

**MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF
ENVIRONMENT**

**NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM
(NPDES) MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEM
(MS4) PERMITS**

2020 MS4 MONITORING GUIDELINES:

**BMP EFFECTIVENESS AND
WATERSHED ASSESSMENTS**

CONTENTS

List of Tables	ii
Introduction	1
<i>BMP Effectiveness</i> Monitoring	3
I. 4	
II. Biological and Habitat Monitoring	5
<i>Watershed Assessment</i> Monitoring	7
I. 8	
II. Bacteria Monitoring	13
III. Chloride Monitoring	16
References	18
Appendices	20
Appendix I. MOU for the BMP Effectiveness Pooled Monitoring	21
Appendix II. MOU for the Watershed Assessment Pooled Monitoring	35
Appendix III. Jurisdiction Costs for the Pooled Monitoring Program	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. The recommended lab methods and detection limits for stormwater monitoring.	4
Table 2. Sample size per year for biological watershed monitoring to achieve 5% precision with different sampling design.	12
Table 3. The estimation of the unit price for watershed monitoring.	43
Table 4. The estimated price for watershed monitoring pool: biological monitoring	44
Table 5. The estimated price for watershed monitoring pool: bacteria monitoring	44
Table 6. The estimated price for watershed monitoring pool: chloride monitoring	44
Table 7. The estimated total price for participating the watershed monitoring pool	45

INTRODUCTION

The Maryland Department of the Environment (Department) is updating the monitoring requirements outlined in the *Assessment of Controls* portion of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permits issued to Phase I jurisdictions within the State. The overall goal is to evaluate the effects of best management practice (BMP) implementation and other management strategies on local water quality. The requirements include *BMP Effectiveness* monitoring and *Watershed Assessment* monitoring.

BMP Effectiveness monitoring requires permittees to conduct chemical, biological, and physical monitoring at a stream of choice in a subwatershed within their jurisdiction. The permittee must choose an outfall and an in-stream location along that stream to collect samples. A monitoring location is chosen where the density of proposed restoration BMPs is comparatively high relative to the watershed size. *Watershed Assessment* monitoring requires permittees to conduct biological, bacteria, and conductivity monitoring throughout the jurisdiction. Results of both monitoring programs will be used to evaluate the effects of BMP implementation, salt management practices, and bacteria control strategies to assess the overall health of biological communities in these watersheds.

Permittees also have the option to participate in a pooled monitoring program (“pool”) coordinated through the Chesapeake Bay Trust (CBT) to meet the *BMP Effectiveness* and/or the *Watershed Assessment* monitoring requirements. Permittees participating in the pool to meet either or both of these monitoring requirements must establish a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with CBT and collaborate with other State-wide funding partners. A copy of the MOU between the CBT and the individual jurisdiction is available in Appendix I for the *BMP Effectiveness* monitoring and in Appendix II for the *Watershed Assessment* monitoring requirements. A jurisdiction may elect to participate in either or both MOUs. In addition, the MOU for the Watershed Assessment monitoring allows a jurisdiction to participate in the pool for either the biological/habitat monitoring, or the bacteria monitoring, or the chloride monitoring, or all 3 requirements. These agreements function similarly to a contract with CBT to perform specific work for a given jurisdiction. The pooled funds will contribute to the CBT

Restoration Research Program which is intended to support scientific research and answer key questions to expand the knowledge of watershed restoration efforts across the State. Participation in the pool will offer permittees an efficient process for meeting permit requirements by collaborating monetary resources and decreasing the burden of overall monitoring expenses at the local level. However, permittees may choose to conduct their own monitoring as outlined in the permit based on local priorities and resources.

This document will provide technical guidelines and criteria for performing the required monitoring in accordance with the Assessment of Controls section of the MS4 permit. The Department requests that each jurisdiction develop a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) for all monitoring requirements. QAPP development will allow for smoother incorporation of the data into State regulatory analyses and programs.

BMP EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING

OBJECTIVES

The objective of *BMP Effectiveness* monitoring is to evaluate the cumulative effects of urban stormwater retrofits and alternative urban BMPs on a subwatershed scale. Monthly event mean concentrations (EMC) and flow measurements from two monitoring stations, in-stream and outfall, should be collected in a headwater watershed to estimate pollutant loadings.

MONITORING GUIDELINES

An acceptable location for this monitoring shall take place in a headwater region (1st or 2nd order on a 1:24,000 scale map) with a comparatively high density of planned restoration BMPs. In addition, watershed size and the number of planned BMPs, years of observation, sampling regularity, and data quality are all critical for detecting changes or trends in analysis. Based on a recent report published by the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB) and Center for Watershed Protection (CWP), on behalf of the Department, in order to increase the probability of detecting changes in water quality from restoration, ideal monitoring study designs should include the following:

- 1) one or a few larger BMPs;
- 2) data from before and after watershed restoration practices are implemented (the longer the period of record for each time period the better); and
- 3) limited development over time.

In addition, in order to enhance the probability of detecting changes, data should maximize periods of record with minimal gaps or sample clustering during a portion of the year (Jepsen and Caraco 2019).

More detailed guidance of storm water monitoring can be found in EPA's manual of *Urban Stormwater BMP Performance Monitoring* (EPA, 2002).

I. CHEMICAL MONITORING

a) Baseflow and Stormflow monitoring

A minimum of 12 storm events (8 for medium Phase I jurisdictions) and 4 quarterly baseflow samples shall be monitored each year at both an in-stream and outfall location. The permit requires collecting stormflow and baseflow measurements for discharge, total suspended solids (TSS), bacteria (*E. coli* or *Enterococcus* spp.), chloride, biological oxygen demand (BOD) or total organic carbon (TOC), Orthophosphate, total nitrogen (TN), nitrate & nitrite, total ammonia, and total phosphate (TP). A qualifying storm is an event that produces enough runoff where the rising, falling, and peak limbs of a storm hydrograph can be identified. Generally, this corresponds to at least 0.25 inches of rainfall. Recommended lab methods and detection limits listed by the EPA are shown in Table 1.

Based on recommendations from Jepsen and Caraco 2019, jurisdictions should attempt to capture storm events throughout all seasons of the year, or two per quarter as required in the permit. This will reduce any bias introduced by seasonal fluctuations in parameters, thereby enhancing future statistical change detection analyses. In the event that extreme weather conditions (e.g., drought) persist, and or in the event of equipment failures or malfunctions, these variables should be noted when the data are reported to the Department. On these occasions, a baseflow measurement shall be captured in lieu of a missing storm sample.

While not a permit requirement, jurisdictions are encouraged to employ flow paced sampling during storm events to allow for a more accurate flow weighted EMC calculation. If a jurisdiction employs flow paced sampling, this should be noted in its QAPP. During baseflow sampling, when an outfall does not have flow, it should be recorded that there was no observed flow on the sampling date. There is no need to go back and resample on a date when there is flow. It is of greater importance to have a data point paired with an in-stream baseflow measurement, whether that measurement is zero or greater.

Total ammonia has been added as a new monitoring parameter while requirements for monitoring metals (lead, copper, zinc) have been removed in the new MS4 permits. Total ammonia and pH can be used to estimate NH_3 or NH_4^+ . Metals were removed from the

monitoring requirements because initial trend analyses indicate that metal concentrations are decreasing among jurisdictions. Furthermore, the State has relatively few water quality impairments due to heavy metal concentrations. Elevated metal concentrations in the water column are generally isolated to specific geographies, i.e., largely those associated with historic industrial activity. The Department consulted with scientists performing restoration research in Maryland, who recommended the removal of metals from permit requirements to offset the cost of some of the new requirements in the updated monitoring programs.

Table 1. The recommended lab methods and detection limits of stormwater monitoring.

Parameter	EPA Method	Recommended Detection Limit (mg/l)
BOD	EPA 405.1	2
Nitrate/Nitrite	EPA 353.2	0.1
TKN	EPA 351.3	1.0
Phosphorous (All Forms)	EPA 365.4	0.01
TSS	EPA 160.2	5
Fecal Coliform	SM 9221E	2

b) Continuous measurements

Permittees are required to continuously record discharge, temperature, pH, turbidity, and conductivity at the in-stream monitoring station. The monitoring of turbidity and conductivity are new requirements in the MS4 permits. These measurements will allow for better estimates of annual and seasonal pollutant loads and reductions to calibrate watershed assessment models.

Turbidity monitoring has been added to the MS4 permit due to recommendations from scientists in the research community because sediment is one of the primary stressors to impaired biological communities in many watersheds. Furthermore, results from continuous turbidity measurements can be used to establish a relationship between turbidity and sediment in urban stormwater. The U.S. Geological Survey’s (USGS) *Proceedings of the Federal Interagency Workshop on Turbidity and Other Sediment Surrogates* (Gray & Glysson, 2003) is a useful resource for establishing a sediment and turbidity relationship.

The USGS sediment monitoring procedures typically use a sonde that has a wiper and turbidity sensor. The USGS has estimated "fixed" costs for the operation of sensors at \$5,000 per year for operation and maintenance and data QA/QC if a sensor is installed at an existing stream gage. The first year of monitoring will incur installation and upgrade costs of several thousand dollars, depending on the site. Installation of a logger at a gage station may not be feasible for first or second order streams. In these cases, permittees may consider installing a weir to allow continuous flow measurements as a surrogate to having a gage. Jurisdictions are encouraged to contact the Department with any questions regarding monitoring equipment.

Continuous conductivity monitoring was also recommended as an added parameter by the research community with the goal of using this data to establish a relationship between chloride and conductivity. If a surrogate relationship is developed, permittees may realize a cost savings when performing monitoring in future permits. Chloride is currently identified as a primary stressor to impaired biological communities in many of Maryland's waterways. Performing conductivity monitoring to establish a surrogate relationship with chloride will provide useful data regarding the health of watersheds in the future.

II. BIOLOGICAL, HABITAT, AND PHYSICAL MONITORING

Benthic macroinvertebrate and habitat assessment should be conducted in the spring between the outfall and in-stream stations with Maryland Biological Stream Survey (MBSS) sampling protocols. Field personnel conducting the field sampling and lab work should participate in MBSS training and maintain valid certifications for Benthic Macroinvertebrate Sampling, Benthic Macroinvertebrate Laboratory Processing and Subsampling, Benthic Macroinvertebrate Taxonomy, and Physical Habitat Assessment.

Annual geomorphologic stream assessments will include a comparison of permanently monumented stream channel cross-sections and the stream profile at both the outfall and in-stream stations. It is recommended that cross sections be established every 200 - 500 feet along the reach where feasible in between the outfall and in-stream stations based on the site-specific conditions in order to obtain a representative dataset (Wood 2020). In

addition, a hydrologic and/or hydraulic model (e.g., TR-20, HEC-2, HEC-RAS, HSPF, SWMM, etc.) shall be used in the fourth year of the permit to analyze the effects of rainfall, discharge rates, and stage.

WATERSHED ASSESSMENT MONITORING

I. BIOLOGICAL MONITORING

OBJECTIVES

A streamlined field survey is required as part of the Phase I MS4 permit monitoring requirements so that the Department can compile results and evaluate the effectiveness of BMP implementation. As part of this effort, permittees are required to use the MBSS methodology to assess the community of benthic megafauna and their habitats at the watershed level. The results will be compiled with other MS4 monitoring data to allow comprehensive analyses and cross-jurisdiction comparison in the future. The objective is to understand the population dynamics of key macroinvertebrates and their relationships with habitat conditions and water quality. The resulting dataset can be used by the Department to narrow data gaps and inform future State level Integrated Report of Surface Water Quality (IR, MDE & DNR, 2014 & MDE, 2013) and biological stressor identification analyses (BSID; MDE, 2014). Ultimately this data will allow the Department to evaluate the overall water quality and aquatic life conditions of MS4 watersheds, facilitate delisting TMDLs, and inform county and State regulation and management.

SAMPLING DESIGN

To ensure data consistency and enable cross-jurisdiction analysis, a random sampling approach using MBSS protocols is required. The field sampling protocols must be based on the *Maryland Biological Stream Survey: Round Four Field Sampling Manual (Round 4: 2014-2018)* (Stranko et al, 2019). In addition, collecting *in situ* dissolved oxygen data using guidance found in the MBSS Round 3 manual will be required (DNR, 2007). In order to meet the minimum permit requirements, all permittees must follow the MBSS protocol and utilize random sampling to ensure the collected data could be used in the IR and BSID analyses.

Additional recommendations are detailed below and include choosing the random sampling sites with GRTS (Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified), adopting a “no rotation” sampling approach (see Table 2), stratifying by at least Maryland 8-digit watershed, and adopting a

1:24,000 scale map. Incorporating these recommendations into the study design will allow the Department to use more advanced statistical analysis across jurisdictional boundaries and link the results with other Statewide restoration efforts. This will significantly enhance the temporal and spatial resolution of the data and its usefulness in data analysis. More specific information on the required field sampling protocols and recommendations are discussed below.

SUMMARY OF SAMPLING DESIGN GUIDELINE:

A. Mandatory:

1. Probability sampling design.

The Department requires random sampling design to ensure unbiased results.

2. Adopt MBSS protocol.

In the field, collect:

- a) benthic macroinvertebrates,
- b) *in situ* environmental data, including temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity, and conductivity with a multi-param probe, and
- c) habitat information, including bar formation, channel alteration, embeddedness, epifaunal substrate condition, erosion severity, observe channelization, instream habitat condition, pool/glide/eddy quality, riffle/run quality, velocity depth diversity, check presence or absence of concrete/gabion and beaver dam, and shading.

Field personnel conducting the sampling should participate in MBSS training and acquire MBSS Benthic Macroinvertebrate and Physical Habitat Assessment Certification to ensure data quality and consistency (Stranko et al., 2019; DNR, 2017 - for measuring in situ dissolved oxygen).

B. Recommended Study Design Considerations

- 3. Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified sampling (GRTS).

To ensure unbiased and spatially-balanced sampling, the Department recommends using EPA's *Spatially Balanced Sampling of Natural Resources* with the package "spsurvey" in R (Thomas et al., 2011; Stevens and Olsen, 2004). "Oversampling" by five times is recommended to avoid land access issues and other field site issues without losing spatial balance. There is also a graphical user interface available for GRTS sampling ("*SDrawNPS*" in R) developed by the National Park Service (Starcevich et al., 2016). Once installed, a user could easily import their stream map, choose stratification, choose sampling size (either a set number or proportion in the watershed), set up oversampling size, and output a GIS file without any code writing. It is free and user friendly to ensure spatially-balanced sampling, and it decreases the chance of concentrating sampling in one area and leaving others unaddressed, which could be common in regular random sampling procedures with ArcGIS.

4. Non-rotation sampling.

All 8-digit watersheds in each jurisdiction are recommended for sampling at least once every year. This design will address annual variability, which is likely to increase as climate change progresses. A rotational design means different regions are surveyed in different years, whereas non-rotational surveys will allow better compatibility among years and allow greater opportunity for statistical analysis when the same regions are sampled every year. The minimal recommended sample size for each jurisdiction is identified in Table 2. The Table shows that the "no-rotation" sampling design will require the least number of samples in order to achieve the same precision.

5. Stratified with at least 8-digit watersheds.

Stratifying with at least 8-digit watersheds along with the non-rotational study design will ensure the greatest consistency with updates to the IR, BSID, and TMDLs, which are at the 8-digit scale. However, many jurisdictions have self-defined watersheds that are smaller than a Maryland 8-digit watershed. In this case, the jurisdiction may choose to stratify by its self-defined watersheds and the Department will aggregate this data back to the 8-digit scale.

6. Use a 1:24,000 map.

USGS's 1:24,000 National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) is the most up-to-date and detailed hydrograph dataset for the Nation. Adopting this map scale will increase total stream miles and include smaller streams, closer to most restoration sites, and will be on the same map scale with the other stormwater monitoring. This will allow for more ecosystem study and cross analysis among different types of restorations and monitoring.

7. Additional *in situ* data.

While this is not a permit requirement, datasets can be enhanced by collecting data for chlorophyll, dissolved organic matter, and nitrate. This will allow real-time, highly-accurate, measurements in the field with comparatively low cost.

8. Chemical grabs.

If budget allows (~\$145 per grab), a chemical grab is recommended when collecting biological data followed by lab analysis for major nutrients including nitrate, nitrite, ammonia, phosphate, total nitrogen, total phosphate, and some anions (particularly chloride).

9. Fixed sites for trend analyses

While not a permit requirement, it is recommended that jurisdictions compliment random biological and habitat monitoring with fixed sites for the purpose of assessing trends over time. Fixed sites can be established by revisiting some of the original, randomly selected stations within a watershed. The Department is currently working on power analyses to determine the ideal revisiting ratio of randomly selected sites within a watershed, and this information will be shared with the jurisdictions once finalized.

10. Continuous trace study.

Collect 5-10 weekly discrete water quality samples beginning in late winter or early spring but no later than March 1 of each year, leading up to the date of biological data collection. Water quality parameters to be collected include temperature, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, major nutrients and anions, and catch data from road-salt

applications the previous winter. This data will capture antecedent conditions of a biological community, increase comparability between sites, and significantly help understanding the relationships between the biological community and their surroundings in a watershed. Consider adding this informative benefit to the fixed stations.

D. QA/QC plan

To ensure data usability for further analysis and allow for compilation with other datasets, the MBSS Sampling Manual (p7-11, Stranko et al., 2019) and the Department's Biological Data Quality Guidelines (MDE, 2013) shall be followed to enhance data quality.

Table 2. Sample size per year for biological watershed monitoring to achieve 5% precision with non-rotation sampling design

County/ City	Minimum sample size
Anne Arundel	25
Baltimore	33
Baltimore City	20
Charles	25
Frederick	25
Harford	33
Howard	25
Montgomery	33
Prince George's	25

(Dong et al, 2019. MDE_UMCES Task memo)

II. BACTERIA MONITORING

OBJECTIVES

Permittees are required to monitor monthly bacteria counts at a fixed station in each jurisdictional watershed with a bacteria TMDL. The number of bacteria watersheds for each Phase I jurisdiction is noted in Appendix III, Table 5. The monthly bacteria datasets will enable both time-series analysis and trend analysis, which will help the Department to identify patterns and track the progress of bacteria source controls. If the bacteria counts are consistently high and all known sources have been remediated, permittees may need to consider source tracking and additional management strategies. Therefore, this monitoring can provide long-term records that will contribute to the adaptive management of implementation efforts in bacteria TMDL watersheds. The data will allow both the Department and permittees to determine if the current suite of implementation practices are having any effect on in-stream bacteria concentrations.

SUMMARY OF SAMPLING DESIGN GUIDELINE

A. Mandatory Guidelines:

1. Monitor bacteria TMDL watersheds

Jurisdictions are required to establish a fixed monitoring station in each bacteria TMDL watershed (*E. Coli*, *Enterococcus*, or fecal coliform for freshwater water contact recreation, marine/tidal water contact recreation, and shellfish harvesting, respectively). Stations shall be located on streams identifiable using a 1:24,000 scale map unless otherwise determined via consultation with the Department.

A bacteria monitoring station could also be at the same location where a bacteria TMDL was developed. If the bacteria monitoring site was located on a mainstem segment split between jurisdictions, permittees could either establish stations in their portion of the watershed, or they could work cooperatively and reach a cost-sharing agreement. The permittee should consult with the Department in regards to where these stations should be established.

2. Monthly sampling with EPA approved methods.

Permittees shall collect at least one monthly grab sample at each fixed station at approximately the same day and time of every month (e.g., the first Thursday of every month), regardless of weather conditions. Weather conditions should be noted for future analysis.

Sample collection shall follow the *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater* published by American Public Health Association (Lenore et al, 1989).

General rules include using sterile containers, keeping samples in a cooler with ice until analyzed, and adopting dilution methods when samples are taken during or after heavy rains or at sites with chronically high levels of bacteria.

Sample analysis shall follow EPA approved or validated analytical methods (<https://www.epa.gov/cwa-methods/approved-cwa-microbiological-test-methods>, or listed in p.59 EPA, 2014) at federally accredited labs to ensure data quality and comparable results. Acceptable accreditation includes the Food and Drug Administration in accordance with National Security Scholars Program (for shellfish water samples), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for Legionella in accordance with ISO/IEC 17025:2005 (for bottled water), or EPA (for drinking water). Bacteria counts shall be expressed in Most Probable Number (MPN) to estimate of organisms present per sample.

More detailed methods are in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part 136. Both sample collection and analyses shall be consistent and recorded within the jurisdiction.

3. Record flow conditions.

Flow should be recorded at each monitoring location for each sampling event. As a surrogate for recording flow for each event, jurisdictions should look up the observed mean daily flow at the nearest USGS gage in the same watershed or adjacent watershed, normalize the flow to the contributing area, and apply this ratio to the monitoring location for a particular event. Additionally, flow conditions should be recorded as high or low flow based on the nearest USGS gage and a comparison to the threshold flow percentile identified in the applicable Bacteria TMDL for the watershed. If a jurisdiction needs

assistance in determining the threshold flow or threshold flow percentile, they should contact the Department. Flow measurements allow for more advanced trend analyses, and the classification of flow regime allows for analyses during low flow periods only, when water contact recreation is expected (Wymer, 2007). Low flow and high flow trend analysis can also be suggestive of bacteria sources within a watershed.

For each sample, the permittee shall report the observed concentration, flow, and flow regime for the sample date/time.

B. Recommended Guidelines

5. Molecular methods for source tracking

When high bacteria persists at stations where all known sources of bacteria have been eliminated, the Department encourages permittees to adopt microbiological performance-based methods (i.e. qPCR) for source tracking with EPA approved methods, for example EPA Method 1696 and EPA Method 1697 (EPA, 2019a, 2019b). Microbial source tracking with genotypic methods match probes with genes from specific sources (i.e. human, dog, cow, goose, poultry, etc.) and therefore has better accuracy than the traditional antibiotic resistance methods, and could help permittees identify the strategies for bacterial control. More source tracking methods and guide are summarized in Scott (2002) and EPA's *Microbial Source Tracking Guide Document* (Santo-domingo et al., 2004). The Department consulted with two University laboratories that may be available to work with permittees on molecular source tracking. They may be contacted at:

Dr. Rachel T Noble at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (rtnoble@email.unc.edu)

Dr. Wolf T. Pecher at University of Baltimore (wpecher@ubalt.edu)

6. Weekly sampling during beach season

The objective of the required monthly bacteria sampling is to establish trends over time and identify/locate sources within a watershed. However, monthly sampling does not meet the data requirements for Integrated Report assessments. This requires a much higher frequency of sampling. Integrated Report assessments will be based on weekly

sampling from Memorial Day through Labor Day (beach season). The new Integrated Report bacteria assessment methodology can be found here: https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Water/TMDL/Integrated303dReports/Documents/Assessment_Methodologies/Bacteria_Listing_Methodology_Final_2_25_2020.pdf. Since the temporal data resolution required under the new permit does not allow for Integrated Report assessment, it is recommended that jurisdictions begin more frequent sampling, once data trends indicate that concentrations are approaching water quality standards.

III. CHLORIDE MONITORING

OBJECTIVES

Elevated chloride concentration is one of the most commonly found chemical stressors to aquatic life in non-tidal streams in Maryland according to the Biological Stressor Identification Analysis (MDE, 2014). Therefore, permittees are required to manage salt application during winter storm events by improving the efficiency of winter weather management activities. In order to measure the effectiveness of these new requirements, permittees must also perform chloride monitoring. The monitoring data will provide a long-term record of conductivity, which will be used to adaptively manage implementation efforts in watersheds impaired by chloride. At a Statewide scale, the data will allow the Department to determine the effects of the current suite of management practices on in-stream chloride concentrations.

SUMMARY OF SAMPLING DESIGN GUIDELINE

Conductivity will be used as a surrogate for measuring in-stream chloride concentration because there is a direct correlation between in-stream conductivity (specific conductance) and chloride concentration during precipitation events where road salt is applied, and it is less expensive and potentially more accurate to monitor continuously. The USGS is currently working to develop surrogate relationships between specific conductance and chloride concentration, which can be applied to predict chloride concentration during non-winter storm events in the future. Permittees must conduct 30-minute instantaneous, in-stream conductivity monitoring, measured as microsiemens per centimeter ($\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$). Selection of monitoring locations should be done in consultation with the Department. Monitoring locations should be located in watersheds that:

- Are identified as impaired by chloride on Maryland's Integrated Report of Surface Water Quality,
- Contain a significant mileage of agency jurisdiction's serviced roads (to isolate effects of management actions to the highest degree possible), and
- Is moderately to highly urbanized.

Large Phase I MS4 jurisdictions are required to monitor 2 locations, one in a 1st-order headwater stream of the selected watershed, and one in a 3rd-order, or higher, on the mainstem of the watershed system. Stream order should be determined using a 1:24,000 scale map. Medium Phase I MS4 jurisdictions are required to monitor one location in a 1st-order headwater stream of the selected watershed.

DATA REPORT

Permittees should report the daily, half-hour instantaneous and the daily maximum conductivity values. Permittees should also summarize and report the mean, median, 75th-percentile, 90th-percentile, and maximum conductivity values collected during wintertime (November 1st through March 31st) and non-wintertime (April 1st through October 31st). During frozen precipitation events, a factor of 0.3 measured in microsiemens per centimeter can be used for winter in-stream conductivity values as a rule of thumb to estimate milligrams of chloride per liter.

EQUIPMENT

Conductivity loggers can be purchased from various water quality instrumentation companies . Jurisdictions are encouraged to contact the Department with any questions regarding monitoring equipment. A logger usually costs approximately \$750. Loggers need to be cleaned about once per month to ensure functionality. Additional details on logger installation, maintenance and conductivity monitoring can be found in the Department's Chloride Monitoring Quality Assurance Plan and Logger Instruction Manual (provide on request) or USGS's Guidelines and Standard Procedures for Continuous Water-Quality Monitors (Wagner et al., 2006).

REFERENCES

- 40 Code of Federal Regulations, part 136. Guidelines establishing test procedures for the analysis of pollutants. 33 u.s.c. 1251.
- DNR, 2007. MBSS Sampling Manual: Field Protocols (Round 3: 2007-2009).
http://dnr.maryland.gov/streams/Publications/ea-07-01b_fieldRevMay2007.pdf
- EPA, 2002. Urban Stormwater BMP Performance Monitoring. A Guidance Manual for Meeting the National Stormwater BMP Database Requirements. EPA-821-B-02-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.
www.epa.gov/npdes/pubs/dmr-fin.pdf
- EPA, 2014. National Beach Guidance and Required Performance Criteria for Grants, 2014 Edition, s, 2014 Edition. EPA-823-B-14-001. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC. <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2018-12/documents/national-beach-guidance-2014-report.pdf>
- EPA, 2019a. Method 1696: Characterization of Human Fecal Pollution in Water by HF183/BacR287 TaqMan® Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (qPCR) Assay. EPA 821-R-19-002. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC. https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-03/documents/method_1696_draft_2019.pdf
- EPA, 2019b. Method 1697: Characterization of Human Fecal Pollution in Water by HumM2 TaqMan® Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (qPCR) Assay®. EPA 821-R-19-003. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC. https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-03/documents/method_1697_draft_2019.pdf
- Gray & Glysson, 2003. Proceedings Of The Federal Interagency Workshop On Turbidity And Other Sediment Surrogates, April 30-May 2, 2002, Reno, Nevada. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1250
- Jepsen, R. and Caraco, D. 2019. Pilot Study of Water Quality Collected under Maryland's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Phase I Permits: Statistical Analysis and Recommendations. ICPRB Report 19-#. Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, Rockville, MD.
- Lenore, S. C., Arnold, E. G., & Andrew, D. E. (1998). Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater. American Public Health Association. American Water Works Association and World Environment Federation. 20th Edition, Washington DC.
- MDE, 2013. MDE Requirements for Use of In-Situ Biological Stream Data.
http://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Water/TMDL/Integrated303dReports/Documents/Assessment_Methodologies/Biological_Data_Quality_Guidelines_4_17_2017.pdf
- MDE & DNR, 2014. Biological Assessment Methodology for Non-Tidal Wadeable Streams. The State of Maryland.
http://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Water/TMDL/Integrated303dReports/Documents/Assessment_Methodologies/Biological_Data_Quality_Guidelines_4_17_2017.pdf

essment_Methodologies/Biological_Listing_Methodology-non-tidalwadeablestreams_2014_Final%20(New%20links).pdf

- MDE, 2014. Maryland Biological Stressor Identification Process. The State of Maryland. http://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Water/TMDL/Documents/BSID_Reports/BSID_Methodology_Final_2014.pdf
- Santo-Domingo, J., J. Hansel, M. Molina, R. Oshiro, O. C. Shanks, G. N. Stelma, T. Edge, J. Griffith, V. Harwood, M. Jenkins, A. Layton, C. Nakatsu, M. Sadoswky, J. Stewart, D. Stoeckel, B. Wiggins, And J. Wilbur. Microbial Source Tracking Guide Document. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., EPA/600/R-05/064, 2004.
- Scott, T. M., Rose, J. B., Jenkins, T. M., Farrah, S. R., & Lukasik, J. (2002). Microbial source tracking: current methodology and future directions. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.*, 68(12), 5796-5803.
- Stranko S., D. Boward, J. Kilian , A. Becker, M. Ashton, M. Southerland , B. Franks, W. Harbold , & Cessna J. (2019). Maryland Biological Stream Survey: Round Four Field Sampling Manual. Maryland Department of Natural Resources.
- Starcevich., L. A., G. DiDonato, T. McDonald, and J. Mitchell. A GRTS User's Manual for the SDrawNPS Package: A graphical user interface for Generalized Random Tessellation Stratified (GRTS) sampling and estimation. U.S. Department of the Interior National Park Service. Natural Resource Report NPS/PWRO/NRR—2016/1233.
- Stevens Jr, D. L., & Olsen, A. R. (2004). Spatially balanced sampling of natural resources. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(465), 262-278. https://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.files/fileID/13339
- Thomas M. Kincaid and Anthony R. Olsen (2011). Spsurvey: Spatial Survey Design and Analysis. R package version 2.2.
- Wagner, R.J., Boulger, R.W., Jr., Oblinger, C.J., and Smith, B.A., 2006, Guidelines and standard procedures for continuous water-quality monitors—Station operation, record computation, and data reporting: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques and Methods 1–D3, 51 p. + 8 attachments; accessed April 10, 2006, at <http://pubs.water.usgs.gov/tm1d3>
- Wood, David. 2020. Consensus Recommendations for Improving the Application of the Prevented Sediment Protocol for Urban Stream Restoration Projects Built for Pollutant Removal Credit. Chesapeake Stormwater Network: https://chesapeakestormwater.net/wp-content/uploads/dlm_uploads/2020/03/PROTOCOL-1-MEMO_WQGIT-Approved_revised-2.27.20_clean_w-appendices.pdf.
- Wymer, L. J. (Ed.). (2007). Statistical framework for recreational water quality criteria and monitoring (Vol. 65). John Wiley & Sons.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I. MOU FOR THE BMP EFFECTIVENESS POOL MONITORING

Chesapeake Bay Trust – County/City/Agency X Cooperative Agreement

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

THIS COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT (“The Agreement”), entered into this ____ day of _____, 2021, by and between the

COUNTY/CITY/AGENCY, MARYLAND

XXXXXX

XXXXXXX

(A Body Corporate and Politic, “the County/ City/ Agency”)

and

CHESAPEAKE BAY TRUST

108 Severn Ave

ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21403

(“The Trust”)

WHEREAS, the County/ City/ Agency and the Trust share a common interest in improvement of water quality in the County/ City/ Agency’s tributaries and advancing the community’s understanding and improvement of methods by which to do so.

WHEREAS, the County/ City/ Agency has opted into the Pooled Monitoring program as described in the BMP Effectiveness section of the County/ City/ Agency’s National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit.

WHEREAS, the Trust administers the Pooled Monitoring Program to answer key restoration questions pertaining to cumulative impacts of watershed restoration activities and the effectiveness of specific restoration practices using robust and rigorous methods.

WHEREAS, the Trust, a nonprofit entity established by the Maryland General Assembly in 1985 to promote public awareness and participation in the restoration and protection of the water quality, aquatic and land resources of the Chesapeake Bay, and other aquatic and land resources of the State, is authorized to contract with other units of government, including the County/ City/ Agency; and

WHEREAS, the Trust has a governance and oversight structure with formal representation from the local government, State natural resource agencies, and the Maryland General Assembly, and uses independent technical review committees to review proposals and recommend awards made through its competitive award programs; and

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I. SCOPE OF WORK

The Trust administers the Pooled Monitoring Program as described in the *Assessment of Controls* section of the County/ City/ Agency’s MS4 permit. The goal of the Pooled Monitoring program is to align monitoring and other resources from multiple sources to rigorously and effectively answer key questions about efficacy of watershed restoration projects, impact of

restoration projects, ability to detect water quality signals from restoration projects or suites of projects (at either the project or catchment scale), and other similar questions. The specific questions to be addressed in each program cycle are determined by the Pooled Monitoring Advisory Committee (PMAC), on which the County/ City/ Agency will have one (1) seat as per the PMAC charter (Attachment A to this agreement, which is expressly incorporated herein and made part of this Agreement).

Questions are posed via open, competitive, publicized Requests for Proposals for each program cycle by the Trust, in consultation with the PMAC. The Trust uses an external peer review process to review proposals, and reviews are discussed and proposals recommended for funding to the Trust board by the PMAC. The Trust, in consultation with the PMAC, manages subsequent awards, and works with the PMAC to interpret and present results for and to various stakeholder audiences.

ARTICLE II. CONSIDERATION AND METHOD OF PAYMENT

The County/ City/ Agency has opted to participate in the Pooled Monitoring Program option for MS4 monitoring as described in the *Assessment of Controls* section of the County/ City/ Agency's MS4 permit at a funding level of \$ _____ (\$x _____) per year for the five-year permit term/ for the remainder of the MS4 permit term as determined by the Maryland Department of the Environment (the Department), the regulatory entity governing compliance with the monitoring section of the MS4 permits.

The County/ City/ Agency may provide additional funds to the Trust upon written agreement by both parties.

The County/ City/ Agency shall provide the annual amount identified above to the Trust in July of each year for the duration of this Agreement. The Trust shall place the award funds in an account to be used solely for administering the Pooled Monitoring Program.

To accomplish the Scope of Work and manage the Program, an amount not to exceed five percent (5%) may be allocated by the Trust to administrative expenses. Copies of financial and programmatic reports prepared by the Trust for the Pooled Monitoring Advisory Committee and

Maryland Department of the Environment will be submitted to the County/ City/ Agency quarterly for quarters ending September 30, December 30, March 31, and July 31 of each year.

The Trust agrees to follow a cost accounting practice, which is in accordance with the standards, principles, and procedures in Code of Maryland Regulation (COMAR) 21.09 and uniform accounting practices of the profession, as acceptable to the County/ City/ Agency.

ARTICLE III. TERM AND RENEWAL

The Agreement Period shall be from XXXXX, 2021, through XXXXX, 2026. The agreement shall be renewable for additional terms of five (5) years upon written agreement by both parties.

ARTICLE IV. AGREEMENT REPRESENTATIVES

The following individuals shall have authority to act under this Agreement for their respective parties:

County/ City/ Agency: County/ City/ Agency X

XXXXX Division

(XXX) XXX-XXXX

Trust: Jana Davis, Ph.D.

Executive Director

Chesapeake Bay Trust

410-974-2941 x100

jdavis@cbtrust.org

ARTICLE V. KEY PERSONNEL

The parties agree that the following named individuals are considered to be essential to the work being performed hereunder and are designated as key personnel who shall be made available to the full extent required to carry out the work under this Agreement:

County/ City/ Agency County/ City/ Agency X

XXXXX Division

(XXX) XXX-XXXX

Trust: Sadie Drescher

Director, Restoration Programs

Chesapeake Bay Trust

410-974-2941 x105

sdrescher@cbtrust.org

Should these individuals become unavailable during the period of performance, personnel of equivalent capability shall be assigned to complete the work related to this Agreement. Any such substitutions shall require prior written approval by the County/ City/ Agency, which approval may be denied by the County/ City/ Agency at its sole discretion, but shall not be unreasonably denied. Should the Trust be unable to provide substitutes acceptable to the County/ City/ Agency, the County/ City/ Agency may terminate this Agreement, or at its option, negotiate with the Trust for an acceptable modification in the work and/or payment under the Agreement relative to the loss of such key personnel.

ARTICLE VI. MERGER

This Agreement, all exhibits and approved modifications hereto (hereinafter referred to collectively as “Agreement Documents”), embody the entire agreement of the parties. There are no promises, terms, conditions, or obligations referring to the subject matter, other than those contained herein or incorporated herein by reference. The Trust’s performance of any work under the Agreement constitutes the Trust’s acceptance of all of the Agreement Documents.

ARTICLE VII. AMENDMENT

Only a writing executed by both parties may amend this Agreement.

ARTICLE VIII. GOVERNING LAW

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed under the laws of the State of Maryland.

ARTICLE IX. NO THIRD-PARTY BENEFICIARIES

Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to: (1) provide a benefit to any third party; (2) operate in any way as a promise, covenant, warranty, or other assurance to any third party; or (3) create any obligation to any third party.

ARTICLE X. INDEMNIFICATION

The Trust shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the County/ City/ Agency, its officers, directors, agents and employees (each, including the County/ City/ Agency, a “Covered Person”) from and against any and all pending or threatened claims, losses, liabilities, litigation, damage, penalty, expense and demands of every kind and nature whatsoever (any of the foregoing a “Loss”), including, without limitation, the costs as and when incurred of defending any such Loss, and including, without limitation, reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements therefore, incurred by a Covered Person resulting from or arising in connection with the performance of this Agreement, caused in part or in whole by any negligent or willful act or omission of the Trust, its officers, agents, employees or representatives. The Trust expressly understands and agrees that any performance bond or insurance protection required by this Agreement or otherwise provided shall in no way limit the responsibility to indemnify, keep and save harmless

and defend the County/ City/ Agency as herein provided. The County/ City/ Agency does not waive any right or defense, or forebear any action, in connection herewith.

ARTICLE XI. ACCOUNTING

Retention of Records. The Trust shall retain and maintain all records and documents relating to this Agreement for three (3) years after final payment or any applicable statute of limitations, whichever is longer. Records and documents relating to this Agreement shall include, but not be limited to, the Request for Proposals, received proposals, proposal reviews, documents related to the selection of the proposals to fund, and all documentation prepared by or for the Awardees.

Audit. The Trust shall make available for inspection all records and documents relating to this Agreement upon request of the County/ City/ Agency. All records and documents relating to this Agreement are subject to audit by the County/ City/ Agency or an authorized representative of the County/ City/ Agency. The Trust shall promptly award access to its facilities to authorized County/ City/ Agency representative(s) for review of documents, information and interviews of Trust personnel. The Trust will provide to the County/ City/ Agency upon request copies of any invoices, records, timesheets, work logs, contracts, or any other documents or information needed in order for the County/ City/ Agency to comply with State or federal reporting and audit requirements.

Payment. Payments to the Trust shall be made in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement by causing the same to be signed by their duly authorized representatives on the day and year first above written.

County/ City/ Agency X, Maryland

Date:

WITNESS

XXXXXX

XXXXXX

XXXXXX

County/ City/ Agency X, Maryland

Approved as to Legal Sufficiency

Date:

Office of Law

CHESAPEAKE BAY TRUST

Date:

WITNESS

Jana Davis, Ph.D.

Executive Director

Chesapeake Bay Trust

ATTACHMENT A

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN COUNTY/ CITY/ AGENCY X, MARYLAND, AND CHESAPEAKE BAY TRUST

Chesapeake Bay Trust Pooled Monitoring Program (PMP)

DRAFT

INTRODUCTION

The Pooled Monitoring Program (PMP) will focus on answering key questions pertaining to the cumulative impacts of watershed restoration activities and the effectiveness of specific restoration practices posed by the regulatory, regulated, scientific, and practitioner communities using robust and rigorous methods.

Two tenets of the Pooled Monitoring Program are as follows:

All data are collected with a specific question or hypothesis in mind

Research products identify a clear path to integrate the new information into the regulatory process and make it accessible to regulators.

PROCESS

There is a Pooled Monitoring Advisory Committee (PMAC) that includes:

Six members from the regulatory community (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland Department of Natural Resources)

1 member from the practitioner community

At least 3 members from the MS4 Phase I permittee community. Any MS4 permittee who contributes funds would be a member.

1 member from the environmental community

2 non-voting members of the scientific community who are experts in experimental design and restoration evaluation.

MS4 Permittees who opt into the Pooled Monitoring Program agree with MDE on level of opt-in funding commitment and generate MOUs with the Chesapeake Bay Trust, which manages the Pooled Monitoring Program.

The Chesapeake Bay Trust and PMAC members maintain a list of key questions about certain kinds of restoration projects as well as a minimum research protocol.

The PMAC meets in the fall of each year to review and prioritize key questions.

Questions are compiled into an RFP that lists the prioritized questions and minimum/preferred methodology. The RFP includes an outreach/dissemination requirement in the scope of work. The RFP is bid out to any type of entity that can address one or more questions, and can include bids to conduct new research or to analyze existing data. Bidding entities could include, but are not limited to, academic institutions, consulting firms, scientifically capable watershed organizations. Existing research/monitoring programs would be eligible to bid. As part of the RFP, resources, such as lists of completed restoration projects or permitted projects not yet constructed, would be made available. Bidders would be allowed to use these projects in their research.

Bids/proposals must identify:

- The question being addressed/answered
- The methodology being used to address (including sample size, location, timing, etc.)
- The analysis proposed
- The final product

The interpretation of the results/dissemination plan, i.e. presentation of the results into a form usable by regulatory and practitioner communities.

The Trust, under guidance of PMAC, composes a Technical Review Committee (TRC) that evaluates proposals and recommends projects for funding. The TRC is composed of external

technical peer reviewers who have expertise in the topics of the proposals submitted and are not involved in any proposals submitted. The TRC will evaluate proposals using criteria to include:

- Relevance of the project and question posed
- Quality of the methods and analysis proposed
- Qualifications of leads and of the organization
- Communication/dissemination plan

PMAC may recommend that Advisory Groups are established to oversee certain projects.

The research is undertaken and completed; reports are sent to PMAC for review. A subset of projects may be sent for external peer review prior to acceptance of final product or dissemination to the public/community.

Results are disseminated to the practitioner community through, at a minimum:

An annual forum to which regulatory audiences are invited/required by their agencies to attend

Other forums as appropriate.

Results are interpreted for the regulatory audiences, and recommendations are prepared for how regulators can integrate the new information into their processes and policies. Some program funds may be used to develop key tools that facilitate use of the results.

The Trust archives reports, synthesized data, and raw data for public use.

**APPENDIX II. MOU FOR THE WATERSHED ASSESSMENT
MONITORING POOL MONITORING**

CHESAPEAKE BAY TRUST – COUNTY/CITY/AGENCY X COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

THIS COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT (“The Agreement”), entered into this ____ day of _____, 2021, by and between the

COUNTY/CITY/AGENCY, MARYLAND

XXXXX

XXXXXX

(A Body Corporate and Politic, “the Jurisdiction/ Agency”)

And

CHESAPEAKE BAY TRUST

108 Severn Ave

ANNAPOLIS, MARYLAND 21403

(“The Trust”)

WHEREAS, the Jurisdiction/Agency and the Trust share a common interest in conducting watershed assessments and evaluating long-term water quality trends within the Jurisdiction/Agency's boundaries.

WHEREAS, the Jurisdiction/Agency has opted into the Pooled Monitoring program as described in the *Watershed Assessment* section of the County/ City/ Agency's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit, for the specific _____ requirement.

WHEREAS, the Trust administers the Pooled Monitoring Program to conduct watershed assessments and evaluate long-term water quality trends throughout Maryland.

WHEREAS, the Trust, a nonprofit entity established by the Maryland General Assembly in 1985 to promote public awareness and participation in the restoration and protection of the water quality, aquatic and land resources of the Chesapeake Bay, and other aquatic and land resources of the State, is authorized to contract with other units of government, including the Jurisdiction/Agency; and

WHEREAS, the Trust has a governance and oversight structure with formal representation from the local government, State natural resource agencies, and the Maryland General Assembly, and uses independent technical review committees to review proposals and recommend awards made through its competitive award programs; and

NOW, THEREFORE, for and in consideration of the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I. SCOPE OF WORK

The Trust administers the Pooled Monitoring Program as described in the *Assessment of Controls* section of the Jurisdiction/Agency's MS4 permit. The goal of the Pooled Monitoring program is to align monitoring and other resources from multiple sources to rigorously and effectively conduct watershed assessments and evaluate long-term water quality trends, and address other issues pertaining to watershed restoration and watershed assessment.

Solicitation of proposals to conduct watershed assessment monitoring, monitoring to evaluate long-term water quality trends, and address other watershed restoration and assessment are posed via open, competitive, publicized Requests for Proposals for each program cycle by the Trust, in consultation with the Pooled Monitoring Advisory Committee (PMAC). The Trust uses an external peer review process to review proposals, and reviews are discussed and proposals recommended for funding to the Trust board by the PMAC. The Trust, in consultation with the PMAC, manages subsequent awards.

ARTICLE II. CONSIDERATION AND METHOD OF PAYMENT

The Jurisdiction/Agency has opted to participate in the Pooled Monitoring Program option for MS4 permit required Watershed Assessment Monitoring as described in the *Assessment of Controls* section of the Jurisdiction/Agency's MS4 permit at a funding level of \$_____ (\$x_____) per year for the five-year permit term/ for the remainder of the MS4 permit term as determined by the Maryland Department of the Environment (the Department), the regulatory entity governing compliance with the monitoring section of the MS4 permits.

The Jurisdiction/Agency shall provide the annual amount identified above to the Trust in July of each year for the duration of this Agreement. The Trust shall place the award funds in an account to be used solely for administering the Pooled Monitoring Program.

To accomplish the Scope of Work and manage the Program, an amount not to exceed five percent (5%) may be allocated by the Trust to administrative expenses. Copies of financial and programmatic reports prepared by the Trust for the Pooled Monitoring Advisory Committee and Maryland Department of the Environment will be submitted to the Jurisdiction/Agency quarterly for quarters ending September 30, December 30, March 31, and July 31 of each year.

The Trust agrees to follow a cost accounting practice, which is in accordance with the standards, principles, and procedures in Code of Maryland Regulation (COMAR) 21.09 and uniform accounting practices of the profession, as acceptable to the Jurisdiction/Agency.

ARTICLE III. TERM AND RENEWAL

The Agreement Period shall be from XXXXX, 2021, through XXXXX, 2026,. The agreement shall be renewable for additional terms of five (5) years upon written agreement by both parties.

ARTICLE IV. AGREEMENT REPRESENTATIVES

The following individuals shall have authority to act under this Agreement for their respective parties:

Jurisdiction/Agency: Jurisdiction/Agency X

*XXXXX Division
(XXX) XXX-XXXX*

*Trust: Jana Davis, Ph.D.
 Executive Director
 Chesapeake Bay Trust
 410-974-2941 x100
 jdavis@cbtrust.org*

ARTICLE V. KEY PERSONNEL

The parties agree that the following named individuals are considered to be essential to the work being performed hereunder and are designated as key personnel who shall be made available to the full extent required to carry out the work under this Agreement:

<i>Jurisdiction/Agency</i>	<i>Jurisdiction/Agency X</i>
<i>XXXXX Division</i>	
<i>(XXX) XXX-XXXX</i>	

Trust: Sadie Drescher
Director, Restoration Programs
Chesapeake Bay Trust
410-974-2941 x105
sdrescher@cbtrust.org

Should these individuals become unavailable during the period of performance, personnel of equivalent capability shall be assigned to complete the work related to this Agreement. Any such substitutions shall require prior written approval by the County/ City/ Agency, which approval may be denied by the County/ City/ Agency at its sole discretion, but shall not be unreasonably denied. Should the Trust be unable to provide substitutes acceptable to the County/ City/ Agency, the County/ City/ Agency may terminate this Agreement, or at its option, negotiate with the Trust for an acceptable modification in the work and/or payment under the Agreement relative to the loss of such key personnel.

ARTICLE VI. MERGER

This Agreement, all exhibits and approved modifications hereto (hereinafter referred to collectively as “Agreement Documents”), embody the entire agreement of the parties. There are no promises, terms, conditions, or obligations referring to the subject matter, other than those contained herein or incorporated herein by reference. The Trust’s performance of any work under the Agreement constitutes the Trust’s acceptance of all of the Agreement Documents.

ARTICLE VII. AMENDMENT

Only a writing executed by both parties may amend this Agreement.

ARTICLE VIII. GOVERNING LAW

This Agreement shall be governed by and construed under the laws of the State of Maryland.

ARTICLE IX. NO THIRD-PARTY BENEFICIARIES

Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to: (1) provide a benefit to any third party; (2) operate in any way as a promise, covenant, warranty, or other assurance to any third party; or (3) create any obligation to any third party.

ARTICLE X. INDEMNIFICATION

The Trust shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the Jurisdiction/Agency, its officers, directors, agents and employees (each, including the Jurisdiction/Agency, a “Covered Person”) from and against any and all pending or threatened claims, losses, liabilities, litigation, damage, penalty, expense and demands of every kind and nature whatsoever (any of the foregoing a “Loss”), including, without limitation, the costs as and when incurred of defending any such Loss, and including, without limitation, reasonable attorneys’ fees and disbursements therefore, incurred by a Covered Person resulting from or arising in connection with the performance of this Agreement, caused in part or in whole by any negligent or willful act or omission of the Trust, its officers, agents, employees or representatives. The Trust expressly understands and agrees that any performance bond or insurance protection required by this Agreement or otherwise provided shall in no way limit the responsibility to indemnify, keep and save harmless and defend the Jurisdiction/Agency as herein provided. The Jurisdiction/Agency does not waive any right or defense, or forebear any action, in connection herewith.

ARTICLE XI. ACCOUNTING

- A. *Retention of Records.* The Trust shall retain and maintain all records and documents relating to this Agreement for three (3) years after final payment or any applicable statute of limitations, whichever is longer. Records and documents relating to this Agreement shall

include, but not be limited to, the Request for Proposals, received proposals, proposal reviews, documents related to the selection of the proposals to fund, and all documentation prepared by or for the Awardees.

B. *Audit.* The Trust shall make available for inspection all records and documents relating to this Agreement upon request of the Jurisdiction/Agency. All records and documents relating to this Agreement are subject to audit by the Jurisdiction/Agency or an authorized representative of the Jurisdiction/Agency. The Trust shall promptly award access to its facilities to authorized Jurisdiction/Agency representative(s) for review of documents, information and interviews of Trust personnel. The Trust will provide to the Jurisdiction/Agency upon request copies of any invoices, records, timesheets, work logs, contracts, or any other documents or information needed in order for the Jurisdiction/Agency to comply with State or federal reporting and audit requirements.

C. *Payment.* Payments to the Trust shall be made in accordance with the terms of the Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement by causing the same to be signed by their duly authorized representatives on the day and year first above written.

Jurisdiction/Agency X, Maryland

WITNESS

Date:

XXXXXX

XXXXXX

XXXXXX

Jurisdiction/Agency X, Maryland

Approved as to Legal Sufficiency

Date:

Office of Law

CHESAPEAKE BAY TRUST

Date:

APPENDIX III. JURISDICTION-SPECIFIC COST BREAKDOWN FOR PARTICIPATING IN THE POOLED WATERSHED MONITORING

Table 3. The minimum sample size* for watershed monitoring pool: biological monitoring

County/ City	sample size
Anne Arundel	25
Baltimore	33
Baltimore City	20
Carroll	25
Charles	25
Frederick	25
Harford	33
Howard	25
Montgomery	30
Prince George's	25

Table 4. The minimum bacteria monitoring sites, which is equal to the numbers of bacteria TMDL watershed

County/ City	Numbers of bacteria TMDL watershed
Anne Arundel	4
Baltimore	7
Baltimore City	4
Carroll	4
Charles	0
Frederick	3
Harford	0
Howard	1
Montgomery	4
Prince George's	3

Table 5. Minimum sample size for watershed monitoring pool: chloride monitoring

County/ City	Large/ Medium	Sample size
Anne Arundel	Large	2
Baltimore	Large	2
Baltimore City	Large	2
Carroll	Medium	1
Charles	Medium	1
Frederick	Medium	1
Harford	Medium	1
Howard	Medium	1
Montgomery	Large	2
Prince George's	Large	2

Table 7. The estimated total price* for participating the watershed monitoring pool

County/ City	Biology	Bacterial	Chloride	Total Cost (Annual)
Anne Arundel	\$126,000	\$31,768	\$15,200	\$172,968
Baltimore	\$166,000	\$54,844	\$15,200	\$236,044
Baltimore City	\$101,000	\$31,768	\$15,200	\$147,968
Carroll	\$126,000	\$31,768	\$8,100	\$165,868
Charles	\$126,000	0	\$8,100	\$134,100
Frederick	\$126,000	\$24,076	\$8,100	\$158,176
Harford	\$166,000	0	\$8,100	\$174,100
Howard	\$126,000	\$8,692	\$8,100	\$142,792
Montgomery	\$151,000	\$31,768	\$15,200	\$197,968
Prince George's	\$126,000	\$24,076	\$15,200	\$165,276

Note*: These costs represent a higher estimate as well as an upper limit, or price cap, for the Request For Proposal to be advertised by CBT for conducting this monitoring via the pooled option. The final cost will be dictated by the chosen proposal and should be not higher than this estimation. Total costs vary, depending on if a jurisdiction is buying into the pool for all, or only specific, select requirements.