PROPOSED RULE MAKING



CR-102 (December 2017) (Implements RCW 34.05.320)

Do NOT use for expedited rule making

CODE REVISER USE ONLY

OFFICE OF THE CODE REVISER STATE OF WASHINGTON FILED

DATE: October 02, 2019

TIME: 11:02 AM

WSR 19-20-120

| Agency: Washington | State Noxio | us Weed Control Board | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | |
| □ Supplemental Noti | ice to WSR | | |
| ☐ Continuance of W | SR | | |
| □ Preproposal State | ment of Inc | uiry was filed as WSR 19-16-01 | 2 and 19-16-03 ; or |
| ☐ Expedited Rule Ma | akingProp | osed notice was filed as WSR _ | ; or |
| □ Proposal is exemp | t under RC | 34.05.310(4) or 34.05.330(1); | or |
| □ Proposal is exemp | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| schedule of monetary | penalties. T ate two new | he Washington State Noxious We sections regarding the Executive | Chapter 16-750 WAC, State noxious weed list and ed Control Board is proposing to amend the state noxious Secretary and the Education Specialist, and update three |
| Hearing location(s): | | | |
| Date: | Time: | Location: (be specific) | Comment: |
| November 5, 2019 | 1:00 pm | The Coast Wenatchee Center Hotel 201 N. Wenatchee Ave Wenatchee, WA 98801 | |
| Date of intended ado | ption: Nove | ember 26, 2019 (Note: This is NO | T the effective date) |
| Submit written comm | nents to: | | |
| Name: Mary Fee | | | |
| | | 560; Olympia, WA 98504-2560 | |
| Email: mfee@agr.wa.g | gov or <u>noxio</u> | <u>usweeds@agr.wa.gov</u> | |
| Fax: 360-902-2053 | | | |
| Other: By (date) <u>November 4</u> , | 2010 | | |
| Assistance for perso | | ahilities: | |
| Contact Deanna Paint | | abinties. | |
| Phone: 360-902-2061 | <u> </u> | | |
| Fax: | | | |
| TTY: (800) 833-6388 | | | |
| Email: <u>dpainter@agr.w</u> | <u>va.gov</u> | | |
| Other: | | | |
| By (date) October 30, | | | |
| Purpose of the propo | sal and its | anticipated effects, including a | ny changes in existing rules: The Washington State |

noxious weed list provides the basis for noxious weed control efforts for county noxious weed control boards and other entities. It also provides guidelines for the state noxious weed control board. This proposal makes a few amendments to WAC 16-750-005 and 16-750-011. Specifically, the Board is considering:

- 1. WAC 16-750-005 One Proposed Class A addition- South American spongeplant, Limnobium laevigatum
- 2. WAC 16-750-011 Proposed Class B designation changes-
 - Designate Eurasian watermilfoil, *Myriophyllum spicatum*, in Kitsap County of region 2, and Kittitas and Whitman counties of region 5
 - Designate Bohemian knotweed, *Polygonum* x *bohemicum*, in San Juan County of region 2, Stevens County of region 4, and Whitman and Yakima counties of region 5
 - Designate Japanese knotweed, Polygonum cuspidatum, in Stevens County of region 4

- Designate Himalayan knotweed. Persicaria wallichii. in Clark County of region 3 and Stevens County of region 4
- Designate lesser celandine, Ficaria verna, in all of region 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and region 2 except for King and Whatcom counties
- Designate leafy spurge, Euphorbia virgata, in Whitman County of region 5 and Garfield County of
- Designate purple loosestrife, Lythrum salicaria, in Pierce County of region 2 and Benton County of region 6
- Designate wand loosestrife, Lythrum virgatum, in Mason County of region 1, Pierce County of region 2, and Benton County of region 6
- Designate poison hemlock, Conium maculatum, in Douglas County of region 4
- Designate policeman's helmet, Impatiens glandulifera, in Pacific County of region 1 and Pierce County of region 2
- Designate Ravenna grass, Saccharum ravennae, in Grant County of region 5
- Designate rush skeletonweed, Chondrilla juncea, in Kitsap County of region 2
- Designate European coltsfoot, *Tussilago farfara*, in Grant County of region 5

Designation changes are intended to better match the distribution/threat of these noxious weeds.

The Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board is also proposing the following changes;

- 1. WAC 16-750-140 Adding a standing legislative committee.
- 2. WAC 16-750-142 Create a new section for the State noxious weed control board—Executive secretary and education specialist—Hiring and dismissal.
- 3. WAC 16-750-145 Editing the State noxious weed control board—Executive secretary—Definition.
- 4. WAC 16-750-146 Adding new section for the State noxious weed control board—Education specialist—Definition.
- 5. WAC 16-750-150 Repealing section on State noxious weed control board- Executive secretary- Hiring and dismissal. Moved to section 142.

Reasons supporting proposal: Under RCW 17.10.080, the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board (WSNWCB) is charged with updating the state noxious weed list on an annual basis to ensure it accurately reflects the noxious weed control priorities and noxious weed distribution. Under RCW 17.10.070, the WSNWCB is charged with adopting, amending, or repealing rules, pursuant to the administrative procedure act, chapter 34.05 RCW, as may be necessary to carry out the duties and authorities assigned to the board by this chapter.

The proposed additional of South American spongeplant, Limnobium laevigatum, as a Class A noxious weed, is intended to keep it from spreading from the one known location in Washington State.

Designation changes of thirteen Class B noxious weeds are intended to better match the distribution/threat of these noxious weeds. Class B noxious weeds are generally designated where they are absent, limited, or pose a serious threat to health, agriculture, or natural areas so the economic impact is not unreasonable.

The additional edits to the remaining sections are intended to improve the ability of the WSNWCB to carry out the duties and

| authorities assigned to the board per Chapter 17.10 RCW. | |
|---|--|
| Statutory authority for adoption: RCW 17.10.070, 17.10.080, | |
| | |
| | |
| Statute being implemented: Chapter 17.10 RCW | |
| | |
| | |
| Is rule necessary because of a: | |
| Federal Law? | ☐ Yes ☒ No |
| Federal Court Decision? | ☐ Yes ⊠ No |
| State Court Decision? | ☐ Yes ☒ No |
| If yes, CITATION: | |
| Agency comments or recommendations, if any, as to statuto | ry language, implementation, enforcement, and fiscal |
| matters: | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| Name of propone | Control Board | ☐ Private | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | ☐ Public | | | |
| | | | | | ⊠ Governmental | | | |
| Name of agency | personnel responsible | for: | | | | | | |
| | Name | Office Loca | tion | | Phone | | | |
| Drafting: | Mary Fee | 1111 Wash | ington St SE, Olym | npia, WA 98504 | (360) 902-2053 | | | |
| Implementation: | Mary Fee | 1111 Wash | ington St SE, Olym | npia, WA 98504 | (360) 902-2053 | | | |
| Enforcement: | Mary Fee | 1111 Wash | ington St SE, Olym | npia, WA 98504 | (360) 902-2053 | | | |
| Is a school district fiscal impact statement required under RCW 28A.305.135? ☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, insert statement here: | | | | | | | | |
| Name: Address Phone: Fax: TTY: | obtain a copy of the sch | nool district fiscal imp | pact statement by c | contacting: | | | | |
| Email: Other: | | | | | | | | |
| Is a cost-benefit | analysis required unde | r RCW 34.05.328? | | | | | | |
| Name: Address Phone: Fax: TTY: Email: Other: ☑ No: Pleas Regulatory Fairn This rule proposal | eliminary cost-benefit and : se explain: The Washing ess Act Cost Consider , or portions of the propo W). Please check the bo | ton State Noxious C ations for a Small E sal, may be exemp | ontrol Board is not susiness Economi | ic Impact Statemen | t: | | | |
| adopted solely to oregulation this rule adopted. Citation and descr This rule propodefined by RCW 3 | osal, or portions of the pr 34.05.313 before filing the osal, or portions of the pr | vith federal statute of form or comply with, oposal, is exempt be e notice of this propo | regulations. Pleas and describe the o cause the agency sed rule. | e cite the specific featonsequences to the | deral statute or state if the rule is not ilot rule process | | | |
| | osal, or portions of the pr | oposal, is exempt ur | der RCW 19.85.02 | 25(3). Check all that | apply: | | | |
| 1 | / 34.05.310 (4)(b) | . , | ☐ RCW 34.05 | . , | , | | | |
| | rnal government operation | ons) | (Dictated by | . , . , | | | | |
| , | / 34.05.310 (4)(c) | , | □ RCW 34.05 | • | | | | |
| (Inco | rporation by reference) | | (Set or adju | ıst fees) | | | | |
| , | / 34.05.310 (4)(d) | | ☐ RCW 34.05 | | | | | |
| (Corı | rect or clarify language) | | ((i) Relating requiremen or permit) | to agency hearings | ; or (ii) process agency for a license | | | |
| | osal, or portions of the premptions, if necessary: | oposal, is exempt ur | der RCW | | | | | |

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ONLY IF NO EXEMPTION APPLIES If the proposed rule is **not exempt**, does it impose more-than-minor costs (as defined by RCW 19.85.020(2)) on businesses? ⊠ No Briefly summarize the agency's analysis showing how costs were calculated. Approximately 250 businesses responded to an online survey emailed to licensed nurseries and agricultural industry associations. Participating businesses do not appear to carry any of the Class B noxious weeds that have proposed designation changes, nine of which are already on WSDA's quarantine list (WAC 16-752). Of the five species that are not already on the quarantine list, only Ravenna grass is known for being ornamental species, and it is currently undergoing rule-making by WSDA to be added to the quarantine list. An analysis of the direct economic effects of the proposed rule amendments indicates that costs to businesses would be negligible or none at all. The thirteen Class B noxious weeds may be designated for control in counties where they are either absent or limited in distribution, business in these counties should not be faced with more than minor costs to control those noxious weeds. Based upon the above analysis, the WSNWCB concludes that direct minor costs – if any – imposed would affect less than 10% of businesses and would not exceed \$100 in lost sales or revenue as a direct result of these proposed rule-making changes. Nor would any of these amendments to the noxious weed list directly cause the creation of or loss of any jobs. The WSNWCB concludes that businesses will not be disproportionately impacted, nor would the proposed rule changes impose more than a minor cost on businesses in an industry. Therefore, we conclude that a formal SBEIS is not required. ☐ Yes Calculations show the rule proposal likely imposes more-than-minor cost to businesses, and a small business economic impact statement is required. Insert statement here: The public may obtain a copy of the small business economic impact statement or the detailed cost calculations by contacting: Name: Mary Fee Address: P.O. Box 42560; Olympia, WA 98504-2560 Phone: 360-902-2053 Fax: 360-902-2094 TTY: (800) 833-6388 Email: mfee@agr.wa.gov Other:

Date: October 2, 2019

Name: Mary Fee

Title: Executive Secretary