



This document is an overview of feedback received for the MS4 workgroup. A similar summary will be published for each workgroup. Comments and levels of agreement for large group policy considerations including statute vs. commission, general fund and the overall process will be shared in a separate full group summary.

RESPONDENT SUMMARY

Total number of respondents: 19
(18 of 19 respondents were permit holders (of 122 total permits))
Respondents who attended meetings: 78%

The MS4 group discussed a proposed structure that includes 5 categories to replace current categories 7 and 23 and 9 associated subcategories. In this annual fee structure, the MS4 group would be placed with the public and private utilities sector. This structure would create significant cost savings for the MS4 group.

Cat./ Sub-cat.	Cat/Sub-Cat Description	No. of Entities	Scenario 1		Scenario 2		Scenario 3		Current cat/ subcat	Current fee
			<i>incl. new services</i>	no new services	<i>incl. new services</i>	no new services	<i>incl. new services</i>	no new services		
06-01	Individual permits	5	\$19,106	\$14,083	\$19,000	\$14,000	\$13,750	\$8,500	23	\$4,360-\$10,580
06-02	General permit <10,000 population	46	\$704	\$503	\$700	\$500	\$530	\$355	07-23	\$355
06-03	General permit >= 10,000 and <50,000 population	44	\$1,508	\$1,106	\$1,500	\$1,100	\$1,160	\$810	07-22	\$810
06-04	General permit >= 50,000 and <100,000 population	14	\$3,620	\$2,716	\$3,600	\$2,700	\$2,800	\$2,020	07-21	\$2,020
06-05	General permit >= 100,000 population	8	\$7,341	\$5,432	\$7,300	\$5,400	\$5,700	\$4,050	07-20	\$4,050

Themes regarding the proposed fee structure

Respondents had the opportunity to provide clarification and/or additional thoughts regarding the proposed fee proposal. Below is a summary of themes received.

(19 respondents)

- 68% indicated agreement with at least one of the three scenarios. Of those:
 - 10 preferred scenario 3.
 - 1 preferred scenario 2.
 - 1 preferred scenario 1.
- 32% indicated a *support* for new services under at least one scenario, however only 11% indicated a *preference* for new services or *equally supported both* new services and no new services.



(19 responses)

- 68% of respondents indicated that more information was needed to support fee increases.
- The majority of respondents indicated the division needs to track time and budget more specifically to this fee category.

Discharge permit applications, application supplements, and permit modifications

- For applications (18 responses), 5 indicated agreement with proposed fees, 3 indicated disagreement, and 10 were neutral.
- For modifications (19 responses), 5 were in agreement with the proposed fees, 5 indicated disagreement, and 9 were neutral.
- Respondents indicated that more detail should be provided on what constitutes major vs. minor permit amendments.



Compliance assistance, administrative actions, and a la carte

Respondents provided clarification and/or additional thoughts regarding the proposed fee proposal. Below is a summary of themes received.

- 89% of respondents indicated agreement for compliance assistance and 70% for administrative actions. The remainder were neutral.
- Overall agreement declined with increases in the complexity tiers for the remaining ala carte fees that were not identified as being applicable to the sector. Between 82 and 94% were neutral for each category. At the highest level of complexity, no respondents were in agreement and three respondents indicated disagreement.

Workgroup recommendations

Each workgroup created a set of recommendations. Below is a summary on the average level of agreement (or disagreement) with each of the recommendations as well as the themes of other recommendations provided through the feedback form.

Themes regarding workgroup recommendations

Recommendation (of those that provided feedback)	Outcome
1. Promote and expand qualifying local program (QLP) to include compliance as part of new services scenario.	The majority agreed or remained neutral. Only one respondent indicated disagreement.
2. Fee associated with conversions in the event of a withdrawal.	The majority were neutral or in agreement. Three respondents indicated disagreement.
3. Do not accrue fund balances to a level that puts general fund at risk.	The majority were in agreement.

Level of agreement (%) on workgroup recommendations (n INDV=18 n GROUP=1)

