

# **BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Maryland Department of the Environment**

**Thursday, December 14 · 1:00 – 3:00pm**

**Video call link: <https://meet.google.com/ehe-wtmj-ncn>**

**Or dial: (US) +1 401-300-5962 PIN: 385 904 693#**

**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 Back River and Patapsco Consent Decree – Andrew Gosden, MDE
- Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation – Walid Saffouri, MDE
- Advisory Committee Annual Report - 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
- 2024 Next Pre-Scheduled Meetings: April 11<sup>th</sup>  
July 11<sup>th</sup>  
October 10<sup>th</sup>  
December 12<sup>th</sup>
- ADJOURNMENT

# **BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Maryland Department of the Environment**

**Virtual Meeting**

**October 12, 2023**

---

## **Meeting Minutes**

### **Welcome/Introduction**

- The meeting was opened by Mr. Murphy, the 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 July 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. 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. Maryland Nutrient Success Story:**

- Ms. Stecker provided an update on the Nutrient Success Stories project. The BRF has been selected as a national nutrient success story by the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission (NEIWPCC), which has a contract with EPA to highlight these success stories. The prizes that we won are communications products. The first product was the handout presented to the committee. It's a one-page summary that NEIWPCC will post with all the other nutrient success stories. Ms. Stecker asked the committee to review and comment on the one-page summary. Another product is a podcast. Jeff Berckes, of NEIWPCC, has separately interviewed Walid Saffouri, Cheryl Lewis, and Bob Summers (a former MDE Secretary) for the podcast. He is currently editing it to be released in November or December. As a third product, NEIWPCC has been working on a story-board-type outline of a story map about BRF. We already plan to have a link to MDA's excellent video about cover crops. Finally, they'll also create some suggested website language that's more educational and aimed for the public.

- Mr. Myers advised that based on his recent interview with a group called Ocean Sewage Alliance, the group is interested in what works with wastewater to reduce eutrophication in estuaries throughout the country. So, when these products are final, we should send links to this group because they certainly want to hold this up as the best example in the country.

## **II. Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation:**

- Mr. Saffouri provided an update on major and minor WWTPs. There have been no changes in the status in both major and minor WWTPs since the last meeting. Projects that are under construction continue to progress without any major issues.
- Mr. Murphy asked whether there was any update on the outreach to the minor plants to encourage them to seek BRF funding and start the planning process to upgrade. Mr. Saffouri indicated that there is no update on these efforts, but the demand continues to be high without the outreach.
- Mr. Sowinski asked whether MDE was continuing to fund the planning phase for minor plants at 100% BRF grant. Mr. Saffouri responded yes. There are about 66 minor facilities that we think could be cost effective to upgrade based on their design capacity and the cost curve estimates. We can fund the planning for these facilities immediately after they decide to proceed. Other minor facilities would have to apply through the regular process and show that their upgrades are cost effective before we can proceed with funding them.

## **III. Update on Cover Crops Activities**

- Mr. Keppler provided an update on the Cover Crops Program. Mr. Keppler provided the final numbers for FY23, which represent the cover crops that were planted in the fall of 2022 and then killed down in the spring of 2023. About 395,000 acres were implemented in our program last year, which represents \$24.2 million worth of investment in the cover crop program. It's certainly not a banner year, but overall, it has been a relatively successful program again this year. A lot of issues with the weather last fall prohibited farmers from planting additional cover crops. We had our open enrollment period for the FY24 program that took place at the end of June/early July. To date, we have received and approved 1,428 applications for approximately 622,000 acres, which would represent \$55 million worth of cover crops if they are all implemented. However, we all recognize that farmers are currently looking through the various options, and they may or may not end up implementing the cover crops option. In addition, weather and other factors can also impact the implementation. Hence, while the enrollments are currently quite high, the actual implementation is expected to be within the normal range of 400,000 acres. Farmers have already been planting and certifying their fall cover crops under this year's program. To date, we have received 85,000 acres worth of fall certifications.

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

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the OSDS Program. Mr. Fretwell presented the FY23 final

numbers of funded septic system upgrades and sewer connections as well as the first quarter of FY24. He focused more on the FY23 final numbers. There are 720 BAT septic upgrades and 173 sewer connections funded in FY23. The BAT upgrade number is lower than previous years, while the sewer connection number is about average. The average number of BAT upgrades over the last five years, FY18 through FY22, has been 852. The average number of septic connections during the same years has been 187, which is highly influenced by one year when there were over 300 sewer connections. The lower number of BAT upgrades in FY23 is due to substantial increase in the statewide pricing for the septic upgrades, which was set through the IFB process in FY22. In addition, the contract includes an inflationary increase based on the consumer price index increase. Chris Murphy asked about this a few meetings ago whether we thought the higher reimbursement rates would ultimately have an impact on our total numbers given that the available funds have not increased. It does seem like that is the case. We have noticed similar cost impacts on the wastewater side due to supply chain, inflation, contractor shortages, et cetera. It's worth noting that we do have \$2.3 million in reverted funds at the end of FY23. These are the funds that counties did not spend during the year. We will be asking the counties what additional funds they need and will go back to the Board of Public Works in December to authorize the additional funds. We do this every year for about the same amount between \$2 and \$3 million.

- Mr. Bozick asked whether the BRF covering only the treatment portion of the septic systems and not the disposal fields could be impacting the number of units that get placed each year. Mr. Fretwell responded that the BRF program pays for the treatment unit and not the drain field, except in cases where the homeowner qualifies as low income. However, the low-income criterion is very low and very few homeowners qualify, so most applicants are not receiving drain field assistance. This has been the case since the inception of the program, so it is unlikely that it is causing the recent decline in the number of installations.
- Mr. Bozick clarified that he was not asking about the funding for the drain fields. His question was more relevant to climate change, sea level rise, getting to older systems with smaller lots, that drain field difficulties are impeding the adding more septic systems, regardless of whether they are funded by the state or not. Ms. Dorsey, MDE Deputy Secretary, responded that certain parts of our state are experiencing climate change impacts that are impacting the effectiveness of the septic systems. Depending on where you are, there are some short- and medium-term solutions. MDE is engaging with the local governments and encouraging them to make long-term plans, which may include additional wastewater treatment plants and hookup options for certain communities. She added that Mr. Bozick was raising an important landscape-level challenge that we're all going to have to face as more and more individuals in rural areas have failing septic systems, and expenses and problems that are associated with it.
- Mr. Murphy asked whether MDE was tracking any failing septic systems in relation to sea level rise or climate change issues. Mr. Fretwell responded that he will get back to him with an answer to this question.

- Mr. Murphy asked that as we were approaching the 20-year anniversary of BRF, is there any thought of using the BRF funds toward upgrading the older systems previously funded and have started reaching the end of their useful life. Mr. Fretwell responded that we have the same question regarding the wastewater treatment plants. He agreed that we do need to start thinking about that. Mr. Murphy added that septic systems are more critical. The treatment plants are reporting on their performance, while septic systems are handled by the individual owner, and it is difficult to determine which ones are not performing appropriately. Mr. Bozick added that even the septic systems that are working properly cannot achieve the same level of removal as the wastewater treatment plants that are upgraded to the ENR level of treatment.

**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 June 30, 2023. The total for the fourth quarter of FY23 is \$27.3 million for the wastewater fund. This is what we typically receive for the fourth quarter. The total for the year for FY23 wastewater is \$114.8 million, which is also consistent with what we typically see. The average for the last five years is \$112.3 million. For the septic fund, the revenues for the fourth quarter of FY23 are \$2 million; \$1.2 million for septic upgrades and \$805,000 for MDA's cover crop program. These are typical fourth quarter numbers for the septic fund. The BRF septic total for FY23 is \$28.25 million, which is slightly lower than typical. The average for the last five years is \$29.2.

- VI.** Mr. Murphy reminded the Committee members that the next meeting will be held on December 14, 2023.

**Materials Distributed at the Meeting**

- Meeting Agenda
- Previous Meeting Minutes
- Maryland Bay Restoration Fund Success Story
- Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status
- BRF Septic Program Funded Installations
- Distribution of Bay Restoration Fee

**Attendance**

**Advisory Committee Members or Designees Attending:**

Chris Murphy, Anne Arundel County DPW, Committee Chairman  
Suzanne Dorsey, Deputy Secretary, Maryland Department of the Environment  
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  
Timothy Male, Environmental Policy Innovation Center  
Doug Abbott, Easton Utilities  
Doug Myers, Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
Bob Buglass, Washington Suburban Sanitary District

**Others in Attendance:**

Joe Sowinski, Hazen & Sawyer  
Peter Bozick, George, Miles & Buhr  
Mathew Kline, Department of Legislative Services  
Rebecca Reske, Office of the Attorney General  
Mary Sheppard, Office of the Attorney General  
Crystal Faison, Shepherd Energy

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

Elaine Dietz	Rajiv Chawla
Kathy Stecker	Sunita Boyle
Paul Emmart	Mehdi Majedi
MiYamie Johnson	Naomi Howell

## Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status

(December 14, 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 Since Previous Meeting:

- No changes in status.

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

Facility	Previous Meeting Percentage Complete	Current Percentage Complete
Westminster	94%	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

13 facilities are in operation  
6 facilities are under construction  
8 facilities are in design  
8 facilities are in planning  
35 total

#### Status Changes Since Previous Meeting:

- Manchester and the College of Southern Maryland have progressed from planning to design.
- Elk Neck State Park has progressed to construction.
- Harbour View has completed the construction and is in the ENR operation.

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

Facility	Previous Meeting Percentage Complete	Current Percentage Complete
Chesapeake City	96%	96%
Victor Cullen	90%	90%
Lewistown	87%	87%
Twin Cities	44%	64%
Smith Island	22%	22%
Elk Neck State Park		9%

*Draft*



**Bay Restoration Fund Advisory Committee**

**Christopher P. Murphy, Chairman**

**Annual Status Report  
January 2024 (19<sup>th</sup> Report)**

**Report to:**

**Wes Moore, Governor  
State of Maryland**

**Aruna Miller, Lt. Governor  
State of Maryland**

**Bill Ferguson, Senate President  
Maryland General Assembly**

**Adrienne A. Jones, House Speaker  
Maryland General Assembly**

**Brian J. Feldman, Chair  
Senate Education, Energy, and the Environment Committee**

**Guy Guzzone, Chair  
Senate Budget and Taxation Committee**

**Marc Korman, Chair  
House Environment and Transportation Committee**

**Ben Barnes, Chair  
House Appropriations Committee**



**BRF Septic Program**  
**Funded Installations FY24 to Date**  
**July 1, 2023- Dec 12, 2023**

County	<b>Total approvals from Fiscal Year 24 Grant</b>	
	<b># Septic Systems funded FY 24</b>	<b># Sewer Connections funded FY 24</b>
Allegany (CVI)	0	2
Anne Arundel	39	2
Baltimore	9	3
Calvert	37	0
Caroline	2	0
Carroll (CVI)	2	0
Cecil	8	5
Charles	10	0
Dorchester	13	0
Frederick (CVI)	3	0
Garrett	2	0
Harford	4	1
Howard (CVI)	0	1
Kent	4	0
Montgomery (CVI)	3	1
Prince George's	0	0
Queen Anne's	11	0
Somerset	4	0
St. Mary's	11	0
Talbot	13	0
Washington (CVI)	1	0
Wicomoco	0	0
Worcester	0	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>15</b>

**Comptroller of Maryland  
Revenue Administration Division  
Bay Restoration Fee - By County  
Program To Date Through October 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	\$25,828,902	\$4,786,010	\$30,614,912	\$30,332,436	767	63	\$282,476	288,960
200 Anne Arundel	\$156,751,878	\$39,636,686	\$196,388,564	\$195,706,276	943	253	\$682,288	680,786
300 Baltimore County	\$207,592,613	\$3,450,316	\$211,042,929	\$211,025,280	243	108	\$17,649	17,681
400 Baltimore City	\$266,528,005	\$27,551,518	\$294,079,523	\$293,847,050	631	170	\$232,473	261,221
500 Calvert	\$6,894,835	\$25,389,482	\$32,284,317	\$31,844,075	613	35	\$440,243	491,880
600 Caroline	\$4,733,301	\$8,004,481	\$12,737,782	\$12,667,116	595	17	\$70,666	77,713
700 Carroll	\$18,764,667	\$41,881,641	\$60,646,308	\$60,344,874	867	126	\$301,434	648,772
800 Cecil	\$16,670,545	\$21,936,390	\$38,606,935	\$38,293,249	1615	131	\$313,686	402,591
900 Charles	\$35,921,428	\$16,695,313	\$52,616,741	\$52,404,042	1787	134	\$212,699	220,274
1000 Dorchester	\$8,826,227	\$10,047,382	\$18,873,608	\$18,551,816	534	118	\$321,792	364,925
1100 Frederick	\$59,997,666	\$27,027,038	\$87,024,705	\$86,826,860	948	245	\$197,844	2,776,456
1200 Garrett	\$4,657,740	\$7,068,150	\$11,725,890	\$11,612,544	338	44	\$113,346	113,129
1300 Harford	\$56,848,121	\$30,767,654	\$87,615,775	\$86,935,362	669	156	\$680,413	687,013
1400 Howard	\$88,371,634	\$15,600,349	\$103,971,984	\$103,894,879	356	83	\$77,105	78,320
1500 Kent	\$6,362,236	\$4,404,836	\$10,767,072	\$10,658,406	578	40	\$108,666	219,028
1600 Montgomery	\$15,337,760	\$12,435,165	\$27,772,925	\$26,582,279	564	118	\$1,190,646	2,408,707
1700 Prince George's	\$552,295,271	\$25,772,302	\$578,067,573	\$567,723,923	462	185	\$10,343,650	10,383,331
1800 Queen Anne's	\$11,283,361	\$9,991,234	\$21,274,595	\$20,736,155	491	137	\$538,440	549,830
1900 St. Mary's	\$4,776,119	\$4,785,277	\$9,561,396	\$9,145,136	223	7	\$416,260	541,308
2000 Somerset	\$13,745,717	\$27,786,736	\$41,532,453	\$41,445,099	444	91	\$87,354	89,288
2100 Talbot	\$11,835,075	\$7,894,911	\$19,729,985	\$19,638,190	726	17	\$91,795	129,812
2200 Washington	\$1,440,231	\$1,399,220	\$2,839,451	\$2,690,888	188	259	\$148,564	238,699
2300 Wicomico	\$38,806,785	\$17,499,714	\$56,306,500	\$56,017,510	799	18	\$288,990	325,258
2400 Worcester	\$17,660,850	\$25,404,092	\$43,064,942	\$42,509,122	839	122	\$555,820	529,823
Undesignated	\$25,788,769	\$6,811,591	\$32,600,360	\$32,022,962	580	92	\$577,398	1,068,403
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 1,657,719,736.73</b>	<b>\$ 424,027,489.16</b>	<b>\$ 2,081,747,225.89</b>	<b>\$ 2,063,455,528.68</b>	<b>16,800</b>	<b>2,769</b>	<b>\$ 18,291,697.21</b>	<b>\$ 23,593,207.64</b>

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 October 31, 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	\$1,252,775	\$95,220	\$1,347,995	\$1,343,625	24		\$4,370	\$4,370
200 Anne Arundel	\$8,591,763	\$1,779,699	\$10,371,463	\$10,340,204	37	5	\$31,258	\$31,113
300 Baltimore County	\$6,898,159	\$98,950	\$6,997,109	\$6,995,360	7		\$1,749	\$1,779
400 Baltimore City	\$4,011,644	\$290,301	\$4,301,944	\$4,301,616	18	7	\$328	\$375
500 Calvert	\$258,333	\$1,117,900	\$1,376,233	\$1,351,298	21		\$24,935	\$42,841
600 Caroline	\$206,770	\$386,674	\$593,443	\$590,134	22		\$3,310	\$5,766
700 Carroll	\$903,303	\$2,568,968	\$3,472,271	\$3,457,469	36	4	\$14,803	\$42,094
800 Cecil	\$846,731	\$996,706	\$1,843,437	\$1,830,116	46	1	\$13,321	\$19,707
900 Charles	\$1,981,272	\$1,076,879	\$3,058,152	\$3,046,609	66		\$11,543	\$12,108
1000 Dorchester	\$660,249	\$279,004	\$939,252	\$926,097	20	3	\$13,155	\$13,610
1100 Frederick	\$3,243,803	\$1,744,279	\$4,988,081	\$4,977,816	34	6	\$10,265	\$217,029
1200 Garrett	\$185,598	\$350,970	\$536,568	\$530,319	11		\$6,249	\$6,249
1300 Harford	\$3,036,690	\$1,770,258	\$4,806,948	\$4,786,642	27	1	\$20,307	\$23,573
1400 Howard	\$4,587,435	\$1,051,620	\$5,639,056	\$5,637,858	12		\$1,198	\$1,153
1500 Kent	\$316,667	\$193,481	\$510,148	\$505,122	22	2	\$5,026	\$25,275
1600 Montgomery	\$840,424	\$38,232	\$878,655	\$841,415	14	2	\$37,240	\$87,933
1700 Prince George's	\$28,555,290	\$669,546	\$29,224,836	\$27,769,631	10	10	\$1,455,205	\$1,449,719
1800 Queen Anne's	\$683,745	\$439,861	\$1,123,607	\$1,096,039	19	7	\$27,568	\$29,113
1900 St. Mary's	\$258,761	\$290,770	\$549,530	\$522,054	9		\$27,477	\$34,216
2000 Somerset	\$211,458	\$1,911,058	\$2,122,516	\$2,119,525	8	4	\$2,991	\$2,991
2100 Talbot	\$616,281	\$474,255	\$1,090,536	\$1,085,800	18	2	\$4,736	\$6,443
2200 Washington	\$504,336	\$452,808	\$957,144	\$911,476	30	10	\$45,668	\$61,444
2300 Wicomico	\$2,171,559	\$926,764	\$3,098,323	\$3,085,873	28		\$12,450	\$14,540
2400 Worcester	\$736,126	\$1,585,653	\$2,321,779	\$2,270,852	29	4	\$50,927	\$50,875
Undesignated	\$990,771	\$47,807	\$1,038,578	\$1,027,464	18		\$11,114	\$19,841
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 72,549,940.11</b>	<b>\$ 20,637,664.37</b>	<b>\$ 93,187,604.48</b>	<b>\$ 91,350,412.84</b>	<b>586</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>\$ 1,837,191.64</b>	<b>\$ 2,204,156.20</b>

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 October 31, 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	\$380,974	\$20,705	\$401,680	\$400,214	8		\$1,466	\$1,466
200 Anne Arundel	\$2,957,773	\$1,274,057	\$4,231,830	\$4,215,438	11	1	\$16,392	\$16,149
300 Baltimore County	\$3,334,183	\$30,000	\$3,364,183	\$3,364,183	2		\$0	\$0
400 Baltimore City	\$2,511	\$4,050	\$6,561	\$6,450	5	3	\$111	\$125
500 Calvert	\$111,363	\$815,871	\$927,234	\$916,826	7		\$10,408	\$15,452
600 Caroline	\$67,118	\$319,067	\$386,185	\$385,740	7		\$445	\$445
700 Carroll	\$300,357	\$1,972,472	\$2,272,829	\$2,267,855	12	1	\$4,974	\$14,079
800 Cecil	\$315,489	\$844,713	\$1,160,202	\$1,155,139	16		\$5,063	\$7,310
900 Charles	\$594,037	\$976,094	\$1,570,131	\$1,568,209	21		\$1,921	\$2,096
1000 Dorchester	\$352,476	\$52,950	\$405,426	\$400,957	7	1	\$4,469	\$4,607
1100 Frederick	\$945,927	\$1,592,284	\$2,538,212	\$2,534,470	11	2	\$3,742	\$52,945
1200 Garrett	\$46,347	\$292,780	\$339,127	\$337,529	4		\$1,598	\$1,598
1300 Harford	\$1,027,094	\$1,478,335	\$2,505,429	\$2,497,091	9	1	\$8,338	\$11,604
1400 Howard	\$1,545,088	\$887,723	\$2,432,812	\$2,432,412	4		\$400	\$385
1500 Kent	\$99,673	\$174,844	\$274,517	\$272,904	7	1	\$1,614	\$5,315
1600 Montgomery	\$272,993	\$170	\$273,163	\$261,149	4		\$12,013	\$29,541
1700 Prince George's	\$9,694,257	\$247,219	\$9,941,476	\$9,444,408	3	4	\$497,068	\$497,068
1800 Queen Anne's	\$219,119	\$392,287	\$611,407	\$601,387	7	1	\$10,020	\$10,596
1900 St. Mary's	\$85,129	\$246,045	\$331,174	\$314,616	3		\$16,559	\$18,637
2000 Somerset	\$72,010	\$1,171,604	\$1,243,614	\$1,242,605	2	2	\$1,009	\$1,009
2100 Talbot	\$208,630	\$444,592	\$653,222	\$651,877	6		\$1,345	\$1,982
2200 Washington	\$217,360	\$401,067	\$618,427	\$588,379	10	3	\$30,049	\$20,984
2300 Wicomico	\$744,364	\$800,197	\$1,544,562	\$1,539,579	9		\$4,983	\$4,983
2400 Worcester	\$264,416	\$1,167,633	\$1,432,049	\$1,385,282	11	1	\$46,767	\$46,738
Undesignated	\$379,586	\$15,661	\$395,247	\$391,540	6		\$3,707	\$9,524
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 24,238,273.22</b>	<b>\$ 15,622,422.42</b>	<b>\$ 39,860,695.64</b>	<b>\$ 39,176,236.41</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>\$ 684,459</b>	<b>\$ 774,639</b>

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 2024**

		<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	
<b>A0111</b>		\$	114,847,299.86	Total Fiscal Year 2024	\$	28,301,218.28
98.50%	1.50%					
\$ 27,876,700.01	424,518.27					
		August 2022	\$	-		
		September				
		October		28,301,218.28		
		November				
		December				
		January 2023				
		February				
		March				
		April				
		May				
		June				
		FM13				
		Total FY 2024	\$	28,301,218.28		
		<b>Program Grand Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>1,646,982,912.62</b>		

<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 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 156,580.00	\$ 104,386.66	\$ 260,966.66
Total Fiscal Year 2006 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 4,782,770.15	\$ 3,188,513.44	\$ 7,971,283.59
Total Fiscal Year 2007 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 8,094,089.27	\$ 5,396,059.51	\$ 13,490,148.78
Total Fiscal Year 2008 60% MDE 40% MDA	\$ 8,489,069.61	\$ 5,659,379.72	\$ 14,148,449.33
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 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	
<b>A0112</b>	Total Fiscal Year 2024	\$ 9,990,762.83	\$ 6,660,508.55	\$ 16,651,271.38
92.00%	8.00%			
	Fiscal Year 2024	<b>60%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>Total</b>
	August 2022	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	September	-	-	\$ -

\$ 9,191,501.80

799,261.03

October	9,990,762.83	6,660,508.55	\$ 16,651,271.38
November			
December			
January 2023			
February			
March			
April			
May			
June			
FM13			
<b>Total FY 2023</b>	<b>\$ 9,990,762.83</b>	<b>\$ 6,660,508.55</b>	<b>\$ 16,651,271.38</b>

<b>Program Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 232,872,605.04</b>	<b>\$ 163,972,553.55</b>	<b>\$ 396,845,158.59</b>
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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
		FY2024	24,161.70
		<b>Program Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,403,128.64</b>

-



2022 Progress

Geography	Septics	WW N EOS	Septic N EOS	Total N EOS	% of TN EOS	% Septic Loads Compared to Wastewater
Allegany, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	4,728	81,983	36,919	1,185,472	3%	-55%
Anne Arundel, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	42,260	483,359	464,793	2,959,000	16%	-4%
Baltimore City, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	35	2,226,320	370	2,999,155	0%	-100%
Baltimore, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	33,352	1,907,253	416,610	6,283,065	7%	-78%
Calvert, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	28,208	8,139	176,539	969,641	18%	2069%
Caroline, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	8,358	6,162	107,436	3,742,158	3%	1644%
Carroll, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	33,340	134,813	455,927	4,458,497	10%	238%
Cecil, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	20,675	80,508	251,847	2,186,674	12%	213%
Charles, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	18,907	146,801	170,768	1,547,085	11%	16%
Dorchester, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	9,938	38,207	52,625	2,925,829	2%	38%
Frederick, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	29,640	177,089	403,839	6,068,205	7%	128%
Garrett, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	2,129	3	9,119	790,110	1%	337308%
Harford, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	26,117	138,550	338,960	2,916,069	12%	145%
Howard, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	16,899	537,324	233,529	2,060,708	11%	-57%
Kent, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	4,452	17,397	38,749	1,985,637	2%	123%
Montgomery, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	18,951	841,442	255,140	3,584,523	7%	-70%
Prince Georges, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	7,641	779,873	72,826	2,762,283	3%	-91%
Queen Annes, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	10,648	26,333	97,393	2,843,739	3%	270%
Somerset, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	5,032	13,971	23,895	1,365,926	2%	71%
St. Marys, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	28,092	61,177	252,391	1,732,276	15%	313%
Talbot, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	8,563	25,046	59,390	2,024,934	3%	137%
Washington, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	20,465	98,537	272,296	2,849,353	10%	176%
Wicomico, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	19,805	34,661	217,884	2,897,428	8%	529%
Worcester, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	2,875	9,567	22,102	1,559,647	1%	131%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>401,106</b>	<b>7,874,511</b>	<b>4,431,347</b>	<b>64,697,413</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>-44%</b>

2022 Progress

Geography	Septics	WW N EOS	Septic N EOS	Total N EOS	% of TN EOS	% Septic Loads Compared to Wastewater
Anne Arundel, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	42,260	483,359	464,793	2,959,000	16%	-4%
Baltimore, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	33,352	1,907,253	416,610	6,283,065	7%	-78%
Carroll, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	33,340	134,813	455,927	4,458,497	10%	238%
Frederick, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	29,640	177,089	403,839	6,068,205	7%	128%
Calvert, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	28,208	8,139	176,539	969,641	18%	2069%
St. Marys, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	28,092	61,177	252,391	1,732,276	15%	313%
Harford, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	26,117	138,550	338,960	2,916,069	12%	145%
Cecil, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	20,675	80,508	251,847	2,186,674	12%	213%
Washington, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	20,465	98,537	272,296	2,849,353	10%	176%
Wicomico, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	19,805	34,661	217,884	2,897,428	8%	529%
Montgomery, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	18,951	841,442	255,140	3,584,523	7%	-70%
Charles, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	18,907	146,801	170,768	1,547,085	11%	16%
Howard, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	16,899	537,324	233,529	2,060,708	11%	-57%
Queen Annes, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	10,648	26,333	97,393	2,843,739	3%	270%
Dorchester, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	9,938	38,207	52,625	2,925,829	2%	38%
Talbot, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	8,563	25,046	59,390	2,024,934	3%	137%
Caroline, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	8,358	6,162	107,436	3,742,158	3%	1644%
Prince Georges, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	7,641	779,873	72,826	2,762,283	3%	-91%
Somerset, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	5,032	13,971	23,895	1,365,926	2%	71%
Allegany, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	4,728	81,983	36,919	1,185,472	3%	-55%
Kent, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	4,452	17,397	38,749	1,985,637	2%	123%
Worcester, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	2,875	9,567	22,102	1,559,647	1%	131%
Garrett, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	2,129	3	9,119	790,110	1%	337308%
Baltimore City, MD (CBWS Portion Only)	35	2,226,320	370	2,999,155	0%	-100%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>401,106</b>	<b>7,874,511</b>	<b>4,431,347</b>	<b>64,697,413</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>-44%</b>