

BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment

Join by phone

+1 937-889-1384

PIN: 681 034 287#

And Keep Your Phone Muted Unless Speaking

April 13, 2023

1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- Approve previous meeting minutes – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- Maryland Nutrient Success Story - Courtney Botelho, NEIWPC, and Kathy Stecker, MDE
- Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation – Walid Saffouri, MDE
- Update on Cover Crops Activities – Jason Keppler, MDA
- Update on Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems (OSDS) – Jeffrey Fretwell, MDE
- Update on BRF Fee Collection and Budget – Jeffrey Fretwell, MDE
- Update on Clean Water Commerce Act – Jeffrey Fretwell, MDE
- Update on Legislative Session - Jeffrey Fretwell, MDE
- Next meetings and other administrative issues to be discussed with the committee – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- 2023 Next Pre-Scheduled Meetings: July 13th
October 12th
- ADJOURNMENT

BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment

Virtual Meeting

January 12, 2023

Meeting Minutes

Welcome/Introduction

- The meeting was opened by Mr. Fretwell on behalf of the Chairman of the Bay Restoration Fund Advisory Committee, Mr. Murphy, who couldn't attend.
- Mr. Fretwell welcomed the committee members and other attendees.

Review of Meeting Minutes

- Previous meeting minutes, from the October 13, 2022 meeting, were shared with the committee members for their review and comments. An electronic copy of the meeting minutes was also e-mailed to the committee members prior to the meeting.
- Mr. Fretwell asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or a motion to approve. The minutes were approved, and they will be posted on the web.

I. Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation:

- Mr. Saffouri provided an update on major WWTPs. There are no changes in status of major WWTPs since the last meeting. We continue to have one WWTP under construction and one in planning. Westminster construction remains at 87% complete, which is the same as what we reported at the last meeting.
- As for the minor WWTPs, Mr. Saffouri added that Preston and Port Deposit have completed the construction and they are optimizing the ENR operation. Projects that are under construction continue to progress without any major issues.
- Mr. Hoffman asked about what major facilities are still in planning? Mr. Saffouri responded that Princess Anne is the only major facility that still in planning.
- Mr. Male suggested that we should provide these updates within the context of where we are going or what are the requirements or where Maryland is in relation to Virginia and Pennsylvania. Mr. Hoffman suggested that another way would be to view the allocation of the funding between the

majors and the minors and the other uses. Mr. Fretwell stated that he can provide a chart or spreadsheet that broken down by fiscal year on how much of the BRF money was allocated to the different uses.

II. Update on the Committee's Annual Report:

- Mr. Saffouri presented a copy of the final report, which was previously emailed to the committee members for their review and comments. The final report was submitted to the General Assembly and the Governor before the January 15th deadline.
- Mr. Hoffman advised that the report was not approved by the committee before it was submitted. Mr. Fretwell responded that we will find a way to get the committee approval of future reports. Ms. Sheppard suggested that the committee can vote today to approve this year's report even though it has already been submitted. The committee accepted Ms. Sheppard's suggestion and approved this year's report.

III. Update on Cover Crops Activities:

- Mr. Keppler provided an update on the Cover Crops Program. MDA has been actively working through the fall certification process and verifying that all those plantings are meeting the standards and specifications as required by the program. So far this year, farmers have planted over 400,000 acres of cover crops. It is slightly down from previous years, but we're still wrapping up some fall certifications. We're hopeful that we'll be closer to the 425K mark again this year. 400,000 acres represents about \$25.7 million in grants if the farmers continue to meet their commitments through the springtime. Many farmers are participating in the delayed kill down option, which provides an additional \$10 an acre. We will probably have more information to share at our next meeting including the various incentive payments and options.

IV. Update on Onsite Sewage Disposal Systems (OSDS):

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the OSDS Program. There have been 215 BAT upgrades and 27 sewer connections funded since the beginning of FY23 (between July 1, 2022 and January 9, 2023). These numbers are similar to previous years. Last year (FY22), in January 2022, we had 240 upgrades at this point and 40 sewer connections. In previous years, in January 2021 and 2020, we had higher number of sewer connections (103 and 120 respectively) due to Queen Anne's County-Southern Kent Island project. The overall program statewide seems to be continuing at its standard pace.

V. Update on BRF Fee Collection and Budget:

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the BRF fee collection and budget using the comptroller's report through October 31, 2022. The report shows the first quarter FY23 revenues of \$35 million plus for the wastewater fund. For reference, last year's total for the first quarter was \$19 million. Last year (FY22) was an anomaly as it had several missing returns. In the year before that (FY21), the first quarter amount was \$34 million. So, we're right where we normally are in the first quarter. Line 2 shows the FY23 first quarter septic fund revenues, which are just under \$14 million, \$13,893,000. \$8.3 million for septic upgrades and \$5.6 million for the cover crop program at MDA. And these numbers are nearly identical to last year's first quarter revenues, which were \$13.7 million with \$8.2 million for septic upgrades and \$5.5 million for cover crops.
- Mr. Male asked whether anything would be different in the revenues next year. Mr. Fretwell response was no. The issue we had last year was largely due to COVID and interruption of remittances from local governments. It doesn't seem to be a systematic issue with the fund, collecting the fund, or trends in terms of the fee amounts changing.

VI. Update on Clean Water Commerce Act:

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the Clean Water Commerce Act program. We are still working through the applications, but we should have something soon. MDE will share any new update with the committee as soon as it becomes available. In the meantime, MDE is resoliciting for the environmental justice carve out (\$4 million). We did not receive any applications for this category during our original solicitation that ended in the end of September. The new solicitation, which is specifically for the environmental justice communities, will remain open through the end of the month of January. We are optimistic that we will get some applications. If we don't receive sufficient applications for any of the carve outs, those funds roll into the following year's solicitation and go into the general pot.
- Mr. Myer asked whether it is possible to share the solicitation with him because his organization (Chesapeake Bay Foundation) is working with the environmental justice communities on many ongoing projects. Mr. Fretwell responded that he will send the information to Mr. Myer as soon as possible.
- Mr. Fretwell added that the general solicitation is also open right now. This is the solicitation for all Bay Restoration Fund dollars that are in the wastewater account as well as the SRF, including the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funding. This solicitation will also be open until the end of this month.
- Mr. Hoffman asked whether the projects would require the BPW approval. Mr. Fretwell responded yes, once the projects are selected and the funding recipients are notified, MDE submits the projects for the BPW approval before any payment can be made.

VII. Other Discussions:

- Mr. Fretwell advised the committee that several vacancies in the committee's membership had been filled. We still have very few vacancies that need to be filled such as the Senate and the House members, which often are vacant. Also, the local health department, and the environmental justice community memberships remain vacant.
- Mr. Hoffman asked whether it is possible that an email be sent to the committee members before the CWCA projects go to the BPW. Mr. Fretwell responded yes, that can be done for sure.
- Mr. Bozick brought the committee's attention to some issues involving septic to sewer connection projects. Due to hydrogeology, large number of on-site disposal systems do not comply with the most updated regulations. Many drain field discharges lack the required four feet separation from the high groundwater table. The BRF funding can be provided for advanced treatment units, but we would still struggle on the discharge side. 18,000 septic tanks were identified in Wicomico County, of which over 10,000 are candidates to be connected to ENR facilities. Compared to the thousands of needed connections, the BRF program has funded only 27 sewer connections statewide in FY23. Funding applications were submitted last year for five projects to connect approximately 2,500 septic tanks to ENR facilities. All the five projects were ranked on the top fourteen of the priority. However, they weren't funded because of the planning requirements for PFAs and water and sewer plan amendments. It is a challenge to get a rural area to be considered as a priority funding area because of the lack of the smart growth density. Also, the TMDL program seems to be way behind in terms of giving the WWTPs an allowance to get some additional loads for connecting septic tanks. As for Spray irrigation (another option), some amazing things has happened this past year on spray irrigation by permitting some of the municipalities on the Eastern Shore to spray irrigate up to two inches a week. One permit was very close to getting MDE approval. However, additional public input caused the application rate in the permit to be reduced to about half an inch a week. While half an inch application rate is a better environmental practice, it increases the amount of acreage required by a factor of four and impacts the project cost.
- Mr. Hoffman asked about what type of funding these applications were intended for, SRF or BRF. Mr. Fretwell responded that they applied last year for whatever the best funding combination they could get. BRF alone doesn't have the capacity to fund these large projects. So, the projects would have been funded predominantly by SRF funding if they were to qualify for funding. BRF funding is limited to \$25,000 per home and it could be offered overtime through the county allocation out of the septic account, or as part of the project funding through the wastewater account.
- Mr. Bozick stated that currently funding is needed for planning, which will include addressing the water and sewer planning, and the PFA issues. However, funding cannot be provided because the projects have water and sewer planning, and the PFA issues. So, we find ourselves in a strange Catch 22.

- Mr. Male suggested that the committee should have at least one in-person meeting this year. Also, he suggested that we should have an issue that the committee can focus on and attempt to resolve. For example, we can focus on an issue facing small systems. Mr. Fretwell stated that this was a good suggestion. We can think about what kind of items we think might be useful for the committee to tackle. Mr. Myers added that for example the Back River and Patapsco have already gotten a lot of money for upgrades, but they have O&M concerns that are not being addressed. Also, is there a way that this committee can discuss rules that have been put together for the distribution of the BRF funds to see if there are tweaks that can be made so that when we have a significant water quality impact in the state, we have a way to address it.
- Mr. Gray asked if we know how wastewater treatment plants funded with the BRF are doing in terms of staffing and preventative maintenance, particularly regarding Back River and Patapsco, but the same question could apply to other plants as well. Ms. Lewis agreed that this is also a major issue for minor plants. Staffing with appropriate licenses can be difficult. You can get your licensed trainees but getting them to meet the final qualifications is complicated, especially when you get in the rural areas and the smaller plants. As far as meeting ENR, we qualified for the first year's O&M grant and we are meeting our permit requirement, but we struggled in the winter before the past because we had very cold winter a year ago. The town was helped by its consultant engineer. Funding after the construction is completed and the plant is up and running could help with resolving some of these operational issues.
- Mr. Abbott stated that MDE used to have an MOU with the Maryland Center of Environmental Training (MCET) for less \$100,000 a year to provide technical assistance to small systems. He personally worked under this MOU with many small systems and helped them go through the process of learning how to operate BNR and ENR facilities. One of the things that these smaller facilities really struggle with is understanding and applying the technology. It is especially critical with the smaller systems that they be provided with a resource in terms of training, in terms of practitioners that can go out and help them, guide them through the process of starting up a program to monitor and adjust the facilities and the controls at the plant, and that will help them achieve these goals much more easily. It was a very inexpensive program. Ms. Lewis agreed that MCET provided critical support to smaller plants. Alternatively, the town is currently using its engineers to try and work some of the issues out with the new plant and is paying the engineering rates. So, MCET would be a really good resource at every level, even in the largest plants.
- Mr. Saffouri stated that MDE was unable to renew the MOU with MCET due to procurement issue. The procurement group wanted us to solicit to private firms that can provide the same technical assistance services that MCET provided. The only alternative to MCET would have been to procure consultant engineers to do the work, which would be much more expensive as Ms. Lewis stated earlier.

VIII. Mr. Fretwell reminded the Committee members that the next meeting will be held on April 13, 2023.

Materials Distributed at the Meeting

- Meeting Agenda
- Previous Meeting Minutes
- Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status
- BRF Advisory Committee Annual Status Report
- BRF Septic Program Funded Installations
- Distribution of Bay Restoration Fee

Attendance

Advisory Committee Members or Designees Attending:

Suzanne Dorsey, Acting Secretary, Maryland Department of the Environment
Fiona Shirk, Maryland Department of Budget and Management
Jeffrey Fretwell, Maryland Department of the Environment
Walid Saffouri, Maryland Department of the Environment
Bob Buglass, Washington Suburban Sanitary District
Jason Keppler, Maryland Department of Agriculture
Ellen Mussman, Maryland Department of Planning
Doug Myers, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Cheryl Lewis, Town of Oxford/MML
Mark Hoffman, Chesapeake Bay Commission
Timothy Male, Environmental Policy Innovation Center
John Dinkel, Dinkel Business Development
Gabe Cohee, Maryland Department of Natural Resources
Doug Abbott, Easton Utilities

Others in Attendance:

Andrew Gray, Department of Legislative Services
Peter Bozick, George, Miles & Buhr
Mary Sheppard, Office of Attorney General
Rebecca Reske, Office of Attorney General
Mike Galvin, JMT
David Kerr, Barton & Loguidice
Kelly Duffy, RK&K

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Attendees:

Sunita Boyle	Paul Emmart
Elaine Dietz	Rajiv Chawla
Lee Currey	Terri Wilson

Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status

(April 13, 2023)

Major WWTPs

Previous Meeting

65 facilities are in operation
1 facility is under construction
1 facility is in planning
67 total

Current

65 facilities are in operation
1 facility is under construction
1 facility is in planning
67 total

Status Changes from Previous Meeting:

- No changes in status.

Percentage completion for facilities under construction for ENR Upgrade:

Facility	Previous Meeting Percentage Complete	Current Percentage Complete
Westminster	87%	90%

Minor WWTPs

Previous Meeting

12 facilities are in operation
5 facilities are under construction
7 facilities are in design
11 facilities are in planning
35 total

Current

12 facilities are in operation
5 facilities are under construction
8 facilities are in design
10 facilities are in planning
35 total

Status Changes from Previous Meeting:

- Point Lookout State Park progressed to the design phase.

Percentage completion for facilities under construction for ENR Upgrade:

Facility	Previous Meeting Percentage Complete	Current Percentage Complete
Harbour View	99%	99%
Victor Cullen	90%	90%
Chesapeake City	90%	94%
Lewistown	48%	62%
Smith Island	10%	10%

BRF Septic Program
Funded Installations FY23 to Date
July 1, 2022- April 11, 2023

County	# Septic Systems funded FY 23	# Sewer Connections funded FY 23
Allegany (CVI)	1	2
Anne Arundel	94	8
Baltimore	6	15
Calvert	48	0
Caroline	12	0
Carroll (CVI)	8	0
Cecil	9	3
Charles	17	3
Dorchester	21	0
Frederick (CVI)	14	0
Garrett	1	0
Harford	9	2
Howard (CVI)	1	4
Kent	8	0
Montgomery (CVI)	5	1
Prince George's	0	0
Queen Anne's	29	25
Somerset	7	0
St. Mary's	34	1
Talbot	30	0
Washington (CVI)	7	0
Wicomoco	8	0
Worcester	0	0
Totals	369	64

**Comptroller of Maryland
Revenue Administration Division
Bay Restoration Fee - By County
Program To Date Through December 31, 2022**

	<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	<u>Collection</u>	<u>Returns w/\$</u>	<u>Zero \$ Returns</u>	<u>Expenses Claimed</u>	<u>Expenses Paid</u>
100 Allegany	\$24,208,040	\$4,534,917	\$28,742,958	\$28,466,235	737	65	\$283,207	276,722
200 Anne Arundel	\$145,566,617	\$37,020,113	\$182,586,730	\$181,954,404	894	248	\$630,931	632,326
300 Baltimore County	\$197,537,756	\$3,321,155	\$200,858,911	\$200,843,010	229	112	\$15,901	15,900
400 Baltimore City	\$262,513,384	\$27,259,787	\$289,773,171	\$289,541,063	606	161	\$260,796	232,108
500 Calvert	\$6,449,539	\$23,613,263	\$30,062,802	\$29,657,797	582	37	\$435,587	405,005
600 Caroline	\$4,423,003	\$7,467,644	\$11,890,647	\$11,825,619	564	18	\$69,205	65,028
700 Carroll	\$17,560,748	\$38,979,700	\$56,540,448	\$56,258,351	822	121	\$593,697	282,097
800 Cecil	\$15,333,088	\$20,573,585	\$35,906,673	\$35,619,309	1548	135	\$375,238	287,364
900 Charles	\$33,414,421	\$15,602,829	\$49,017,250	\$48,817,413	1713	137	\$206,847	199,837
1000 Dorchester	\$8,145,690	\$9,522,020	\$17,667,710	\$17,359,719	509	114	\$350,465	307,991
1100 Frederick	\$55,658,336	\$25,143,202	\$80,801,537	\$80,616,443	905	239	\$2,556,705	185,095
1200 Garrett	\$4,417,960	\$6,655,069	\$11,073,029	\$10,967,746	324	44	\$105,066	105,283
1300 Harford	\$52,935,946	\$28,917,184	\$81,853,130	\$81,199,929	632	157	\$656,534	653,201
1400 Howard	\$80,655,528	\$13,615,178	\$94,270,707	\$94,196,869	340	83	\$76,457	73,837
1500 Kent	\$5,999,449	\$4,139,454	\$10,138,903	\$10,036,582	550	38	\$192,430	102,320
1600 Montgomery	\$14,261,909	\$12,396,512	\$26,658,421	\$25,515,852	546	115	\$2,193,523	1,142,569
1700 Prince George's	\$514,836,642	\$24,746,176	\$539,582,818	\$531,144,442	445	177	\$8,483,545	8,438,376
1800 Queen Anne's	\$10,402,388	\$9,353,860	\$19,756,249	\$19,255,306	465	128	\$510,458	500,943
1900 St. Mary's	\$4,493,069	\$4,463,788	\$8,956,857	\$8,570,824	211	7	\$499,827	386,033
2000 Somerset	\$13,498,614	\$25,416,434	\$38,915,048	\$38,831,676	432	85	\$85,305	83,372
2100 Talbot	\$11,004,423	\$7,386,585	\$18,391,008	\$18,305,311	702	15	\$121,376	85,696
2200 Washington	\$35,560,766	\$16,402,490	\$51,963,256	\$51,694,279	761	20	\$302,214	268,977
2300 Wicomico	\$16,712,153	\$23,562,424	\$40,274,577	\$39,771,135	802	119	\$477,497	503,441
2400 Worcester	\$24,735,034	\$6,748,359	\$31,483,393	\$30,920,661	558	92	\$1,044,244	562,732
Undesignated	\$932,072	\$937,261	\$1,869,333	\$1,766,506	150	248	\$75,563	96,481
Total	\$ 1,561,256,577.85	\$ 397,778,987.95	\$ 1,959,035,565.80	\$ 1,943,136,483.56	16,027	2,715	\$ 20,602,617.26	\$ 15,892,736.96

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 2022 Through December 31, 2022**

	<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	<u>Collection</u>	<u>Returns w/\$</u>	<u>Zero \$ Returns</u>	<u>Expenses Claimed</u>	<u>Expenses Paid</u>
100 Allegany	\$1,329,385	\$142,296	\$1,471,681	\$1,463,899	27		\$7,782	\$7,782
200 Anne Arundel	\$8,525,727	\$1,795,822	\$10,321,550	\$10,289,869	41	4	\$31,583	\$31,681
300 Baltimore County	\$10,407,658	\$90,372	\$10,498,030	\$10,498,030	8		\$0	\$0
400 Baltimore City	\$18,144,795	\$1,631,498	\$19,776,293	\$19,775,884	20	7	\$500	\$409
500 Calvert	\$341,441	\$1,213,330	\$1,554,772	\$1,526,308	20		\$34,982	\$28,464
600 Caroline	\$280,162	\$388,605	\$668,767	\$665,031	25		\$3,962	\$3,737
700 Carroll	\$901,552	\$2,637,819	\$3,539,371	\$3,524,341	39	3	\$39,495	\$15,030
800 Cecil	\$826,275	\$998,716	\$1,824,991	\$1,810,612	48	2	\$20,965	\$14,379
900 Charles	\$2,021,884	\$1,079,735	\$3,101,619	\$3,087,591	86		\$14,704	\$14,028
1000 Dorchester	\$449,918	\$456,243	\$906,161	\$890,400	20	3	\$14,078	\$15,761
1100 Frederick	\$3,616,828	\$1,717,716	\$5,334,544	\$5,322,958	39	11	\$275,306	\$11,587
1200 Garrett	\$210,729	\$352,191	\$562,921	\$557,986	13		\$4,753	\$4,935
1300 Harford	\$2,896,717	\$1,987,977	\$4,884,694	\$4,863,739	28	2	\$20,955	\$20,955
1400 Howard	\$3,088,939	\$128,912	\$3,217,850	\$3,216,962	11		\$829	\$889
1500 Kent	\$363,721	\$216,473	\$580,195	\$575,101	21	2	\$37,354	\$5,094
1600 Montgomery	\$639,305	\$435,637	\$1,074,942	\$1,032,015	19	7	\$109,764	\$42,927
1700 Prince George's	\$28,968,747	\$1,315,685	\$30,284,432	\$28,822,277	15	10	\$1,507,031	\$1,462,155
1800 Queen Anne's	\$610,906	\$442,425	\$1,053,331	\$1,024,206	26	6	\$31,095	\$29,125
1900 St. Mary's	\$253,411	\$294,970	\$548,381	\$527,005	9		\$37,247	\$21,377
2000 Somerset	\$211,027	\$2,234,529	\$2,445,556	\$2,443,128	10	1	\$1,981	\$2,428
2100 Talbot	\$608,357	\$481,335	\$1,089,692	\$1,085,106	24	1	\$7,167	\$4,586
2200 Washington	\$1,614,884	\$985,802	\$2,600,686	\$2,587,948	31		\$15,640	\$12,737
2300 Wicomico	\$851,753	\$1,603,281	\$2,455,033	\$2,414,672	30	4	\$24,829	\$40,361
2400 Worcester	\$1,334,481	\$75,685	\$1,410,166	\$1,394,433	21		\$39,478	\$15,733
Undesignated	\$689,053	\$426,356	\$1,115,409	\$1,061,022	26	14	\$119,479	\$54,387
Total	\$ 89,187,656.36	\$ 23,133,410.31	\$ 112,321,066.67	\$ 110,460,520.75	657	77	\$ 2,400,960.23	\$ 1,860,545.92

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
Forth Quarter of Tax Year 2022 Through December 31, 2022**

	<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	<u>Collection</u>	<u>Returns w/\$</u>	<u>Zero \$ Returns</u>	<u>Expenses Claimed</u>	<u>Expenses Paid</u>
100 Allegany	\$0	\$75	\$75	\$75	1		\$0	\$0
200 Anne Arundel	\$101,390	\$3,779	\$105,169	\$104,401	1	2	\$768	\$768
300 Baltimore County	\$0	\$3,464	\$3,464	\$3,389	1		\$75	\$75
400 Baltimore City	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0
500 Calvert	\$0	\$18,075	\$18,075	\$18,075	1		\$0	\$0
600 Caroline	\$32,297	\$2,897	\$35,194	\$35,114	3		\$80	\$80
700 Carroll	\$8,075	\$3,000	\$11,075	\$10,672	3		\$414	\$403
800 Cecil	\$512	\$1,665	\$2,177	\$2,095	3		\$750	\$82
900 Charles	\$7,246	\$12,150	\$19,396	\$18,818	17		\$740	\$578
1000 Dorchester	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0
1100 Frederick	\$28,183	\$45	\$28,228	\$27,017	3	2	\$75,327	\$1,211
1200 Garrett	\$9,116	\$123	\$9,239	\$9,239	1		\$0	\$0
1300 Harford	\$0	\$102,680	\$102,680	\$102,680	1		\$0	\$0
1400 Howard	\$0	\$900	\$900	\$855	1		\$30	\$45
1500 Kent	\$51,077	\$0	\$51,077	\$50,837	2		\$7,932	\$240
1600 Montgomery	\$0	\$177	\$177	\$177	2	1	\$0	\$0
1700 Prince George's	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		1	\$0	\$0
1800 Queen Anne's	\$8,880	\$0	\$8,880	\$8,436	2	1	\$773	\$444
1900 St. Mary's	\$38,888	\$331,214	\$370,102	\$370,102	1		\$0	\$0
2000 Somerset	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			\$0	\$0
2100 Talbot	\$0	\$660	\$660	\$627	1	1	\$66	\$33
2200 Washington	\$15,214	\$30	\$15,244	\$14,674	2		\$570	\$570
2300 Wicomico	\$54,457	\$285	\$54,742	\$53,718	2	1	\$1,011	\$1,024
2400 Worcester	\$308,079	\$0	\$308,079	\$308,079	2		\$0	\$0
Undesignated	\$544,800	\$45	\$544,845	\$517,605	2	1	\$80,724	\$27,240
Total	\$ 1,208,213.87	\$ 481,264.00	\$ 1,689,477.87	\$ 1,656,685.95	52	10	\$ 169,260	\$ 32,792

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 January 31, 2023

<u>MD Dept of Environment</u>			
<u>Line 1:</u>			
4/05 - 6/05:			
Total Fiscal Year 2005	\$ 7,022,667.18	Total Fiscal Year 2006	\$ 57,686,674.75
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	\$ 98,087,149.34	Total Fiscal Year 2022	\$ 119,371,455.88
Total Fiscal Year 2023	\$ 60,924,947.84		

August 2022	\$ -
September	-
October	35,184,165.22
November	
December	
January 2023	25,740,782.62
February	
March	
April	
May	
June	
July 2023 accrual	
Total FY 2023	\$ 60,924,947.84

Program Grand Total \$ 1,593,060,560.60

<u>Line 2:</u>	<u>MD Dept of Environment</u>	<u>MD Dept of Agriculture</u>	<u>Total Line 2</u>
4/05 - 6/05			
Total Fiscal Year 2005	\$ 156,580.00	\$ 104,386.66	\$ 260,966.66
60% MDE 40% MDA			
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	\$ 8,489,069.61	\$ 5,659,379.72	\$ 14,148,449.33
60% MDE 40% MDA			
Total Fiscal Year 2009	\$ 9,484,117.74	\$ 6,322,745.15	\$ 15,806,862.89
60% MDE 40% MDA			

Total Fiscal Year 2010	\$	3,118,419.66	\$	10,803,096.68	\$	13,921,516.34
22.4% MDE						
77.6% MDA						

Total Fiscal Year 2011 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 8,173,632.20	\$ 5,449,088.14	\$ 13,622,720.34
Total Fiscal Year 2012 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 8,271,087.10	\$ 5,514,058.08	\$ 13,785,145.18
Total Fiscal Year 2013 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 15,992,799.08	\$ 10,661,866.06	\$ 26,654,665.14
Total Fiscal Year 2014 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 16,801,348.71	\$ 11,200,899.10	\$ 28,002,247.81
Total Fiscal Year 2015 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 17,456,798.39	\$ 11,637,865.59	\$ 29,094,663.98
Total Fiscal Year 2016 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 17,311,866.76	\$ 11,541,244.49	\$ 28,853,111.25
Total Fiscal Year 2017 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 17,113,840.66	\$ 11,409,227.10	\$ 28,523,067.76
Total Fiscal Year 2018 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 17,811,270.90	\$ 11,874,180.60	\$ 29,685,451.50
Total Fiscal Year 2019 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 16,883,720.52	\$ 11,255,813.67	\$ 28,139,534.19
Total Fiscal Year 2020 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 17,397,453.75	\$ 11,598,302.51	\$ 28,995,756.26
Total Fiscal Year 2021 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 16,989,802.10	\$ 11,326,534.72	\$ 28,316,336.82
Total Fiscal Year 2022 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 18,553,175.61	\$ 12,368,783.78	\$ 30,921,959.39
Total Fiscal Year 2023 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 11,249,083.14	\$ 7,499,388.80	\$ 18,748,471.94

Fiscal Year 2023	60%	40%	Total
August 2021	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
September	-	-	\$ -
October	8,335,867.29	5,557,244.88	\$ 13,893,112.17
November	-	-	-
December	-	-	-
January 2023	2,913,215.85	1,942,143.92	4,855,359.77
February	-	-	-
March	-	-	-
April	-	-	-
May	-	-	-
June	-	-	-
July 2023 accrual	-	-	-
Total FY 2023	\$ 11,249,083.14	\$ 7,499,388.80	\$ 18,748,471.94

Program Grand Total	\$ 234,130,925.35	\$ 164,811,433.80	\$ 398,942,359.15
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Administrative cost recovery by Comptroller

FY 2005	\$ 44,941.58	FY 2014	120,303.41
FY 2006	52,122.42	FY 2015	152,674.27
FY 2007	57,482.53	FY 2016	158,749.94
FY 2008	57,777.62	FY 2017	158,735.88

FY 2009	46,721.16	FY 2018	168,013.19
FY 2010	112,654.00	FY 2019	188,999.78
FY 2011	59,098.66	FY 2020	219,425.05
FY 2012	94,566.86	FY 2021	212,919.00
FY 2013	102,423.14	FY 2022	160,131.05
		FY 2023	39,224.02
		Program Grand Total	\$ 2,222,941.14

-