

# Summary of Major Ecology Budget Cuts by Program

## 2009-11 Biennial Budget Through the 2011-13 Biennial Budget

### Table of Contents

<b>Summary of Major Ecology Budget Cuts by Program (spreadsheet)</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<i>Reduce Watershed Implementation Grants</i> .....	4
<i>Reduce Flood Control Grants Assistance Program</i> .....	5
<i>Reduce Advance Mitigation Work in Shorelands Program</i> .....	5
<b>Waste 2 Resources Program</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<i>Reduce Litter Pickup Activity</i> .....	5
<i>Reduce Public Participation Grants</i> .....	6
<i>Continued Litter Pickup Reduction</i> .....	6
<b>Agency Administration Reductions</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<i>Administration Reduction</i> .....	7
<i>Manage Administration Vacancies</i> .....	7
<i>Five Percent Administration Reduction</i> .....	8
<i>Administration Program Reduction</i> .....	8
<i>Consolidating Administration</i> .....	8
<i>Executive Reduction</i> .....	9
<i>Management Efficiency and Collocation</i> .....	9
<i>Administrative Reduction</i> .....	9
<b>Water Resource Program</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<i>Reduce Water Rights Processing</i> .....	10
<i>Reduce Water Resource Data Activity</i> .....	10
<i>Reduce Water Resource Data Collection</i> .....	10
<i>Reduce Water Resources Program</i> .....	10
<i>Water Resources Program Reduction</i> .....	10
<b>Water Quality Program</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<i>Water Quality Permit Fee Account Reduction</i> .....	11

<i>Water Quality Federal Funds Reduction</i> .....	11
<i>Reduce Water Quality Program</i> .....	11
<b>Air Quality Program</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<i>Reduce Woodstove Education and Enforcement (GF-S)</i> .....	12
<i>Reduce Woodstove Education and Enforcement (WEEA)</i> .....	12
<i>Reduce Air Quality Program</i> .....	12
<i>Air Pollution Control Account Reduction</i> .....	13
<b>Spill Prevention and Preparedness Program</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<i>Oil Spill Prevention and Preparedness Activities Due to Oil Spill Account Shortfall</i> .....	13
<b>Office of Climate Policy</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<i>Climate Policy Group Reduction</i> .....	14
<b>Environmental Assessment Program</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<i>Reduce Environmental Studies</i> .....	14
<i>Reduce Water Resource Data Collection</i> .....	14
<i>Reduce Monitoring Program</i> .....	14
<b>Summary of Agencywide Budget Reductions</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<i>Governor-Directed Freeze</i> .....	15
<i>Governor-Directed One Percent Cut</i> .....	15
<i>Other Ecology Dedicated Account Shortfalls</i> .....	15
<i>Temporary Layoffs</i> .....	16
<i>Utilize Dedicated Accounts</i> .....	16
<i>Three Percent Cut for State Employees</i> .....	17
<b>Attachment A: Fund Transfers from Ecology Dedicated Accounts to the State General Fund</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Attachment B: Fund Shifts from Ecology Dedicated Accounts to the State General Fund</b> .....	<b>19</b>

## Summary of Major Ecology Budget Cuts by Program

November 2011		2009-11 Biennium Through the 2011-13 Biennium		
\$ in Thousands	Budget Reference	GF-S	Other	Total
<b>Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program</b>				
Reduce Watershed Implementation Grants	2009-11 Biennial	(6,167)		(6,167)
Reduce Watershed Implementation Grants	2011 Supplemental	(500)		(500)
Reduce Watershed Implementation Grants	2011-13 Biennial	(5,928)		(5,928)
Reduce Flood Control Grants Assistance Program	2009-11 Biennial	(1,985)		(1,985)
Reduce Flood Control Grants Assistance Program	2011-13 Biennial	(2,000)		(2,000)
Reduce Advance Mitigation Work in Shorelands Program	2011 Supplemental	(200)		(200)
<b>Sub-Total SEA Program</b>		<b>(16,780)</b>		<b>(16,780)</b>
<b>Waste 2 Resources Program</b>				
Reduce Litter Pickup Activity	2009-11 Biennial & 2010 Supplemental		(6,039)	(6,039)
Reduce Public Participation Grants	2009-11 Biennial		(2,000)	(2,000)
Continued Litter Pickup Reduction	2011-13 Biennial		(7,000)	(7,000)
<b>Sub-Total W2R Program</b>			<b>(15,039)</b>	<b>(15,039)</b>
<b>Administration, Management, and Efficiency Reductions</b>				
Administration Reduction	2009-11 Biennial	(3,067)		(3,067)
Manage Administration Vacancies	2010 Supplemental	(318)		(318)
Five Percent Administration Reduction	2010 Supplemental & 2011-13 Biennial	(740)	(1,634)	(2,374)
Administration Program Reduction	2011 Supplemental	(256)		(256)
Consolidating Administration	2011-13 Biennial	(556)		(556)
Executive Reduction	2011-13 Biennial	(45)		(45)
Management Efficiency and Collocation Savings	2011-13 Biennial	(1,130)		(1,130)
Administrative Reduction	2011-13 Biennial	(389)		(389)
<b>Sub-Total Administration, Management, and Efficiency Reductions</b>		<b>(6,501)</b>	<b>(1,634)</b>	<b>(8,135)</b>
<b>Water Resources Program</b>				
Reduce Water Rights Processing	2009-11 Biennial	(2,880)		(2,880)
Reduce Water Resource Data Activity	2009-11 Biennial	(400)		(400)
Reduce Water Resource Data Collection	2010 Supplemental & 2011-13 Biennial	(396)		(396)
Reduce Water Resources Program	2011 Supplemental	(1,259)		(1,259)
Water Resources Program Reduction	2011-13 Biennial	(2,482)		(2,482)
<b>Sub-Total WR Program</b>		<b>(7,417)</b>		<b>(7,417)</b>
<b>Water Quality Program</b>				
Water Quality Permit Fee Account Reduction	2009-11 Biennial		(3,100)	(3,100)
Water Quality Federal Funds Reduction	2009-11 Biennial		(360)	(360)
Reduce Water Quality Program	2011 Supplemental	(300)		(300)
<b>Sub-Total WQ Program</b>		<b>(300)</b>	<b>(3,460)</b>	<b>(3,760)</b>
<b>Air Quality Program</b>				
Reduce Woodstove Education and Enforcement	2010 Supplemental & 2011-13 Biennial	(100)		(100)
Reduce Woodstove Education and Enforcement	2011 Supplemental		(30)	(30)
Reduce Air Quality Program	2011 Supplemental	(600)		(600)
Air Pollution Control Account Reduction	2011 Supplemental & 2011-13 Biennial		(1,492)	(1,492)
<b>Sub-Total AQ Program</b>		<b>(700)</b>	<b>(1,522)</b>	<b>(2,222)</b>
<b>Spill Prevention, Preparedness, and Response Program</b>				
Reduce Oil Spill Prev. & Prep. Activities Due to Oil Spill Acct. Shortfall	2009-11 Biennial		(1,928)	(1,928)
<b>Office of Climate Policy</b>				
Climate Policy Group Reduction	2011-13 Biennial	(880)		(880)
<b>Environmental Assessment Program</b>				
Reduce Environmental Studies	2010 Supplemental	(71)		(71)
Reduce Water Resource Data Collection	2010 Supplemental	(111)		(111)
Reduce Monitoring Program	2011 Supplemental	(200)		(200)
<b>Sub-Total EA Program</b>		<b>(382)</b>		<b>(382)</b>
<b>Agencywide Budget Reductions</b>				
Governor-Directed Freeze	2009-11 Biennial	(743)		(743)
Governor-Directed 1% Cut	2009-11 Biennial	(1,106)		(1,106)
Ecology Dedicated Account Shortfalls	2009-11 Biennial		(2,620)	(2,620)
Temporary Layoffs	2010 Supplemental	(1,261)	(1,941)	(3,202)
Utilize Dedicated Accounts	2011 Supplemental	(2,485)		(2,485)
3% Pay Cut for State Employees	2011-13 Biennial	(1,724)	(4,392)	(6,116)
<b>Sub-Total Agencywide Budget Reductions</b>		<b>(7,319)</b>	<b>(8,953)</b>	<b>(16,272)</b>
<b>Major Ecology Budget Cuts 2009-11 Through 2011-13</b>		<b>(40,279)</b>	<b>(32,536)</b>	<b>(72,815)</b>

# Introduction

This compilation summarizes large Ecology budget cut information from the 2009-11 enacted biennial budget through the 2011-13 biennial budget. Not every single budget reduction item is captured (only the larger ones), and budget increases during this period are not captured here (the purpose is to identify larger cuts during this timeframe).

The information is from the Office of Financial Management's BASS system, with added budget cut impact and service reduction descriptions coming from Ecology environmental programs. Each description includes the BASS budget reference, the cut amount and account, whether it is ongoing or one-time, and impacts on work tasks, activities, stakeholders/local partners, and the environment. The information is organized by program, and in order of the programs with the largest total dollar reductions to those with lower total reductions. The grand total of the program-directed reductions described for the past two biennia is \$56,543,000.

Agencywide budget reductions affect all programs. For the past two biennia, Ecology was required to manage six of these reductions (e.g., temporary layoffs, Governor's one percent reduction, three percent salary reduction) totaling an additional \$16,272,000. They are summarized at the end of this document, with pertinent BASS details along with Ecology environmental program work impacts. The total of these program direct and agencywide reductions is \$72,815,000.

There are two other aspects of Ecology's budget over the past two biennia - fund transfers and fund shifts - that have helped the State General Fund (GF-S) shortfall due to the economic decline. \$255.307 million from Ecology dedicated accounts have been transferred to the GF-S since 2009, contributing directly to the state's ability to manage the shortfall (see Attachment A). A portion of these funds were backfilled; for example, in the 2009-11 capital budget, Model Toxics Control Account (MTCA) appropriations for several projects were shifted to State Building Construction Account. However, substantial Ecology-managed dedicated account fund balance has been transferred to GF-S in lieu of funding new or expanded work to prevent, manage, or clean up toxic and hazardous wastes. In addition, fund shifts amounting to \$14,517,000 from the MTCA accounts have contributed to the state's ability to manage the GF-S shortfall over the past two biennia. While neutral to Ecology on a net-appropriation basis, fund switches from the 2010 supplemental budget and the 2011-13 biennial budget have lowered GF-S appropriations and increased State and Local Toxics appropriations by equal amounts (see Attachment B).

The total of directed cuts, agencywide cuts, fund shifts, and fund transfers to the State General Fund is \$342,639,000 during this period.

## Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program

### 1) Reduce Watershed Implementation Grants

- (\$6,167,000) - State General Fund – 2009-11 Biennial Budget [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item 23]
- (\$500,000) - State General Fund – 2011 Supplemental Budget [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 77; Item OD]
- (\$5,928,000) - State General Fund – 2011-13 Biennial Budget [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item JWP]

The Watershed Planning Act of 1998 establishes a framework for state, local, and tribal governments to plan for and implement projects to secure their water supply needs. Budget cuts over these two biennia reduced grants to local governments by \$8,826,000. Ecology staff support for this work has been reduced by 50 percent (6.0 FTEs), reducing critical scientific, economic,

and other technical assistance provided to local planning units. The total cut to staff, grants, and Ecology's administration program over the 2009-13 period is \$12,595,000. [Note: The 2009-11 reduction includes both the General Fund-State (GF-S) reduction of \$3 million and Water Quality Account reduction of \$2.867 million, since the Water Quality Account was absorbed into GF-S.]

These cuts greatly reduce implementation of important local projects to improve water supplies and management. These projects meet local needs for achieving economic vitality and environmental quality. Priority projects were identified in detailed implementation agreements with support from all stakeholders. Important actions to improve management of surface water and groundwater supplies are not moving forward as a result of the budget cuts. These cuts affect communities across the state, from the San Juan Islands to the Columbia Basin. The objectives of the Watershed Planning Act remain unmet, because local communities do not have the resources to implement their most important projects for improving water supplies and management.

## **2) Reduce Flood Control Grants Assistance Program**

- (\$1,985,000) -- 2009-11 Biennial Budget, Flood Control Assistance Account (FCAAP) [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item HFC]
- (\$2,000,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, FCAAP [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item 10]

Funding is significantly reduced for the Flood Control Assistance Program's (FCAAP) local grants by \$1.985 million in 2009-11 and \$2.0 million in 2011-13. The total reduction in grant funding (\$4 million) is nearly 50 percent of the biennial funding for communities to plan actions and projects to control flooding. These reductions leave essentially no FCAAP funding for flood mitigation projects, as laid out in the Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plans developed by communities in years past through this program. Local governments' need for funding flood projects is high, and it will likely continue to be high for some time. Projects protect residents, businesses, infrastructure, and the environment. There are active flood issues around the state needing funding from FCAAP.

With little to no funding emerging from FCAAP, communities are more likely to seek funds through budget provisos, as several communities have over the last two biennia. This leads to uneven application of limited state funds to specified flood projects, without the benefit of comparison to other projects around the state provided by the competitive FCAAP funding process. Also, proviso projects may not be well defined or considered in the larger context of a comprehensive approach to floodplain management. At the reduced funding levels, there will likely be more demand for emergency funding than FCAAP can support.

## **3) Reduce Advance Mitigation Work in Shorelands Program**

- (\$200,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 77; Item OD]

Funding and 1.0 FTE are reduced in the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program work on "advance mitigation" frameworks. This reduces capacity to develop creative opportunities to mitigate impacts to wetlands and other aquatic resources. In particular, this reduces Ecology's ability to move beyond wetland banking to create other frameworks for mitigation – especially for riparian and marine shoreline impacts not addressed in the existing bank program.

### **Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program (\$16,780,000)**

## **Waste 2 Resources Program**

### **1) Reduce Litter Pickup Activity**

- (\$6,039,000) – 2009-11 Budget, Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account (WRRLLCA) [Includes \$4 million One-Time Reduction from the 2009-11 Biennial Budget; BASS V. 3M; Item 19 plus \$2.039 million One-Time Reduction from the 2010 Supplemental Budget; BASS V. 4X, Item 47]

The Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account funds litter prevention and pickup activity within Ecology. Remaining funding will allow the agency to operate a scaled-back litter pickup program. Funding and FTE staffing are reduced on a one-time basis for litter pickup activities managed by Ecology, other state agencies, and local governments. This also

includes a reduction in related administrative funding. Remaining litter pickup funding of \$1.0 million is dedicated to litter pickup along interstate highways.

Impacts of the reduction include:

- Ecology Youth Corps (EYC) budget reductions result in 300,000 pounds less litter picked up and 80 fewer youths hired.
- EYC coordinator positions were reduced from 4.0 FTEs to 1.0 FTE.
- Litter Prevention Campaign is suspended (surveys had shown a 25 percent reduction in litter because of the prevention campaign).
- The state agency litter pickup program is reduced, resulting in more litter accumulation in state parks and recreation areas.
- The community litter cleanup program is reduced, resulting in more litter accumulation on county roads and an increase in illegal dumping.
- There is no funding for a litter survey, which eliminates Ecology's evaluation of the effectiveness of the litter pickup and prevention programs.
- Funding was not secured for research partnerships at Washington State University and the University of Washington for organics management projects.
- Waste 2 Resources Program had to suspend filling vacant staff positions (1.6 FTE) for coordinating the litter survey and prevention campaigns for the biennium.

## **2) Reduce Public Participation Grants**

- (\$2,000,000) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, State Toxics Control Account (STCA) and Local Toxics Control Account (LTCA) [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item HPP]

Funding is reduced for Public Participation Grants during the 2009-11 biennium. Public Participation Grants provide funding to not-for-profit public interest organizations and citizen groups to encourage public involvement in monitoring cleanup of contaminated sites and pollution prevention through waste reduction and elimination.

The Public Participation Grant program (PPG) is required by law (RCW 70.105D.070) to be funded at one percent of the revenues deposited into the State and Local Toxic Control Accounts. A maintenance level funding request for PPG is submitted each biennium to bring appropriations into alignment with one percent of the estimated deposits into the State and Local Toxics Control Accounts.

During the 2009-11 biennium, the Legislature suspended the one percent funding requirement and reduced PPG below the estimate of one percent funding levels. \$1.5 million remained available to the public for assisting with toxic waste cleanup and waste management issues. This resulted in reduced input and monitoring from citizens, stakeholders, and public interest groups for often complicated and potentially controversial toxic waste cleanups. Public education on pollution prevention through waste reduction and elimination was also reduced.

## **3) Continued Litter Pickup Reduction**

- (\$7,000,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, WRRLLCA [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item 11]

During the 2009-11 biennium, the Legislature reduced Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account (WRRLLCA) funding by \$6 million for litter pickup activities. In the 2011-13 biennium, this reduction was increased to \$7 million, continuing previously implemented litter pickup activities reductions, and reducing Ecology's waste reduction and recycling activities that are also funded from WRRLLCA. Proviso language was also added, which restricted some ongoing work of the Waste 2 Resources Program, and prioritized litter pickup by correctional crews, work on regulatory programs, and technical assistance to local governments. The impacts described above for the \$6 million reduction in the 2009-11 biennium for the litter prevention campaign, the litter survey, and suspension of 1.6 FTE positions continue. Additional impacts include:

- Washington State Patrol highway monitoring work focusing on secured load requirements is suspended.
- The Litter Hotline is no longer in service resulting in less education and outreach to the public (0.65 FTE).

- Beyond Waste coordination and outreach, implementing the Green Building initiative (2.0 FTEs), and work promoting food waste composting and prevention programs were all suspended because of added proviso language.
- The school awards program is also suspended, resulting in fewer incentives for exceptional waste reduction and recycling efforts in schools.
- Staff for the 1-800-RECYCLE hotline was greatly reduced (1.2 FTE), along with staffing for technical assistance work with construction and demolition recycling facilities (which make up a third of the waste stream that is landfilled) – leading to increase greenhouse gases.
- There is a reduction in staffing and contract funds to compile, manage, and organize solid waste management and litter reduction data and share this information with local governments.
- There is no funding for a planned statewide waste characterization study.

In addition, to continue accomplishing program priority work, Ecology had to shift some work of existing staff to other eligible funding sources. The result of this reprioritization is approximately 5.8 FTEs in unfunded vacancies. The following summarizes the impacts:

- 1.0 FTE was reduced from the Public Participation Grant program (less technical assistance and oversight for grant recipients).
- 1.0 FTE for regional facility support was suspended (less support for regional bio-solids, construction and demolition, and organics facilities).
- 1.0 FTE for policy work was suspended (fewer resources available to respond to legislative issues and important new work on product stewardship).
- 1.0 FTE solid waste management work was suspended (impacts tracking financial assurance at solid waste facilities, overseeing the operator certification program, and providing technical assistance to local governments on solid waste planning, enforcement, and oversight related to transporter and facility requirements).
- 1.0 FTE for the electronics recycling program was suspended (reduced ability to track down orphan brand owners illegally selling their products in the state and reduced ability to focus on other compliance issues).
- 0.8 FTE for information technology program support was suspended (delays needed program database maintenance, enhancements for the Information Clearinghouse and the Solid Waste Facility Database, delays online reporting, and delays for the mapping project).

**Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Waste 2 Resources Program (\$15,039,000)**

<b>Agency Administration, Management, and Efficiency Reductions</b>
---------------------------------------------------------------------

**1) Administration Reduction**

- (\$3,067,000) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item S10]

Agencies were directed to reduce State General Fund spending. Savings were to be achieved through leaving vacant positions unfilled, reducing staff, and developing administrative efficiencies and other expenditure reductions.

This reduction was spread agencywide. Funding in support of 11.5 FTEs was reduced in Ecology’s ten Environmental Programs. The Agency Administration Program eliminated 2.5 FTEs, which included an IT position supporting regional offices, word processing support at the Northwest Regional Office, and an IT specialist supporting Human Resources. These reductions resulted in:

- Loss of staff efficiency through eliminating word processing support in regions.
- Delaying deployment of replacement computers.
- Reducing capacity to accomplish employee investigations in Human Resources.

**2) Manage Administration Vacancies**

- (\$318,000) – 2010 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 49; Item 40]

Ecology's Administration Program achieved General Fund-State savings by managing staff vacancies based on agency business needs and reducing certain administrative services. This specifically created delays and increased workload in processing financial transactions. Two fiscal analyst positions were put on hold for the biennium which delayed processing of payments to vendors and grantees.

### **3) Five Percent Administration Reduction**

- (\$2,374,000) – 2010 Supplemental Budget and 2011-13 Biennial Budget, (\$1,634,000) various dedicated accounts & (\$740,000) State General Fund [Total includes \$1.187 million Ongoing Reduction from the 2010 Supplemental Budget; BASS V. 4X; Item 48, plus \$1.187 million Ongoing Reduction (CFL) from the 2011-13 Biennial Budget; BASS V. 4M; Item 35]

Impacts included reducing Ecology's financial management, communication, facilities management, and other administrative functions by five percent. To implement this cut, Ecology eliminated the graphic designer position dedicated to agency-wide communications efforts for all programs (graphics projects for many programs are performed under interagency agreement by DSHS staff on a per-job basis). The agency also eliminated: a human resource consultant supporting several environmental programs, an environmental specialist focused on SEPA review, office assistants supporting a regional office and HQ reception, and an IT specialist dedicated to application development for financial and administrative systems.

These reductions resulted in:

- Fewer direct services in every program.
- Delays in processing and other work activities for the Fiscal Office, Information Technology, Human Resources, and Building Services.
- Reduced funds available for contracts and equipment purchases from local businesses.
- Loss of graphics support for effectively conveying important messages to citizens and stakeholders.
- Delays in reducing risks related to improper overtime designations.
- Reduced ability to provide comments on SEPA documents to avoid surprises in permitting processes.
- Loss of capacity to develop administrative and financial information technology systems to improve efficiency.
- Reduced customer service due to cuts in administrative support in regional and field offices.
- Increased potential for vehicle breakdowns due to delaying purchase of replacement vehicles.

### **4) Administration Program Reduction**

- (\$256,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 77; Item OG]

Funding and FTEs are reduced in the Administration and Support Program. Ecology eliminated 1.6 FTEs which included a management analyst position, reducing capacity for federal grant reporting, cost recovery, accounts receivable, and updates to the agency technology system that manages grants, contracts, and loans; and a fiscal analyst which impacts federal grant reporting and receivable processing.

### **5) Consolidating Administration**

- (\$556,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item SCA]

Funding and FTEs are reduced from the budget for administration. Ecology was encouraged, but not required, to coordinate and collaborate with other natural resources agency staff to satisfy administrative requirements and accomplish duties that include but are not limited to: human resources, contracting and procurement, purchasing, communications, and information technology.

This cut is intended to reduce administrative services, compel further efficiencies, and encourage additional coordination and collaboration with other natural resources agencies on administrative-type functions such as human resources, contracting and procurement, purchasing, communications and information technology. The reduction was accomplished by:

- Eliminating a Washington Management Service, Band 2 (WMS2) position dedicated to managing and reducing facilities and fleet related risk.
- Eliminating an IT specialist dedicated to emergency management and continuity of business activities.

- Eliminated a community educator position that led Ecology's work to further community and school-based environmental education partnerships.
- Reassigned an administrative assistant supporting executive management. It now supports all programs and costs are shared agencywide.

#### **6) Executive Reduction**

- (\$45,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item SER]

Funding is reduced for executive administrative staff. This reduction represents 15 percent of the General Fund-State appropriation for executive staff and is proportional to the reductions related to consolidating back-office functions. This cut greatly reduces the leadership capacity for climate change activities since Ecology reduced the Executive Policy Assistant to the Director focused on climate change to a part-time position.

#### **7) Management Efficiency and Collocation Savings**

- (\$1,030,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item SME]
- (\$100,000) - 2011-13 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item SCS]

Funding is reduced to reflect management and administrative reforms, such as de-layering and streamlining support functions that will result in increased efficiency. Per the enacted budget, management reductions of seven to ten percent are expected to be achieved over the course of the biennium. The budget also indicated that state agencies can expect continuous legislative policy and fiscal committee examination of the architecture and cost of the state's workforce, and must be prepared to provide relevant information in hearings and work sessions.

This reduction affected all Ecology Programs. The agency Administration Program consolidated two administrative services units eliminating a WMS 2 position and management layer, eliminated an equipment technician position, and consolidated fleet management functions with the state's central motor pool.

Environmental Program impacts included:

- Reduced purchase of agency supplies.
- Reduced telephone costs by eliminating lines.
- Reduced the number of personal computers being replaced by extending the computer life cycle.
- Reduced network costs by joining the state's optical network.
- Reduced staff travel, equipment, training, and printing and mailing costs for documents, reports, and related materials.
- Eliminated funding for a part-time Ecology position responsible for both the northwest freshwater ambient monitoring project and supporting stream gaging staff. This reduction delays the evaluation, analysis, and reporting of data collected. It also reduces stream gaging work and contributes to reducing streamflow measuring gages from 195 to 110.
- Reduced the level of effort in SEPA review, water quality 401 certifications, and watershed activities.

#### **8) Administrative Reduction**

- (\$389,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item SR1]

This reflects Ecology's biennial budget reduction proposal, less the administrative consolidation reductions and the executive reductions reflected in other reductions. Impacts include:

- Reduced administrative services from Ecology's Fiscal Office, Information Technology, Human Resources, and Building Services.
- Less funds available for contracts and equipment purchases from the private sector, resulting in reduced staff efficiency due to not having the tools needed for work tasks.

#### **Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Agency Administration (\$8,135,000)**

## Water Resources Program

### 1) Reduce Water Rights Processing

- (\$2,880,000) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item 30]

Ecology is responsible for making decisions on applications for new water rights and requests for changes and transfers to existing water rights. Funding was reduced for processing water rights decisions during the 2009-11 biennium. This resulted in fewer water rights decisions being made. There is a backlog of 7,000 permit applications, and this reduction allowed less progress on water right decisions for individuals, businesses, and agriculture. As a result of this one-time cut, roughly 14 FTE fewer staff were available to process water rights. This translated into approximately 115 to 165 fewer water right decisions made during the biennium.

### 2) Reduce Water Resource Data Activity

- (\$400,000) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M, Item 18]

Funding and FTEs were reduced on an ongoing basis for water resource-related data collection, management, and sharing, both inside and outside Ecology. Impacts include reduced water resource data collection supporting water rights permitting and metering activities, program management, and information sharing. There were 2.0 FTE staff reductions in the Water Resource Program. Headquarters water resource-related information technology administrative support was eliminated, resulting in longer times to process personnel documentation, respond to external correspondence, and schedule program activities.

### 3) Reduce Water Resource Data Collection

- (\$396,000) – 2010 Supplemental and 2011-13 Biennial Budgets, State General Fund [Includes \$264,000 Ongoing Reduction from the 2010 Supplemental Budget; BASS V. 4X; Item SO2, plus \$132,000 Ongoing CFL Reduction from the 2011-13 Biennial Budget; BASS V. 4M; Item 62]

Funding from the State General Fund is reduced by five percent for water resource data collection and stream flow measurement and management activities. The \$396,000 reduction, which includes both the 2010 Supplemental Budget amount (\$264,000) plus the carry forward level from the enacted 2011-13 Biennial Budget (\$132,000), impacts both the Water Resources Program (WRP) and Environmental Assessment Program. 1.2 FTEs were reduced, resulting in a five percent reduction in WRP data collection supporting water rights permitting and metering activities, stream flow measurement, and management activities. This reduction also eliminates Water Resources Program metering and well drilling data input at the Eastern Regional Office.

### 4) Reduce Water Resources Program

- (\$1,259,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 77; Item OC]

Funding and 6.5 FTEs are reduced in the Water Resources Program. This will result in less work accomplished in the following activities: water rights adjudication, instream flow setting, dam safety, water rights processing, water law compliance, data and information management, water use data analysis, and local watershed management technical assistance.

This reduction was one-time vacancy savings accrued during the hiring freeze. Impacts to the WRP result from delays in filling vacant positions. More specifically, this reduction:

- Limits the program's capacity to regulate unauthorized water appropriations in over-appropriated basins (including the Yakima River Basin) in response to claims of impairment by senior water right holders.
- Delays review of water system plans.
- Delays filling water master staff positions.
- Delays management of adjudication documents needed to advance legal proceedings in a timely way.
- Delays public Web access to critical documents, applications, and permit tools.
- Delays development of instream flow rules.

### 5) Water Resources Program Reduction

- (\$2,482,000) - 2011-13 Biennial Budget - State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item JWR]

This reduction included three components: (1) continuation of the \$2.880 million cut to water rights processing from the 2009-11 biennium – see ‘Reduce Water Right Processing’ above; (2) a transfer of \$2.15 million from the watershed implementation activity to the water rights processing activity per proviso language; and, (3) a reduction of \$1.752 million from the water rights program.

Combined, these three items totaled a \$2.482 million reduction to the Water Resources Program. This results in lower than desired levels of water right application processing staff. Fourteen new FTEs would have been added back from the one-time cut in 2009-11 which would have increased capacity for processing water applications for the public, resulting in WRP processing an additional 115-165 decisions annually. Due to this cut being made permanent, no additional processing staff were added back in 2011-13. The second cut item (\$2.15 transfer) further reduces the statewide watershed planning activity (managed through the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program), limiting funds for grants and technical assistance.

**Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Water Resources Program (\$7,417,000)**

<b>Water Quality Program</b>
------------------------------

**1) Water Quality Permit Fee Account Reduction**

- (\$3,100,000) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, Water Quality Permit Fee Account [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item 38] (Note: The total for Ecology, which included reductions to other agency dedicated environmental accounts due to lower permit and fee revenue, was (\$5,720,000). The remaining reduction amount of (\$2,620,000) is included under “Agencywide Budget Reductions”.)

Expenditure authority was reduced for selected Ecology dedicated accounts to match anticipated revenues impacting a variety of programs and projects. \$3.1 million of the \$5.720 million reduction is addressed here, impacting water discharge regulation and assistance, and natural resource restoration.

For the Water Quality Program, 18 FTEs were eliminated. This significantly reduced Ecology’s presence in the field and limited our ability to provide technical assistance to local governments and businesses, including compliance with permit requirements and reviewing local ordinances to ensure compliance with statewide water quality standards.

**2) Water Quality Federal Funds Reduction**

- (\$360,000) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund-Federal [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item AC]

Federal expenditure authority was reduced on an ongoing basis to match an anticipated reduction in federal funding for administration of capital project loans for wastewater treatment facilities managed during the 2009-11 biennium.

For the Water Quality Program, impacts included:

- Reduced ability to provide technical assistance to local governments for wastewater and stormwater infrastructure repair, replacing failing on-site sewage systems, implementing riparian restoration and protection programs, reducing nonpoint pollution through source control, and implementing best management practices.
- Reduced ability to administer loans, collect loan repayments, and maintain information and data systems used to track and manage the Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund.

**3) Reduce Water Quality Program**

- (\$300,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 77; Item OF]

Funding and FTEs are reduced in the Water Quality Program. Staffing is reduced by 1.4 FTE. These reductions delay work on water quality cleanup plans. There also are fewer resources to respond to environmental complaints that are not emergency health or environmental situations. And this reduces staffing capacity for managing water quality financial assistance, including loans and grants to local governments. Specifically, there is reduced capacity for the following work, increasing the risk of audit issues:

- Grant and loan payment requests; an issue because turn-around time is increasing.
- Review of grant and loan documents for non-ARRA projects.
- Monitoring/reviewing information at the more detailed sub-recipient level.

**Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Water Quality Program (\$3,760,000)**

<b>Air Quality Program</b>
----------------------------

**1) Reduce Woodstove Education and Enforcement (GF-S)**

- (\$100,000) – 2010 Supplemental and 2011-13 Biennial Budgets, State General Fund [Includes \$50,000 Ongoing Reduction from the 2010 Supplemental Budget; BASS V. 4X, Item HWA, plus \$50,000 Ongoing CFL Reduction from the 2011-13 Biennial Budget; BASS V. 4M; Item 59]

The Woodstove Education and Enforcement Program (WEEP) under the Air Quality Program is supported by a one-time purchase fee of \$30 assessed to consumers upon purchase a woodstove, fireplace, or other solid fuel burning device. The program provides strategic and substantive education, technical assistance, and support to the hearth products industry and users of wood heat. This is done to ensure the best technology hits the market; so people understand how to burn cleanly, safely and legally; and to improve public health and reduce woodsmoke in communities suffering from high wintertime pollution levels. The WEEP is 65 percent subsidized by the State General Fund. This reduction amount, which includes the carry forward level from the enacted biennial budget, pertains to the State General Fund portion of WEEP funding.

Impacts included:

- Reduced staff resources and funding for local clean air agencies and Ecology to control woodstove emissions throughout the state, especially in areas violating (or nearly violating) federal air quality standards for particulates.
- Reduced staff resources and funding to assist wood heat users with buying, installing, and properly operating the right appliance for their needs.
- Reduced education of consumers about the air quality implications of woodstove burning.
- Reduced ability to respond timely to air pollution health threats and complaints.
- Compromised enforcement capabilities.

**2) Reduce Woodstove Education and Enforcement (WEEA)**

- (\$30,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget, Woodstove Education and Enforcement Account (Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 92, Item 0Q]

Expenditure authority is reduced for the Woodstove Education and Enforcement Account to reflect a reduction in expected fee revenue. This will result in less agency capacity to control woodstove emissions.

Impacts included:

- Reducing the capacity of Ecology’s Air Quality Program and local clean air authorities’ to control woodstove emissions in areas violating (or nearly violating) federal air quality standards for particulates.
- Reducing timely response to air pollution health threats and complaints.
- Compromising wood smoke enforcement capabilities.

**3) Reduce Air Quality Program**

- (\$600,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 77, Item OE]

Funding and staff are reduced in the Air Quality Program. This reduction will result in fewer staff available to work on reducing vehicle emissions, industrial permits, air quality analysis and improvement planning, and grant management.

Impacts of 2.5 FTE staff reduction included:

- Reduced evaluation of air quality conditions and the causes and contributors to air pollution problems.
- Reduced special ambient air quality monitoring projects critical to understanding health impacts of air pollution and effectiveness of clean air strategies.
- Reduced oversight of motor vehicle emission testing programs (and related contracts with local vehicle testing businesses). This oversight ensures high polluting vehicles are identified, properly repaired, and possible vehicle testing or repair fraud eliminated. This also slows development of needed technical improvements from the automobile industry.
- Delays issuing high-priority industrial permits necessary for businesses to build or expand, which delays economic growth.
- Decreases the state's ability to influence federal clean air actions and mitigate health impacts to Washington residents and businesses.

**4) Air Pollution Control Account Reduction**

- (\$1,492,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget and 2011-13 Biennial Budget, Air Pollution Control Account (APCA) [Includes \$546,000 One-Time Reduction from the 2011 Supplemental Budget, BASS V. 92, Item OT, plus \$946,000 One-Time Reduction from the 2011-13 Biennial Budget; BASS V. 4M; Item 14]

Expenditure authority is reduced on a one-time basis to reflect a statutory delay in greenhouse gas emissions reporting. Ongoing work that was to be funded by fees is absorbed by the program, delaying other critical work and data system projects.

There are two reductions (\$546,000 from the 2011 Supplemental Budget and \$946,000 from the 2011-13 Biennial Budget), which have the following impacts:

- Delays reporting of emissions data and information designed to achieve progress on the Governor's Climate Change Initiative started in the 2007-09 biennium.
- Delays reporting of data collected from polluters, which impacts the state's ability to develop a comprehensive statewide climate change plan or appropriate policies, and threatens the state's ability to meet federal greenhouse gas requirements for reporting and permitting of industrial sources.
- Delays in reporting could also impact environmental review of proposals under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).
- Undermines our ability to synchronize state rules with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations.

**Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Air Quality Program (\$2,222,000)**

<b>Spill Prevention, Preparedness, and Response Program</b>
-------------------------------------------------------------

**1) Reduce Oil Spill Prevention and Preparedness Activities Due to Oil Spill Account Shortfall**

- (\$1,928,000) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, Oil Spill Prevention Account [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item BR]

Ecology's Spill Prevention, Preparedness, and Response program provides services to protect Puget Sound, the outer coast, and inland waters from the effects of oil spills. Because of cost increases and flat-to-declining revenues, the Oil Spill Prevention Account, a major program funding source, was facing a projected \$7.5 million shortfall during the 2009-11 biennium. The shortfall was addressed through a combination of ongoing expenditure and staffing reductions, as well as a one-time revenue transfer into the account. As a result, Ecology accomplished less prevention and preparedness work, including fewer vessel boardings and response readiness drills, and reviewed and approved fewer prevention and contingency plans.

Specifically, oil spill prevention work was cut by \$1.928 million and 8 FTEs. The 15 percent reduction resulted in 135 fewer vessel boardings, 158 fewer vessel and substantial-risk compliance inspections, and 70 fewer spill drills.

**Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Spills Program (\$1,928,000)**

## Office of Climate Policy

### 1) Climate Policy Group Reduction

- (\$880,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item HA3]

Funding is reduced for the Climate Policy Group currently working on the state integrated climate change response strategy, maintaining scientific and technical information on the impacts of climate change in the state, developing greenhouse gas emission reduction strategies, and collaborating with national and regional organizations to address issues related to climate change. This is a 50 percent reduction in the General Fund-State appropriation.

- The reduction scales back the state's participation in joint work with British Columbia, Oregon, and California on climate change adaptation.
- It reduces the state's resources for monitoring climate science and data.

**Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Office of Climate Policy (\$880,000)**

## Environmental Assessment Program

### 1) Reduce Environmental Studies

- (\$71,000) – 2010 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund (One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 4X; Item SO4)

Funding from the State General Fund was reduced by five percent for laboratory analysis and data collection activities that help identify and control pollution sources. This reduced laboratory analysis and data collection activities that help to identify and control pollution sources by five percent.

### 2) Reduce Water Resource Data Collection

- (\$111,000) – 2010 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 4X; Item SO2]

Funding from the State General Fund is reduced by five percent for water resource data collection and stream flow measurement and management activities. This cut impacted both the Water Resources Program (WRP) and Environmental Assessment Program (EAP). For EAP, the reduction lowered water resource data collection by five percent and reduced stream flow measurement and management activities.

### 3) Reduce Monitoring Program

- (\$200,000) – 2011 Supplemental Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 77; Item OH]

Funding and staff are reduced in the Environmental Assessment Program. This cut results in fewer staff devoted to measuring and collecting stream flow data, and reduces monitoring the effectiveness of water cleanup plans.

**Sub-Total Budget Reductions – Environmental Assessment Program (\$382,000)**

## Summary of Agencywide Budget Reductions

Below is a list of Ecology agencywide budget reductions from the 2009-11 biennial Budget through the 2011-13 biennial budget. These reductions, which total \$16,272,000, are not specifically targeted to environmental program work, so they are not included in the program reduction summaries already listed. Instead, these reductions are managed by the agency through the budget allotment process.

### 1) Governor-Directed Freeze

- (\$743,000) and (2.2 FTEs) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item Z7]

Funding is reduced by assuming a similar amount of savings each fiscal year as was achieved in Fiscal Year 2009 by the freeze on new hiring, out-of-state travel, personal services contracts, and equipment purchases not related to public safety or other essential activities. This resulted in a temporary halt on hiring needed employees and travel to regional meetings and conferences; and decreased training on critical skills for staff, contracting for services, and equipment purchases.

### 2) Governor-Directed One Percent Cut

- (\$1,106,000) and (4.0 FTEs) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item Z8]

Funding is reduced by assuming a similar amount of savings each fiscal year as was achieved in Fiscal Year 2009 through the one percent cut enacted by the Governor in Fiscal Year 2008. Impacts to the Environmental Assessment, Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction, Air Quality, and Toxics Cleanup Programs included:

- Environmental Assessment Program: This cut affected the Laboratory Accreditation Program by reducing funding to match revenue. This required a rule revision to modify business practices to be able to continue the Lab Accreditation Program with fewer staff. The primary change was to reduce the frequency of on-site audits of labs in the program. Legislative authority was also given to raise laboratory accreditation fees to increase fee revenue to cover the costs of running the program.
- Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction Program: This cut resulted in 16 percent fewer site visits to businesses that generate hazardous wastes (HW) that are toxic, flammable, reactive, or corrosive. These site visits would have helped approximately 100 businesses per year reduce their use of toxics, become more economically viable, and reduce harm to human health and contamination of the environment from spills and illegal disposal. The reduction includes contacting businesses newly identified as generators to make sure they know hazardous waste handling and disposal requirements before formal inspections. In Fiscal Year 2011, 60 percent of the HW compliance inspections found significant threats to public health and environment.
- Air Quality Program:
  - Reductions in air quality monitoring critical to understanding public health impacts and effectiveness of clean air strategies.
  - Delayed cleaning up regional haze pollution.
  - Slowed processing of air permits for new or expanding businesses.
  - Reduced local air agency grants, resulting in poorer air quality.
  - Delayed statewide air quality work to reduce pollution through cleaner transportation fuels and cleaner vehicles.
  - Reduced air quality work on localized air toxic hotspots that affect public health.

### 3) Other Ecology Dedicated Account Shortfalls

- (\$2,620,000) and (19.0 FTEs) – 2009-11 Biennial Budget, various accounts - WQPFA, WRRLLCA, USTA, Reclamation Account, AOPA, CPA, [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 3M; Item 38]

Expenditure authority is reduced in selected dedicated accounts to match anticipated revenues. Water discharge regulation and assistance, waste reduction activities, well construction regulation, management of underground storage tanks, regulation of large stationary air pollution sources, and natural resource restoration will be impacted by these reductions.

The total reduction for this item is \$5,720,000. \$3.1 million of the reduction impacted the Water Quality Program's permitting activities and is included in the summary of environmental program directed reductions. The remaining reduction amount of \$2,620,000 affected work funded through fees and permits deposited into dedicated accounts managed by the Toxics Cleanup; Waste 2 Resources; Water Resources; Air Quality; and Spills Prevention, Preparedness and Response Programs.

#### **4) Temporary Layoffs**

- Total (\$3,202,000) – 2010 Supplemental Budget, (\$1,941,000) various dedicated accounts and (\$1,261,000) State General Fund [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 4X; Item TL2]

Agency appropriations were reduced consistent with Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6503, as amended. This bill closed state agencies and higher education institutions on specified dates, or allowed equivalent reductions for approved alternative compensation reduction plans. This resulted in temporary layoffs for state employees, which reduced their salaries and lowered Ecology's operating costs on the specified days. On those days, most environmental work was halted, impacting protecting Puget Sound; managing water for people, farms, and fish; reducing toxic threats to public health and the environment; cleaning up Hanford; and protecting the Columbia River.

#### **5) Utilize Dedicated Accounts**

- (\$2,485,000) and (5.4 FTEs) – 2011 Early Supplemental Budget (HB 3225), State General Fund [Ongoing Reduction; BASS V. 92; Item HOL]

By shifting costs for a number of programs to other dedicated accounts with positive variances, and by reducing General Fund-State spending in other programs, General Fund-State expenditure authority is reduced. This reduction impacts the following programs: Administration; Air Quality; Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction; Shorelands and Environmental Assistance; Spills Prevention, Preparedness and Response; Waste 2 Resources; and Water Quality.

Numerous programmatic impacts include:

- **Air Quality Program:**
  - Further reduces air quality monitoring and increases risk of violation of federal air standards (non-attainment), and increases public health threat from particulate matter. There also is less enforcement by local air authorities and Ecology.
  - Eliminates most state efforts to reduce pollution through cleaner transportation fuels.
  - Delays diesel engine and woodstove replacements which generate jobs while protecting health and air quality.
- **Hazardous Waste and Toxics Reduction Program:** Reductions include fewer technical assistance site visits to businesses that reduce contamination from hazardous waste and prevent use of highly toxic chemicals; delays to corrective action work at 29 active sites; and cutting new work on financial assurance and closure plans at recycling facilities for the remainder of the biennium.
- **Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program:** Reductions and delays to SEPA reviews; reduced 401 water quality work; reduction in watershed plan implementation; reduced wetland protection; and reductions in contracts and equipment purchases.
- **Waste 2 Resources Program:** Fewer inspections of solid waste and industrial facilities; delays in permitting for large industrial facilities; less technical assistance to local governments; and increased risk to public health and the environment from illegal dumping and discharge.
- **Water Quality Program:** Reduction and delays for Stormwater Manual and Hydrology Manual updates; and less public outreach and technical assistance.
- **Water Resources Program:** Shift funding for adjudication work from State General Fund to Reclamation Revolving Account, contributing to delays in rule making and permitting.
- **Administration Program:** Reductions in financial services, human resources, facilities, communication and management all contribute to Ecology environmental program reductions noted above, along with vacancies and non-staff cost savings.

## **6) Three Percent Pay Cut for State Employees**

- Total (\$6,116,000) – 2011-13 Biennial Budget, (\$4,392,000) various dedicated accounts & (\$1,724,000) State General Fund [One-Time Reduction; BASS V. 4M; Item GLK]

Funding for state agencies and institutions is reduced to reflect a three percent cost savings in employee salaries (except for employees who earn less than \$2,500 per month, student employees, and certain employees of the Washington State Patrol and the Washington State Department of Transportation). Compensation expenditures by state institutions of higher education from non-appropriated funds are not subject the three percent of salary reduction. This reduction is temporary through the 2011-13 biennium only. Impacts include:

- Reduced work hours and workload capacity.
- Salary reductions impact employee's financial situation, increases stress, and lowers morale.
- Talented professionals affected by salary reductions may seek other job opportunities.
- Recruiting hindered as wages for certain classifications continue to degrade below counterparts in the private sector.

**Sub-Total Agencywide Budget Reductions (\$16,272,000)**

## Attachment A

### Fund Transfers from Ecology Dedicated Accounts to the State General Fund

(\$ thousands)								
Updated: June 16, 2011								
<b>Transfers To GF-S</b>								
2009 Supplemental Through 2011 Early Savings Supplemental Budget	2009	4/24/09 Op. Budg.	09-11 Enacted	4/24/09 Op. Budg.	2010	4/12/10 Op. Budg.	2010 2nd	12/11/2010
	Suppl. Budget	ESHB 1244	Budget	ESHB 1244	Suppl. Budget	ESSB 6444	Suppl. Budget	Early Sav. HB 3225
Local Toxics Control Account	-75,000	Sec 1702	-73,060	Sec 805	-12,759	Sec. 803 & 942		
State Toxics Control Account	-2,000	Sec 1702	-29,740	Sec 805	-3,380	Sec. 803 & 942	-20,000	Sec. 801
Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account			-4,000	Sec 805	-2,000	Sec. 803 & 945		
State Emergency Water Projects Revolving Account			-390	Sec 805				
Water Quality Capital Account					-278	Sec. 803 & 948		
Flood Control Assistance Account			-2,000	Sec 961				
<b>Total Transfers to GF-S</b>	<b>-77,000</b>		<b>-109,190</b>		<b>-18,417</b>		<b>-20,000</b>	
<b>Transfers To GF-S</b>								
Cumulative totals through 11-13 Biennial Budget	2011	2/17/2011	11-13 Biennial	5/24/11 Op. Budg.	Cumulative Impact			
	Suppl. Budg.	Early Action ESHB 1086	Budget	ESHB 1087	of Fund Transfers to GF-S			
Local Toxics Control Account	-17,000	Sec. 801			<b>-177,819</b>			
State Toxics Control Account					<b>-55,120</b>			
Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account			-7,000	Sec. 805 & 963	<b>-13,000</b>			
State Emergency Water Projects Revolving Account					<b>-390</b>			
Water Quality Capital Account					<b>-278</b>			
Flood Control Assistance Account			-2,000	Sec. 976	<b>-4,000</b>			
State Drought Preparedness Account	-4,000	Sec. 801			<b>-4,000</b>			
Freshwater Aquatic Algae Control Account	-400	Sec. 801			<b>-400</b>			
Freshwater Aquatic Weeds Control Account	-300	Sec. 801			<b>-300</b>			
<b>Total Transfers to GF-S</b>	<b>-21,700</b>		<b>-9,000</b>		<b>-255,307</b>			

## Attachment B

### Fund Shifts from Ecology Dedicated Accounts to the State General Fund

Fund Shift Summary (From Enacted Budgets)				
	2010	2011-13		
	Supplemental Budget	Biennial Budget		
	ESSB 6444	ESHB 1087	BASS Description	
			Comment	
State Toxics Control Account	5,017,000		The general fund portion of activities that support cleaning up polluted waters, controlling stormwater pollution, and preventing point source and non-point source pollution	One-time reduction. This fund shift from a dedicated account managed by Ecology reduces STCA dollars otherwise available for toxic and hazardous waste cleanup and pollution prevention activities.
General Fund State	(5,017,000)			
State Toxics Control Account		5,000,000	Continuing a budget change initiated in the 2010 supplemental operating budget, the General Fund-State portion of activities that support cleaning up polluted waters, controlling stormwater pollution, and preventing point source and non-point source pollution is shifted, on a one-time basis, to the State Toxics Control Account.	One-time reduction. This fund shift from a dedicated account managed by Ecology reduces STCA dollars otherwise available for toxic and hazardous waste cleanup and pollution prevention activities. Specifically, fewer STCA funds are available for cleaning up Puget Sound toxic waste sites. Additional funding would have been used at the following sites: Whatcom County- Bellingham Bay; the Jacobsen Property in King County; and Cornet Bay – Island County.
General Fund State		(5,000,000)		
Local Toxics Control Account		4,500,000	Base funding of \$4.5 million is shifted permanently from General Fund-State to the Local Toxics Control Account for grants to local governments engaged in Shoreline Master Program updates.	Ongoing reduction. Ecology requested this fund shift to support local shoreline grants, managed through the Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program
General Fund State		(4,500,000)		
<b>Totals</b>			<b>Grand Totals</b>	
State Toxics Control Account	5,017,000	5,000,000	10,017,000	
Local Toxics Control Account		4,500,000	4,500,000	
General Fund State	(5,017,000)	(9,500,000)	(14,517,000)	