

ATTACHMENT 4



Reducing Stormwater Costs through Low Impact Development (LID) Strategies and Practices



Reducing Stormwater Costs through Low Impact Development (LID) Strategies and Practices

December 2007

EPA 841-F-07-006

Prepared under Contract No. 68-C-02-108

United States Environmental Protection Agency

Nonpoint Source Control Branch (4503T)

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20460

Available for download at www.epa.gov/nps/lid

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Contents | i |
| Tables..... | ii |
| Foreword..... | iii |
| Executive Summary | iv |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Background | 1 |
| Low Impact Development | 2 |
| Evaluations of Benefits and Costs | 6 |
| Overview of Benefits..... | 6 |
| Environmental Benefits | 7 |
| Land Value and Quality of Life Benefits..... | 8 |
| Compliance Incentives..... | 9 |
| Cost Considerations..... | 9 |
| Case Studies | 11 |
| 2nd Avenue SEA Street, Seattle, Washington..... | 12 |
| Auburn Hills Subdivision, Southwestern Wisconsin | 13 |
| Bellingham, Washington, Parking Lot Retrofits | 14 |
| Central Park Commercial Redesigns, Fredericksburg, VA (A Modeling Study)..... | 15 |
| Crown Street, Vancouver, British Columbia..... | 15 |
| Gap Creek Subdivision, Sherwood, Arkansas..... | 17 |
| Garden Valley, Pierce County, Washington (A Modeling Study) | 17 |
| Kensington Estates, Pierce County, Washington (A Modeling Study)..... | 18 |
| Laurel Springs Subdivision, Jackson, Wisconsin..... | 19 |
| Mill Creek Subdivision, Kane County, Illinois | 20 |
| Poplar Street Apartments, Aberdeen, North Carolina | 21 |
| Portland Downspout Disconnection Program, Portland, Oregon..... | 21 |
| Prairie Crossing Subdivision, Grayslake, Illinois..... | 22 |
| Prairie Glen Subdivision, Germantown, Wisconsin..... | 23 |
| Somerset Subdivision, Prince George’s County, Maryland | 24 |
| Tellabs Corporate Campus, Naperville, Illinois | 25 |
| Toronto Green Roofs, Toronto, Ontario (A Modeling Study) | 26 |
| Conclusion | 27 |

TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1. Summary of LID Practices Employed in the Case Studies..... | 11 |
| Table 2. Summary of Cost Comparisons Between Conventional and LID Approaches | 12 |
| Table 3. Cost Comparison for 2 nd Avenue SEA Street | 13 |
| Table 4. Cost Comparison for Auburn Hills Subdivision | 14 |
| Table 5. Cost Comparison for Bellingham’s Parking Lot Rain Garden Retrofits | 14 |
| Table 6. Site Information and Cost Additions/Reductions Using LID Versus Traditional Designs..... | 15 |
| Table 7. Cost Comparison for Gap Creek Subdivision..... | 17 |
| Table 8. Cost Comparison for Garden Valley Subdivision..... | 18 |
| Table 9. Cost Comparison for Kensington Estates Subdivision | 18 |
| Table 10. Cost Comparison for Laurel Springs Subdivision | 19 |
| Table 11. Cost Comparison for Mill Creek Subdivision..... | 20 |
| Table 12. Cost Comparison for Prairie Crossing Subdivision | 22 |
| Table 13. Cost Comparison for Prairie Glen Subdivision..... | 23 |
| Table 14. Cost Comparison for Somerset Subdivision | 24 |
| Table 15. Cost Comparison for Tellabs Corporate Campus | 25 |

FOREWORD

One of the most exciting new trends in water quality management today is the movement by many cities, counties, states, and private-sector developers toward the increased use of Low Impact Development (LID) to help protect and restore water quality. LID comprises a set of approaches and practices that are designed to reduce runoff of water and pollutants from the site at which they are generated. By means of infiltration, evapotranspiration, and reuse of rainwater, LID techniques manage water and water pollutants at the source and thereby prevent or reduce the impact of development on rivers, streams, lakes, coastal waters, and ground water.

Although the increase in application of these practices is growing rapidly, data regarding both the effectiveness of these practices and their costs remain limited. This document is focused on the latter issue, and the news is good. In the vast majority of cases, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has found that implementing well-chosen LID practices saves money for developers, property owners, and communities while protecting and restoring water quality.

While this study focuses on the cost reductions and cost savings that are achievable through the use of LID practices, it is also the case that communities can experience many amenities and associated economic benefits that go beyond cost savings. These include enhanced property values, improved habitat, aesthetic amenities, and improved quality of life. This study does not monetize and consider these values in performing the cost calculations, but these economic benefits are real and significant. For that reason, EPA has included a discussion of these economic benefits in this document and provided references for interested readers to learn more about them.

Readers interested in increasing their knowledge about LID and Green Infrastructure, which encompasses LID along with other aspects of green development, should see www.epa.gov/npdes/greeninfrastructure and www.epa.gov/nps/lid. It is EPA's hope that as professionals and citizens continue to become more knowledgeable about the effectiveness and costs of LID, the use of LID practices will continue to increase at a rapid pace.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarizes 17 case studies of developments that include Low Impact Development (LID) practices and concludes that applying LID techniques can reduce project costs and improve environmental performance. In most cases, LID practices were shown to be both fiscally and environmentally beneficial to communities. In a few cases, LID project costs were higher than those for conventional stormwater management practices. However, in the vast majority of cases, significant savings were realized due to reduced costs for site grading and preparation, stormwater infrastructure, site paving, and landscaping. Total capital cost savings ranged from 15 to 80 percent when LID methods were used, with a few exceptions in which LID project costs were higher than conventional stormwater management costs.

EPA has identified several additional areas that will require further study. First, in all cases, there were benefits that this study did not monetize and did not factor into the project's bottom line. These benefits include improved aesthetics, expanded recreational opportunities, increased property values due to the desirability of the lots and their proximity to open space, increased total number of units developed, increased marketing potential, and faster sales. Second, more research is also needed to quantify the environmental benefits that can be achieved through the use of LID techniques and the costs that can be avoided. Examples of environmental benefits include reduced runoff volumes and pollutant loadings to downstream waters, and reduced incidences of combined sewer overflows. Finally, more research is needed to monetize the cost reductions that can be achieved through improved environmental performance, reductions in long-term operation and maintenance costs, and/or reductions in the life cycle costs of replacing or rehabilitating infrastructure.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Most stormwater runoff is the result of the man-made hydrologic modifications that normally accompany development. The addition of impervious surfaces, soil compaction, and tree and vegetation removal result in alterations to the movement of water through the environment. As interception, evapotranspiration, and infiltration are reduced and precipitation is converted to overland flow, these modifications affect not only the characteristics of the developed site but also the watershed in which the development is located. Stormwater has been identified as one of the leading sources of pollution for all waterbody types in the United States. Furthermore, the impacts of stormwater pollution are not static; they usually increase with more development and urbanization.

Extensive development in the United States is a relatively recent phenomenon. For the past two decades, the rate of land development across the country has been twice the rate of population growth. Approximately 25 million acres were developed between 1982 and 1997, resulting in a 34 percent increase in the amount of developed land with only a 15 percent increase in population.^{1,2} The 25 million acres developed during this 15-year period represent nearly 25 percent of the total amount of developed land in the contiguous states. The U.S. population is expected to increase by 22 percent from 2000 to 2025. If recent development trends continue, an additional 68 million acres of land will be developed during this 25-year period.³

Water quality protection strategies are often implemented at three scales: the region or large watershed area, the community or neighborhood, and the site or block. Different stormwater approaches are used at different scales to afford the greatest degree of protection to waterbodies because the influences of pollution are often found at all three scales. For example, decisions about where and how to grow are the first and perhaps most important decisions related to water quality. Growth and development can give a community the resources needed to revitalize a downtown, refurbish a main street, build new schools, and develop vibrant places to live, work, shop, and play. The environmental impacts of development, however, can pose challenges for communities striving to protect their natural resources. Development that uses land efficiently and protects undisturbed natural lands allows a community to grow and still protect its water resources.

Strategies related to these broad growth and development issues are often implemented at the regional or watershed scale. Once municipalities have determined where to grow and where to preserve, various stormwater management techniques are applied at the neighborhood or community level. These measures, such as road width requirements, often transcend specific development sites and can be applied throughout a neighborhood. Finally, site-specific stormwater strategies, such as rain gardens and infiltration areas, are incorporated within a particular development. Of course, some stormwater management strategies can be applied at several scales. For example, opportunities to maximize infiltration can occur at the neighborhood and site levels.

Many smart growth approaches can decrease the overall amount of impervious cover associated with a development's footprint. These approaches include directing development to already degraded land; using narrower roads; designing smaller parking lots; integrating retail, commercial, and residential uses; and designing more compact residential lots. These development approaches, combined with other techniques aimed at reducing the impact of development, can offer communities superior stormwater management.

Stormwater management programs have struggled to provide adequate abatement and treatment of stormwater at the current levels of development. Future development will create even greater challenges for maintaining and improving water quality in the nation's waterbodies. The past few decades of stormwater management have resulted in the current convention of control-and-treatment strategies. They are largely engineered, end-of-pipe practices that have been focused on controlling peak flow rate and suspended solids concentrations. Conventional practices, however, fail to address the widespread and cumulative hydrologic modifications within the watershed that increase stormwater volumes and runoff rates and cause excessive erosion and stream channel degradation. Existing practices also fail to adequately treat for other pollutants of concern, such as nutrients, pathogens, and metals.

LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT

Low Impact Development (LID)⁴ is a stormwater management strategy that has been adopted in many localities across the country in the past several years. It is a stormwater management approach and set of practices that can be used to reduce runoff and pollutant loadings by managing the runoff as close to its source(s) as possible. A set or system of small-scale practices, linked together on the site, is often used. LID approaches can be used to reduce the impacts of development and redevelopment activities on water resources. In the case of new development, LID is typically used to achieve or pursue the goal of maintaining or closely replicating the predevelopment hydrology of the site. In areas where development has already occurred, LID can be used as a retrofit practice to reduce runoff volumes, pollutant loadings, and the overall impacts of existing development on the affected receiving waters.

In general, implementing integrated LID practices can result in enhanced environmental performance while at the same time reducing development costs when compared to traditional stormwater management approaches. LID techniques promote the use of natural systems, which can effectively remove nutrients, pathogens, and metals from stormwater. Cost savings are typically seen in reduced infrastructure because the total volume of runoff to be managed is minimized through infiltration and evapotranspiration. By working to mimic the natural water cycle, LID practices protect downstream resources from adverse pollutant and hydrologic impacts that can degrade stream channels and harm aquatic life.

It is important to note that typical, real-world LID designs usually incorporate more than one type of practice or technique to provide integrated treatment of runoff from a site. For example, in lieu of a treatment pond serving a new subdivision, planners might incorporate a bioretention area in each yard, disconnect downspouts from driveway surfaces, remove curbs, and install grassed swales in common areas. Integrating small

practices throughout a site instead of using extended detention wet ponds to control runoff from a subdivision is the basis of the LID approach.

When conducting cost analyses of these practices, examples of projects where actual practice-by-practice costs were considered separately were found to be rare because material and labor costs are typically calculated for an entire site rather than for each element within a larger system. Similarly, it is difficult to calculate the economic benefits of individual LID practices on the basis of their effectiveness in reducing runoff volume and rates or in treating pollutants targeted for best management practice (BMP) performance monitoring.

The following is a summary of the different categories of LID practices, including a brief description and examples of each type of practice.

Conservation designs can be used to minimize the generation of runoff by preserving open space. Such designs can reduce the amount of impervious surface, which can cause increased runoff volumes. Open space can also be used to treat the increased runoff from the built environment through infiltration or evapotranspiration. For example, developers can use conservation designs to preserve important features on the site such as wetland and riparian areas, forested tracts, and areas of porous soils.

Development plans that outline the smallest site disturbance area can minimize the stripping of topsoil and compaction of subsoil that result from grading and equipment use. By preserving natural areas and not clearing and grading the entire site for housing lots, less total runoff is generated on the development parcel. Such simplistic, nonstructural methods can reduce the need to build large structural runoff controls like retention ponds and stormwater conveyance systems and thereby decrease the overall infrastructure costs of the project. Reducing the total area of impervious surface by limiting road widths, parking area, and sidewalks can also reduce the volume of runoff that must be treated. Residential developments that incorporate conservation design principles also can benefit residents and their quality of life due to increased access and proximity to communal open space, a greater sense of community, and expanded recreational opportunities.

Examples of Conservation Design

- Cluster development
- Open space preservation
- Reduced pavement widths (streets, sidewalks)
- Shared driveways
- Reduced setbacks (shorter driveways)
- Site fingerprinting during construction

Infiltration practices are engineered structures or landscape features designed to capture and infiltrate runoff. They can be used to reduce both the volume of runoff discharged from the site and the infrastructure needed to convey, treat, or control runoff. Infiltration practices can also be used to recharge ground water. This benefit is especially important in areas where maintaining drinking water supplies and stream baseflow is of special concern because of limited precipitation or a high ratio of withdrawal to recharge rates. Infiltration of runoff can also help to maintain stream temperatures because the infiltrated water that moves laterally to replenish stream baseflow typically has a lower temperature than overland flows, which might be subject

Examples of Infiltration Practices

- Infiltration basins and trenches
- Porous pavement
- Disconnected downspouts
- Rain gardens and other vegetated treatment systems

to solar radiation. Another advantage of infiltration practices is that they can be integrated into landscape features in a site-dispersed manner. This feature can result in aesthetic benefits and, in some cases, recreational opportunities; for example, some infiltration areas can be used as playing fields during dry periods.

Runoff storage practices. Impervious surfaces are a central part of the built environment, but runoff from such surfaces can be captured and stored for reuse or gradually infiltrated, evaporated, or used to irrigate plants. Using runoff storage practices has several benefits. They can reduce the volume of runoff discharged to surface waters, lower the peak flow hydrograph to protect streams from the erosive forces of high flows, irrigate landscaping, and provide aesthetic benefits such as landscape islands, tree boxes, and rain gardens. Designers can take advantage of the void space beneath paved areas like parking lots and sidewalks to provide additional storage. For example, underground vaults can be used to store runoff in both urban and rural areas.

Examples of Runoff Storage Practices

- Parking lot, street, and sidewalk storage
- Rain barrels and cisterns
- Depressional storage in landscape islands and in tree, shrub, or turf depressions
- Green roofs

Runoff conveyance practices. Large storm events can make it difficult to retain all the runoff generated on-site by using infiltration and storage practices. In these situations, conveyance systems are typically used to route excess runoff through and off the site. In LID designs, conveyance systems can be used to slow flow velocities, lengthen the runoff time of concentration, and delay peak flows that are discharged off-site. LID conveyance practices can be used as an alternative to curb-and-gutter systems, and from a water quality perspective they have advantages over conventional approaches designed to rapidly convey runoff off-site and alleviate on-site flooding. LID conveyance practices often have rough surfaces, which slow runoff and increase evaporation and settling of solids. They are typically permeable and vegetated, which promotes infiltration, filtration, and some biological uptake of pollutants. LID conveyance practices also can perform functions similar to those of conventional curbs, channels, and gutters. For example, they can be used to reduce flooding around structures by routing runoff to landscaped areas for treatment, infiltration, and evapotranspiration.

Examples of Runoff Conveyance Practices

- Eliminating curbs and gutters
- Creating grassed swales and grass-lined channels
- Roughening surfaces
- Creating long flow paths over landscaped areas
- Installing smaller culverts, pipes, and inlets
- Creating terraces and check dams

Filtration practices are used to treat runoff by filtering it through media that are designed to capture pollutants through the processes of physical filtration of solids and/or cation exchange of dissolved pollutants. Filtration practices offer many of the same benefits as infiltration, such as reductions in the volume of runoff transported off-site, ground water recharge, increased stream baseflow, and reductions in thermal impacts to receiving waters. Filtration practices also have the added advantage of providing increased pollutant removal benefits. Although pollutant build-up and removal may be of concern, pollutants are typically captured in the upper soil horizon and can be removed by replacing the topsoil.

Examples of Filtration Practices

- Bioretention/rain gardens
- Vegetated swales
- Vegetated filter strips/buffers

Low impact landscaping. Selection and distribution of plants must be carefully planned when designing a functional landscape. Aesthetics are a primary concern, but it is also important to consider long-term maintenance goals to reduce inputs of labor, water, and chemicals. Properly preparing soils and selecting species adapted to the microclimates of a site greatly increases the success of plant establishment and growth, thereby stabilizing soils and allowing for biological uptake of pollutants. Dense, healthy plant growth offers such benefits as pest resistance (reducing the need for pesticides) and improved soil infiltration from root growth. Low impact landscaping can thus reduce impervious surfaces, improve infiltration potential, and improve the aesthetic quality of the site.

Examples of Low Impact Landscaping

- Planting native, drought-tolerant plants
- Converting turf areas to shrubs and trees
- Reforestation
- Encouraging longer grass length
- Planting wildflower meadows rather than turf along medians and in open space
- Amending soil to improve infiltration

EVALUATIONS OF BENEFITS AND COSTS

To date, the focus of traditional stormwater management programs has been concentrated largely on structural engineering solutions to manage the hydraulic consequences of the increased runoff that results from development. Because of this emphasis, stormwater management has been considered primarily an engineering endeavor. Economic analyses regarding the selection of solutions that are not entirely based on pipes and ponds have not been a significant factor in management decisions. Where costs have been considered, the focus has been primarily on determining capital costs for conventional infrastructure, as well as operation and maintenance costs in dollars per square foot or dollars per pound of pollutant removed.

Little attention has been given to the benefits that can be achieved through implementing LID practices. For example, communities rarely attempt to quantify and monetize the pollution prevention benefits and avoided treatment costs that might accrue from the use of conservation designs or LID techniques. To be more specific, the benefits of using LID practices to decrease the need for combined sewer overflow (CSO) storage and conveyance systems should be factored into the economic analyses. One of the major factors preventing LID practices from receiving equal consideration in the design or selection process is the difficulty of monetizing the environmental benefits of these practices. Without good data and relative certainty that these alternatives will work and not increase risk or cost, current standards of practice are difficult to change.

This report is an effort to compare the projected or known costs of LID practices with those of conventional development approaches. At this point, monetizing the economic and environmental benefits of LID strategies is much more difficult than monetizing traditional infrastructure costs or changes in property values due to improvements in existing utilities or transportation systems. Systems of practices must be analyzed to determine net performance and monetary benefits based on the capacity of the systems to both treat for pollutants and reduce impacts through pollution prevention. For example, benefits might come in the form of reduced stream channel degradation, avoided stream restoration costs, or reduced drinking water treatment costs.

One of the chief impediments to getting useful economic data to promote more widespread use of LID techniques is the lack of a uniform baseline with which to compare the costs and benefits of LID practices against the costs of conventional stormwater treatment and control. Analyzing benefits is further complicated in cases where the environmental performance of the conservation design or LID system exceeds that of the conventional runoff management system, because such benefits are not easily monetized. The discussion below is intended to provide a general discussion of the range of economic benefits that may be provided by LID practices in a range of appropriate circumstances.

OVERVIEW OF BENEFITS

The following is a brief discussion of some of the actual and assumed benefits of LID practices. Note that environmental and ancillary benefits typically are not measured as part of development projects, nor are they measured as part of pilot or demonstration projects, because they can be difficult to isolate and quantify. Many of the benefits described below are assumed on the basis of limited studies and anecdotal evidence.

The following discussion is organized into three categories: (1) environmental benefits, which include reductions in pollutants, protection of downstream water resources, ground water recharge, reductions in pollutant treatment costs, reductions in the frequency and severity of CSOs, and habitat improvements; (2) land value benefits, which include reductions in downstream flooding and property damage, increases in real estate value, increased parcel lot yield, increased aesthetic value, and improvement of quality of life by providing open space for recreation; and (3) compliance incentives.

Environmental Benefits

Pollution abatement. LID practices can reduce both the volume of runoff and the pollutant loadings discharged into receiving waters. LID practices result in pollutant removal through settling, filtration, adsorption, and biological uptake. Reductions in pollutant loadings to receiving waters, in turn, can improve habitat for aquatic and terrestrial wildlife and enhance recreational uses. Reducing pollutant loadings can also decrease stormwater and drinking water treatment costs by decreasing the need for regional stormwater management systems and expansions in drinking water treatment systems.

Protection of downstream water resources. The use of LID practices can help to prevent or reduce hydrologic impacts on receiving waters, reduce stream channel degradation from erosion and sedimentation, improve water quality, increase water supply, and enhance the recreational and aesthetic value of our natural resources. LID practices can be used to protect water resources that are downstream in the watershed. Other potential benefits include reduced incidence of illness from contact recreation activities such as swimming and wading, more robust and safer seafood supplies, and reduced medical treatment costs.

Ground water recharge. LID practices also can be used to infiltrate runoff to recharge ground water. Growing water shortages nationwide increasingly indicate the need for water resource management strategies designed to integrate stormwater, drinking water, and wastewater programs to maximize benefits and minimize costs. Development pressures typically result in increases in the amount of impervious surface and volume of runoff. Infiltration practices can be used to replenish ground water and increase stream baseflow. Adequate baseflow to streams during dry weather is important because low ground water levels can lead to greater fluctuations in stream depth, flows, and temperatures, all of which can be detrimental to aquatic life.

Water quality improvements/reduced treatment costs. It is almost always less expensive to keep water clean than it is to clean it up. The Trust for Public Land⁵ noted Atlanta's tree cover has saved more than \$883 million by preventing the need for stormwater retention facilities. A study of 27 water suppliers conducted by the Trust for Public Land and the American Water Works Association⁶ found a direct relationship between forest cover in a watershed and water supply treatment costs. In other words, communities with higher percentages of forest cover had lower treatment costs. According to the study, approximately 50 to 55 percent of the variation in treatment costs can be explained by the percentage of forest cover in the source area. The researchers also found that for every 10 percent increase in forest cover in the source area, treatment and chemical costs decreased approximately 20 percent, up to about 60 percent forest cover.

Reduced incidence of CSOs. Many municipalities have problems with CSOs, especially in areas with aging infrastructure. Combined sewer systems discharge sanitary wastewater during storm events. LID techniques, by retaining and infiltrating runoff, reduce the frequency and amount of CSO discharges to receiving waters. Past management efforts typically have been concentrated on hard engineering approaches focused on treating the total volume of sanitary waste together with the runoff that is discharged to the combined system. Recently, communities like Portland (Oregon), Chicago, and Detroit have been experimenting with watershed approaches aimed at reducing the total volume of runoff generated that must be handled by the combined system. LID techniques have been the primary method with which they have experimented to reduce runoff. A Hudson Riverkeeper report concluded, based on a detailed technical analysis, that New York City could reduce its CSO's more cost-effectively with LID practices than with conventional, hard infrastructure CSO storage practices.⁷

Habitat improvements. Innovative stormwater management techniques like LID or conservation design can be used to improve natural resources and wildlife habitat, maintain or increase land value, or avoid expensive mitigation costs.

Land Value and Quality of Life Benefits

Reduced downstream flooding and property damage. LID practices can be used to reduce downstream flooding through the reduction of peak flows and the total amount or volume of runoff. Flood prevention reduces property damage and can reduce the initial capital costs and the operation and maintenance costs of stormwater infrastructure. Strategies designed to manage runoff on-site or as close as possible to its point of generation can reduce erosion and sediment transport as well as reduce flooding and downstream erosion. As a result, the costs for cleanups and streambank restoration can be reduced or avoided altogether. The use of LID techniques also can help protect or restore floodplains, which can be used as park space or wildlife habitat.⁸

Real estate value/property tax revenue. Homeowners and property owners are willing to pay a premium to be located next to or near aesthetically pleasing amenities like water features, open space, and trails. Some stormwater treatment systems can be beneficial to developers because they can serve as a "water" feature or other visual or recreational amenity that can be used to market the property. These designs should be visually attractive and safe for the residents and should be considered an integral part of planning the development. Various LID projects and smart growth studies have shown that people are willing to pay more for clustered homes than conventionally designed subdivisions. Clustered housing with open space appreciated at a higher rate than conventionally designed subdivisions. EPA's *Economic Benefits of Runoff Controls*⁹ describes numerous examples where developers and subsequent homeowners have received premiums for proximity to attractive stormwater management practices.

Lot yield. LID practices typically do not require the large, contiguous areas of land that are usually necessary when traditional stormwater controls like ponds are used. In cases where LID practices are incorporated on individual house lots and along roadsides as part of the landscaping, land that would normally be dedicated for a stormwater pond or other large structural control can be developed with additional housing lots.

Aesthetic value. LID techniques are usually attractive features because landscaping is an integral part of the designs. Designs that enhance a property’s aesthetics using trees, shrubs, and flowering plants that complement other landscaping features can be selected. The use of these designs may increase property values or result in faster sale of the property due to the perceived value of the “extra” landscaping.

Public spaces/quality of life/public participation. Placing water quality practices on individual lots provides opportunities to involve homeowners in stormwater management and enhances public awareness of water quality issues. An American Lives, Inc., real estate study found that 77.7 percent of potential homeowners rated natural open space as “essential” or “very important” in planned communities.¹⁰

Compliance Incentives

Regulatory compliance credits. Many states recognize the positive benefits LID techniques offer, such as reduced wetland impacts. As a result, they might offer regulatory compliance credits, streamlined or simpler permit processes, and other incentives similar to those offered for other green practices. For example, in Maryland the volume required for the permanent pool of a wet pond can be reduced if rooftop runoff is infiltrated on-site using LID practices. This procedure allows rooftop area to be subtracted from the total impervious area, thereby reducing the required size of the permanent pool. In addition, a LID project can have less of an environmental impact than a conventional project, thus requiring smaller impact fees.

COST CONSIDERATIONS

Traditional approaches to stormwater management involve conveying runoff off-site to receiving waters, to a combined sewer system, or to a regional facility that treats runoff from multiple sites. These designs typically include hard infrastructure, such as curbs, gutters, and piping. LID-based designs, in contrast, are designed to use natural drainage features or engineered swales and vegetated contours for runoff conveyance and treatment. In terms of costs, LID techniques like conservation design can reduce the amount of materials needed for paving roads and driveways and for installing curbs and gutters. Conservation designs can be used to reduce the total amount of impervious surface, which results in reduced road and driveway lengths and reduced costs. Other LID techniques, such as grassed swales, can be used to infiltrate roadway runoff and eliminate or reduce the need for curbs and gutters, thereby reducing infrastructure costs. Also, by infiltrating or evaporating runoff, LID techniques can reduce the size and cost of flood-control structures. Note that more research is needed to determine the optimal combination of LID techniques and detention practices for flood control.

It must be stated that the use of LID techniques might not always result in lower project costs. The costs might be higher because of the costs of plant material, site preparation, soil amendments, underdrains and connections to municipal stormwater systems, and increased project management.

Another factor to consider when comparing costs between traditional and LID designs is the amount of land required to implement a management practice. Land must be set aside for both traditional stormwater management practices and LID practices, but the former require the use of land *in addition to* individual lots and other community areas, whereas bioretention areas and swales can be incorporated into the landscaping of yards, in rights-

of-way along roadsides, and in or adjacent to parking lots. The land that would have been set aside for ponds or wetlands can in many cases be used for additional housing units, yielding greater profits.

Differences in maintenance requirements should also be considered when comparing costs. According to a 1999 EPA report, maintenance costs for retention basins and constructed wetlands were estimated at 3 to 6 percent of construction costs, whereas maintenance costs for swales and bioretention practices were estimated to be 5 to 7 percent of construction costs.¹¹ However, much of the maintenance for bioretention areas and swales can be accomplished as part of routine landscape maintenance and does not require specialized equipment. Wetland and pond maintenance, on the other hand, involves heavy equipment to remove accumulated sediment, oils, trash, and vegetation in forebays and open ponds.

Finally, in some circumstances LID practices can offset the costs associated with regulatory requirements for stormwater control. In urban redevelopment projects where land is not likely to be available for large stormwater management practices, developers can employ site-dispersed BMPs in sidewalk areas, in courtyards, on rooftops, in parking lots, and in other small outdoor spaces, thereby avoiding the fees that some municipalities charge when stormwater mitigation requirements cannot otherwise be met. In addition, stormwater utilities often provide credits for installing runoff management practices such as LID practices.¹²

CASE STUDIES

The case studies presented below are not an exhaustive list of LID projects nationwide. These examples were selected on the basis of the quantity and quality of economic data, quantifiable impacts, and types of LID practices used. Economic data are available for many other LID installations, but those installations often cannot be compared with conventional designs because of the unique nature of the design or the pilot status of the project. Table 1 presents a summary of the LID practices employed in each case study.

Table 1. Summary of LID Practices Employed in the Case Studies

| Name | LID Techniques | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|
| | Biore-tention | Cluster Building | Reduced Impervious Area | Swales | Permeable Pavement | Vegetated Landscaping | Wetlands | Green Roofs |
| 2 nd Avenue SEA Street | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| Auburn Hills | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Bellingham Parking Lot Retrofits | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| Central Park Commercial Redesigns | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | |
| Crown Street | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| Gap Creek | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | |
| Garden Valley | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Kensington Estates | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Laurel Springs | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| Mill Creek | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| Poplar Street Apartments | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| Portland Downspout Disconnection* | | | ✓ | | | | | |
| Prairie Crossing | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Prairie Glen | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Somerset | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | |
| Tellabs Corporate Campus | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Toronto Green Roofs | | | | | | | | ✓ |

*Although impervious area stays the same, the disconnection program reduces directly connected impervious area.

The case studies contain an analysis of development costs, which are summarized in Table 2. Note that some case study results do not lend themselves well to a traditional vs.

LID cost comparison and therefore are not included in Table 2 (as noted). *Conventional development cost* refers to costs incurred or estimated for a traditional stormwater management approach, whereas *LID cost* refers to costs incurred or estimated for using LID practices. *Cost difference* is the difference between the conventional development cost and the LID cost. *Percent difference* is the cost savings relative to the conventional development cost.

Table 2. Summary of Cost Comparisons Between Conventional and LID Approaches^a

| Project | Conventional Development Cost | LID Cost | Cost Difference ^b | Percent Difference ^b |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2 nd Avenue SEA Street | \$868,803 | \$651,548 | \$217,255 | 25% |
| Auburn Hills | \$2,360,385 | \$1,598,989 | \$761,396 | 32% |
| Bellingham City Hall | \$27,600 | \$5,600 | \$22,000 | 80% |
| Bellingham Bloedel Donovan Park | \$52,800 | \$12,800 | \$40,000 | 76% |
| Gap Creek | \$4,620,600 | \$3,942,100 | \$678,500 | 15% |
| Garden Valley | \$324,400 | \$260,700 | \$63,700 | 20% |
| Kensington Estates | \$765,700 | \$1,502,900 | -\$737,200 | -96% |
| Laurel Springs | \$1,654,021 | \$1,149,552 | \$504,469 | 30% |
| Mill Creek ^c | \$12,510 | \$9,099 | \$3,411 | 27% |
| Prairie Glen | \$1,004,848 | \$599,536 | \$405,312 | 40% |
| Somerset | \$2,456,843 | \$1,671,461 | \$785,382 | 32% |
| Tellabs Corporate Campus | \$3,162,160 | \$2,700,650 | \$461,510 | 15% |

^a The Central Park Commercial Redesigns, Crown Street, Poplar Street Apartments, Prairie Crossing, Portland Downspout Disconnection, and Toronto Green Roofs study results do not lend themselves to display in the format of this table.

^b Negative values denote increased cost for the LID design over conventional development costs.

^c Mill Creek costs are reported on a per-lot basis.

2ND AVENUE SEA STREET, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

The 2nd Avenue Street Edge Alternative (SEA) Street project was a pilot project undertaken by Seattle Public Utilities to redesign an entire 660-foot block with a number of LID techniques. The goals were to reduce stormwater runoff and to provide a more “livable” community. Throughout the design and construction process, Seattle Public Utilities worked collaboratively with street residents to develop the final street design.¹³



The design reduced imperviousness, included retrofits of bioswales to treat and manage stormwater, and added 100 evergreen trees and 1,100 shrubs.¹⁴ Conventional curbs and gutters were replaced with bioswales in the rights-of-way on both sides of the street, and the street width was reduced from 25 feet to 14 feet. The final constructed design reduced imperviousness by more than 18 percent. An estimate for the final total project cost was \$651,548. A significant amount of community outreach was involved, which raised the level of community acceptance. Community input is important for any project, but because this was a pilot study, much more was spent on communication and redesign than what would be spent for a typical project.

The costs for the LID retrofit were compared with the estimated costs of a conventional street retrofit (Table 3). Managing stormwater with LID techniques resulted in a cost savings of 29 percent. Also, the reduction in street width and sidewalks reduced paving costs by 49 percent.

Table 3. Cost Comparison for 2nd Avenue SEA Street ¹⁵

| Item | Conventional Development Cost | SEA Street Cost | Cost Savings* | Percent Savings* | Percent of Total Savings* |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Site preparation | \$65,084 | \$88,173 | -\$23,089 | -35% | -11% |
| Stormwater management | \$372,988 | \$264,212 | \$108,776 | 29% | 50% |
| Site paving and sidewalks | \$287,646 | \$147,368 | \$140,278 | 49% | 65% |
| Landscaping | \$78,729 | \$113,034 | -\$34,305 | -44% | -16% |
| Misc. (mobilization, etc.) | \$64,356 | \$38,761 | \$25,595 | 40% | 12% |
| Total | \$868,803 | \$651,548 | \$217,255 | -- | -- |

* Negative values denote increased cost for the LID design over conventional development costs.

The avoided cost for stormwater infrastructure and reduced cost for site paving accounted for much of the overall cost savings. The nature of the design, which included extensive use of bioswales and vegetation, contributed to the increased cost for site preparation and landscaping. Several other SEA Street projects have been completed or are under way, and cost evaluations are expected to be favorable.

For this site, the environmental performance has been even more significant than the cost savings. Hydrologic monitoring of the project indicates a 99 percent reduction in total potential surface runoff, and runoff has not been recorded at the site since December 2002, a period that included the highest-ever 24-hour recorded rainfall at Seattle-Tacoma Airport.¹⁶ The site is retaining more than the original design estimate of 0.75 inch of rain. A modeling analysis indicates that if a conventional curb-and-gutter system had been installed along 2nd Avenue instead of the SEA Street design, 98 times more stormwater would have been discharged from the site.¹⁷

AUBURN HILLS SUBDIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN WISCONSIN

Auburn Hills in southwestern Wisconsin is a residential subdivision developed with conservation design principles. Forty percent of the site is preserved as open space; this open space includes wetlands, green space and natural plantings, and walking trails. The subdivision was designed to include open swales and bioretention for stormwater management. To determine potential savings from using conservation design, the site construction costs were compared with the estimated cost of building the site as a conventional subdivision.¹⁸ Reduced stormwater management costs accounted for approximately 56 percent of the total cost savings. A cost comparison is provided in Table 4. Other savings not shown in Table 4 were realized as a result of reduced sanitary sewer, water distribution, and utility construction costs.



Table 4. Cost Comparison for Auburn Hills Subdivision¹⁹

| Item | Conventional Development Cost | Auburn Hills LID Cost | Cost Savings* | Percent Savings* | Percent of Total Savings* |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Site preparation | \$699,250 | \$533,250 | \$166,000 | 24% | 22% |
| Stormwater management | \$664,276 | \$241,497 | \$422,779 | 64% | 56% |
| Site paving and sidewalks | \$771,859 | \$584,242 | \$187,617 | 24% | 25% |
| Landscaping | \$225,000 | \$240,000 | -\$15,000 | -7% | -2% |
| Total | \$2,360,385 | \$1,598,989 | \$761,396 | — | — |

* Negative values denote increased cost for the LID design over conventional development costs.

The clustered design used in the development protected open space and reduced clearing and grading costs. Costs for paving and sidewalks were also decreased because the cluster design reduced street length and width. Stormwater savings were realized primarily through the use of vegetated swales and bioswales. These LID practices provided stormwater conveyance and treatment and also lowered the cost of conventional stormwater infrastructure. The increase in landscaping costs resulted from additional open space present on-site compared to a conventional design, as well as increased street sweeping. Overall, the subdivision’s conservation design retained more natural open space for the benefit and use of the homeowners and aided stormwater management by preserving some of the site’s natural hydrology.²⁰

BELLINGHAM, WASHINGTON, PARKING LOT RETROFITS

The City of Bellingham, Washington, retrofitted two parking lots—one at City Hall and the other at Bloedel Donovan Park—with rain gardens in lieu of installing underground vaults to manage stormwater.²¹ At City Hall, 3 parking spaces out of a total of 60 were used for the rain garden installation. The Bloedel Donovan Park retrofit involved converting to a rain garden a 550-square-foot area near a catch basin. Both installations required excavation, geotextile fabric, drain rock, soil amendments, and native plants. Flows were directed to the rain gardens by curbs. An overflow system was installed to accommodate higher flows during heavy rains.



The City compared actual rain garden costs to estimates for conventional underground vaults based on construction costs for similar projects in the area (\$12.00 per cubic foot of storage). Rain garden costs included labor, vehicle use/rental, and materials. Table 5 shows that the City Hall rain garden saved the City \$22,000, or 80 percent, over the underground vault option; the Bloedel Donovan Park installation saved \$40,000, or 76 percent.

Table 5. Cost Comparison for Bellingham’s Parking Lot Rain Garden Retrofits²²

| Project | Conventional Vault Cost | Rain Garden Cost | Cost Savings | Percent Savings |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| City Hall | \$27,600 | \$5,600 | \$22,000 | 80% |
| Bloedel Donovan Park | \$52,800 | \$12,800 | \$40,000 | 76% |

CENTRAL PARK COMMERCIAL REDESIGNS, FREDERICKSBURG, VA (A MODELING STUDY)

The Friends of the Rappahannock undertook a cost analysis involving the redesign of site plans for several stores in a large commercial development in the Fredericksburg, Virginia, area called Central Park.^{23,24} Table 6 contains a side-by-side analysis of the cost additions and reductions for each site for scenarios where LID practices (bioretention areas and swales) were incorporated into the existing, traditional site designs. In five of the six examples, the costs for the LID redesigns were higher than those for the original designs, although they never exceeded \$10,000, or 10 percent of the project. One example yielded a \$5,694 savings. The fact that these projected costs for LID were comparable to the costs for traditional designs convinced the developer to begin incorporating LID practices into future design projects.²⁵



Table 6. Site Information and Cost Additions/Reductions Using LID Versus Traditional Designs

| Name | Total BMP Area (ft ²) | Total Impervious Area Treated (ft ²) | Percent of Impervious Area Treated | Cost Additions ^a | Cost Reductions ^b | Change in Cost After Redesign |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Breezewood Station Alternative 1 | 4,800 | 64,165 | 98.4% | \$36,696 | \$34,785 | + \$1,911 |
| Breezewood Station Alternative 2 | 3,500 | 38,775 | 59.5% | \$24,449 | \$21,060 | + \$3,389 |
| Olive Garden | 1,780 | 31,900 | 59.1% | \$14,885 | \$11,065 | + \$3,790 |
| Kohl's, Best Buy, & Office Depot | 14,400 | 354,238 | 56.3% | \$89,433 | \$80,380 | + \$9,053 |
| First Virginia Bank | 1,310 | 20,994 | 97.7% | \$6,777 | \$1,148 | + \$5,629 |
| Chick-Fil-A ^c | 1,326 | 28,908 | 82.2% | \$6,846 | \$12,540 | - \$5,694 |

^a Additional costs for curb, curb blocks, storm piping, inlets, underdrains, soil, mulch, and vegetation as a result of the redesign.

^b Reduced cost for curb, storm piping, roof drain piping, and inlets as a result of the redesign.

^c Cost reduction value includes the cost of a Stormceptor unit that is not needed as part of the redesign.

CROWN STREET, VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

In 1995 the Vancouver City Council adopted a Greenways program that is focused on introducing pedestrian-friendly green space into the City to connect trails, environmental areas, and urban space. As a part of this program, the City has adopted strategies to manage stormwater runoff from roadways. Two initiatives are discussed here.



The Crown Street redevelopment project, completed in 2005, retrofitted a 1,100-foot block of traditional curb-and-gutter street with a naturalized streetscape modeled after the Seattle SEA Street design. Several LID features were incorporated into the design. The total imperviousness of the street was decreased by reducing the street width from 28 feet to 21 feet with one-

way sections of the road narrowed to 10 feet. Roadside swales that use vegetation and structural grass (grass supported by a grid and soil structure that prevents soil compaction and root damage) were installed to collect and treat stormwater through infiltration.²⁶

Modeling predicts that the redesigned street will retain 90 percent of the annual rainfall volume on-site; the remaining 10 percent of runoff will be treated by the system of vegetated swales before discharging.^{27,28} The City chose to use the LID design because stormwater runoff from Crown Street flows into the last two salmon-bearing creeks in Vancouver.²⁹ Monitoring until 2010 will assess the quality of stormwater runoff and compare it with both the modeling projections and the runoff from a nearby curb-and-gutter street.

The cost of construction for the Crown Street redevelopment was \$707,000. Of this, \$311,000 was attributed to the cost of consultant fees and aesthetic design features, which were included in the project because it was the first of its kind in Vancouver. These added costs would not be a part of future projects. Discounting the extra costs, the \$396,000 construction cost is 9 percent higher than the estimated \$364,000 conventional curb-and-gutter design cost.³⁰ The City has concluded that retrofitting streets that have an existing conventional stormwater system with naturalized designs will cost marginally more than making curb-and-gutter improvements, but installing naturalized street designs in new developments will be less expensive than installing conventional drainage systems.^{31,32}

One goal of Vancouver's Greenways program is to make transportation corridors more pedestrian-friendly. A method used to achieve this goal is to extend curbs at intersections out into the street to lessen the crossing distance and improve the line of sight for pedestrians. When this initiative began, the City relocated stormwater catch basins that would have been enclosed within the extended curb. Now, at certain intersections, the City uses the new space behind the curb to install "infiltration bulges" to collect and infiltrate roadway runoff. The infiltration bulges are constructed of permeable soils and vegetation. (The City of Portland, Oregon, has installed similar systems, which they call "vegetated curb extensions.") The catch basins are left in place, and any stormwater that does not infiltrate into the soil overflows into the storm drain system.³³

The infiltration bulges have resulted in savings for the City. Because the stormwater infiltration bulges are installed in conjunction with planned roadway improvements, the only additional costs associated with the stormwater project are the costs of a steel curb insert to allow stormwater to enter the bulge and additional soil excavation costs. These additional costs are more than offset by the \$2,400 to \$4,000 cost that would have been required to relocate the catch basins. To date, the City has installed nine infiltration bulges, three of which are maintained by local volunteers as part of a Green Streets program in which local residents adopt city green space.³⁴

GAP CREEK SUBDIVISION, SHERWOOD, ARKANSAS

Gap Creek’s original subdivision plan was revised to include LID concepts. The revised design increased open space from the originally planned 1.5 acres to 23.5 acres. Natural drainage areas were preserved and buffered by greenbelts. Traffic-calming circles were used, allowing the developer to reduce street widths from 36 to 27 feet. In addition, trees were kept close to the curb line. These design techniques allowed the development of 17 additional lots.



The lots sold for \$3,000 more and cost \$4,800 less to develop than comparable conventional lots. A cost comparison is provided in Table 7. For the entire development, the combination of cost savings and lot premiums resulted in an additional profit to the developer of \$2.2 million.^{35,36}

Table 7. Cost Comparison for Gap Creek Subdivision³⁷

| Total Cost of Conventional Design | Gap Creek LID Cost | Cost Savings | Percent Savings | Savings per Lot |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| \$4,620,600 | \$3,942,100 | \$678,500 | 15% | \$4,800 |

GARDEN VALLEY, PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON (A MODELING STUDY)

The Garden Valley subdivision is a 9.7-acre site in Pierce County, Washington. A large wetland on the eastern portion of the site and a 100-foot buffer account for 43 percent of the site area. Designers evaluated a scenario in which roadway widths were reduced and conventional stormwater management practices were replaced with swales, bioretention, and soil amendments. The use of these LID elements would have allowed the cost for stormwater management on the site to be reduced by 72 percent. A cost comparison is provided in Table 8.³⁸ Other costs expected with the LID design were a \$900 initial cost for homeowner education with \$170 required annually thereafter. Annual maintenance costs for the LID design (not included above) were expected to be \$600 more than those for the conventional design, but a \$3,000 annual savings in the stormwater utility bill was expected to more than offset higher maintenance costs.



Table 8. Cost Comparison for Garden Valley Subdivision³⁹

| Item | Conventional Development Cost | Garden Valley LID Cost | Cost Savings* | Percent Savings* |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Stormwater management | \$214,000 | \$59,800 | \$154,200 | 72% |
| Site paving | \$110,400 | \$200,900 | -\$90,500 | -82% |
| Total | \$324,400 | \$260,700 | \$63,700 | — |

* Negative values denote increased cost for the LID design over conventional development costs.

The design incorporated the use of narrower roadways coupled with Grasscrete parking along the roadside, which increased the overall site paving costs. However, this added cost was more than offset by the savings realized by employing LID for stormwater management. The LID practices were expected to increase infiltration and reduce stormwater discharge rates, which can improve the health and quality of receiving streams.

KENSINGTON ESTATES, PIERCE COUNTY, WASHINGTON (A MODELING STUDY)



A study was undertaken to evaluate the use of LID techniques at the Kensington Estates subdivision, a proposed 24-acre development consisting of single-family homes on 103 lots. The study assumed that conventional stormwater management practices would be replaced entirely by LID techniques, including reduced imperviousness, soil amendments, and bioretention areas. The design dictated that directly connected impervious areas on-site were to be minimized. Three wetlands and an open space tract would treat stormwater discharging from LID installations. Open space buffers were included in the design. The LID proposal also included rooftop rainwater collection systems on each house.^{40,41}

The proposed LID design reduced effective impervious area from 30 percent in the conventional design to approximately 7 percent, and it was approximately twice as expensive as the traditional design. A cost comparison is provided in Table 9.

Table 9. Cost Comparison for Kensington Estates Subdivision⁴²

| Item | Conventional Development Cost | Kensington Estate LID Cost | Additional Cost |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Stormwater management | \$243,400 | \$925,400 | \$ 682,000 |
| Site paving | \$522,300 | \$577,500 | \$55,200 |
| Total | \$765,700 | \$1,502,900 | \$737,200 |

Although the study assumed that roadways in the LID design would be narrower than those in the conventional design, site paving costs increased because the LID design assumed that Grasscrete parking would be included along the roadside to allow infiltration. The use of Grasscrete increased the overall site paving costs.

The avoidance of conventional stormwater infrastructure with the use of LID afforded significant cost savings. The LID measures eliminated the need for a detention pond and made more lots available for development. The significant cost for the rooftop rainwater collection systems was assumed to be offset somewhat by savings on stormwater utility bills.⁴³

The study also anticipated that the use of LID would reduce stormwater peak flow discharge rates and soil erosion. Furthermore, greater on-site infiltration increases ground water recharge, resulting in increased natural baseflows in streams and a reduction in dry channels. Proposed clustering of buildings would allow wetlands and open space to be preserved and create a more walkable community. The reduced road widths were anticipated to decrease traffic speeds and accident rates.

LAUREL SPRINGS SUBDIVISION, JACKSON, WISCONSIN

The Laurel Springs subdivision in Jackson, Wisconsin, is a residential subdivision that was developed as a conservation design community. The use of cluster design helped to preserve open space and minimize grading and paving. The use of bioretention and vegetated swales lowered the costs for stormwater management.



The costs of using conservation design to develop the subdivision were compared with the estimated cost of developing the site with conventional practices (Table 10).⁴⁴ The total savings realized with conservation design were just over \$504,469, or approximately 30 percent of the estimated conventional construction cost. Savings from stormwater management accounted for 60 percent of the total cost savings. Other project savings were realized with reduced sanitary sewer, water distribution, and utility construction costs.

Table 10. Cost Comparison for Laurel Springs Subdivision⁴⁵

| Item | Conventional Development Cost | Laurel Springs LID Cost | Cost Savings | Percent Savings | Percent of Total Savings |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Site preparation | \$441,600 | \$342,000 | \$99,600 | 23% | 20% |
| Stormwater management | \$439,956 | \$136,797 | \$303,159 | 69% | 60% |
| Site paving and sidewalks | \$607,465 | \$515,755 | \$91,710 | 15% | 18% |
| Landscaping | \$165,000 | \$155,000 | \$10,000 | 6% | 2% |
| Total | \$1,654,021 | \$1,149,552 | \$504,469 | — | — |

In addition to preserving open space and reducing the overall amount of clearing and grading, the cluster design also reduced street lengths and widths, thereby lowering costs for paving and sidewalks. Vegetated swales and bioswales largely were used to replace conventional stormwater infrastructure and led to significant savings. Each of these factors helped to contribute to a more hydrologically functional site that reduced the total amount of stormwater volume and managed stormwater through natural processes.

MILL CREEK SUBDIVISION, KANE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

The Mill Creek subdivision is a 1,500-acre, mixed-use community built as a conservation design development. Approximately 40 percent of the site is identified as open space; adjacent land use is mostly agricultural. The subdivision was built using cluster development. It uses open swales for stormwater conveyance and treatment, and it has a lower percentage of impervious surface than conventional developments. An economic analysis compared the development cost for 40 acres of Mill Creek with the development costs of 30 acres of a conventional development with similar building density and location.⁴⁶



When compared with the conventional development, the conservation site design techniques used at Mill Creek saved approximately \$3,411 per lot. Nearly 70 percent of these savings resulted from reduced costs for stormwater management, and 28 percent of the savings were found in reduced costs for site preparation. A cost comparison is provided in Table 11. Other savings not included in the table were realized with reduced construction costs for sanitary sewers and water distribution.

Table 11. Cost Comparison for Mill Creek Subdivision⁴⁷

| Item | Conventional Development Cost per Lot | Mill Creek LID Cost per Lot | Cost Savings per Lot | Percent Savings per Lot | Percent of Total Savings |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Site preparation | \$2,045 | \$1,086 | \$959 | 47% | 28% |
| Stormwater management | \$4,535 | \$2,204 | \$2,331 | 51% | 68% |
| Site paving and sidewalks | \$5,930 | \$5,809 | \$121 | 2% | 4% |
| Total | \$12,510 | \$9,099 | \$3,411 | — | — |

The use of cluster development and open space preservation on the site decreased site preparation costs. The majority of the cost savings were achieved by avoiding the removal and stockpiling of topsoil. In addition to cost savings from avoided soil disturbance, leaving soils intact also retains the hydrologic function of the soils and aids site stormwater management by reducing runoff volumes and improving water quality. The site's clustered design was also responsible for a decrease in costs for paving and sidewalks because the designers intentionally aimed to decrease total road length and width.

The designers used open swales as the primary means for stormwater conveyance. Coupled with other site techniques to reduce runoff volumes and discharge rates, significant savings in stormwater construction were avoided because of reduced storm sewer installation; sump pump connections; trench backfill; and catch basin, inlet, and cleanout installation.

In addition to the cost savings, the conservation design at Mill Creek had a positive effect on property values: lots adjacent to walking/biking trails include a \$3,000 premium, and lots adjacent to or with views of open space include a \$10,000 to \$17,500 premium. The

600 acres of open space on the site include 127 acres of forest preserve with quality wetlands, 195 acres of public parks, and 15 miles of walking/biking trails.⁴⁸


POPLAR STREET APARTMENTS, ABERDEEN, NORTH CAROLINA

The use of bioretention, topographical depressions, grass channels, swales, and stormwater basins at the 270-unit Poplar Street Apartment complex improved stormwater treatment and lowered construction costs. The design allowed almost all conventional underground storm drains to be eliminated from the design. The design features created longer flow paths, reduced runoff volume, and filtered pollutants from runoff. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, use of LID techniques resulted in a \$175,000 savings (72 percent).⁴⁹



PORTLAND DOWNSPOUT DISCONNECTION PROGRAM, PORTLAND, OREGON

The City of Portland, Oregon, implemented a Downspout Disconnection Program as part of its CSO elimination program. Every year, billions of gallons of stormwater mixed with sewage pour into the Willamette River and Columbia Slough through CSOs. When roof runoff flows into Portland's combined sewer system, it contributes to CSOs. The City has reduced the frequency of CSOs to the Columbia Slough and hopes to eliminate 94 percent of the overflows to the Willamette River by 2011.⁵⁰



The Downspout Disconnection Program gives homeowners, neighborhood associations, and community groups the chance to work as partners with the Bureau of Environmental Services and the Office of Neighborhood Involvement to help reduce CSOs. Residents of selected neighborhoods disconnect their downspouts from the combined sewer system and allow their roof water to drain to gardens and lawns. Residents can do the work themselves and earn \$53 per downspout, or they can have community groups and local contractors disconnect for them. Community groups earn \$13 for each downspout they disconnect. (Materials are provided by the City.)

More than 44,000 homeowners have disconnected their downspouts, removing more than 1 billion gallons of stormwater per year from the combined sewer system. The City estimates that removing the 1 billion gallons will result in a \$250 million reduction in construction costs for an underground pipe to store CSOs by reducing the capacity needed to handle the flows. The City has spent \$8.5 million so far to implement this program and will continue to encourage more homeowners and businesses to disconnect their downspouts to achieve additional CSO and water quality benefits.

PRAIRIE CROSSING SUBDIVISION, GRAYSLAKE, ILLINOIS

The Prairie Crossing subdivision is a conservation development on 678 acres, of which 470 acres is open space. The site was developed as a mixed-use community with 362 residential units and 73 acres of commercial property, along with schools, a community center, biking trails, a lakefront beach, and a farm. The site uses bioretention cells and vegetated swales to manage stormwater.⁵¹



A cost analysis was performed to compare the actual construction costs of Prairie Crossing with the estimated costs of a conventional design on the site with the same layout. Cost savings with conservation design were realized primarily in four areas: stormwater management, curb and gutter installation, site paving, and sidewalk installation. The total savings were estimated to be almost \$1.4 million, or nearly \$4,000 per lot (Table 12). Savings from stormwater management accounted for approximately 15 percent of the total savings. The cost savings shown are relative to the estimated construction cost for the items in a conventional site design based on local codes and standards.

Table 12. Cost Comparison for Prairie Crossing Subdivision⁵²

| Item | Cost Savings | Percent Savings |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Reduced Road Width | \$178,000 | 13% |
| Stormwater Management | \$210,000 | 15% |
| Decreased Sidewalks | \$648,000 | 47% |
| Reduced Curb and Gutter | \$339,000 | 25% |
| Total | \$1,375,000 | — |

Reduced costs for sidewalks accounted for nearly half of the total cost savings. This savings is attributed in part to the use of alternative materials rather than concrete for walkways in some locations. In addition, the design and layout of the site, which retained a very high percentage of open space, contributed to the cost savings realized from reducing paving, the length and number of sidewalks, and curbs and gutters. The use of alternative street edges, vegetated swales, and bioretention and the preservation of natural areas all reduced the need for and cost of conventional stormwater infrastructure.⁵³ Benefits are associated with the mixed-use aspect of the development as well: residents can easily access schools, commercial areas, recreation, and other amenities with minimal travel. Proximity to these resources can reduce traffic congestion and transportation costs. Also, mixed-use developments can foster a greater sense of community and belonging than other types of development. All of these factors tend to improve quality of life.

PRAIRIE GLEN SUBDIVISION, GERMANTOWN, WISCONSIN

The Prairie Glen subdivision is nationally recognized for its conservation design approach. A significant portion of the site (59 percent) was preserved as open space. Wetlands were constructed to manage stormwater runoff, and the open space allowed the reintroduction of native plants and wildlife habitat. The site layout incorporated hiking trails, which were designed to allow the residents to have easy access to natural areas.⁵⁴



To evaluate the cost benefits of Prairie Glen’s design, the actual construction costs were compared with the estimated costs of developing the site conventionally. When compared with conventional design, the conservation design at Prairie Glen resulted in a savings of nearly \$600,000. Savings for stormwater management accounted for 25 percent of the total savings. Table 13 provides a cost comparison. Other savings not included in the table were realized with reduced sanitary sewer, water distribution, and utility construction costs.

Table 13. Cost Comparison for Prairie Glen Subdivision⁵⁵

| Item | Conventional Development Cost | Prairie Glen LID Cost | Cost Savings* | Percent Savings* | Percent of Total Savings* |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| Site preparation | \$277,043 | \$188,785 | \$88,258 | 32% | 22% |
| Stormwater management | \$215,158 | \$114,364 | \$100,794 | 47% | 25% |
| Site paving and sidewalks | \$462,547 | \$242,707 | \$219,840 | 48% | 54% |
| Landscaping | \$50,100 | \$53,680 | -\$3,580 | -7% | -1% |
| Total | \$1,004,848 | \$599,536 | \$405,312 | — | — |

* Negative values denote increased cost for the LID design over conventional development costs.

The cluster design and preservation of a high percentage of open space resulted in a significant reduction in costs for paving and sidewalks. These reduced costs accounted for 54 percent of the cost savings for the overall site. Reduced costs for soil excavation and stockpiling were also realized. The use of open-channel drainage and bioretention minimized the need for conventional stormwater infrastructure and accounted for the bulk of the savings in stormwater management. Landscaping costs increased due to the added amount of open space on the site.

SOMERSET SUBDIVISION, PRINCE GEORGE’S COUNTY, MARYLAND



The Somerset subdivision, outside Washington, D.C., is an 80-acre site consisting of nearly 200 homes. Approximately half of the development was built using LID techniques; the other half was conventionally built using curb-and-gutter design with detention ponds for stormwater management.

Bioretention cells and vegetated swales were used in the LID portion of the site to replace conventional stormwater infrastructure. Sidewalks were also eliminated from the design. To address parking concerns, some compromises were made: because of local transportation department concern that roadside parking would damage the swales, roads were widened by 10 feet.⁵⁶ (Note that there are alternative strategies to avoid increasing impervious surface to accommodate parking, such as installing porous pavement parking lanes next to travel lanes.)

Most of the 0.25-acre lots have a 300- to 400-square-foot bioretention cell, also called a rain garden. The cost to install each cell was approximately \$500—\$150 for excavation and \$350 for plants. The total cost of bioretention cell installation in the LID portion of the site was \$100,000 (swale construction was an additional cost). The construction cost for the detention pond in the conventionally designed portion of the site was \$400,000, excluding curbs, gutters, and sidewalks.^{57,58} By eliminating the need for a stormwater pond, six additional lots could be included in the LID design. A comparison of the overall costs for the traditional and LID portions of the site is shown in Table 14.


Table 14. Cost Comparison for Somerset Subdivision

| Conventional Development Cost | Somerset LID Cost | Cost Savings | Percent Savings | Savings per Lot |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| \$2,456,843 | \$1,671,461 | \$785,382 | 32% | \$4,000 |

In terms of environmental performance, the LID portion of the subdivision performed better than the conventional portion.⁵⁹ A paired watershed study compared the runoff between the two portions of the site, and monitoring indicated that the average annual runoff volume from the LID watershed was approximately 20 percent less than that from the conventional watershed. The number of runoff-producing rain events in the LID watershed also decreased by 20 percent. Concentrations of copper were 36 percent lower; lead, 21 percent lower; and zinc, 37 percent lower in LID watershed runoff than in conventional watershed runoff. The homeowners’ response to the bioretention cells was positive; many perceived the management practices as a free landscaped area.

TELLABS CORPORATE CAMPUS, NAPERVILLE, ILLINOIS

The Tellabs corporate campus is a 55-acre site with more than 330,000 square feet of office space. After reviewing preliminary planning materials that compared the costs of conventional and conservation design, the company chose to develop the site with conservation design approaches. Because the planning process included estimating costs for the two development approaches, this particular site provides good information on commercial/industrial use of LID.⁶⁰



Development of the site included preserving trees and some of the site's natural features and topography. For stormwater management, the site uses bioswales, as well as other infiltration techniques, in parking lots and other locations. The use of LID techniques for stormwater management accounted for 14 percent of the total cost savings for the project. A cost comparison is provided in Table 15. Other cost savings not shown in Table 15 were realized with reduced construction contingency costs, although design contingency costs were higher.

Table 15. Cost Comparison for Tellabs Corporate Campus⁶¹

| Item | Conventional Development Cost | Tellabs LID Cost | Cost Savings | Percent Savings | Percent of Total Savings |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Site preparation | \$2,178,500 | \$1,966,000 | \$212,500 | 10% | 46% |
| Stormwater management | \$480,910 | \$418,000 | \$62,910 | 13% | 14% |
| Landscape development | \$502,750 | \$316,650 | \$186,100 | 37% | 40% |
| Total | \$3,162,160 | \$2,700,650 | \$461,510 | — | — |

Savings in site preparation and landscaping had the greatest impact on costs. Because natural drainage pathways and topography were maintained to the greatest extent possible, grading and earthwork were minimized; 6 fewer acres were disturbed using the conservation design approach. Landscaping at the site maximized natural areas and restored native prairies and wetland areas. The naturalized landscape eliminated the need for irrigation systems and lowered maintenance costs when compared to turf grass, which requires mowing and regular care. In the end, the conservation approach preserved trees and open space and provided a half acre of wetland mitigation. The bioswales used for stormwater management complemented the naturalized areas and allowed the site to function as a whole; engineered stormwater techniques augmented the benefits of the native areas and wetlands.⁶²

TORONTO GREEN ROOFS, TORONTO, ONTARIO (A MODELING STUDY)

Toronto is home to more than 100 green roofs. To evaluate the benefits of greatly expanded use of green roofs in the city, a study was conducted using a geographic information system to model the effects of installing green roofs on all flat roofs larger than 3,750 square feet. (The model assumed that each green roof would cover at least 75 percent of the roof area.) If the modeling scenario were implemented, 12,000 acres of green roofs (8 percent of the City's land area) would be installed.⁶³ The study quantified five primary benefits from introducing the green roofs: (1) reduced stormwater flows into the separate storm sewer system, (2) reduced stormwater flows into the combined sewer system, (3) improved air quality, (4) mitigation of urban heat island effects, and (5) reduced energy consumption.⁶⁴



The study predicted economic benefits of nearly \$270 million in municipal capital cost savings and more than \$30 million in annual savings. Of the total savings, more than \$100 million was attributed to stormwater capital cost savings, \$40 million to CSO capital cost savings, and nearly \$650,000 to CSO annual cost savings. The cost of installing the green roofs would be largely borne by private building owners and developers; the cost to Toronto would consist of the cost of promoting and overseeing the program and would be minimal. Costs for green roof installations in Canada have averaged \$6 to \$7 per square foot. The smallest green roof included in the study, at 3,750 square feet, would cost between \$22,000 and \$27,000. The total cost to install 12,000 acres of green roofs would be \$3 billion to \$3.7 billion.^{65,66} Although the modeled total costs exceed the monetized benefits, the costs would be spread across numerous private entities.

CONCLUSION

The 17 case studies presented in this report show that LID practices can reduce project costs and improve environmental performance. In most cases, the case studies indicate that the use of LID practices can be both fiscally and environmentally beneficial to communities. As with almost all such projects, site-specific factors influence project outcomes, but in general, for projects where open space was preserved and cluster development designs were employed, infrastructure costs were lower. In some cases, initial costs might be higher because of the cost of green roofs, increased site preparation costs, or more expensive landscaping practices and plant species. However, in the vast majority of cases, significant savings were realized during the development and construction phases of the projects due to reduced costs for site grading and preparation, stormwater infrastructure, site paving, and landscaping. Total capital cost savings ranged from 15 to 80 percent when LID methods were used, with a few exceptions in which LID project costs were higher than conventional stormwater management costs.

EPA has identified several additional areas that will require further study. First, in all the cases, there were benefits that this study did not monetize and factor into the project's bottom line. These benefits include improved aesthetics, expanded recreational opportunities, increased property values due to the desirability of the lots and their proximity to open space, increased number of total units developed, the value of increased marketing potential, and faster sales.

Second, more research is also needed to quantify the environmental benefits that can be achieved through the use of LID techniques and the costs that can be avoided by using these practices. For example, substantial downstream benefits can be realized through the reduction of the peak flows, discharge volumes, and pollutant loadings discharged from the site. Downstream benefits also might include reductions in flooding and channel degradation, costs for water quality improvements, costs of habitat restoration, costs of providing CSO abatement, property damage, drinking water treatment costs, costs of maintaining/dredging navigable waterways, and administrative costs for public outreach and involvement.

Finally, additional research is needed monetize the cost reductions that can be achieved through improved environmental performance, reductions in long-term operation and maintenance costs and/or reductions in the life cycle costs of replacing or rehabilitating infrastructure.

¹ D. Beach, *Coastal Sprawl: The Effects of Urban Design on Aquatic Ecosystems in the United States* (Arlington, VA: Pew Ocean Commission, 2002).

² USDA, *Summary Report: 1997 National Resources Inventory* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 1999 [revised 2000]).

³ Beach, 2002.

⁴ The term *LID* is one of many used to describe the practices and techniques employed to provide advanced stormwater management; *green infrastructure*, *conservation design*, and *sustainable stormwater management* are other common terms. However labeled, each of the

identified practices seeks to maintain and use vegetation and open space, optimize natural hydrologic processes to reduce stormwater volumes and discharge rates, and use multiple treatment mechanisms to remove a large range of pollutants. In the context of this report, case studies ascribing to one of the above, or similar, labels were evaluated, and these terms are used interchangeably throughout the report.

⁵ Trust for Public Land, *The Economic Benefits of Open Space* (Trust for Public Land, 1999), http://www.tpl.org/tier3_cd.cfm?content_item_id=1195&folder_id=727 (accessed March 29, 2006).

⁶ Trust for Public Land and American Water Works Association. *Protecting the Source* (San Francisco, CA: Trust for Public Land, 2004).

⁷ Riverkeeper, *Sustainable Raindrops: Cleaning New York Harbor by Greening The Urban Landscape* (accessed Nov. 30, 2007).

⁸ Trust for Public Land, 1999.

⁹ USEPA, *Economic Benefits of Runoff Controls* (Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, 1995).

¹⁰ National Park Service, *Economic Impacts of Protecting Rivers, Trails, and Greenway Corridors: A Resource Book* (National Park Service, 1995), <http://www.nps.gov/pwro/rtca/econindx.htm> (accessed June 1, 2006).

¹¹ USEPA, *Preliminary Data Summary of Urban Stormwater Best Management Practices*, EPA-821-R-99-012 (Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1999), <http://www.epa.gov/OST/stormwater> (accessed March 1, 2006).

¹² Water Environment Federation, Credits Bring Economic Incentives for Onsite Stormwater Management, *Watershed & Wet Weather Technical Bulletin* (January 1999).

¹³ C. Kloss and C. Calarusse, *GI Report* (New York, NY: Natural Resources Defense Council, April 2006).

¹⁴ R.R. Horner, H. Lim, and S.J. Burges, *Hydrologic Monitoring of the Seattle Ultra-Urban Stormwater Management Projects: Summary of the 2000–2003 Water Years*, Water Resources Series: Technical Report No. 181 (Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, 2004), http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/util/stellent/groups/public/@spu/@esb/documents/webcontent/hydrologic_200406180904017.pdf. (accessed November 19, 2007).

¹⁵ J. Haugland, *Changing Cost Perceptions: An Analysis of Conservation Development* (Elmhurst, IL: Conservation Research Institute, 2005), http://www.nipc.org/environment/sustainable/conservationdesign/cost_analysis (accessed March 1, 2006).

¹⁶ Horner et al., 2004.

¹⁷ Horner et al., 2004.

¹⁸ Haugland, 2005.

¹⁹ Haugland, 2005.

²⁰ Haugland, 2005.

²¹ Puget Sound Action Team, *Reining in the Rain: A Case Study of the City of Bellingham's Use of Rain Gardens to Manage Stormwater* (Puget Sound Action Team, 2004), www.psat.wa.gov/Publications/Rain_Garden_book.pdf (accessed September 11, 2007).

-
- ²² Puget Sound Action Team, 2004.
- ²³ Friends of the Rappahannock, *Example LID Commercial Re-designs and Costs Spreadsheets for Re-designs* (Friends of the Rappahannock, 2006), <http://www.riverfriends.org/Publications/LowImpactDevelopment/tabid/86/Default.aspx>. (accessed November 19, 2007).
- ²⁴ C.S. Ingles, Stafford County Helps Pioneer Low Impact Design Movement, *Virginia Town & City* 39, no. 8 (2004).
- ²⁵ Ingles, 2004.
- ²⁶ Kloss and Calarusse, 2006.
- ²⁷ A. Steed, *Naturalized Streetscapes: A Case Study of Crown Street, Vancouver* (City of Vancouver Greenways, Vancouver, BC: City of Vancouver Greenways, no date), <http://www.sustainability.ca/Docs/Naturalized%20Streetscapes-AS.pdf?CFID=19075623&CFTOKEN=60214114> (accessed March 31, 2006).
- ²⁸ Personal communication with Otto Kauffmann, Engineering Project Coordinator, City of Vancouver Streets Division, April 2005.
- ²⁹ Scott Deveau, Street in for Crowning Touch, *The Vancouver Courier* (September 22, 2004) <http://spec.bc.ca/article/article.php?articleID=340> (accessed March 9, 2005).
- ³⁰ American dollars converted from Canadian equivalent based on April 25, 2005, exchange rate.
- ³¹ City of Vancouver, British Columbia, *Crown Street: Vancouver's First Environmentally Sustainable Street* (City of Vancouver, BC, 2005), prepared for TAC's Environmental Council, Vancouver, BC, <http://www.transportationassociation.ca/english/pdf/conf2005/s5/kauffman.pdf> (accessed November 19, 2007).
- ³² Personal communication with Otto Kauffmann, Engineering Project Coordinator, City of Vancouver Streets Division, November 2005.
- ³³ Kloss and Calarusse, 2006.
- ³⁴ Personal communication with David Yurkovich, Greenways Landscape Designer, City of Vancouver Greenways, April 2005.
- ³⁵ Haugland, 2005.
- ³⁶ HUD, *The Practice of Low Impact Development (LID)* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, 2003), <http://www.huduser.org/Publications/PDF/practLowImpctDevel.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2006).
- ³⁷ Haugland, 2005.
- ³⁸ CH2MHill, *Pierce County Low Impact Development Study—Final Report* (Belleview, WA: CH2MHill, 2001), <http://www.co.pierce.wa.us/xml/services/home/environ/water/CIP/LID/final-lid-report.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2006).
- ³⁹ CH2MHill, 2001.
- ⁴⁰ USEPA, Low-Impact Development Pays Off, *Nonpoint Source News-Notes* 75 (May 2005): 7–10, <http://www.epa.gov/owow/info/NewsNotes/issue75/75issue.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2006).
- ⁴¹ CH2MHill, 2001.
- ⁴² CH2MHill, 2001.
- ⁴³ CH2MHill, 2001.
-

-
- ⁴⁴ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁴⁵ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁴⁶ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁴⁷ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁴⁸ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁴⁹ HUD, 2003.
- ⁵⁰ Portland Bureau of Environmental Services, *Downspout Disconnection Program* (Portland, OR: Portland Bureau of Environmental Services, 2006), <http://www.portlandonline.com/bes/index.cfm?c=31246> (accessed March 31, 2006).
- ⁵¹ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁵² Haugland, 2005.
- ⁵³ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁵⁴ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁵⁵ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁵⁶ USEPA, Maryland Developer Grows “Rain Gardens” to Control Residential Runoff, *Nonpoint Source News-Notes* 42 (August/September 1995), <http://www.epa.gov/owow/info/NewsNotes/pdf/42issue.pdf> (accessed March 1, 2006).
- ⁵⁷ USEPA, 2005.
- ⁵⁸ HUD, 2003.
- ⁵⁹ USEPA, 2005.
- ⁶⁰ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁶¹ Haugland, 2005.
- ⁶² Haugland, 2005.
- ⁶³ D. Banting, H. Doshi, J. Li, P. Missios, A. Au, B.A. Currie, and M. Verrati, *Report on the Environmental Benefits and Costs of Green Roof Technology for the City of Toronto* (Toronto, ON: City of Toronto and Ontario Centres of Excellence—Earth and Environmental Technologies, 2005), <http://www.toronto.ca/greenroofs/pdf/fullreport103105.pdf> (accessed December 16, 2005).
- ⁶⁴ Kloss and Calarusse, 2006.
- ⁶⁵ American dollars converted from Canadian equivalent based on December 19, 2005, exchange rate.
- ⁶⁶ Banting et al., 2005.