#### BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment Join by phone

(US) +1 407-986-6994 PIN: 429 101 290# And Keep Your Phone Muted Unless Speaking July 15, 2021 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

## **Meeting Agenda**

- Introduction Chris Murphy, Acting Committee Chairman
- Approve previous meeting minutes Chris Murphy, Acting Committee Chairman
- Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation Walid Saffouri, MDE
- Update on the O&M Grants Walid Saffouri, MDE
- Update on Cover Crops Activities Jason Keppler, MDA
- Update on Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems (OSDS) Jeff Fretwell, MDE
- Update on BRF Fee Collection and Budget Jeff Fretwell, MDE
- Next meetings and other administrative issues to be discussed with the committee Chris Murphy, Acting Committee Chairman
- 2021 Pre-Scheduled Meetings: Thursday October 14, 2021
- ADJOURNMENT

#### BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment Virtual Meeting April 15, 2021

## **Meeting Minutes**

#### **Welcome/Introduction**

- The meeting was opened by Mr. Chris Murphy, Acting Chairman of the Bay Restoration Fund Advisory Committee.
- Mr. Murphy welcomed the committee members and other attendees.

#### **Review of Meeting Minutes**

- Previous meeting minutes from the January 14, 2021 meeting were shared with the committee members for their review and comments. An electronic copy of the meeting minutes was also emailed to the committee members prior to the meeting.
- Mr. Murphy asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or a motion to approve. The minutes were approved and they will be posted on the web.

#### **Discussion**

#### I. Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation:

- Mr. Saffouri provided an update on major WWTPs. There has been no change in status of the projects. Currently, there are only two WWTPs under construction and one is in planning. All the three projects are progressing without any issues.
- As for minor plants, Union Bridge and New Windsor were selected for funding and they have signed the funding agreement to proceed with the planning phase. Valley Proteins was also selected, but it has not signed the agreement.
- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on Valley Proteins funding status. The Department received an application from Valley Proteins to upgrade their wastewater treatment plant to ENR during last year solicitation cycle. The project ranked fifth on the priority list based on the nitrogen load reductions and cost effectiveness. The project was included on Governor's proposed capital

budget to be funded at 100% of the eligible ENR cost, which was estimated at \$12,786,000. The General Assembly subsequently reduced the funding for the project to \$7,675,000. Also, the law was changed to limit BRF funding for all privately owned wastewater treatment plants to be at 50% of the eligible costs instead of the current 100 percent.

- Mr. Murphy asked when does the law change goes into effect. Mr. Fretwell responded that it is a budget-related item so it would be effective on July 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Mr. Ball stated that based on a newspaper article, Valley Proteins is planning to expand its operations, which would require the expansion of the WWTP to support the operational expansion. So, we should know all the facts before we can move forward. While we should support the nitrogen and phosphorus reductions, we shouldn't encourage the expansion. Mr. Ball added that it may be reasonable to limit the funding to 50%. Mr. Saffouri responded that we will have a better idea about what the plans are when they submit the preliminary engineering report for our review. If the WWTP upgrade includes expansion, we will make sure through our eligibility determination that the expansion portion of the project is not funded by the grants.
- Mr. Gray asked about the status of the new discharge permit for Valley Proteins. Their current permit expired in 2006, but it will remain in effect until the new permit is processed. Mr. Saffouri responded that he did not know the status. No one else offered any other response.
- Mr. Ball asked whether the current permit requires ENR level of treatment. Mr. Saffouri responded no, the current permit does not have ENR limits. So ENR limits should be added to the new permit if the WWTP receives BRF funding for the upgrade. In addition, the WWTP will need to achieve nutrient reductions beyond the current permit and TMDL to make the project cost effective in \$ per pound reduced. The cost effectiveness guidelines are available on WQFA's website.

#### **II.** Update on Cover Crops Activities:

• Mr. Keppler provided an update on the Cover Crops Program. MDA has received close to 1,600 applications for 640,000 acres. We were able to approve 1,517 of those applications for 634,000 acres. Ultimately, 1,350 farmers (applicants) were able to plant 433,000 acres of cover crops. We processed approximately 530 partial payments in the fall, totaling \$6.6 million. Currently, we are actively working through the spring certification process and we anticipate a full payout of close to \$22.9 million by the end of the fiscal year. So we are well on our way to meeting our Chesapeake Bay restoration WIP goals for this year.

#### III. Update on Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems (OSDS):

• Mr. Fretwell updated the committee on the Onsite Sewage Disposal System (OSDS) funding in FY21, between July 1, 2020 and April 8, 2021. Mr. Fretwell provided a handout showing that 452

BAT upgrades and 113 sewer connections that were funded to date in FY21. The number of upgrades and connections are close to the previous year counts around this time of the year.

#### IV. Update on BRF Fee Collection and Budget:

- Mr. Fretwell updated the committee on the BRF fee collection using the Comptroller's report through February 28, 2021. Mr. Fretwell advised the committee that the report showed the up to date revenues for FY21, which is roughly \$58,494,000 for the Wastewater Fund (Line 1), with \$24,167,000 collected in the most recent quarter. The grand total since the start of the program was \$1.37 billion. As for the Septic Fund (Line 2), revenues were \$21,739,000. \$13 million of that was for MDE septic upgrades, and \$8.7 million was for MDA cover crops. The grand total since the start of the program was almost \$342 million for both the septic and cover crop programs. Mr. Fretwell added that COVID-19 may impact this year's revenues, but we would not know for sure until the end of the fiscal year.
- Mr. Murphy suggested that we look at the past recession in 2008-09 to see how it impacted the BRF revenues. Mr. Fretwell reviewed the revenues for those two years in the Comptroller's Report and advised that there was no impact on the revenues during these years. Therefore, it is possible that COVID-19 may have no impact on the revenues.

## V. Update on the O&M Grant Regulations Change:

• Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the O&M grant regulations change. The committee has discussed these changes at previous BRFAC meetings. Following the committee meeting in January, MDE published the regulations change, which keeps the base grant at its current level and provides additional funding for reductions below the ENR levels of treatment. The regulations modification was published in the Maryland Register on January 29th, 2021, with 30 days of public comment, which ended on March 1, 2021. MDE received and responded to one set of comments from MAMWA. Both the comments and responses are included in the handouts. Following the publication review and full consideration of the received comments, we decided to finalize the regulation as originally published. The notice of final action should be published in the Maryland Register at either the end of April or mid-May. The changes will take effect 10 days after the notice of final action is published. This will enable MDE to use the updated methodology to award additional O&M grants to wastewater plants achieving better than ENR levels beginning with FY22. We believe this will provide additional financial support to a larger number of wastewater plants as well as provide incentive to accelerate nutrient reductions to meet the Bay TMDL 2025 deadline.

#### VI. Update on Legislative Bills:

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the legislative session this year and the passed bills that may impact the Bay Restoration Fund. House Bill 589 (Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act of 2021) has amended the Environment Article to reduce grant funding for privately owned wastewater facilities to 50% of the eligible project cost. Publicly owned wastewater facilities will continue to be funded at 100%. This change was made after a discussion was made regarding Valley Proteins, which was included in the proposed budget to receive BRF funding for its ENR upgrade.
- Mr. Murphy asked whether there is a difference in the level of funding between private residential versus commercial wastewater treatment plants. Mr. Fretwell responded that any privately owned facility will be funded at the 50% level, which may cause some hardship to some facilities serving residential users.
- House Bill 878 authorizes a county to borrow money and incur indebtedness through the issuance and sale of notes in anticipation of the receipt of the county's allocation of funds from the BRF septic fund, which provides \$15 million a year for septic upgrades and septic connections. Each county gets a certain amount of money and then administers the funding at the local level. The funds that would be generated through those notes would still have to be used to either make grants and loans to upgrade to BAT as authorized under the BRF statute. In addition, it could be used to make grants and loans to cover engineering costs and non-BAT components of septic upgrades, including drain fields or refunding prior issues of notes.
- Mr. Murphy asked whether MDE is planning to provide some guidance on what would be allowed under this legislation. Would engineering cost and interest be covered? Also, what non-BAT components will be covered? Mr. Fretwell responded that this legislation does not appear to expand the use of fund other than assisting with the projects financing. Interests will continue to be not eligible. Only the principal will be funded. Engineering and no-BAT items will continue to be covered only for low income homes. Mr. Fretwell agreed that more guidance needs to be provide. Ms. Trescott stated that MDE guidance would be very valuable to the local health departments.
- House Bill 991 (Tree Solutions Now Act of 2021) was amended in the closing days of the legislative session to establish a goal of planting and maintaining 5 million trees by the end of calendar year 2031. 500,000 of those trees are to be planted in underserved areas through the new Urban Trees Program established in the bill to be administered by the Chesapeake Bay Trust. In order to meet the tree planting goals, \$15 million in new funding is needed annually, \$2.5 million are for a per-acre sign-up bonuses for farmers to participate in MDA's CREP program, \$2.5 million for DNR tree plantings on public and private lands, and \$10 million for Chesapeake Bay Trust for the new Urban Trees Program. For FY23 only, the \$15 million in funding will be coming from a transfer out of the Bay Restoration Fund. Then for FY24 through FY31 the funding will come from the governor's annual state budget.

- Mr. Murphy asked which side of the BRF funding will the money come out of. Mr. Fretwell responded that it will be coming out of the Wastewater program. The Department will fund any cost-effective wastewater treatment plant upgrade before the funds can be transferred to this program. So it will effectively reduce the amount of money that would be available for septic connections, stormwater upgrades and CSO/SSO work in the Bay Restoration Fund-Wastewater account.
- Mr. Ball asked about the status of the bill. Mr. Fretwell responded that all the bills being presented have passed and are expected to be signed into law soon. Since the transfer for the Tree Solutions Now Act is in FY23 and not in FY22, it wouldn't impact the revenues beginning this July 1st. It would be the following July 1st when the money would be transferred.
- Mr. Ball expressed some concern that the committee was not asked for input on a bill that directly affects the fund. Mr. Murphy and Mr. Fretwell suggested that the committee can discuss in future meetings how it can be more active during the legislative session in similar manner as the Environmental Justice and Lead commissions. Mr. Myers agreed that the committee does have a role to play in reviewing proposed legislations and commenting on them. However, the committee members will need to adjust their schedules because some of the members are involved with other legislative bills and activities.
- Senate Bill 22 (On-Site Sewage Disposal Systems Inspection Licensing) repeals the current requirements related to the certification of people engaged in the business of property transfer inspections for septic systems and replaces the existing requirements with new requirements that, by July 1st, 2022, any person who engages in the business of inspecting a septic system must obtain an on-site wastewater property transfer inspection license issued by MDE. MDE has to adopt regulations and establish a license eligibility criteria. The only part of the bill that does impact the BRF is that the bill establishes an administrative penalty for violators and the penalties are deposited into the septic account of the Bay Restoration Fund.
- Ms. Trescott asked whether the revenue generated from the penalties would be deposited into a separate septic account. Mr. Fretwell responded that there are two separate accounts, BRF-Wastewater and BRF-Septic. The penalties will be deposited into the BRF-Septic and they will not be in an account separate from BRF-Septic. We currently receive approximately \$15 million a year from the septic fees. This amount will now be increased to \$15 million plus these penalties. We do not know how much more revenue these penalties will generate.
- Senate Bill 119 (Clean Water Commerce Act of 2021) reauthorizes and modifies the Clean Water Commerce Act of 2017 and it will be effective beginning in July 1, 2021 (FY22) through June 30, 2030. It requires MDE to transfer \$20 million a year from the Bay Restoration Fund-Wastewater account into the Clean Water Commerce account. The Clean Water Commerce Act funding is then used to purchase environmental outcomes that support the State's efforts to achieve the Bay TMDL and have an expected life of at least 10 years. 35% of the funding must be to procure environmental outcomes from agricultural practices (previously was not allowed), 20% must be

used to procure environmental outcomes from projects in communities disproportionately burdened by environmental harms and risks; and 10% percent is for non-agricultural landscape restoration projects. The remaining 35% could be for any other practices. Any unencumbered funds could roll over into the next year's solicitation and they would no longer be subject to the above allocation requirements. The bill also adds two new members to our Bay Restoration Fund Advisory Committee, one individual will be representing the Chesapeake Bay Commission and one representing communities disproportionately burdened by environmental harms and risks as identified by MDE in consultation with the Commission on Environmental Justice and Sustainable Communities.

- Mr. Hoffman thanked MDE for participating in the work group discussions of the bill. The purpose of the bill is to assist Maryland in achieving its portion of the 2025 TMDL. Mr. Hoffman asked that since the Department was not able to delay the start of this program to FY23 as it was able to do with the Tree Solutions Now Act, how MDE is going to handle the FY22 budget. Mr. Fretwell responded that the Department has started to discuss this issue internally. We have projects that have gone through the budgeting and the General Assembly process, and they have been approved for funding. In the meantime, we have to transfer \$20 million from the same FY22 budget to this program. So, it's definitely a fund management issue that we are still sorting through. We don't know yet for sure how to address this budget over-commitment issue. We definitely can update the committee at a future meeting.
- V. Mr. Murphy reminded the Committee members that the next meeting will be held on July 15, 2021.

#### **Materials Distributed at the Meeting**

- Meeting Agenda
- Previous Meeting Minutes
- Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status
- BRF Septic Program Funded Installations
- Program-to-Date BRF Fee Collection Report (Comptroller Report)
- MAMWA's March 1st Letter Commenting on the O&M Regulations
- MDE's April 2<sup>nd</sup> Response
- House Bill 589
- House Bill 878
- House Bill 991
- Senate Bill 22
- Senate Bill 119

#### **Attendance**

#### **Advisory Committee Members or Designees Attending:**

Chris Murphy, BRF Advisory Committee Acting Chairman
Jeff Fretwell, Maryland Department of the Environment
Walid Saffouri, Maryland Department of the Environment
Bob Buglass, Washington Suburban Sanitary District
Gabe Cohee, Department of Natural Resources
Jason Keppler, Maryland Department of Agriculture
Ellen Mussman, Maryland Department of Planning
Jason Wardrup, Maryland Department of Budget and Management
Sara L. Trescott, Conference of Local Environmental Health Directors
Doug Myers, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
William Ball, Chesapeake Research Consortium
Cheryl Lewis, Town of Oxford

#### Others in Attendance:

Mark Hoffman, Chesapeake Bay Commission Sarah Taggart, Barton & Laguidice Andrew Gray, Department of Legislative Services Hans Schmidt, Maryland Department of Agriculture

#### Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Attendees:

Rajiv Chawla Paul Emmart Nony Howell Sunita Boyle

Nathaniel Woodrow

#### **Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status**

(July 15, 2021)

#### **Major WWTPs**

#### **Status Update:**

Previous Meeting	Current
64 facilities are in operation	64 facilities are in operation
2 facilities are under construction	2 facilities are under construction
0 facilities are under design	0 facilities are under design
1 facilities are in planning	1 facilities are in planning
67 total	67 total

### **Status Changes from Previous Meeting:**

• No change in status.

## Percentage completion for facilities under construction for ENR Upgrade:

Facility	Previous Meeting Percentage Complete	Current Percentage Complete
Hampstead	94%	97%
Westminster	55%	66%

#### **Minor WWTPs**

#### **Status Update:**

Previous Meeting	Current
8 facilities are in operation	9 facilities are in operation
7 facilities are under construction	6 facilities are under construction
5 facilities are under design	6 facilities are in design
11 facilities are in planning	10 facilities are in planning
31 total	31 total

#### **Status Changes from Previous Meeting:**

- Construction was completed at Betterton WWTP.
- Elk Neck State Park progressed from planning to design.
- Town of Secretary, Lewistown, and Victor Cullen completed the design and they are in the bidding phase. They should start construction before the end of the year.

#### Percentage completion for facilities under construction for ENR Upgrade:

Facility	Previous Meeting	Current
	Percentage Complete	Percentage Complete
Oxford	99%	99%
Preston	98%	99%
Port Deposit	84%	96%
Harbour View	91%	91%
Chesapeake City	6%	19%
Smith Island	10%	10%

### BRF Septic Program Funded Installations FY21 to Date July 1, 2020- July 12, 2021

County	# Septic Systems funded FY 21	# Sewer Connections funded FY 21		
Allegany (CVI)	0	3		
Anne Arundel	181	10		
Baltimore	20	15		
Calvert	105	2		
Caroline	17	0		
Carroll	15	2		
Cecil	11	0		
Charles	19	3		
Dorchester	33	0		
Frederick (CVI)	7	0		
Garrett	2	0		
Harford	33	4		
Howard (CVI)	0	7		
Kent	21	0		
Montgomery (CVI)	8	1		
Prince George's	0	1		
Queen Anne's	60	81		
Somerset	15	0		
St. Mary's	35	1		
Talbot	24	0		
Washington (CVI)	7	0		
Wicomoco	5	0		
Worcester	6	0		
Totals	624	130		

# Comptroller of Maryland Revenue Administration Division Bay Restoration Fee - By County Program To Date Through April 30, 2021

		<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	Collection	Returns w/\$ ;	Zero \$ Returns	Expenses <u>Claimed</u>	Expenses <u>Paid</u>
100	Allegany	\$21,269,095	\$4,115,455	\$25,443,941	\$25,440,710	679.00	64.00	\$246,338	239,853
200	Anne Arundel	\$125,947,387	\$32,546,215	\$158,686,574	\$158,546,918	804.00	241.00	\$556,620	552,558
300	<b>Baltimore County</b>	\$233,313,932	\$24,618,635	\$257,948,785	\$257,969,791	562.00	145.00	\$259,871	231,365
400	Baltimore City	\$170,429,359	\$3,140,783	\$173,605,363	\$187,139,293	205.00	111.00	\$15,901	15,900
500	Calvert	\$5,555,751	\$19,997,185	\$25,596,054	\$26,260,709	532.00	36.00	\$357,901	336,461
600	Caroline	\$3,821,513	\$6,541,989	\$10,385,875	\$10,386,614	510.00	17.00	\$56,698	55,167
700	Carroll	\$15,731,838	\$33,518,641	\$49,267,564	\$49,273,105	741.00	113.00	\$516,030	247,713
800	Cecil	\$13,532,848	\$18,334,521	\$32,506,082	\$32,297,029	1436.00	129.00	\$334,423	257,515
900	Charles	\$29,297,146	\$13,428,706	\$43,006,304	\$43,006,469	1528.00	133.00	\$174,425	168,601
1000	Dorchester	\$7,130,377	\$8,374,664	\$15,613,632	\$15,616,656	461.00	105.00	\$317,804	277,287
1100	Frederick	\$48,894,493	\$21,678,600	\$70,744,339	\$70,775,348	821.00	213.00	\$2,033,154	161,420
1200	Garrett	\$3,997,311	\$5,921,451	\$9,919,149	\$9,919,262	299.00	43.00	\$95,399	95,546
1300	Harford	\$46,194,212	\$24,970,035	\$71,273,255	\$71,312,579	568.00	150.00	\$612,233	608,899
1400	Howard	\$71,311,034	\$12,388,943	\$83,714,325	\$83,717,722	305.00	83.00	\$74,089	70,870
1500	Kent	\$5,303,027	\$3,645,028	\$8,982,922	\$8,815,177	506.00	32.00	\$128,351	92,362
1600	Montgomery	\$12,670,959	\$11,314,179	\$24,136,865	\$24,104,848	513.00	104.00	\$1,881,052	1,024,047
1700	Prince George's	\$457,440,035	\$22,102,021	\$480,406,192	\$490,666,878	407.00	161.00	\$5,534,733	5,534,440
1800		\$9,125,355	\$8,302,236	\$17,464,923	\$17,457,162	411.00	113.00	\$449,622	443,610
1900	,	\$13,043,782	\$20,786,469	\$33,834,297	\$33,838,719	408.00	81.00	\$79,473	77,093
2000	Somerset	\$3,942,256	\$3,874,292	\$7,839,374	\$7,846,990	191.00	7.00	\$438,285	335,060
2100	Talbot	\$9,710,332	\$6,384,820	\$16,109,740	\$16,176,225	648.00	14.00	\$106,250	76,039
2200	Washington	\$31,710,028	\$14,311,823	\$46,066,376	\$46,056,100	692.00	18.00	\$265,535	237,843
2300	Wicomico	\$15,022,746	\$20,212,003	\$35,271,673	\$35,276,346	739.00	110.00	\$429,164	424,506
2400	Worcester	\$21,960,580	\$5,699,297	\$27,691,812	\$27,689,769	507.00	90.00	\$857,756	465,920
	Undesignated	\$229,986	\$479,195	\$709,660	\$709,239	71.00	43.00	\$56,691	32,873
İ	Total .	\$ 1,376,585,383.93	\$ 346,687,188.84	\$ 1,726,225,076.19	\$ 1,750,299,658.84	14,544	2,356	\$ 15,877,797.60	\$ 12,062,946.48

Note - Some facilities may cross county lines in the performance of services. For example, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is headquartered in Prince George's County and, as such, revenue collected by them is reported under Prince George's County. However, the Commission performs services in more than one county.

## Comptroller of Maryland Revenue Administration Division Bay Restoration Fee - By County Tax Year 2020 Through April 30, 2021

		<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	Collection	Returns w/\$	Zero \$ Returns	Expenses <u>Claimed</u>	Expenses <u>Paid</u>
100	Allegany	\$1,616,971	\$206,666	\$1,823,639	\$1,823,642	39		\$5,475	\$5,476
200	Anne Arundel	\$10,747,297	\$2,671,365	\$13,434,186	\$13,416,189	62		\$34,340	\$35,581
300	<b>Baltimore County</b>	\$18,120,721	\$2,029,530	\$20,150,252	\$20,177,666	32	15	\$725	\$27,970
400	Baltimore City	\$10,061,419	\$191,403	\$10,257,896	\$10,222,792	12	8	\$1	\$0
500	Calvert	\$389,460	\$1,170,267	\$1,561,483	\$2,218,597	27	1	\$28,825	\$28,282
600	Caroline	\$294,443	\$543,885	\$839,617	\$842,438	31		\$2,409	\$2,409
700	Carroll	\$1,401,019	\$3,029,572	\$4,430,591	\$4,430,604	53	5	\$40,336	\$19,037
800	Cecil	\$1,519,096	\$1,423,494	\$2,942,792	\$2,942,897	89	4	\$31,586	\$24,739
900	Charles	\$3,034,561	\$1,168,146	\$4,202,709	\$4,202,776	98	2	\$16,715	\$15,980
1000	Dorchester	\$468,204	\$1,081,709	\$1,550,761	\$1,555,097	33	7	\$31,533	\$28,047
1100	Frederick	\$5,244,258	\$1,864,752	\$7,110,307	\$7,129,320	53	15	\$253,325	\$14,721
1200	Garrett	\$327,130	\$471,559	\$798,688	\$798,757	20		\$7,094	\$7,241
1300	Harford	\$3,969,303	\$2,166,468	\$6,136,834	\$6,147,519	38	4	\$30,533	\$31,896
1400	Howard	\$5,980,765	\$1,105,327	\$7,086,255	\$7,084,888	17	1	\$1,539	\$2,475
1500	Kent	\$329,889	\$483,149	\$818,235	\$770,814	34	1	\$26,748	\$7,621
1600	Montgomery	\$1,062,100	\$758,927	\$1,821,295	\$1,820,666	30	8	\$173,330	\$80,595
1700	Prince George's	\$44,741,047	\$1,831,005	\$46,572,044	\$56,831,771	24	18	\$2,259,265	\$2,259,265
1800	Queen Anne's	\$993,775	\$708,857	\$1,705,387	\$1,697,163	27	14	\$44,243	\$42,911
1900	St. Mary's	\$277,018	\$2,903,144	\$3,183,225	\$3,183,225	14	4	\$3,644	\$3,643
2000	Somerset	\$378,005	\$372,505	\$750,509	\$752,961	14		\$37,255	\$34,745
2100	Talbot	\$947,475	\$517,399	\$1,464,876	\$1,464,878	30	1	\$6,401	\$5,521
2200	Washington	\$3,120,009	\$1,182,759	\$4,304,917	\$4,293,514	45	1	\$29,784	\$24,298
2300	Wicomico	\$1,177,935	\$1,934,453	\$3,113,109	\$3,113,074	41	8	\$23,838	\$23,890
2400	Worcester	\$1,530,108	\$98,682	\$1,628,790	\$1,628,937	28		\$45,182	\$20,930
	Undesignated	\$192,081	\$448,575	\$640,657	\$640,657	13	7	\$55,057	\$31,662
	Total	\$117,924,088.67	\$30,363,600.24	\$ 148,329,053.19	\$ 159,190,841.78	904	124	\$ 3,189,179.75	\$ 2,778,934.56

Note - Some facilities may cross county lines in the performance of services. For example, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is headquartered in Prince George's County and, as such, revenue collected by them is reported under Prince George's County. However, the Commission performs services in more than one county.

## Comptroller of Maryland Revenue Administration Division Bay Restoration Fee - By County First Quarter of Tax Year 2021 Through April 30, 2021

		<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	Collection	Returns w/\$	Zero \$ Returns	Expenses <u>Claimed</u>	Expenses <u>Paid</u>
100	Allegany	\$396,024	\$113,372	\$509,397	\$509,398	12		\$1,542	\$1,542
200	Anne Arundel	\$2,947,375	\$928,443	\$3,875,818	\$3,875,840	23		\$13,957	\$14,335
300	<b>Baltimore County</b>	\$4,508,076	\$593,226	\$5,101,302	\$5,101,303	11	6	\$250	\$222
400	Baltimore City	\$104	\$33,705	\$34,211	\$30,108	2	3	\$0	\$0
500	Calvert	\$54,782	\$99,706	\$154,488	\$155,502	7		\$4,693	\$4,125
600	Caroline	\$94,279	\$153,877	\$248,197	\$247,783	9		\$824	\$824
700	Carroll	\$545,246	\$474,750	\$1,019,996	\$1,020,001	18	2	\$12,092	\$5,113
800	Cecil	\$621,836	\$490,069	\$1,111,948	\$1,111,777	30	2	\$12,008	\$9,736
900	Charles	\$1,156,544	\$123,231	\$1,279,776	\$1,279,776	30		\$4,264	\$4,003
1000	Dorchester	\$276,575	\$302,751	\$579,327	\$579,328	12	2	\$9,397	\$8,300
1100	Frederick	\$2,120,406	\$203,278	\$2,323,703	\$2,323,809	18	6	\$98,617	\$5,079
1200	Garrett	\$154,015	\$104,188	\$258,202	\$258,206	8		\$3,069	\$3,236
1300	Harford	\$1,075,171	\$322,352	\$1,397,707	\$1,409,090	11	2	\$10,124	\$10,191
1400	Howard	\$1,483,957	\$103,243	\$1,587,200	\$1,587,203	5		\$385	\$838
1500	Kent	\$158,526	\$137,413	\$295,936	\$243,271	12		\$15,356	\$3,181
1600	Montgomery	\$282,916	\$313,474	\$596,390	\$596,949	11	2	\$86,934	\$26,968
1700	Prince George's	\$17,779,940	\$561,250	\$18,341,181	\$18,341,190	8	8	\$896,906	\$896,906
1800	Queen Anne's	\$407,110	\$256,275	\$663,385	\$663,385	9	5	\$17,685	\$16,860
1900	St. Mary's	\$99,293	\$1,087,904	\$1,187,197	\$1,187,197	4	2	\$953	\$953
2000	Somerset	\$127,225	\$73,312	\$200,537	\$200,538	5		\$14,455	\$10,027
2100	Talbot	\$333,081	\$37,275	\$370,356	\$370,357	9		\$2,145	\$1,354
2200	Washington	\$1,076,372	\$184,896	\$1,261,269	\$1,261,260	15		\$11,525	\$8,959
2300	Wicomico	\$455,927	\$370,442	\$826,370	\$826,368	13	3	\$3,366	\$3,447
2400	Worcester	\$585,529	\$27,979	\$613,509	\$613,510	10		\$10,836	\$5,972
	Undesignated	\$64,176	\$42,414	\$106,590	\$106,590	4	2	\$18,424	\$5,238
	Total	\$ 36,804,484.22	\$ 7,138,825.65	\$ 43,943,988.02	\$ 43,899,738.39	296	45	\$ 1,249,807.86	\$ 1,047,408.28

Note - Some facilities may cross county lines in the performance of services. For example, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission is headquartered in Prince George's County and, as such, revenue collected by them is reported under Prince George's County. However, the Commission performs services in more than one county.

## Comptroller of Maryland Distribution of Bay Restoration Fee through April 30, 2021

	MD Dept of Environment			
Line 1:				
4/05 - 6/05: Total Fiscal Year 2005	\$ 7,022,667.18	Total Fiscal Year 2006	\$	57,686,674.75
Total Fiscal Total 2000	Ψ 1,022,001.10	Total Fiscal Feat 2000	Ψ	37,000,074.73
Total Fiscal Year 2007	\$ 69,141,379.76	Total Fiscal Year 2008	\$	54,695,910.00
Total Fiscal Year 2009	\$ 53,339,463.89	Total Fiscal Year 2010	\$	54,398,088.37
Total Fiscal Year 2011	\$ 55,461,809.59	Total Fiscal Year 2012	\$	55,971,051.91
Total Fiscal Year 2013	\$ 102,145,356.32	Total Fiscal Year 2014	\$	110,688,785.91
Total Fiscal Year 2015	\$ 109,796,411.58	Total Fiscal Year 2016	\$	124,301,135.01
Total Fiscal Year 2017	\$ 115,989,051.47	Total Fiscal Year 2018	\$	115,308,016.48
Total Fiscal Year 2019	\$ 107,545,498.54	Total Fiscal Year 2020	\$	121,185,706.78
Total Fiscal Year 2021	\$ 73,945,939.44			
4 4 0000	•			
August 2020	\$ -			
September October	34,326,745.38			
November	-			
December	_			
January 2021	24,167,675.39			
February	-			
March	-			
April	15,451,518.67			
May	-			
June	-			
July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021	\$ 73,945,939.44			
TOTALL LOS	Ψ 75,545,555.44			
Program Grand Tota	al \$ 1,388,622,946.98			

Line 2:	MD De	ept of Environment	MD	Dept of Agriculture		Total Line 2
4/05 - 6/05 Total Fiscal Year 2005 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$	156,580.00	\$	104,386.66	\$	260,966.66
Total Fiscal Year 2006	\$	4,782,770.15	\$	3,188,513.44	\$	7,971,283.59
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2007	\$	8,094,089.27	\$	5,396,059.51	\$	13,490,148.78
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2008 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$	8,489,069.61	\$	5,659,379.72	\$	14,148,449.33
	φ	0 404 447 74	Ф	6 222 745 45	<b>c</b>	4E 006 062 00
Total Fiscal Year 2009 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$	9,484,117.74	\$	6,322,745.15	\$	15,806,862.89
Total Fiscal Year 2010 22.4% MDE 77.6% MDA	\$	3,118,419.66	\$	10,803,096.68	\$	13,921,516.34

Total Fiscal Year 2011	\$	8,173,632.20	\$	5,449,088.14	\$	13,622,720.34
60% MDE 40% MDA	<del>-</del>	0,110,002.20	<u> </u>	0,110,000.11	<u> </u>	10,022,120.01
00 % WIDE 40 % WIDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2012	φ	0 074 007 40	φ	E E 1 1 0 E 0 0 0	φ	12 705 145 10
	\$	8,271,087.10	\$	5,514,058.08		13,785,145.18
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2013	\$	15,992,799.08	\$	10,661,866.06	\$	26,654,665.14
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2014	\$	16,801,348.71	\$	11,200,899.10	\$	28,002,247.81
60% MDE 40% MDA		<u> </u>				
Total Fiscal Year 2015	\$	17,456,798.39	\$	11,637,865.59	\$	29,094,663.98
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2016	\$	17,311,866.76	\$	11,541,244.49	\$	28,853,111.25
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2017	\$	17,113,840.66	\$	11,409,227.10	\$	28,523,067.76
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2018	\$	17,811,270.90	\$	11,874,180.60	\$	29,685,451.50
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2019	\$	16,883,720.52	\$	11,255,813.67	\$	28,139,534.19
60% MDE 40% MDA						
Total Fiscal Year 2020	\$	17,397,453.75	\$	11,598,302.51	\$	28,995,756.26
60% MDE 40% MDA	<del>-</del>	,,	<u> </u>	,,		
0070 11122 1070 111271						
Total Fiscal Year 2021	\$	15,418,716.45	\$	10,279,144.29	\$	25,697,860.74
				· · ·		, ,
60% MDE 40% MDA						
60% MDE 40% MDA						
		60%		40%		Total
Fiscal Year 2021	\$	<u>60%</u>	\$	<u>40%</u>	\$	<u>Total</u>
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020	\$	<u>60%</u> -	\$	<u>40%</u> -	\$	<u>Total</u> -
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September	\$	- -	\$	- -	\$	
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October	\$	60% - - 11,062,617.85	\$	<b>40%</b> - - 7,375,078.57		Total - - 18,437,696.42
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020  September  October  November	\$	- -	\$	- -	\$	
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020  September  October  November  December	\$	- - 11,062,617.85 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - -
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020  September  October  November  December  January 2021	\$	- -	\$	- -	\$	
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020  September  October  November  December  January 2021  February	\$	- - 11,062,617.85 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - -
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020  September  October  November  December  January 2021	\$	- - 11,062,617.85 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - -
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020  September  October  November  December  January 2021  February	\$	- - 11,062,617.85 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - -
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March	\$	11,062,617.85 - - 1,980,994.57 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - - 1,320,663.04 - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - - 3,301,657.61 - -
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April	\$	11,062,617.85 - - 1,980,994.57 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - - 1,320,663.04 - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - - 3,301,657.61 - -
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June	\$	11,062,617.85 - - 1,980,994.57 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - - 1,320,663.04 - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - - 3,301,657.61 - -
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual		- 11,062,617.85 - - 1,980,994.57 - - 2,375,104.03 - -		7,375,078.57 - - 1,320,663.04 - - 1,583,402.68 - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - - 3,301,657.61 - - 3,958,506.71
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June	\$	11,062,617.85 - - 1,980,994.57 - -	\$	7,375,078.57 - - - 1,320,663.04 - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - - 3,301,657.61 - -
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021	\$	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 - - 15,418,716.45		7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - - - 10,279,144.29	\$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual	\$	- 11,062,617.85 - - 1,980,994.57 - - 2,375,104.03 - -		7,375,078.57 - - 1,320,663.04 - - 1,583,402.68 - -	\$	18,437,696.42 - - 3,301,657.61 - - 3,958,506.71
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total	\$     \$	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 - - 15,418,716.45 202,757,580.95	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - - - 10,279,144.29	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total Administrative cost recove	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95	\$	7,375,078.57 - 7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,583,402.68 - 10,279,144.29  143,895,870.79	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 346,653,451.74
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Administrative cost recovers	\$     \$	11,062,617.85 - 11,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,0279,144.29  143,895,870.79  FY 2014	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 346,653,451.74
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recove FY 2005 FY 2006	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 11,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,0279,144.29  143,895,870.79  FY 2014 FY 2015	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Administrative cost recovers	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 11,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,0279,144.29  143,895,870.79  FY 2014	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 346,653,451.74
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recove FY 2005 FY 2006	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 11,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,0279,144.29  143,895,870.79  FY 2014 FY 2015	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total Administrative cost recov FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42 57,482.53 57,777.62	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 1,583,402.68 10,279,144.29  FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27 158,749.94 158,735.88
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recov FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42 57,482.53 57,777.62 46,721.16	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,583,	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27 158,749.94 158,735.88 168,013.19
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recov FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009 FY 2010	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42 57,482.53 57,777.62 46,721.16 112,654.00	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,583,402.68 - 10,279,144.29  FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017 FY 2018 FY 2019	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27 158,749.94 158,735.88 168,013.19 188,999.78
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recov FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009 FY 2010 FY 2011	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42 57,482.53 57,777.62 46,721.16 112,654.00 59,098.66	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,0279,144.29  143,895,870.79  FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017 FY 2018 FY 2019 FY 2020	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27 158,749.94 158,735.88 168,013.19 188,999.78 219,425.05
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recov FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2010 FY 2011 FY 2011	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42 57,482.53 57,777.62 46,721.16 112,654.00 59,098.66 94,566.86	\$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,583,402.68 - 10,279,144.29  FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017 FY 2018 FY 2019	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27 158,749.94 158,735.88 168,013.19 188,999.78
Fiscal Year 2021 August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recov FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009 FY 2010 FY 2011	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42 57,482.53 57,777.62 46,721.16 112,654.00 59,098.66	\$ \$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,0279,144.29  143,895,870.79  FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017 FY 2018 FY 2019 FY 2020 FY 2021	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27 158,749.94 158,735.88 168,013.19 188,999.78 219,425.05 114,448.29
Fiscal Year 2021  August 2020 September October November December January 2021 February March April May June July 2021 accrual Total FY 2021  Program Grand Total  Administrative cost recov FY 2005 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2010 FY 2011 FY 2011	\$   <b>\$</b>   ery by C	11,062,617.85 - 1,980,994.57 - 1,980,994.57 - 2,375,104.03 2,375,104.03 15,418,716.45  202,757,580.95  comptroller 44,941.58 52,122.42 57,482.53 57,777.62 46,721.16 112,654.00 59,098.66 94,566.86	\$ \$	7,375,078.57 - 1,320,663.04 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,583,402.68 - 1,0279,144.29  143,895,870.79  FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2016 FY 2017 FY 2018 FY 2019 FY 2020	\$ \$	18,437,696.42 - 3,301,657.61 - 3,958,506.71 25,697,860.74 25,697,860.74 120,303.41 152,674.27 158,749.94 158,735.88 168,013.19 188,999.78 219,425.05