Presentation to Connecticut LID and SGP Partners

Summary of US State General Permitting Programs
May 26, 2010



Presentation Overview

- Background and Purpose
- Methods of Collection
- State Information Collected and Interviews with Program Managers
- Key Findings



Background and Purpose

- Reviewed 20 State Programs
- Ideas that may:
 - Inform Connecticut's approach
 - Create a starting point for discussion
 - Germinate ideas for Connecticut



Methods of Data Collection

- Two Basic Methods:
 - Web searches and webpage mining
 - Interviews with stormwater managers



State Information & Interviews

We Collected Information from the Following States:

- Alaska
- Arizona
- California
- Florida
- Idaho
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Nevada
- New Mexico

- New Hampshire
- New York
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- Vermont
- Washington
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin



State Information & Interviews

We Conducted Interviews with the 13 Highlighted States:

- Alaska
- Arizona
- California
- Florida
- Idaho
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota
- Nevada
- New Mexico

- New Hampshire
- New York
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- Vermont
- Washington
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin



Findings—Summary Format

- Narrative Discussion Including:
 - General (overview)
 - General permits—focus on four permit types (construction, MS4, industrial, and commercial)
 - Performance standards
 - References

Specific Standards Found in Alaska General Permits

Key Items	Standards
Runoff volume as an environmental indicator	Not Found
Volume control in relation to pollutant control	Not Found
Permit limits related to storm size and runoff volume	Not Found
Performance criteria	Not Found
LID	Not Found
Pollution prevention	Not Found
End of pipe	Not Found



Findings--General

The Following States have LID Guidance Documents:

- Alaska
- California
- Idaho
- Maine
- Massachusetts
- Minnesota

- New Hampshire
- New York
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- Vermont
- Washington
- West Virginia



Findings—General

LID in GPs or Regulation

- California—encouraged in GP
- Maine—encouraged in regulation
- Massachusetts—SW policy
- Minnesota—pollution prevention

- New York—GP cites manual
- Rhode Island—GP cites LID
- Vermont—towns required; LID encouraged in IPs
- Washington—Added to GPs
- West Virginia—1" standard in GP



Findings—General

Where is LID Encouraged, but not Required?

- Alaska—Guidance, but not required
- Arizona—Some locals use incentives
- California—Encouraged in GP;
 Regions may require
- Idaho—Guidance, but not required
- Maine—Regulations strongly encourage
- Minnesota—Extensive guidance

- New Hampshire—Guidance, but not required
- New York—Guidance, but not required
- Oklahoma—LID promoted by locals
- Pennsylvania—Guidance, but not required
- Vermont—Guidance, but not required
- West Virginia—Encourage in CGP, but required of MS4s



Findings—Performance Stnds

What Types of Performance Standard are used?

Type of Standard	Examples
Runoff Volume	• WQV (1", 0.5", 25%, etc.); require or encourage LID
Pollution Reduction (linked to volume)	• 80 or 90% TSS
	• Turbidity
	 Nutrients
	Sensitive sites
Performance standard	Area set-aside for LID
	MEP and narrative
	Imperviousness reduction



Findings—LID Primacy

What Types of Standards are used to Establish Primacy?

Type of Standard	Examples
Runoff Volume	 Percentage or Fraction of WQV
Performance standard	Area set-aside for LID
	MEP and narrative
	 Imperviousness reduction requirements

