MEP Analysis Carroll County & Municipal Co-Permittees MS4 Phase I Permit

Introduction

Carroll County appreciates the working relationship with the Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) on the administration of the NPDES permit. We have had many productive meetings from both a policy and a technical perspective through the duration of the permits. Carroll County is unique in many ways, including our cooperative agreement with our municipalities; one of the strongest agricultural land preservation programs in the nation; and our dedication to complying with NPDES permit requirements without resorting to nutrient trading. We look forward to discussing the fifth generation permit with MDE and establishing terms that are specific to Carroll County and an equitable assignment of responsibility.

Physical Capacity Questionnaire

What is the typical implementation time frame (from planning through construction) for a restoration project? Provide a typical Gantt chart for the following three main classes of BMPs and break down into planning, design, and construction phases: 1. Large upland stormwater projects (e.g., new and retrofits for ponds, bioretention, infiltration basins, etc.); 2. Instream restoration projects; and, 3. Alternative projects (not annual) (e.g., tree planting). Provide a written justification to explain the time frames for each BMP class and phase.

The Carroll County capital and operating plans lay out each of these budgets five years into the future. Projects are generally scheduled according to the budgeting process and projected availability of funds for each given fiscal year. Therefore, not all projects will begin the planning stage in the current year and could be planned to begin five years out, leading to a planning duration of one to five years. However, secondary benefits, such as addressing drainage issues, resolving maintenance problems, and establishing cooperative opportunities with private entities, may allow a stormwater retrofit project to move up in the queue (earlier budgeted start year) or reduce planning duration.

Large Upland Projects

	_ Li	arge U	pland	Proje	t
			Years		
	1	2	3	4	5
Planning					
Design/Permitting					
Construction					

Planning

The planning phase of an individual project generally ranges from one to five years. Factors that influence the duration of the planning phase for any given project include, among others, the priority of the project compared to other stormwater projects and to other budgeted projects, the potential for secondary benefits, and grant-funding opportunities.

All planning activities are performed by County staff, with the occasional watershed study performed by consultants. Watershed studies typically evaluate a small watershed to determine the best opportunities for stormwater improvements and help guide County staff in prioritization of future projects.

Design/Permitting

The County maintains term contracts with contractors who can perform design work up to an upset limit of \$150,000. When the determination is made that a project is to move forward with design, these contracts are in place to allow the County to move forward quickly. If a project is anticipated to cost more than \$150,000 to design, an open procurement process is required, which may increase the length of the design/permitting phase. The time required to design and permit a project also depends on the size or complexity of the project and if grant funding is being used that requires additional reviews. Grant requirements can greatly extend the design duration. The last County project completed with Federal Highway Transportation Alternatives Program Funding took two additional years to get through the supplemental reviews by Maryland State Highway Administration. Typically, a project takes between six months to three years to design, with an average of 18 months.

Permitting is typically performed by County staff and runs parallel to the design work being performed by the consultants. While permitting does add some time to the design/permitting phase of a project, we are usually able to address permitting without affecting the desired notice to proceed for construction.

Construction

The County maintains term contracts with contractors who can perform construction work up to an upset limit of \$200,000. When the determination is made that a project is to move forward with construction, these contracts are in place to allow the County to move forward quickly. If a project is anticipated to cost more than \$200,000 to construct, an open procurement process is required, which may increase the construction time. Following receipt of all approvals, the process to advertise, award,

construct, and as-built approve a facility typically takes between three to 18 months. The duration is dictated by the complexity of the project and the construction season. Projects that finish in the heat of summer or the middle of winter tend to be extended due to final stabilization requirements. Average construction time is approximately six months.

Instream Restoration Projects

	_	In	stream	n Proje	cts	
			Ye	ars		
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning						
Design/Permitting						
Construction						

Planning

Carroll County has not focused heavily on instream projects due to our philosophy of addressing the hydrologic cause(s) of stream instability. At the time of this report, one instream project was completed in the spring of 2021. Two projects are currently under construction, one of which has been on hold for three months due to the stream closure season. Finally, one project is currently in the design phase.

For instream restoration projects, the planning duration (and factors influencing it) is similar to that of Large Upland Projects – typically one to five years.

Design/Permitting

Design duration and influencing factors for instream projects are similar to those of Large Upland Projects. Durations are sometimes slightly longer due to additional permitting requirements. Term contract limit for design services is \$150,000.

Construction

Construction durations are typically slightly longer than Large Upland Projects, due to larger project sizes and stream closure restrictions. Construction duration is still estimated to be less than one year. Term contract limit for construction services is \$200,000.

Alternative Projects

Alternative Proje	ects	
	Yea	ars
	1	2
Planning		
Design/Permitting		
Construction		

Planning

The County has an active program to reach out to private property owners for tree plantings and to identify public areas that could benefit from tree plantings. Planning duration is typically less than one year, as potential planting sites are continuously documented throughout the year in anticipation of either spring or fall plantings.

Design/Permitting

Planting plans and other design requirements are performed in-house and typically take less than three months to develop. Work includes negotiation with property owners, property surveys, species selection, planting plan documentation, and bid preparation. Design and permitting is performed by County staff.

Construction

Construction is dependent on the weather and the selected contractor's workload. Typically, projects are advertised in August for bids due in September. Once awarded, some plantings happen immediately, while others run into December. Construction time frames, therefore, average two months to complete. The County does not have term contractors specializing in tree plantings and therefore construction procurement is through an open procurement process with the County purchasing office.

Provide the average time to authorize capital improvement project (CIP) budgets for the initial project planning phase and for the design phase of a typical restoration project (assumes CIP approval for each phase is required). Do you have the ability to combine these two phases or do you have to get CIP approval for each phase consecutively?

The NPDES budget ("Watershed Assessment and Improvement" and "Stormwater Facility Renovation") is based on estimates of design and construction costs over the upcoming five years, as project planning occurs in-house by staff. Each year, the budget process for the following fiscal year(s) begins in late fall and concludes with budget approval and adoption by the County Commissioners in May. The program functions within those annual budget constraints, which may include changing specific projects as other secondary factors require adjustment. Individual project procurements of design or construction

services that exceed term contract limits must be approved by County Commissioners. Term contract limit for design services is \$150,000. Term contract limit for construction services is \$200,000.

Provide the average time to procure professional planning, design, and construction services. Is procurement done in phases (e.g., procurement for planning, then procurement for design, and then procurement for construction)? How would a pay-for-performance type of contract or a design-build-operation-maintenance contract affect these time frames? Please provide information on any innovative contracting mechanism you use to reduce procurement time frames and what those reduced time frames are.

Consultant services for planning studies or design services are typically procured through term contracts. The County has five term consultants who have been pre-qualified to provide Environmental Support Services. When services are required, the Bureau of Resource Management develops a Request for Bid and supplies it to between three and five of the term consultants. Turnaround time is typically one month between solicitation of Request for Bid (RFB) and notice to proceed.

If consulting services are required that exceed the term consultant limit of \$150,000 for design, a Request for Proposal (RFP) is developed and advertised through the County's procurement process. Due to the size of the project, evaluation of qualifications, and final approval by the County Commissioners, this process can take two to three months.

Hiring of construction services is very similar to design. The County has five term contractors who are pre-approved to perform construction tasks up to \$200,000. An RFP is issued for construction tasks that exceed that limit. The County's procurement process typically lasts two to three months.

The County maintains an excellent selection of efficient and cost-effective consultants and contractors. This practice tends to streamline the total process and associated time frames, improving efficiency and cost-effectiveness of individual projects and benefitting the program overall.

The County attempted to pilot a design-build project to explore the potential of that contracting mechanism. However, staff determined that local contractors are risk-adverse, and the project pricing exceeded the budget. The proposed design-build bid exceeded \$6M. The bid was rejected, and a traditional design-bid-build process was performed. The actual total project cost, including all design and construction, finished at \$3.4M.

Provide the number of requests for proposals (RFPs) for BMP construction and for BMP design advertised during the past 5-year permit term. Of these, how many bids were submitted for each RFP, and how many required re-advertising? Was there a trend over the permit term in the number of bid submittals received? How many unique companies provided bids for all RFPs?

The vast majority of all design services are procured from our five term consultants. The County decides, based on the scope of services and expertise of our consultants, which of the five are invited to bid. Requests for bids (RFB) are sent to between three and five of the consultants.

Recently the County had one design bid that exceeded the capacity of the term contracts. That project was advertised through the County procurement process and seven firms bid on the work.

The table on Page 7, "Representation of Design Solicitations," represents the design solicitations for our current term consultants. The bid offered by each contractor is shown, and the contractor awarded the work for each project is highlighted.

While the County does maintain term contract for construction work, the majority of retrofit projects exceed the \$200,000 contract limit. The table on Page 8, "Representation of Construction Solicitations," is a representative list of construction projects, number of bids, and the three lowest bids received for each project.

The number of bidders fluctuates based on time of year that construction is expected and the current economic situation. The Woodsyde project and Trevanion Terrace projects were bid mid-pandemic, and 14 and 12 firms, respectively, bid on these projects. These are high compared to the six or seven bids that are normally received.

Project	BAI	Century	CLSI	RK&K	WMA	Ecotone	Status	Final Design Fee
Shiloh	\$ 28,800.00	\$ 59,136.00	\$ 27,270.00	\$ 22,493.00	\$ 52,251.00		Complete	\$ 118,121.00
Mayberry	\$ 285,470.00	\$339,172.00	\$ -	\$484,775.00	\$ -	\$170,000.00	Under Construction	\$ 178,556.00
Woodville Study	\$ 49,660.00	\$ 38,902.00	\$ 94,990.00	\$ 69,369.00	\$ 70,751.00		Complete	\$ 38,902.00
Elmer Wolfe	\$ 29,970.00	\$ 53,268.00	\$ 48,645.00	\$ 71,550.00	\$ 51,082.00		Complete	\$ 29,970.00
Locust	\$ 64,350.00	\$ 54,796.00	\$ -	\$ 77,725.00	\$ 64,822.00		Design	
Central MD 2	\$ 49,960.00	\$ 69,796.00	\$ 47,950.00	\$ 66,791.00	\$ -		Complete	\$ 47,950.00
Greens of Westminster	\$ 57,220.00	\$ 68,280.00	\$ 48,350.00	\$ 73,905.00	\$ 46,874.50		Complete	\$ 46,874.00
Woodsyde	- \$	\$ 59,988.00	\$ -	\$ 72,999.00	- \$		Under Construction	\$ 203,531.00
Trevanion	\$ 56,900.00	\$115,766.00	\$ 83,510.00	\$155,257.00	\$ 83,019.50		Design	
Aspen Run	\$ 40,280.00	\$ 54,843.00	\$ 47,850.00	\$ 66,868.00	\$ 59,239.00		Complete	\$ 40,280.00
East West	\$ 79,660.00	\$ 96,863.00	\$ 73,745.00	\$ 130,798.00	\$ -		Under Construction	\$ 90,225.00
Melstone	\$ 79,735.00	\$161,468.00	\$ 71,920.00	\$ -	\$ 104,528.00		Design	
St. Georges Gate	\$ 40,200.00		\$ 52,320.00		\$ 47,209.00		Design	
Stone Manor	\$ 65,040.00		\$ 44,870.00		\$ 51,008.00		Design	
Hampstead Valley Study		\$134,480.00		\$ 65,944.00	\$ -		Complete	\$ 65,944.00
Bevard Square			\$ 18,390.00	\$ -	\$ 16,789.00		Design	
Brynwood Storm Drain	\$ 88,490.00	\$ 88,482.00	\$ 95,710.00				Design	
Brynwood Stream Restoration		\$ 99,740.00		\$149,201.80			Design	
Benjamins Claim			\$ 9,580.00				Complete	\$ 17,470.00
Hampstead Valley 4		\$149,696.00	\$ 99,880.00	\$128,271.00			Design	
NC Library	\$ 35,350.00		\$ 27,010.00		\$ 23,643.00		Design	
Hampstead Valley 1			\$ 77,590.00		\$ 77,868.00		Design	

Representation of Design Solicitations

				LOWEST IN	Lowest Inree Bladers		
Project	Number of Bidders	Bidder Name	Bid Amount	Bidder Name	Bid Amount	Bidder Name	Bid Amount
Bear Branch Stream Restoration	7	Magstone	\$ 1, 781,000.00	SMI	\$ 1,844,400.00	Environmental	\$ 1,920,357.50
Blue Ridge Manor SWM Pond Reconstruction	6	ТВН	\$ 429,900.00	White Pine	\$ 474,900.00	Conewago	\$ 497,121.00
Central Maryland Facility 2 SWM Facility Retrofit	12	Stambaugh's	\$ 493,710.00	White Pine	\$ 537,130.00	L W Wolfe	\$ 784,000.00
Central MD Service & Distribution Center	7	White Pine	\$ 530,762.00	Stambaugh's	\$ 582,436.00	Kibler	\$ 590,000.00
East West Pond	6	Kibler	\$ 1,070,193.18	CJ Miller	\$ 1, 244, 480. 00	W.F. Delauter	\$ 1,498,117.00
Elderwood SWM Basin #2/Oklahoma Phase 4 SWM Facility Retrofit	5	Kibler	\$ 2, 303, 223. 70	White Pine	\$ 2,944,793.70	Triangle	\$ 3,643,691.26
Gillis Falls Tree Planting Fall 2020	9	Red Hill	\$ 159,167.50	Wright	\$ 170,500.00	JC Kirby	\$ 187,744.00
Greens of Westminster SWM Restoration	7	Kibler	\$ 655,359.41	Guyer	\$ 761,000.00	CJ Miller	\$ 762,500.00
Langdon SWM Facility	7	НТІ	\$ 1,696,300.85	White Pine	\$ 1, 781, 071. 20	Conewago	\$ 2,125,538.00
Langdon SWM - New Windsor Fill Site	3	Stambaugh's	\$ 340,841.00	Highland	\$ 434,545.00	Triangle	\$ 511,020.00
Merridale Gardens SWM Requirement & Contract	7	Conewago	\$ 1,071,212.00	W.F. Delauter	\$ 1, 161, 138.68	White Pine	\$ 1,298,690.00
Piney Run Tree Planting Fall 2020	4	Quality	\$ 12,120.00	Chesapeake	\$ 15,464.00	Ecological	\$ 21,034.22
Private Landowner Tree Plantings Fall 2020	7	JC Kirby	\$ 243,743.00	Conservation	\$ 247,894.51	Shenandoah	\$ 266,008.40
Roberts Mill SWM Retrofit & Bridge Superstructure	3	W.F. Delauter	\$ 3, 186, 350.00	Kibler	\$ 3,430,000.00	CJ Miller	\$ 3,950,700.00
Shannon Hawk SWM Facility Retrofit	5	W.F. Delauter	\$ 938,511.41	CJ Miller	\$ 940,000.00	Conewago	\$ 1,050,995.00
Shiloh Middle School SWM Facility Retrofit	5	W.F. Delauter	\$ 958,322.43	Kibler	\$ 1,019,090.01	CJ Miller	\$ 1,375,654.00
Small Crossings SWM Facility Design Retrofit	7	ТВН	\$ 329,510.00	White Pine	\$ 338,994.00	Stambaugh's	\$ 425,875.00
Taneytown Memorial Park Fill Site	4	W.F. Delauter	\$ 105,417.00	Highland	\$ 415,256.55	Outdoor	\$ 486,000.00
Tree Planting Fall 2017 - Contract 1	7	Aspen	\$ 14,324.00	JC Kirby	\$ 15,370.10	Wright	\$ 18,011.59
Tree Planting Fall 2017 - Contract 2	7	Aspen	\$ 42,246.00	Quality	\$ 46,080.00	JC Kirby	\$ 47,643.20
Tree Planting Fall 2017 - Contract 3	6	Quality	\$ 36,237.00	JC Kirby	\$ 38,413.20	Wright	\$ 46,260.20
Tree Planting Fall 2018	10	Red Hill	\$ 61,242.85	Quality	\$ 73,819.50	Aspen	\$ 84,120.30
Trevanion Terrace SWM Facility Retrofit	12	CJ Miller	\$ 1, 108,000.00	Pleasants	\$ 1, 124, 559. 73	Kibler	\$ 1,149,639.38
Twin Ridge SWM Facility Retrofit	6	Hamilton	\$ 802,690.00	W.F. Delauter	\$ 885,360.00	L W Wolfe	\$ 1,064,212.00
Whispering Valley SWM Facility Retrofit	6	White Pine	\$ 798,643.00	W.F. Delauter	\$ 969,679.00	Guyer	\$ 1,092,500.00
Willow Pond SWM Retrofit	7	Kibler	\$ 2, 950,000.00	White Pine	\$ 3, 399, 810.00	Old Line	\$ 3,639,509.53
Woodsyde SWM Retrofit & Stream Restoration	14	Magstone	\$ 1, 383,670.71	CJ Miller	\$ 1, 744, 800.00	Stormwater	\$ 1,960,000.00

Representation of Construction Solicitations

Provide information on contracting limitations that result in longer project implementation times. Examples: Limited qualified construction contractors; woman-owned business enterprise (WBE) or minority-owned business enterprise (MBE) requirements limit available qualified construction contractors and/or engineering contractors. Describe the issue and provide the time extension that results due to the issue.

Carroll County encourages WBE and MBE contractors to bid on work but does not impose participation requirements. While projects receiving partial grant funding sometimes include participation goals, these requirements have not adversely affected project schedules.

Provide a typical time frame required to obtain permits from local, State, and federal agencies for the three main BMP project classes (i.e., upland stormwater ponds, instream restoration, and alternative projects) prior to construction. Describe how these time frames affect the overall project implementation time frames described in Question #1. How can these time frames be reduced to help get these projects out the door faster?

The project design time frame for Large Upland Projects and Instream Projects described earlier (six months to three years) incorporates the permitting process. While obtaining permits is typically the final requirement prior to proceeding with construction, we have largely been successful in obtaining all permits in a timely manner that does not delay desired construction notice to proceed. However, the following are three situations that have caused some delay in projects:

- Transportation Alternatives Program Grant Funding The County has successfully utilized this grant program for several projects. The Federal Highway Administration funds this program, which is administered through the Maryland State Highway Administration (MSHA). The review and approval process through MSHA has progressively gotten longer with each project performed. The latest project, which had all approvals and was shovel-ready when submitted to MSHA, took two years to receive approval.
- Permits issued by the Army Corps of Engineers typically are reviewed and approved by the Baltimore office. During the last permit term, review and approval of one of the permit/project applications was completed by the Pennsylvania office due to workload issues in the Baltimore office. An unfamiliarity of the plans and process in the Baltimore region delayed the issuance of the permit.
- 3. Projects that require approval from MDE's Dam Safety Division have taken longer to get approved. It appears that changes in organizational structure, changes in personnel, and increased scope of review for that group caused these delays in recent years.

These permitting delays appear to be primarily a resource issue at the permitting agencies and not a systemic process problem that needs to be addressed.

What type of a project do you consider as "low-hanging fruit"? What is your remaining capacity of available "low-hanging fruit" projects (estimate the number and impervious acre treatment total)?

Carroll County is fortunate that the County maintains ownership of residential structural practices. Therefore, the focus of the County's program has been on the retrofit of large structural facilities with large amounts of impervious area draining to them. The absence of significant time and costs for property acquisition has resulted in a relatively low cost per impervious acre to meet permit requirements. While there is not a particular "low-hanging fruit" threshold to identify and quantify, the amount of impervious area that can be addressed with a single project and/or is on land already owned or controlled by the County will continually decline as the program progresses. Consequently, the cost per impervious acre will continue to rise, particularly as land acquisition becomes a more frequent project cost.

As the availability of residential structures declines, the County will shift its focus to commercial/industrial facilities that are privately owned. While the County may benefit from the low cost per impervious acre for these facilities, they will require public/private partnerships, and County funding will require cash, as projects on private property cannot be bonded.

Complete the spreadsheet provided for restoration projects to be planned, designed, and/or constructed from the end of the 4th generation permit through 2028. Include for each restoration project the estimated impervious acres treated, estimated total nitrogen (TN) reduction, estimated total phosphorus (TP) reduction, and estimated total suspended sediments (TSS) reduction; any local total maximum daily load (TMDL) parameter (or other water quality objective) addressed; estimated cost; implementation status; and projected completion year. Include projects that will be in the planning or design phase but will not be completed until after 2026. This information should be more specific for the first reporting year but may be more generalized for the remaining reporting years.

The spreadsheet on the following pages provides the requested information. Note that no data is populated for the previous permit term, as Carroll County and its municipal co-permittees met the fourth-generation permit requirements.

			1				Rest	oration Proje	cts To Be Plann	ned, Designed	, and/or C	onstructed Fro	om The End C	Of 4th Gene	eration Permit	Through CY 2028			
Remaining Unmet F Previous Permit (In	Restoration Obligation Pression Pressi Pression Pression Pressi Pression Pression Pression Pression Pression Pression Pr	on from		,															
REST BMP ID	REST BMP TYPE ¹	BMP CLASS ¹	PERMA- NENT OR ANNU AL BMP	NUM BMP	DRAIN -AGE AREA (acres)	PE (inches)	LENGTH RESTORED (feet)/ LANE MILES (miles)/ MASS LOADING (lbs)	TP REDUCTION (Ibs/year)	TSS REDUCTION (lbs/year)	TN [®] REDUCTION (Ibs/year)	IMP ACRES (IA)	GREEN STORMWATER INFRASTRUC- TURE (GSI) CREDIT (IA X 0.35)	WATERSHED MANAGE- MENT (WM) CREDIT	TOTAL IMP ACRES (W/GSI AND WM CREDITS)	IMPLEMEN- TATION COST	IMPLEMEN- TATION STATUS ²	PROJECTED IMPLEMEN- TATION YEAR	TMDL PARAMETER OR WQ OBJECTIVE ADDRESSED	GENERAL COMMENTS ⁷
										Remaining	Unmet Resto	ration Obligations	from Previous I	Permit					
	l Programs (Unmet (Obligation	s from Previou	s Permit) ³ ,	4														
Street Sweeping*		A	ANNUAL											0					
		A	ANNUAL											0					
		A	ANNUAL											0					
		А	ANNUAL											0					
		А	ANNUAL											0					
		А	ANNUAL											0					
Catch Basin		А	ANNUAL											0					
		A	ANNUAL											0					
		A	ANNUAL											0					
		A	ANNUAL											0					
		A	ANNUAL											0					
Septic Sytem		A												0					
Pumping												1		-					
		A												0					
		A												0					
		A												0					
		A												0					
Subtotal Operation	c ³	A		0				0	0	0	0			0	\$0				
	nmet Obligations fro	m Previou	s Permit Term	÷				0	0	0	0		1	0	υç				
capital rojects (or	innet obligations ne		ST CHINE ICHI		1	1			1	1	1	1		0					
									1		1	1		0			+ +		
									1			1		0			+ +		
		1									1			0			+ +		
Subtotal Capital				0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0				
	gations from Previou	us Permit 1	erm)						•				-						
														0					
														0					
Subtotal Other				0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Total of Remaining The Previous Permi				0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0				

Restoration Projects to Be Planned, Designed, and/or Constructed from End of 4th Generation Permit through 2028 (Page 1 of 4)

					Resto	oratio	n Projects t	o Be Plann	ed, Design	ed, and/o	r Const	ructed froi	m End of 4	4th Gen	eration Pe	mit through	2028 (Pa	ige 2 of 4)	
REST BMP ID	REST BMP TYPE'	BMP CLASS ¹	PERMA- NENT OR ANNUAL BMP	NUM BMP	DRAIN -AGE AREA (acres)	PE A (inches)	LENGTH RESTORED (feet)/ LANE MILES (miles)/ MASS LOADING (lbs)	TP REDUCTION (Ibs/year)	TSS REDUCTION (Ibs/year)	TN [®] REDUCTION (lbs/year)	IMP ACRES (IA)	GREEN STORMWATER INFRASTRUC- TURE (GSI) CREDIT (IA X 0.35)	WATERSHED MANAGE- MENT (WM) CREDIT	TOTAL IMP ACRES (W/GSI AND WM CREDITS)	IMPLEMEN- TATION COST	IMPLEMEN- TATION STATUS ²	PROJECTED IMPLEMEN- TATION YEAR	TMDL PARAMETER OR WQ OBJECTIVE ADDRESSED	GENERAL COMMENTS ⁷
										Obligatio	ons from Pre	vious Permit That	Must Be Continu	ued					
Annual		-	1	1	T	-							1				1	1	
Street Sweeping			ANNUAL	1				0.35	464	6.04	1			1			2019		
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	A	ANNUAL	7				56.15	16845	140.38	16			16			2019		
														0					
Subtotal Operation	ons ³			2				11	3,462	29	3			3.4	\$0				
	1		1		1	-	Г Г Г		[Capital P	rojects (Prop	osed to Replace A	Annual Obligatio	ons)		[1	I	1
														0					
														0					
														0					
Subtatal Canital				0				0		0	0	0	0	0	ćo				
Subtotal Capital	to Replace Annual Ob	linetions)		0			L	0	U	0	0	U	U	0	\$0				
other (Proposed	I Replace Annual Ob		1	1	T	T					1		1	0					
		-				+								0					
Subtotal Other				0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Obligations from Previous Permit				2				11.3	3,461.8	0	0	0.0	0.0	3.4	\$0				

					Resto	oration	n Projects t	to Be Planı	ned, Desigr	ed, and/o	r Const	ructed fro	m End of	4th Gen	eration Pe	rmit through	2028 (Pa	ge 3 of 4)	
REST BMP ID	REST BMP TYPE ¹	BMP CLASS ¹	PERMA- NENT OR ANNUAL BMP	NUM BMP	DRAIN -AGE AREA (acres)	PE (inches)	LENGTH RESTORED (feet)/ LANE MILES (miles)/ MASS LOADING (lbs)	TP REDUCTION (Ibs/year)	TSS REDUCTION (Ibs/year)	TN⁵ REDUCTION (Ibs/year)	IMP ACRES (IA)	GREEN STORMWATER INFRASTRUC- TURE (GSI) CREDIT (IA X 0.35)	WATERSHED MANAGE- MENT (WM) CREDIT	TOTAL IMP ACRES (W/GSI AND WM CREDITS)	IMPLEMEN- TATION COST	IMPLEMEN- TATION STATUS ²	PROJECTED IMPLEMEN- TATION YEAR	TMDL PARAMETER OR WQ OBJECTIVE ADDRESSED	GENERAL COMMENTS ⁷
										ſ	Proposed Res	toration for the N	ext Permit				· · · · · ·		
Operational Street Sweeping	MSS	A	ANNUAL					0.35	464	6.04	1			1			2020		
Catch Basin	СВС	А	ANNUAL					69.65	20896	174	20						2020		
Cleaning												-							
Subtotal Operation	ns (up to 2026)⁵			0		Ť –		14	4,272	36	4			0	\$0				
Capital Projects	MCCM	6	Dearmont	1	7.86	0.97		4.20	1077	55.00	2.05			2.05	¢111.000	Complete	2020		Designing Claim, Jacoba
CR21RST000001 CR20APY000006	FCB	S A	Permanent Permanent	1	7.86	0.97		4.20 0.28	1977 619	55.90 2.66	2.05 0.12			2.05 0.12	\$111,000	Complete Complete	2020 2020	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Benjamins Claim - Jacobs Forest Conservation Buffer
CR20APY000014		А	Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.00			0.00		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Forest Conservation Buffer
CR20APY000008 CR20APY000012	-	A	Permanent Permanent	1				1.50 1.53	3366 3422	14.43 14.67	0.63			0.63		Complete Complete	2020 2020	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Forest Conservation Buffer Forest Conservation Buffer
	FCB	A	Permanent	1				0.72	1611	6.91	0.30			0.30		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Forest Conservation Buffer
	FCB	Α	Permanent	1				0.68	1532	6.57	0.29			0.29		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Forest Conservation Buffer
CR20APY000017 CR20APY000021		A	Permanent Permanent	1				0.07	146 1625	0.63	0.03			0.03		Complete Complete	2020 2020	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Forest Conservation Buffer Manchester Impervious Removal
CR20APY000007		A	Permanent	1				0.02	0	0.20	0.01			0.01		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Non-Riparian Conservation Landscaping
CR20APY000011		Α	Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.03	0.00			0.00		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Non-Riparian Conservation Landscaping
CR20APY000016 CR20APY000015	NCL RCL	A	Permanent Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.01	0.00			0.00		Complete Complete	2020 2020	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Non-Riparian Conservation Landscaping Riparian Conservation Landscaping
	RCL	A	Permanent	1				0.15	0	1.37	0.10			0.10		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Riparian Conservation Landscaping
	RCL	Α	Permanent	1				0.73	0	6.64	0.49			0.49		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Riparian Conservation Landscaping
CR20APY000020 CR20APY000018	RCL	A	Permanent Permanent	1				0.02	0	0.21	0.02			0.02		Complete Complete	2020 2020	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Riparian Conservation Landscaping Riparian Conservation Landscaping
	PWED	S	Permanent	1	303.6	1.15		137.65	78160	1330.81	91.80			91.80	\$3,500,000	Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Roberts Mill
	SEPD	А	Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.16			0.16		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Septic Upgrades
CR20APT000002 CR20APT000003		A	Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.16			0.16		Complete	2020 2020	Impervious Treatment	Septic Upgrades
CR20APT000003		A	Permanent Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.16			0.16		Complete Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Septic Upgrades Septic Upgrades
CR20APT000005		А	Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.16			0.16		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Septic Upgrades
CR20APT000006		A	Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.16			0.16		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Septic Upgrades
CR20APT000007 CR20APT000008	SEPD SEPD	A	Permanent Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.16			0.16		Complete Complete	2020 2020	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Septic Upgrades Septic Upgrades
CR20APT000009	SEPD	А	Permanent	1				0.00	0	0.00	0.16			0.16		Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Septic Upgrades
CR18RST000005	FSND	S	Permanent	2	83.83	1.81		53.10	25600	678.40	19.61			19.61	\$1,100,000	Complete	2020	Impervious Treatment	Shiloh Middle
	FSND PWED	S S	Permanent Permanent	1	38.31 194	2.23		19.88 109.55	11479 66624	183.97 877.12	16.42 92.10			16.42 92.10	\$700,000 \$3,300,000	Complete Complete	2021 2021	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Greens of Westminster Sec 2 #6 Langdon (Jantz)
	FPU	A	Permanent	1							64.90			64.90	\$402,911	Under Construction	2021	Impervious Treatment	Tree Plantings
CR18RST000006		S	Permanent	1	601	2.50		217.05	108741	2680.57	100.00			100.00	\$2,700,000	Under Construction	2021	Impervious Treatment	Willow Pond
CR19ALN000003 CR21ALN000001	• • • • •	A	Permanent Permanent	1			1304 1682	73.00 114.40	83000 417136	751.10 126.20	28.20 34.00			28.20 34.00	\$600,000 \$750,000	Under Construction Design	2021 2022	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Willow Pond - Stream restoration Brynwood
CR21RST000002	-	S	Permanent	1	47.61	2.13	1002	31.06	15089	390.33	19.52			19.52	\$1,250,000	Planning	2022	Impervious Treatment	Hampstead Valley 1
	FSND	S	Permanent	1	83.01	2.50		42.95	19240	652.39	20.52			20.52	\$600,000	Design	2022	Impervious Treatment	IDA Property (Mt. Airy)
	WPKT STRE	S A	Permanent Permanent	1	35.9	1.00	6000	16.09 605.97	9203 1556780	152.81 6738.54	11.00 279.31			11.00 279.31	\$200,000 \$2,200,000	Design Under Construction	2022 2022	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Locust wetland Mayberry
CR18RST000011		S	Permanent	1	170	1.00		55.72	28275	677.07	22.50			22.50	\$800,000	Design	2022	Impervious Treatment	Melstone Valley
00400000000	FPU	A	Permanent	1		4.00		400.00	47000	4267.01	12.50			12.50	\$125,000	Planning	2022	Impervious Treatment	Tree Plantings
CR16RST000022 CR18RST000007	PWED FSND	S S	Permanent Permanent	1	181 63.36	1.00 2.50		100.20 35.39	47808 16339	1307.81 505.98	52.00 19.28			52.00 19.28	\$1,800,000 \$800,000	Design Under Construction	2022 2022	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Trevanion Terrace Woodsyde Estates Large Facility
	FSND	s	Permanent	1	9.02	0.50		3.42	1581	47.92	1.05			1.05	\$100,000	Under Construction	2022	Impervious Treatment	Woodsyde Estates Small Facility
CR19ALN000004		A	Permanent	1			2100	207.00	366692	729.00	59.57			59.57	\$700,000	Under Construction	2022	Impervious Treatment	Woodsyde Stream Restoration
CR19RST000006 CR21RST000003		S S	Permanent Permanent	1	14.77 45.18	2.50 1.50		11.68 29.96	5977 14723	128.47 363.68	9.24 17.84			9.24 17.84	\$300,000 \$1,000,000	Planning Planning	2023 2023	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Carroll Co Health Department Hampstead Valley 4
	FSND	S	Permanent	1	103.98	2.50		71.58	35353	871.76	50.32			50.32	\$800,000	Planning	2023	Impervious Treatment	Manchester East
	FSND	S	Permanent	1	5.16	2.50		5.31	2869	48.66	4.94			4.94	\$120,000	Planning	2023	Impervious Treatment	Manchester Elementary
CR21RST000004 CR21RST000005	FSND MSGW	S S	Permanent Permanent	1	32.6 19.37	1.75 1.08		15.74 10.99	6867 5255	248.22 142.92	5.94 5.74			5.94 5.74	\$350,000 \$350,000	Design Design	2023 2023	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Saint Georges Gate Stone Manor
	FPU	A	Permanent	1	15.57	1.00				172.32	12.50			12.50	\$125,000	Planning	2023	Impervious Treatment	Tree Plantings
CR18RST000014		S	Permanent	1	27.09	2.50		13.88	6191	212.48	6.50			6.50	\$145,000	Planning	2023	Impervious Treatment	Valley Vista
	FSND STRE	S A	Permanent Permanent	1	35	2.50	675	24.77 45.90	12327 167400	295.51 50.63	17.88 13.50			17.88 13.50	\$150,000 \$850,000	Planning Planning	2024 2024	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Candice Estates Hampstead Valley 2&3
	WPKT	S	Permanent	1	34.5	1.00		18.76	11311	154.35	15.34			15.34	\$1,100,000	Planning	2024	Impervious Treatment	New Windsor Railroad
CR16RST000023		S	Permanent	1	25.7	2.50		16.65	8081	212.28	11.00			11.00	\$825,000	Planning	2024	Impervious Treatment	Piney Ridge Village As-built 57
CR18RST000012	FPU PWED	A S	Permanent Permanent	1	79.4	1.00		43.67	26397	356.34	12.50 36.01			12.50 36.01	\$125,000 \$1,100,000	Planning Planning	2024 2024	Impervious Treatment Impervious Treatment	Tree Plantings Winters Street
CN10N31000012		3	remanent	1. <u>+</u>	/9.4	1.00		43.07	20397	330.34	30.01			30.01	\$1,100,000	Fiaililling	2024		winters street

					Resto						Const					innt through	2020 (1 4)	56 1 01 1/	
REST BMP ID	REST BMP TYPE ¹	BMP CLASS ¹	PERMA- NENT OR ANNUAL	NUM BMP	DRAIN -AGE AREA	PE (inches)	LENGTH RESTORED (feet)/	TP REDUCTION	TSS REDUCTION		IMP ACRES (IA)	GREEN STORMWATER INFRASTRUC-	WATERSHED MANAGE- MENT (WM)	TOTAL IMP ACRES (W/GSI	IMPLEMEN- TATION COST	IMPLEMEN- TATION STATUS ²	PROJECTED IMPLEMEN- TATION YEAR	TMDL PARAMETER OR WQ OBJECTIVE ADDRESSED	GENERAL COMMENTS ⁷
					(acres)		LANE MILES	(Ibs/year)	(lbs/year)	(lbs/year)							TATION TEAK	WQ OBJECTIVE ADDRESSED	
			BMP				the second se					TURE (GSI)	CREDIT	AND WM					
							(miles)/ MASS LOADING					CREDIT (IA X 0.35)		CREDITS)					
							(lbs)					(IA X 0.55)							
CR21RST000006		S	Permanent	1	30.35	1.00	(103)	31.17	17058	263.15	25.03			25.03	\$1,100,000	Planning	2025	Impervious Treatment	Eldersburg Crossing (Walmart)
	PWED	S	Permanent	1	350	2.50		159.70	88190	1636.49	116.88			116.88	\$1,525,000	Planning	2025	Impervious Treatment	Hampstead Regional Facility
	PWED	S	Permanent	1	36.8	2.50		17.62	9892	173.95	13.75			13.75	\$1,500,000	Planning	2025	Impervious Treatment	Squires
CITIONS 1000021	FPU	A	Permanent	1	50.0	2.50		17.02	5052	175.55	12.50			12.50	\$125,000	Planning	2025	Impervious Treatment	Tree Plantings
CR20RST000004	FSND	S	Permanent	1	79.46	1.00		83.97	317496	367.49	36.10			36.10	\$825,000	Planning	2025	Impervious Treatment	Bevard Square
CR21RST000007	FSND	S	Permanent	1	22.1	1.00		11.69	5494	158.02	5.73			5.73	\$835,000	Planning	2026	Impervious Treatment	Meadow Ridge (2)
CR21R51000007	FPU	A	Permanent	1	22.1	1.00		11.05	5454	150.02	12.50			12.50	\$125,000	Planning	2026	Impervious Treatment	Tree Plantings
CR21RST000008	WSHW	S	Permanent	1	52.07	1.00		66.71	277286	321.31	24.00			24.00	\$1,585,000	Planning	2026	Impervious Treatment	Westminster Market
	PWED	S	Permanent	1	135	1.00		42.95	21487	534.74	14.00			14.00	\$1,425,000	Planning	2026	Impervious Treatment	Wind Song Est.
CIT2I/21/00/002		5		1	100	1.00		42.33	2140/	334.74	14.00			0	÷1,423,000	Flatting	2020	impervious readment	
Subtotal Capital (up	a to 2026)			68				2555.18	3905697	24482.83	1430.36	0	0	1430.36	\$38,123,911				
Other	5102020)			00				2333.18	3903097	24402.05	1430.30	0	0	1450.50	\$38,123,911				
	[1		1				1	1	1		1		\$881,330	1	2019		Half operating cost 2019
														0	\$1,827,460		2019		Operating Costs
														0	\$1,698,416		2020		Operating Costs
															\$2,070,210		2021		
															\$2,070,210		2022		Operating Costs
			1	-											\$2,303,958 \$2,530,518		2023		Operating Costs
															\$2,750,283		2024		Operating Costs Operating Costs
															\$2,750,285		2025		
															\$2,963,769		2028		Operating Costs
															\$300,000		2020		Renovation Maintenance Renovation Maintenance
															\$300,000		2021		Renovation Maintenance
															\$300,000		2022		Renovation Maintenance
															\$300,000		2023		Renovation Maintenance
															\$300,000		2024		Renovation Maintenance
															\$300,000		2023		Renovation Maintenance
															\$300,000		2020		
		1												0			+ +		
Subtotal Other (up	to 2026)			0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$18,244,614				
Permit	10 2020)	-		0				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$18,244,014				
(up to 2025)				68				2,569.2	3,909,969.5	24,518.8	1,434.6	0.0	0.0	1,430.4	\$56,368,525				
(
				1					1		1			1	r				
Total for Next Perm	nit and Projected			68				2,565.2	3,908,748.9	24,508.6	1,433.4	0.0	0.0	1,430.4	\$56,368,525				
Years																			
Total for Remaining																			
The Previous Perm	it, Continued														4-0.000-00-				
Obligations, and Pr	oposed Activities			70				2,580.5	3,913,431.3	24,548.1	1,438.0	0.0	0.0	1,433.8	\$56,368,525				
for The Next Permi	t (up to 2026)																		
Total for Remaining	Obligations from														1				
	-																		
The Previous Perm				69				2,573.2	3,911,221.6	24,529.5	1,435.8	0.0	0.0	1,432.8	\$57,249,855				
Obligations, and Pr																			
for The Next Permi	(up to 2028)																		

Restoration Projects to Be Planned, Designed, and/or Constructed from End of 4th Generation Permit through 2028 (Page 4 of 4)

Provide a copy of your 5-year CIP for restoration projects (End of 4th Generation Permit-2028).

The following table shows the projects included in the County's five-year capital improvement plan ("Community Investment Plan" or CIP). It is important to note that this plan is constantly in flux as project factors change, such as actual costs, prioritization from citizen/political request, permitting, property acquisition, and funding sources. For example, the timing of the construction projects planned for FY22 are uncertain at this time:

- The Brynwood project was anticipated to receive grant funding, which did not occur. Located on private property, the County will need to determine if cash is available to move forward with the project in FY22.
- Challenging design constraints may delay the FY22 construction planned for Hampstead Valley 1.
- The IDA Mount Airy project is shovel-ready, but the County-owned property is now being sold. The determination if the new developers will want to work cooperatively with the County on the construction of this proposed facility will most likely take years to settle.
- Melstone Valley hit a serious design issue, and a complete redesign is now being performed that may cause a delay in construction.

Restoration Projects to Be Planned, Designed, and/or Constructed from End of 4th Generation Permit through 2028 (Page 4)

Project Name	Status	IA Credit	Watershed		FY22	FY23	FY24		FY25		FY26	
				ſ	132.9	95.4	106.0		168.3		94.2	IA Credit
Brynwood	Design	54.2	Liberty	\$	600,000.00							
Hampstead Valley 1	Planning	23.2	Loch Raven	\$	1,200,000.00							
IDA Mt. Airy	Design	20.5	Lower Monocacy	\$	500,000.00							
Melstone Valley	Design	22.5	South Branch	\$	750,000.00							
Tree Planting	Planning	12.5		\$	100,000.00							
Carroll County Health Dept	Planning	6.7	Double Pipe	\$	50,000.00	\$ 250,000.00						
Hampstead Valley 4	Planning	20.7	Loch Raven			\$ 1,000,000.00						
Manchester East	Planning	36.6	Prettyboy	\$	50,000.00	\$ 750,000.00						
Manchester Elementary	Planning	3.6	Prettyboy	\$	20,000.00	\$ 100,000.00						
Saint Georges Gate	Design	5.0	Liberty			\$ 300,000.00						
Stone Manor	Design	5.6	Liberty			\$ 300,000.00						
Tree Planting	Planning	12.5				\$ 100,000.00						
Valley Vista	Planning	4.7	Prettyboy	\$	20,000.00	\$ 125,000.00						
Candice Estates	Planning	13.0	Lower Monocacy				\$ 150,000.00					
Hampstead Valley 2&3	Planning	13.5	Loch Raven			\$ 125,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00					
New Windsor Railroad	Planning	15.3	Double Pipe			\$ 100,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00					
Piney Ridge Village	Planning	11.0	South Branch			\$ 75,000.00	\$ 750,000.00					
Tree Planting	Planning	12.5					\$ 100,000.00					
Winters Street	Planning	36.0	Liberty			\$ 100,000.00	\$ 1,000,000.00					
Eldersburg Crossing (Walmart)	Planning	25.0	Liberty			\$ 100,000.00		\$ 1	,000,000.00			
Hampstead Regional	Planning	117.0	Liberty			\$ 125,000.00		\$ 1	,400,000.00			
Squires	Planning	13.8	Liberty			\$ 100,000.00		\$ 1	,400,000.00			
Tree Planting	Planning	12.5						\$	100,000.00			
Bevard Square	Design	36.0	Liberty			\$ 75,000.00				\$ 7	50,000.00	
Meadow Ridge (2)	Planning	5.7	Double Pipe			\$ 85,000.00				\$ 7	50,000.00	
Tree Planting	Planning	12.5								\$ 1	.00,000.00	
Westminster Market	Planning	24.0	Liberty			\$ 85,000.00				\$ 1,5	00,000.00	
Windsong Estates	Planning	16.0	Lower Monocacy				\$ 125,000.00			\$ 1,2	.00,000.00	
BTR (Black and Decker)	Planning	50.0	Liberty					\$	125,000.00			
Linton Springs	Planning	19.4	Liberty					\$	85,000.00			
Long Valley Road	Planning	16.6	Double Pipe					\$	85,000.00			
North Carroll Farms 4	Planning	7.5	Prettyboy					\$	100,000.00			
Tree Planting	Planning	12.5										
Winters Mill HS	Planning	18.2	Liberty					\$	100,000.00			
Avondale Run Phase 2	Planning	9.3	Double Pipe							\$	75,000.00	
County Park Wetland	Planning	32.0	Liberty							\$ 1	.50,000.00	
Evapco	Planning	18.8	Upper Monocacy							\$ 1	.00,000.00	
Roberts Field Wet	Planning	66.2	Loch Raven									
Tree Planting	Planning	12.5										
Roberts Field Municipal	Planning	33.4	Loch Raven									
Waters Edge Sec 4	Planning	21.2	South Branch									
Lexington Run Section 1	Planning	2.6	South Branch									
Solo Cup	Planning	34.2	Liberty									
Town Mall Westminster	Planning	43.5	Liberty									
Sumners Hollow Pond 1	Planning	4.1										
				\$	140,000.00	\$ 970,000.00	\$ 125,000.00	\$	495,000.00	\$ 3	25,000.00	Engineering
				\$	3,150,000.00	\$ 2,925,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$ 3	,900,000.00	\$ 4,3	00,000.00	Construction
				\$	3,290,000.00	\$ 3,895,000.00	\$ 4,125,000.00	\$4	,395,000.00	\$ 4,6	25,000.00	Total

Provide a copy of your operating budget for annual restoration projects (FY2020).

Provide a copy of your operating and maintenance budget for all BMPs implemented under the MS4 permit? (FY2020)

The County has a dedicated operating budget for administration of the NPDES permit. The budgeted and actual expenses for FY20 are shown in the table below. The line item specific to routine maintenance is 544314 "MowSeedMul." The County also maintains a capital budget for significant maintenance activities and renovation of stormwater facilities. The intent of these capital projects is to extend the life of facilities for another 40 years. As that \$300,000 per year budget is capital, it is not represented here.

It also should be noted that the eight municipalities in Carroll County are party to our permit. Each municipality maintains their own stormwater facilities and these costs are not represented in the table below. It is estimated that, combined, the eight municipalities spend an additional \$175,000 in maintenance costs per year.

		FY 20	FY 20
Code	Category	Budget	Actual
522101	Full Time	\$742,630.00	\$736,415.98
522105	Ovtm-Reg	\$1,200.00	\$2,549.63
522112	FlexActBal	\$1,200.00	\$1,003.70
522190	PersOHAllc	-	-
522201	FICA Tax	\$46,190.00	\$44,183.73
522202	HlthInsur	\$213,240.00	\$197,728.64
522205	401K	\$6,700.00	\$4,531.71
522206	WorkerComp	\$19,680.00	\$19,640.38
522207	Group Life	\$1,250.00	\$1,217.32
522208	ShTrmDisab	-	\$1,334.09
522211	DeathBenef	-	-
522213	DentalIns	\$5,190.00	\$5,015.96
522220	LgTrmDisab	\$2,090.00	\$2,034.01
522221	Medicare	\$10,800.00	\$10,333.51
522224	EmpPension	\$51,920.00	\$42,909.82
522240	OPEBARC	\$55,720.00	\$50,790.90
533101	RegistrFee	-	-
533106	HotelMotel	-	-
544314	MowSeedMul	\$127,000.00	\$124,645.72
544323	LabTestFee	\$20,000.00	\$16,322.50
566439	LabSupplys	\$700.00	\$189.38
566486	CmplMgmtSp	\$4,200.00	\$406.66
566499	OthOperSup	\$2,900.00	\$2,040.62
566501	Gasoline	\$3,000.00	\$2,126.28
566603	RepPrtSupp	\$5,000.00	\$1,606.03
588306	SmlMachEqu	\$1,300.00	\$743.12
588823	PrYrEncumb	-	\$3,560.00
589102	BondInters	\$505,550.00	\$464,618.40
589202	BondPrinci	\$676,290.00	\$676,289.92
	Total	\$2,503,750.00	\$2,412,238.01

Budgeted and Actual Operating Expenses FY 20

Financial Capacity Spreadsheet

The "Financial Capacity Spreadsheet" for Carroll County can be found on Page 19. There are several key factors to note in evaluating the County's financial capacity.

 Carroll County is a bedroom community to the Baltimore and Washington metropolitan areas. The County's excellent schools and rural nature make Carroll County a desirable location for people to live while commuting to the surrounding urban areas. This means that, relatively speaking, Carroll County has a higher household median income than several other jurisdictions in the area, such as Baltimore County, Harford County, and Prince George's County.

Our rural nature lends itself to having excellent contractor resources who appreciate working locally and the County's fast turnaround on invoice payment.

It has been County policy to require County ownership of residential structural BMPs rather than allowing ownership and maintenance by homeowner associations. This provides a significant savings regarding land acquisition costs for restoration projects.

Carroll County, therefore, has the funding and resources available to efficiently meet our permit requirements without resorting to nutrient trading. The County will continue to work with MDE to meet fair and equitable permit requirements.

Carroll County has all of the typical competing sectors for funding that all other municipalities have: aging public works infrastructure, underfunded schools, undercompensated employees, increased demand for emergency services, increased demand for citizen services, and critical health issues such as the opioid epidemic. Additionally, while Carroll County may have a relatively high median income, it also has a smaller population contributing to the tax base, resulting in lower revenues than similar-sized counties.

The County is, therefore, not in favor of an analysis to determine financial capacity to meet permit requirements. The County will continue to work with MDE to meet fair and equitable permit requirements based upon our impacts to water quality. This analysis has the potential to penalize the fiscally responsible work that the County has performed through our previous permits. Success or failure should be measured by accomplishments, not by how much money is spent.

- Carroll County does not have a stormwater fee, as approved by the State Attorney General, as the County Commissioners have dedicated a portion of tax revenues to operating and capital expenses associated with the MS4 permit. The Board has consistently been supportive of program requirements and has adequately funded the program since its inception. Therefore, there is no value to input into cell 2f.
- Cell 3a represents expenses spent on the previous permit term. Carroll County met the thirdgeneration permit requirements and continued the restoration program during the period that the permit was administratively extended. The restoration requirements of the fourthgeneration program were met with projects performed from 2009 to mid-2019. The County did

not begin separating out operational expenses related to the permit until 2015. Therefore, this value does not include operating costs from 2009 to 2014 and realistically should be close to \$5M higher.

• The average annual cost represented in cell 3c represents the total capital investment divided by the 9.5 years that work was performed on the fourth-generation permit from 2009 to mid-2019. However, the investment in the fourth-generation permit greatly accelerated in the most recent five years of the permit. The value in cell 3b is, therefore, artificially low. The annual average for the past five years is closer to \$4.8M.

Financial Capacity Spreadsheet

1	County/City Name: C	arroll Cou	nty	
2	Cost as a Percent of House	ehold Incon	ne	
2a	Median Household Income (I	MHI)		\$96,769
2b	Total Number of Households	in Jurisdictic	on	63,564.00
2c	Average Annual Cost for Pub	lic Stormwate	er Related Management Programs	\$8,626,139.00
2d	Annual Cost for Public Storm	water Relate	d Management Programs Per Household	135.71
2e	% of MHI Spent on Public Sto	rmwater Rel	ated Management Programs	0.14%
2f	Total Annual Stormwater Ren	mediation Fe	e Per Household	
2g	% of MHI Spent Annually on S	Stormwater I	Remediation Fee	0.00%
3	Cost of Impervious Surfac	e Restoratio	on as a Percent of Household Income	
3a	Total in Previous Permit Tern	n Spent on th	e Impervious Surface Restoration Plan (ISRP)	\$34,177,050.00
3b	Average Annual Cost of the I	SRP During th	ne Previous Permit Term	\$3,597,584.21
3c	Annual Cost of the ISRP Per H	lousehold Du	uring the Previous Permit Term	\$56.60
3d	% of MHI Spent on the ISRP [During the Pr	evious Permit Term	0.06%
3e	Total Projected Cost for Rest	oration Portf	olio	\$56,368,525.00
3f	Projected Annual Cost for Re	storation Poi	rtfolio	\$7,515,803.33
3g	Projected Annual Cost for Re	storation Poi	rtfolio Per Household	\$118.24
3h	% of MHI Spent on Projected	Cost of Rest	oration Portfolio	0.12%
4	Cost for Low-Income Resid	dential Cust	tomers as a Percent of Household Income	
4a	Percentage of Households wi	ith Annual In	come <\$25,000	10.00%
4b	% of Income for Low Income Management Programs	Households	Spent on Public Stormwater Related	0.54%
4c		Households	Spent on Stormwater Remediation Fees	0.00%
4d	% of Income for Low Income		•	0.23%
4e			Projected Cost of Restoration Portfolio	0.47%
5	Key Socioeconomic Indica	-		
5a	Percentage Unemployed			2.20%
5b	Median Household Income			\$96,769
5c	Percent of Individuals (All Pe	ople) Below I	Poverty Level	5.20%
6	Financial Capacity Indicate	ors		
6a			Bond Rating – GO ¹ Bonds	AAA
6b	Debt Indicators		Bond Rating – Revenue Bonds	N/A
6c			Net Debt as A % Of FMPV ²	1.51%
6d	Financial Management India	tors	Property Tax Revenues As % Of FMPV	1.06%
6e	Financial Management Indica		Property Tax Revenue Collection Rate	99.00%