MDE-SERV Meeting





Table 1: WMA Staffing as of July 21, 2016(continue on next slide)

	Total Number of Budgeted Positions	Number of Current Vacancies	Number of Vacancies Approved for Filling	Number of Overdue End-Cycle PEPs as of July 21, 2016
Director's Office	15 ¹	0	0	0
Operational Services and Administration	92	0	0	0
Compliance Program	65	6	1	0
Sediment, Stormwater and Dam Safety	31.5	2	1	8



Table 1: WMA Staffing as of July 21, 2016

	Total Number of Budgeted Positions	Number of Current Vacancies	Number of Vacancies Approved for Filling	Number of Overdue End-Cycle PEPs as of July 21, 2016
Wastewater Permits	39	5	1	1
Water Supply	46.5 ³	64	2^{5}	6
Wetlands and Waterways	55.5	5.5	2.5	0
Total	261.5	24.5	7.5	15



Table 2: Restoration Project Applications(continue on next slide)

Approval Type	CY16 Standard	TOTAL Number of Pending Applications Associated with Restoration Projects, Including All Projects Associated with TMDL and WIP Requirements	Number of Pending Applications Associated with Restoration Projects, Including All Projects Associated with TMDL and WIP Requirements, THAT ARE OVERDUE
Nontidal Wetlands and Waterway Construction	90 days for restoration projects when no public hearing requested	17	0
	8 months for minor projects	N/A	N/A
	12 months for major projects	5	0



Table 2: Restoration Project Application

Approval Type	CY16 Standard	TOTAL Number of Pending Applications Associated with Restoration Projects, Including All Projects Associated with TMDL and WIP Requirements	Number of Pending Applications Associated with Restoration Projects, Including All Projects Associated with TMDL and WIP Requirements, THAT ARE OVERDUE
Tidal Wetland Licenses and Permits	90 days for minor projects	0	0
	8 months for major projects	0	0
	11 months for major projects with a public informational hearing	0	0



Table 3: Wetlands Permit Application TurnaroundPerformance, January-June 2016 (continue on next slide)

Approval Type	CY16 Standard	Target Minimum Percentage	Number of Decisions Issued, Jan – June 2016	Number of Decisions Issued Within Standards, Jan – June 2016	Percent of Decisions Issued Within Standards, Jan – June 2016	Number of Application s Currently Pending Longer Than Standard Time
Nontidal Wetlands and Waterway Construction	90 days for restoration projects when no public hearing requested	90%	35	25	71.4%	01
	8 months for minor projects	90%	388	372	95.9%	9
	12 months for major projects	90%	34	29	85.3%	5



Table 3: Wetlands Permit Application Turnaround Performance, January – June 2016

Approval Type	CY16 Standard	Target Minimum Percentage	Number of Decisions Issued, Jan – June 2016	Number of Decisions Issued Within Standards, Jan – June 2016	Percent of Decisions Issued Within Standards, Jan – June 2016	Number of Applications Currently Pending Longer Than Standard Time
Tidal Wetland Licenses and	90 days for minor projects	100%	502	474	94.4%	34
Permits	8 months for major projects	90%	80	48	60.0%	12
	11 months for major projects with a public informational hearing	90%	1 Poplar Island/Paul S. Sarbanes Environmen tal Restoration Project	0	0%	1 Little Choptank River Oyster Restoration Project – app on hold at request of DNR



Table 4: Nontidal Wetlands Permitting Mitigation in the Past 8 Years (continue on next slide)

1	Number of permits/ authorizations that required permittee mitigation	181
2	For the number in Row 1 – Number of sites to be utilized for construction (Note: Number of Sites Constructed – for Example 5 permits could be combined into 1 construction site)	119
3	Of the number in Row $2 -$ The actual number of mitigation sites that have been constructed	64
4	Of the number in Row 3 – The actual number of mitigation sites that have been inspected	57



Table 4: Nontidal Wetlands Permitting Mitigationin the Past 8 Years

5	Of the number constructed in Row 3, number of sites for which required monitoring reports have been received and are on schedule	54
6	Of the number in Row 3, number of sites confirmed to have achieved satisfactory hydrology and vegetation (Note: Sites constructed in last 3 years – generally have not generated reports)	30
7	Of the number in Row 3, number of sites for which no reports have been received, and also no inspection has occurred (Note: Typically constructed within last one year.	3



Table 5: Nontidal Wetlands Gains and Losses,1/1/91-6/30/16

	CY91- FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
Permanent Impacts (loss)	913.60	18.36	19.80	30.75
Permittee Mitigation Required	1016.45	16.27	26.46	25.81
Programmatic Gains Through CBT	0	0	0	0
Other Programmatic Gains if Any	481.42	0	0	0
Other Gains	144.18	.10	9.18	Pending*
Net (gain)	728.45	-1.99	15.84	Pending*

*FY2016 data is still being compiled.



Table 6: Nontidal Wetlands Compensation FundActivity, FY13 – FY16

	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16
Starting Fund Balance	2,390,851.49	2,620,173.54	2,858,770.08	2,901,145.85
FY Revenue	325,375.72	293,290.48	100,918.52	223,992
FY Expenditures	96,053.67	54,693.94	58,542.75	283,848.45
Ending Fund Balance	2,620,173.54	2,858,770.08	2,901,145.85	2,841,289.40*

*Year-end balance pending any final entries at closeout.



Table 7: Chesapeake Bay Trust Wetlands Project

	Last RFP Prior to Spring 2014	Spring 2014 RFP	Spring 2015 RFP
Number of Proposals Received	5	4	4
Number of Projects Selected for Funding	0	2	2
Amount of Funds Encumbered for Selected Projects	0	\$1,070,354	\$729,646
Acres of Wetlands Restored	0	10.33 acres pending construction	26.5 acres pending construction
Acres of Wetlands Created	0	0	0
Acres of Wetlands Enhanced	0	60 acres pending construction	0



Table 8: Significant-Hazard Dams in Service in Maryland: EAP Status

		In Unknown, Poor, or Worse Condition	In Better Than Poor Condition
EAP dated 2013	3 or later on file	8	63
No EAP from 2013	Permit requires EAP	2	6
or later on file	No permit requirement	12	26



Table 9: High–Hazard Dams in Service in Maryland Without Current EAPs

	1/27/14	2/23/15	1/13/16	7/15/16	
Last EAP update was more than a year ago	NR	38		Permit requires EAP	11
				No permit requirement	30
Last EAP update was more than three years ago	31	16	15	Permit requires EAP	2
				No permit requirement	10
Last EAP update was more than five years ago, or no EAP on file	20	13	9	Permit requires EAP	2
				No permit requirement	10

NR means "not requested".



Table 10: Restoration Progress (continue on next slide)

Phase I Jurisdictions	Date Financial Assurance Plan Received	Date Last Restoration Progress Report Received	Restoration Target (acres*)	Restoration Progress (acres*)
Montgomery County	7/1/2016	7/1/2016	3,777	1,726
Baltimore County	7/13/2016	7/13/2016	6,036	1,203
Baltimore City	7/1/2016	7/1/2016	4,291	2,372
Prince George's County	6/30/2016	6/30/2016	6,105	139
Anne Arundel County	6/28/2016	6/28/2016	5,979	649

*or any measure you prefer



Table 10: Restoration Progress

Phase I Jurisdictions	Date Financial Assurance Plan Received	Date Last Restoration Progress Report Received	Restoration Target (acres*)	Restoration Progress (acres*)
Howard County	7/1/2016	7/1/2016	2,044	157
Charles County	6/29/2016	6/29/2016	1,409	223
Carroll County	6/30/2016	6/30/2016	1,344	1,123
Frederick County	6/28/2016	6/28/2016	1,013	161
Harford County	6/24/2016	6/24/2016	1,883	487
SHA	NA	NA	NA	NA

*or any measure you prefer

Ben Grumbles, Secretary

