

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 2192 HB	Title: Water mgmt/biofuel, organic
-----------------------------	---

Estimated Cash Receipts

Agency Name	2011-13		2013-15		2015-17	
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total
Department of Ecology	0	0	4,130	5,163	10,486	13,108
Total \$	0	0	4,130	5,163	10,486	13,108

Estimated Expenditures

Agency Name	2011-13			2013-15			2015-17		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Department of Ecology	2.5	592,497	592,497	7.8	2,175,278	2,175,278	7.9	1,939,156	1,939,156
Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office	.1	32,000	32,000	.3	56,000	56,000	.3	56,000	56,000
Total	2.6	\$624,497	\$624,497	8.1	\$2,231,278	\$2,231,278	8.2	\$1,995,156	\$1,995,156

Estimated Capital Budget Impact

NONE

Prepared by: Linda Steinmann, OFM	Phone: 360-902-0573	Date Published: Final 1/13/2012
--	-------------------------------	---

* See Office of the Administrator for the Courts judicial fiscal note

** See local government fiscal note

FNPID 30505

FNS029 Multi Agency rollup

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 2192 HB	Title: Water mgmt/biofuel, organic	Agency: 461-Department of Ecology
-----------------------------	---	--

Part I: Estimates

☐ No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

ACCOUNT	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
General Fund-State 001-1				4,130	10,486
Water Rights Tracking System Account-State 10G-1				1,033	2,622
Total \$				5,163	13,108

Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
FTE Staff Years	0.0	5.0	2.5	7.8	7.9
Account					
General Fund-State 001-1	0	592,497	592,497	2,175,278	1,939,156
Total \$	0	592,497	592,497	2,175,278	1,939,156

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- ☒ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- ☐ If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- ☐ Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- ☐ Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Jason Callahan	Phone: 360-786-7117	Date: 01/04/2012
Agency Preparation: Jim Skalski	Phone: 360-407-6617	Date: 01/11/2012
Agency Approval: Erik Fairchild	Phone: 360-407-7005	Date: 01/11/2012
OFM Review: Linda Steinmann	Phone: 360-902-0573	Date: 01/11/2012

Request # 12-13-2

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

Note: This bill was introduced during the 2008 Legislative Session as HB 3081 & SB 6758 but did not receive a hearing or fiscal note request.

Background: In 2006, Ecology created the legislatively authorized Office of Columbia River (OCR) to develop new water supplies using storage, conservation, and voluntary regional water management agreements. The legislature tasked OCR with six primary directives:

- Find sources of water supply for pending water right applications. (RCW 90.90.020(3)(b)).
- Develop water sources for new municipal, domestic, industrial, and irrigation water needs within the Columbia River Basin (RCW 90.90.020(3)(d))
- Issue supply and demand reports. (RCW 90.90.040(3)).
- Secure alternatives to groundwater for agricultural users in the Odessa subarea aquifer. (RCW 90.90.020(3)(a)).
- Find a new uninterruptible supply of water for the holders of interruptible water rights on the Columbia River mainstem. (RCW 90.90.020(3)(c)).
- Develop water supplies for instream as well as out-of-stream uses.” (RCW 90.90.020(1)(a)(ii)).

The Columbia River Policy Advisory Group (PAG) was also created to assist OCR with policy development and project selection. The PAG is composed of representatives from federal, state, local, and tribal governments, business and environmental groups, and water users.

This bill would establish an allocation / reserve of one hundred thousand acre feet of water (annual aggregate) from the Columbia River mainstem and the Lower Snake river mainstem in perpetuity for the purpose of biofuel and organic crop irrigation. The department would be authorized and directed to issue permits and certificates for the uninterruptible appropriation and use of the water allocated under this act, but solely for the purpose of biofuel irrigation and organic crop irrigation.

A section by section summary of the bill follows.

Section 1(1) would establish legislative findings that (a) there is sufficient water in the Columbia River mainstem and lower Snake River mainstem to establish an allocation of 100,000 acre-feet of water annually for biofuel crop irrigation and organic crop irrigation without harming instream resources; (b) the program will provide significant environmental and economic benefits; and (c) new water withdrawals for biofuel and organic crop irrigation must reach 100,000 acre-feet. The legislature will review the economic and environmental benefits resulting from this authorization no later than 2018.

Section 1(2) would establish an allocation of an annual aggregate of one hundred thousand acre feet of water from the Columbia River mainstem and the lower Snake River mainstem in perpetuity. The waters allocated under this section would have to be available for appropriation and use for biofuel crop irrigation and organic crop irrigation. The department would be authorized and directed to issue new permits and certificates for the uninterruptible appropriation and use of the water allocated under this section, but solely for the purposes of biofuel crop irrigation and organic crop

irrigation.

Section 1(3) would direct that no application, permit, or certificate to appropriate and use waters pursuant to this section may be denied or conditioned to be interruptible on the grounds that such a denial or condition is necessary to satisfy the instream flow or no net loss requirements, or any other state law or rule. In addition, except as specifically provided in this section, water allocated under the provisions of this section and permits and certificates issued pursuant to this section are deemed as not requiring any further mitigation and the allocation of water under this section and permits and certificates issued pursuant to this section are deemed to satisfy all consultation requirements under state law related to the issuance of new water rights.

Section 1(4) would establish the terms and conditions applicable to permits and certificates for water issued under this act. These include that (a) withdrawal locations conform to RCW 90.90.030(12); (b) water be used for biofuel and organic crop irrigation; (c) except as modified by this section, water rights issued for this purpose would be subject to existing provisions of the current water code; (d) a specific designation would have to be included on the permit to state where the water will be used and how many acres are authorized. Any changes to place of use would have to be approved by the department and no change to use other than biofuel and organic crop irrigation would be allowed; (e) the total water duty for biofuel and organic crops could be no more than 2.8 acre-feet of water per acre; (f) water rights issued under this section may be used with another water right to establish a suitable, multi-year crop rotation; (g) except as modified by this section, standard provisions such as providing water measuring and fish screens must be included in the permits and certificates issued; and, (h) that applicants for a biofuel crop irrigation or organic crop irrigation water right under this section must agree, as a condition of the department issuing the new water right, that the total water duty for all existing water rights owned by the applicant be recalibrated using methodologies that have been jointly agreed upon by the department and the state's water conservancy boards as of the effective date of this section, and consistent with the current water code. Data and technical information for recalibration of existing water rights must be submitted to the department by the applicant within one year after the applicant's receipt of the new water right or rights issued pursuant to this section. Recalibrated water rights must be reissued after the existing thirty-day appeal period for department water orders, with existing public/agency notification standards in place.

Section 1(5) would authorize that this section may be included under RCW 90.90.030 Voluntary Regional Agreements.

Section 1(6) would establish definitions related to the new section.

There would be significant fiscal impact from implementing section 1 of this bill due to the requirements to permit/certificate new water supplies, recalibrate existing water rights, act on applications to change water rights, perform compliance & education actions resulting from information identified during recalibration of water rights, and support of appeals of decisions made by Ecology or support other legal action. Some new revenue would be created due to change applications being filed with the department on an annual basis.

Ecology assumes that new water resources would be required to implement this bill so that existing permitting/water supply development of Lake Roosevelt, Sullivan Lake and other OCR projects would not be impacted from this new permitting requirement.

Ecology and the Attorney General's Office (AGO) also assume that some new litigation would result from this bill based

on impairment of existing water rights and/or ESA related litigation from tribes, federal fisheries agencies, and/or environmental groups due to the perceived creation of a reserve (by some stakeholders) that is immune to public interest and impairment challenges.

No additional costs are included for Department of Fish and Wildlife consultation as section 1(3) of the bill expressly states no further mitigation or consultation is required to issue such permits.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Ecology assumes that existing agricultural irrigation applications on file in the pending application queue would have first-in-time-first-in-right access to the 100,000 acre feet of water to be made available under this bill. The amount of water each applicant would receive would be variable. The bill specifies the Columbia River and Lower Snake Mainstem as defined in RCW 90.90.030(12), which is surface water and groundwater within a mile in those river reaches. Ecology queried our application database for applications meeting these parameters and needing irrigation water. Using this information, we determined that the first 180 such applications would require approximately 715 CFS (cubic feet per second), or approximately 100,000 acre-feet of water.

Since permit fees have already been paid for these applications, this bill would not result in new permit application fees. However, future applications for changes in use would be subject to change fees.

Section 1(d) would authorize that changes to place of use must be approved by the department and be limited to no other use than biofuel and organic crop irrigation. Ecology assumes that of the 180 initial new permits issued, 25% annually (beginning in FY14) would require a change in place of use for the purpose of crop rotation. This would in turn require that an application for a change in use be filed with the department with the appropriate fees. (Ecology assumed that the permit applications are already in our queue, so no new revenue would result from new permit fees.)

Cash receipts calculation rates are based on the existing fee schedule for a change application of 50 cents per 1/100th of a Cubic Foot per Second (of water) with a minimum of \$50 and a maximum of \$12,500.

The total amount is calculated assuming that 715 CFS corresponds to the 100,000 acre-feet target in the bill:

- 715 CFS (or 71,500 hundredths) would be available to be permitted through the 180 new permits;
 - 25% of total (17,875 hundredths) would be subject to change applications, in 45 initial change applications (25% of 180) submitted over 5 years;
 - \$8,937.50 would be maximum fees associated with 45 initial change applications submitted once all (180) new applications were acted upon and at a rate of \$0.50 per hundredth;
 - Annual revenues are prorated based on the number of change applications estimated to be in play each year.
- (Change fees for crop rotations in successive years would have to be factored in.)

Ecology assumes that the 180 permits would be issued as follows: 30 permits would be issued in FY13, 40 per year in FY 14 thru 16, and 30 in FY17. The number of change applications would be 25% of the number of permits issued the prior year, PLUS the number of change applications in the prior year (assuming on-going annual crop rotation): 8 in FY14, 10+8=18 in FY15, 10+18=28 in FY16, 10+28=38 in FY17 and 7+38=45 in FY18 .

The following change applications and total cash receipts are projected for each fiscal year as follows. Please note that the total revenue will be split 80% to the State General Fund and 20% to the Water Rights Tracking System Account.

FY13 - No changes or revenue in the first fiscal year.

FY14 – 8 and \$1,588.00 (\$1,270 to GF-S and \$318 to 10G)

FY15 - 18 and \$3,575.00 (\$2,860 to GF-S and \$715 to 10G)

FY16 - 28 and \$5,561.00 (\$4,449 to GF-S and \$1,112 to 10G)

FY17 - 38 and \$7,547.00 (\$6,037 to GF-S and \$1,510 to 10G)

FY18 - 45 and \$8,937.00 (\$7,149 to GF-S and \$1,788 to 10G)

II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Section 1 of this bill would require new resources to implement or support five specific activities required by the bill:

- (1) processing and permitting new water supplies,
- (2) processing change applications generated by crop rotation,
- (3) performing compliance and education functions related to information developed through recalibration of water rights,
- (4) support and defense of appeals to Ecology decisions related to permitting water rights, and,
- (5) support of anticipated litigation from implementing decisions that are perceived (by some stakeholders) to be contrary to existing public interest, impairment and ESA takings law.

Ecology assumes implementation of this bill beginning in FY13.

Expenditure estimates are broken down by these five categories as follows:

Section 1(1)(2) Processing New Water Rights: Estimate of new resources required based on average of 15 decisions per FTE and an estimated 180 new permits being issued. The estimate of new permits issued is based on existing applications in the water rights backlog that request additional irrigation water. Ecology further assumes that the permits would be issued over a period of five years with 30 permits issued in FY13, 40 in FY 14 thru 16 and 30 in FY17. At the rate of 15 decisions per FTE, this would require 2.0 additional FTE in FY13, 2.66 in FY 14 thru 16 and 2.0 in FY17. FTE classifications include Environmental Specialist 3 and 4 levels and are based on current staff classifications performing similar work.

Section 1(4) Processing Water Right Changes: Ecology estimates that 25% of the new permits issued will result in additional change decisions due to the likelihood that applicants will rotate crops and place of use to maximize production. These types of changes tend to be more straightforward than permitting new water supplies. Thus, Ecology estimates that 1 FTE could handle the additional 45 change decisions per year (based on fully implemented new permitting estimate of 180 decisions from FY13 thru FY17). FTE included in this section are prorated based on the number of new decisions issued in the prior year and include 0.18 FTE in FY14, 0.38 FTE in FY15, 0.61 FTE in FY16, 0.83 FTE in FY 17 and 1.0 FTE in FY18 and beyond.

At the end of FY17, Ecology assumes that work related to implementing new decision on the 180 estimated permits will

be complete and that workload related to change applications will be ongoing (averaging 45 per year after FY17) workload.

Section 1(4) Recalibration of Existing Water Rights: Based on the number of rights owned by existing applicants in-line to receive this type of water (estimated to be roughly 180 decisions for perhaps 124 applicants), there would be several hundred water rights that would need to be recalibrated. Recalibration of existing rights triggers other permitting work (induced effects), such as assignments, splits, change applications, enforcement and technical assistance. For example, an applicant may have sold some of the land (splitting the right or permit), or planted trees on an adjacent parcel (requiring a change in place of use), or have a well not constructed properly (requiring enforcement or technical assistance), or may not have a meter (requiring a metering order). Ecology estimates that an additional 2.0 FTE in FY13, 2.33 in FY 14 thru 16 and 2.0 in FY17 would be required to process decisions related to recalibration of existing rights. FTE classifications include Environmental Specialist 3 and 4 levels and are based on current staff classifications performing similar work.

Section 1(4) Compliance & Technical Assistance: Ecology estimates that of the 180 new permits issued, that 124 existing applicants would be satisfied with permits for new biofuel / organic crop water. Of these 124 applicants, Ecology estimates that approximately 33% will require some form of technical assistance or compliance actions to ensure conformance with the water code. Ecology estimates that 1.0 FTE of Environmental Specialist 4 for three years (FY 15 thru 17) would be required to implement this element.

Section 1(1)(2)(3)(4) Legal Support, Appeals & Litigation: There are several potential legal costs associated with the bill and issuing 180 new permits.

a. Costs of Appeal on New Permits. Some applicants or 3rd parties may appeal the 180 new permits. Assuming 1:10 permits is appealed, that's 18 new appeals. We estimate that 2 FTE of AGO time and 1 FTE of Ecology Environmental Specialist 4 support would be necessary to defend the 18 appeals over five years. FTE included in this section are prorated based on the number of new decisions issued in the prior year.

b. Costs of Appeal on Recalibration. Some applicants or 3rd parties may appeal recalibration decisions. The 180 new permits may spawn as many as 500 recalibration decisions. These should be less controversial than new permits, as quantities will either stay the same or go down. Assuming 1:20 of those decisions are appealed, that is 25 appeals over five years. We estimate 2.5 FTEs of AGO time and 1.25 FTEs of Ecology Environmental Specialist 4 support would be necessary to defend the 25 appeals over five years. FTE included in this section are prorated based on the number of new decisions issued in the prior year.

c. Litigation Support: The AGO estimates that 1 FTE of AGO time for 3 years (FY14 thru FY16), and 0.5 FTE of Ecology Environmental Specialist 4 time for 3 years would be required to litigate implementation issues and challenges (this is common in the implementation of changes in water law). For fiscal note purposes, Ecology assumes the start of litigation in FY14 although this could be earlier or later.

Notes on costs by object:

Salary estimates are based on current actual rates in effect for each job classification, and are calculated at the step corresponding to the experience level required.

Employee Benefits are calculated at the agency average of 33.1% of salaries.

Goods and Services are calculated at the agency average rate of \$5,008 per direct program FTE. Goods and Services costs also include AGO expenditures calculated at a rate of \$187,024 per AGO FTE. AGO FTE included are 0.71 in FY13, 2.02 in FY14, 2.04 in FY15, 2.02 in FY16 and 0.71 in FY17. (Please note: these costs are based on preliminary consultation with the AGO and are subject to refinement by AGO financial Services.)

Travel expenditures are calculated at the agency average rate of \$1,097 per direct program FTE.

Start-up Equipment costs for the first year are calculated at the agency average rate of \$2,666 per direct program FTE based on current costs for basic computer equipment, and an office chair.

Agency Administrative Overhead is calculated at the federal indirect rate of 34.40% of program salaries and benefits, and is identified in Expenditures by Object as 9-Agency Administrative Overhead.

Administration program FTEs are included at 0.15 FTE per direct program FTE, and are identified in the Part III-B FTE Detail table as Fiscal Analyst 2.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
FTE Staff Years		5.0	2.5	7.8	7.9
A-Salaries and Wages		235,656	235,656	740,568	751,188
B-Employee Benefits		78,002	78,002	245,128	248,643
C-Personal Service Contracts					
E-Goods and Services		154,572	154,572	827,426	579,685
G-Travel		4,772	4,772	14,919	15,138
J-Capital Outlays		11,597	11,597	8,158	560
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
9-Agency Administrative Overhead		107,898	107,898	339,079	343,942
Total:	\$0	\$592,497	\$592,497	\$2,175,278	\$1,939,156

III. B - Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
Environmental Specialist 3 - Change Processing	50,304				0.3	0.7
Environmental Specialist 3 - Permitting & Recalib	50,304		2.3	1.1	3.0	2.6
Environmental Specialist 4 - Appeals	58,320		0.4	0.2	1.0	0.7
Environmental Specialist 4 - Compliance & Tech. A	58,320				0.5	1.0
Environmental Specialist 4 - Permitting & Recalib	58,320		1.8	0.9	2.0	1.9
Fiscal Analyst 2			0.7	0.3	1.0	1.0
Total FTE's	275,568		5.0	2.5	7.8	8.0

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

NONE

NONE

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

NONE

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 2192 HB	Title: Water mgmt/biofuel, organic	Agency: 468-Environmental & Land Use Hearings
-----------------------------	---	--

Part I: Estimates

☐

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
FTE Staff Years	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3
Account					
General Fund-State 001-1	0	32,000	32,000	56,000	56,000
Total \$	0	32,000	32,000	56,000	56,000

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- ☐ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- ☒ If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- ☐ Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- ☐ Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Jason Callahan	Phone: 360-786-7117	Date: 01/04/2012
Agency Preparation: Robyn Bryant	Phone: 360-664-9166	Date: 01/13/2012
Agency Approval: Bill Lynch	Phone: (360) 664-9179	Date: 01/13/2012
OFM Review: Linda Steinmann	Phone: 360-902-0573	Date: 01/13/2012

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

HB 2192 establishes an allocation of an annual aggregate of 100,000 acre feet of water from the Columbia River mainstem and the lower Snake River mainstem in perpetuity. This water may only be used for the purpose of biofuel crop irrigation and organic crop irrigation. The Department of Ecology will issue new water right permits and certificates for this water allocation, which are appealable to the Pollution Control Hearings Board.

Water right appeals normally require multi-day hearings before the PCHB because of their complexity. The Department of Ecology assumes that approximately 8 appeals per year will be filed with the PCHB as a result of this legislation for FY2013 through FY2017.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

No cash receipt impact

II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Expenditure assumptions assume the need for a quarter time Administrative Appeals Judge. As a quarter FTE this position is not eligible for retirement or health benefits. Goods and Services costs will provide the standard communications, training, personnel fees, and court reporter costs. Travel assumes one overnight travel to eastern Washington for four staff members utilizing a motor pool vehicle. Equipment costs assume the standard one time cost for work station equipment, computers, phones, etc.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
FTE Staff Years		0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3
A-Salaries and Wages		21,000	21,000	44,000	44,000
B-Employee Benefits		2,000	2,000	4,000	4,000
C-Personal Service Contracts					
E-Goods and Services		3,500	3,500	7,000	7,000
G-Travel		500	500	1,000	1,000
J-Capital Outlays		5,000	5,000		
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
9-					
Total:	\$0	\$32,000	\$32,000	\$56,000	\$56,000

III. B - Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2012	FY 2013	2011-13	2013-15	2015-17
Administrative Appeals Judge	7,160		0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3
Total FTE's	7,160		0.3	0.1	0.3	0.3

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

NONE

No capital budget impact

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

No new rules needed.