

BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment

Join by phone

1 320-818-0787 PIN: 557 157 207#

And Keep Your Phone Muted Unless Speaking

October 13, 2022

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

Meeting Agenda

- Introduction – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- Approve previous meeting minutes – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation – Walid Saffouri, MDE
- Update on 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
- Update on Clean Water Commerce Act – Jeffrey Fretwell, MDE
- Next meetings and other administrative issues to be discussed with the committee – Chris Murphy, Committee Chairman
- 2023 Next Pre-Scheduled Meeting: January 12th
April 13th
July 13th
October 12th
- ADJOURNMENT

BAY RESTORATION FUND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Maryland Department of the Environment

Virtual Meeting

July 14, 2022

Meeting Minutes

Welcome/Introduction

- The meeting was opened by Mr. Chris Murphy, 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 April 14th 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. Mr. Hoffman pointed out a minor typo on page 2 under item III. A \$ sign should be added to the numbers, and the statement should read as “between \$30,000 and \$40,000.” The minutes were approved with the correction, and the corrected version will be posted on the web.

I. Update on Major and Minor WWTPs ENR Implementation:

- Mr. Saffouri provided an update on major WWTPs. There are no changes in status of major WWTPs since the last meeting. Currently, there is only one WWTP under construction (Westminster), and one is in planning (Princess Anne).
- Mr. Saffouri added that there are more activities on the minor WWTPs side. Oxford has completed the construction and is in ENR operation. Rock Hall and St. Clements Shores have progressed from planning to design. Two WWTPs (Preston, and Port Deposit) are at 99% construction, and they may be completed soon.

II. Update on Cover Crops Activities:

- Mr. Keppler provided an update on the Cover Crops Program. MDA is finishing up last year's (FY22) program. So far, there are 434,000 spring certified acres of cover crops. MDA still has another 75 to 100 spring certifications to complete. Upon completion of the certifications, we may have over \$20 million worth of payments. In the meantime, enrollment for the FY23 program is underway. It began on July 1st and will continue until July 18th. To date, MDA has received about 600 applications for approximately 300,000 acres.
- Mr. Keppler also introduced the new Cover Crops Plus program, which is a pilot program developed based on the Soil Health Advisory Committee recommendations. The goal is to achieve the environmental benefits of nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment reduction, while incentivizing practices to help promote soil health. MDA will continue to implement the traditional cover crops program in addition to this new program. Under the new plus program, farmers commit to a three-year agreement where they agree to plant cover crops for three consecutive years. The traditional program provides only one year commitment. In return to the three years commitment, they are given a premium incentive payment of \$115 per acre per year, compared to \$45 under the traditional program. Also, there are some additional incentive payments that go on top of that to meet these different options such as the conservation crop rotation option, livestock integration incentive payment, and pre-sidedress soil nitrate testing program. All cover crops under the plus program must be planted early, by October 1st of each year. Also, MDA is requiring a mix different from the traditional program. The mix must include 50% cereal grains, and 25% percent legume. The legumes are important because they are nitrogen producing crops because they fix nitrogen in the soil and allow that nitrogen to be used for subsequent crops. Also, many other practices are encouraged to promote soil health. Since this is a pilot program, MDA is limiting enrollment in this program to up to 500 acres per farmer.
- Mr. Myers asked that in addition to the cap of 500 acres per farmer, is there a total cap for the program? Mr. Keppler responded that there no total program cap at this time. MDA believes that the 500 acre per farmer cap may be sufficient.
- Ms. Lewis asked about the type of crops being proposed as alternates under the plus program. Mr. Keppler responded that MDA is leaving it up to the farmers. It's important to note though that if the farmers were to take advantage of this rotation option, they have to document what they intend to do differently so we have a good understanding of what the current baseline is and where they would like to go. So, MDA is going to evaluate the pre and post implementation to make sure that there is diversity being added to their rotation.
- Mr. Murphy asked about the type of verifications done during the three years of cover crop activities. Mr. Keppler responded that in the fall, when the farmers plant their cover crops, MDA has field planners and technicians that go out and do a random check of approximately 20% of what's planted in each of the categories. In the springtime, MDA works with USGS and the USDA AG Research Service in Beltsville in implementing the remote sensing techniques to analyze cover crop performance in the springtime. So, we have a pretty good system where we

have satellite imagery that's flown over on a consistent basis. When we find the farms that look problematic, we go out and double check them in person.

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

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the OSDS Program. As of July 11, 2022, there have been 688 BAT upgrades and 108 sewer connections funded in FY22. There is a lag on when the counties send these funding requests in, so there are still some more systems coming in, and these are not the final numbers for FY22. These are strong numbers and consistent with what we have been seeing in previous years. In 2021, through the same period, we had 624 BAT upgrades and 130 sewer connections.
- In addition, Mr. Fretwell advised the committee that the BAT upgrade reimbursement rate for all systems will increase by 12% effective July 1st. This was part of the statewide pricing that we set last fall which included a provision to increase the price of the systems based on the producer price index for concrete products. MDE also increased the maximum reimbursement for septic connections from \$20,000 to \$25,000, also effective July 1st. This number is established based on the cost of the BAT systems. Hence, it was increased due to the higher bid prices received last year in the statewide pricing and then the subsequent 12% increase.
- Mr. Murphy asked whether increase in prices of BAT would mean fewer septic connections to sewer. Also, are we still seeing the same number of septic system connections every year that are getting done, or is it starting to trend down? Mr. Fretwell responded that the number of connections has been consistent. However, with reimbursement rates are higher, in aggregate we may do less connections. The same is true with the BAT upgrades. In the meantime, the counties will continue to have high demand for funding. There are still a lot of failing systems out there that need to be replaced or connected. So, it's going to be about prioritizing within the counties and making sure that funds are being used for the failings in the critical area and then failings outside the critical area before they move to other things.
- Mr. Hoffman asked why in the handout some counties have “CVI.” What does that mean? Mr. Fretwell responded that CVI is for Canaan Valley Institute, which is a nonprofit organization. Some of the counties have an agreement with Canaan Valley Institute to run the administrative side of their BRF septic programs.
- Mr. Murphy asked whether CVI receives additional BRF grant to handle the septic programs in these counties. Mr. Fretwell responded that these counties pay CVI from the administrative grants that they receive from BRF. So, these funds go to CVI instead of going to the local Health or Public Works Departments.
- Mr. Sowinski asked that Queen Anne has a high percentage of sewer connections. Is that due to SKI project? Mr. Fretwell responded yes, connections and funding are being done annually for SKI project. The listed 59 connections this year is lower than usual for SKI.

IV. Update on BRF Fee Collection and Budget:

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the BRF fee collection and budget. FY22 revenues to date were \$91,238,341 for the wastewater fund. This amount is higher than normal because it includes some of the FY21 funding that was received late. As discussed at the previous meetings, MDE had been working closely with the Comptroller's office to resolve the shortfall in revenues in FY21, which were \$10 to \$15 million below normal years. The Comptroller's office, through their compliance efforts, found additional funding that was added to this report. The grand total for the wastewater fund since the start of the program is \$1.504 billion. Line two is the septic fund revenues since the beginning of FY22, which were \$27,425,967. Over \$16 million of this were allocated for septic upgrades and almost \$11 million for the cover crop program at MDA. These amounts were right where they should be based on the fee collections for prior fiscal years. The grand total for the septic fund since the start of the program was \$376,697,895.76.
- Mr. Hoffman asked whether Mr. Fretwell can elaborate more about the nature of the revenue's shortfall in FY21. Mr. Fretwell responded that he could not discuss this issue very specifically. There was one large entity that collected the fee on behalf of the state and did not remit the fee to the state for three quarters. In the meantime, the Comptroller's office had suspended enforcement and compliance as part of the COVID emergency. So, the account was not flagged until the significant shortfall was discovered.
- Mr. Murphy asked whether the BRF would get back its high bond rating since this issue had been resolved. Mr. Fretwell responded that the bonding agencies downgraded the existing BRF bonds from AA2 to AA3. Mr. Fretwell asked them about the process to get our bonds upgraded after they had been downgraded. Moody basically said that usually does not happen. The rating agencies are aware that we have found the additional revenue, it was missing because of COVID, and this will not be a trend. However, we may continue to have the lower rating (AA3) for a long time.

V. Draft Clean Water and Drinking Water Intended Use Plans:

- Mr. Fretwell presented to the committee the MDE's Draft Clean Water and Drinking Water Intended Use Plans for the federal FY22. There are several different funds being utilized to fund these projects: the normal revolving loan fund capitalization grant from EPA, the bipartisan infrastructure law general capitalization grant from EPA, the recycled funds (the repayments from existing loans), and the state funds as a match to federal grants. State grant amounts, including the Bay Restoration Fund, are not listed on the funding tables because they are not public numbers until the Governor's budget is released in January. There were many minor wastewater ENR upgrade requests again this year. So, the BRF may be fully programmed for again for just minor ENR requests with the remainder of the funding for the clean water commerce program. The priority lists include all the projects that applied for funding during this solicitation period. We had 43 drinking water applications for \$393 million in funding requested, and 91 clean water applications for \$1.13 billion in funding requested.

- Mr. Hoffman asked that at what point in the process would applicants know that they will receive a loan forgiveness. Mr. Fretwell responded that the applicants can review this Intended Use Plan list and see where their projects are on the list and whether they're programmed for loan forgiveness. Loan forgiveness is offered to any eligible disadvantaged community starting at the top of the priority list. 49% of the funds in FFY22 need to be programmed for loan forgiveness. Each eligible project receives up to 50% in loan forgiveness with \$1.5 million cap, matched by 50% in loan.
- Mr. Hoffman asked whether the \$40 million transfer from the Water Quality SRF under the Drinking Water SRF Sources and Uses of Funds is related to the negative \$40 million in Future Revenue Bonds. Mr. Fretwell responded yes; they are related. We have several large drinking water projects, mostly in Baltimore City, that we're funding. The revenue to fund those projects we had shown in previous lists as bonds we were planning to issue under the Drinking Water SRF program. However, at this point instead of issuing bonds we intend to transfer some funds from the Water Quality SRF to Drinking Water, which is allowed under federal law. We're basically showing that we're not going to be issuing \$40 million in bonds on the drinking water side as the funds will be coming from the Water Quality SRF Program. Mr. Hoffman asked whether there was any limit on moving the funds between the two programs. Mr. Fretwell responded yes, there was a limit in the federal law, and he would send the information to Mr. Hoffman later.
- Mr. Murphy asked Mr. Fretwell to confirm that based on the needs for the minor system upgrades and the funds transfer to the Clean Water Commerce Act program, there is no BRF funding left for any other purpose this year. Mr. Fretwell confirmed that this was correct. Also, this situation is expected to continue in the future funding years if we continue to get this level of requests for minor WWTP upgrades, followed by the significant fund transfer to the Clean Water Commerce Act program.
- Mr. Murphy asked why many projects, including some in Anne Arundel County, were bypassed because they are not consistent with the water and sewer plans and/or not in the PFA. Mr. Fretwell responded that projects need to meet both requirements before they can be funded. Most septic connection projects qualify for a PFA exception. Mr. Fretwell indicated that MDE can work with MDP and the applicants to resolve these issues.
- Mr. Hoffman asked whether the high demand for minor WWTP upgrades were due to aging infrastructure. Mr. Fretwell responded that there were a variety of factors that could trigger the need for the upgrades. Mr. Saffouri added that most of the time the upgrade is needed due to a compliance issue. Sometimes it's needed due to expansion or aging infrastructure. In some cases, it is a combination of reasons.
- Mr. Hoffman asked that since there continues to be a lot of concern about the management and the operational efficiency of Back River and Patapsco, would MDE provide any O&M funding from the BRF for those two plants. Mr. Fretwell responded that they are not eligible for the O&M grants under the BRF program because they are not achieving the ENR goals. If MES identifies capital needs that need to happen to get the plants to come back into compliance and achieve ENR,

funding would be available for that. Obviously, the city would need to apply for funding. The city has already been actively participating in all our funding programs. So, they're familiar with our process.

- Mr. Myers stated that based on his review of the current intended use plan, it appeared that there were several funding requests for both Patapsco and Back River, but they were a little further down below the funding line. Mr. Myers stated that he was just wondering about the public perception of whether those projects should have been funded instead of some projects higher on the list (considering all the compliance issues at these two plants). Mr. Fretwell responded that he will look into it.

VI. Update on Clean Water Commerce Act:

- Mr. Fretwell provided an update on the Clean Water Commerce Act program. MDE released an RFP for the new Clean Water Commerce Act on June 10th. This program is intended to pay for performance where we purchase environmental outcomes (nitrogen reductions) after they're delivered and verified. The funding source for this program is \$20 million annually to be transferred from the Bay Restoration Fund Wastewater program. Applications are due for this round of funding by September 9th. Also, Mr. Fretwell presented the application documents, which include the application, the eligibility determination document, and the application instructions.
- Mr. Murphy asked why the decision was made to purchase only nitrogen reduction instead of all three reductions (nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment). Mr. Hoffman responded that was where the state was most behind in the Bay TMDL. Quite frankly, we're meeting our sediment goals and it seems quite clear we're going to be able to achieve our phosphorus goals. Nitrogen is the only reduction that really needed because we were and continue to be behind in achieving the nitrogen goal. So, it was decided with the consensus among the group to focus on the nitrogen reduction.

- VII.** Mr. Murphy reminded the Committee members that the next meeting will be held on October 13, 2022.

Materials Distributed at the Meeting

- Meeting Agenda
- Previous Meeting Minutes
- Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status
- BRF Septic Program Funded Installations
- Distribution of Bay Restoration Fee
- Drinking Water and Water Quality Draft Intended Use Plans
- Clean Water Commerce Account Proposal Package

Attendance

Advisory Committee Members or Designees Attending:

Chris Murphy, BRF Advisory Committee Chairman
Secretary David Brinkley, Maryland Department of Budget and Management
Fiona Shirk, Maryland Department of Budget and Management
Jeffrey Fretwell, Maryland Department of the Environment
Walid Saffouri, Maryland Department of the Environment
Bob Buglass, Washington Suburban Sanitary District
Gabe Cohee, Department of Natural Resources
Jason Keppler, Maryland Department of Agriculture
Ellen Mussman, Maryland Department of Planning
Doug Myers, Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Cheryl Lewis, Town of Oxford/MML
Teigen Hall, Nemphos Braue
Mark Hoffman, Chesapeake Bay Commission

Others in Attendance:

Andrew Gray, Department of Legislative Services
Julie Pippel, Lanco-Pennland
Chris Derbyshire, George, Miles & Buhr
Katherine McAllister, George, Miles & Buhr
Mary Sheppard, Office of Attorney General
Kelly Duffy, RK&K
Joe Sowinski, HDR

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) Attendees:

Rajiv Chawla
Paul Emmart

Sunita Boyle
Terri Wilson

Wastewater Treatment Plants ENR Upgrade Status

(October 13, 2022)

Major WWTPs

Previous Meeting

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

Current

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

Status Changes from Previous Meeting:

- No changes in status.

Percentage completion for facilities under construction for ENR Upgrade:

Facility	Previous Meeting Percentage Complete	Current Percentage Complete
Westminster	78%	87%

Minor WWTPs

Previous Meeting

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

Current

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

Status Changes from Previous Meeting:

- No changes in status.

Percentage completion for facilities under construction for ENR Upgrade:

Facility	Previous Meeting Percentage Complete	Current Percentage Complete
Preston	99%	99%
Port Deposit	99%	99%
Harbour View	91%	99%
Victor Cullen	45%	85%
Chesapeake City	76%	83%
Lewistown	21%	21%
Smith Island	10%	10%

BRF Septic Program
 Funded Installations FY23 to Date
 July 1, 2022- Oct. 7, 2022

County	Total approvals from Fiscal Year 23 Grant	
	# Septic Systems funded FY 23	# Sewer Connections funded FY 23
Allegany (CVI)	0	2
Anne Arundel	5	2
Baltimore	1	7
Calvert	15	0
Caroline	3	0
Carroll (CVI)	1	0
Cecil	0	0
Charles	6	1
Dorchester	5	0
Frederick (CVI)	2	0
Garrett	0	0
Harford	0	0
Howard (CVI)	0	1
Kent	3	0
Montgomery (CVI)	1	0
Prince George's	0	0
Queen Anne's	7	0
Somerset	0	0
St. Mary's	8	0
Talbot	0	0
Washington (CVI)	0	0
Wicomico	0	0
Worcester	0	0
Totals	57	13

Total approvals from Fiscal Year 22 Grant	
# Septic Systems funded FY22- 23	# Sewer Connections funded FY22- 23
0	4
225	13
21	18
92	2
27	1
13	2
27	1
23	2
40	2
22	0
4	0
28	1
4	12
29	0
11	1
3	7
72	66
25	1
90	0
71	4
18	0
37	0
28	0
910	137

**Comptroller of Maryland
Revenue Administration Division
Bay Restoration Fee - By County
Program To Date Through June 30, 2022**

	<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	<u>Collection</u>	<u>Returns w/\$</u>	<u>Zero \$ Returns</u>	<u>Expenses Claimed</u>	<u>Expenses Paid</u>
100 Allegany	\$23,799,832	\$4,513,082	\$28,312,914	\$28,041,272	726.00	65.00	\$278,126	271,642
200 Anne Arundel	\$142,625,907	\$35,737,015	\$178,362,922	\$177,743,910	878.00	245.00	\$617,723	619,011
300 Baltimore County	\$194,269,281	\$3,291,155	\$197,560,435	\$197,544,535	226.00	113.00	\$15,901	15,900
400 Baltimore City	\$250,203,423	\$26,344,298	\$276,547,722	\$276,315,800	598.00	159.00	\$260,596	231,921
500 Calvert	\$6,339,318	\$22,716,410	\$29,055,728	\$28,661,002	575.00	37.00	\$422,478	394,726
600 Caroline	\$4,303,152	\$7,144,136	\$11,447,288	\$11,383,338	554.00	18.00	\$68,019	63,949
700 Carroll	\$17,269,736	\$36,949,805	\$54,219,541	\$53,942,713	807.00	120.00	\$579,671	276,829
800 Cecil	\$15,158,120	\$19,714,377	\$34,872,498	\$34,589,752	1531.00	135.00	\$367,936	282,746
900 Charles	\$32,729,337	\$14,629,503	\$47,358,840	\$47,164,164	1673.00	137.00	\$201,260	194,675
1000 Dorchester	\$7,957,385	\$9,234,573	\$17,191,958	\$16,888,794	502.00	113.00	\$345,498	303,164
1100 Frederick	\$54,443,968	\$23,585,281	\$78,029,249	\$77,848,935	890.00	233.00	\$2,403,627	180,314
1200 Garrett	\$4,342,846	\$6,364,519	\$10,707,365	\$10,603,884	319.00	44.00	\$103,285	103,481
1300 Harford	\$52,010,574	\$27,230,386	\$79,240,959	\$78,595,319	622.00	157.00	\$648,974	645,641
1400 Howard	\$80,655,291	\$13,609,352	\$94,264,643	\$94,190,896	336.00	83.00	\$76,397	73,747
1500 Kent	\$5,846,461	\$3,941,733	\$9,788,194	\$9,687,730	541.00	37.00	\$174,727	100,464
1600 Montgomery	\$14,231,018	\$12,018,789	\$26,249,807	\$25,127,605	538.00	112.00	\$2,166,784	1,122,202
1700 Prince George's	\$504,921,225	\$23,855,930	\$528,777,155	\$520,840,283	439.00	174.00	\$7,982,041	7,936,872
1800 Queen Anne's	\$10,027,328	\$8,560,542	\$18,587,870	\$18,104,154	454.00	125.00	\$493,546	483,716
1900 St. Mary's	\$4,413,883	\$4,216,869	\$8,630,752	\$8,258,311	208.00	7.00	\$483,627	372,441
2000 Somerset	\$13,423,967	\$23,902,137	\$37,326,105	\$37,242,732	429.00	85.00	\$85,305	83,372
2100 Talbot	\$10,808,444	\$6,932,744	\$17,741,188	\$17,657,137	694.00	14.00	\$118,654	84,050
2200 Washington	\$34,864,375	\$15,537,311	\$50,401,686	\$50,138,171	749.00	20.00	\$295,573	263,516
2300 Wicomico	\$16,387,465	\$22,390,214	\$38,777,679	\$38,325,423	791.00	117.00	\$441,670	452,256
2400 Worcester	\$24,055,483	\$6,733,019	\$30,788,503	\$30,229,374	549.00	93.00	\$1,036,818	559,129
Undesignated	\$309,941	\$538,758	\$848,699	\$796,215	140.00	243.00	\$76,251	52,484
Total	\$ 1,525,397,761.01	\$ 379,691,937.94	\$ 1,905,089,698.95	\$ 1,889,921,447.82	15,769	2,686	\$ 19,744,487.30	\$ 15,168,251.13

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 2021 Through June 30, 2022**

	<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	<u>Collection</u>	<u>Returns w/\$</u>	<u>Zero \$ Returns</u>	<u>Expenses Claimed</u>	<u>Expenses Paid</u>
100 Allegany	\$1,739,681	\$313,227	\$2,052,909	\$2,042,303	33		\$5,346	\$10,605
200 Anne Arundel	\$11,151,680	\$2,676,445	\$13,828,126	\$13,776,878	52	1	\$45,778	\$51,248
300 Baltimore County	\$13,951,103	\$120,372	\$14,071,474	\$14,071,474	12		\$0	\$0
400 Baltimore City	\$16,078,400	\$1,608,763	\$17,687,163	\$17,686,720	24	9	\$650	\$443
500 Calvert	\$478,030	\$1,805,594	\$2,283,624	\$2,247,912	27		\$40,603	\$35,712
600 Caroline	\$300,312	\$534,476	\$834,788	\$830,479	29		\$4,988	\$4,309
700 Carroll	\$1,194,042	\$2,974,195	\$4,168,237	\$4,148,257	48	4	\$45,499	\$19,980
800 Cecil	\$1,278,713	\$1,327,996	\$2,606,710	\$2,587,164	65	3	\$26,663	\$19,546
900 Charles	\$2,674,917	\$1,138,282	\$3,813,200	\$3,795,533	94	2	\$18,078	\$17,667
1000 Dorchester	\$544,197	\$750,622	\$1,294,820	\$1,273,716	28	4	\$21,110	\$21,104
1100 Frederick	\$4,431,607	\$1,871,443	\$6,303,050	\$6,289,317	49	14	\$281,445	\$13,733
1200 Garrett	\$295,204	\$422,757	\$717,961	\$711,214	16		\$6,697	\$6,747
1300 Harford	\$3,954,215	\$2,068,534	\$6,022,748	\$5,994,487	35	4	\$28,261	\$28,262
1400 Howard	\$6,234,389	\$1,097,820	\$7,332,209	\$7,330,348	15		\$1,538	\$1,861
1500 Kent	\$419,246	\$285,610	\$704,857	\$698,376	26	2	\$37,707	\$6,481
1600 Montgomery	\$1,168,738	\$772,012	\$1,940,750	\$1,862,226	22	9	\$241,096	\$78,524
1700 Prince George's	\$37,835,474	\$1,528,865	\$39,364,339	\$37,448,396	19	11	\$1,960,818	\$1,915,942
1800 Queen Anne's	\$666,890	\$239,845	\$906,735	\$876,875	29	8	\$32,946	\$29,860
1900 St. Mary's	\$354,872	\$327,163	\$682,035	\$651,262	12		\$40,315	\$30,773
2000 Somerset	\$278,966	\$2,662,096	\$2,941,062	\$2,936,689	14	2	\$3,926	\$4,373
2100 Talbot	\$820,253	\$516,551	\$1,336,804	\$1,331,361	32		\$8,373	\$5,443
2200 Washington	\$2,234,168	\$1,104,762	\$3,338,931	\$3,321,477	39		\$21,240	\$17,453
2300 Wicomico	\$1,055,433	\$1,871,614	\$2,927,046	\$2,903,030	38	4	\$8,792	\$24,016
2400 Worcester	\$1,461,830	\$524,162	\$1,985,992	\$1,938,051	27		\$79,541	\$47,941
Undesignated	\$67,402	\$36,164	\$103,566	\$99,384	25	19	\$18,624	\$4,182
Total	\$ 110,669,762.30	\$ 28,579,371.77	\$ 139,249,134.07	\$ 136,852,931.13	810	96	\$ 2,980,034.58	\$ 2,396,202.94

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 2022 Through June 30, 2022

	<u>Sewer</u>	<u>Septic</u>	<u>Liability</u>	<u>Collection</u>	<u>Returns w/\$</u>	<u>Zero \$ Returns</u>	<u>Expenses Claimed</u>	<u>Expenses Paid</u>
100 Allegany	\$416,585	\$31,482	\$448,067	\$446,683	8		\$1,384	\$1,384
200 Anne Arundel	\$2,723,199	\$230,948	\$2,954,147	\$2,944,442	13		\$9,859	\$9,705
300 Baltimore County	\$3,577,443	\$30,258	\$3,607,701	\$3,607,701	3		\$0	\$0
400 Baltimore City	\$161,846	\$17,687	\$179,533	\$179,422	5	2	\$125	\$112
500 Calvert	\$117,233	\$154,474	\$271,707	\$262,228	7		\$11,926	\$9,479
600 Caroline	\$88,300	\$18,846	\$107,146	\$105,753	8		\$1,432	\$1,393
700 Carroll	\$303,036	\$277,818	\$580,854	\$576,028	12	1	\$12,933	\$4,827
800 Cecil	\$328,717	\$42,346	\$371,063	\$366,147	16		\$6,841	\$4,916
900 Charles	\$653,328	\$43,271	\$696,599	\$692,250	23		\$4,496	\$4,349
1000 Dorchester	\$122,124	\$88,569	\$210,693	\$206,277	6	1	\$4,564	\$4,416
1100 Frederick	\$1,139,408	\$36,857	\$1,176,265	\$1,172,815	12	3	\$85,980	\$3,449
1200 Garrett	\$66,251	\$25,950	\$92,201	\$90,509	4		\$1,532	\$1,692
1300 Harford	\$979,149	\$141,712	\$1,120,861	\$1,115,274	9	1	\$5,587	\$5,587
1400 Howard	\$1,529,006	\$58,287	\$1,587,293	\$1,586,893	4		\$385	\$400
1500 Kent	\$90,658	\$9,131	\$99,789	\$98,170	6		\$10,262	\$1,619
1600 Montgomery	\$304,847	\$6,782	\$311,629	\$300,934	5	2	\$41,164	\$10,695
1700 Prince George's	\$9,087,815	\$200,514	\$9,288,329	\$8,830,442	4	2	\$502,764	\$457,887
1800 Queen Anne's	\$188,461	\$9,730	\$198,191	\$189,185	8	2	\$10,775	\$9,006
1900 St. Mary's	\$83,229	\$12,601	\$95,830	\$91,039	3		\$17,542	\$4,792
2000 Somerset	\$69,080	\$338,473	\$407,553	\$406,562	3	1	\$991	\$991
2100 Talbot	\$197,219	\$7,385	\$204,604	\$202,936	8		\$2,439	\$1,668
2200 Washington	\$667,500	\$72,016	\$739,516	\$734,287	11		\$6,086	\$5,228
2300 Wicomico	\$249,057	\$203,768	\$452,825	\$451,197	10	1	\$1,556	\$1,628
2400 Worcester	\$292,472	\$15,614	\$308,086	\$304,524	6		\$6,521	\$3,562
Undesignated	\$66,922	\$20,378	\$87,300	\$83,325	9	4	\$18,474	\$3,975
Total	\$ 23,502,883.29	\$ 2,094,897.38	\$ 25,597,780.67	\$ 25,045,023.48	203	20	\$ 765,616.36	\$ 552,757.19

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

Comptroller of Maryland
Distribution of Bay Restoration Fee
through June 30, 2022

	<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

August 2021	\$	-
September		-
October		19,126,275.33
November		-
December		-
January 2022		28,619,586.13
February		13,403,850.92
March		-
April		26,526,889.23
May		-
June		3,561,739.81
July 2022 accrual		28,133,114.46
Total FY 2022	\$	119,371,455.88

Program Grand Total \$ 1,532,135,612.76

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

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

Fiscal Year 2022	60%	40%	Total
August 2021	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
September	-	-	\$ -
October	8,249,239.46	5,499,492.98	\$ 13,748,732.44
November	-	-	-
December	-	-	-
January 2022	3,540,992.95	2,360,661.98	5,901,654.93
February	-	-	-
March	-	-	-
April	4,665,348.33	3,110,232.24	7,775,580.57
May	-	-	-
June	-	-	-
July 2022 accrual	2,097,594.87	1,398,396.58	3,495,991.45
Total FY 2022	\$ 18,553,175.61	\$ 12,368,783.78	\$ 30,921,959.39

Program Grand Total	\$ 222,881,842.21	\$ 157,312,045.00	\$ 380,193,887.21
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

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
		Program Grand Total	<u>\$ 2,167,739.54</u>

-