



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
Recommendation 1 - Fees should remain in statute. Please rate how favorably you view this recommendation.	1	Fees need to stay in statute	The department's current recommendation is that fees should remain in statute. An option we are exploring is a fee cap that would also be in statute.
	2	The commission should have the authority to increase fees up to a certain percentage without having to change statute--this would make for a more streamlined process and ensure that services continue to be provided.	As outlined in Issue 4 in this comment form, we are seeking feedback on utilizing this option.
	3	Fees are disguised taxes. Since they are already in the regulations, they will not be removed as it would contribute to too many governmental job losses as increasing taxes are difficult for law makers to deal with.	The department's current recommendation is that fees should remain in statute. An option we are exploring is a fee cap that would also be in statute.
	4	If fees are to be removed from statute, there must be assurances in place to protect regulated entities from large rate increases. These could include a floor on general fund appropriations, assurances that federal funds will be used to mitigate fee increases, and caps on the amounts that fees can increase in any given year.	The department's current recommendation is that fees should remain in statute. An option we are exploring is a fee cap that would also be in statute.
	5	This has been the commitment all along, and the stakeholders and the department have indicated the same.	The department's current recommendation is that fees should remain in statute. An option we are exploring is a fee cap that would also be in statute.
	6	Fees shall remain in statute and future changes will be addressed through the stakeholder process.	The department's current recommendation is that fees should remain in statute. An option we are exploring is a fee cap that would also be in statute.
Recommendation 2 - Fee structure should remain the same. Existing sectors (Commerce and Industry, Construction, Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4), Pesticides, Public and Private Utilities and Water Quality Certifications) and associated categories do not require changes. Please rate how favorably you view this recommendation.	7	The division needs to remain whole and understand that changes need to be made to fee structure	It is not clear what the commenter recommends for changes to the fee structure. At this point, the department's recommendation is that the only part of the fee structure that would change are the fees. Our current recommendation is that fees would be adjusted at the sector level and fees would not vary at the category or sub-category level.
	8	Fees should be based on usage of services--if one sector uses more services (hours), they should pay the greater percentage of the fees.	Based on historic time tracking and actual expenditure data, the department has developed a five-year forecast identifying the total needs or usage of each sector. This is the basis for the fee changes being discussed as part of this stakeholder effort.
	9	It is critical that data be collected and disseminated to demonstrate that the Division is using its resources efficiently and effectively so that fee increases are clearly necessary and as minimal as possible.	Stakeholders, through the Phase I process, requested additional transparency regarding how fees are utilized and monies spent. In response, the division submits revenue and expenditure tracking information on a quarterly basis as required by the Joint Budget Committee.
	10	While maintaining the same overall ratio, generally (GF/CF/FF), rebalancing within each sector to reflect that ratio is not something that we would find objectionable. In fact, we believe that is the direction we were moving in to begin with.	Varying scenarios of General Fund to cash fund will be explored at the second stakeholder meeting. Federal Funds will also be discussed.
	11	Refinement within sectors is needed, e.g., there is a disparity in Phase I and II MS4 permit fees for municipalities of similar size.	Our current recommendation is that fees would be adjusted at the sector level and fees would not vary at the category or sub-category level.
	12	It has appeared that the good part of this effort to this point has focused uniquely on how to address - in a transparent and accountable manner - the existing perceived operational budget shortfall the WQCD has faced in administering the Clean Water Program at a level that merely maintains the status quo level of services. It also appears that up to now, this focus has resulted in a conversation about fee amounts only, not changes to existing fee categories. This is not to say that there is not interest in deeper discussion about the fee structure, fee categories, or levels of service being provided, but it is not clear this process has the time or capacity to address all of these questions in full before the deadline to submit a proposal per HB-16-1413.	Comment noted.
	13	It is understood that the current fee structure does not provide sufficient resources for the permits program and we are interested in working with the Division and stakeholders to develop a new fee structure.	Comment noted.



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
Recommendation 3 - Services should remain the same, for now. The legislative fix that is required at this time would maintain existing level of services. The department is willing to discuss fees for new services outside of this current clean water fee bill process. However, this current process is focused on maintaining existing services. Existing services are at risk of being reduced if clean water fees are not addressed. Please rate how favorably you view this recommendation.	14	Although I'm never in favor of having to pay more, I would be willing to pay more to retain good talent and reduce the turnover in the existing positions. Services should remain the same, but lets be competitive in the workplace so I don't have to train/get up to speed a new person every six months- it wastes a lot of time and money on both of our ends to have to train a new person due to high turnover.	The department agrees that having a stable funding base would help address employee retention.
	15	Every scenario mentioned requires legislative action. It appears that existing services costs have inflated beyond the fee coverage or the services have expanded beyond their original intent so the existing fees are not adequate. Look at what the current fee structure was intended to cover to see if those bounds have been exceeded and cut back to the original intent.	Costs of services provided currently exceeds revenue generated from fees.
	16	Reclaimed water services are inadequate for needs of Colorado currently and with the expected implementation of additional uses, users and treaters, these resources will be stretched even further.	The department is currently working with interested stakeholders and other state agencies regarding funding of new and additional reuse services.
	17	Existing services must be the starting point for this process, not the final goal. There have been many comments made in the last several years about how Division staff may not be able to participate in existing and future regulatory workgroups or provide opportunities to collaborate with regulated entities on new or renewal permits. "Existing services" must include this participation for the regulatory community to support the fee proposal.	If fees are increased to maintain existing services then the division will continue to be able to support workgroups and provide opportunities to collaborate with regulated entities on new or renewal permits. If fees are not increased to maintain existing services, services including collaborative efforts, will have to be cut.
	18	The process should address other funding requirements and to what extent those services should appropriately be funded by fees or other sources	Cash, General and federal funds are the collective source of all funds for the division. Though federal funds are not up for discussion as part of this process, they have been included for full transparency.
	19	There is no reason why there should be a decline in services, unless the State is unwilling to maintain its General Fund commitment to the Division.	The General Fund made available as part of HB16-1413 was a one time transfer to the department's Water Quality Improvement Fund from the General Fund. This funding is not guaranteed after the 2016-17 fiscal year.
	20	New services to be added should be addressed as an increase to each individual sector either in the base funding or separately as a fee for service model.	The department agrees with this recommendation.
	21	It has appeared that the good part of this effort to this point has focused uniquely on how to address - in a transparent and accountable manner - the existing perceived operational budget shortfall the WQCD has faced in administering the Clean Water Program at a level that merely maintains the status quo level of servies. It also appears that up to now, this focus has resulted in a conversation about fee amounts only, not changes to existing fee categories. This is not to say that there is not interest in deeper discussion about the fee structure, fee categories, or levels of service being provided, but it is not clear this process has the time or capacity to address all of these questions in full before the deadline to submit a proposal per HB-16-1413.	Comment noted.
	22	It seems that services have been reduced. How does the Division define "existing services"?	To balance our budget, the division has held vacant positions open and this has increased our permit backlog. If the division is funded as we have discussed in the stakeholder effort then that should help address permit backlog and will allow the division to continue to participate in stakeholder efforts.
	23	Funding needs to be maintained no matter what; fees need to make up for what is not supplied by the general fund. Since general funding can change, the ability to change fees needs to be there.	As we outlined in Issue 4 in this comment form, we are seeking feedback on how we could change fees using a fee cap.



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
Recommendation 4 - Develop sector specific fee changes based on General Fund/cash fund ratios. These fee changes would apply across the entire sector for all categories and subcategories within a given sector. Please rate how favorably you view this recommendation.	24	The ratios are too disparate. If this is the model they should be between 40 and 60 percent. Giving public utilities a 75 Pct ratio and Commerce and Industry a 25Pct. The Public good argument is no more persuasive that the fact that businesses pay taxes that end up in the GF C&I should get a 75 Pct share as the creator of the largess for the nontaxed publics. Overall the ratios should be equal between sectors or you are going to have a helluva fight on your hands. the difference between a 25 Pct ration and 50 Pct ration is a 150 Pct fee increase and a 72 Pct increase. My industry will fight a 150 percent increase to the death. Especially when under the last iteration two sessions ago it was determined by the Department that they did not have complicated permits and their permit structure remained largely the same. to swallow even a 72 percent increase is unconscionable.	The purpose of the starting scenario was to introduce the concept of General Fund to cash funds ratio by sector and for stakeholders to provide feedback on what the is appropriate ratio of General Fund to cash funds for their sector. At this time, the department does has not recommended a percentage fee change by sector. We will be seeking feedback during the final two stakeholder meetings on fee changes.
	25	I am not sure of all of the factors which might affect either the numerator or denominator of the ratio, but I suspect that the general fund can be affected greatly and to maintain the ratio desired, you would adjust fees accordingly. No oversight on fee increases.	Yes, this is how the fee changes are set-up to be estimated based on the spreadsheet tool that was provided to stakeholders. Because fees are in statute, the legislature currently has oversight on fees and associated fee increases. The department is recommending that fees remain in statute.
	26	Ratios make sense if they are done with some flexibility and in conjunction with a statutory floor on general fund contributions. However there are many moving parts that have not been considered or included in the proposal that require additional analysis and discussion.	The purpose of the ratio is to ensure a fair amount of General Fund in comparison with the level of cash funds.
	27	Fees by sector and sub-categories are skewed because permit staff does not often have the experience or knowledge about specific category functions, limitations and discharges. This is particularly true for the commerce and industry sectors so results in staff spending more time on these permits.	Comment noted.
	28	Depending on how this is done (see answer to recommendation 3), there may be merit here. However, Federal Funds must also be part of the ratio discussion.	Federal funds will be discussed at the second stakeholder meeting.
	29	Funding ratios should be structured to include a process which would determine when fees are adjusted on increases in General Fund either through program expansions, reductions in federal funds or common policy actions, such as salary survey and inflationary increases. Ratios need to reflect actual costs of services for sectors. Sector cost projections do not appear to match the ratios observed through first three quarters of this fiscal year. Also, fee changes uniformly to MS4 continue the disparity noted above.	The Long Bill provided bottom line funding for the new sectors in FY 2015-16 to provide the needed flexibility. The division has provided the budget vs. actual expenditure data for transparency as required by the Joint Budget Committee. The expenditure ratios are aligning very closely with the budget that was established at the beginning of the FY.
Recommendation 5 - Fee changes should be based on a five year forecast. This means that fees would be set and would not require revision until the fiscal year 2022-23 timeframe. A shorter time period such as three years would require the department to begin another stakeholder process around fees in 2017. Please rate how favorably you view this recommendation.	30	All sectors should pay the same cash fund percentage. It's not clear how the fees would be adjusted if the amount of General Fund changes.	Varying scenarios of General Fund to cash funds will be explored at the second stakeholder meeting. Federal Funds will also be discussed.
	31	5yr minimum is appropriate, if not longer.	The department agrees that 5 years is an appropriate minimum timeframe. If fees remain in statute with a cap and the department could change fees within the cap the length of time until another legislative fix is required could be extended beyond five years.
	32	Five year minimum, if not longer.	The department agrees that 5 years is an appropriate minimum timeframe. If fees remain in statute with a cap and the department could change fees within the cap the length of time until another legislative fix is required could be extended beyond five years.
	33	Like the division, most MS4 operate on a 2-year budget cycle and keeping fees the same for a 5 year cycle would be most beneficial.	The department agrees that 5 years is an appropriate minimum timeframe. If fees remain in statute with a cap and the department could change fees within the cap the length of time until another legislative fix is required could be extended beyond five years.



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
	34	I think if the fee changes are within a certain percentage, the department should be able to change the fees (with the approval of the Commission) without going through the Stakeholder process. If the fee changes are significant (greater than a set percentage), then yes, stakeholders input needs to be included.	The department agrees with this recommendation.
	35	Why not 7 year cycle?	The department recommends that 5 years is an appropriate minimum timeframe. If fees remain in statute with a cap and the department could change fees within the cap the length of time until another legislative fix is required could be extended beyond five years.
	36	In reviewing the Fact Sheet - Starting Scenarios document, there is confusion as to how the escalation based on the consumer price index (4%/yr) + development of a fund balance (3.3%/yr) + administration and various extraneous costs add up. Is the division implying that in order to keep services at the existing level there needs to be a minimum of 7.3%/yr growth in fees + extraneous costs? At 4%/yr, does a 5 year delay means that the regulated community is starting from 20% hole in 2022? If this is correct, starting the stakeholder process in 2017 is preferable. If this is not correct, delaying to 2022 is preferable as this would allow time to evaluate and fine tune the new fee structure before starting the stakeholder process over.	The department is not recommending a 5-year delay but is recommending an increase in current fee revenue and/or General Fund based on the 5-year forecast to support existing services. The 4% CPI increase is intended to cover state approved annual personal services increases. After five years, there will be a 16.5% fund balance (3.3%/year for 5 years) and therefore the 3.3% annual increase will be removed. Other than these two areas, cost cannot grow beyond current levels without legislation.
	37	The option for an individual sector to enter into discussions with the division and the JBC to modify fees for their sector to allow for additional assistance from the division is supported.	The department agrees that this is a benefit to the sector approach.
	38	Permit fees should pay for all staff under the Permit Section, a percentage of the Clean Program and Safe Drinking Water Program Manager's salary, and a percentage of the Watershed and Drinking Water Compliance Assurance Sections. Furthermore, vacancies in the Permits Section staffing should be filled.	The purpose of this fee stakeholder process and associated recommendations to the Joint Budget Committee is for the Clean Water Program's fees. The 5-year forecast developed by the department covers costs associated with all Clean Water Program areas - Permits Section, Watershed Section, Compliance and Enforcement, Engineering and Field Services. In addition the forecast addresses the total department costs which include administration, POTS, and indirect costs.
	39	As to paying for administration and supporting expenses, these should largely be paid for out of General Fund money, on a fee for services basis, or as an opt in by sector i.e. modify fees across the entire sector. There is concern that administration and supporting expenses will not be clearly defined, and that there is potential for this category to grow unchecked.	The administrative and supporting expenses are very clearly defined in the budget and cannot grow unchecked. Administrative and supporting expenses are generally paid by all fund sources at proportional levels so that these costs are covered in an equitable manner.
	40	The City is interested in exploring an expedited permit process whereby the utility would hire a consultant to perform activities normally performed by division staff such as AMMTOX modeling, PELs, reasonable potential and low flow analysis. Division staff would review results but not rerun the work. This has the added benefit of saving division staff time. This suggestion is similar to the third-party TMDL process that the State and Division are agreeable with.	Please contact the division director or clean water program manager to discuss this option further. Our experience with third-party TMDLs has shown that the division's time and involvement is not greatly reduced.
	41	Certainty is critical during this transition period, so five years is the minimum timeframe that should be used. During this period an independent audit of the Division should be performed to determine if the Division is using its resources efficiently and effectively, and to make recommendations on how to improve the effective and efficient use of resources.	Comment noted.
	42	If a commitment can be made to cease the JBC staff from trying to change the direction of the discussion every year, then even an annual stakeholder process would not be cumbersome. We spend all our time reacting to curve balls and not sticking with the program.	Comment noted.



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
	43	If a process is in place to address fluctuations in general fund or federal funding, a fee change review of three years could be appropriate. A five year sunset of this funding mechanism should be added in case the stakeholders felt it necessary to make changes or eliminate the process altogether.	Comment noted.
	44	This recommendation should be paired with keeping fees in statute. If the heightened level of data collection and reporting, now required in statute continues, future stakeholder processes should not be as demanding as processes have been up to now.	Comment noted.
	45	The fee amount should remain constant for some period of time so that there is some certainty for permittees. It seems that the General Fund that the Division receives varies from year to year. If the fees are set, and the General Fund decreases, how would that impact the Division's operating budget?	If General Fund decreases, cash funds will need to be increased to accommodate the decreases. Federal funds are anticipated to be flat for the next three to five years.
Recommendation 6 - Develop a two month reserve or 16.5 percent fund balance by sector over a five year period. Statute allows for cash funds to develop a two month reserve. The purpose of this reserve is to allow a smooth transition between fiscal years as revenue catches up with expenditures over the first two months of a fiscal year. Please rate how favorably you view this recommendation.	46	As long as there is a string attached that it cannot be swept into another fund. The fees should be earmarked for that specific purpose.	The specific line item appropriations for each sector supports this philosophy.
	47	Two month reserve is prudent planning for emergencies, not in planning that your expenditures will always exceed income. This entire process is knowing that you over spend constantly and need a way to increase your revenue rather than understanding the causes for over spending and fixing them.	The Water Quality Control Division does not overspend its annual appropriation. The 16.5% fund balance is allowable by statute in order to cover cash flow needs from one fiscal year to another.
	48	We are in favor of the creation of a reserve, but we are not convinced that these funds should come from the regulated community. Federal funds have not been included in this proposal; while there is no guarantee on the amount of federal funds that the State will receive, the criteria for use of these funds has not been discussed and no assurance has been given that they will be used to keep fee increases to a minimum. The use of federal funds to establish the reserve fund should be considered.	The reserve applies only to cash funds which are solely funded by the regulated community. Therefore, federal funds cannot be used to establish a cash fund reserve. Federal funds are distributed to each sector which does offset the need for higher fees.
	49	Need more informaton.	Comment noted.
	50	Clarify that once the 16.5% balance is achieved, this will no longer be part of the fee except to replenish 16.5% when needed. Should federal fund ratio be increased to share in this cost?	Federal funds cannot be increased. Once the 16.5% balance is achieved this part of the fee could be removed.
	51	How would this 2 month reserve be developed?	This reserve would be developed by increasing fees for each sector by 3.3% annually for five years.
Issue 1 - What is an appropriate effective date for fee increases?	52	Our budgets for 2017 are already set in stone.	Comment noted.
	53	The turnover in staffing is getting old. Lets get enough funding for the program to retain staff.	The department agrees that having a stable funding base would help address employee retention.
	54	For those who rely on public entities and/or ratepayers for their revenue, sufficient time must be given to enable those entities to adjust their budgets accordingly.	Comment noted.
	55	This answer depends on how exactly fee increases will be achieved.	Comment noted.
	56	2017 budgets have already been set. Our budget year is a calendar year.	Comment noted.
Issue 2 - If your sector faces a fee increase, should that fee increase be phased over multiple years?	57	It depends on how big the increase is. The larger the increase, the more years it should be phased over	Comment noted.
	58	If it below, say 5% no; if yes, then no more than a 5% increase year over year to the appropriate funding level. Could also be based off size of company. I could handle a larger increase, but I'm not a utility relying on consumers to pay for a service.	Comment noted.
	59	Over 3 years at a minimum.	Comment noted.
	60	3 to 5 years	Comment noted.
	61	Upon developing a consensus proposal, WQCD should repose this question to stakeholders.	Comment noted.
	62	2 years. Phasing may not be necessary if the magnitude of the fee increase is not significant..	comment noted.



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
Issue 3 - If sector specific General Fund/cash funds ratios are set in statute how favorably would you view a clause in the statute that after a 5-year period cash fees would automatically adjust based on the General Fund/cash fund ratio? This clause could result in cash fee increases or decreases that vary annually.	63	We would prefer predictability.	Comment noted.
	64	With a max % of increase.	Comment noted.
	65	Automatic tax increases are destructive for effective cost management.	Comment noted.
	66	Nothing should be automatic with regard to the fee program. As noted above, certainty is critical for the regulated community. In addition, there must be the opportunity for oversight to ensure that there is efficient and effective use of funds.	Comment noted.
Issue 4 - How favorably would you view fees remaining in statute with a defined cap on fees that could not be increased without legislative approval? This option would allow the department or Water Quality Control Commission to establish minor fee changes within the statutory cap.	67	Wait until after the initial five year test is complete to decide if this is appropriate.	Comment noted.
	68	This conflicts with Recommendation 1 to keep fees in statute. It is not clear how this type of program would work through existing budget and or AQCC processes.	Comment noted.
	69	Very clear definition is needed on what a minor fee change is...	Comment noted.
	70	Provided that the ratio nonsense is dropped and a statutory min is begun starting with how much general fund is currently in the program is adopted by bill	Comment noted.
	71	This would required some legislative consideration on further taxing clean water.	Comment noted.
	72	We are generally in support of this idea, but would like to see more information on how this works in practice. What would the definition of "minor" be, how are changes in fees distributed fairly across sectors, does this plan require public participation every five years and what does that look like?	Minor would be defined by the amount under the cap that is needed to cover the direct and indirect cost for each sector as defined by the annual budget. It is assumed that the department will conduct a similar stakeholder process for future fee review periods.
	73	While fee increases will likely be necessary, they will be less objectionable if general fund contributions are consistent, federal funds are used to mitigate fee increases, and ongoing oversight is maintained. All adjustments should be transparent and supported by data.	Cash, General and federal funds are the collective source of all funds for the division. Though federal funds are not up for discussion as part of this process, they have been included for full transparency.
Do you have other feedback or a different policy recommendation or issue that needs discussed? Please describe.	74	This would be a total diversion from the route that we've consistently agreed upon going. My organization would oppose any fee authority being conferred to the Commission	Comment noted.
	75	Too uncertain - would require a cap on increases considered in Issue 2.	Comment noted.
	76	This conflicts with Recommendation 1 to keep fees in statute. It is not clear how this type of program would work through existing budget and or AQCC processes.	Comment noted.
	77	We need to retain employees in the division.	The department agrees that having a stable funding base would help address employee retention.
	78	We have to get a statutory minimum in statute as a condition for a fee increase. early notice from OSPB and the CDPHE about fee increases has to be mandatory. there has to be a lean program review every three years and an audit committee review every 5 years. If ratios remain then they have to be equal among sectors or a 40-60 percent bandwidth adopted.	Comment noted.
	79	THE DEPARTMENT SHALL CONDUCT A STAKEHOLDER PROCESS REGARDING THE APPROPRIATE AND NECESSARY FEES THAT EACH SUBCATEGORY OF EACH SECTOR SHOULD PAY TO ENABLE EACH SECTOR TO BE ADEQUATELY FUNDED BY FEES COLLECTED FROM THAT SECTOR.	Comment noted.
	80	There have been incremental increases in available funds for the reclaimed water program that don't seem tied to fees. Transparency within the sectors would help. Also, while input has been sought on how those funds are spent, that input has not affected where funding goes and the process seems to be exclusive.	Comment noted.
	81	Non-permittees should also be funding for services that they receive. For example, participation in public hearings, requests for information, etc.	General Fund, cash funds and federal funds support all services the Clean Water Program provides to permittees and non-permittees.



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
	82	Stay the course. After all the stakeholder meetings and discussions, there have been many common themes and (more importantly) and general agreement that each sector should 1) pay its own way and; 2) be funded with combination of FF/GF/CF in a ratio that is consistent across all sectors. Only the misguided direction of a JBC analyst have diverted everyone else off that path, and it is important that we remain true to it. If the Division proposes a bill that rebalances fees in proportion, we will support it - even if it means our sector increases. Consistency is important. Coming up with yet another new scheme instead of sticking with the path we are on would guarantee yet another year of no progress.	Comment noted.
	83	Have other fee structures been considered? Has the Division looked at how the other Divisions within CDPHE collect permit-related fees? While maybe not directly applicable, has the Division looked at how fees in other state clean water programs are collected?	Modernizing the fee structure was discussed in Phase I of the stakeholder process and did not receive favorable support from stakeholders.
How favorably do you view the 5-year forecast that was used to establish the starting scenario of fee changes?	84	Don't agree with first assumption	The first assumption is an escalation factor based on consumer price index data. At this time the department has not received input on an alternate method to develop a forecast.
	85	Do not agree with first assumption.	The first assumption is an escalation factor based on consumer price index data. At this time the department has not received input on an alternate method to develop a forecast.
	86	Better cost management in needed to operate within the limits of existing revenues.	Comment noted.
	87	5-year forecast that meets in the intent of HB16-1413.	Comment noted.
	88	Neutral: I don't know enough to support or oppose the forecast.	Comment noted.
	89	Additional information and discussion is necessary to ensure that the assumptions used are appropriate. As noted above, use of federal funds to establish the reserve fund would alter the assumptions.	All assumptions for the forecast were documented in a spreadsheet available on the department's website. Federal funds have been included for information purposes.
	90	Process difficult to understand. Cannot easily track back through calculations and understand if applied properly. The columns on the effect of HB 1413 need more explanation.	Comment noted.
Comment on starting scenario (as needed).	91	There is no good policy argument for not making the ratios equal between sectors. or said another way, all the sectors can make a good argument for why they deserve general funds, The spread between 25 and 75 percent will be too large and at 75 percent the C&I sector faces a 150 percent increase in fees. That is a total no starter. You will have a GIANT fight on your hands with multiple companies trying to kill the bill. This is your Dr. Phil moment to ask "what were we thinkin?"	The purpose of the starting scenario was to introduce the concept of General Fund to cash funds ratio by sector and for stakeholders to provide feedback on what the is appropriate ratio of General Fund to cash funds for their sector. At this time the department does has not recommended a percentage fee change by sector. We will be seeking feedback during the final two stakeholder meetings on fee changes.
	92	Better cost management in needed to operate within the limits of existing revenues. Too volatile for changes.	Comment noted.
	93	As stated by the Division presentation to the Colorado Stormwater Council on June 22, 2016, this starting scenario meets the intent of the legislature and these ratios calculate the appropriate and necessary fees that each subcategory of each sector should pay to enable each sector to be adequately funded by fees collected by from that sector.	At the June 22, 2016 Colorado Stormwater Council division staff stated that the 5-year forecast was the appropriate and necessary spending authority from which to base a fee change recommendation. The purpose of the starting scenario was to introduce the concept of General Fund to cash funds ratio by sector and for stakeholders to provide feedback on what the is appropriate ratio of General Fund to cash funds for their sector. At this time the department does has not recommended a percentage fee change by sector. We will be seeking feedback during the final two stakeholder meetings on fee changes.



Recommendation	No.	Comment	Response
	94	At the June 22, 2016 Colorado Stormwater Council division staff stated that the 5-year forecast was the appropriate and necessary spending authority from which to base a fee change recommendation. The purpose of the starting scenario was to introduce the concept of General Fund to cash funds ratio by sector and for stakeholders to provide feedback on what the is appropriate ratio of General Fund to cash funds for their sector. At this time the department does has not recommended a percentage fee change by sector. We will be seeking feedback during the final two stakeholder meetings on fee changes.	Comment noted.
	95	Biased question because it only requests favorable responses.	Comment noted.
	96	It is not at all clear why these ratios 1) do not include federal funding, and 2) are inconsistent across each sector.	Different scenarios will be discussed at the 2nd stakeholder meeting.
	97	The starting scenario does not appear to properly reflect current funding levels and therefore is misleading regarding how each sector is to be funded. The starting scenario would have been more helpful if it had used the current funding mix in the spreadsheet. It could have included the first three quarters of actual data and a projection of the fourth quarter. We need to understand the actual difference in fees we will pay for our permits before supporting this or other ratios.	Comment noted.
	98	This Staff Recommendation conflicts with Recommendation 1 to keep fees in statute and was developed without input from stakeholders in a manner that disregarded prior efforts of stakeholders and the division on HB-15-1249. Furthermore, the ratios were developed without stakeholder input per an arbitrary public/private benefit sliding scale that is not accurately reflect the benefits and beneficiaries of each CWP sectors' operations.	Comment noted.
	99	All sectors should be treated the same and all pay the same percentage.	Comment noted.
	100	50/50 for Commerce and Industry	Comment noted.