

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Alabama	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require use of fee schedule certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None	Funds are available to pay all incoming investigative/corrective action requests for payment and for third party claims.	Success is measured by reviewing all cost proposals within the required 120 timeframe, reimbursing within 60 days, and providing funds for cleanup to protect human health and the environment.
Alaska*	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget prioritize claims to conserve funds		Fund is no longer active	
Arizona	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	NA	The AZ state fund is supporting cleanups through the state lead program. Eligibility for the state funded reimbursement program was phased out. Only releases reported by June 30, 2006 were eligible to submit claims for coverage and payment eligibility for those claims ended June 30, 2010. Recent legislation created an UST Advisory Committee to evaluate future program options.	Number of confirmed releases with remediation initiated. Percentage of releases closed.
Arkansas	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) limit overhead paid cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	Act 406 of 2013 to clarify the law regarding transfer of eligibility for payment of third-party claims and to clarify reimbursement eligibility to a lender or secured creditor.	Funds are available to pay all approved corrective action plans and third-party claims.	Number of confirmed releases with cleanups initiated. Number of sites closed (cleanups completed).

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
California	<p>*Requires pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget *Requires competitive bidding overhead paid *Prioritize claims to conserve funds</p> <p style="text-align: right;">*Limited</p>	<p>*Fee increase to \$0.02 per gallon *Additional fraud prevention measures and prosecution *Extending the Fund sunset date of 1-1-16</p>	<p>The Fund continues to accept claims for unauthorized releases. An annual appropriation of funds each fiscal year continues to provide for the payments of claims.</p>	<p>Key measurements of the Fund's success includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The completion of technical claim reviews for closure 2) Increase the number of UST sites closed with claim closure 3) Balance the UST Fund income to expenditure ratio and UST Fund overhead rates for FY 13/14 4) Ensure the timely processing of claims and payments
Colorado	<p>use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	<p>New - Established in both statute and regulation the Petroleum Cleanup and Redevelopment Fund, separate from the Colorado Petroleum Storage Tank Fund, using monies obtained from settlements and judgments. This Redevelopment Fund can be used to cleanup sites otherwise not eligible to the Petroleum Storage Tank Fund; ie. pre-88 releases. Currently an Advisory Committee is being established and we hope to begin accepting applications as of July 1, 2014. The Redevelopment Fund will reimburse up to \$2K for each tank removal, \$20K for a Level I Site Assessment and \$30K for a Level II Site Characterization with the applicant responsible for 10% of costs, and up to \$500K for a Level III Cleanup with the applicant responsible for 50% of costs. Proposed - Using the Petroleum Storage Tank Fund to offer incentives to Owners/Operators to stay in compliance. This would involve providing reimbursement for periodic testing and monitoring such as annual tank, line and leak detector tests and/or cathodic protection tests. The intent is to enhance operational compliance and detect releases sooner.</p>	<p>The Colorado Petroleum Storage Tank Fund is solvent with a fiscal year 2013 year end fund balance of \$1.076 million. The Environmental Response Surcharge (the source of greater than 90% of our revenue) was \$50/tanker at fiscal year end, but was increased to \$100/tanker as of 8/1/13.</p>	<p>Success is measured based on the number and amount of claims paid: for fiscal year 2013 1425 claims were paid totaling \$25.6 million. In addition payments were made within the statutory requirement of 90 days (average of 45 days).</p>

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Connecticut	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require competitive bidding (tank owner) require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) limit overhead paid cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	Program sunset for different size applicants. Large 10/2012 Mid-Size 10/2013 Muni, other and small 10/2014 reverse auction payment process established for payment of claims for Large and Mid-size applicants DEEP Commissioner administers program in lieu of Review Board	Currently processing claims and making payments when funds are available.	Implementation of the 2012 legislative program changes and sunset provisions.
Delaware	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget limit overhead paid certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	As the program sunsetted 12/31/2011 we are proposing removing the program from the UST Statute.	Sunsets 12/31/2011. Tank owners and operators must comply with FR requirements through private mechanisms.	Sites closed.
Florida	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans, require pre-approval of cleanup plans, use competitively procured contractors and costs, use pay-for-performance prioritize cleanups to conserve funds, qualify contractors, cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	Implemented competitive procurement in all cleanup work	The Inland Protection Trust Fund is sound and well funded, with a legislative appropriation this FY of \$125 M for cleanup at eligible sites. Continuing effort to screen all eligible facilities in the next 6-8 years with a limited assessment to better identify imminent health threats, potential clean closures and estimate future trust fund liabilities.	Overall by the number of drinking water supplies and sensitive receptors protected, next by the number of cleanups completed or brought to natural attenuation monitoring status, and lastly by the number of competitively procured purchase orders processed and paid which accomplish these goals.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Georgia*	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance prioritize claims to conserve funds cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	As of June 2012, there is a proposed fee increase from \$0.005/gal to \$0.0075/gal for volunteer participation.	solvent	Fund Success versus Program Success is specifically measured by: 1) How quickly a claim is paid after approval; and 2) The ability to pay without delays due to the lack of immediate funding.
Idaho	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) limit overhead paid certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	None	Actuarially sound for at least the next five years.	We provide Idaho tank owners insurance to meet financial responsibility at the lowest possible cost.
Illinois	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None	Fund has a positive balance.	Claims paid within 90 days of receipt.
Indiana	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None during this reporting period	Solvent	Number of closures achieved; number of claims processed; timeliness of claims processing; and financial stability and strength.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Iowa	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance certify contractors employ a third-party administrator cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	None during this reporting period	Solvent and in run off with 625 open claims.	Site closure and cost efficiency.
Kansas	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) use pay-for-performance certify contractors	require secondary containment of UST systems	solvent	protection of human health and the environment while remaining solvent
Kentucky	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require use of fee schedule use pay-for-performance cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	PSTA and SOTRA deadlines extended to July 15, 2016	Solvent	By evaluating the number of NFA's issued, site investigations completed and the timeliness of payments compared to past trends.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Louisiana	Use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans, Require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget, Require competitive bidding (tank owner), Require use of fee schedule, Use pay-for-performance, Certify contractors, Cover cleanups based on site specific risk-based end points	None at this time.	Solvent	Known releases meet the required limiting standards(screening and risk based) for soils and groundwater, by utilizing the most time efficient and cost effective methods for assessment and remediation.
Maine	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) limit overhead paid prioritize claims to conserve funds cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	2012-Modified membership of review board, eliminated a public member and gave oversight board broader authority. 2013-Review Board lowered surcharge fees for gas from .20 to .18 cents/barrel. Lowered fee on refined products from .10 to .06 cents/barrel, reducing revenue when fund balance dips below \$5 M.	Currently sound but requires active monitoring and management.	Ability to provide quick response, protect public health and pay for corrective actions and third party damages.
Maryland*				a) After 12/31/2007, only residential AST and UST heating oil systems are eligible for reimbursement from the Site Cleanup fund.(b) There have been 523 residential applications since the residential reimbursement program was initiated of which 188 applications remain open at this time. (c) Although no applications can be accepted for RCRA I and Commercial USTs, approximately 36 previously approved applications remain open (i.e. allocated funds remain - cleanup ongoing).(d) Reduction of application backlog while insuring the Fund balance remains "in-the-black"

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Massachusetts	require competitive bidding (tank owner) require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid developed web-based claim submittal software cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	Beginning 1/1/2015, the Delivery Fee (\$0.025/gal) will be subject to annual increases based on the CPI.	The dedicated UST fund was repealed in 2003. Current funding of the UST program is provided by annual legislative appropriations as part of the overall state budget. The UST program budget has generally been sufficient (with the exception of 2010) to meet claim obligations	There is no formal method for measuring "success". Due to recent program changes, the claim backlog was reduced by 90%.
Michigan	require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	A bill has recently been introduced into the state Senate to create a \$20 million per year reimbursement program with revenues coming from the current 7/8 cent per gallon fee which brings in approximately \$50 million per year (the first \$20 million each year would fund the proposed new program).	We do not currently have a reimbursement fund.	
Minnesota	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None.	Financially sound.	Claim review within statutory requirements.
Mississippi	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule certify contractors	Proposed coverage of releases from above ground storage tanks.	Solvent	Fund balance and processing reimbursement requests in 30 days or less.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Missouri	require pre-approval of costs for all work require competitive bidding (tank owner) limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance employ a third-party administrator cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None	Excellent. Collaborative work with regulator and industry minimizes number of new leaks; workload is decreasing as old sites are cleaned up; funding is available for all claims.	Very few leaks, with minimal environmental impact Prompt cleanups done in a cost-effective manner Efficient reimbursement of claims Good relationship with industry and other state agencies
Montana	require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule prioritize claims to conserve funds cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None	Continue to obligate available fund to releases which pose greatest threat to human health and the environment.	Fund balance and claim processing time
Nebraska	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget may require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance prioritize claims to conserve funds cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	January 2014 bill (LB767) introduced that would reimburse UST operator training costs.	RBCA Tier 1 & Tier 2 investigation program working well. PFP Program has 36 contracts at orphan tank sites with 10 completed successfully, 11 contracts terminated, and 15 in progress.	The number of sites closed. Expenditures keeping pace with revenues. Application payment is less than 60 days.
Nevada	require pre-approval of corrective action plans and budget require standard forms with cost limitations for activities require competitive bidding (tank owner) limit overhead paid certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points		Solvent	Number of claims submitted vs. Number of claims processed

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
New Hampshire	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid prioritize claims to conserve funds certify contractors	Legislation to extend sunset date to 7/1/2025 in progress/before the Legislature this year - 2014	Fund is active. We continue to prioritize work based on site risk and available funds	# of claims processed and cleanups completed
New Jersey*	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure			
New Mexico	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) require use of fee schedule use pay-for-performance prioritize claims to conserve funds certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	NA since 2004	Constant oversight and reconciliation is required and prioritization of sites activity as necessary to ensure that we do not over extend available funds.	1) Number of sites addressed per year; 2) Number of sites issued "No Further Action Required" letters; and 3) Timely payment of eligible claims in accordance with the regulations.
New York*				
North Carolina	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget use of fee schedule claims to conserve funds based on site specific risk-based end points monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure (tank owner) for items exceeding \$2,000	None	Comm - Active & Solvent Noncomm - Active, but restricted due to funding	Reduction in number of open release incidents and backlog

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
North Dakota	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) limit overhead paid cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None	Healthy - Solvent	Reduction in open claim, surplus above statutory requirement.
Ohio	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	At its November 20, 2013 meeting, the Board voted to reduce the annual fee by \$100 per UST. This change will be effective with the fee year beginning July 1, 2014.	The Fund continues to accept claims for releases discovered before and after 12/22/98. It is supported solely by annual tank fees, revenue bond proceeds and interest income. As of June 30, 2013, all previously issued revenue bonds were retired or refunded. No change in the Fund as the State's financial responsibility mechanism is anticipated.	The Fund's success is measured by the 1) maintenance of an affordable fee structure that generates sufficient revenues to maintain Fund solvency; 2) maintenance of claims submissions standards that encourage cost-effective remediations; and 3) timely reimbursement of eligible claimed costs.
Oklahoma*	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance prioritize claims to conserve funds certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	As of 07/01/09, 8% of the \$0.01 assessment is apportioned to the Okla Dept of Environmental Quality (ODEQ). As of 05/21/12, \$57M of the assessment will go to Okla Dept of Transportation (ODOT) over a span of 9-10 years, per O.S. 17 SS 354 C.3. Sunset date was extended from December 31, 2012 to December 31, 2022 per O.S. 17 SS 354 D.1.	Active & Solvent	We consider our fund successful as remediation of sites is being accomplished, claims are being processed in a timely manner and the fund remains solvent.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Pennsylvania	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance employ a third-party administrator cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	There are no current proposed changes to the Fund.	Fund is financially viable and processes claims as they are submitted and confirmed for eligibility.	84% of all claims submitted are deemed eligible for reimbursement. We do not have to prioritize payments. Sufficient funds available to process claims.
Rhode Island		Possible change to Board make-up and quorum limit	The RI UST Fund disburses quarterly and is currently one and a half disbursements behind.	Ability to continue to pay its claims
South Carolina	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) require use of fee schedule use pay-for-performance prioritize claims to conserve funds certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure	none	2013 increase in tank fees generated \$2.3 million in cleanup funds	EPA Annual Soundness Snapshot and Assessment of the SC State Fund/Yearly legislative review by SUPERB Advisory Committee
South Dakota	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) require use of fee schedule cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure		The PRCF is able to pay all claims in a timely manner and has sufficient revenue to handle future claims.	Success is measured by the efficiency, timeliness and cost-effectiveness of the corrective action. Success is also measured by the speed of claims approval and maintenance of the fund's solvency.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Tennessee	Use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require use of fee schedule certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget	none	solvent	maintaining a positive balance
Texas	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) require use of fee schedule limite overhead paid certify contractors cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	none	The fund is able to pay all claims in a timely manner and has sufficient revenue to handle future claims.	Success is measured by the number of cleanups completed and timely review and payment of claims.
Utah	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid use pay-for-performance certify contractors	None	Positive cash balance.	Positive cash balance and NFAs.
Vermont	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid prioritize claims to conserve funds cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	Vermont passed legislation which increased both the annual tank fees and deductibles for higher risk tank systems (single-walled tanks). VT also established drop dead dates for when single-walled tank systems need to be removed from the ground.	The Fund continues to provide resources to address petroleum releases from USTs and ASTs. Future releases remain covered under the program.	Solvent fund. Able to pay claims in a timely manner. Good working relationship with our stakeholders.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Virginia	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid employ a third-party administrator cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	None	Claims are released for payment once a month due to continued cash flow limitations.	Overall success is measured through: Number of cleanups completed; Average cleanup cost; Claims processing times; Overall reasonableness of cost approved.
Washington	multi-party agreement between insurer, state fund, and state regulator use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid certify contractors employ a third-party administrator	None	Tax extended until 2020.	Time to claim closure
Washington-heating oil only	use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require use of fee schedule limit overhead paid certify contractors	None	Fee extended until 2020.	Claim processing time; Average cleanup cost; Time to claim closure

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updated 2012

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
West Virginia			Fund is no longer active	
Wisconsin*	unknown			
Wyoming	require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner) certify contractors		Fund is used to pay for cleanups based on priority.	

* No updated response received for 2013 survey.

Cost Control measures:

- Use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans
- require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget
- require competitive bidding (tank owner)
- require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner)
- require use of fee schedule
- limit overhead paid
- use pay-for-performance
- prioritize claims to conserve funds
- certify contractors
- employ a third-party administrator
- cover cleanups based on site specific risk-based end points
- cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure
- corrective actions undertaken only as a result of a capital improvement