# Presentation to Connecticut LID and SGP Partners

Summary of Partner Interviews

May 26, 2010



#### **Presentation Overview**

- Background
- Informing and Engaging Partners
- Telephone Interviews
- Findings



#### **Background and Purpose**

- Partner-driven process, we want to begin to gather ideas at the start of the project
- We will continue to gather your ideas throughout the project using workshops and reviews of project materials





#### Informing and Engaging Partners

- Letter from Paul Stacey
- Phone interviews
- Webpage
  - Agendas and summaries
  - Workshop presentations
  - Project reports and deliverables



#### STATE OF CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



May 12, 2016



The Connection Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has initiated a project to expine opportunities to all four impact devolupment (LDI) concepts and planning into four stormwarter premise (SGP)—construction, municipal separate storm sever systems (MS48s), industrial, and commercial. The project will also make recommendation for modifications of the Solid Tension and Solidonic Control Consideration and the Solidonic Control Consideration and the Solidonic Consideration (See Solidonic Consideration Considera

We will hold a workshop at our '79 Ein Street Offices in the Phoenix Auditorium on May 26, 2010 from 9:15 to 11:45 am. to legin the process. You are invited and an agend after the meeting in statched. This meeting will be the first in a series of five meetings to be held over the coarse of the act eight meeting. Fiss & decreased of the coarse of the alway 26 partner weakshop to begin the discussion of L1D and the SGP amendment process. Your descent will also be used to guide activities at the workshop.

Living American Reinventment and Recovery Art finding. DEP netted atto, a context with Fass & O'Neill Consultant, who assisted as with the unite recent update to the Somewhere Quality Manuar. They will conduct a study of general permits around the county, IID polity, and the Somewhere Quality Manuar. They will conduct a study of general permits around the county, IID polity, and the Somewhere Quality Manuar (and the Contract of the Contract o

A web page has been created on DEP's web site at:

http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2719&q=459488&depNav\_GID=1654

The website represents a node of communication for this project and will efficiently put project materials at your fingertips while avoiding unnecessary printouts, mailtings, etc. It will include project materials such as workshop agendas, workshop summaries, and technical reports.

Why are we making this partner driven? We recognize that whatever policy is established will ultimately be implemented at the ground level by Connecticut's regulated sector and community organizations. Thus, the properties to regulation must be practicable for everyone. DEF hospes everyone will be fully engaged in prohementation.

We very much look forward to working with you on this important project and look forward to seeing y May 26.

Sincerely,

Faul Estacey
Paul E. Stacey
Director
Bureau of Water Protection and Land Res

(Printed on Recycled Paper)
79 Elm Street • Hartford, CT 06106-5127
www.ct.gov/dep
An Eastel Opportunity Employer

http://www.ct.gov/dep/cwp/view.asp?a=2719&q=459488&depNav\_GID=1654



### Telephone Interviews

- Interviewed 17 partners through May 19
- Fuss & O'Neill placed calls
- Interviews were loosely based on an interview questionnaire





## Findings—Are You Familiar...?

- 13 of 17 said "yes."
- 3 said "a little" or "somewhat."
- 1 answered "no."





# Findings—Experience with LID

Table 1
Interviewee Reports of Experience with LID

Type of LID Experience	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
At Least Some Experience	13	76%
Policy or Advocacy Only	4	24%
Project Experience Only	2	12%
Both Project and Policy	5	29%



#### Findings—How should LID be Incorporated?

Table 2
Interviewee's Preference for Type of LID Standard

Type of LID Standard	Number of Responses <sup>1</sup>	Percentage of Responses
Guidance	5	29%
No Regulation	5	29%
Incentive-Based Approach	2	12%
Regulation	6	35%
Performance Standard	4	24%
Not sure or no response	3	17%

Note:

Total number of responses do not sum to 17 as several respondents suggested use of a combination of approaches.



# Findings—BMP of Choice?

Table 3
Interviewee's Response to the Question
"Should LID be the BMP of Choice?"

Should LID be the BMP of Choice?	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Yes no Qualification	4	24%
Yes with Qualification	8	48%
No Response	1	6%
Other Approach Suggested	3	17%
No	0	0%



# Findings—Demonstration of LID?

Table 4
Interviewee's Response to the Question
"How Should LID be Demonstrated?"

How Should LID be Demonstrated?	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Runoff Volume	4	24%
Graduated Permit Limits	1	6%
Pollutant Levels Based on Runoff	1	6%
Volume		
Performance Criteria	3	17%
No Response or Not Sure	5	29%
Suggested "Flexibility" in Response	2	12%
Suggested "Simplicity" in Response	3	17%
Other Approach Suggested	3	17%



# Findings—Utility Districts?

Table 5
Interviewee's Response to the Question
"Should we use Stormwater Utility Districts as a Regulatory Device?"

Should we use Utility Districts as a Regulatory Device?	Number of Responses	Percentage of Responses
Yes	4	24%
Maybe, Not Sure, etc.	6	6%
No	7	6%
Politically Unlikely	6	17%
Unnecessary Government	5	29%



# Findings—What Role would you?

Table 6 Interviewee's Response to the Question "What Role would you like to Play?"

What Role would you like to Play?	Number of Affirmative Responses	Percent of Affirmative Responses
Develop and/or Review Policy and Standards	15	88%
Engage a Constituency	12	71%
Education and Training of Others	14	82%
Qualified Local Program and Utility Districts	7	40%
Participation as a Partner	15	88%

