



California Stormwater Quality Association®
Dedicated to the Advancement of Stormwater Quality Management, Science and Regulation

October 3, 2023 **due at noon**

Courtney Tyler
Clerk to the State Water Board
State Water Resources Control Board
P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812-2000

Submitted online via email: commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov

Subject: Comment Letter – Draft Municipal Stormwater Cost Policy

Dear Ms. Tyler:

The California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)¹ appreciates the opportunity to provide input on the State Water Resources Control Board's (State Water Board's) *Draft Water Quality Control Policy for Standardized Cost Reporting in Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits* (Draft Policy or Cost Reporting Policy) as well as the Draft Municipal Stormwater Cost Policy Staff Report (Draft Staff Report) that were released on August 17, 2023.

CASQA appreciates the extensive outreach and engagement during the development of the Draft Policy. State Water Board staff have engaged with municipalities throughout the state, through a beta testing process as well as other outreach. CASQA will continue to support and facilitate that engagement, inclusive of consideration and incorporation of the beta tests results and potential future next steps prior to the consideration of a final policy.

Our comment letter on the Draft Policy is structured to provide feedback based on the following:

- Policy level comments pertaining to the goals, and therefore structure, of the Cost Reporting Policy (Comments #1 - #3)
- Specific comments on the Draft Policy as proposed (Comments #4 – #9)
- Feedback to certain questions posed by State Water Board staff during the public workshop held on September 7, 2023 (Workshop Questions #1 - #3)

¹ CASQA is a nonprofit corporation that advances sustainable stormwater management protective of California water resources. With well over 2,000 members, our membership is comprised of a diverse range of stormwater quality management organizations and individuals, including cities, counties, special districts, federal agencies, state agencies, ports, universities and school districts, wastewater agencies, water suppliers, industries, and consulting firms throughout the state. Collectively, CASQA represents over 34 million people in California.

Commented [KC1]: or internal background – recorded public workshop available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1No6CBFr618>

Policy Level Comments

Our Policy level comments (Comments #1 - #3) focus on the achieving the following:

- **Establish the Goal:** What do we want to achieve? What decisions do we want to make?
- **Build the Framework to Achieve the Goal:** What do we need to know to make those decisions? What data is needed?
- **Include Assessment / Refinement (Future Considerations):** What do we need to modify? What lessons have we learned?

COMMENT #1: THE PURPOSE OF THE COST REPORTING POLICY SHOULD BE CLEAR AND FOCUSED ON DETERMINING THE COST OF MS4 PERMIT IMPLEMENTATION

The most important and first step is to clearly define the goal (e.g., what is the policy trying to achieve?). While the Draft Policy includes a purpose statement (Section 1.1), it does not clearly define a goal other than to collect standardized data. The Draft Policy later provides three ways to use this data (Section 4):

- Section 4.1: Inform permitting decisions
- Section 4.2: Justify proposed stormwater funding measures
- Section 4.3: Address environmental justice issues

Each of those uses of data are essentially three different goals, which would impact what type of data is collected and reported and therefore the overall structure and intent of the cost reporting policy itself. Cumulatively, those goals require many different data types and significantly expand the scope beyond determining the cost of MS4 permit implementation.

We therefore recommend focusing first on determining the cost to implement a stormwater program as required by the applicable permit. This goal will provide many benefits and is a foundational building block for other goals (including the uses of data identified in the Draft Policy). Focusing on the cost to implement a permit also directly aligns with the State Auditor's Report² that recommends that the regional water boards obtain adequate and consistent information on the stormwater program management costs.

CASQA Recommendation:

- In the Draft Policy, modify the Purpose (Section 1.1) as follows: The purpose of the Draft Policy for Water Quality Control for Standardized Cost Reporting in Municipal Stormwater Permits (Municipal Stormwater Cost Policy, hereafter Draft Policy) is to ensure that municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permittees (Permittees) in California estimate, track, and report annual expenditures ~~related to the implementation of MS4 permits~~ in a consistent manner **to determine what it costs to implement each municipal stormwater program as required by the applicable permit.**

² California State Auditor (CSA) 2018, "State and Regional Water Boards: They Must Do More to Ensure That Local Jurisdictions' Costs to Reduce Storm Water Pollution Are Necessary and Appropriate."

COMMENT #2: THE DATA COLLECTED SHOULD ALIGN WITH THE GOAL OF DETERMINING THE COST OF MS4 PERMIT IMPLEMENTATION

Based upon feedback from the municipalities that are participating in the beta testing process, the Draft Policy requires 103 separate reporting items:

1. By **Category Name** and then **line item** = 77 different reporting items
(E.g., *Category 4. Planning and Land Use Development, Sub-category a. Personnel cost*)
2. By **Category Name** and then **Sub-category** = 26 different reporting items
(E.g., *Category 4. Planning and Land Use Development, Sub-category a. Post construction BMPs*)

We recommend refining and focusing the data collection requirements and aligning the framework of the policy with the purpose of determining the cost of MS4 permit implementation.

CASQA Recommendation:

To achieve this alignment, we specifically recommend the following:

- **Cost Categories and Sub-Categories:** Given the variation of MS4 permit requirements throughout the state, the Cost Reporting Policy should require reporting at the category level and allow optional reporting at the sub-category level.
 - Modify Section 5.1 as follows:
 - “Phase I MS4 Permittees covered by a Phase I MS4 Permit shall report all municipal agency-related expenditures incurred while implementing Permit-required activities using the applicable all cost categories described below and as. ~~Permittees shall further itemize expenditures using various sub-categories as shown in Table 1.~~
 - Modify Table 1 as follows:
 - “Table 1: List of standardized categories ~~and sub-categories~~ for reporting cost of Phase I implementation”
 - Delete the Sub-categories column.
- **Line Items:** The cumulative cost of each category should be required, though a further breakdown via the line items should be optional. The line items provide a refined level of information that will benefit internal management more than regulatory decisions. The line items as proposed would also benefit from modification to more closely align with the major categories that may be tracked in a municipality. Lastly, not all line items apply to all categories. A table to demonstrate that captures these recommendations is provided in Appendix A.
 - Modify Section 5.2 as follows: “Phase I MS4 Permittees ~~may~~ shall track and report all expenditures in each cost category ~~using the following line items.~~”
 - Modify the line items of Section 5.2 to align with the kinds of costs incurred by municipal programs
 - Personnel & Overhead
 - External Professional / Other
 - Capital
 - Planning, Design, Permitting, Construction
 - Land Acquisition
 - Operation and Maintenance
 - Specify which line items apply to specific categories, include a summary table within the Policy similar to what is included in Appendix A, and modify the Cost Survey Tool.

Comment Letter on State Water Board Draft Municipal Stormwater Cost Policy

- **Extraneous Data:** The Cost Reporting Policy requires significant data collection that is extraneous to the purpose of determining the cost of MS4 permit implementation.

Section 5.3 of the Draft Policy mandates each Phase I Permittee to provide details for every “structural stormwater BMP,” including location (address and GPS coordinates), BMP type, surface area, loading rate, drainage area, and the total cost of the completed project.

Section 7.4 instructs Permittees to offer in-depth descriptions of their street sweeping activities, detailing the area covered, type of sweepers used, and the volume of debris gathered. The Draft Staff Report also implies that if street sweeping costs are reported, supplementary information on the program will be mandated, encompassing details already specified in Section 7.4.

- Modify Section 5.3 as follows:

Phase I MS4 Permittees shall track and report construction costs for structural stormwater BMPs upon project completion. ~~Permittees shall also include relevant project details, including location (address and Global Positioning System coordinates), BMP type, BMP surface area, volumetric loading rate, and drainage area with the total project cost of the completed project.~~

- Modify Section 7.4 as follows:

Permittees may attribute expenditures incurred while performing routine activities that are part of municipal operations required by an MS4 Permit (e.g., street sweeping, storm drain cleaning) entirely to the MS4 program. Permittees shall only report costs for the Permit-required frequency (costs incurred past the Permit-required frequency shall not be included). ~~Permittees shall include relevant details of street sweeping, including area swept, type of sweepers, and volume of debris collected.~~

COMMENT #3: ADD A NEW SECTION TO THE COST REPORTING POLICY SPECIFIC TO FUTURE ASSESSMENT AND REFINEMENT

All data collection efforts should involve a step for assessment and refinement. Are the data providing the information necessary to answer the question? Are any modifications necessary? Are there additional goals that can build off the initial goal? Given that the Cost Reporting Policy is novel and the first of its kind, this assessment and future refinement aspect should be an explicit part of the final policy.

For example, Section 4 of the draft Cost Reporting Policy identifies a number of potential uses of the collected data. As noted in Comment #1, these uses significantly expand the scope of the Cost Reporting Policy beyond determining the cost of MS4 permit implementation. Both Section 4.1 and Section 4.3 represent potential future uses of the data, but both uses need to recognize that the data collected under the policy would not be the sole source of data needed. While data collected under this policy will provide more consistent information on annual implementation costs associated with existing permit limitations, additional information would be necessary to allow the Water Boards to fully consider the economic implications of permit provisions when developing or reissuing permits. Similarly, 4.2 is an ancillary goal of the draft Cost Reporting Policy, but other information would be needed for stormwater permittees to justify proposed funding measures.

CASQA Recommendation:

- Add a new section to the Cost Reporting Policy to explicitly incorporate an assessment and refinement process.
- Move Sections 4.1 and 4.3 of the Draft Policy to this new section.

Specific Comments on the Policy

COMMENT #4 THE USES AND INHERENT LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA SHOULD BE CLEARLY DEFINED IN THE COST REPORTING POLICY TO AVOID UNINTENDED INTERPRETATIONS AND USES OF THE COLLECTED DATA.

At a broad scale, there will inherently be limitations associated with the compilation and interpretation of cost reporting data. These limitations are recognized in the *Guidance for Obtaining Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit Compliance Costs* (ORPP Guidance), which states (in part)³:

- *Storm water pollution reduction measures and their costs are difficult to standardize.*
 - *Minimum Control Measures reflect slightly differing requirements defined historically in individual Regional permits. Standardized, statewide guidance on select Minimum Control Measures does not exist.*
 - *There are appropriate grounds for differences among municipal storm water permits. What is practicable and prudent in one community may not work in other communities due to differences in population, hydrology, pollution sources, water uses, and municipal infrastructure, among other things.*
 - *There are various implementation approaches (in-house implementation versus sub-contracted or regional programs) and methods for tracking costs (asset and information data management system functionality and scope). Consequently, analysis of cost data supplied by permittees is complex and is not covered here.*
- *Permittees may consider additional storm water-related costs than this guidance does. For example, some storm water control measures may be integrated into multi-benefit projects serving many objectives (e.g., a public park whose mowing maintenance schedule is designed to maximize storm water retention).*

In addition, when the BAMS Collaborative developed the draft guidance document and cost reporting tool pursuant to the Region 2 Cost Reporting requirements (C.20), the inherent limitations associated with the compilation and interpretation of the data were discussed and summarized in Appendix A of the Guidance Manual.

CASQA Recommendations:

- *Modify Section 4.2 to recognize that this is an ancillary goal to the Draft Policy, but that the data and information obtained may be used by MS4 Permittees to supplement other necessary data and information that would support potential stormwater funding efforts.*
- *Add a Limitations subsection to Section 4. Potential language is included in Appendix A.*
- *Guidance for State Water Board and Regional Water Board staff – Develop guidance for Board staff regarding the limitations associated with the interpretation of the cost reporting data as well as the intended uses of the data (linking the uses of the data back to the identified management questions).*

COMMENT #5 GUIDANCE IS NEEDED TO PROMOTE THE GOAL OF COLLECTING CONSISTENT COST DATA.

While Section 5.5 in the Draft Staff Report provides some general guidance on best practices for cost accounting and reporting, a more robust cost reporting guidance is needed to promote the goal of gathering consistent data. Specific guidance on what data are reported in each category, sub-category, and line item are needed. This guidance is necessary prior the adoption of the Cost Reporting Policy to ensure all stakeholders have the ability to fully understand the intent and have the opportunity to provide feedback and comment.

³ ORPP Guidance, Limitations and Warnings, pg 2.

Examples of topics that should be addressed include when the expenditures should be included if a project is implemented over multiple years, how expenditures should be calculated when the activity is a part of a larger project, and how expenditures to regional programs are accounted for.

As a point of reference, a robust draft guidance document and accompanying cost reporting tool were recently developed by the Bay Area Municipal Stormwater (BAMS) Collaborative in compliance with the Region 2 Cost Reporting requirements (C.20). This guidance could inform a similar document for the Cost Reporting Policy.

CASQA Recommendations:

- *Modify Section 1.2: "The Draft Policy describes the cost categories that Phase I MS4 Permittees and Traditional Phase II Permittees shall use to track their Permit implementation costs, including best practices for cost accounting." [note: this sentence may be better placed in a section other than "Purpose"]*
- *Guidance for Municipalities - Review the Bay Area Cost Reporting Guidance Manual and accompanying Framework Tool developed by the Bay Area Municipal Stormwater (BAMS) Collaborative (dated June 2023) and develop similar guidance for public review prior to the finalization and adoption of the Cost Reporting Policy.*

COMMENT #6: MODIFY THE COST CATEGORIES AND LINE ITEMS FOR PHASE II PERMITTEES TO PROVIDE SOME CONSISTENCY TO THE COST CATEGORIES FOR PHASE I PERMITTEES.

The Draft Policy recognizes the resources limitations for Phase II Permittees and provides a streamlined option for cost reporting (Section 6.1). CASQA appreciates and supports the streamlining option, which essentially combines many of the Phase I categories into a higher level of reporting (e.g., allowing Phase II Permittees to report collectively on all Minimum Control Measures (MCMs) in lieu of a breakdown by each specific MCM). To allow for a level of consistency between the Phase I and Phase II data at this higher level, we recommend a few minor modifications.

The same comments pertaining to line items (Comment #3) apply equally to the Phase II Permittees. Similar to the construct of the cost categories, the line items should be similarly modified for the Phase II Permittees.

CASQA Recommendations:

- *Section 6.1 – Modify the alternative set of cost categories as follows so that they are consistent with the Phase I categories:*
 - *Overall Program Management and Administration*
 - ~~*Capital Costs*~~
 - *TMDLs / Pollutant Specific / Special Programs*
 - *Minimum Control Measures (Total for Items 2-7 in Table 1)*
 - *Water Quality Monitoring*
 - *Miscellaneous Costs*
- *Section 6.2 – Modify the approach and cost line items so that they are consistent with the Phase I approach and categories.*

COMMENT #7. THE TRACKING AND SUBMITTAL OF COST REPORTING DATA SHOULD ALIGN WITH THE TIMELINES OF THE APPLICABLE PERMIT.

Section 7.1 and Section 8.1 require specific timeframes for the tracking and submittal of cost reporting data. We recommend modifying these requirements to align with the timeframes required by the applicable MS4 permit.

CASQA Recommendations:

- *Modify Section 7.1 to require that the Cost Reporting information be submitted as a part of the Annual Reporting requirements as specified in the applicable stormwater permit.*
 - *Permittees shall track all municipal agency-related expenditures directly related to Permit implementation activities (consistent with the applicable Permit) for each fiscal year beginning July 1 and ending June 30.*
- *Modify Section 8.1 to require that the Cost Reporting information be submitted as a part of the Annual Reporting requirements as specified in the applicable stormwater permit.*
 - *Each Permittee shall document and submit the municipal agency total MS4 Permit-related expenditures as a part of the Annual Report (consistent with the applicable Permit) and electronically into the Cost Survey Tool within 30 days after the submittal of the Annual Report annually by September 30. The submission shall contain expenditure information from the previously-concluded fiscal year, beginning July 1 and ending June 30.*

COMMENT #8. THE COST REPORTING POLICY SHOULD REQUIRE A NARRATIVE SUMMARY OF THE TYPES OF FUNDING SOURCES THAT SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STORMWATER PROGRAM.

The Draft Policy requires Phase I and Traditional Phase II stormwater programs to identify the specific amount for each fund source, as follows:

- *Section 7.5 Permittees shall track portions of Permit-implementation costs recuperated by a cost recovery program (e.g., one time or recurring fees).*
- *Section 7.6 Permittees shall track the sources of funds and amounts associated with each source to implement their MS4 permits.*

While some Phase I Permittees are already tracking the general types of sources of funds to implement the stormwater program, few, if any programs are actively tracking and/or have access to the total amounts provided by each source of funds on an annual basis.

As it is unclear how this data supports the purpose of determining the cost of implementation, or what regulatory decisions will be made based on the data that is generated from this requirement, we recommend requiring the submittal of narrative funding information rather than tracking and reporting specific amounts.

CASQA Recommendations:

- *Delete Section 7.5 and 7.6 and modify Section 8.2 as follows:*
 - *Each Permittee shall identify ~~report~~ the types of sources of funds used to implement its MS4 permit.*
- *Modify the Draft Policy to include the options that the Permittees select from when identifying the types of sources of funds so that the information is normalized and consistent across submittals. Categories may include, but are not limited to:*
 - *Primary Sources*
 - *General Fund*

Comment Letter on State Water Board Draft Municipal Stormwater Cost Policy

- *Property Related Fee / Tax*
- *Stormwater Utility*
- *Regulatory Fee(s) (e.g., Inspections, Development Reviews)*
- *IDDE Cost Recovery*
- *Grants/ Loans*
- *Secondary Sources*
 - *Sales Tax*
 - *Vehicle Registration / License Fees*
 - *Solid Waste Fees*
 - *Gas Tax*
 - *Utility Tax / Charge*
 - *Special District Fund*

COMMENT #9. THE COST REPORTING POLICY SHOULD PROVIDE MORE DEFINITION FOR SEVERAL KEY TERMS TO MINIMIZE CONFUSION WITH EXISTING PERMIT REQUIREMENTS AND TERMINOLOGY.

In addition to the proposed terms in the Cost Reporting Policy, terminology for cost reporting is already in use in the ORPP Guidance as well as three municipal stormwater permits. There is drift in how these terms are applied, which is causing confusion (see the table below). We recommend a review of the terminology, precisely defining each term, and explicitly addressing any change in terminology from terms already in use in permits (if applicable).

| Document/Permit | Permit Categories | Permit Sub-Categories | Types of Costs |
|---|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Draft Policy (August 2023) | Cost Categories | Cost Sub-Categories | Cost Line Items |
| ORPP Guidance (August 2020) | Cost Categories | --- | Types of Costs |
| Bay Area Municipal Regional Permit (R2-2022-0018) | Program Areas | --- | Cost Categories |
| Los Angeles Regional Permit (R4-2021-0105) | Category | --- | Category |
| City of Salinas Permit (R3-2019-0073) | Cost Categories | --- | Types of Costs |

Definitions – There are several terms that are introduced in the Draft Policy that are not currently included within the definition section or explained within the Policy. Each of these terms should be clearly defined with examples so that it is clear how they are to be applied within the context of the municipal cost reporting.

CASQA Recommendations:

- *Review terminology, precisely define each term, and explicitly address any change in terminology from terms already in use in permits (if applicable). Including a table to support any transition of terms would be beneficial.*
- *Modify the title of the Draft Policy to “Water Quality Control Policy for Standardized Municipal Agency Cost Reporting in Municipal Stormwater Permits.” Make other conforming edits as needed within the Draft Policy and Draft Staff Report.*
- *If these terms remain in the Cost Reporting Policy, add the following terms into the definitions with examples as to what types of costs each includes:*
 - *Direct Costs*
 - *Indirect Costs*

Feedback Based on The Public Workshop

During the public workshop on September 7, 2023, there were several questions that were raised by State Water Board staff and Water Board members for stakeholders to consider. We understand that responses to these questions may not be part of the official response to comments at this stage. We do though want to be responsive and are therefore providing feedback and recommendations. We will also continue to work with staff on these questions.

Workshop Question #1: Should the Cost Reporting Policy establish different requirements for Phase I Permittees and Traditional Phase II Permittees?⁴

Based upon the Draft Policy *as proposed*, CASQA supports differentiating the cost reporting requirements for Phase I and Traditional Phase II Permittees. The Staff Report appropriately recognizes the resource limitations of Phase II programs, impacting staffing levels and the robustness of data collection systems in use in those communities.

As State Water Board staff evaluate potential modifications to the Draft Policy, CASQA will continue to engage with the Phase II community to provide additional feedback on feasibility.

Workshop Question #2: Should the Schedule for the Consideration of a Final Cost Reporting Policy be Modified?⁵

CASQA appreciates the question raised by State Water Board staff pertaining to the schedule for approving the Draft Policy and the time needed to incorporate the information gained from the Beta Testing process.

As the Cost Reporting Policy is novel (the first of its kind for the Water Boards), CASQA supports taking the time that is necessary to fully consider feedback received through the public workshop, written comments, as well as the Beta Testing process. The proposed schedule (consideration of adoption in Spring 2024) particularly constrains the time available to consider the outcomes of the beta testing, develop any potential modifications, and propose a modified (and final) policy.

In addition, there are potentially beta testers who would be willing to test any potential modifications prior to the development of a final policy. Again, given the significance of the Cost Reporting Policy, additional feedback on potential modifications would be worth the time investment.

CASQA Recommendations

- Extend the current schedule to allow for sufficient time for the consideration of the beta testing process, additional public engagement, and as applicable, any proposed modifications to the Cost Report Policy.
- If beta testers are willing, test any potential modifications, and allow for additional public engagement, prior to the development of a final policy.

Workshop Issue #3: How Should the Cost Reporting Policy be Implemented?⁶

State Water Board staff recognized that the Policy is not self-implementing and that there may be a substantial period of time before the Phase I Permits and Phase II Permit are reissued to include the cost reporting requirements. As such, regulatory tools such as a Water Code Section 13383 order may be implemented for the interim period between the effective date of the Policy and the amendment or reissuance of permits incorporating the cost reporting requirements.⁷

⁴ Jonathan Bishop "Does it make sense for us to split Phase I and Phase II?", Public Workshop September 7, 2023. [min 25:10]

⁵ Jonathan Bishop, Public Workshop September 7, 2023. [min 25:50]

⁶ Jonathan Bishop, "How do we implement this", Public Workshop September 7, 2023. [min 26:32]

⁷ Draft Staff Report, pg 2.

Comment Letter on State Water Board Draft Municipal Stormwater Cost Policy

Based on the lessons learned from the use of 13383 Orders for the Statewide Trash Amendments, CASQA recommends that if other regulatory tools like 13383 Orders are issued, the requirements from the Order are fully incorporated into the municipal stormwater permits when they are reissued. The primary goal is to ensure that the work initiated under the 13383 Orders (or other regulatory tools) is continued seamlessly into permit implementation, avoiding significant redirections or reinterpretations. This direction should be explicitly stated in the Orders (or other regulatory tools).

CASQA Recommendations:

- *If the State Water Board issues 13383 orders - the 13383 orders should be aligned with the final cost reporting adopted language and written such that they can be fully incorporated into the municipal stormwater permits when they are reissued.*

Thank you for your consideration of our comments and we look forward to ongoing collaboration as the Cost Reporting Policy is refined. If you have any questions, please contact me at (310) 462-4939 or karen.cowan@casqa.org.

Sincerely,

Karen Cowan, Executive Director
California Stormwater Quality Association

cc: Jonathan Bishop, State Water Resources Control Board
Karen Mogus, State Water Resources Control Board
Amanda Magee, State Water Resources Control Board
CASQA Board of Directors,
Executive Program Committee
Policy and Permitting Subcommittee
Phase I Subcommittee
Non-Traditional Phase II Subcommittee
Funding Subcommittee

Appendix A Detailed Suggested Language

The information in Appendix A provides additional detailed suggested language related to a specific comment within the main body of the comment letter.

Comment #4: Potential language for a section on limitations

- Add a *Limitations* subsection to Section 4. Potential language is included in Appendix A.
 - *The cost reporting values are compiled from multiple, internal sources and different cost accounting programs and methods, and attempt to separate out duties and time that staff spend complying with the numerous requirements in the applicable municipal stormwater permit. As a result, the reported values are not auditable from an accounting perspective and may differ from the adopted budgets. However, supporting documentation for the cost reporting data submittals will be made available to the State Water Board and/or Regional Water Board, as needed.*
 - *Given the complexities in compiling the wide range of staff and expenditures associated with the implementation of the stormwater program throughout the Permittees' jurisdiction and the use of both specific accounting values and estimated percentages based on best professional judgement, the cost reporting values are rounded to the nearest \$1,000.*
 - *Given the diversity of the municipal stormwater Permittee agencies (e.g., size, characteristics, jurisdiction, permit requirements, types of programs implemented, ranges of staff that implement the program elements) as well as the fact that some program costs are one-time costs while others are annual, on-going costs, the values presented for various program areas may or may not be directly comparable.*
 - *Minimum Control Measures in each municipal stormwater permit reflect slightly differing requirements. Standardized Minimum Control Measure requirements do not exist.*
 - *There are inherent differences among municipal storm water permits and programs. What is practicable and prudent in one community may not work in other communities due to differences in population, hydrology, pollution sources, water uses, and municipal infrastructure, among other things.*
 - *There are various implementation approaches (e.g., agency staff versus sub-contractors, regional programs) and methods for tracking and compiling cost reporting data. Consequently, the approach for the analysis of cost data supplied by permittees and potential comparability is complex and is not covered within this Policy.*
 - *Cost data shall not be used to compare Permittees' performance and assess the efficacy of their municipal stormwater programs⁸.*
 - *Any comparisons between permittees would need to take numerous considerations into account such as the specific permit requirements, type of staff involved in the implementation, local socio-economic conditions, other challenges, etc.⁹*

⁸ Draft Staff Report, Section 8 Use of Standardized Cost Data, pg 48.

⁹ Draft Staff Report, Section 8 Use of Standardized Cost Data, pg 48.

Comment #2: Suggested Table for Cost Categories and Line Items

| Cost Category | Required Total Cost | Optional Line Items | | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--|---|------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Personnel & Overhead (Not O&M related) | External Professional/ Other (Not O&M related) | Capital Expenditures | | Operation and Maintenance |
| | | | | Planning, Design, Permitting & Construction | Land Acquisition | |
| Program Management | \$ | \$ | \$ | | | |
| Stormwater Permit Fees | \$ | | \$ | | | |
| Minimum Control Measures | | | | | | |
| Municipal Operations | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Planning/Land Development <i>(note: Muni Projects Only)</i> | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Industrial and Commercial | \$ | \$ | \$ | | | |
| Illicit Connections | \$ | \$ | \$ | | | |
| Construction Site Control | \$ | \$ | \$ | | | |
| Public Education | \$ | \$ | \$ | | | |
| Water Quality Monitoring | \$ | \$ | \$ | | | |
| TMDLs/Pollutant Specific/ Special Programs | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Trash | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |
| Other | \$ | \$ | \$ | | | |