**Project or issue**

Propose water quality permit fee increases.

**Purpose of your communication**

Build support, inform persons affected by the fee increases, and involve all interested parties.

**Key messages**

1. DEQ proposes an increase of existing water quality permit fees.
2. DEQ is proposing the fee increases to account for increased program costs and to recover costs associated with effectively implementing the permit program.
3. The proposed fees will affect most, but not all, existing and future water quality permit holders. (A few exceptions exist – 700-PM, 2401, 2402.)

**Background**

In 2002, DEQ convened the Blue Ribbon Committee on Wastewater Permitting (comprised of industry, environmental and local government representatives) to recommend improvements to DEQ’s water quality permit program. In 2004, the committee published a report containing a variety of recommendations, including increasing fee revenue by no more than three percent each year to address increasing program costs. The annual fee increase recommendation was adopted into law in 2005, and DEQ implemented fee increases in 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011 and 2012.

**Goals and desired outcomes**

The goal is for the rulemaking to be adopted and help move DEQ toward more stable funding for its water quality program.

**Legal or program requirements**

DEQ is doing the rulemaking voluntarily; there is no legal or program requirement that is directing DEQ into the rulemaking.

**Constraints**

Regarding the annual fee increase, existing permit fees may be increased by no more than 3 percent, regardless of whether program cost increases represent a greater percentage. Stakeholders may oppose fee increases due to poor program performance (specifically, the current high level of permit backlog despite previous fee increases to cover permit program operations).

**Worst-case scenario**

Not of significant concern. Opposition is expected to be minimal.

**Measurement**

Goal: Through outreach, stakeholders understand the fee increase and are aware of the rulemaking. Fees are adopted in October 2013 and effective Nov. 1, 2013.

Method of measurement:

How many questions are received following rule adoption?

When were the rules adopted?

**People who may be interested and should be involved in outreach**

**Outreach group name (general or specific):** Blue Ribbon Committee

**Key issue or interest in this project/process:** Members of the outreach group represent permittees who will be directly affected by fee increases.

**Rationale for involving:** Build support for fee increases.

**Involved DEQ staff**

Chris Clipper – subject expert, process expert, project assistant

Dennis Ades – Manager

Greg Aldrich – Administrator

Yongkie Hurd – review fiscal statement

Brian White – messaging/communications assistance

BSD Analyst – update fee database

**Responsibilities and approval process**

All rulemaking documentation to be completed by Chris, with approval by Dennis Ades, review team, Greg Aldrich, Director’s Office and the Environmental Quality Commission.

**Outreach tools**

**Tool:** advisory committee meeting, web content, Govdelivery, emails to legislators, postcards, public hearings, news release, Secretary of State Bulletin

**Target audience:** permittees, stakeholders

**Rationale:** The tools will help achieve the purpose of this communication, which is to build support and involve stakeholders.

| **Activity** | **Purpose** | **Begin Date** | **Complete** | **Staff** | **Approval** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gather initial stakeholder input | Blue Ribbon Committee to serve as fiscal impact advisory committee | Meeting May 23, 2013 | Comments due July 2, 2013 | Clipper, Ades | Revise fiscal impact statement as necessary per comments |
| Compile talking points  (Message Map or Q and A) | Assemble a brief, bulleted list of key messages to be used, if necessary, to answer questions from public, stakeholders, news media | July 16, 2013 | July 16, 2013 | Clipper, working with Brian White | Ades |
| Monitor Environmental Quality Commission involvement | Inform EQC members on rulemaking scope and any issues of public concern.  Director’s Dialogue requested by EQC. | July 29, 2013  Due to Stephanie Caldera Aug. 7, 2013 | Director’s Dialogue at EQC on Aug. 21, 2013. | Clipper | Ades or Aldrich |
| Produce Rulemaking Announcement on Proposed WQ Fee Increases | Will use rulemaking announcement of fee increases in lieu of a fact sheet to avoid duplication of work. Document will outline purpose of proposed fee increase; describe how specific fee increases would support specific WQ program functions. | March 2013 | Division Administrator review July 2, 2013 | Clipper | Ades, review team, Aldrich |
| Create gov.delivery list for interested parties | Provide outreach and notification to people and groups interested in the rulemaking development regarding rule changes and public hearings. | July 16, 2013 | July 22, 2013 | Clipper, working with WQ support staff | Clipper |
| Public Notice, SOS Bulletin announcement of start of comment period; legal notice | Announce public comment opportunities, including official public comment period. | June 26, 2013 | July 22, 2013 | Clipper, working with various staff | Ades |
| News release  (statewide) | Announces proposed rulemaking, start of public comment period, how to comment, and information on public hearings | July 8, 2013 | July 23, 2013 | White working with Clipper | Clipper |
| Second news release for information meetings/public hearings (optional) | Announces details of public hearings to be held; will be issued close to actual hearing dates.  OCO may do follow-up calls with local news media to remind them of the local hearing. | (not necessary) | NA | NA | NA |
| Newspaper display ads for public hearings | Briefly advertises the time, place and purpose of each public hearing. At least one display ad to be placed in each community where hearing will be held.  (Use template from previous rulemakings.) | (not necessary) | NA | NA | NA |
| Public Hearings | Provide the public with rulemaking information and an opportunity to comment during a formal public hearing. | Schedule hearings June 25, 2013 | Aug.20, 2013 in Portland | Clipper,  Presiding Officer | Clipper |
| Staff Report | Develop staff report for EQC review and eventual vote. | Aug. 5, 2013 | Submit staff report to Director’s Office by Sept. 10, 2013 | Clipper | Ades, Division Admin. |
| EQC Meeting/ Rule adoption | Fees proposed for adoption by EQC. | EQC meeting Oct. 16, 2013 | Fee increases effective Nov. 1, 2013. | Clipper | EQC may or may not adopt rules. |
| Follow-up | Include information on DEQ website and via gov.delivery to inform stakeholders of next steps after EQC meeting.  (Complete implementation plan.) | Oct. 1-3, 2013  (initial tasks) | Oct. 29-31, 2013  (final tasks) | Clipper, working with website representatives | NA |

**Review and approvals**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Plan completed Date**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Communications and Outreach review Date**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Manager’s approval Date**

**Modifications reviewed and approved**

***Modification one:*** *Short descriptive statement of modification*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Communications and Outreach review Date**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Manager’s approval Date**

**RESULTS**

**Summary**

Briefly describe whether you think this outreach effort worked. What were the major highlights? What were major concerns or unanticipated issues? Did it go according to plan? Did it stay within the expected timeframe?

**Measurements**

Include measurements listed in the plan and the actual results.

**Data:** What did you measure?

**Result:** What happened?

**Explanation:** Did the result meet the threshold for success? Explain.

**Analysis and follow-up**

If outreach was a success, say so. If more or different outreach is needed, briefly describe options and provide some next steps for follow-up, if necessary.