

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

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; utilize unit rates	Trust Fund coverage per occurrence increased to \$1.5 million on October 1, 2015	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. Number of release incidents with approved Corrective Action Plans and number of cleanups completed.
Alaska*	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget prioritize claims to conserve funds		Fund is no longer active.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 for state lead projects (state as agent of owner) cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points	In 2015, House Bill 2636 established several new UST program components for AZ. None of the programs may be used to demonstrate compliance with financial responsibility requirements. Programs include: funding for UST removal, suspected release confirmation, baseline assessments, and system upgrades to new tank installation standards; an expanded state lead program to conduct UST removals, suspected release confirmation, and baseline assessments; a cleanup funding assistance (preapproval) program; and, a time-barred claims program to reimburse corrective action costs for owners and operators who were time-barred from submittal under the old state fund program (deadline to submit for time-barred - December 31, 2016).	State Fund as partial FR mechanism is no longer active.  New AZ programs are in initial stages of implementation with funding available for cleanup and leak prevention efforts.	Number of confirmed releases with remediation initiated. Percentage of releases closed (cleanups completed).

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
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		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).
California	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Requires pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget</li> <li>*Requires competitive bidding</li> <li>*Limited overhead paid</li> <li>*Prioritize claims to conserve funds</li> </ul> *Review scope required by regulators to focus on tasks to meet closure criteria. Cost guidelines. Electronic invoicing with data checkers. Law only allows reimbursement of reasonable and necessary costs which are determined upon review of incurred costs.	No new or proposed legislation for FY 16/17	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. Significant cash balance as regulatory cases close, and unnecessary remediation not implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Minimize time to meet closure criteria and cost to close cases</li> <li>2) Balance the UST Fund income to expenditure ratio and UST Fund overhead rates for FY 16/17</li> <li>3) Ensure the timely processing of claims and payments</li> </ul>

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Colorado	<p>Use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans</p> <p>Require pre-approval of cleanup plans and budget</p> <p>Require competitive bidding for remediation subcontractor costs &gt; \$100,000</p> <p>Require use of fee schedule</p> <p>Limit overhead paid</p> <p>Certify consultants</p> <p>Cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p> <p>Additional risk-based closure criteria were put into rule in October 2014 which allow for regulatory closure with dissolved phase impacts off property. This has allowed our program to effectively close low-risk sites that have undergone multiple remedial and mass reduction efforts where all exposure pathways have been eliminated. A beneficial result of this is that the Fund can focus spending on high-risk sites where remedial efforts can recognize much larger returns on investment.</p>	<p>House Bill 16-1044 was signed by the Governor on March 2, 2016 extending the Colorado Petroleum Storage Tank Fund sunset to September 1, 2023.</p> <p>The Petroleum Cleanup and Redevelopment Fund, separate from the Colorado Petroleum Storage Tank Fund, funded by monies obtained from settlements and judgments has now accepted 26 sites for assessment and cleanup. Approximately \$450K has been allocated for these efforts including removal of 24 tanks. House Bill 15-1299 was signed by the Governor on May 8, 2015 allowing the Petroleum Storage Tank Fund to offer incentives to Owners/Operators for compliance testing. OPS worked with a stakeholder group to develop the specifics of a process where incentives are offered for early testing and upgrade of spill buckets and containments as now required by OPS regulations, and also for tank removals. The incentive is a reduction or elimination of the deductible if a release is discovered during the testing or upgrade, or tank removal. Colorado regulations were revised to adopt the new requirements in EPA's 2015 regulation revision. Colorado's SPA application has been submitted to EPA.</p>	<p>The Colorado Petroleum Storage Tank Fund is solvent with a fiscal year 2016 year end fund balance of \$1,681,299. The Environmental Response Surcharge (the source of greater than 90% of our revenue) was \$100/tanker throughout the fiscal year.</p>	<p>Success is measured based on the number, amount and timeliness of claims paid:</p> <p>for fiscal year 2016 1,241 claims were paid totaling \$24 million. In addition payments were made well within the statutory requirement of 90 days (average of 25 working days).</p>

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Connecticut	<p>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                      Completion of remediation Milestones</p>	None	Currently processing claims and making payments when funds are available.	Implementation of the 2012 legislative program changes and sunset provisions.
Delaware	<p>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</p>	Program closed on 12/31/2011 via statute change.	closed 12/31/2011. Tank owners and operators must comply with FR requirements through private mechanisms.	Sites closed.
District of Columbia	NA	None	None Existant - Tank owners and operators must comply with FR requirements through private mechanisms.	NA- Case Closures/Cleanup Completed and successful cost recovery from RPs, if DC LUST Trust Funds are used for a cleanup/site assessment.
Florida*	<p>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</p>	<p>The existing Advanced Cleanup Program, whereby Site Owners/RPs can be funded out priority order if they share 25% or more of the cost, was modified to allow groups of 20 or more sites to be bundled under performance based cleanup agreements to satisfy the net cost share with co-payment, cost savings compared to standard contract rates, cost savings for risk based cleanup compared to unconditional closure, or any combination of the three.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Georgia	<p>Use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans                      require use of fee schedule                      limit overhead paid                      use pay-for-performance (primarily state contractor but some on private contractor)                      prioritize claims to conserve funds                      cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure</p>	None	Solvent.	<p>Fund Success versus Program Success is specifically measured by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) How quickly a claim is paid after approval</li> <li>2) How quickly sites are closed</li> <li>3) Average/median cost to closure for each phase of corrective action</li> <li>4) Cost-benefit analysis of reaching closure</li> </ol>
Idaho	<p>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</p>	None	Actuarially sound for at least the next five years.	<p>We provide Idaho tank owners insurance to meet financial responsibility at the lowest possible cost. Prompt and fair payment of claims</p>
Illinois	<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                      cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	None	Fund has a positive balance.	Claims paid within 90 days of receipt.
Indiana	<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                      cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	<p>None during this reporting period                      New statute requirements will become effective on July 1, 2016. There are changes to eligibility requirements, increases the cap to \$2.5 million and allows both current and former owners, operators and property owners to access the fund.</p>	Solvent.	<p>Number of closures achieved; number of claims processed; timeliness of claims processing; and financial stability and strength.</p>

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Iowa	use standard forms for 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 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	2016 Legislation (HF 2464) passed ends collection of environmental protection charge (0.01 cent / gallon petro deposited into UST or AST) on 12/31/2016. Same bill ends funding for the State Remedial Program as of 12-31-2016	Solvent and in run off with 389 open claims; loss portfolio transfer under consideration for majority (50%-60%) of remaining 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)	Modifying regulations to meet new EPA regulatory requirements.	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	N/A	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 Updates 2016

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, utilizing unit pricing, Use pay-for-performance, Certify contractors, Cover cleanups based on site specific risk-based end points	Act 521 of the 2016 Regular Session implemented a number of changes to the program. These include redefining bulk facilities, motor fuel, insuring 3rd party claims were included in the max expenditure of \$1.5M, requiring site initial assessments to be completed within two years of request, increasing the max obligation difference from \$20M to \$40Mm and several other program language clarifications.	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	Effective July 4, 2015, the Ground Water Oil Clean-up Fund was combined with the Surface Waters Oil Clean-up Fund to create the Maine Ground and Surface Waters Clean-up and Response Fund. Fund eligible AST applicants coverage for eligible clean-up costs and third party damages was reduced to \$750,000. Sunset date eliminated.	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	Reimbursement limits are set in State law Applicants must follow standard application process Eligibility criteria are detailed in State regulations	Funding is reviewed every three years and funding for 2017 past June 2017 is currently with the Maryland General Assembly	Currently sound until June 2017	An annual report on the fund is sent to the Maryland State Legislature and is available here: <a href="http://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Land/OilControl/FactSheetsPublications/Pages/Programs/LandPrograms/Oil_Control/FactsheetsPublications/index.aspx">http://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Land/OilControl/FactSheetsPublications/Pages/Programs/LandPrograms/Oil_Control/FactsheetsPublications/index.aspx</a> .

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Massachusetts	<p>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</p>	<p>Effective 7/1/2014 the per gallon Delivery Fee is now placed into the Commonwealth Transportation Fund and is no longer indirectly used to support the state fund program.                      In November 2015, the Legislature passed a law to create a separate reimbursement ceiling for Third Party Damages equal to \$1 million in addition to the \$1.5 ceiling for response actions (i.e. \$2.5 million total per Occurrence) All program regulations are being revised to update them with recent statute changes, current policies and practices.</p>	<p>Current funding of the UST program is provided by annual legislative appropriations as part of the overall state budget.</p>	<p>There is no formal method for measuring "success".</p>
Michigan <sup>1</sup>	<p>require competitive bidding (tank owner)                      require use of fee schedule                      limit overhead paid                      cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	<p>Legislative changes passed on December 21, 2016 reduced the per claim deductible for owners of 7 or fewer USTs to \$2,000 (down from \$15,000) and eliminated the need for these owners to buy-down their deductible amount by paying an annual \$500 per tank fee. Per claim deductible amounts for owners of 8 USTs or more was lowered from \$50,000 to \$10,000.</p>	<p>Financially sound.</p>	<p>Timeliness of claim and invoice reviews, number of LUST sites that are closed using Fund. % of refined petroleum UST owners that use the Fund to meet their financial responsibility requirement.</p>
Minnesota	<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                      cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Financially sound.</p>	<p>Claim review within statutorily-mandated timeframes of 60 days for initial claims and 120 days for supplemental claims.</p>
Mississippi	<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                      certify contractors</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Solvent.</p>	<p>Fund balance and processing reimbursement requests in 30 days or less.</p>

Based on responses to a survey conducted by the Vermont Department of Environmental Conservation. Updated Summer 2017.



TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Missouri	<p>Require pre-approval of costs for all work.                      Require competitive bidding (tank owner).                      Control overhead costs.                      Use pay-for-performance                      Employ a third-party administrator                      Cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	None	Excellent. Collaborative work with regulator and industry minimizes number of new leaks. Funding is available for all claims. Significant progress being made in reducing backlog.	<p>Very few leaks from active tanks, with minimal environmental impact.                      Cleanups completed promptly and in a cost-effective manner.                      Efficient reimbursement of claims.                      Good relationship with industry and other state agencies.</p>
Montana	<p>require competitive bidding (tank owner)                      require use of fee schedule                      Statistics by task                      cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	None	<p>Solvent,                      Continue to obligate available funds to releases which pose greatest threat to human health and the environment.</p>	Fund balance, claim processing time, cost effective cleanup
Nebraska	<p>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                      prioritize claims to conserve funds                      cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</p>	<p>January 2016 bill to extend the sunset date from June 30, 2016 to June 30, 2020 became law. The 2017 legislative session has several bills introduced that would transfer money from the Fund for other uses. LB 22 transfers \$700,000 to general funds and LB 331 would transfer up to \$1.5 million per year for Superfund cleanups.</p>	<p>RBCA Tier 1 &amp; Tier 2 investigation program working well. PFP Program did 36 contracts at orphan tank sites with 12 completed successfully, 20 contracts terminated, and 4 in progress. No contracts have been bid since 2011.</p>	<p>The number of sites closed. Expenditures keeping pace with revenues. Application payment is less than 60 days.</p>
Nevada	<p>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</p>	<p>Use of annual excess Petroleum Funds (greater than \$7.5M) for grants associated with October 2018 UST Compliance Assistance</p>	Solvent.	<p>Dollar amount of PetroleumFund claims approved for reimbursement and the number of claims processed</p>

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
New Hampshire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans</li> <li>require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget</li> <li>require competitive bidding (tank owner)</li> <li>require use of fee schedule</li> <li>limit overhead paid</li> <li>certify contractors</li> </ul>	None	Fund is active. We continue to prioritize work based on site risk and available funds.	# of claims processed and sites closed
New Jersey	<p>All projects costs are subject to rates posted in a cost guidance document. Services must be performed by certified contractors or Licensed Site Remediation Professionals. All requests for funding must be submitted prior to the requestor expending their own funds, with the exception of requests for financial assistance at a requestors primary residence, or requests for financial assistance for an Unregulated Heating Oil Tank at a location owned by a 501 (c) 3 Non-Profit Organization.</p> <p>Applicant must own less that 10 USTs in state.</p>	None since 2009	Current requests for funding exceed available funding. Requests for funding are prioritized for regulated UST facilities and Petroleum UST discharges that pose a threat to Human Health and the Environment. Unregulated UST requests for financial assistance are not reviewed for a period of 1-2 years as these requests for funding are prioritized based on actual available funds.	Number of sites that are remediated.
New Mexico*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget</li> <li>require competitive bidding (tank owner)</li> <li>require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner)</li> <li>require use of fee schedule</li> <li>use pay-for-performance</li> <li>prioritize claims to conserve funds</li> <li>certify contractors</li> <li>cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</li> </ul>	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*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>prioritize claims to conserve funds</li> </ul>	None related to USTs	Fund is 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 Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
North Carolina	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget use of fee schedule 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 require competitive bidding (tank owner) for items exceeding \$5,000 require prioritize	Commercial Fund continuation review by legislature determine current funding mechanism appropriate; Noncommercial claims no longer accepted after 6/30/16	Comm - Active & Solvent Noncomm - Terminated 12/31/16 (final liabilities transferred to Commercial Fund for payment)	Reduction in number of open release incidents and backlog
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	None	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, if any, and interest income. 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 Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
Pennsylvania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget</li> <li>limit overhead paid</li> <li>use pay-for-performance</li> <li>employ a third-party administrator</li> <li>cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</li> <li>cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure</li> </ul>	<p>Allocations to the Pa DEP are scheduled to sunset on June 30, 2017 unless it is reestablished by the General Assembly</p>	<p>Fund is financially viable and processes claims as they are submitted and confirmed for eligibility.</p>	<p>Performance Survey is conducted every 5 years by the Underground Storage Tank Indemnification Board who review and make recommendations for continuation or termination of the Fund to the General Assembly. The survey will be conducted in 2017. We do not have to prioritize payments. Sufficient funds available to process claims.</p>
Rhode Island		<p>Proposed edits would allow for the Department to access the Fund and directly manage and pay for the remediation efforts when a responsible party has a documented financial inability to comply with the ordered work. Additional changes also would allow for a sliding deductible up to \$20,000.</p>	<p>The RI UST Fund disburses quarterly and is currently up to date on payment of claims.</p>	<p>Ability to continue to pay its claims</p>
South Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use standard forms for site assessment and corrective action plans</li> <li>require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget</li> <li>require competitive bidding (tank owner)</li> <li>require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner)</li> <li>require use of fee schedule</li> <li>use pay-for-performance</li> <li>prioritize claims to conserve funds</li> <li>certify contractors</li> <li>cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</li> <li>cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure</li> </ul>	<p>none</p>	<p>2015 increase in tank fees generated \$4.8 million in cleanup funds (2016 calendar year).</p>	<p>EPA Annual Soundness Snapshot and Assessment of the SC State Fund/Yearly legislative review by SUPERB Advisory Committee</p>
South Dakota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget</li> <li>require competitive bidding (state as agent of owner)</li> <li>require use of fee schedule</li> <li>cover cleanups based on site-specific risk-based end points</li> <li>cover long-term monitoring/maintenance of engineering controls following risk-based closure</li> </ul>		<p>The PRCF is able to pay all claims in a timely manner and has sufficient revenue to handle future claims.</p>	<p>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.</p>

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

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	Effective July 1, 2015 the State Fund cap was raised to \$2,000,000 per covered release.	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 of contractor submittals.
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	Surcharge increased from 0.5 to 0.65 cents per gallon. Rebates of up to 40% for UST facilities that upgrade their USTs to reduce risk of leaking into the environment. 10-year, 0% interest loans available to UST owner/operators to upgrade their USTs. Annual tank fund fee changed to \$150 if facility throughput is greater than 70,000 gallons and \$450 if facility throughput is 70,000 gallons or less.	Positive cash balance.	Positive cash balance and NFAs.

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
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	None	For 2016 the Fund ended with a positive balance, with the motor fuel account in excellent shape in spite of additional financial pressure from a 1/1/18 single-wall combination tank deadline. The heating fuel account continued to run an annual deficit, this time pulling the overall account balance into the red. This was remedied, as done in the past, by transferring money between accounts (i.e., motor fuel account to heating fuel account). New rules requiring inspections of all ASTs (including homeowner tanks) went into effect 8/15/17. The rules are expected to reduce the number of releases and help stabilize the heating oil account	Solvent fund. Able to pay claims in a timely manner. Good working relationship with our stakeholders.
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	No new or recent legislative activity.	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 require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget limit overhead paid	Loan and Grant Program	Tax extended until 2030.	Time to claim closure; Claim cost

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
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	None	Fee extended until 2030.	Claim processing time; Average cleanup cost; Time to claim closure

TABLE 4. Cost Control Measures/State Fund Updates 2016

State	Cost Control Measures	New or Proposed Legislative Changes	Current Status of Fund	How is Success Measured
West Virginia <sup>2</sup>			Fund is no longer active.	
Wisconsin*	require pre-approval of cleanup plans and/or budget require competitive bidding (tank owner) require use of fee schedule certify contractors	These changes have been adopted: No new claimants allowed into the program as of 7/20/2015. All claims must be submitted within 6 months of incurring costs. Program will sunset and all claims must be submitted by 6/30/2020	Sufficient funding until 2020.	# of sites closed
Wyoming	require competitive bidding; professional services selection process; prequalify contractors and consultants	Fund balance in excess of \$5 million may be used for landfill cleanup at the Director's discretion beginning in FY19.	Fund is used to pay for cleanups based on priority. Third-party affected sites are also cleaned up using the fund.	# of sites reaching MCLs in groundwater and are closed

\* No updated response received for 2016 survey

<sup>1</sup>MI 2015 Update: Data provided is for new Fund created on December 30, 2014.

<sup>2</sup>WV: No change of information for WV. WV does not have a state fund - the state insurance fund expended all remaining funds in 2003

**Additional Information:**

Washington, DC does not have a reimbursable state fund program, all RPs must comply with corrective action requirements through other FR mechanisms, usually private/self insurance. DOEE can administer state lead cleanup using LUST Trust Funds for emergency response and pursue cost recovery from the RPs.

**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