

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 6415 SB	Title: Storm water discharge permit
-----------------------------	--

Estimated Cash Receipts

Agency Name	2003-05		2005-07		2007-09	
	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total	GF- State	Total
Department of Ecology	0	936,133	0	1,946,489	0	2,049,821
Total \$	0	936,133	0	1,946,489	0	2,049,821

Local Gov. Courts *						
Local Gov. Other **						
Local Gov. Total						

Estimated Expenditures

Agency Name	2003-05			2005-07			2007-09		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Department of Ecology	4.1	0	917,624	9.3	0	1,860,008	6.0	0	1,244,682
Total	4.1	\$0	\$917,624	9.3	\$0	\$1,860,008	6.0	\$0	\$1,244,682

Local Gov. Courts *									
Local Gov. Other **	Non-zero but indeterminate cost. Please see discussion.								
Local Gov. Total									

--

Prepared by: Ann-Marie Sweeten, OFM	Phone: 360-902-0538	Date Published: Final 2/ 6/2004
--	-------------------------------	---

* See Office of the Administrator for the Courts judicial fiscal note

** See local government fiscal note

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 6415 SB	Title: Storm water discharge permit	Agency: 461-Department of Ecology
-----------------------------	--	--

Part I: Estimates

☐ No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

FUND	FY 2004	FY 2005	2003-05	2005-07	2007-09
Water Quality Permit Account-State 176-1		936,133	936,133	1,946,489	2,049,821
Total \$		936,133	936,133	1,946,489	2,049,821

Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2004	FY 2005	2003-05	2005-07	2007-09
FTE Staff Years	0.0	8.1	4.1	9.3	6.0
Fund					
Water Quality Permit Account-State 176-1	0	917,624	917,624	1,860,008	1,244,682
Total \$	0	917,624	917,624	1,860,008	1,244,682

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- ☒ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- ☐ If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- ☐ Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- ☐ Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact:	Phone:	Date: 01/20/2004
Agency Preparation: Vince Chavez	Phone: (360) 407-7544	Date: 01/28/2004
Agency Approval: Nancy Stevenson	Phone: (360) 407-7007	Date: 02/06/2004
OFM Review: Ann-Marie Sweeten	Phone: 360-902-0538	Date: 02/06/2004

Part II: Narrative Explanation

II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

This bill would authorize the department of Ecology to issue storm water general permits under the national pollution discharge elimination system (NPDES) of the federal clean water act (CWA) if such permits are required to comply with federal standards or are necessary for the effective implementation of chapter 90.48 RCW. However, the permits would be subject to the following conditions:

Section 1(1) The implementation and maintenance of best management practices for on-site pollution control is presumed to constitute compliance with the standards and requirements of the permit, subject to the conditions of this act.

Section 1(2) For purposes of storm water discharges, meeting effluent discharge limits would have to be demonstrated through implementation of best management practices sufficient to equate to all known and reasonable treatment. Ecology could monitor best management practices, for as long as deemed necessary, to determine their effectiveness in managing pollutants in storm water.

Section 1(2)(b) would require Ecology to determine if a specific storm water discharge has adverse impact on water quality through the collection of substantial time-weighted and statistically significant numeric and/or biological data. This determination would be subject to appeal.

Section 1(3)(a) Standard mixing zones would have to be allowed for all applicable permittees. Additional application for coverage under a general permit or further approval by Ecology under the terms of the permit could not be a condition on the use of standard mixing zones. Standard mixing zones would have to be based on six criteria.

Section 1(3)(b) would require Ecology to notify the permittee and provide a compliance schedule and technical assistance, as identified in subsection (5) of this section, to: (i) Correct the problems identified with the mixing zone; (ii) Conduct studies as necessary to support an alternative mixing zone; or (iii) Make physical and operational changes as necessary to meet applicable discharge standards under the permit for a facility without a mixing zone. Ecology would be required to adopt rules to implement this subsection.

Section 1(5)(e) At the request of the permittee, Ecology would be required to provide the permittee with technical assistance to assist with the application of best management practices or other methods that may allow the permittee to come in compliance with the permit.

Section 1(6) would authorize Ecology to use fees collected in conjunction with storm water permits to support necessary storm water-related ambient monitoring, subject to budgetary approval by the legislature.

Section 1(8) would require Ecology to issue an individual permit in lieu of coverage under a general permit upon application by the permittee who requires a mixing zone, compliance schedule, or is subject to a total maximum daily load (TMDL).

This bill would establish a new permitting standard for stormwater general permits as being all known and reasonable treatment of stormwater. Except in certain circumstances this bill would prohibit the use of numeric effluent limits in stormwater general permits. This bill would shift the responsibility for determining whether a particular discharger is impacting water quality and complying with applicable standards from the discharger to the department of Ecology. Once the department of Ecology determines that a particular discharger is failing to meet applicable discharge standards the department is required to provide a compliance schedule and technical assistance to the discharger. While subject to a compliance schedule the discharger is assigned an interim effluent limitation equivalent to the current discharge.

Assumptions:

Section 1(3)(b) would require Ecology to provide technical assistance to dischargers upon request when they do not qualify for a standard mixing zone and when they are subject to a compliance schedule.

Ecology would be responsible for determining the effect on water quality of both individual dischargers and for the stormwater general permit as a whole. The department would be responsible for all in-stream or ambient monitoring.

Standard mixing zones would have to be included in stormwater general permits. But no mixing zone could be included unless the supporting information clearly indicated that the mixing zone would not result in the loss of sensitive or important habitat. Under this bill Ecology would not be able to ask individual dischargers for this supporting information. Ecology would be responsible for collecting all information necessary to support the use of standard mixing zones.

It is assumed that Ecology would not conduct the monitoring program authorized in Section 1(2) to measure the effectiveness of best management practices managing pollutants in stormwater.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Permit fees are collected under current law for stormwater general permits.

Ecology currently has four stormwater general permits (industrial storm water general permit, construction, sand & gravel, and boatyards) which cover 3,130 individual dischargers discharging stormwater defined as stormwater associated with industrial activities. [NOTE: the scope or types of stormwater sources requiring permits is defined by federal rules. Under federal law stormwater associated with industrial activities must have a discharge permit.]

Because additional revenue is not identified in the bill, it is assumed that Ecology would have to increase permit fees collected in the four stormwater general permit categories to cover projected costs. For the purposes of this note, FY03 data is used (industrial storm water permit billing cycle has not been completed for FY04). Out of the 3,130 eligible storm water general permits that were billed, approximately 3,036 permits were collected totalling \$1,635,359 for FY03. This equates to approximately \$539 per permit average. [NOTE: The actual cost for storm water general permits range from \$97 up to \$3,000.]

For the purposes of this note, in order to cover projected costs identified in sections 2 through 5, it is estimated that storm water general permit fees would have to be increased from the assumed average of \$539 per permit to a new amount of \$847 per permit average to cover projected costs. This would equate to a 57% increase over FY03 actuals that would be applied in FY05. Fees would be updated each year based on the fiscal growth factor. For the purposes of this note, the fiscal growth factor is assumed to be FY06 = 2.62%; ongoing = 2.62%.

It is reasonable to expect an indeterminate number of existing dischargers permitted under existing stormwater general permits would request an individual permit in lieu of being covered under the general permit. It is also reasonable that there would be a number of new and un-permitted dischargers which would request to be permitted under stormwater general permits. Because of this uncertainty, the change in number of general permits was not included as a factor in either the expenditures or revenue.

This fiscal note also does not address either the additional revenue or additional expenditures associated with writing and issuing stormwater general permits to implement the federal phase II stormwater regulations which went into effect in March 2003. These regulations require an estimated additional 100 cities and counties to obtain stormwater discharge permits for their municipal separate storm sewer systems. These regulations also require small construction operators disturbing between 1 and 5 acres to obtain a permit for their stormwater discharges. Because permit fees have not been established for these permits required by the phase II stormwater regulations, and the permits have not been written yet, the revenue and expenditure impacts can not be determined.

II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Subsection 2 of this bill would establish a new permitting standard for stormwater general permits. This would require an amendment to chapter 173-226 Waste Discharge General Permit Program. Before the rule revisions could go into effect they would have to be reviewed and approved by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). For the purposes of this fiscal note it is assumed the revisions to the general permit regulation would take one year (start July 2004) and would require 1.0 annual FTE at the Environmental Specialist 4 (ES4) level. This rule revision would be done concurrently with the amendments to the mixing zone requirements in the state water quality standards (required by subsection 3). For the cost estimate detail, refer to Attachment 1, Subsection 2.

A legal challenge to implementation is likely, due to the apparent conflict between the permitting standards in this bill and the federal Clean Water Act. The legal challenge could occur when revised permitting rules are adopted, it could occur as part of the EPA review and approval process, or it could occur when stormwater general permits are issued in conformance with the new standard. For the purposes of this fiscal note it is assumed that the challenge would occur at the first opportunity for a challenge, which is when revised permitting rules are adopted by Ecology. For the purposes of this fiscal note it is assumed that it would take 0.25 FTE of assistant attorney general time over 6-9 months to defend the revised permitting rules (starting July 2005).

For the cost estimate detail, refer to Attachment 1, Attorney General Costs.

Assuming the new permitting standard is upheld, subsection 2(b) would require Ecology to collect substantial time-weighted and statistically significant numeric and/or biological data to determine whether a specific discharge is having a sustained adverse impact on water quality. The federal standard for determining whether water quality-based effluent limitations are necessary is based on a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedence of state water quality standards. Further, under federal rules, nonnumeric effluent limitations such as best management practices may be used unless they are not effective at achieving compliance with water quality standards and federal technology based effluent standards. There are more than 1000 dischargers covered under stormwater general permits which currently contain numeric water quality based effluent limitations. Removal of these numeric effluent limitations would be illegal under the federal Clean Water Act. This fiscal note assumes the collection substantial time weighted and statistically significant numeric and/or biological data to determine whether a specific discharge is having a sustained adverse impact on water quality would not be required to continue to include these numeric effluent limitations in future stormwater general permits.

Based on recent monitoring results from the industrial stormwater general permit, an estimated 10 dischargers covered under stormwater general permits would annually require the collection of substantial time-weighted and statistically significant numeric and/or biological data to determine whether a specific discharge is having a sustained adverse impact on water quality. It is assumed that it would take an estimated .20 FTE at the Environmental Specialist 3 (ES3) level for each discharger to collect time-weighted and statistically significant numeric and/or biological data to determine whether a specific discharge is having a sustained adverse impact on water quality (total of 2.0 FTE's). It is also assumed for each affected discharger there would be an estimated \$5,000 for lab costs. NOTE: this assumes that it would be logistically practical for Ecology to collect this information, and that the terms "time-weighted," "statistically significant," and "sustained adverse impact" can be defined in ways that result in straightforward measurement and implementation.] This data collection would begin July 2004 and be ongoing.

For the cost estimate detail, refer to Attachment 1, Subsection 2(b).

This fiscal note does not include any estimate for any costs associated with appeals of Ecology's determination that a specific discharge is having a sustained adverse impact on water quality.

This fiscal note assumes no change in the current practices or schedules for developing total maximum daily loads for polluted water bodies listed on the state's 303(d) list.

Subsection 3 of this bill would require all stormwater general permits to include a standard mixing zone for all applicable dischargers. Before a standard mixing zone could be included in a stormwater general permit Ecology would be required to collect enough supporting information to clearly indicate the standard mixing zone would not have a reasonable potential to cause a loss of sensitive or important habitat, substantially interfere with existing or characteristic uses, result in damage to the ecosystem, or adversely affect public health. It is assumed that supporting information does not need to be collected for each discharger and the required demonstration can be made for each general permit on a programmatic basis. Based on these assumptions it is assumed that it would require an additional .25 FTE at the ES4 level for each stormwater general permit (4 general permits total) to collect enough supporting information to meet this requirement for each stormwater general permit. This would equate to 1.0 total FTE (.25 FTE x 4 permits = 1.0)

For the cost estimate detail, refer to Attachment 1, Subsection 3.

Subsection 3(b)(iii) would require Ecology adopt rules to implement subsection 3. These rules would be amendments to the mixing zone provisions of the state's Water Quality standards. Based on recent experience in revising the state water quality standards this rule amendment would take an estimated .75 FTE at the Environmental Specialist 4 (ES4) level, and an estimated .25 FTE at the Environmental Education/Outreach Specialist 2 (EEOS 2) level over a period of 18 months starting July 1, 2004. Also, an estimated .50 FTE at the Environmental Specialist 3 (ES3) level over a period of 6 months starting July 1, 2004 and .25 FTE at the Economic Analyst 3 (EA3) level over a period of 4 months starting July 1, 2005. [NOTE: this estimate does not include costs associated with consultation with federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to get this revision to the water quality standards approved.]

For the cost estimate detail, refer to Attachment 1, Subsection 3(b)(iii).

Subsection 3(b) of this bill would also require Ecology to notify the discharger and provide the technical assistance to the discharger if the department determines that a granted standard mixing zone would cause significant degradation to the environment. Under this subsection, Ecology would be required to provide technical assistance to correct the problems identified in the mixing zone, conduct studies as necessary to support an alternative mixing zone or make physical and operational changes necessary to meet applicable discharge standards under a permit for a facility without a mixing zone. Subsection 5 of this bill would also require Ecology provide the dischargers with technical assistance at their request. It is assumed that 5% of all dischargers covered under stormwater general permits would request technical assistance annually (total of 157 requests). It is assumed that it would take 3.0 FTE (annually) at the Environmental Engineer 3 level to provide the necessary technical assistance per dischargers request.

For the cost estimate detail, refer to Attachment 1, Subsection 3(b) and 5.

This fiscal note assumes that all current work on renewing expired and expiring stormwater general permits would have to stop until the required rule amendments were completed. Currently Ecology has an estimated 2.5 FTEs (1 FTE at ES 3 level and 2.5 FTEs at the ES4 level) devoted to renewing stormwater general permits. Once the rule amendments were completed in July 2006, and approved by the EPA by January 2007, all four stormwater general permits will have either expired or will be so close to expiring that they will need to be renewed. This fiscal note assumes that work would begin on renewing all four stormwater general permits in July 2006 and would be completed by July 2007. It is assumed that the renewal of all four stormwater general permits would require an estimated 5.0 FTEs (1 FTE at the EEOS 2 level, one FTE at the ES 3 level, and three FTEs at the ES 4 level).

For the cost estimate detail, refer to Attachment 1, Other costs.

This fiscal note does not include costs associated with writing or issuing individual permits for dischargers which request an individual permit in lieu of coverage under a stormwater general permit as provided for in subsection 6 of this bill. The number of requests is indeterminate and the costs associated with writing and issuing an individual permit are highly variable.

FTE Detail:

Salaries and Wages Detail: Direct program salaries are calculated at step K.

Employee Benefits for direct program staff are calculated at the agency average of 21.1% of salaries.

Goods and Services are calculated at the agency average of \$4,942 per direct FTE. Standard agency administrative overhead costs are also included.

Travel Expenditures are calculated at the agency average rate of \$1,299 per direct program FTE.

Equipment Detail: \$6,302 for start-up equipment is budgeted for each new direct FTE, based on current costs for an office chair, 1/5 motor pool vehicle, and basic computer equipment.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2004	FY 2005	2003-05	2005-07	2007-09
FTE Staff Years		8.13	4.1	9.3	6.0
A-		410,820	410,820	875,196	516,720
B-		86,683	86,683	184,666	109,028
C-					
E-		348,363	348,363	742,421	603,346
G-		10,554	10,554	24,135	15,588
J-		61,204	61,204	33,590	
N-					
P-					
S-					
Total:	\$0	\$917,624	\$917,624	\$1,860,008	\$1,244,682

III. B - Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2004	FY 2005	2003-05	2005-07	2007-09
Econ 3	46,992				0.2	
EEOS 2	31,032		0.1	0.1	0.6	
ES3	45,816		2.5	1.3	2.5	2.0
ES4	53,136		5.5	2.8	6.0	4.0
Total FTE's			8.1	4.1	9.3	6.0

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

As a result of this bill, Ecology would be required to amend rules to chapter 173-201A of the Waste Discharge General Permit Program and 226 WAC.

SB 6415 WATER QUALITY PROGRAM STORM WATER ADMIN ANALYSIS - 2003-05 BIEN

ATTACHMENT 1

FY05

Subsection 2

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	40,038	1,299	16,302	121,986
Total Subsection 2	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	40,038	1,299	16,302	121,986

Subsection 2(b)

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES3	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	12,604	152,208
Total Subsection 2(b)	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	12,604	152,208

Subsection 3

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	6,302	151,986
Total Subsection 3	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	6,302	151,986

Subsection 3(b)(iii)

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	0.50	4,428	934	5,362	6	32,174	-	15,019	650	3,151	50,993
ES3	0.50	3,818	806	4,624	6	27,742	-	13,290	650	3,151	44,832
Econ 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
EEOS 2	0.13	2,586	546	3,132	6	18,790	-	19,920	162	788	39,660
Total Subsection 3(b)(iii)	1.13	10,832	2,286	13,118	6	78,705	-	48,229	1,461	7,090	135,485

Subsection 3(b) and 5

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	18,906	355,959
Total Subsection 3(b) and 5	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	18,906	355,959

TOTAL FY05	8.13	27,934	5,894	33,828	11	455,927	-	389,939	10,554	61,204	917,624
-------------------	-------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	-----------	----------------	----------	----------------	---------------	---------------	----------------

SB 6415 WATER QUALITY PROGRAM STORM WATER ADMIN ANALYSIS - 2003-05 BIEN

ATTACHMENT 1

FY06

Attorney General costs

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
AG	0.25	-	-	-	9	-	-	141,849	-	-	141,849
Total Attorney General costs	0.25	-	-	-	9	-	-	141,849	-	-	141,849

Subsection 2(b)

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES3	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604
Total Subsection 2(b)	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604

Subsection 3

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684
Total Subsection 3	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684

Section 3(b)(iii)

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	30,038	1,299	-	95,684
ES3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Econ 3	0.33	3,916	826	4,742	4	18,969	-	9,029	429	2,080	30,506
EEOS 2	0.25	2,586	546	3,132	12	37,580	-	27,867	325	-	65,771
Total Subsection 3(b)(iii)	1.58	10,930	2,306	13,236	9	120,897	-	66,933	2,052	2,080	191,962

Subsection 3(b) and 5

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053
Total Subsection 3(b) and 5	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053
TOTAL FY06	7.83	23,604	4,980	28,584	11	433,771	-	510,455	9,846	2,080	956,151

SB 6415 WATER QUALITY PROGRAM STORM WATER ADMIN ANALYSIS - 2003-05 BIEN

ATTACHMENT 1

FY07

Subsection 2(b)

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES3	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604
Total Subsection 2(b)	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604

Subsection 3

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684
Total Subsection 3	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684

Subsection 3(b) and 5

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053
Total Subsection 3(b) and 5	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053

Other Costs

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
EEOS 2	1.00	2,586	546	3,132	12	37,580	-	19,598	1,299	6,302	64,779
ES3	1.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	26,580	1,299	6,302	89,665
ES4	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	39,922	3,897	18,906	127,072
Total Other Costs	5.00	10,832	2,286	13,118	12	157,411	-	86,100	6,495	31,510	281,516
TOTAL FY07	11.00	23,506	4,960	28,466	12	470,285	-	387,773	14,289	31,510	903,857

SB 6415 WATER QUALITY PROGRAM STORM WATER ADMIN ANALYSIS - 2003-05 BIEN

ATTACHMENT 1

FY08

Subsection 2(b)

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES3	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604
Total Subsection 2(b)	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604

Subsection 3

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684
Total Subsection 3	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684

Subsection 3(b) and 5

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053
Total Subsection 3(b) and 5	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053

TOTAL FY08	6.00	12,674	2,674	15,348	12	312,874	-	301,673	7,794	-	622,341
-------------------	-------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	-----------	----------------	----------	----------------	--------------	----------	----------------

FY09

Subsection 2(b)

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES3	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604
Total Subsection 2(b)	2.00	3,818	806	4,624	12	55,483	-	81,522	2,598	-	139,604

Subsection 3

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684
Total Subsection 3	1.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	64,348	-	80,038	1,299	-	145,684

Subsection 3(b) and 5

Position	FTE	Salary (A)	Benefit (B)	Total A + B	Months	Sal & Ben Total	Contracts	Goods & Svcs	Travel	Equip	Total
ES4	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053
Total Subsection 3(b) and 5	3.00	4,428	934	5,362	12	193,043	-	140,113	3,897	-	337,053

TOTAL FY09	6.00	12,674	2,674	15,348	12	312,874	-	301,673	7,794	-	622,341
-------------------	-------------	---------------	--------------	---------------	-----------	----------------	----------	----------------	--------------	----------	----------------

Notes:

Employee benefits for direct program staff are calculated at the agency standard average of 21.1% of salaries.

Goods & Svcs are calculated at the agency standard average of \$4,942 per direct FTE, also, includes overhead charges calculated at agency standard of 39% of total salary & benefits, also, misc. for purchased svcs (lab costs, mailings, postage, workshops).

Travel expenditures are calculated at the agency standard average of \$1,299 per direct program FTE.

Equipment detail: \$6,302 for start-up equipment is budgeted for each new direct FTE, based on current costs for an office chair, 1/5 motor pool vehicle, and basic computer equipment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

Bill Number: 6415 SB

Title: Storm water discharge permit

Part I: Jurisdiction-Location, type or status of political subdivision defines range of fiscal impacts.

Legislation Impacts:

☒ Cities:

☒ Counties:

☐ Special Districts:

☐ Specific jurisdictions only:

☐ Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

☐ No fiscal impacts.

☐ Expenditures represent one-time costs:

☐ Legislation provides local option:

☒ Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: Long term impacts

Estimated revenue impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY 2004	FY 2005	2003-05	2005-07	2007-09
City					
County					
Special District					
TOTAL \$					
GRAND TOTAL \$					

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

Indeterminate Impact

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Linda Bradford	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 01/20/2004
Leg. Committee Contact:	Phone:	Date: 01/20/2004
Agency Approval: Linda Bradford	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 01/27/2004
OFM Review: Ann-Marie Sweeten	Phone: 360-902-0538	Date: 01/27/2004

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

Provide a clear, succinct description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.

This bill would condition stormwater discharge permits under the National Pollution Discharge System (NPDES) of the federal Clean Water Act.

Sec 1 authorizes the Dept. of Ecology (DOE) to issue general permits if they comply with federal standards

Sec 1 (1) implementation and maintenance of best management practices is presumed to constitute compliance with NPDES requirements, provided effluent discharge limits are demonstrated (Sec 1 (2)).

According to DOE, this bill would shift the burden of proof regarding compliance from the permittees to DOE.

B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS

Briefly describe and quantify the expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the expenditure provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.

No immediate fiscal impacts, but indeterminate long term impacts.

Since this bill generally relaxes permitting standards, there is no immediate cost impact to local governments. It is, however, favorable to industry and development, and might save local governments some minor permitting costs. However, the long term environmental impacts and any related cost impacts are currently indeterminate.

SOURCES:

Department of Ecology

Assn. of WA Cities

WA State Assn. of Counties

Whatcom Co. Public Works

King Co. Public Works

C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS

Briefly describe and quantify the revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the revenue provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.

None