



Ohio Department of Natural Resources

BOB TAFT, GOVERNOR

SAMUEL W. SPECK, DIRECTOR

Office of the Director
1930 Belcher Drive - Bldg. D-3
Columbus, OH 43224-1387

Phone: (614) 265-6879 Fax: (614) 261-9601

175316

June 3, 2002

Docket Management Facility (USCG-2001-10486) -23
U.S. Department of Transportation, Room PL-401
400 Seventh Street SW
Washington, DC 20590-0001

DEPT. OF TRANSPORTATION
DOCKET'S
02 JUN -3 PM 4:34

Subject: Docket Number USCG-2001-10486

Dear Sir or Madam:

This correspondence pertains to the request for comments regarding Standards for Living Organisms in Ship's Ballast Water Discharged in U.S. Waters as published in the Federal Register, on March 4, 2002, Docket Number USCG-2001-10486. The attached comments are the result of discussions within the Ohio Department of Natural Resources and the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency.

The comments follow the outline of the Goals and Standards text in the Federal Register as requested. Please contact Gary Isbell, Executive Administrator, Division of Wildlife, at 614-265-6345 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Samuel W. Speck, Director
Ohio Department of Natural Resources

SWS/mw

attachment

- c: Lisa Morris, Chief, OEPA, Division of Surface Water
- Mike Budzik, Chief, ODNR Division of Wildlife
- Gary Isbell, Executive Administrator, ODNR Division of Wildlife
- Jeff Hoedt, Chief, ODNR Division of Watercraft
- Jim Morris, Chief, ODNR Division of Water

Ohio Department of Natural Resources & Ohio Environmental Protection Agency Comments
Standards for Living Organisms in Ship's Ballast Water Discharged in U.S. Waters
Federal Register Docket Number USCG-2001-10486, Published March 4, 2002

Q1. Should the Coast Guard adopt G1, G2, G3, or some other goal (please specify) for BWT?

Goal 1 (No discharge...) As the goal is stated, it reads like a treatment standard. The goal should articulate a simple, yet powerful statement of what we hope to accomplish. The Goal 1 language also falls short by failing to mention explicitly the discharge of all live or viable vertebrate, and invertebrate species and vascular plants. A goal that expresses the idea of "no new aquatic nuisance species discharges" is recommended. Although such a goal is very aggressive, it is necessary to set the stage for the types of measures that will need to be implemented to solve the problem.

Goal 2 (Treat... to same extent as drinking water.) The drinking water standard is not specified, and therefore is not adequate. There is no comparison between drinking water standards and standards to achieve with BWT; they are done to achieve totally different results.

Goal 3 (BWT ...as effective as ballast water exchange.) This goal fails to sufficiently address the issue and it is unknown how effective exchange is, and is therefore not adequate. The information provided in the Federal Register suggests that the results of BWE are highly variable, depending on a number of factors, and not consistently effective. Consequently, BWE should not be used as a goal against which to measure BWT.

Q2. Should the Coast Guard adopt any of the standards, S1-S4 as an interim BWT standard? (You also may propose alternative quantitative or qualitative standards.)

Standard 1 (...95% reduction) This standard is not adequate, because it allows too much risk to the environment. A 95% reduction could still mean that significant numbers of all kinds of taxa could be discharged, thereby threatening the Great Lakes.

Standard 2 (Remove, kill, or inactivate all organisms larger than 100 microns in size.) Although this standard appears to be more in concert with our desired goal of "no discharge", we are unsure of the practicality/efficiency of addressing organisms larger than 100 microns.

Standard 3 (Remove 99% ...) This standard is vague regarding fish and therefore is not adequate.

Standard 4 (Discharge no organisms greater than 50 microns ...) This standard could be the most desirable standard if the 50 micron limit size can achieve the goal of "no new aquatic nuisance species discharges." We support the addition of the federal criteria for contact recreation.

Q4. General comments on how to structure any cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis that evaluates the above four possible standards. We are requesting comments on how the Coast Guard should measure the benefits to society of the above possible standards in either qualitative or quantitative terms. How would the benefits be measured considering each possible standard would continue to allow the introduction of invasive species, but at different rates? What would the costs be to industry in each of the four proposals? How would the cost to industry differ by possible standard?

There are significant, irreversible ecological damages from ANS. It is possible that subsequent invasions could be far worse than zebra mussels. We favor a structure for cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis that is long-term and geographically broad. The economic effects of the zebra mussel has yet to be fully appreciated. The ecosystem effects are continuing to unfold in the Great Lakes and the geographic range of the infestation is continuing to expand throughout the country. We understand that this is a philosophical position that is difficult to incorporate into analyses, yet we feel that it is necessary to point out the difference between a biological invasion and an oil spill, for example.

Q6. What potential environmental impacts would the goals or standards carry?

If a goal is adopted that specifies anything other than ultimate elimination of the risk of invasions, then the subsequent standards and treatments will likely be less than adequate for the environment. That is, this issue requires an all-out effort in a short period of time, in order to avert more disastrous effects on our Great Lakes environment. We believe that goals or standards that are set simply because they can be readily met will not result in the type of response we are looking for.