

Table 1. Number and percent of major municipal sewage treatment facilities with numeric effluent limits for nitrogen (N) and/or phosphorus (P). This table represents the total number of individual permitted WWTFs that have nitrogen limits only, phosphorus limits only, or have limits for both pollutants. This data includes all individual, non-stormwater NPDES permitted facilities with data in ICIS as of February 2016. (This data includes EPA-issued permits and tribal permits. This data only includes limits with measuring units that are either mass-based or concentration-based. WWTFs are publicly-owned treatment works (POTWs) with the primary permit standard industrial classification ("SIC") code 4952, and where there is no SIC code, the Facility Type Indicator field is labeled "POTW.")

EPA Region	State	Universe	Limits							
			N only		P Only		Both N and P		Any (N or P or Both N and P)	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
10	AK	20	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	AL	119	19	16%	3	3%	14	12%	36	30%
6	AR	78	2	3%	9	12%	7	9%	18	23%
9	AS ⁽⁴⁾	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	AZ	48	2	4%	1	2%	3	6%	6	13%
9	CA	175	68	39%	0	0%	7	4%	75	43%
8	CO	91	12	13%	6	7%	5	5%	23	25%
1	CT ⁽²⁾	64	1	2%	13	20%	0	0%	14	22%
3	DC	2	0	0%	1	50%	0	0%	1	50%
3	DE	8	0	0%	0	0%	5	63%	5	63%
4	FL ⁽⁵⁾	94	13	14%	1	1%	51	54%	65	69%
4	GA	151	0	0%	74	49%	0	0%	74	49%
6	GM ⁽⁴⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	GU ⁽⁴⁾	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	HI	2	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
7	IA ^{(3),(6)}	96	13	14%	1	1%	0	0%	14	15%
10	ID	28	0	0%	14	50%	1	4%	15	54%
5	IL	214	0	0%	58	27%	0	0%	58	27%
5	IN	133	0	0%	58	44%	0	0%	58	44%
7	KS	45	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	KY	87	0	0%	22	25%	0	0%	22	25%
6	LA	105	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1	MA	91	1	1%	45	49%	8	9%	54	59%
3	MD	47	1	2%	1	2%	41	87%	43	91%
1	ME	61	0	0%	5	8%	0	0%	5	8%
5	MI	105	0	0%	105	100%	0	0%	105	100%
5	MN	75	0	0%	50	67%	0	0%	50	67%
7	MO	123	1	1%	8	7%	0	0%	9	7%
9	MP ⁽⁴⁾	2	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%
4	MS	65	0	0%	0	0%	16	25%	16	25%
8	MT	21	2	10%	0	0%	11	52%	13	62%
4	NC ⁽²⁾	147	1	1%	23	16%	4	3%	28	19%
8	ND ⁽³⁾	16	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%
7	NE	30	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%
1	NH	36	2	6%	14	39%	0	0%	16	44%
2	NJ ^{(3),(7)}	92	0	0%	28	30%	7	8%	35	38%
6	NM	22	2	9%	1	5%	1	5%	4	18%
9	NV	7	1	14%	1	14%	1	14%	3	43%
2	NY	211	30	14%	64	30%	5	2%	99	47%
5	OH	205	0	0%	101	49%	5	2%	106	52%
6	OK	69	3	4%	2	3%	0	0%	5	7%
10	OR	50	0	0%	4	8%	0	0%	4	8%
3	PA	291	0	0%	35	12%	109	37%	144	49%
2	PR ⁽⁴⁾	33	13	39%	1	3%	16	48%	30	91%
1	RI	19	6	32%	1	5%	5	26%	12	63%
4	SC	98	0	0%	16	16%	0	0%	16	16%
8	SD	20	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	TN	107	2	2%	1	1%	15	14%	18	17%
6	TX ⁽⁸⁾	489	3	1%	29	6%	1	0%	33	7%
8	UT	29	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%	2	7%
3	VA ⁽²⁾	92	10	11%	4	4%	40	43%	54	59%
2	VI ⁽⁴⁾	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
1	VT ⁽³⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
10	WA ⁽³⁾	48	1	2%	2	4%	0	0%	3	6%
5	WI	86	0	0%	86	100%	0	0%	86	100%
3	WV	50	3	6%	2	4%	6	12%	11	22%
8	WY ⁽³⁾	16	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total		4,420	214	5%	893	20%	386	9%	1,493	34%

Footnotes to table:

- (1) Note that all permits with limits should also have corresponding monitoring requirements for each parameter that is limited to track compliance.
- (2) These states have watershed-based permitting for multiple dischargers for nutrients. These permits/facilities may not be reflected in this table. (VA - approx. 112 WWTFs covered for N & P; NC - approx. 54 WWTF covered for N; and CT - approx. 79 facilities covered for N)
- (3) IA, ND, VT, WA, and WY did not have primary SIC codes entered into the Permit Basic Info section of ICIS for most or all of their facilities. NJ has only entered SIC codes for 46 percent of its individual permittees in ICIS.
- (4) The following territories and regions are included in these tables: American Samoa (AS), Gulf of Mexico (GM), Guam (GU), Northern Mariana Islands (MP), Puerto Rico (PR), and U.S. Virgin Islands (VI).
- (5) Upon review, this state indicated that it uses other monitoring location codes in addition to the ones used for this analysis. [FL]
- (6) Iowa is in the process of transitioning to a new NPDES database and is working to ensuring accurate transfer and migration of required data into the EPA ICIS-NPDES data system. This process is expected to be complete by summer 2017.
- (7) This state noted that its data is batch-loaded into ICIS, and therefore there are some errors based on the state's records. [NJ]
- (8) This state indicated that our data managed to capture 12 permits that are either for stormwater (MS4) or industrial facilities. [TX]

Table 2. Number and percent of non-major municipal sewage treatment facilities with numeric effluent limits for nitrogen (N) and/or phosphorus (P). Please note that at the time of this data collection from ICIS-NPDES, data for non-major facilities was not required to be entered into the system. Therefore, the data below represents what was in the system at the time of the collection, and it may not reflect the entire universe of facilities as well as limit and monitoring requirements.

EPA Region	State	Universe	Limits							
			N only		P Only		Both N and P		Any (N or P or Both N and P)	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
10	AK	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	AL	259	26	10%	11	4%	8	3%	45	17%
6	AR	311	4	1%	13	4%	3	1%	20	6%
9	AS ⁽⁴⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	AZ	57	4	7%	0	0%	4	7%	8	14%
9	CA	85	14	16%	0	0%	1	1%	15	18%
8	CO	156	9	6%	11	7%	2	1%	22	14%
1	CT ⁽²⁾	23	4	17%	10	43%	0	0%	14	61%
3	DC	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	DE	7	0	0%	1	14%	3	43%	4	57%
4	FL ⁽⁵⁾	80	12	15%	2	3%	33	41%	47	59%
4	GA	192	0	0%	31	16%	1	1%	32	17%
6	GM ⁽⁴⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	GU ⁽⁴⁾	3	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	2	67%
9	HI	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
7	IA ^{(3),(6)}	703	114	16%	1	0%	0	0%	115	16%
10	ID	90	2	2%	20	22%	2	2%	24	27%
5	IL	398	1	0%	25	6%	1	0%	27	7%
5	IN	369	0	0%	65	18%	0	0%	65	18%
7	KS	418	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%
4	KY	182	0	0%	26	14%	0	0%	26	14%
6	LA	364	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	1%
1	MA	29	1	3%	12	41%	0	0%	13	45%
3	MD	127	6	5%	7	6%	37	29%	50	39%
1	ME	71	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
5	MI	162	0	0%	130	80%	0	0%	130	80%
5	MN	287	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	2%
7	MO	1,316	2	0%	52	4%	1	0%	55	4%
9	MP ⁽⁴⁾	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	MS	292	0	0%	1	0%	16	5%	17	6%
8	MT	86	7	8%	0	0%	18	21%	25	29%
4	NC ⁽²⁾	264	0	0%	21	8%	1	0%	22	8%
8	ND ⁽³⁾	29	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
7	NE	266	7	3%	0	0%	0	0%	7	3%
1	NH	13	0	0%	8	62%	0	0%	8	62%
2	NJ ^{(3),(7)}	141	0	0%	33	23%	5	4%	38	27%
6	NM	37	1	3%	1	3%	4	11%	6	16%
9	NV	7	2	29%	0	0%	3	43%	5	71%
2	NY	388	16	4%	73	19%	1	0%	90	23%
5	OH	1,083	2	0%	113	10%	5	0%	120	11%
6	OK	201	0	0%	6	3%	0	0%	6	3%
10	OR	132	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	PA	672	0	0%	2	0%	75	11%	77	11%
2	PR ⁽⁴⁾	17	1	6%	2	12%	14	82%	17	100%
1	RI	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	SC	66	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%
8	SD	171	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%
4	TN	299	3	1%	3	1%	16	5%	22	7%
6	TX ⁽⁸⁾	1,323	2	0%	32	2%	3	0%	37	3%
8	UT	32	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	2	6%
3	VA ⁽²⁾	255	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%
2	VI ⁽⁴⁾	12	0	0%	5	42%	0	0%	5	42%
1	VT ⁽³⁾	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
10	WA ⁽³⁾	193	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	3	2%
5	WI	467	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	8	2%
3	WV	239	38	16%	1	0%	16	7%	55	23%
8	WY ⁽³⁾	57	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total		12,440	283	2%	734	6%	281	2%	1,298	10%

Footnotes to table:

- (1) Note that all permits with limits should also have corresponding monitoring requirements for each parameter that is limited to track compliance.
- (2) These states have watershed-based permitting for multiple dischargers for nutrients. These permits/facilities may not be reflected in this table. (VA - approx. 112 WWTFs covered for N & P; NC - approx. 54 WWTF covered for N; and CT - approx. 79 facilities covered for N)
- (3) IA, ND, VT, WA, and WY did not have primary SIC codes entered into the Permit Basic Info section of ICIS for most or all of their facilities. NJ has only entered SIC codes for 46 percent of its individual permittees in ICIS.
- (4) The following territories and regions are included in these tables: American Samoa (AS), Gulf of Mexico (GM), Guam (GU), Northern Mariana Islands (MP), Puerto Rico (PR), and U.S. Virgin Islands (VI).
- (5) Upon review, this state indicated that it uses other monitoring location codes in addition to the ones used for this analysis. [FL]
- (6) Iowa is in the process of transitioning to a new NPDES database and is working to ensuring accurate transfer and migration of required data into the EPA ICIS-NPDES data system. This process is expected to be complete by summer 2017.
- (7) This state noted that its data is batch-loaded into ICIS, and therefore there are some errors based on the state's records. [NJ]
- (8) This state indicated that our data managed to capture 12 permits that are either for stormwater (MS4) or industrial facilities. [TX]

Table 3. Number and percent of major municipal sewage treatment facilities with nitrogen (N) and/or phosphorus (P) monitoring requirements for monitoring only purposes or for compliance with an effluent limit. *This table represents the total number of individual permitted WWTFs that have monitoring requirements for nitrogen only, phosphorus only, or have monitoring requirements for both pollutants. This data includes all individual, non-stormwater NPDES permitted facilities with data in ICIS as of February 2016. (This data includes EPA-issued permits and tribal permits. This data only includes requirements with measuring units that are either mass-based or concentration-based. WWTFs are publicly-owned treatment works (POTWs) with the primary permit standard industrial classification ("SIC") code 4952, and where there is no SIC code, the Facility Type Indicator field is labeled "POTW.")*

EPA Region	State	Universe	Monitoring Requirements							
			N only		P Only		Both N and P		Any (N or P or Both N and P)	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
10	AK	20	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%
4	AL	119	0	0%	0	0%	119	100%	119	100%
6	AR	78	6	8%	9	12%	51	65%	66	85%
9	AS ⁽⁴⁾	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	AZ	48	0	0%	0	0%	43	90%	43	90%
9	CA	175	26	15%	2	1%	116	66%	144	82%
8	CO	91	26	29%	3	3%	5	5%	34	37%
1	CT ⁽²⁾	64	0	0%	42	66%	2	3%	44	69%
3	DC	2	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%
3	DE	8	1	13%	0	0%	4	50%	5	63%
4	FL ⁽⁵⁾	94	3	3%	8	9%	35	37%	46	49%
4	GA	151	0	0%	78	52%	43	28%	121	80%
6	GM ⁽⁴⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	GU ⁽⁴⁾	3	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	HI	2	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%
7	IA ^{(3),(6)}	96	2	2%	5	5%	51	53%	58	60%
10	ID	28	1	4%	3	11%	22	79%	26	93%
5	IL	214	27	13%	20	9%	149	70%	196	92%
5	IN	133	1	1%	75	56%	13	10%	89	67%
7	KS	45	0	0%	0	0%	45	100%	45	100%
4	KY	87	10	11%	10	11%	66	76%	86	99%
6	LA	105	0	0%	1	1%	12	11%	13	12%
1	MA	91	21	23%	18	20%	43	47%	82	90%
3	MD	47	0	0%	0	0%	47	100%	47	100%
1	ME	61	0	0%	14	23%	0	0%	14	23%
5	MI	105	0	0%	20	19%	0	0%	20	19%
5	MN	75	15	20%	9	12%	50	67%	74	99%
7	MO	123	3	2%	1	1%	30	24%	34	28%
9	MP ⁽⁴⁾	2	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	MS	65	0	0%	0	0%	61	94%	61	94%
8	MT	21	1	5%	0	0%	20	95%	21	100%
4	NC ⁽²⁾	147	24	16%	0	0%	106	72%	130	88%
8	ND ⁽³⁾	16	0	0%	0	0%	8	50%	8	50%
7	NE	30	0	0%	0	0%	24	80%	24	80%
1	NH	36	6	17%	15	42%	2	6%	23	64%
2	NJ ^{(3),(7)}	92	2	2%	17	18%	44	48%	63	68%
6	NM	22	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%	3	14%
9	NV	7	1	14%	0	0%	6	86%	7	100%
2	NY	211	83	39%	8	4%	90	43%	181	86%
5	OH	205	79	39%	1	0%	120	59%	200	98%
6	OK	69	2	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3	4%
10	OR	50	2	4%	0	0%	26	52%	28	56%
3	PA	291	12	4%	8	3%	196	67%	216	74%
2	PR ⁽⁴⁾	33	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	5	15%
1	RI	19	10	53%	0	0%	9	47%	19	100%
4	SC	98	18	18%	3	3%	56	57%	77	79%
8	SD	20	6	30%	0	0%	5	25%	11	55%
4	TN	107	2	2%	0	0%	83	78%	85	79%
6	TX ⁽⁸⁾	489	7	1%	9	2%	6	1%	22	4%
8	UT	29	0	0%	1	3%	23	79%	24	83%
3	VA ⁽²⁾	92	12	13%	3	3%	22	24%	37	40%
2	VI ⁽⁴⁾	2	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	2	100%
1	VT ⁽³⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
10	WA ⁽³⁾	48	2	4%	1	2%	35	73%	38	79%
5	WI	86	0	0%	69	80%	17	20%	86	100%
3	WV	50	0	0%	0	0%	18	36%	18	36%
8	WY ⁽³⁾	16	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	2	13%
Total		4,420	419	9%	457	10%	1,929	44%	2,805	63%

Footnotes to table:

- (1) Note that all permits with limits should also have corresponding monitoring requirements for each parameter that is limited to track compliance.
- (2) These states have watershed-based permitting for multiple dischargers for nutrients. These permits/facilities may not be reflected in this table. (VA - approx. 112 WWTFs covered for N & P; NC - approx. 54 WWTF covered for N; and CT - approx. 79 facilities covered for N)
- (3) IA, ND, VT, WA, and WY did not have primary SIC codes entered into the Permit Basic Info section of ICIS for most or all of their facilities. NJ has only entered SIC codes for 46 percent of its individual permittees in ICIS.
- (4) The following territories and regions are included in these tables: American Samoa (AS), Gulf of Mexico (GM), Guam (GU), Northern Mariana Islands (MP), Puerto Rico (PR), and U.S. Virgin Islands (VI).
- (5) Upon review, this state indicated that it uses other monitoring location codes in addition to the ones used for this analysis. [FL]
- (6) Iowa is in the process of transitioning to a new NPDES database and is working to ensuring accurate transfer and migration of required data into the EPA ICIS-NPDES data system. This process is expected to be complete by summer 2017.
- (7) This state noted that its data is batch-loaded into ICIS, and therefore there are some errors based on the state's records. [NJ]
- (8) This state indicated that our data managed to capture 12 permits that are either for stormwater (MS4) or industrial facilities. [TX]

Table 4. Number and percent of non-major municipal sewage treatment facilities with nitrogen (N) and/or phosphorus (P) monitoring requirements for monitoring only purposes or for compliance with an effluent limit. *Please note that at the time of this data collection from ICIS-NPDES, data for non-major facilities was not required to be entered into the system. Therefore, the data below represents what was in the system at the time of the collection, and it may not reflect the entire universe of facilities as well as limit and monitoring requirements.*

EPA Region	State	Universe	Monitoring Requirements							
			N only		P Only		Both N and P		Any (N or P or Both N and P)	
			#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
10	AK	7	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	AL	259	26	10%	11	4%	8	3%	45	17%
6	AR	311	4	1%	13	4%	3	1%	20	6%
9	AS ⁽⁴⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	AZ	57	4	7%	0	0%	4	7%	8	14%
9	CA	85	14	16%	0	0%	1	1%	15	18%
8	CO	156	9	6%	11	7%	2	1%	22	14%
1	CT ⁽²⁾	23	4	17%	10	43%	0	0%	14	61%
3	DC	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	DE	7	0	0%	1	14%	3	43%	4	57%
4	FL ⁽⁵⁾	80	12	15%	2	3%	33	41%	47	59%
4	GA	192	0	0%	31	16%	1	1%	32	17%
6	GM ⁽⁴⁾	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
9	GU ⁽⁴⁾	3	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	2	67%
9	HI	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
7	IA ^{(3),(6)}	703	114	16%	1	0%	0	0%	115	16%
10	ID	90	2	2%	20	22%	2	2%	24	27%
5	IL	398	1	0%	25	6%	1	0%	27	7%
5	IN	369	0	0%	65	18%	0	0%	65	18%
7	KS	418	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	0%
4	KY	182	0	0%	26	14%	0	0%	26	14%
6	LA	364	1	0%	0	0%	1	0%	2	1%
1	MA	29	1	3%	12	41%	0	0%	13	45%
3	MD	127	6	5%	7	6%	37	29%	50	39%
1	ME	71	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
5	MI	162	0	0%	130	80%	0	0%	130	80%
5	MN	287	0	0%	5	2%	0	0%	5	2%
7	MO	1,316	2	0%	52	4%	1	0%	55	4%
9	MP ⁽⁴⁾	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	MS	292	0	0%	1	0%	16	5%	17	6%
8	MT	86	7	8%	0	0%	18	21%	25	29%
4	NC ⁽²⁾	264	0	0%	21	8%	1	0%	22	8%
8	ND ⁽³⁾	29	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
7	NE	266	7	3%	0	0%	0	0%	7	3%
1	NH	13	0	0%	8	62%	0	0%	8	62%
2	NJ ^{(3),(7)}	141	0	0%	33	23%	5	4%	38	27%
6	NM	37	1	3%	1	3%	4	11%	6	16%
9	NV	7	2	29%	0	0%	3	43%	5	71%
2	NY	388	16	4%	73	19%	1	0%	90	23%
5	OH	1,083	2	0%	113	10%	5	0%	120	11%
6	OK	201	0	0%	6	3%	0	0%	6	3%
10	OR	132	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
3	PA	672	0	0%	2	0%	75	11%	77	11%
2	PR ⁽⁴⁾	17	1	6%	2	12%	14	82%	17	100%
1	RI	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
4	SC	66	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%
8	SD	171	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	2	1%
4	TN	299	3	1%	3	1%	16	5%	22	7%
6	TX ⁽⁸⁾	1,323	2	0%	32	2%	3	0%	37	3%
8	UT	32	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	2	6%
3	VA ⁽²⁾	255	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	0%
2	VI ⁽⁴⁾	12	0	0%	5	42%	0	0%	5	42%
1	VT ⁽³⁾	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
10	WA ⁽³⁾	193	1	1%	0	0%	2	1%	3	2%
5	WI	467	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%	8	2%
3	WV	239	38	16%	1	0%	16	7%	55	23%
8	WY ⁽³⁾	57	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total		12,440	283	2%	734	6%	281	2%	1,298	10%

Footnotes to table:

- (1) Note that all permits with limits should also have corresponding monitoring requirements for each parameter that is limited to track compliance.
- (2) These states have watershed-based permitting for multiple dischargers for nutrients. These permits/facilities may not be reflected in this table. (VA - approx. 112 WWTFs covered for N & P; NC - approx. 54 WWTF covered for N; and CT - approx. 79 facilities covered for
- (3) IA, ND, VT, WA, and WY did not have primary SIC codes entered into the Permit Basic Info section of ICIS for most or all of their facilities. NJ has only entered SIC codes for 46 percent of its individual permittees in ICIS.
- (4) The following territories and regions are included in these tables: American Samoa (AS), Gulf of Mexico (GM), Guam (GU), Northern Mariana Islands (MP), Puerto Rico (PR), and U.S. Virgin Islands (VI).
- (5) Upon review, this state indicated that it uses other monitoring location codes in addition to the ones used for this analysis. [FL]
- (6) Iowa is in the process of transitioning to a new NPDES database and is working to ensuring accurate transfer and migration of required data into the EPA ICIS-NPDES data system. This process is expected to be complete by summer 2017.
- (7) This state noted that its data is batch-loaded into ICIS, and therefore there are some errors based on the state's records. [NJ]
- (8) This state indicated that our data managed to capture 12 permits that are either for stormwater (MS4) or industrial facilities. [TX]