis, and shoreline walks to search for mussel shells, particularly in reservoirs that have been drawn down.

**Table 2. Interim list of top 11 high-risk water bodies in Washington based solely on water chemistry and boat use data.<sup>37</sup> Detailed information about the top five water bodies can be found in Appendix VII.**

Water Body Name	Ca++ mg/L	pH	Risk of Establishment	Risk of Introduction
Moses Lake	30.5	8.18	High	High
Potholes Reservoir outflow	28.3	8.14	High	High
Pend Oreille River	20.1	-	Medium	High
Lake Washington, inflow	18.8	7.77	Medium	High
Banks Lake	17.8	7.90	Medium	High
Columbia River, Lake Celilo	16.8	-	Medium	High
Columbia River, Lake Bonneville	16.5	8.11	Medium	High
Clear Lake	16.4	8.47	Medium	High
Williams Lake	20.5	7.39	Medium	Medium
Columbia River, Lake Wanapum	18.1	8.02	Medium	Medium
Lake Crescent	15.9	6.94	Medium	Medium

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Wells, S., T.D. Counihan, A. Puls, M. Sytsma and B. Adair. 2010. Prioritizing Zebra and Quagga Mussel Monitoring in the Columbia River Basin Prepared for Bonneville Power Administration and the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission BPA Contract Number: 00003373 TI Project Number: 152.

## VERIFICATION AND INITIAL RESPONSE TO DREISSENIDS AND OTHER AIS REPORTS

Determining the credibility of any AIS report and further verifying an AIS or dreissenid mussel introduction can be difficult and time consuming. The initial response to an AIS report, including that of dreissenids, depends on protocols and steps established before any introduction. Clearly anticipating the nuances of any report can be difficult, and final determination of status/action is ultimately determined by the AIS Coordinators. Guidelines have been established for verifying a report, assigning a status to water bodies of concern, and addressing the tasks associated with each status level to facilitate the objectives of the CRB Plan as well as prepare for a complete response to a positive introduction. Steps are primarily focused on information gathering and preventing further spread while awaiting final confirmation of dreissenid or other AIS presence.

### VERIFY REPORTED INTRODUCTION

Washington has an interim process relative to positive mussel identification (Table 3). The process assigns a status level to the water body in question and sets forth a list of corresponding actions to be undertaken by the AIS coordinators as the verification proceeds. Figure 2 shows a mock timeline of how these actions might unfold along the report verification timeline.

The verification process is divided into categories based on life stage and identification technique involving an adult mussel or veliger discovered under cross-polarized light microscopy (XPLM), which is subdivided to allow for various levels of confidence within each type of sample/report.

After an initial detection report is received and evaluated by the AIS coordinators, the verification matrix is activated. In an ideal situation, no more than 7 business days elapse between the results of the initial notification and the verification step. In reality, times will likely vary divergently on a case-by-case basis.

If the verification results are contradictory or vague, the status of the water body will remain “Inconclusive” until further verification results are available. The status remains “Inconclusive” until a rationale is provided and accepted. This may require additional sampling the following season or reevaluating archived samples from the water body. This will be undertaken on a case-by-case basis by an advisory team assembled by the Washington AIS coordinator.

If further verification efforts fail to confirm the initial detection, the Washington AIS coordinator may evaluate the situation and determine if down-grading the status of the water body or further research/exploration is warranted and in accordance with the de-listing protocols below.

It should be noted that verified reports for the presence of dreissenid veligers or a single adult mussel does not indicate that a water body is “positive” for a mussel infestation or “infested” i.e. supports a reproducing mussel population (see definitions below).

Current definitions for water body status categories and requirements for delisting are as follows:

### Definitions:

- **Verification** – the scientifically-based process to confirm the presence of Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS).
- **Detect or detected** – the verified presence of AIS.

### Water body definitions:


Management  
Trigger →

- **Status Unknown** – Waters that have not been monitored.
- **Undetected/Negative** - sampling/testing is ongoing and nothing has been detected, or nothing has been detected within the time frames for de-listing.
- **Inconclusive** (temporary status) – Water body has not met the minimum criteria for detection, but has had one positive test result.
- **Suspect** – Water body that has met the minimum criteria for detection.
- **Positive** – Multiple (2 or more) subsequent sampling events that meet the minimum criteria for detection.
- **Infested** – A water body that has an established population (reproducing population with both juveniles and adults) of AIS.

### De-listing a Water Body for Dreissenids:

- **Inconclusive** – 1 year of negative testing including at least one sample taken in the same month of subsequent year as the positive sample (accounting for seasonal environment variability) to get to undetected/negative.
- **Suspect** – 3 years of negative testing to become undetected/negative.
- **Positive** – 5 years of negative testing to become undetected/negative.
- **Infested** – Following a successful eradication or extirpation event including a minimum of 5 years post-event testing/monitoring with negative results.

**Table 3. Interim protocols for verifying adult and veliger stages of dreissenids, with corresponding water body determinations.<sup>38</sup>**

Adult		Veliger/Microscopy (XPLM) (Veliger sample preservation/handling to meet minimum PCR requirements (e.g., 70% buffered EtOH, cold storage, isopropyl alcohol))			
Visual ID of settled adult by expert	Plausible report, no shell/specimen available, survey water body	Strong positive visual ID [multiple larval states, high quality sample]	Positive visual ID [lacking "strong" criteria]	Weak visual ID [suspect bivalve, poor quality sample]	
Confirmation of visual ID by additional expert [photo okay]		Independent expert confirmation of Dreissenid veliger [photo okay] – must be confirmed by at least 2 independent experts	Same as "strong"	[Evaluate other samples if avail.]	
Confirmation of ID and determination of species		Microscopy by independent lab and/or PCR by independent lab	Same as "strong"	PCR confirmation X 2 and gene sequence match	

<sup>38</sup> Unusual or contradictory results to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by committee. Microscopy refers to cross-polarized light microscopy or XPLM. Protocols for scanning electron microscopy or SEM have not yet been developed.




Figure 2. Mock timeline (in days) showing verification of identification, accompanying tasks and water body status following preliminary identification/reporting of dreissenid mussel veligers.

## STATUS LEVELS AND CORRESPONDING ACTIONS

### **Water Body Status: INCONCLUSIVE**

- Brief the MAC Chair and CRB Team Coordinator, WISC Coordinator, and WA AIS Coordinator, formal internal communication begins
- Veligers prepped for 2nd and 3rd ID, images sent
- Assemble preliminary RA table for water body
- Field agent may be deployed to take additional veliger samples and inspect shoreline/hard substrate

### **State Preparation Begins**

- Deploy field crews to take additional water samples
- WA AIS coordinator, CRB, WISC Coordinator, MAC chair, etc. updated
- Governor's office, WDFW director, and WISC members notified
- Talk with key water body land management authorities
- AIS Coordinators plan for internal mobilization of resources/ response teams

### **Water Body Status: SUSPECT**

- Brief WA AIS Coordinator and MAC Chair
- MAC convened to launch ICS
- Joint Information Center press release
- Decontamination stations running
- ICS designates team to write management plan
- Boater movement surveyed to determine high-risk water bodies for spread
- Survey teams launched:
  - Veliger samples taken (re-sample at 2 week intervals minimum in spawning season)
  - Additional WQ sampling as needed
  - Shoreline and fixed/temporary hard substrate surveys for adults (exposed infrastructure - stakeholders)
  - Benthic sampling and or diver/snorkeler surveys of hard substrate
  - Survey moored boats/moorages/marinas if any for potential "carriers"

# INITIAL RESPONSE

## REPORTING

In Washington, there are two key recommended venues for reporting sightings of aquatic invasive species:

- The Washington AIS Program has a telephone number, 1-888-WDFW-AIS, to report an AIS sighting or to obtain information.
- WISC staffs an [online reporting form](#) and smartphone app ('WA Invasives') to report suspected sightings of invasive species.

Section 108 of Senate Bill 6040 (passed during the 2014 legislative session) provides authority to the WDFW to implement rapid response management actions where a prohibited Level 1 species, such as a zebra or quagga mussel, is detected in or on a water body or property. These actions may include, "expedited actions to contain, control, or eradicate the prohibited species; and, if applicable, be implemented in conjunction with a quarantine declaration." Section 108 notes that if a rapid response management action exceeds seven days, the WDFW may implement an incident command system for rapid response, including scope, duration, and types of actions to support mutual assistance and cooperation between WDFW and other affected state and federal agencies, tribal sovereign nations, local governments, and private water body or property owners. The legislation notes that WDFW may engage in cooperative agreements with partner entities to establish incident command structures, among other actions.

The first participating agency to discover or receive a report of a potential dreissenid [or other AIS infestation] will notify the WDFW Invasive Species Coordinator. The initial recipient should collect:

- Date and time of the report.
- Name and contact information of the report recipient
- Name and type of organism (e.g. zebra mussel, seaweed, etc.)
- Date and time of the sighting(s).
- Name, agency and contact information for the person making the report.
- Name, agency/entity and contact information of identifying biologist (if any)
- Details of the location of the infestation
  - Name of the affected water body,
  - Landmarks, highway mile, and other identifying details
  - GPS (if possible)



- Description of surface attached to (if fouling organism) or substrate found on/in if appropriate
- Other relevant conditions (draw down, low tide, etc.)
- An estimate of the number, density, and extent of the introduction
- Digital or other photographs (with scale indicator), ideally images shot from multiple angles
- If no photograph possible, obtain a detailed description of organism (size, coloration, flowering, etc.). Ensure reporter is looking at actual specimen not at an ID card/wanted poster.
- A sample of the organism (inform caller of proper storage/handling if necessary)
- Comments: These might include notes about the condition the specimen was in when found, how reporter came across organism, had they seen it before, access limitation to site, etc.

Notification of positive results from veliger monitoring (either through cross-polarized light microscopy or PCR) should be sent directly to the State Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator(s) along with all supporting documents and the sample collection information (Appendix VIII describes documentation requested for veliger analysis).

## NOTIFICATION

*The following information pertains to a report and incident response. Responses on federal or tribal-owned land will not trigger state involvement unless invited by the landowner. A Washington ICS should be augmented with resources (staff and equipment) from the landowner in keeping with the “whole of government” approach embodied in this plan.*

## Washington AIS Incident Command System (ICS)

The coordinating structure of Washington AIS ICS (Figure 3) is designed to comply with the requirements of a National Incident Management System (NIMS) and describes the composition of the Washington AIS ICS, which focuses on interagency decision making and communication.




Figure 3. Example Washington AIS ICS.

#### WASHINGTON MULTI-AGENCY COORDINATION GROUP (WA MAC)

The Washington Multi-Agency Coordination Group (WA MAC) should be led by WDFW and include USFWS, Ecology, WSDA, the Chair and Coordinator of the WISC, a representative of the Governor's office and others as determined by the incident (e.g., USFS, BLM, WDNR, Ecology, etc.) and the incident location.

Reporting directly to the WA MAC is the Planning and Response Coordinator. This will be staffed by WDFW. The Planning and Response Coordinator will oversee the Planning Team, the Response Team and any logistics staff.

The composition of the Planning Team, similar to the MAC, will be dependent on the location of the incident, but will include all the state AIS leads and major stakeholders.

The Joint Information Center will be a shared position staffed by WDFW, including Public Information Officers.

The Scientific Advisory Panel membership will include academia, AIS responders with experience in dreissenid infested waters and others who can provide planning advice and review response plans.

In the case of a mussel report, the Washington AIS Coordinator will alert other state AIS coordinators and the Regional USFWS AIS coordinator. Should the Columbia River Basin Rapid Response Plan (CRBRRP) be deemed by the Multi-Agency Coordination Group (CRB MAC) to not be the appropriate response structure to respond to the introduction,<sup>39</sup> the Washington AIS ICS will be used. The Washington AIS ICS structure has also been created to fit into the CRBRRP incident command structure to implement those objectives that are delegated to the state or responsible agency.

The objective of notification is to ensure that all parties that have jurisdiction over response decisions are engaged quickly and at the appropriate stage of any response. Table 2 of this document lists the agencies and entities with AIS management and coordination responsibilities or interests in Washington. Additional stakeholders may need to be notified in the course of a response, including, but not limited to, tribal sovereign nations, public utility districts, irrigation districts, municipal water users, marinas, and boat ramp operators.

---

<sup>39</sup> This may happen for one of several reasons: the infestation may be located outside of the Columbia River Basin (e.g., the Skagit River); the CRB MAC deems a situation to be better situated to a single state response; the plan is used for a non-dreissenid AIS response; etc.

Although the lead entity for undertaking initial notifications at the alert and suspect levels is WDFW, it may be appropriate for other agencies to take the lead in notifying their existing partners.

Appendix IX provides the contact information for individuals that should be notified when water bodies are determined to be inconclusive and suspect.

Inconclusive notification:

- WDFW
- Ecology, WSP, WDNR, WISC Coordinator
- USFWS RO, CRB MAC chair
- State/Federal AIS Coordinators as appropriate if shared waters

Suspect Notification (in addition to the above)

- Washington ISC, CRB MAC
- Primary stakeholders
- Governor's Office/ Governor's Natural Resource Cabinet
- Initial Press Release and briefing
- Notification of affected user groups
- Communicating with stakeholders and other agencies

Generic language for this initial release of information about the initial infestation is as follows:

*We are currently investigating reports of [name of invasive species] in the vicinity of [general location]. Experts from the [Columbia River Basin Interagency Team or WA AIS Coordinator] and local agencies are responding, and we will have additional information available as we are able to confirm it. We will hold a briefing at [location] and will notify the press at least ½ hour prior to the briefing. At this time, the briefing is the only place where officials are authorized to speak about the incident and confirmed information will be available. Thank you for your assistance.*

A sample press release for a Suspect water body is provided in Appendix X.

An external communications system will be established and activated consistent with the guidance for a CRB RRP. The WDFW Public Information officers would be responsible for the coordinated formulation and release of information about the infestation to the news media, the public, and other agencies. The Public Information Officers are also responsible for disseminating summary information on the project if/when the AIS ICS is disbanded.

Lead Agency: WDFW Public Information Officers

## DEFINING THE EXTENT OF COLONIZATION

To inform policy and tactical response to the infestation, survey crews (formed based on location of potentially infested water body) will establish the physical range of infestation and identify the life-cycle phase(s)/age of infestation of mussels present. These demographics will guide subsequent management decisions, including survey design. Investigation of the geographic extent of infestation will require surveying upstream and downstream areas and any connected water bodies.

Lead entity: WDFW, lead agency where incident occurs

### Tasks:

1. Survey nearby water bodies with vulnerability to the same vectors (using information from boater surveys, where available, to determine high traffic areas). Potential methodologies include:
  - Sampling fixed and temporary hard substrates
  - Shoreline surveys
  - SCUBA and snorkel surveys
  - Plankton sampling. Plankton sampling may be analyzed microscopically or via Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) genetic analysis. Plankton samples should involve sufficient water volume to detect low veliger concentrations via either of those methods. These efforts should follow existing regional or national protocols.
2. Assess maturity and spawning condition of mussels at the infestation site(s).
3. Determine likely water flow dispersal of mussel veligers. Potential methodologies include:
  - Dye studies
  - Other hydrographic research techniques
  - Interviewing field personnel
4. Identify facilities (e.g., hydropower, fish hatcheries, irrigation systems, etc.) that could be affected.

5. Ensure that surveys are completed and that results are reported

## PREVENTING FURTHER SPREAD

Preventing spread of an original introduction is crucial to the success of a rapid response plan. The use of a quarantine or temporary closure will likely be necessary until prevention techniques can be implemented to manage the pathways that spread dreissenid mussels. The duration of the emergency closure will last until a prevention plan is implemented for the water body. If closure is untenable, Watercraft Inspection Teams (WIT) must be on hand for decontamination.

Lead entity: WDFW

### Tasks:

1. Identify dispersal vectors (including movement by humans, fish and wildlife, water traffic, water flow, and other processes). Assume measures are needed to prevent release of veligers as well as movement of adult mussels.
  - Assess the likely movement of boats that recently used the infested water body to identify inspection needs in other water bodies.
2. Establish public outreach efforts, including:
  - Ensure that zebra/quagga mussel —alert signs are adequately deployed.
  - Alert prior users of these waters of the risks their boats and equipment create for other water bodies.
  - Design and implement educational outreach programs using print, electronic media and other avenues, with an emphasis on raw water users.
3. Restrict dispersal pathways, where feasible, including:
  - If feasible, identify and eliminate the likely source of mussel inoculation (e.g., infested boat).
  - Quarantine any hatcheries or aquaculture operations that are likely to spread mussels or their larvae via transfers outside the affected watershed(s).
  - Quarantine infested water bodies as needed to prevent spread by watercraft.
  - Consider and implement any needed prevention of overland veliger or adult mussel transport to other water bodies.

- Develop and implement Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) plans to ensure that response personnel do not further spread the original introduction.
  - Stop or slow water release to potentially uninfested sites.
  - Draw water from below thermocline.
  - Install physical barriers.
  - Consider special management measures for operations of locks and commercial vessel traffic.
4. Establish wash and inspection requirements on boats and equipment, and provide for associated logistical support (e.g., disinfection kits).
- Begin a post haul-out inspection of boats and equipment in the areas where mussels were found.
  - Begin a pre-launch inspection program for all boats and equipment in places where boats and equipment from a contaminated area are likely to be launched next.

A template that includes information that should be included in a management plan is described in Appendix XI.

## INITIATING AVAILABLE/RELEVANT CONTROL ACTIONS

Evaluate management options and proceed either with eradication efforts or containment/mitigation activities. Convene scientific advisory team to consult (Appendix V).

Lead entity: WDFW

### Tasks:

1. Decide if eradication is possible based on rapid analysis of population dynamics and pathways of spread. Consider the following:
  - Cost versus benefit of treatment options.
  - Type of water body (e.g., contained lake, mainstem reservoir, tributary reservoir, small stream, large river, estuary, or water diversion facility).
  - Type of substrate (e.g., rocks that allow mussel attachment on their undersides where chemicals may not reach them).

- Extent of population distribution (isolated vs. widespread coupled with a priori assumptions about the spread of mussels before detection).
- Life stage(s) present (default assumption is both veligers and adults).
- Time of year in relation to spawning season.
- Is spawning occurring now or possible based on current water temperature (e.g., 12 °C or greater)?
- When is the likely spawning season based on predicted temperature conditions?
- How do mean monthly temperature patterns for the water body relate to mussel spawning requirements?
- Amount of water in reservoir or waterway.
- Does the reservoir need to be drawn down before treatment?
- How much can the reservoir be drawn down?
- Is river flow low enough for effective treatment?
- Circulation patterns in water body.
- Spreading pattern of population within the water body.
- Inflow rates and sources.
- If drawdown needs to occur, what is the feasibility given input source(s)?
- Rate of outflow and distance of veliger dispersal.
- Do flow patterns help or hinder eradication options?
- Presence of state or federally listed threatened or endangered species.
- Special status of water body, including:
  - Water use designation (e.g., drinking water).
  - Wild and scenic designation.
  - Wilderness area.
  - Potential impact to cultural resources.
  - Department of Defense or other restricted access areas.
  - Tribal lands.
  - Endangered Species Act critical habitat.
  - Presence of marine mammals covered by Marine Mammal Protection Act.
  - Clean Water Act 303(d) listing.
  - Beneficial uses of water bodies.
  - Use of area by threatened and endangered species.

2. If eradication is attempted, select appropriate method(s).

3. If eradication is not possible or fails, develop control objectives and select/design appropriate control measures.



4. Obtain relevant permits and regulatory agency concurrence (see Appendices IV, V).
5. Implement eradication or control strategies.

## EXTENDED RESPONSE

### LONG-TERM MONITORING

This objective provides data for adaptive management and long-term evaluation of management and control efforts, and will be included in the management plan for each water body.

Lead entity: The responsible agency where the infestation of mussels is found.

#### **Tasks:**

1. Continue control strategy developed during Initial Response phase.
2. Develop long-term control objectives
3. Design a monitoring program to evaluate the status of the zebra/quagga mussel populations, emphasizing veliger sampling. Monitoring activities should be implemented in coordination with other field operations, such as environmental monitoring requirements associated with control action regulatory compliance (e.g., National Pollutant Elimination Discharge System [NPDES] permits).
4. Disseminate findings through an easily-accessible, consolidated, coordinated real-time database and listserv.
5. Evaluate control strategy against results of monitoring program and revise strategy as needed to meet long-term control objectives.

## OTHER AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES

In addition to this plan, the State of Washington published the “Washington State Aquatic Nuisance Species Management Plan,” in 2001. The plan described coordination of aquatic invasive species management actions in existence, and identified additional needed management actions, all of which were intended to focus on feasible, cost-effective, collaborative management practices.

In 2005, the Aquatic Invasive Species Prevention and Enforcement Program, co-managed by the Fish and Enforcement Divisions of the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, was

established. The program addresses a wide variety of priority aquatic invasive species, including dreissenids. For example:

- In 2008, 3.5% of the watercraft inspected at mandatory check stations were infested with aquatic invasive species.
- Since 2009, a multi-stakeholder work group has been formed to replace prohibited crayfish with native crayfish for use in schools.
- The program has worked with the shellfish aquaculture industry by providing guidance on how to minimize risk of infestations to culture facilities and prevent the spread of invasives during shellfish transport.

In its 2012 report to the Legislature, the Washington Invasive Species Council and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife staff documented challenges to implementing its statutory authority associated with aquatic invasive species, including scattered statutes that create jurisdictional uncertainties and budget reductions that have affected programs involving tunicates, ballast water, Atlantic salmon, green crab monitoring, and enforcement. Senate Bill 6040, which was passed during the 2014 legislative session, helped to consolidate state invasive species laws and provide certainty for those agencies authorized to regulate invasive species. However, the legislation passed without funding—the challenges associated with implementing a comprehensive aquatic invasive species program in Washington remain until those budget gaps can be addressed.

In 2012, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife published version 2.0, “Invasive Species Management Protocols,” a document that provides protocols for work in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems as well as other “special” situations, such as working with fish tankers, and diving equipment. The protocols document, in combination with this rapid response plan and other species-specific plans, such as the 2007–2009 Tunicate Management Plan, if funded, create a suite of policy guidance documents that will efficiently allow the state to prevent and manage invasive species.

## APPENDICES

Appendix I.	Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6040 - 2014 Regular Session - 63 <sup>rd</sup> Legislature.
Appendix II.	List of State Resources for <i>Dreissena</i> Response.
Appendix III.	Quarantine Authority.
Appendix IV.	Washington Environmental Regulatory Compliance Framework.
Appendix V.	Flow Chart of Permitting Alternatives and Associated Contacts.
Appendix VI.	Interim List of At-Risk Water Bodies in Washington.
Appendix VII.	Details for Top Five Interim High-Risk Water Bodies in Washington.
Appendix VIII.	Veliger Analysis Documentation.
Appendix IX.	Interim Notification List for Reports of Dreissenids in Washington.
Appendix X.	Sample Press Release.
Appendix XI.	Outline for Draft Management Plan.

## APPENDIX I. ENGROSSED SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL 6040 - 2014 REGULAR SESSION - 63<sup>RD</sup> LEGISLATURE

Senate Bill 6040 was signed by the Washington Governor Jay Inslee in March of 2014. The following are key sections of the bill:

**Background:** Classification and Regulation of Aquatic Animal Species. The Fish and Wildlife Commission (Commission) has the authority to classify species as a prohibited aquatic animal species or regulated aquatic animal species, depending on the risk level and any beneficial use of the species. Unless authorized by the Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), it is generally illegal to possess, transport, propagate, buy, sell, or release a prohibited or regulated aquatic animal species. The release of a regulated aquatic animal species or a species that has not yet been classified is also illegal. In general, these offenses are punishable as gross misdemeanors.

When the Commission identifies a prohibited aquatic animal species infestation, DFW must develop a rapid response plan to address potential actions such as eradication, containment, enforcement, and public education. DFW and other agencies may post signs at an infestation site to identify the infestation and notify the public of potential penalties for possessing and transporting these species.

Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Enforcement. In general, anyone that has used a commercial or recreational watercraft outside of the state must have documentation that the watercraft is free of AIS. A violation of this requirement is an infraction. DFW must adopt rules to implement the documentation requirement, including identifying the types of allowable documentation.

Specifically, DFW may require anyone transporting a watercraft to stop at a check station and failure to do so is a gross misdemeanor. Check stations must be plainly marked and operated by at least one DFW Officer. A person with a watercraft that is contaminated with AIS must bear the expense for any necessary impoundment, transportation, or decontamination.

However, a person who stops at a check station and complies with DFW directives is exempt from AIS-related criminal penalties and forfeiture.

**Summary:** Specifies General Invasive Species Authority. DFW is designated as the state's lead agency for managing many types of invasive species, both aquatic and terrestrial. Subject to the availability of funding, DFW may conduct activities to include the following:

monitoring and rapid response actions; conducting education and outreach; aligning standards, classifications, and enforcement provisions with regional, national, and international provisions; and providing technical assistance or other support to government entities and private groups.

AIS Classification System. A new AIS classification system framework is established, similar to the existing classification system but with more potential classification options. DFW must adopt species classifications in consultation with the Invasive Species Council (Council). The framework is as follows:

*Prohibited Species.* Prohibited species are a priority for prevention and management actions. There are three categories of prohibited species: level 1 species pose a high invasive risk and are a priority for prevention and rapid response actions; level 2 species pose a high invasive risk and are a priority for infested site management; and level 3 species pose a moderate to high invasive risk and may be appropriate for prevention or management action;

*Regulated Species.* There are three classifications for regulated species. Type A species pose a low to moderate invasive risk and have a beneficial use; type B species pose a low or unknown risk and are used for personal or commercial uses, such as aquariums; and type C species pose a low or unknown risk and do not qualify as a type B species; and

Interim classifications are provided until new rules are adopted by DFW.

Rapid Response, Infested Site Management, and Quarantine Authorities. When a prohibited level 1 species is detected, DFW may implement rapid response management actions to contain, control, or eradicate the species. DFW may utilize an incident command system if the action exceeds seven days, and may cooperate with other agencies, specified entities, and private landowners. In implementing a rapid response management action, DFW may enter onto property when authorized by a warrant supported by reasonable cause.

Infested site management actions are authorized when a prohibited level 2 species is detected, and may include long-term actions to contain, control, or eradicate the species. DFW must consult with other agencies, specified entities, and private landowners. In implementing an infested site management action, DFW may enter onto property when authorized by a warrant supported by reasonable cause.

DFW may issue a quarantine declaration due to threats posed by a prohibited level 1 or 2 species. The declaration may include a prohibition or limitation on the movement of

conveyances or water from an area. DFW may use this authority separately or in conjunction with a rapid response or infested site management action.

DFW may, in consultation with the Council, request that the Governor order emergency measures in circumstances where prohibited level 1 or 2 species pose an imminent environmental, economic, or human health danger. DFW may implement measures approved by the Governor, which may include the use of pesticides after consultation with other agencies and landowners and evaluation of alternative measures.

Notification, consultation, and appeals procedures are established for the exercise of these AIS management authorities, as well as a requirement that DFW publicly list infested water bodies. In exercising these authorities, DFW must endeavor to contain, control, and eradicate AIS while protecting human safety and minimizing impacts to the environment and landowners.

AIS Inspections and Decontamination. The scope of vehicles and equipment that must comply with AIS documentation requirements is expanded to any aquatic conveyance entering the state, which includes transportable personal property such as watercraft, watercraft-related equipment, float planes, fish tanker trucks, irrigation equipment, and fishing gear. DFW must implement this requirement by rule, including identifying allowable certificate of inspection forms and the type of conveyances to which the requirement applies.

Anyone using an aquatic conveyance must clean and drain the conveyance after use on a water body or property. This includes removal of visible aquatic plants, animals, other organisms, and water from the water body. DFW may begin enforcing clean and drain provisions on watercraft and seaplanes transporting aquatic plants, but must adopt rules before enforcing the requirement more broadly.

As under current law, DFW may establish mandatory check stations for the inspection of watercraft. DFW may adopt rules covering other types of aquatic conveyances that must stop at check stations. At least one DFW officer, ex-officio officer, or agency representative must be present during check station operation. A person stopped at a check station must allow inspection for AIS and clean and drain requirements, and follow any clean and drain or decontamination orders given.

When encountering an aquatic conveyance with AIS, a DFW officer or ex-officio officer may require decontamination on site, prohibit launch into a water body until decontamination, require immediate transport to a decontamination station, or seize and transport the conveyance to a decontamination station. The specific order depends on the risk and

availability of resources, and compliance must occur at the expense of the person in possession of the conveyance.

DFW may operate inspection and decontamination stations, which can be either part of or separate from inspection stations. Authorized representatives with sufficient training may operate inspection, decontamination, and check stations. These stations must be operated consistent with rules established by DFW. Within two years, DFW must submit a recommended fee schedule that DFW-authorized representatives may charge for inspection and decontamination services.

AIS Inspection and Enforcement. DFW officers and ex-officio officers are provided the authority to: temporarily stop persons to inspect aquatic conveyances for AIS or compliance with clean and drain requirements based on reasonable cause; and execute a search or arrest warrant issued by a court based on probable cause that a violation of an invasive species law has occurred.

DFW staff may take samples of invasive species or inspect property or a water body under a warrant issued by a court based on probable cause that an invasive species is present and after seeking the owner's permission for the inspection.

The following acts are established as gross misdemeanors:

- failure to allow inspection while stopped at a check station;
- failure to comply with a decontamination order;
- possession of a prohibited level 1 or 2 species without DFW authorization;
- possession of, introduction of, or trafficking in a prohibited level 3 species without DFW authorization;
- introduction of a regulated type A, B, or C species without DFW authorization;
- failure to clearly identify by species or subspecies name a regulated type B species used for commercial purposes; and
- a knowing violation of a quarantine declaration.

Interfering with DFW personnel authorized by a warrant to conduct a rapid response or infested site management action is included within the existing crime of unlawful interfering in department operations, which is punishable as a gross misdemeanor. A class C felony is established for trafficking or introducing a prohibited level 1 or 2 species without DFW authorization, or if a person commits a second invasive species related act punishable as a gross misdemeanor within five years.



A new infraction is established for failure to follow clean and drain requirements or a clean and drain order.

In addition to criminal penalties, violators are subject to any costs incurred in managing the invasive species and its progeny. Certain exemptions apply to AIS offenses, including those in compliance with directives at a check station, acting in a manner authorized by DFW, or returning AIS caught while fishing into the water.

APPENDIX II. LIST OF STATE RESOURCES FOR *DREISSENA* RESPONSE

WIT 1 Level Trained Personnel

NAME		AGENCY	DIVISION
LAST	First		
ALEXANDER	Brian	WDFW	Enforcement
ANDERSON	Chris	WDFW	Enforcement
ANDERSON	Eric	WDFW	Enforcement
ANDERSON	Patrick	WDFW	Enforcement
ANDERSON	Dan	WDFW	Enforcement
APPLE	Mike	WDFW	Enforcement
BALAZS	Ken	WDFW	Enforcement
BEAUCHENE	JoLynn	WDFW	Enforcement
BRINSON	Dan	WDFW	Enforcement
BUSCHING	Chris	WDFW	Enforcement
CAPELLI	Jason	WDFW	Enforcement
CATON	Michael	WDFW	Enforcement
CENCI	Mike	WDFW	Enforcement
CHADWICK	Dan	WDFW	Enforcement
CHAMBERLIN	Brandon	WDFW	Enforcement
CHANDLER	Kim	WDFW	Enforcement
CHRISTENSEN	Dan	WDFW	Enforcement
CILK	Harry	WDFW	Enforcement
CLEMENTSON	Chris	WDFW	Enforcement
COOK	Julie	WDFW	Enforcement
CROWN	Steve	WDFW	Enforcement
CZEBOTAR	Jason	WDFW	Enforcement
DAVIDSON	Bryan	WDFW	Enforcement
DAY	Jason	WDFW	Enforcement
DO	Loc	WDFW	Enforcement
DOWNES	Ralph	WDFW	Enforcement
ERHARDT	Chris	WDFW	Enforcement
ERICKSON	Severin	WDFW	Enforcement
FAIRBANKS	Brian	WDFW	Enforcement
FLOWERS	Dennis	WDFW	Enforcement
FULTON	Brian	WDFW	Enforcement
GASTON	Zach	WDFW	Enforcement
GRANT	Graham	WDFW	Enforcement
GRANT	Morgan	WDFW	Enforcement
GRESHOCK	Jacob	WDFW	Enforcement

<b>HAHN</b>	Lenny	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>HAW</b>	Greg	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>HILLMAN</b>	Mark	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>HJELMSTAD</b>	Jesse	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>HOBBS</b>	Michael	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>HOPKINS</b>	Bret	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>HORN</b>	Jonathan	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>HUGHES</b>	David	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JACKSON</b>	Ted	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JACOBSON</b>	Paul	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JAMES</b>	Mark	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JAROS</b>	Tony	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JEWELL</b>	Mike	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JEWETT</b>	Matt	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JOHN</b>	Ryan	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JOHNSON</b>	Phillip	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JONES</b>	David	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>JORG</b>	Nicholas	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>KIM</b>	Hwa	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>KING</b>	Doug	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>KIRSCH</b>	Keith	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>KLEIN</b>	Carl	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>KLUMP</b>	Danyl	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>KOONTZ</b>	Joshua	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>LANGBEHN</b>	Jason	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>LANTIEGNE</b>	Bill	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>LEE</b>	Jeff	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>LEONETTI</b>	Tony	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>LUDWIG</b>	John	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MANN</b>	Richard	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MARTHALLER</b>	Aaron	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MARTIN</b>	Lance	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MASCHHOFF</b>	Justin	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MAURSTAD</b>	Jennifer	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MCCORMICK</b>	Troy	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MCGARY</b>	Chad	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MCLERRAN</b>	Kerry	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MCQUARY</b>	Robert	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MCQUOID</b>	Mike	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MOATS</b>	Thomas	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MOSMAN</b>	Paul	WDFW	Enforcement

<b>MOSZETER,</b>	Chris	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MULLINS</b>	Russ	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MYERS</b>	Shawn	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>MYERS</b>	Alan	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>NELSON</b>	Jim	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>NICKS</b>	Dennis	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>NIXON</b>	Matt	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>O'HAGAN</b>	Dan	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>OLSON</b>	Erik	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>ORR</b>	Gary	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>OSWALD</b>	Eric	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>PACE</b>	Carlo	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>PARKERT</b>	Nick	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>PETERS</b>	Carly	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>PETERSON</b>	Cory	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>PHILLIPS</b>	Rich	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>PRATER</b>	Dustin	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>RAHN</b>	Dan	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>RICHARDS</b>	Bruce	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>ROSENBERGER</b>	Kit	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SCHERZINGER</b>	Brent	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SCHLENKER</b>	Murray	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SCHROEDER</b>	Scott	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SMITH</b>	Chris	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SMITH</b>	William	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SNYDER</b>	Jason	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SPRECHER</b>	Mike	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SPURBECK</b>	David	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>STEFFLER</b>	Glenn	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>STEPHENSON</b>	Tylar	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>STEVENS</b>	Lance	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SUMMIT</b>	Jeff	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>TAYLOR</b>	Pam	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>THOMPSON</b>	Katie	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>TRESER</b>	Calvin	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>VALENTINE</b>	Ryan	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>VAN</b>	Isabel	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>VLADRICKEN</b>			
<b>VANCE</b>	Brendan	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>VARYVODA</b>	Roman	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>VOROUS</b>	Natalie	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>WATTS</b>	Cody	WDFW	Enforcement

<b>WEAVER</b>	Bob	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>WENDT</b>	Lauren	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>WICKERSHAM</b>	Jeffrey	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>WILLETTE</b>	Wendy	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>WOOD</b>	Curt	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>ZUCHLEWSKI</b>	Christopher	WDFW	Enforcement

**WIT 1 Level Trained Personnel**

Name		Agency	Division
Last	First		
<b>ANDERSON</b>	Eric	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>CORRADO</b>	Greg	Washington Sea Plane Pilots Association	N/A
<b>JOHNSON</b>	Phil	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>KLEIN</b>	Carl	WDFW	Enforcement
<b>SCHULTZ</b>	Jesse	WDFW	Fish Management
<b>WILKINSON</b>	Michael	WDFW	Fish Management

### APPENDIX III. QUARANTINE AUTHORITY

Excerpted from Z-0454.4/Engrossed Senate Bill 6040

Section 107.

If the department determines it is necessary to protect the environmental, economic, or human health interests of the state from the threat of a prohibited Level 1 or Level 2 species, the department may declare a quarantine against a water body, property, or region within the state. The department may prohibit or condition the movement of aquatic conveyances and waters from such a quarantined place or area that are likely to contain a prohibited species.

A quarantine declaration under this section may be implemented separately or in conjunction with rapid response management actions under section 108 of this act and infested site management actions under section 109 of this act in a manner and for a duration necessary to protect the interests of the state from the threat of a prohibited Level 1 or Level 2 species. A quarantine declaration must include:

- (a) The reasons for the action including the prohibited Level 1 or Level 2 species triggering the quarantine;
- (b) The boundaries of the area affected;
- (c) The action timeline;
- (d) Types of aquatic conveyances and waters affected by the quarantine and any prohibition or conditions on the movement of those aquatic conveyances and waters from the quarantine area; and
- (e) Inspection and decontamination requirements for aquatic conveyances.

## APPENDIX IV. WASHINGTON ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY COMPLIANCE FRAMEWORK

Of particular relevance to the application of pesticides to state waters is the recently revised status of Clean Water Act NPDES permitting requirements. Prior to 2009, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ruled that a CWA NPDES permit was not required when legally registered pesticides are applied for pest control purposes (Federal Register Vol. 71, No. 227, November 27, 2006). In response to legal challenges in 2009, however, the sixth circuit federal court determined that EPA must issue NPDES permits for all chemical pesticide applications that leave a residue or excess pesticide in water (as well as biological pesticide applications). In response, EPA issued a Pesticide General Permit in October 2011 to cover discharges in areas under their permitting authority, which included six states, most tribal lands, and federal facilities in four additional states (including Washington). States with EPA delegated authority to issue NPDES permits (e.g., Montana, Oregon, and Washington) have developed state-specific permitting approaches that may be similar or more stringent than the federally issued Pesticide General Permit.

Fact Sheet:

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/pesticides/InvasiveSpecies/docs/DraftAISGPfactsheet2016.pdf> Aquatic Invasive Species Management NPDES General Permit:

<http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/pesticides/InvasiveSpecies/docs/aipermit08082016.pdf>

### PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS COVERED UNDER THE PERMIT

This general permit covers management activities for nonnative invasive aquatic animals and nonnative invasive marine algae that result in the discharge of chemicals or control products into surface waters of the state of Washington. Surface waters include fresh, brackish, marine, and estuarine waters. Products regulated under this permit include algaecides, herbicides, insecticides, molluscicides, piscicides and any other chemical or product appropriate for use in managing these organisms.

TABLE IV1. PESTICIDE USE MATRIX FOR AN ISOLATED ZEBRA MUSSEL INFESTATION IN WASHINGTON’S COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

REGULATORY REGIME	REGULATORY APPROVAL PROVISIONS	EMERGENCY PROVISIONS
<p><b>Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA)</b>—administered by US EPA. Pesticide licensing and application authority delegated to Washington State Dept. of Agriculture (WSDA). Implemented under the <b>Washington Pesticide Control Act (RCW 15.58)</b> and the <b>Pesticide Application Act (RCW 17.21)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pesticides approved for aquatic application by the WSDA must also be covered under a general NPDES permit or a State Waste Permit issued by the Dept. of Ecology (see below).</li> <li>▪ For commercial pesticides not currently approved by WSDA, a formal Section 3 application process is required. The requesting body would submit an application through the WSDA.</li> <li>▪ For an emergency situation, FIFRA provides for exemptions under Sections 18 and 24. See next column.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 18 of FIFRA allows for the temporary use of a pesticide that is not registered for the proposed use when WDFW or scientists identify an urgent and non-routine situation and where there are no registered pesticides or alternative practices that will effectively address the problem. The complete application is submitted by WDFW or other entity for review by WSDA<sup>1</sup>, who evaluates the request and may submit it to the EPA. The EPA must perform a multi-disciplinary risk assessment of the requested use, relying largely on data that have already been reviewed for the pesticide. A dietary risk assessment, an occupational risk assessment, an ecological and environmental risk assessment, and an assessment of the emergency are conducted prior to making a decision. The Agency's evaluation also includes an assessment of the progress toward registration for the use in question. If the emergency appears valid and the risks are acceptable, EPA approves the emergency exemption request. EPA will deny an exemption request if the pesticide use may cause unreasonable adverse effects to health or the environment, or if emergency criteria are not met. As a matter of course, a state may withdraw an exemption request at any point in the process. EPA typically makes a decision on requests within 50 days to make a decision. EPA’s lead reviewer will decide if their Agency must publish a Notice of Receipt (NOR) in the Federal Register for the Section 18 request. A NOR is required for certain types of requests, such as for new chemicals, first food uses, or uses that are of higher concern, to allow a 15-day public comment period. The total process may take as long as 120 days if it is a new request, or</li> </ul>



REGULATORY REGIME	REGULATORY APPROVAL PROVISIONS	EMERGENCY PROVISIONS
		<p>80 days if is a repeat request. If approved, the approval has a one-year duration for specific exemptions and three years for quarantine exemptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A state or federal agency may issue a crisis exemption for unpredictable and immediate emergency pest situations and when the time from discovery of the emergency to the time when the pesticide use is needed is insufficient to allow for the authorization of a Specific or Quarantine exemption by EPA. Crisis exemptions are meant to be a last resort in addressing an emergency situation and are expected to be rare. Crisis exemption would allow unregistered use of a registered pesticide for 15 days. Unregistered pesticides are not eligible for crisis exemptions. The requesting entity has to justify the crisis to WSDA, who then must contact the EPA Section 18 Team Leader about the situation and its intent to utilize the crisis exemption. The EPA must concur on a crisis exemption prior to the SLA’s issuance of one. Use beyond the 15 days requires an emergency exemption. Section 24 (c) allows the states to register an additional use of a federally registered pesticide, or a new use, if there is a “special local need” and a current tolerance for the use approved by EPA. The application is usually submitted by the registrant to WSDA for review. WSDA may approve a 24c based upon satisfactory supporting information and whether they are able to determine if an appropriate federally registered pesticide product is not sufficiently available. Applications approved by WSDA are then submitted to the EPA for review.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Endangered Species Act (ESA)</b>—The ESA is administered jointly by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pesticide-related response actions undertaken in the CRB could affect species or critical habitat listed under the ESA. In those cases, if the action is being taken by a federal agency, or is being funded by a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agency applications to the EPA for FIFRA Section 18 or Section 24 to use pesticides for emergency response actions that may affect a listed species or critical habitat would trigger the requirement for an ESA Section 7</li> </ul>


REGULATORY REGIME	REGULATORY APPROVAL PROVISIONS	EMERGENCY PROVISIONS
<p>freshwater and terrestrial species, and NOAA Fisheries for anadromous and marine species.</p> <p>Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife(WDFW) maintains a <b>state species of concern list (WAC 232-12-297)</b></p>	<p>federal agency, an ESA Section 7 consultation needs to occur. See next column for Section 7 consultation emergency provisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For state-only actions, ESA consultation is not required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect salmon, steelhead and bull trout, WDFW fish timing windows are incorporated into the NPDES Aquatic Invasive Species General Permit issued by Ecology.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>consultation between EPA and NOAA Fisheries and/or the FWS depending on the species and critical habitat affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Under emergency circumstances, such consultation would be conducted informally during the emergency. Formal consultation would be initiated, as appropriate, as soon as practicable after the emergency is under control.</li> <li>▪ If formal consultation is required, the FWS and/or NOAA Fisheries provide an after-the-fact biological opinion to the EPA that documents the effects of the emergency response action on listed species and/or critical habitat.</li> <li>▪ If informal consultation is appropriate, the FWS and/or NOAA Fisheries provide written concurrence to the EPA that the response action is not likely to adversely affect listed species or critical habitat.</li> <li>▪ Under non-emergency circumstances, the same response action would be the subject of a completed consultation in advance of the response action being implemented. WDFW would have to be consulted if a state species of concern was at risk.</li> </ul>
<p><b>National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)</b>— administered by US EPA.</p> <p><b>State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)</b>— administered by WA Dept. of Ecology. <b>(RCW 43.21)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Any federally initiated action, or action on federal lands, or action that uses federal funds, must also comply with the provisions of NEPA. An Environmental Assessment (EA) would be required, and a finding of no significant impact needed before the action could take place. For an emergency situation, see next column.</li> <li>▪ SEPA provides a statewide process for identifying and evaluating the potential adverse environmental impacts of a proposal. SEPA requirements are addressed in the Ecology permit process described in the next section below.</li> <li>▪ During development of the Aquatic Invasive Species General Permit (see next section below), a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ NEPA provides for an emergency action through consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality. The lead federal action agency would call CEQ, write a letter of notification, and prepare an environmental action statement. CEQ would respond in 24 hours. After the action is complete, a formal EIS or EA would have to be prepared.</li> </ul>

REGULATORY REGIME	REGULATORY APPROVAL PROVISIONS	EMERGENCY PROVISIONS
	non-project EIS was developed to satisfy state SEPA requirements.	
<b>Clean Water Act (CWA)</b> —administered by US EPA with authority delegated to the WA Dept. of Ecology (Ecology) for regulating pollutants in state waters. Implemented under the <b>Washington Water Pollution Control Law (RCW 90.48)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Aquatic Invasive Species NPDES and State Waste Discharge General Permit (see notes below) has been developed by Ecology to allow for the treatment of aquatic invasive species.</li> <li>▪ After permit coverage is issued, allowed chemicals could be used immediately, provided that appropriate FIFRA labels or exemptions have been obtained. Permittees covered under the NPDES permit for invasive species must complete an adaptive management plan. If treatment will occur before the plan is completed, the Permittee may complete it within the 18 months following treatment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water pollution control laws do not have provisions that exempt emergency situations from requiring a permit. Applying a pesticide under Section 18 or 24 of FIFRA still requires a water quality permit.</li> </ul>
<b>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</b> —administered by US EPA with authority delegated to the Washington Dept. of Ecology <b>Dangerous Waste Regulations (WAC 173-303)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pesticide waste must be managed in a non-leak, closed container or tank that is appropriately labeled.</li> <li>▪ Properly managed containers may be stored for up to one year.</li> <li>▪ Containers must be transported to permitted hazardous waste facility following Washington and Federal Dept. of Transportation regulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Releases must be immediately contained and transferred to appropriate container. Releases over 200 #s or 25 gallons must be reported to the National Response Center 1 (800) 424-8802 and to the Washington Emergency Management Division 1 (800) 258-5990 and the appropriate Ecology regional office.</li> </ul>

NOTES:

1. Applications are submitted to the Policy Assistant in the Pesticide Management Division of WSDA in Olympia. The contact number is 1 (360) 902- 2078.
2. Ecology has issued an NPDES/State Waste General Permit for aquatic invasive species control. <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/pesticides/invasive.html>
3. The SEPA program can be contacted at (360) 407-6922.

# APPENDIX V. FLOW CHART OF PERMITTING ALTERNATIVES AND ASSOCIATED CONTACTS



## APPENDIX VI. INTERIM LIST OF INTERIM AT-RISK WATER BODIES IN WASHINGTON

Table 19. Interim list of water bodies in Washington that have a high to medium relative risk of dreissenid mussel establishment and/or introduction. Risk categories were formulated using best professional judgment. The amount of data used to assign risk categories varied for each water body. Data is summarized in Appendix 1 and II, and risk categories based on one or two data points are flagged with an asterisk. Dreissenids can establish in areas identified with low to very low risk of establishment.

Water Body Name	Ca <sup>++</sup> mg/L	pH	Risk of Establishment	Risk of Introduction
Moses Lake	30.5	8.18	High	High
Potholes Reservoir Outflow	28.3	8.14	High	High
Pend Oreille River	20.1	-	Medium	High
Lake Washington Inflow	18.8	7.77	Medium	High
Banks Lake	17.8	7.90	Medium	High
Columbia River, Lake Celilo	16.8	-	Medium	High
Columbia River, Lake Bonneville	16.5	8.11	Medium	High
Clear Lake	16.4	8.47	Medium	High
Williams Lake	20.5	7.39	Medium	Medium
Columbia River, Lake Wanapum	18.1	8.02	Medium	Medium
Lake Crescent	15.9	6.94	Medium	Medium
Nooksack River	12.0	7.57	Low	Medium
Silver Lake	10.4	7.49	Very Low	High
Deer Lake	9.3	7.50	Very Low	High
Cowlitz River	8.1	7.47	Very Low	High
Lake Cushman	11.6	7.55	Very Low	Medium
Diamond Lake	7.5	7.90	Very Low	Medium
Mineral Lake Outflow	5.8	7.64	Very Low	Medium
Alder Lake	5.1	7.45	Very Low	Medium
Cle Elum Reservoir	4.7	7.08	Very Low	Medium
Bumping Reservoir	3.8	7.55	Very Low	Medium

Source: Wells, S., T.D. Counihan, A. Puls, M. Sytma, and B. Adair. 2011. Prioritizing Zebra and Quagga Mussel Monitoring in the Columbia River Basin. Center for Lakes and Reservoirs Publications. Paper 10.

[http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/centerforlakes\\_pub/10](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/centerforlakes_pub/10)

APPENDIX VII. DETAILS FOR TOP FIVE HIGH-RISK WATER BODIES IN WASHINGTON

	Moses Lake	Potholes Reservoir	Pend Oreille River	Lake Washington	Banks Lake
Waterbody Type	Reservoir	Reservoir	River	Natural Lake	Reservoir
<b>Location</b>					
Latitude	47. 04' 06.23"N	46. 58' 54.24" N		47.37'0"N	47.37'12"N
Longitude	119. 19' 55.51"W	119. 15'53.70"W		122.15'53"W	119.18'27"W
County	Grant	Grant	Pend Oreille	King	Grant
Drainage	Columbia Basin	Columbia Basin	Columbia Basin		Columbia Basin
Inflow	Crab Creek	Moses lake	Priest River/Lake Pend Oreille	Sammamish and Cedar Rivers	Lake Roosevelt
Outflow	Potholes Reservoir	Crab Creek	Columbia River	Lake Washington Ship Canal	
<b>Statistics</b>					
Surface Elevation (ft)	1,050	1,046		16	1,571
Basin Area (mi <sup>2</sup> )	3,080	3,920	25,792	315,000	
Surface Area (ac)	6,728	27,800		21,000	26,886
Volume (ac ft)	131,000	332,800		2,400,000	1,237,000
Max. Depth (ft)	38	142		214	177
Mean Depth (ft)	19	18		108	46
Shoreline length (mi)					135
Trophic state	eutrophic	eutrophic		mesotrophic	
<b>Water quality/monitoring</b>					
pH	8.18	8.14	7.92	7.77	7.9
Ca <sup>++</sup>	30.5	28.3	20.1	18.8	17.8
Secchi		8.8			
<p>The Center for Lakes and Reservoirs at Portland State University maintains a searchable <a href="#">database</a> of water bodies in the United States that are sampled for dreissenids and <i>Corbicula</i>. Results are reported as “non-detect,” “unknown,” and “results pending,” and identify substrate type (e.g., natural, artificial, plankton, SCUBA, ROV, other, and unspecified). For additional information, or updated information not yet loaded into the database, contact:            Mark Sytsma, Ph. (503)725-2213, Fx. (503)725-3834, Email. <a href="mailto:sww@pdx.edu">sww@pdx.edu</a>            Mailing: Portland State University, PO BOX 751-ESM, Portland OR 97207-0751            Physical: Portland State University, 1719 SW 10th Ave, SRTC Rm 218, Portland OR 97201</p>					
<b>Information</b>					
Dam	Moses Lake	O’Sullivan		None	



Owned/ Administered by:	Bureau of Reclamation/ Moses Lake Irrigation and Rehabilitation District	Bureau of Reclamation		King County Water and Land Resources Division	
URL				KingCounty.g ov	
Contact Info					
Dam type	earthfill	earthfill		None	
Draw down y/n	Y	Y		N	
Irrigation y/n	Y	Y		N	
Irrigation District	Moses Lake Irrigation and Rehabilitation District	East and South Columbia Basin Irrigation Districts			
WDFW Contact	<a href="mailto:TeamEphrata@dfw.wa.gov">TeamEphrata@ dfw.wa.gov</a>	Greg Fitzgerald, <a href="mailto:colbaswa@dfw.wa.gov">colbaswa@dfw. wa.gov</a>			Greg Fitzgerald, <a href="mailto:colbaswa@dfw.wa.gov">colbaswa@dfw. wa.gov</a>
<b>Adjacent land managers/owners</b>					
WDFW Contact	<a href="mailto:TeamEphrata@dfw.wa.gov">TeamEphrata@ dfw.wa.gov</a>	Greg Fitzgerald, <a href="mailto:colbaswa@dfw.wa.gov">colbaswa@dfw. wa.gov</a>			Greg Fitzgerald, <a href="mailto:colbaswa@dfw.wa.gov">colbaswa@dfw. wa.gov</a>
<b>Access</b>					
Public ramps?	Y <a href="http://wdfw.wa.gov/fishing/washington/388/">http://wdfw.wa. gov/fishing/was hington/388/</a>	Y <a href="http://wdfw.wa.gov/lands/wildlife_areas/columbia_basin/access_sites.php#banks">http://wdfw.wa. gov/lands/wildli fe_areas/columb ia_basin/access sites.php#banks</a>		Y	Y <a href="http://wdfw.wa.gov/lands/wildlife_areas/columbia_basin/access_sites.php#banks">http://wdfw.wa. gov/lands/wildli fe_areas/columb ia_basin/access sites.php#banks</a>
Private ramps?	N	N		N	
Moorages?	N	N			

## APPENDIX VIII. VELIGER ANALYSIS DOCUMENTATION

### Sample information:

Name

Date

Location

Preservation Technique

Handling: (OR Veliger sample preservation/handling to meet minimum PCR requirements (e.g. 70% EtOH, cold storage, isopropyl alcohol)



APPENDIX IX. NOTIFICATION LIST FOR REPORTS OF DREISSENIDS IN WASHINGTON.  
 NAMES LISTED ARE CONTACTED WHEN WATER BODIES ARE DETERMINED TO BE  
 INCONCLUSIVE.

AGENCY	NAME	PHONE	MOBILE	FAX	EMAIL
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Allen Pleus, AIS Coordinator	(360) 902-2724	(360) 918-3868		<a href="mailto:allen.pleus@dfw.wa.gov">allen.pleus@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Lt. Eric Anderson, AIS Enforcement Coordinator	(360) 640-0493	(253)381-7387		<a href="mailto:eric.anderson@dfw.wa.gov">eric.anderson@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Bill Tweit, Special Assistant to Director	(360) 902-2723	(360) 489-2644		<a href="mailto:william.tweit@dfw.wa.gov">william.tweit@dfw.wa.gov</a>
Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission	Stephen Phillips	(503) 595-3100			<a href="mailto:stephen_phillips@psmfc.org">stephen_phillips@psmfc.org</a>
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Linda Beck, Region 1 AIS Coordinator	(503) 736-4722			<a href="mailto:linda_beck@fws.gov">linda_beck@fws.gov</a>

## APPENDIX X. SAMPLE PRESS RELEASE

Contact: Allen Pleus, WDFW Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator, (360) 902-2724, [Allen.Pleus@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:Allen.Pleus@dfw.wa.gov)

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) has declared \_\_\_\_\_ a “suspect location” for infestation of invasive quagga mussels. This report has been initially verified by [agency/recognized expert], and efforts are underway to [describe what’s next, if anything, to confirm identification].

This discovery is a serious environmental and economic concern for the Pacific Northwest. Invasive quagga and zebra mussels are small nonnative freshwater mollusks that have caused major problems in the United States after their introduction in the 1980s.

Officials have not yet determined how these mussels entered \_\_\_\_\_. Recreational boats are known to be a major source of invasive mussel spread in the United States, and there are a number of past incidents where boats fouled by live invasive mussels have been intercepted prior to launching in Northwest waters.

In preparation for an introduction of invasive mussels in Washington, officials developed a rapid response plan outlining a set of actions to address the initial finding and monitor the situation long term.

Until additional surveys are conducted, the extent of the infestation is unknown. During this phase of rapid response, the \_\_\_\_\_ (agency) has \_\_\_\_\_ (restricted access) to \_\_\_\_\_ (infected location) to help prevent further potential dispersal of the invasive mussels. The public can help by avoiding the \_\_\_\_ (infected area) and following some good general guidelines. They should clean all boats, trailers, and other equipment after leaving a lake or stream and never release any live organisms into the wild.

Allen Pleus, WDFW Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator, emphasized the importance of inspecting boats. “We recognize the inconvenience to boaters and understand the need for additional sampling and identification to determine if this water body is positive for quagga mussels,” Pleus said. “Our staff will ensure that boats will go through the inspection process as efficiently as possible.”

Boaters can assist with the process by arriving at \_\_\_\_\_ with a clean, drained and dry vessel.

For more information, visit WDFW’s website at <http://wdfw.wa.gov/ais/>

## APPENDIX XI. OUTLINE FOR DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Upon discovery of a suspected infestation, the State of Washington implements a Dreissenid Rapid Response Plan, which includes:

- a. Detection activities—define the extent of the mussel infestation, its distribution and maturity.
- b. Coordination activities—define the lead agency, coordinate collaboration among agencies, and allocate resources for a response and coordinate communication.
- c. Mitigation and control strategies—to avoid further spread of the infestation, control<sup>40</sup> and reduce the size of the infestation and establish a monitoring plan to assess control effectiveness.

Upon confirmation of an infestation (i.e., a water body is determined to be positive for invasive mussels), the State will develop a management plan for that water body. The plan will include the following elements:

- **Identify objectives, priorities, and timeframes.**
  - **Objective: Determine extent of infestation**
    - Establish training and assessment protocols
    - Conduct surveys
    - Compile findings and distribute online
    - Collect additional samples
    - Identify at-risk infrastructure and coordinate with local infrastructure authorities
  - **Objective: Contain infestation**
    - **Coordinate with land management authority to implement mandatory inspection and decontamination of boats upon entry and exit of water body**
    - **Ensure decontamination units are available at water body**
    - **Communications**

---

<sup>40</sup> Details on potential treatment methods can be found in Appendix D1 of the [Columbia River Basin Interagency Invasive Species Response Plan: Zebra Mussels and Other Dreissenid Species](#).

- **Management Authority-specific**
  - Develop and distribute survey decontamination protocols
  - Train individuals in mussel detection and communication with the public (draft key messages)
  - **Establish and maintain internal communication** protocols with partner agencies.
  - **Establish and maintain communications** with other geographic response organizations.
  - **Develop briefing statements** to inform senior management within the partner agencies.
  - **Establish an interagency public affairs team** to promote coordinated public outreach effort.
  - **Continue to participate in efforts to address quagga/zebra mussels** via 100<sup>th</sup> meridian, Western Regional Panel, Pacific Northwest Economic Region, and others.
- **External**
  - **Raise public awareness** via media outlets by issuing news releases, sponsoring a media day event.
  - Post signs at water body and throughout local community.
  - Promote Clean, Drain, Dry
- **Objective: Investigate treatment options**
  - Determine most appropriate option to control or eradication mussels (Review Appendix D1 of the *Columbia River Basin Interagency Invasive Species Response Plan: Zebra Mussels and Other Dreissenid Species* to explore treatment options)
  - Explore and implement permitting requirements needed to effect management actions (Refer to Table IV1. Pesticide Use Matrix For An Isolated Zebra Mussel Infestation In Washington’s Columbia River Basin as well as appendices of *Columbia River Basin Interagency Invasive Species Response Plan: Zebra Mussels and Other Dreissenid Species*).

- Coordinate with water body land management authority (ies) to manage use of the lake and control implementation actions.
  - **Objective: Identify actions needed to meet statutory responsibility of management agencies**
  - **Identify Members of the Scientific Advisory Panel**, composed of both subject matter experts on *Dreissena* spp. as well as limnologists and aquatic ecologists familiar with the watershed (academia, AIS responders with experience in dreissenid infested waters and others), who can provide planning advice and review response plans.
  - **Economics**
    - **Accurately track costs and cost estimates** of the response and share with management authorities and the public. Provide justifications for expenditures.
    - Communicate financial responsibility to all incident responders
  - **Identify ecological impacts**
    - Measure and track ecological changes, develop mitigation plans, and implement long-term mitigation actions (examples listed below).
      - Food chain
      - Water clarity
      - Bioaccumulation of pollutants and toxic metals
      - Alteration of waterfowl migration
      - Effects on sport fisheries
      - Effects on threatened and endangered species
-