



Overview of the Fiscal Impacts and Implementation Advisory Committee's Work

Presented by Co-Chairs:

Kristin Lee, ECONorthwest

Sarah Kruse, Ecotrust



What is FIIAC?

- Nine member advisory committee
- Names recommended to DEQ by variety of sources
- Representatives from tribes (2), public health (1), municipal water agencies (1), local government (1), industry (2), economic consulting firm (1) and non-profit research organization (1)
- Six meetings to date, beginning January 29, 2008



Summary of FIIAC's Charge

- Review and comment on the initial 'Cost Analysis'
- Provide any recommendations on fiscal impact and implementation strategies
- Consider and contribute to the Implementation Strategies Inventory
 - Discuss implementation options for multiple fish consumption rate scenarios
- Provide information about the potential economic benefits of an increased fish consumption rate



Overview of FIIAC's Work

1. Review and comment on SAIC cost analysis
2. Review other cost analyses
3. Comment on benefits and alternative implementation strategies discussions
4. Uncertainties and limitations
5. Looking forward: What next for the FIIAC?

SAIC Analysis

GOAL: Review draft, provide comments, review revised version, draw conclusions and make recommendations based on findings

- Provided initial round of comments – numerous concerns
- Time frame for doing and finalizing the analysis impacted FIIAC's ability to comment as a group
 - All members have reviewed, but FIIAC did not receive in time to discuss latest version prior to today
- Result: FIIAC can not make conclusions or recommendations at this time

Other Cost Analyses

GOAL: Use these analyses to complement the SAIC report

- Heard presentations of cost analyses by the Northwest Pulp and Paper Association and the Oregon Association of Clean Water Agencies
- FIIAC had opportunity to ask questions and discuss analyses
 - Had no chance to review underlying assumptions or analyses of these studies
- Result: FIIAC unable to make comparisons, conclusions or recommendations at this time



Uncertainties and Limitations

- Varying perspectives on numerous assumptions (e.g. baseline, viability of technologies and treatments (operational and legal), on-going policy changes, statistical representativeness of sample, specific types of costs, etc.)
- Lack of funds to support a benefits analysis
- Lack of cost and benefits analysis for various alternative implementation strategies



What FIIAC Can Say Today About a Revised Fish Consumption Rate:

Given the presentations and discussions:

- Will take time for municipalities, industry and others to comply
- Will have associated increased costs — especially with traditional approaches
- Will need innovative approaches to attain the standard
- Will have associated benefits (but the level of those benefits have not been evaluated)
- Will require a comprehensive approach



Looking Forward: What Next for the FIIAC

Goal: Provide conclusions and recommendations to inform the EQC

- Review final SAIC report and other analyses
- If possible, provide cost estimate consensus recommendations
- Develop qualitative discussion of potential benefits
- Consider alternative implementation strategy for recommendation