

# WDFW BUDGET AND POLICY ADVISORY GROUP: DRAFT LONG-TERM FUNDING PLAN OUTLINE

---

Relevant proviso language: *“In order to address [the Department budget shortfall] on a long-term basis, the department must develop a plan for balancing projected revenue and expenditures and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of agency operations, including: (i) Expenditure reduction options that maximize administrative and organizational efficiencies and savings, while avoiding hatchery closures and minimizing impacts to fisheries and hunting opportunities; and (ii) Additional revenue options and an associated outreach plan designed to ensure that the public, stakeholders, the commission, and legislators have the opportunity to understand and impact the design of the revenue options. (iii) The range of options created under (a)(i) and (ii) of this subsection must be prioritized by impact on achieving financial stability, impact on the public and fisheries and hunting opportunities, and on timeliness and ability to achieve intended outcomes.”*

## Front Section:

---

- Cover Page
- Acknowledgments: BPAG Members, etc.
- Executive Summary *[target length: 2-3 pages, so it could be a stand-alone document]*
- Table of Contents
- Acronyms and Abbreviations

## 1. Introduction

---

- a. Purpose of this plan: why this plan is needed and what it does, including reiterating the relevant section of the Proviso and how this responds to it
- b. Brief description of the challenge, the role of the BPAG relative to the challenge, and what information the BPAG used
- c. Key Questions Answered by this Plan
  - What does WDFW do and how is it funded?
  - What is the Department budget shortfall?
  - Why/how did this shortfall occur?
  - How much of the shortfall should be made up with efficiencies? *[From the Matrix report]*
  - How much of the shortfall should be made up with expenditure reductions?
  - What are revenue options to address the remaining shortfall for the long-term after efficiencies and expenditure reductions are taken?
  - What are the impacts of these revenue options and which are highest priority? *[Based on evaluation using the criteria the Legislature specified and any other criteria from the BPAG]*
- d. Remaining Work to be Done *[tee up remaining questions and next steps]*

## 2. WDFW's Mission and Role

---

- a. Brief history of the Department, including bigger picture context of how WDFW contributes to conservation in the state
- b. Statutory, treaty, and ESA and other responsibilities, including notable differences between WDFW roles and those of other agencies (Ecology, DNR, Parks, USFWS, NOAA Fisheries)
- c. Current WDFW Work *[From the ZBB analysis]*
  - Describe major work areas of the Department, including outcomes, strategies, and performance measures. As much as possible, lead with intended outcomes linked back to Agency responsibilities (e.g., WDFW is responsible for preserving and protecting species, to accomplish that outcome, the Department.... etc.)
  - Use graphics to show the outcomes/strategies and illustrate relationships to one another
- d. Future Challenges

## 3. WDFW's Current Funding, Expenditures, and Performance

---

- a. How Is WDFW Funded?
  - Summary of revenue/funding sources by category and historical trends, with graphics/charts as appropriate to illustrate
- b. What Does WDFW Do with Its Funding? *[From the ZBB analysis]*
  - WDFW expenditures by outcomes and strategies, with graphics/charts to illustrate
  - Will need to show both total/proportional investment for each outcome and the source of the funding
- c. What is WDFW Accomplishing with Its Funding?
  - Accomplishments by outcomes and strategies, with graphics/ charts as appropriate
  - Performance gaps / areas in need of additional investment or resources

## 4. WDFW's Funding Shortfall

---

- a. Describe the shortfall amount
- b. Describe how the shortfall came about
  - Structural shortfall (COLA)
  - ESA-related shortfall (new requirements for monitoring, analysis associated with managing fisheries for ESA listed species without commensurate funding)
- c. Describe potential "make up" from efficiencies *[from the Matrix report]*
- d. Describe potential "make up" from expenditure reductions *[mentioned specifically in proviso]*

## 5. Funding Needs and Priorities for the Next 3 Biennial Budgets

---

- a. Estimates of Maintenance Funding Needs *[current estimate is approximately \$27-30 million per biennium to address the shortfall]*
  - For 2019-21
    - 2019-21 carry-forward level (as baseline)
    - Opportunities to re-purpose funding in 2017-19 biennium
    - 2018 supplemental budget (maintenance level component and performance level component)

- Opportunities to re-purpose funding in 2019-21 biennium (but tied to legislative request—either new authorities or repealing statutes which require WDFW to do low priority work)
  - For 21-23
  - For 23-25
- b. Potential enhancements
  - For 2019-21
  - For 21-23
  - For 23-25

## 6. BPAG Principles for Sustainable Funding

---

- a. Funding principles. Might cover things like:
  - What is the role of broad-based funding (general) fund vs the role of user fees?
  - If there are user fees how should they be scaled and who should contribute?
  - What are guideposts for Department approach to funding and transparency?
  - What are thoughts on administration of funding?
  - Other?

## 7. Funding Options and Evaluation Results

---

- a. Options considered (consistent with principles)
- b. Evaluation framework and evaluation
  - Evaluation should include criteria from the proviso and any other ideas from e.g., research on other states, past proposals (WA Wild Future), etc.
- c. Results (priorities) and recommendations (if any)

## 8. The Longer-term Path to Sustainable Funding

---

- a. Vision for sustainable funding such as: efficient administration, fully serving all constituencies (hunters, anglers, conservationists/non-consumptive users, non-game species), accountable to the public, etc.
- b. Relevant trends in fish and wildlife agencies and in Washington demographics; reiteration of future challenges
- c. Relationship of sustainable funding discussions to strategic planning
- d. Recommendations (if any) for longer-term funding (based on the principles) – for example, this could be researching or exploring options that may require longer processes to change (e.g., legislative changes like indexing hunting/fishing license fees and other fund sources to inflation to cover maintenance level budget decisions; or simplifying the hunting/fishing license structure or strategic planning processes)

## Appendices

---

Possible appendices could include:

- Summary reference material from Zero-Based Budget and/or WDFW efficiency analyses
- Summary of research on other state fish & wildlife agency funding
- Definitions of criteria used to evaluate funding options and/or additional details about the analysis of funding options for WDFW
- Other?