
MS4 Information

Jurisdiction	Carroll County
Contact Name	Tom Devilbiss
Phone	410-386-2639
Address	225 North Center Street
City	Westminster
State	Maryland
Zip	21157
Email	tdevilbiss@ccg.carr.org
Baseline Acres	1344.00
Permit Num	11-DP-3319
Reporting Year	2016

Check with MDE Geodatabase:

Should match Permit info table of Geodatabase, except for Impervious Acre Baseline -- that should match Impervious Surface Table.

Background

VERSION 4-7-16

The 2015 Maryland General Assembly passed Senate Bill 863 – Watershed Protection and Restoration Programs – Revisions. While SB 863 repealed the mandate for Phase I MS4 permittees to implement a stormwater remediation fee to fund stormwater projects, in its place, the bill requires annual reporting to Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) for certain information related to the Watershed Protection and Restoration Fund and stormwater projects implemented during the previous year. SB 863 also requires a jurisdiction to file a financial assurance plan (FAP) with MDE every two years. The first report is to be filed by July 1, 2016, and then every two years thereafter on the anniversary date of the issuance of the NPDES Phase 1 MS4 permit.

The FAP must demonstrate that the jurisdiction has sufficient funding in the current fiscal year and subsequent budgets to meet its anticipated costs for the 2-year period immediately following the filing date of the plan. The local governing body must hold a public hearing and approve an FAP before it can be submitted to MDE. MDE will make the plan publically available on its website within 14 days after the plan is submitted.

MDE has 90 days from receipt of the FAP to determine if a jurisdiction’s FAP demonstrates sufficient funding. Starting September 1, 2016, and every year thereafter, MDE must submit an annual report to the Governor and environmental committees of the Maryland General Assembly evaluating the compliance of Phase I jurisdictions with the requirements of the stormwater fee law.

Summary of Carroll County FAP

Carroll County’s third generation permit, which expired in 2009, required restoration of 10 percent of untreated impervious surface. The initial 10 percent restoration requirement was achieved in 2009. The County continued to work toward the next 10 percent, as required by the permit, while awaiting issuance of the fourth generation permit. By the issuance of the fourth generation permit in December 2014, restoration of 23 percent of the untreated impervious surface had been achieved. Because the original

10 percent was complete, and work on the next 20 percent began in 2009, all projects completed that contribute toward the current 20 percent requirement have been included in these spreadsheets to ensure proper credit is given. Total operating and capital costs of \$12,576,575 have been expended thus far through FY 2015 to comply with the 20 percent restoration requirement of the current permit since the third generation permit expired.

With the fourth generation permit, which was issued December 29, 2014, Carroll County and its eight municipalities became co-permittees. The permit requires restoration of 20 percent of untreated impervious surface in the unincorporated areas of the county, as well as restoration of 20 percent of untreated impervious surface in the municipalities. With the addition of the municipalities to the permit, the impervious surface was reassessed, the results of which were incorporated into the FY 2015 annual NPDES report. However, as MDE has not yet officially approved the new impervious area numbers, the untreated impervious acres (6,715) in the approved FY 2014 annual report were used for this FAP.

The County projects spending a total of \$42,962,810 over the permit term for completed and planned projects (Sheet 1 Total Permit Term Costs of \$30,386,235 plus Sheet 5 Total Complete to Date of \$12,576,575). Impervious area restored is projected to be greater than 20 percent through the end of this permit term in anticipation of additional restoration requirements that will be included in the fifth generation permit, the amount of which as yet has not been determined by MDE. In addition, the FAP demonstrates that revenues are projected to meet estimated Impervious Surface Restoration Plan (ISRP) costs for the two-year period following the filing date, as shown on Sheet 3.

Additional items that should be noted are as follows:

- “All Actions” and “Spec Actions” Worksheets – Projects completed prior to 2009 but counting toward the current permit’s 20 percent restoration requirement are included in these worksheets to ensure proper credit toward the current permit’s ISRP.
- “All Actions” Worksheet – Costs under “Other” were not funded by County revenues. Therefore, no cost is reported. These BMPs were acquired through the development process, as a result of County policies and requirements, and contribute toward the County’s impervious surface restoration requirement.
- “ISRP Costs” Worksheet – Property tax revenues are intended to cover General Fund costs for Projected Costs Years 2 through 5 are \$0 “General Fund” under “Paygo” sources are \$0 unless property taxes are not enough to cover the expenses in that year. General Fund dollars are only used if additional funds are needed. Therefore, no dollars in Years 2 through 5 have been included, as revenues are projected to cover costs.
- “Spec Actions” Worksheet – Septic pumping does not appear under operating costs, as it is not a cost incurred by the County. These costs are paid by the individual property owners.

The specifics and details related to restoration projects and program implementation can be found in the County’s annual NPDES reports. Funding and efforts related to NPDES permit compliance have historically been, and continue to be, a high priority for Carroll County. This FAP provides confirmation related to that commitment, and, therefore, this submittal represents a level of effort which meets the

Article 4-202.1(j)(1)(i): Actions that will be required of the county or municipality to meet the requirements of its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit.

Note: To identify all "actions" required under the MS4 permit, provide an executive summary of the jurisdiction's MS4 programs. See MDE's FAP Guidance. For proposed actions to meet the impervious surface restoration plan, fill in the table below.

Baseline: 1,344 Requirement: 20%

REST BMP TYPE*	BMP CLASS	IMP ACRES	IMPL COST	% ISRP COMPLETE	IMPL STATUS**	PROJECTED IMPL YR
Operation Programs						
				0.0%		
				0.0%		
				0.0%		
				0.0%		
				0.0%		
Average Operations Next Two Years (FY 2017-FY 2018)***		#DIV/0!	\$0	0.0%		
Average Operations Permit Term (FY 2014-FY 2018)***		#DIV/0!	\$0	0.0%		
Average Operations Permit Term and Projected Years (FY 2014-FY 2020)***		#DIV/0!	\$0	0.0%		
Capital Projects						
PWED	S	24.93	\$1,200,000	1.9%	Under Construction	2016
FPU	A	11.42	\$119,660	0.8%	Construction (Maintenance)	2016
FSND	S	17.00	\$830,000	1.3%	Under Construction	2016
FBIO	S	4.00	\$70,000	0.3%	Under Construction	2016
PWED	S	47.05	\$3,500,000	3.5%	Proposed	2016
FSND	S	94.98	\$2,740,000	7.1%	Proposed	2017
PWED	S	92.10	\$1,800,000	6.9%	Proposed	2017
WPKT	S	24.00	\$750,000	1.8%	Proposed	2017
PWED	S	139.20	\$4,000,000	10.4%	Proposed	2018
FSND	S	61.50	\$2,500,000	4.6%	Proposed	2018
FPU	A	12.50	\$300,000	0.9%	Planning	2018
PWED	S	199.30	\$3,150,000	14.8%	Planning	2019
WPKT	S	10.00	\$350,000	0.7%	Planning	2019
FSND	S	55.00	\$800,000	4.1%	Planning	2019
FPU	A	15.00	\$400,000	1.1%	Planning	2019
OUT	A	10.00	\$240,000	0.7%	Planning	2020
FSND	S	21.00	\$640,000	1.6%	Planning	2020
FPU	A	18.00	\$550,000	1.3%	Planning	2020
				0.0%		
Subtotal Capital Next Two Years (FY 2017-FY 2018)		424.28	\$12,090,000	31.6%		
Subtotal Capital Permit Term (FY 2015-FY 2019)		1,412.62	\$30,386,235	84.3%		
Subtotal Capital Permit Term and Projected Years (FY 2015-FY 2020)		1,461.62	\$36,516,235	108.8%		
Other						
NSCA	E	13.50	\$0	1.0%		2016
XFLD	E	3.24	\$0	0.2%		2016
NSCA	E	13.50	\$0	1.0%		2017
XFLD	E	3.24	\$0	0.2%		2017
NSCA	E	13.50	\$0	1.0%		2018
XFLD	E	3.24	\$0	0.2%		2018
NSCA	E	27.00	\$0	2.0%		2019-2020
XFLD	E	6.48	\$0	0.5%		2019-2020
Subtotal Other Next Two Years		33	\$0	2.49%		
Subtotal Other Permit Term (FY 2015-FY 2019)		552	\$0	41.1%		
Subtotal Operations Permit Term and Projected Years (FY 2015-FY 2020)		602	\$0	44.8%		
Total Next Two Years (FY 2017-2018)		457.8	\$12,090,000	34.1%		
Total Permit Term (FY 2015-FY 2019)		1,964.5	\$30,386,235	125.4%		
Total Permit Term and Projected Years (FY2015-FY2020)		2,063.7	\$36,516,235	153.5%		

Miller/Watts
Upper Monocacy/Westminster/New Windsor/Double PC 3 Treeplanting
Carroll Co. Main.
Farm Museum
Finksburg Ind., Miller/Watts
Elderwood, Blue Ridge
Langdon
Manchester Skate
Willow, Shannon
Merr, Small, Whisp.
Treeplanting \$8,000/acre
Null, Centr, Greens
U.B. Project
Centr (Dry), Squires
Treeplanting \$9,000/acre
Springmount
Piney Ridge Village, Candice Estates
Treeplanting \$10,000/acre

FBIO Bioretention
FPRSE Floodplain Restoration
FSND Sand Filter
WPKT Pocket Wetland
MENF Enhanced Filters
FPU Planting Trees
OUT Outfall Stabilization
PWED Extended Detention (Wet)

Check with MDE Geodatabase:

Type, class, impervious acres, implementation cost and implementation status should match the various geodatabase tables for BMPs (AltBMPLine, AltBMPPoint, AltBMPPoly, and RestBMP) -- aggregated by type and status.

*Use BMP domains from MDE Geodatabase.

**Complete, Under Construction, Planning, or Proposed

***IMPL COST is a summation and not an average.

VERSION 4-7-16

Article 4-202.1(j)(1)(i)2: Projected annual and 5-year costs for the county or municipality to meet the impervious surface restoration plan requirements of its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit.

DESCRIPTION	PAST UP THRU FY 2015	CURRENT/PROJECTED YEAR 1 FY 2016	PROJECTED YEAR 2 FY 2017	PROJECTED YEAR 3 FY 2018	PROJECTED YEAR 4 FY 2019	PROJECTED YEAR 5 FY 2020	TOTAL COSTS
Operating Expenditures (costs)							
Support of Capital Projects	\$2,980,828	\$923,270	\$955,210	\$996,281	\$1,039,700	\$1,085,640	\$7,980,929
Debt Service Payment	\$759,578	\$655,743	\$973,510	\$1,359,650	\$1,759,540	\$2,115,960	\$7,623,981
Other (please stipulate program expenditure)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Capital Expenditures (costs)							
General Fund (Paygo)	\$715,508	\$287,800	-	-	-	-	\$1,003,308
WPR Fund (Paygo)	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Municipalities	-	\$516,000	\$871,000	\$405,400	\$458,000	\$223,600	\$2,474,000
Developer contributions	\$328,042	-	-	-	-	-	\$328,042
Debt Service	\$5,541,551	\$4,112,200	\$4,977,000	\$3,432,600	\$3,012,000	\$2,546,400	\$23,621,751
Grants & Partnerships	\$2,199,268	\$1,023,519	\$3,755,377	-	-	-	\$6,978,164
Other (please stipulate capital expenditure)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Subtotal operation and paygo:	\$4,455,914	\$1,866,813	\$1,928,720	\$2,355,931	\$2,799,240	\$3,201,600	\$16,608,218
Total expenditures:	\$12,524,775	\$7,518,532	\$11,532,097	\$6,193,931	\$6,269,240	\$5,971,600	\$50,010,175

Removed the Lab Testing and Supplies and Mowing

Total ISRP costs except debt service: \$42,386,194

Compare ISRP costs (except debt service) / total ISRP proposed actions: 139.49%

Check with MDE Geodatabase:

The total current FY 2015 expenditure should be less than the combined total of the "OP_cost" and "CAP_Cost" fields in the fiscal analyses table of the geodatabase.

The total projected FY 2016 expenditure should be less than the combined total of the "OP_budget" and "CAP_budget" fields in the fiscal analyses table of the geodatabase.

*Insert additional rows as necessary.

VERSION 4-7-16

Article 4-202.1(j)(1)(i)3: Projected annual and 5-year revenues or other funds that will be used to meet the cost for the county or municipality to meet the impervious surface restoration plan requirements under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit.

DESCRIPTION	PAST UP THRU FY 2015	CURRENT/PROJECTED YEAR 1 FY 2016	PROJECTED YEAR 2 FY 2017	PROJECTED YEAR 3 FY 2018	PROJECTED YEAR 4 FY 2019	PROJECTED YEAR 5 FY 2020	TOTAL NEXT 2-YEARS FY 17-18*	TOTAL CURRENT + PROJECTED
Annual Revenue** Appropriated for ISRP	\$15,414,774	\$7,693,492	\$11,694,567	\$6,361,274	\$6,441,605	\$6,149,136	\$18,055,841	\$53,754,848
Annual Costs towards ISRP***	\$12,524,775	\$7,518,532	\$11,532,097	\$6,193,931	\$6,269,240	\$5,971,600	\$17,726,028	\$50,010,175

Compare annual costs / revenue appropriated: **102%**
WPRP 2016 Reporting Criteria **75%**

ISRP = Impervious Surface Restoration Program, or 20% Restoration Requirement

* Article 4-202.1(j)(2): Demonstration that county or municipality has sufficient funding in the current fiscal year and subsequent fiscal year budgets to meet its estimated cost for the 2-year period immediately following the filing date of the FAP. Note that the appropriations and expenditures include time period up to FY 2018.
 ** Revenue means "dedicated revenues, funds, or sources of funds (per Article 4-202.1(j)(4)(ii). Note that budget appropriations have only been approved by governing bodies through FY 2016 at the time of FAP reporting.
 *** See table of ISRP Cost.

Article 4-202.1(j)(1)(i)4: Any sources of funds that will be utilized by the county or municipality to meet the requirements of its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit.

SOURCE	PAST UP THRU FY 2015	CURRENT/PROJECTED YEAR 1 FY 2016	PROJECTED YEAR 2 FY 2017	PROJECTED YEAR 3 FY 2018	PROJECTED YEAR 4 FY 2019	PROJECTED YEAR 5 FY 2020	TOTAL PERMIT CYCLE
Paygo Sources							
Stormwater Remediation Fees (WPR Fund)	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Miscellaneous Fees (WPR Fund)	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
General Fund	\$4,730,304	\$943,543	-	-	-	-	\$5,673,847
Property Tax	\$1,066,890	\$1,047,048	\$2,038,882	\$2,469,397	\$2,916,111	\$3,321,977	\$9,538,328
Municipalities	\$249,474	\$566,326	\$922,708	\$458,659	\$512,857	\$280,103	\$2,710,024
Developer Contributions	\$328,042	-	-	-	-	-	\$328,042
Interest	\$583	\$856	\$600	\$618	\$637	\$656	\$3,294
Subtotal Paygo Sources	\$6,375,293	\$2,557,773	\$2,962,190	\$2,928,674	\$3,429,605	\$3,602,736	\$18,253,535
Debt Service (paygo sources will be used to pay off debt service. Note that previous appropriations for debt service used for ISRP is listed in FY 2014).							
County Transportation Bonds	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
General Obligation Bonds	\$6,840,425	\$4,112,200	\$4,977,000	\$3,432,600	\$3,012,000	\$2,546,400	\$22,374,225
Revenue (Utility) Bonds	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
State Revolving Loan Fund	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Public-private partnership (debt service)	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Subtotal Debt Service	\$6,840,425	\$4,112,200	\$4,977,000	\$3,432,600	\$3,012,000	\$2,546,400	\$22,374,225
Grants and Partnerships (no payment is expected)							
State funded grants	\$2,199,056	\$1,023,519	\$3,755,377	-	-	-	\$6,977,952
Federal funded grants	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Public-private partnership (matched grant)	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$0
Subtotal Grants and Partnerships	\$2,199,056	\$1,023,519	\$3,755,377	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,977,952
Total Annual Sources of Funds	\$15,414,774	\$7,693,492	\$11,694,567	\$6,361,274	\$6,441,605	\$6,149,136	\$47,605,712
Percent of Funds Directed Toward ISRP	81.25%	97.72%	98.61%	97.37%	97.32%	97.11%	

Compare total permit term paygo ISRP costs / subtotal permit term paygo sources: 73%

Compare total permit term ISRP costs / total permit term annual sources of funds: 93%

* WPR Fund: Watershed Protection and Restoration Fund.

Check with MDE Geodatabase:

The total sources related to WPR Funds in Current FY 2015 should match the "WPR_Fund" field of the geodatabase.

