

BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment

Thursday, October 12 · 1:00 – 3:00pm

Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/yuq-orne-xev>

Or dial: (US) +1 401-684-3354 PIN: 245 449 639#

And Remain Muted Unless Speaking

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- Approve previous meeting minutes – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- Update on Maryland Nutrient Success Story - 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
- Next meetings and other administrative issues to be discussed with the committee – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- 2023 Next Pre-Scheduled Meetings: December 14th (instead of January 2024)
- ADJOURNMENT

BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment

Virtual Meeting

July 13, 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 April 13, 2023 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.

Discussion

I. Maryland Nutrient Success Story:

- Ms. Stecker provided an update on the Nutrient Success Stories project. MDE will be working with the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPCC), under a grant from EPA, to put together a story map for the BRF website, in addition to an episode of the National Clean Water podcast about the BRF. This will be in time for the Fund's 20th anniversary next year. MDE Office of Communications will go out to record short videos to include in the story map. At the last meeting the committee suggested locations for videos to highlight cover crops, wastewater facility upgrades, and septic system upgrades and connections around the state. In addition, we need a few people to be interviewed, maybe someone familiar with the history of the BRF.

II. Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation:

- Mr. Saffouri provided an update on major WWTPs. There have been no changes in the status of major WWTPs since the last meeting. We continue to have one WWTP under construction (Westminster), and one (Princess Anne) in planning.
- As for the minor WWTPs, Mr. Saffouri added that Twin Cities has progressed toward construction. Projects that are under construction continue to progress without any major issues.
- Mr. Male asked whether major and minor WWTPs are being upgraded to the same level of treatment system or there is a difference between them. Mr. Saffouri responded yes, all WWTPs are being upgraded to ENR treatment level, which allows them to achieve 3 mg/l total nitrogen and 0.3 total phosphorus.
- Mr. Hoffman asked for an update on the Back River and Patapsco operational issues. Mr. Saffouri responded that based on the data collected for the purpose of the O&M grants, both plants appeared to be improving in terms of nitrogen and phosphorus treatment and reduction. The Water and Science Administration (WSA) Compliance Program may have more detailed information that they can share with us. Mr. Fretwell added that WSA are the regulatory enforcement folks for the Department. They have established an early warning system process that can flag earlier in the process wastewater treatment plants that may be running into performance issues and contact them earlier in the process to avoid us getting to the point that we've gotten to with these two plants.
- Mr. Sowinski asked whether there was a backlog on minor systems. Mr. Saffouri responded that there was no backlog. It's just a matter of when the treatment plants proceed with the planning, design, and construction. Usually, the planning phase takes a long time.
- Mr. Sowinski asked about the minor systems' overall participation in the program. Mr. Saffouri responded that their participation level has been great. The BRF law requires that minor plants upgrade must be cost effective. It is estimated that 66 of the approximately 300 minor plants could be eligible based on the cost-effectiveness criteria. 35 of the 66 eligible plants (more than 50%) are participating in the program.
- Ms. Lewis asked whether we should reach out to the other 50 percent that haven't participated in the program yet. Mr. Saffouri responded that the only outreach being done is the annual solicitation between December and January. Mr. Fretwell added that in the last two years we've gotten a substantially large number of applications for minor wastewater upgrades. \$78 million in requests in fiscal FY23 and \$66 million in FY24. Also, we've just finished our solicitation in January of this year for FY25 during which we received new requests for minor wastewater treatment plant upgrades. So, it seems to be continuing. Ms. Lewis stated that she would be happy to contact other smaller municipalities and encourage them to apply. Mr. Saffouri offered to share the potentially eligible WWTPs with Ms. Lewis.

- Mr. Sowinski asked whether BRF would continue to fund the preliminary engineering studies. Ms. Lewis added that this is the reason why she offered to reach out. Also, there is a second means of funding for the preliminary engineering reports. Anything that MDE doesn't cover, generally you can get covered by the USDA. Mr. Saffouri responded that MDE offers 100 percent grant participation in the planning phase to any of the listed facilities. In addition to evaluating the upgrade alternatives, the preliminary engineering studies provide an evaluation of each unit process at the treatment plant. So that could be a good incentive for the small treatment plants. They get a free evaluation of their treatment plant that identifies the unit processes that need improvements before the plant starts running into problems or compliance issues.
- Mr. Hoffman asked about the timing when the facilities decided to approach MDE to fund their upgrade. Mr. Saffouri responded that some facilities become interested in the upgrade when they need expansion. They can combine the upgrade to ENR with the expansion and get BRF grants prorated based on the existing capacity. Another time we've seen towns come to us for an upgrade is if they have some violations, which don't have to be related to nitrogen or phosphorus. They could be related to BOD or suspended solids, but once the plant is upgraded to the more advanced ENR treatment, the other violations will get fixed automatically. The third category is if the treatment plan is very old and needs to be replaced. The old facility can be replaced with an ENR plant. The fourth category is due to changes in the discharge permit. For example, some facilities will soon be required to meet more stringent ammonia limits, and part of the ENR process is removing ammonia. So, knowing that these limits will be coming soon, some of these facilities have decided that it is a good time to upgrade to ENR.
- Mr. Bozick added that another category is a new discharge permit for a community served by failing septic systems, usually Eastern Shore older communities with high groundwater tables. Also, a lot of older septic tanks are on smaller sized lots that are not amenable to upgrading on site. Mr. Saffouri agreed because he is aware of two communities with this situation. These projects are very challenging due to permitting and high cost per user issues, and so far, we haven't been successful in completing any project under this category.

III. Update on Cover Crops Activities

- Mr. Keppler provided an update on the Cover Crops Program. We are nearing the end of FY23 program. Approximately 396,000 acres were spring certified this year, not our high watermark but close to the usual 400,000. Mr. Keppler will have the final numbers for FY23 at the next meeting. The cover crop program was jointly funded by the BRF (\$12.6 million) and the Chesapeake and Atlantic Coastal Bays Trust Fund (\$11.2 million) for a total of \$23.8 million paid out this year. So overall, it is a relatively successful program again this year. The FY24 program is currently open for enrollment until the 17th of July. So hopefully we'll have another good enrollment.

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

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the OSDS Program. There have been 507 BAT upgrades and 90 sewer connections funded since the beginning of FY23 (between July 1, 2022, and July 11, 2023). Last year at this time we had 688 BAT upgrades and 108 sewer connections. The year before that, we had 634 BAT upgrades and 130 sewer connections. So, we are a little bit lower than usual this year. However, these aren't the final numbers, and we will continue to have payments processed for additional upgrades and connections through the end of August as part of FY23. We will have the final numbers for this fiscal year at the October meeting. We typically spend all the funds (\$15 million) in this account every year. The State establishes statewide pricing for these BAT systems through the bidding process and inflationary adjustments. We also establish the maximum cost allowance for the septic connections. Both have increased over the last couple of years, which could be impacting these numbers.

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 May 31, 2023. The report shows the third quarter FY23 revenues of \$26.6 million in the wastewater fund, which is nearly identical to last year's third quarter of \$26.5 million. The total to date this year is approximately 87.5 million for the wastewater fund. This is very similar to where we were last year through the same period where we had 87.7 million. The septic fund, the third quarter Fiscal Year 23 revenues are \$7.5 million, \$4.5 million for septic upgrades, and \$3 million for the MDA cover crop program. Total revenues thus far in Fiscal Year 23 are \$26.2 million, which is very similar to last year's total (\$27.4 million) through the same period. So, everything seems to be in line with where it should be. No red flags on any of these revenues that are causing any concerns for us.

VI. Update on Clean Water Commerce Act:

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the Clean Water Commerce Act. MDE released the FY23 Clean Water Commerce list on June 12th to all the interested parties including those that applied. Mr. Fretwell presented the list, which includes all the projects that have applied for funding during the application period. The projects MDE is funding are highlighted in green on the spreadsheet. There are also projects being funded by MDA (highlighted in yellow). Projects highlighted in blue are receiving federal funding through the Environmental Policy Innovation Center. As for MDE funding, \$14 of the \$20 million is going to be the top four projects using the agricultural carve out (\$7 million), and the general pot of funds (\$7 million). The remaining MDE projects are being funded through the non-agricultural landscape carve out (\$2 million). The price per pound of nitrogen reduction was very competitive, and many of the projects included co-benefits such as phosphorus and sediment reductions, carbon benefits, and habitat improvements. We didn't receive any applications for the Environmental Justice carve out (\$4 million), even though we tried twice. We had the initial solicitation that ended in September and then we ran a second

solicitation between December and January. The unutilized \$4 million will roll over to next year's solicitation (FY24) and it will be added to the general pot.

- Mr. Hoffman asked whether MDE would be able to share the full project applications in addition to this list. Mr. Fretwell responded that MDE may be able to provide summaries of the funded projects.
- Mr. Fretwell concluded his presentation by thanking MDA and the Environmental Policy Innovation Center for helping with this program.

VII. BRF-Wastewater Funded Projects (FY18 Thru FY24):

- As was requested by the committee in a previous meeting, Mr. Fretwell presented a list of the Bay Restoration Fund Wastewater Funded Projects, FY18 through FY24. We started with FY18 since that was the year when the fund became available for additional uses beyond the major/minor wastewater treatment plant upgrades. The last two fiscal years, '24 and '23, have been almost exclusively for minor wastewater treatment plant upgrades. In previous years we have funded many sewer rehab projects as well as some sewer extensions. We have funded very few stormwater management projects. Most of the funding has gone toward either minor wastewater upgrades or sewer rehab projects with sewer extensions being the next most prominent category, and then followed by stormwater management projects.

VIII. Other Discussions:

- Mr. Gray asked whether the Carter project on the CWCA list will result in over 500,000 lbs. of nitrogen reduction. Mr. Fretwell responded that was correct. It is a very large project that includes stream restoration, wetland creation, and other practices.
- Mr. Hoffman asked about the status of the vacancies in the committee membership. Mr. Fretwell responded that we continue to have a few openings. Specifically, we have two openings for the local environmental health representatives. We have reached out to the Maryland Association of Counties (MACo) and their environmental health group to try to get those two spots filled. We are still waiting for some specific recommendations. Also, the Environmental Justice representative membership is still open.
- Mr. Male suggested that in a future meeting MDE should provide the committee with an overview on the new Chesapeake Bay Comprehensive Evaluation of System Response (CESR) report. Mr. Fretwell agreed to add that to the agenda for October.
- Mr. Hoffman asked about the challenge of climate change, rising groundwater tables, and failing septic systems in rural areas. Onsite solution is not feasible for these situations, the septic systems must be connected to a wastewater treatment plant. However, as was mentioned earlier, these

communities are too small to have a treatment plant. Mr. Fretwell agreed that those are difficult situations that we're seeing. For example, we have a community in Dorchester County served by failing Berm Infiltration Pond (BIP) systems. MDE is working with the County to decommission the BIP systems and connect the community to Cambridge WWTP. The BIP systems in low lying climate vulnerable areas. Mr. Saffouri mentioned a similar situation we have in northern Caroline County where several towns are served by failing septic systems. MDE has been working with the County to connect these towns to Greensboro WWTP. So far, we have been successful in connecting Goldsboro. MDE continues to work with the County to connect the other three towns in the area. There are many more similar communities in Maryland that still have no feasible solution.

- Mr. Bozick added that the Maryland GIS website provides a good viewpoint of the groundwater level and locations where there are flooding and hurricanes. Large portions of impacted areas are in the Eastern Shore counties that will be submerged even just during king tides and storm events in the coming years. Another example we have is a town with 36 houses right on the edge of the Wicomico River, where the streets flood three or four times a month. The 36 houses are served by septic tanks, which produce 18 pounds per septic tank per year for a total of about 600 pounds. If you construct an ENR package plant for 10,000 or 15,000 gallons a day, you could reduce that load to 100 pounds a year. Instead of surface discharge, which may not be permitted by MDE, you could spray irrigate to agricultural or forested land. It's a solvable problem. Also, at many locations such as Kent Island and Dorchester County, it is feasible to pump the wastewater to an existing municipal service area. In Wicomico County, we have identified 8,000 or 9,000 that we think can connect to the municipalities. 5,000 additional houses will need septic system replacements. Ms. Lewis added that we need to get to a point where we can reuse wastewater to spray irrigate crops on private farms. There are plenty of private farms. With climate change, some farms may not have the ability to dig a well and have their own irrigation system. We need to figure out a way to get the treated wastewater where it can be used.

IX. Mr. Fretwell reminded the Committee members that the next meeting will be held on October 12, 2023.

Materials Distributed at the Meeting

- Meeting Agenda
- Previous Meeting Minutes
- Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status
- BRF Septic Program Funded Installations
- Distribution of Bay Restoration Fee
- Clean Water Commerce Act FY 2023 Solicitation
- BRF Wastewater FY18 – FY24

Attendance

Advisory Committee Members or Designees Attending:

Secretary Rebecca Flora, Maryland Department of Planning
Laura Allen, Maryland Department of Budget and Management
Jeffrey Fretwell, Maryland Department of the Environment
Walid Saffouri, Maryland Department of the Environment
Jason Keppler, Maryland Department of Agriculture
Ellen Mussman, Maryland Department of Planning
Cheryl Lewis, Town of Oxford/MML
Mark Hoffman, Chesapeake Bay Commission
Timothy Male, Environmental Policy Innovation Center
Doug Abbott, Easton Utilities
John Dinkle, Dinkle Business Development
Doug Myers, Chesapeake Bay Foundation

Others in Attendance:

Joe Sowinski, Hazen & Sawyer
Peter Bozick, George, Miles & Buhr
Mathew Kline, Department of Legislative Services
Kathleen Kennedy, Department of Legislative Services
Andrew Gray, Department of Legislative Services
Rebecca Reske, Office of the Attorney General
Mary Sheppard, Office of the Attorney General
Paola Argueta, B&L

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Attendees:

Elaine Dietz	Rajiv Chawla
Kathy Stecker	Susan Iaconangelo
Sunita Boyle	Paul Emmart
Mehdi Majedi	MiYamie Johnson

Maryland's Bay Restoration Fund – Success on the Chesapeake Bay



Maryland
Department of
the Environment

A Bay in Need

The Chesapeake Bay is the largest estuary in the United States; its 64,000 square mile watershed encompasses nearly the entire state of Maryland and portions of five other states and Washington D.C. The estuary provides important ecological functions that help bolster the local economy, but by the early 2000s, water quality in the bay continued to show signs of degradation in spite of the previous restoration efforts.

The reason for the declining water quality was determined to be an over-enrichment of nutrients like phosphorus and nitrogen, which can enter the water from a variety of human-related activities. Excess nutrients can result in a process called eutrophication, which increases the amount of algae and plant material able to grow in an area. This can lead to algal blooms and, when plants and algae die off, result in dead zones where living organisms no longer have enough oxygen to survive.

Nutrients entering the bay were mainly caused by effluent from wastewater treatment plants, as well as urban and agricultural runoff. As the situation worsened, officials realized that current cleanup efforts were not enough to drive meaningful restoration to the Bay and a larger effort would instead be necessary.

Residents to the Rescue: The Bay Restoration Fund

Senate Bill 320, also known as the Bay Restoration Fund (BRF), was passed in 2004 by the Maryland General Assembly. Since then, the BRF has collected a monthly fee from each Maryland home serviced by a wastewater treatment plant or septic system to create a dedicated fund for implementing nitrogen reduction strategies.

In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, in collaboration with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and other state jurisdictions, established a total maximum daily load (TMDL) for the Bay. To meet the TMDL, BRF monies were directed towards cost-efficient and effective nitrogen-reduction strategies, including continued upgrades to existing wastewater treatment plants.

The BRF also provides funding opportunities to address nutrients from septic systems and agricultural runoff. With these funds, Maryland farmers receive an incentive to plant cover crops on their land to help prevent excess nitrogen from running off and entering waterways.

In addition, around 10% of BRF funds are earmarked for an incentive program that encourages treatment plants to aim for higher nutrient removal levels than what is required of them. Facilities that meet the criteria receive grants based on the level of additional reduction achieved.



Chesapeake Bay Watershed

TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL)

A TMDL defines the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive while still meeting water quality standards.

Maryland BRF by the Numbers

- **\$1.912 billion** raised for the BRF.
- **8.5 million** pounds of nitrogen prevented per year.
- **12,553** septic systems upgraded.
- **1,334** homes connected to public sewer.
- **67** major wastewater treatment plant upgrades.
- **20** years since BRF was implemented.



Success by the Numbers

In the 20 years since the implementation of the BRF, the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay has shown significant signs of improvement. More than \$1.9 billion has been collected since the program began, which has been used to prevent an estimated 8.5 million pounds of nitrogen from entering the Bay each year.

The restoration funding has supported upgrades to all 67 major wastewater treatment plants that discharge into the bay, as well as additional updates to minor plants in the area. These upgrades added enhanced nutrient removal technologies that are essential to meeting the nitrogen and phosphorus reduction goals for each plant. In total, upgrades at the wastewater treatment plants are responsible for around 7.5 million pounds of nitrogen reduction per year.

Another successful strategy has been the planting of cover crops. In 2022, more than 424,616 acres of cover crops were added, helping to remove an estimated 3 million pounds of nitrogen and an additional 3,400 pounds of phosphorus. In addition to nutrient reductions, these cover crops also helped farmers prevent soil erosion and improve soil health.

In total, \$233 million of the BRF has gone towards upgrading 12,553 total septic systems. In 2022 alone, more than 910 failing septic systems were upgraded with the best available technology for nutrient removal, many of which were located in designated critical areas for the state of Maryland. Since the BRF began, 1,334 homes that were previously using septic systems have been connected to public sewers that are capable of higher levels of nitrogen reduction.

What is Next for the Chesapeake Bay?

With the contributions from Maryland residents, the Bay is cleaner and closer to meeting the TMDL. Nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment loads have decreased throughout the state of Maryland. In June of 2023, the lowest recorded amount of hypoxic (low dissolved oxygen) waters since 1985 was recorded.

Despite this progress, further steps are still needed in order to meet the 2025 TMDL load reduction goals. Currently, Maryland releases around 52.7 million pounds of nitrogen into the Bay per year; by 2025, the goal is to reduce this number to 45.8 million pounds. One of the main priorities is ensuring that BRF-targeted upgrades to wastewater and agriculture continue to be implemented during the upcoming years.



This project has been funded wholly or in part by the United States Environmental Protection Agency under assistance agreement 84039101 to NEIW PCC. The contents of this document do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency, nor does the EPA endorse trade names or recommend the use of commercial products mentioned in this document.



Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status

(October 12, 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	90%	94%

Minor WWTPs

Previous Meeting

12 facilities are in operation
6 facilities are under construction
7 facilities are in design
10 facilities are in planning
35 total

Current

12 facilities are in operation
6 facilities are under construction
7 facilities are in design
10 facilities are in planning
35 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
Harbour View	99%	99%
Chesapeake City	96%	96%
Victor Cullen	90%	90%
Lewistown	69%	87%
Twin Cities	8%	44%
Smith Island	17%	22%

BRF Septic Program
 Funded Installations FY24 to Date
 July 1, 2023- Sep. 25, 2023

County	Total approvals from Fiscal Year 24 Grant From 7/1/23-09/25/23	
	# Septic Systems funded FY 24	# Sewer Connections funded FY 24
Allegany (CVI)	0	0
Anne Arundel	11	0
Baltimore	1	1
Calvert	8	0
Caroline	2	0
Carroll (CVI)	0	0
Cecil	2	0
Charles	2	0
Dorchester	9	0
Frederick (CVI)	0	0
Garrett	2	0
Harford	0	0
Howard (CVI)	0	0
Kent	2	0
Montgomery (CVI)	0	0
Prince George's	0	0
Queen Anne's	0	0
Somerset	0	0
St. Mary's	3	0
Talbot	0	0
Washington (CVI)	0	0
Wicomoco	0	0
Worcester	0	0
Totals	42	1

County	Total approvals from Fiscal Year 23 Grant	
	# Septic Systems funded FY23- 24	# Sewer Connections funded FY23- 24
Allegany (CVI)	1	5
Anne Arundel	157	18
Baltimore	17	20
Calvert	82	0
Caroline	23	0
Carroll (CVI)	9	0
Cecil	34	19
Charles	24	5
Dorchester	26	0
Frederick (CVI)	19	0
Garrett	5	0
Harford	14	6
Howard (CVI)	3	9
Kent	18	0
Montgomery (CVI)	8	3
Prince George's	0	1
Queen Anne's	52	78
Somerset	23	1
St. Mary's	81	3
Talbot	62	4
Washington (CVI)	14	0
Wicomoco	28	0
Worcester	20	1
Totals	720	173

**Comptroller of Maryland
Revenue Administration Division
Bay Restoration Fee - By County
Program To Date Through June 2023, 2023**

	<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	\$25,447,928	\$4,765,304	\$30,213,232	\$29,932,222	759	65	\$281,010	287,495
200 Anne Arundel	\$153,683,275	\$38,351,709	\$192,034,984	\$191,369,088	930	252	\$665,896	664,637
300 Baltimore County	\$204,258,232	\$3,420,316	\$207,678,548	\$207,660,909	241	108	\$17,640	15,951
400 Baltimore City	\$262,685,183	\$27,289,088	\$289,974,271	\$289,741,908	625	168	\$232,362	261,096
500 Calvert	\$6,783,472	\$24,573,611	\$31,357,083	\$30,927,249	606	35	\$429,834	476,428
600 Caroline	\$4,633,467	\$7,685,414	\$12,318,880	\$12,250,296	586	18	\$68,585	73,558
700 Carroll	\$18,286,916	\$39,848,670	\$58,135,586	\$57,839,126	853	124	\$296,460	634,692
800 Cecil	\$16,224,659	\$21,091,677	\$37,316,336	\$37,007,713	1599	132	\$308,623	395,281
900 Charles	\$35,324,378	\$15,719,049	\$51,043,427	\$50,832,739	1763	134	\$210,688	218,028
1000 Dorchester	\$8,339,895	\$9,944,286	\$18,284,181	\$17,970,873	525	117	\$313,308	356,303
1100 Frederick	\$59,042,373	\$25,434,754	\$84,477,127	\$84,283,056	936	243	\$194,072	2,723,480
1200 Garrett	\$4,611,393	\$6,775,370	\$11,386,763	\$11,275,015	334	44	\$111,748	111,530
1300 Harford	\$55,709,590	\$29,289,320	\$84,998,910	\$84,326,835	660	155	\$672,076	675,409
1400 Howard	\$86,826,546	\$14,712,626	\$101,539,172	\$101,462,467	352	83	\$76,705	77,935
1500 Kent	\$6,262,414	\$4,229,992	\$10,492,406	\$10,385,355	571	39	\$107,052	213,713
1600 Montgomery	\$15,064,697	\$12,406,346	\$27,471,042	\$26,293,842	559	117	\$1,177,200	2,379,166
1700 Prince George's	\$542,600,997	\$25,525,083	\$568,126,080	\$558,279,498	458	181	\$9,846,582	9,886,263
1800 Queen Anne's	\$11,064,240	\$9,598,946	\$20,663,187	\$20,134,767	484	136	\$528,420	539,234
1900 St. Mary's	\$4,690,990	\$4,539,232	\$9,230,222	\$8,830,520	220	7	\$399,702	522,671
2000 Somerset	\$13,673,707	\$26,615,132	\$40,288,839	\$40,202,494	442	89	\$86,344	88,278
2100 Talbot	\$11,626,445	\$7,450,319	\$19,076,764	\$18,986,314	720	16	\$90,450	127,830
2200 Washington	\$37,564,051	\$16,699,517	\$54,263,568	\$53,979,560	790	19	\$284,007	320,275
2300 Wicomico	\$17,241,181	\$24,104,996	\$41,346,177	\$40,837,120	829	121	\$509,058	483,089
2400 Worcester	\$25,344,805	\$6,795,900	\$32,140,706	\$31,569,976	572	92	\$570,730	1,057,925
Undesignated	\$1,216,303	\$998,108	\$2,214,411	\$2,095,896	176	258	\$118,515	217,715
Total	\$ 1,628,207,137.67	\$ 407,864,764.80	\$ 2,036,071,902.47	\$ 2,018,474,836.40	16,590	2,753	\$ 17,597,066.07	\$ 22,807,981.03

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 2023 Through June 30, 2023**

	<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	\$1,647,905	\$252,222	\$1,900,127	\$1,890,759	32		\$9,368	\$9,368
200 Anne Arundel	\$11,039,852	\$2,614,694	\$13,654,546	\$13,607,661	50	7	\$46,885	\$46,914
300 Baltimore County	\$9,988,951	\$129,162	\$10,118,113	\$10,116,374	10		\$1,739	\$49
400 Baltimore City	\$12,481,075	\$944,790	\$13,425,865	\$13,425,424	25	9	\$441	\$500
500 Calvert	\$443,704	\$1,850,152	\$2,293,856	\$2,258,777	28		\$35,079	\$53,921
600 Caroline	\$292,047	\$539,208	\$831,255	\$827,597	29		\$3,658	\$4,562
700 Carroll	\$1,017,180	\$2,898,865	\$3,916,044	\$3,896,413	46	4	\$19,631	\$55,022
800 Cecil	\$1,035,591	\$1,377,300	\$2,412,891	\$2,387,782	62	1	\$25,109	\$26,495
900 Charles	\$2,595,041	\$1,089,546	\$3,684,587	\$3,668,575	87		\$16,013	\$16,768
1000 Dorchester	\$382,510	\$709,713	\$1,092,222	\$1,082,079	23	4	\$10,144	\$10,804
1100 Frederick	\$4,598,405	\$1,849,473	\$6,447,878	\$6,434,121	46	10	\$13,758	\$319,853
1200 Garrett	\$268,547	\$410,851	\$679,398	\$671,132	15		\$8,266	\$8,246
1300 Harford	\$3,691,409	\$2,058,934	\$5,750,343	\$5,723,908	36		\$26,435	\$26,435
1400 Howard	\$6,126,227	\$1,103,274	\$7,229,500	\$7,227,884	16		\$1,617	\$1,538
1500 Kent	\$415,953	\$288,184	\$704,137	\$697,550	29	1	\$6,588	\$38,986
1600 Montgomery	\$833,679	\$386,644	\$1,220,323	\$1,165,324	19	5	\$54,999	\$212,382
1700 Prince George's	\$37,679,772	\$1,669,153	\$39,348,925	\$37,439,216	16	9	\$1,909,710	\$1,904,223
1800 Queen Anne's	\$874,640	\$642,218	\$1,516,858	\$1,478,657	28	11	\$38,200	\$39,185
1900 St. Mary's	\$277,106	\$322,363	\$599,469	\$572,209	12		\$27,260	\$39,043
2000 Somerset	\$249,740	\$2,712,994	\$2,962,734	\$2,959,762	12	2	\$2,972	\$2,973
2100 Talbot	\$818,001	\$517,575	\$1,335,576	\$1,329,177	26	2	\$6,400	\$9,176
2200 Washington	\$2,259,413	\$1,106,329	\$3,365,742	\$3,348,309	39		\$17,434	\$21,644
2300 Wicomico	\$853,716	\$1,714,453	\$2,568,169	\$2,526,386	37	4	\$41,783	\$26,399
2400 Worcester	\$1,289,322	\$62,881	\$1,352,203	\$1,340,602	22		\$11,601	\$21,107
Undesignated	\$901,016	\$459,349	\$1,360,365	\$1,294,334	35	15	\$66,031	\$141,464
Total	\$ 102,060,801.10	\$ 27,710,326.29	\$ 129,771,127.39	\$ 127,370,009.19	780	84	\$ 2,401,118.20	\$ 3,037,056.79

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
Second Quarter of Tax Year 2023 Through Jun 30, 2023**

	<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	\$402,402	\$22,829	\$425,230	\$424,252	8		\$978	\$978
200 Anne Arundel	\$2,664,928	\$220,303	\$2,885,231	\$2,878,563	12	3	\$6,668	\$6,789
300 Baltimore County	\$137,790	\$68,950	\$206,740	\$205,001	3		\$1,739	\$40
400 Baltimore City	\$167,973	\$23,275	\$191,248	\$191,139	7	2	\$109	\$125
500 Calvert	\$38,105	\$105,524	\$143,629	\$139,359	7		\$4,270	\$13,765
600 Caroline	\$51,818	\$21,074	\$72,892	\$72,089	7		\$803	\$1,186
700 Carroll	\$118,698	\$225,833	\$344,532	\$339,721	10	1	\$4,810	\$14,109
800 Cecil	\$197,599	\$3,045	\$200,644	\$197,404	15		\$3,240	\$5,283
900 Charles	\$677,107	\$39,918	\$717,025	\$712,090	19		\$4,935	\$5,122
1000 Dorchester	\$21,110	\$52,453	\$73,563	\$72,926	4	1	\$638	\$785
1100 Frederick	\$1,162,911	\$33,412	\$1,196,323	\$1,192,445	12	1	\$3,878	\$78,847
1200 Garrett	\$68,149	\$17,832	\$85,981	\$83,224	4		\$2,757	\$2,757
1300 Harford	\$951,753	\$136,036	\$1,087,789	\$1,079,560	9		\$8,229	\$8,229
1400 Howard	\$1,564,842	\$64,555	\$1,629,397	\$1,628,999	4		\$398	\$383
1500 Kent	\$103,811	\$6,919	\$110,730	\$108,849	7	1	\$1,881	\$10,230
1600 Montgomery	\$244,040	\$9,243	\$253,283	\$241,162	5		\$12,121	\$26,986
1700 Prince George's	\$9,343,941	\$223,361	\$9,567,302	\$9,094,967	3	3	\$472,335	\$472,335
1800 Queen Anne's	\$228,112	\$10,352	\$238,464	\$228,659	6	2	\$9,804	\$10,033
1900 St. Mary's	\$87,342	\$13,476	\$100,819	\$95,778	3		\$5,041	\$7,583
2000 Somerset	\$70,909	\$343,287	\$414,196	\$413,206	3	1	\$990	\$991
2100 Talbot	\$196,187	\$6,675	\$202,862	\$200,968	6		\$1,894	\$2,439
2200 Washington	\$673,929	\$72,022	\$745,951	\$740,649	11		\$5,302	\$6,225
2300 Wicomico	\$258,805	\$192,911	\$451,716	\$449,293	10	1	\$2,423	\$2,416
2400 Worcester	\$241,366	\$15,318	\$256,684	\$255,933	4		\$751	\$684
Undesignated	\$210,688	\$21,578	\$232,266	\$221,365	10	3	\$10,901	\$20,230
Total	\$ 19,884,313.55	\$ 1,950,181.86	\$ 21,834,495.41	\$ 21,267,600.99	189	19	\$ 566,894	\$ 698,549

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
Fiscal Year 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	\$	114,847,299.86		

August 2022	\$	-
September		-
October		35,184,165.22
November		
December		
January 2023		25,740,782.62
February		
March		
April		16,660,279.15
May		9,961,014.89
June		15,743,414.49
FM13		11,557,643.49
Total FY 2023	\$	114,847,299.86

Program Grand Total \$ 1,646,982,912.62

<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 60% MDE 40% MDA	<u>\$ 9,484,117.74</u>	<u>\$ 6,322,745.15</u>	<u>\$ 15,806,862.89</u>
Total Fiscal Year 2010 22.4% MDE 77.6% MDA	<u>\$ 3,118,419.66</u>	<u>\$ 10,803,096.68</u>	<u>\$ 13,921,516.34</u>

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	\$ 16,949,975.95	\$ 11,299,984.02	\$ 28,249,959.97

Fiscal Year 2023	60%	40%	Total
August 2022	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
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	3,458,578.47	2,305,718.99	5,764,297.46
May	1,034,226.27	689,484.18	1,723,710.45
June	1,092,452.84	728,301.89	1,820,754.73
FM13	115,635.23	77,090.16	192,725.39
Total FY 2023	\$ 16,949,975.95	\$ 11,299,984.02	\$ 28,249,959.97

Program Grand Total	\$ 239,831,818.16	\$ 168,612,029.02	\$ 408,443,847.18
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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	211,227.40
		Program Grand Total	<u>\$ 2,394,944.52</u>

-