

Heritage Complex 2662 Riva Road Annapolis, MD 21401

Christopher J. Phipps, P.E. Director

July 26, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Smith Manager, Sediment, Stormwater, and Dam Safety Program Maryland Department of the Environment 1800 Washington Boulevard Baltimore, MD 21230

Dear Ms. Smith:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional information regarding Anne Arundel County's responses to the Maryland Department of the Environment's (MDE) Financial Capacity, Physical Capacity, and Restoration Project Portfolio requests, submitted to MDE on May 30, 2019. The County provided this information in support of MDE and the University of Maryland Environmental Finance Center's maximum extent practicable (MEP) determination for our fifth generation Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) permit. On June 26, 2019, Mr. Stewart Comstock provided the County with a set of questions and requested clarifications that would assist MDE in completing the MEP review. Accompanying this letter are the County's updated Restoration Portfolio and Financial Capacity Spreadsheet. While the questions and clarifications requested centered on the County's Restoration Portfolio, we believe the additions to the Portfolio necessitated an update to the Financial Capacity Spreadsheet, as well.

Restoration Project Portfolio Updates

The initial Restoration Project Portfolio submitted to MDE demonstrated how the County plans to address its unmet obligations from its previous permit, which includes the implementation of Capital Projects through 2023 and the use of Nutrient Credit Trading with the County's wastewater treatment facilities. The revised Restoration Portfolio now includes a suite of Capital Projects that are planned through 2026; during the next permit term these projects are anticipated to restore 127 acres of impervious surface, as well as reduce pollutant loads of total nitrogen (TN) and total suspended solids (TSS) by 5,904 pounds/year and 811 tons/year, respectively.

The previously submitted Portfolio indicated that the County would exceed the previous permit's impervious restoration requirement by 62 acres; three stream restoration projects providing 62 acres of equivalent impervious treatment were reallocated from the set of projects meeting the County's previous permit obligations to the set of projects providing TN and TSS pollutant load reductions during the next permit term. The County has included additional entries that demonstrate the continuation of Annual Operational Programs (required to be maintained from the previous permit) through 2025.

For all Capital Projects in the Portfolio, the County has now included total phosphorus (TP) pollutant load reductions. Information was also included to indicate if a Capital Project would reduce pollutant loads to a local waterbody with an approved Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). Co-benefits were also assigned to Capital Projects based on the type of best management practice (BMP) and in accordance with the factsheet series "Principles for Phase III Watershed Implementation Plans." Line items were added to the Portfolio for the cost of annual operations and maintenance associated with completed capital projects, and for the costs of capital projects that provide stormwater management or flood control (repairs or enhancement to stormwater to infrastructure, dams, emergency spillways, etc.) but are not eligible for water quality credit.

Financial Capacity Spreadsheet

There was a significant increase to the total implementation costs of the Portfolio, from \$111,367,879 to \$207,497,096, due to the addition of 24 Capital Projects, extending Annual Operations through 2025, and the incorporation of the line item costs noted above. The focus of Section 3 of the Financial Capacity Spreadsheet is the cost of impervious surface restoration and draws from projected total and annual cost information in the Restoration Portfolio. The County made adjustments to Items 3e (total Portfolio cost) and 3f (annual Portfolio cost per household) and 3h (annual Portfolio cost as a percent of mean household income).

We believe the above revisions to our Restoration Portfolio and Financial Capacity Spreadsheet should fully address Mr. Comstock's questions and request for clarifications. If you have any additional questions, please contact me at <u>pwmich20@aacounty.org</u> or (410) 222-7520.

Sincerely,

Cila. Min

Erik Michelsen, Administrator Watershed Protection and Restoration Program

Phone: 410-222-7520 Email: pwmich20@aacounty.org www.dpwandyou.com Recycled Paper

Enclosures

 cc: Ginger Ellis, Planning Administrator, Watershed Protection and Restoration Program
 Janis Markusic, Senior Planner, Watershed Protection and Restoration Program
 Brenda Morgan, Engineer Manager, Watershed Protection and Restoration Program

Maryland Department of the Environment Physical Capacity Questionnaire for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permittees as Part of a Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) Analysis April 12, 2019

Anne Arundel County

1. 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 typical implementation timeframe for projects is below:

- 1) Large upland stormwater projects
 - a. Planning (including landowner coordination) 12-18 months.
 - b. Design 12-18 months.
 - c. Construction -3-6 months

Explanation: Though these projects tend to occur in areas where the County either owns the property or holds a stormwater easement, there generally needs to still be community education and buy-in in order to move forward with project implementation. This initial phase, as well as the design phase, are significantly longer than the construction phase, which can usually move fairly quickly if the weather is cooperative.

- 2) In-stream restoration projects
 - a. Planning (including landowner coordination) 12-18 months.
 - b. Design & Permitting 24-36 months.
 - c. Property acquisition 6-12 months.
 - d. Construction 12-18 months.

Explanation: These projects tend to be much more extensive, and can require significant additional public engagement, as well as the acquisition of easements on properties not already controlled by the County. Design and permitting tend to take much longer for these sorts of projects, and can be further delayed in cases where changes to FEMA floodplain elevations, additional environmental impact analyses, or other unforeseen circumstances arise. During the construction phase, these projects are particularly susceptible to wet weather delays. For instance, the excessive rains in 2018 and early 2019 likely led to construction extensions of 4-6 months. Project construction may also be affected by or delayed due to the stream closure period during the spring.

3) Alternative projects (e.g., tree planting)

- a. Planning (including landowner coordination) 6-12 months.
- b. Design & Permitting 2-3 months.
- c. Construction 3-4 months.

Explanation: While these projects can take significantly less time to complete, once target sites are identified and permission granted, they tend to be much smaller yield, and perhaps paradoxically, quite a bit more expensive per acre treated than the other two classes of projects. Even working with public land holders, there is not a substantial amount of interest in permanently reforesting large swathes of property.

2. 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?

Capital Budget development generally begins in September of the current fiscal year, and that is when any new projects would provisionally be inserted into the CIP. If approved internally, and by the County Council, those dollars would be available for contracting July 1 of the following year (9 months later). We have the capacity to request authorization for funding all phases at once, though construction cost estimates are traditionally refined significantly as a result of design development, and it is not unusual to have full construction funding requested a year or two after design funding has been authorized.

3. 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 timeframes and what those reduced time frames are.

Under ideal circumstances, design procurement using an existing "open end" contract takes approximately 3 months for contract award. Utilizing competitive bid solicitations for design can routinely take 9 months for contract award. From that point, design generally takes 12-18 months for simpler projects, with an additional 6 month window for permitting. Depending on the construction contracting mechanism, it can take between 6 weeks (using our blanket order contractors) to 6 months (putting projects out to competitive bid) to get a contractor on board. At that point, depending on the complexity of construction, the project can take between 3 and 18 months.

Approximately three years ago, we put in place a pay for performance contracting mechanism – our "Full Delivery of Water Quality Improvements" solicitation. The process has been refined a bit, but the time from solicitation to contract award is still between 8-9 months. On average, the time to project completion, after award, ranges from 1 to 3 years. We have been satisfied with this contracting approach to meet a portion of our MS4 needs, but it is not likely to be a tool that we would use to accomplish all of our restoration requirements.

We have also used our restoration grant program through the Chesapeake Bay Trust to engage non-profit partners in our restoration efforts. The design/permitting/construction of these projects is completely handled by the non-profit, and the average time from grant award to project completion is in the range of 1 to 2 years (as the projects are often designed and permitted by the time of grant award).

4. 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?

It is estimated that Anne Arundel County solicited upwards of 60 RFPs for design and 15 RFPs for construction during the past 5 year permit term (the construction RFP number may seem low, but that is because the County's two task order contractors perform a significant share of WPRP construction work on projects less than \$500k). On average, the number of bids submitted for design work were five, with the number of bids submitted for construction work around four. None of the RFPs had to be re-advertised. In terms of trends, the most notable was the increase in construction bidders as time went on. It appears that new firms have moved into the environmental construction space in Maryland over the past several years. The number of unique bidders on the design side is approximately 15-20, with approximately 5-7 unique bidders on the construction side. One element that should be mentioned, is that, while it may appear that there are a sufficient number of firms in this space, there is often a significant range in the technical skill of firms. For instance, while there may be ten firms willing to bid on stream restoration design work, there may actually only be 3 to 4 who wouldn't require an inordinate amount of management in order to deliver a high quality product in a reasonable timeframe.

5. 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.

Anne Arundel County does not have MBE/WBE requirements for contractors, so the primary contracting limitation that we have encountered has been a limited (through growing) pool of qualified contractors to do this work. Anne Arundel County currently has two task order restoration contractors who are responsible for the bulk of construction work done by the WPRP in the <\$500k range. These contractors, however, are only able to take on 5-8 projects apiece during each calendar year. Work beyond the load they can handle, and above their contracting threshold, must therefore be bid out. The urgency created by needing to bid out a large number of projects in a relatively small timeframe tilts the market to the advantage of the fairly small number of qualified contractors bidding on these sorts of jobs. A more sustainable, prolonged restoration implementation schedule prevents the creation of a work "bubble" and allows jurisdictions to get better pricing on their contracts for this specialized work.

6. 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?

Stormwater Ponds – Generally speaking, these sorts of retrofits only require local grading permits. The grading permit process can range from 6 - 12 months depending upon extenuating factors (e.g., forest conservation area impacts, critical area impacts, modifications, etc.). We are currently working on legislation at the local level to try to expedite some of these processes. Pursuing a broader exemption of restoration work from forest conservation act (FCA) requirements at the State level would be very helpful as well.

In-Stream Restoration – After several years working to improve the State/Federal permitting process, in 2016-2017 those permitting timelines reduced significantly. Currently, those permits can take 6-12 months for issuance. They were routinely taking 12-24 months (and, in some cases, much longer) prior to this timeframe. These in-stream projects routinely take about the same amount of time for the local permitting as the stormwater pond retrofits do. The projects, in particular, would benefit from a change to the State FCA requirements.

Alternative Projects – Anne Arundel County also undertakes a fair number of living shoreline projects which require State/Federal permits. These permits also generally take 6-12 months, and are usually processed without much issue.

7. 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)?

"Low hanging fruit" projects are generally those where the County already owns or has access to a piece of property that is being used in some programmatic capacity for stormwater management (e.g., dry pond, outdated wet pond, etc.). Nearly all of these projects were targeted for retrofit in our 2014-2019 permit cycle. In the case of those sites where we could accomplish the retrofits, most are completed or in process. A number of dry pond retrofit opportunities fell by the wayside as a result of community opposition and/or the fact that those areas also served as community open space. Nearly all of the County's largest wet facilities have also either been retrofitted or analyzed for feasibility. In terms of "low hanging fruit" opportunities, I would estimate there are perhaps 20 sites left totaling around 200 impervious acres of treatment.

Restoration Projects To Be Planned, Designed, and/or Constructed from CY 2019 Through CY 2027 Anne Arundel County

Remaining Unmet Restoration Obligation from Previous Permit ______2,549

REST BMP ID	REST RMD TVDE1	BMD	NUMB		FS TSS	TN ⁶	IMPLEMENTATION	IMPLEMENTATION	PROJECTED	TMDI PARAMETER	CENEDAL COMMENTS** ⁷
KLST DWF ID	REST DIVIP TITE	CLASS ¹			REDUCTIO (lbs/year)	N REDUCTION (lbs/year)	COST	STATUS ²	IMPLEMENTATION	OR WQ OBJECTIVE	GENERAL COMIMENTS**
	(1)						Remainin	g Unmet Restoration Ob	ligations from Previous	s Permit	
Annual Operational Program Street Sweeping	VSS	A A STOCK	evious Per	mit) ^{s/*}			1	1			The County does not plan any additional street sweeping to meet its obligations under the previous permit.
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	A	0	1							The County does not plan any additional inlet cleaning to meet its obligations under the previous permit.
Septic System Pumping	SEPP	А	0								The County does not plan any additional septic system pumping to meet its obligations under the previous permit.
Subtotal Operations ³			0	0			\$0				
Capital Projects (Unmet Oblig	ations from Previou	s Permit	Term)	-			1	T	1		
AA18RST000009	SPSC	S	1	-	2.9 4,75	8.0 115.1	\$528,187	Complete	2019	9.64	
AA18RS1000044	SPSC	S	1		0.5 1,22	4.4 42.4	\$102,303	Complete	2019	2.77	
AA18K3T000008	SPSC	s	1	-	11.1 7.68	6.4 190.5	\$677.983	Complete	2019	15.56	
AA19ALN000013	OUT	A	1		0.2	0.0 0.0	\$199,110	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000012	OUT	А	1		0.2	0.0 0.0	\$24,087	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000011	OUT	А	1		1.0	0.0 0.0	\$321,820	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000009	OUT	Α	1		0.2	0.0 0.0	\$249,878	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000014	OUT	A	1	-	0.3	0.0 0.0	\$68,755	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000010	OUT	A	1		0.3	0.0 0.0	\$23,948	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000015		A	1	-	0.7	0.0 0.0	\$42,824	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000040	OUT	A	1		2.0	0.0 0.0	\$34,101	Complete	2019	0.00	
	OUT	Α	1		1.6	0.0 0.0	\$102,960	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000018	OUT	А	1		0.7	0.0 0.0	\$583,869	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000017	OUT	Α	1		0.3	0.0 0.0	\$182,147	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000016	OUT	A	1		0.9	0.0 0.0	\$90,944	Complete	2019	0.00	
AA19ALN000026	SHST	A	1		11.7 40,00	4.0 21.9	\$0 \$165 222	Complete	2019	19.86	Climate Adaptation, Recreation
AA18KS1000013	FBIO	s	1		3.1 2.00	0.6 7.0	\$165,237 \$206,031	Complete	2019	0.71	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA16RST000043	PWFD	S	1		13.7 11.65	8.6 197.8	\$596,701	Complete	2019	20.51	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
AA16RST000044	PWET	S	1		4.5 2,77	7.8 39.7	\$417,136	Complete	2019	4.67	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
AA19RST000016	WEDW	S	1		1.4 1,24	9.2 22.9	\$71,426	Complete	2019	2.25	Flood Risk Mitigation
AA18RST000043	MSGW	E	1		0.2 22	9.2 3.3	\$0	Complete	2019	0.39	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River
AA18RST000042	MSWB	E	1		1.2 94	4.0 16.6	\$355,549	Complete	2019	1.68	I Flood Risk Mitigation
AA19APY000004	FPU	A	1	-	0.5 69	2.2 13.9	\$72,948	Complete	2019	1.80	D Energy Efficiency
AA19AP1000003	STRF	A	1		11.0	2.0 0.4	\$30,903	Complete	2019	0.14	Ellergy Elliciency
AA18ALN000017	STRE	A	1		46.6 610.00	0.0 696.0	\$2,445,682	Complete	2019	321.00	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor. Healthy Watersheds. Flood Risk Mitigation
AA19ALN000004	STRE	Α	1		14.0 45,14	6.0 2,016.0	\$164,122	Complete	2019	316.00	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA18ALN000028	STRE	А	1		8.4 6,00	0.0 30.0	\$2,479,485	Complete	2019	27.20	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA18RST000003	IBAS	S	1		3.8 4,70	3.8 169.3	\$331,333	Under Construction	2019	10.78	3
AA16RST000047	IBAS	S	1		2.4 2,85	3.2 52.7	\$416,504	Under Construction	2019	5.93	Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
AA16RST000066	PWED	S	1		14.8 8,88	6.9 84.6	\$564,879	Under Construction	2019	14.79	Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
AAI6KSTUUUU61		5	1		26.6 22.97	7 0 206 7	¢105 727	Under Construction	2010	/1 26	Sediment IMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watersned, Nutrient IMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Flood Risk
AA17RST000010	WPWS	S	1		18.6 13.65	2.1 227.5	\$1.621.537	Under Construction	2019	23.91	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor. Flood Risk Mitigation
AA16RST000060		S									Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Flood Risk
	WSHW		1		9.0 8,30	3.2 84.9	\$826,353	Under Construction	2019	14.04	Mitigation
AA16RST000062		S									Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Flood Risk
	WSHW		1		4.5 4,16	7.1 39.7	\$317,293	Under Construction	2019	6.92	Mitigation
AA19ALN000028	SHST	A	1	-	10.8 36,99	0.0 20.3	\$0	Under Construction	2019	18.36	Climate Adaptation, Recreation
AA17ALN000009	STRE	A	1		145.9 113,70	0.0 1,678.9	\$5,754,269	Under Construction	2019	166.70	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA18ALN00003	SHST	A	1		64.0 1.206.85	6.0 112.0	\$4 511 312	Under Construction	2019	20.40	Sediment TMDL for the Other West Chesaneake Bay Watershed. Climate Adaptation. Recreation
AA18RST000028	FBIO	S	1		3.8 5.91	3.8 43.8	\$762,774	Design	2020	4.98	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor. Flood Risk Mitigation
AA18RST000029	FBIO	S	1		1.7 2,29	4.4 16.1	\$337,226	Design	2019	2.00	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA19RST000006	ITRN	S	1		0.7 48	2.1 7.3	\$0	Design	2019	0.88	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River
AA17RST000007	MIBR	S	1		3.4 2,00	1.9 37.3	\$492,157	Design	2019	3.78	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
AA19RST000026	PWED	S	1		262.6 139,82	6.4 1,478.0	\$104,231	Design	2019	219.38	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River
AA19RST000025	PWED	S	1	+	7.9 5,42	2.5 66.7	\$175,000	Design	2019	8.77	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River
AA18KS1000019	SPSC	5	1	+	2.9 4,66	9.3 137.2 5.5 27.4	\$641,448	Design	2019	10.00	
AA10K51000008	SPSC	S	1	+	12.7 11.05	5.5 57.4 8.3 188.4	\$1,534 272	Design	2019	5.15 19.48	
AA17RST000005	SPSC	s	1		4.5 3,52	4.7 78.1	\$840,768	Design	2019	6.97	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor

Section Product 3 1 Constrained Product Produ	AA16RST000065	SPSC	S	1	7.8	5,148.7	118.7	\$475,321	Design	2019	10.23	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	AA19RST000005	SPSC	S	1	1.5	1,747.9	39.9	\$0	Design	2019	3.48	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River
	AA19RST000018	MSGW	E	1	0.3	204.1	2.8	\$0	Design	2019	0.37	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	AA19RST000019	MSGW	E	1	0.7	870.0	23.5	\$0	Design	2019	1.82	
minipute No. No. No. No. No. <t< td=""><td>AA18ALN000011</td><td>SHST</td><td>Α</td><td>1</td><td>29.6</td><td>267,670.2</td><td>22.0</td><td>\$247,928</td><td>Design</td><td>2019</td><td>1.34</td><td>Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation</td></t<>	AA18ALN000011	SHST	Α	1	29.6	267,670.2	22.0	\$247,928	Design	2019	1.34	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
Section 2000 VID	AA18ALN000007	STRE	Α	1	10.0	7,125.0	35.6	\$520,805	Design	2019	32.30	Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Automotion Dist	AA16RST000063	FSND	S	1	6.4	5,120.7	60.7	\$475,321	Design	2020	8.22	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	AA19RST000023	IBAS	S	1	6.3	3,798.1	72.0	\$309,900	Design	2020	7.20	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
	AA17RST000003	ITRN	S	1	2.7	2,099.1	21.4	\$700,167	Design	2020	3.55	Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
MUNITY PS N <t< td=""><td>AA17RST000002</td><td>ITRN</td><td>S</td><td>1</td><td>2.6</td><td>1,765.8</td><td>13.6</td><td>\$659,334</td><td>Design</td><td>2020</td><td>2.79</td><td>Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor</td></t<>	AA17RST000002	ITRN	S	1	2.6	1,765.8	13.6	\$659,334	Design	2020	2.79	Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
Model Disc. 10 1 1.0	AA18RST000023	SPSC	S	1	6.5	10,819.5	486.0	\$1,654,214	Design	2020	26.92	
Add B00004 UPC 1 1 4 <t< td=""><td>AA19RST000004</td><td>SPSC</td><td>S</td><td>1</td><td>1.4</td><td>1,399.8</td><td>23.5</td><td>\$536,190</td><td>Design</td><td>2020</td><td>2.60</td><td>Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor</td></t<>	AA19RST000004	SPSC	S	1	1.4	1,399.8	23.5	\$536,190	Design	2020	2.60	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
Automation Dist 1 <	AA18RST000014	SPSC	S	1	21.6	29,887.9	623.6	\$1,810,679	Design	2020	61.69	Sediment TMDL for the Little Patuxent River
Matrix Matrix Matrix Matrix Matrix Matrix Matrix MAX MAX I A I Image: Construction of the submatrix Matrix Ma	AA17RST000001	SPSC	S	1	4.7	3,309.0	28.1	\$995,071	Design	2020	5.34	Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
BPC A I Dist Dist <thdist< th=""> <thdist< th=""> Dist<td>AA18RST000002</td><td>WEDW</td><td>S</td><td>1</td><td>2.4</td><td>2,627.7</td><td>44.6</td><td>\$307,094</td><td>Design</td><td>2020</td><td>4.62</td><td>Flood Risk Mitigation</td></thdist<></thdist<>	AA18RST000002	WEDW	S	1	2.4	2,627.7	44.6	\$307,094	Design	2020	4.62	Flood Risk Mitigation
Instrument Instrum		SEPC	Α	1	33.9	0.0	0.0	\$510,143	Design	2020		
Line Line <thline< th=""> Line Line <thl< td=""><td></td><td>SEPC</td><td>Α</td><td>1</td><td>2.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.0</td><td>\$30,097</td><td>Design</td><td>2020</td><td></td><td>Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor</td></thl<></thline<>		SEPC	Α	1	2.0	0.0	0.0	\$30,097	Design	2020		Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
Line C A A BB 360 0.0 55550 [Supple] 200 Definition BDQ, for Phages Revices Random SDQ, for Phage Revices Random Ran		SEPC	Α	1	38.6	0.0	0.0	\$580,870	Design	2020		Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
MADE 2000000 Bit T A I 1.1		SEPC	Α	1	39.0	0.0	0.0	\$586,890	Design	2020		Sediment TMDL for the Patapsco River Lower North Branch Watershed, Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
Mathematical Birth A I Ed. State	AA19ALN000005	SHST	Α	1	12.0	41,100.0	22.5	\$1,523,415	Design	2020	20.40	Climate Adaptation, Recreation
Amb 2000000 Initial of a base of a babae of a	AA18ALN000012	SHST	А	1	36.4	280,580.0	87.7	\$363,964	Design	2020	5.34	Climate Adaptation, Recreation
Add Number Decision A i Here State	AA17ALN000008	SHST	Α	1	55.0	168,027.0	102.4	\$2,013,797	Design	2020	6.23	Climate Adaptation, Recreation
bit A 1 100 40 100 400 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500 410 500	AA19ALN000027	SHST	А	1	16.4	56,170.0	30.8	\$1,606,000	Design	2020	27.88	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		SHST	Α	1	100.0	342,500.0	187.5	\$0	Design	2020	170.00	Sediment TMDL for the Other West Chesapeake Bay Watershed, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
Add Add 00000 ITM A I Bod Build Status 0 Bod Bod <td>AA17ALN000011</td> <td>STRE</td> <td>Α</td> <td>1</td> <td>65.0</td> <td>76,400.0</td> <td>621.0</td> <td>\$3,373,174</td> <td>Design</td> <td>2020</td> <td>48.50</td> <td>Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation</td>	AA17ALN000011	STRE	Α	1	65.0	76,400.0	621.0	\$3,373,174	Design	2020	48.50	Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Add Advance Title A 1 91.3 92.007 99.00 92.0000 <t< td=""><td>AA18ALN000005</td><td>STRE</td><td>Α</td><td>1</td><td>8.0</td><td>6,980.0</td><td>111.2</td><td>\$482,405</td><td>Design</td><td>2020</td><td>8.65</td><td>Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation</td></t<>	AA18ALN000005	STRE	Α	1	8.0	6,980.0	111.2	\$482,405	Design	2020	8.65	Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Add 30.400002 Title A 3 2.75 344,00 5000 344,00 Solar 2.000 144,00 Solar Solar <t< td=""><td>AA18ALN000026</td><td>STRE</td><td>Α</td><td>1</td><td>31.5</td><td>22,500.0</td><td>112.5</td><td>\$1,007,289</td><td>Design</td><td>2020</td><td>102.00</td><td>Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation</td></t<>	AA18ALN000026	STRE	Α	1	31.5	22,500.0	112.5	\$1,007,289	Design	2020	102.00	Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AMS64400000 STR A 1 BAS14 BAS14 BAS14 BAS14 BAS14 BAS14 BAS14 BAS14 BAS144 BAS144<	AA19ALN000020	STRE	А	1	7.5	268,655.0	400.0	\$564,000	Design	2020	144.00	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Add backwords Title A 1 1133 11320 1172 S.77000 Parage 2220 128000 128000 128000 128000 128000	AA19ALN000008	STRE	Α	1	30.1	9,472.0	369.0	\$1,915,000	Design	2020	81.00	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Add Sub00000 SPRE A 1 100 BEX.00000 CPRE A 200 6700 Selecter TMC. Unit all south Magacine Constraints (Magacine Constraints, Food Bak Magacine Constrainte Constraints, Food Bak Magacine Constraints, Food Ba	AA19ALN000022	STRE	А	1	31.5	11,352.0	517.0	\$5,270,000	Design	2020	26.70	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
STR A 1 7.4 2.00 72.0 512.200 2002 2000 32.00	AA19ALN000006	STRE	Α	1	19.0	81,000.0	2,446.0	\$378,487	Design	2020	697.00	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Add All All 200000 STR A 1 2.2 33.6.000 698.5 597.5.2 Design 2.000 13.2.4 Schemet TMOL for the Falsaent Ruley Ugae Valenched, Analy Valenched, Rod Rul Mugation Add All All 20000013 STR A 1 6.01 2.02.0 1.02.0 Autor 1.02.0 Autor Autor Mugation Hold Mugation Ho		STRE	Α	1	7.4	2,000.0	73.0	\$192,940	Design	2020	20.00	Sediment TMDL for the Other West Chesapeake Bay Watershed, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA12AU00001 STRE A 1 97.1 23.000.07 17.10 Aution MOM Filter MML for the Balance Watch, Field Watchelds, Field	AA18ALN000006	STRE	Α	1	2.9	343,000.0	490.5	\$878,526	Design	2020	132.40	Sediment TMDL for the Patuxent River Upper Watershed, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Answer NR A 1 3930 3230 3120 0.1100 [sign] 3221 Nutrier TMOL for the Baltimore taking, Healthy Waterhele, Flood Risk Mitigation AnsiseAncoord STR A 1 6340 20625 3126 0.1100 [sign] 3221 Nutrier TMOL for the Baltimore taking, Healthy Waterhele, Flood Risk Mitigation AnsiseAncoord STR A 1 6310 20625 20520 [sign] 2022 20120 [sign] 2012 [sign] 2010 [sign] 2012 [sign]	AA17ALN000010	STRE	А	1	57.1	28,480.0	761.2	\$2,052,373	Design	2021	74.71	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Add Subtraction The bit is a statute or labolity water bit is a statute or	AA18ALN000015	STRE	Α	1	39.8	28,395.0	142.0	\$1,287,601	Design	2021	128.72	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Add Number 20021 STRE A 1 6.18 15.82.8 79.23 SSG00000 perge 2021 124.40 Section TMCs for the Non-Flad South Mergation Add Number 20021 STRE A 1 4.93 52.050.4 68.03.6 52.950.3 0 berge 2022 14.80 Number TMCs for the Jathmer Fundor, Nexthy Watcheds, Tood Risk Mitigation Add Number 200000 STRE A 1 4.93 52.050.4 1.88.02 53.150.13 berge 2022 2023 2023 Softwart TMCs for the Jathmer Fundor, Nexthy Watcheds, Tood Risk Mitigation Add Number 200000 STRE A 1 4.05.2 62.02.00 20221 63.5 62.02.00 2021 62.5 62.02.00 2021 62.5 62.02.00 6.00 60.00 Formation TMCs for the Jathmer TMCs for the Jathmer Pundor TMCs for the Stath Mergation 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00 60.00	AA19ALN000023	STRE	А	1	39.4	2,044,928.0	2,682.4	\$1,805,161	Design	2021	1088.50	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Alad Number Strep A 1 87.53 52.59.00 Perform 2022 207.50 Perform Alad Number Alad Number Strep A 1 13.53 55.50.00 Perform 2022 17.33 Number	AA19ALN000021	STRE	А	1	61.8	18,582.8	759.3	\$500,000	Design	2021	124.40	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Ansolution STRE A 1 9.35 51.0014 51.0014 51.0014 51.0013 Design 2022 1144-00 Nutrient TMO, for the Baltimere Hander, Healthy Watersheef, Rood Risk Mitigation A13.04.N000018 STRE A 1 0.02 50.0012 2012 2005.32 Sediment TMOL for the Baltimere Hander, Healthy Watersheef, Rood Risk Mitigation A13.04.N000018 STRE A 1 0.02 2002.02 2005.32 Sediment TMOL for the Paturent Risk Mitigation A13.04.N000018 STRE A 1 0.66 54.02.42 2000 2011.11 2000 1.014 MARY A 1 0.66 7.02.01 66.03 Grange Zifficiency 6.00 Grange Zifficie	AA18ALN000016	STRE	А	1	83.5	26,763.0	850.3	\$2,950,340	Design	2022	207.90	Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
A 304 NAD00001 STRE A 1 1125 65,0353 Design 2022 173.30 Durinert TNDL for the Builtmere Nation, Healthy Watershefs, Flood Bick Mitigation A A134 NAD00019 STRE A 1 4052 452,043 Design 2022 2075 Sediment TNDL for the Builtmere Nation, Healthy Watershefs, Flood Bick Mitigation A 10 4087 A 1 4085 522,0201 651,509,329 Participation 2020 1.00 1.00 4.00 3.05 522,000 1.01 4.00 2.022 77.70 Sediment TNDL for the Datument ever, Healthy Watershefs, Flood Bick Mitigation M 10 1.00 555 1.4 59,500 Participation 2.020 1.01 Sediment TNDL for the Non-Tidal Sunh River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation M 10 1.01	AA19ALN000002	STRE	Α	1	93.9	51,501.4	1,108.4	\$5,139,504	Design	2022	148.40	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
A 158,41,000018 STRE A 1 10125 458,04500 202.2 205.25 Selectiment MOL for the Faturem River, Upent Watershedt, Flood Riuk Mitgation A A158,41,000018 STRE A 1 46.8 2.62,600 2.02.12 51.43,47.02 2003 737.700 Selectiment MOL for the Faturem River, Tientify Watershedt, Flood Riuk Mitgation MAT A 1 6.6 7,202.1 66.8 502.300 Planning 2000 6.00 Faturem River, Tientify Watershedt, River, Mits Mitgation MAT A 1 1.6.6 7,202.1 66.8 5702.025 Planning 2000 6.0.10 Faturem River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation MAT A 1 1.0.5 6.1.2 50.000 Planning 2010 0.3.10 Solidiment Mol. for the Non-Tidd South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation MAT A 1 1.0.12 7.0 50.0000 Planning 2011 5.0.305 Solidiment Mol. for the Non-Tidd South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation MAT A 1 1.0.2 1.0.2 5.0.000 Planning 2011 0.00 Planning 2011	AA19ALN000001	STRE	Α	1	132.6	61,140.0	1,814.7	\$5,150,315	Design	2022	173.30	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
A139,L1000019 STRE A 1 4430 2,22,2000 2,021.2 52,3437,622 begins 2023 237.70 Soliment TMOL for the Life Plausent River, Itelity Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation MATE A 1 0.0 355 1.4 59,550 Planning 2000 6.00 Ferry STRE (intro) SIST A 1 0.0 355 1.4 59,550 Planning 2000 6.01 Entropy STRE (intro) SIST A 1 51.6 25,550 Planning 2000 6.01 Entropy Stress (intro) Control Mode Stress (intro) SIST A 1 51.6 25,500 Planning 2010 0.31.20 Selfment TMOL for the Non Taid South River, Eleith Matersheet, Flood Mitigation SIST A 1 1.2 51.13 Stress (intro) 2010 51.85 Stress (intro) 2010 Stress (intro) Stress (intro) 2010 Stres (intro) Stres (intro)	AA18ALN000018	STRE	А	1	102.5	450,945.0	262.6	\$1,090,932	Design	2022	205.52	Sediment TMDL for the Patuxent River Upper Watershed, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Image: New T 5 1 9.6 7.2021 665 5523.00 Planning 2000 11.04 Image: Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark Mark	AA19ALN000019	STRE	Α	1	408.7	2,622,600.0	2,012.1	\$14,347,462	Design	2023	737.70	Sediment TMDL for the Little Patuxent River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
IMPF A 1 0.0 35.9 1.4 55.50 Planning 2020 6.00 Energy fficency INST A 1 138.6 64,722.5 35.4 570.225 Planning 2020 91.13 Sediment TMM. for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation SNST A 1 70.6 5,550 26.3 517.000 Planning 2020 91.13 Sediment TMM. for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation SNST A 1 70.6 5,550 26.3 517.000 Planning 2021 51.66 Sediment TMM. for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation SNST A 1 70.6 66.6 51.12.700 Planning 2021 60.83 Sediment TMM. for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation SNST A 1 17.6 66.6 51.12.700 Planning 2021 90.00 Annual Operators & Mantenance Costs N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 55.117.000 Complete 2019 Stormate/flood control for this stormater management or infrastructure projects delighef or water quality credit		PWET	S	1	9.6	7,202.1	68.5	\$629,500	Planning	2020	11.04	
SHST A 1 189 64,725 33.4 570,295 Planning 2020 32.13 Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tald South Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation SHST A 1 7.0 55.200 183,5500 100.5 570,2925 Planning 2020 23.80 Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tald South Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation SHST A 1 7.0 5.2500 26.80 51,730,000 Planning 2021 51.86 Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tald South Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation N/A N/A A 1 17.8 13.32.5 66.6 51,127.079 Planning 2021 60.35 Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tald South Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 0.0 Status Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tald South Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 Status Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation Status Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 Status Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation Status Niver, Clinate Adaptaton, Recreation		IMPF	Α	1	0.0	35.9	1.4	\$9,590	Planning	2020	6.09	Energy Efficiency
SHST A 1 53.6 133.8300 100. 5702.252 Planning 2020 31.12 Sedment TMDL for the Non-Tidal Such Rive, Hauft Adgataton, Recardon SHST A 1 70.0 5.250.0 26.3 551.000 Planning 2021 55.68 Sedment TMDL for the Non-Tidal Such Rive, Hauft Adgataton, Reck, Hauft Adga		SHST	А	1	18.9	64,732.5	35.4	\$702,925	Planning	2020	32.13	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
STRE A 1 7.0 5.250.0 26.3 5.17,0000 Planning 2020 23.80 Seliment TMDL for the Non-Tidal Such Kiner, Healthy Waterheids, Flood Risk Mitigation STRE A 1 17.8 1.3 17.8 1.3 17.8 1.3 17.8 1.3 17.8 1.3 17.8 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.5 66.6 51.12,70.70 Planning 2021 60.35 Seliment TMDL for the Non-Tidal Such Kiner, Healthy Waterheids, Flood Risk Mitigation N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 51,550,000 Omplete 2019 Stormwater/flood Control projects not eligible for water quality cells (for water quality cells (f		SHST	Α	1	53.6	183,580.0	100.5	\$702,925	Planning	2020	91.12	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
SHST A 1 30.4 104,20.0 57.0 S50.000 Planning 2021 51.68 Sediment TMOL for the Non-Tidal West River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation N/A N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 0.0 51.122.797 Planning 2021 6035 Sediment TMOL for the Non-Tidal West River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 0.0 Status 2019 0.00 Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs. N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 Status Complete 2019 0.00 Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs. N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 Status Complete 2019 Annual Operations, Recreation Maintenance Costs. N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 0.0 Status Required for this		STRE	Α	1	7.0	5,250.0	26.3	\$1,730,000	Planning	2020	23.80	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
STRE A 1 17.8 13.312.5 66.6 S1.127.079 Planing 2021 60.35 Sediment TMUE for the Non-Tial South River, Head South		SHST	Α	1	30.4	104,120.0	57.0	\$50,000	Planning	2021	51.68	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal West River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline N/A & NA & NA & 0.0 $		STRE	Α	1	17.8	13,312.5	66.6	\$1,127,079	Planning	2021	60.35	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
Image: NA N/A N/A N/A 0.0		N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$1,550,000	Complete	2019	0.00	Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs
Image: NA N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 S8,117,000 Complete 0.00 flooding). Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 S8,117,000 Complete 0.00 flooding). Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation N/A Image: N/A <										2019		Stormwater/flood control projects not eligible for water quality credit (includes culvert and closed storm drain rehabilitation;
N/A N/A N/A 0.0 0.0 0.0 S8,117,000 Complete 0.00 floodingl. Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation Image: Subtotal Capital Image: Subtotal Capital Image: Subtotal Capital N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only Subtotal Capital N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only Subtotal Capital N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only Subtotal Capital N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only Subtotal Capital N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only Subtotal Capital N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this section, provided for informational purposes only N/A - Data not required for this sectio												emergency storm drain repairs; and stormwater management or infrastructure projects designed to relieve ponding or
Image: subtraining Obligations from The Previous Form		N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$8,117,000	Complete		0.00	flooding). Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation
Image: Normal billing of the section of the sectio												
Image: section is section informational purposes only S111,629,195 Image: section informational purposes only Image: section informational purposes only Subtotal Capital A 1 1,812 S0 Planning 2019 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WVTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Other (Unmet Obligations from Previous Permit Term) A 1 1,812 S0 Planning 2019 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WVTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. A 1 1,068 S0 Planning 2020 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WVTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtotal Other A 1 409 S0 Planning 2021 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WVTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtotal Other A 1 409 S0 Planning 2021 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WVTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtotal Other A 1 409 S0 Planning 2022 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WVTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtotal Other A 1 409 S0 Planning 2022						N/A - Data not	N/A - Data not				N/A - Data not	
Image: section of the section of th						required for this	required for this				required for this	
Subtoal Capital A 1 1,812 Solution of minormational purposes only purposes purposes purposed purposes only purposes only				101	2.549	section,	section,	\$111.629.195			section, provided for	
Subtotal Capital Informational purposes only Informational purposes only purposes only Other (Unmet Obligations from Previous Permit Term)					_,= .=	provided for	provided for	+,,			informational	
Subtotal Capital Image: Constraint of the Method of th						informational	informational				purposes only	
Other Other A 1 1,812 \$0 Planning 2019 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Cher A 1 1,068 \$0 Planning 2020 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtract A 1 822 \$0 Planning 2020 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtract A 1 822 \$0 Planning 2021 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtract A 1 409 \$0 Planning 2021 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtract A 1 409 \$0 Planning 2022 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Subtract of the maining Obligations from The Previous 101 2,549 \$111,629,195 Credits accessed through nutrient credit trading each year. Subtract not applicable. Obligations from The Previous Puretified to be Microixed from Demoted to be Microixed from Demoted to be Microixed from Demoted to be	Subtotal Capital					purposes only	purposes only				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
A 1 1,812 S0 Planning 2019 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTPs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Image: State of the state of	Other (Unmet Obligations fre	om Previous Permit T	arm)	1		I	I					
rd A 1 1,058 90 remaining 2019 Nutrient Credit Trading with County WVFS - to be replaced by Capital projects listed above. Image: State of the	other (onnier obligations inc	Sin Trevious reiffilt I	^	1 1	1 017			¢n	Planning	2010		Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTDs - to be replaced by conital projects listed above
C A 1,000 00 remaining 2021 Inducers Creater Hading with County WVFS - to be replaced by capital projects listed above. Image: Second Seco		1	Δ	1	1,012			نږ ۵۷	Planning	2019		Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTrs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above.
r A Occ SO Framming ZO21 Nutrient Credit maning with County WVFS - to be replaced by Capital projects listed above. Subtotal Other A 1 409 \$0 Planning 2022 Nutrient Credit maning with County WVFS - to be replaced by Capital projects listed above. Subtotal Other So So Credits accessed through nutrient credit trading each open. Total of Remaining Obligations from The Previous 101 2,549 \$111,629,195 Credits accessed through nutrient credit trading each open.		+	A .	1	1,008			ος. 0	Planning	2020		Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTrs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above.
Subtail Other I and Control of the Meridian Dependent of the Meridian		1	Δ	1	022			نږ ۵۷	Planning	2021		Nutrient Credit Trading with County WWTrs - to be replaced by capital projects listed above.
Total of Remaining Obligations from The Previous 101 2,549 50 Cleans and the previous P	Subtotal Other		~	1	409			ço ço	r ionn illig	2022		Credits accessed through putrient credit trading each year. Subtotal not applicable
Total of Remaining Obligations from The Previous Permit Dermit Dermited Dermited by the Meintering Form Previous Permit That Must Be Continued Dermited Dermited by the Meintering Permit Form Permited Dermited D		L						ŞU				a consideration and agin nument a can a anni yean. Saotuta nut applicable.
Permit Obligations from Previous Permit That Must Be Continued	Total of Remaining Obligatio	ns from The Previous		101	2,549			\$111.629.195				
Obligations from Previous Permit That Must Be Continued	Permit				_,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			+===, 525155				
A second Descentioned Descenter of Descenter of Asses Description of Asses Description								Obligat	ions from Previous Peri	mit That Must Be Conti	nued	
Annual Operational Programs Required to be invalutanted from Previous Permit ²	Annual Operational Program	s Required to be Mai	ntained f	rom Previous	s Permit ^{3,4}							

											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Credit
o			255	150.0	477.004.4	4 470 0	4202 702		2010		averages are based on program maturity (FY16-FY18). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to
Street Sweeping	V55	A	256	168.9	177,381.4	1,478.2	\$283,780	Design	2019	,	show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Street sweeping frequency twice monthly.
											will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Street sweeping
Street Sweeping	VSS	А	256	168.9	177,381.4	1,478.2	\$292.293	Planning	2020		frequency twice monthly.
U U U U							<i>,,</i>				Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). The County
											will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Street sweeping
Street Sweeping	VSS	А	256	168.9	177,381.4	1,478.2	\$301,062	2 Planning	2021		frequency twice monthly.
											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). The County
											will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Street sweeping
Street Sweeping	VSS	А	256	168.9	177,381.4	1,478.2	\$310,094	1 Planning	2022	2	frequency twice monthly.
											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). The County
Street Sweeping	VICE		256	169.0	177 201 4	1 479 2	6210 207	Dianning	2022		will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Street sweeping
street sweeping	V33	А	250	108.9	177,561.4	1,476.2	\$319,397	Plaining	2023		requercy (write mononly, Craditing is based on mass loading mothodology in MDE's WLA and imponing craditing guidance (August 2014). The County
											will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Street sweeping
Street Sweeping	VSS	А	256	168.9	177.381.4	1.478.2	\$328.979	Planning	2024	L.	frequency twice monthly.
					,		1.5.7,5.				Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). The County
											will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Street sweeping
Street Sweeping	VSS	А	256	168.9	177,381.4	1,478.2	\$338,848	8 Planning	2025	j	frequency twice monthly.
											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Credit
											averages are based on FY17-FY18 (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	Α	3,291	69.8	73,294.2	610.8	\$614,960) Design	2019)	show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Credit
	67 G			FO 0	72 204 2				2020		averages are based on FY17-FY18 (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	A	3,291	69.8	/3,294.2	610.8	\$633,409	Planning	2020)	snow compliance in maintenance of these credits.
											creating is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's wilk and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Creating averages are based on FY17-FY18 (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	Δ.	3 201	69.8	73 204 2	610.8	\$652.411	Planning	2021		averages are based on 117-116 (programmatury): the county will demonstrate the same level of programmatic enort to show compliance in maintenance of these cradits.
Cateri basin cicaning	cbc		5,251	05:0	75,254.2	010.0	Ş052,411	i iaining	2023	-	Trediting is based on mass-hading methodology in MDF's WIA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Credit
											averages are based on FY17-FY18 (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	А	3,291	69.8	73,294.2	610.8	\$671,984	Planning	2022		show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Credit
											averages are based on FY17-FY18 (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	Α	3,291	69.8	73,294.2	610.8	\$692,144	1 Planning	2023		show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Credit
											averages are based on FY17-FY18 (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic effort to
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	A	3,291	69.8	73,294.2	610.8	\$712,908	Planning	2024		show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
											Crediting is based on mass-loading methodology in MDE's WLA and impervious crediting guidance (August 2014). Credit
Catch Basin Cleaning	CBC	Δ.	3 201	69.8	73 204 2	610.8	\$73/ 296	Planning	2025		averages are based on 117-116 (programmatury): the county will demonstrate the same level of programmatic enort to show compliance in maintenance of these cradits.
Catch basin cicaning	656		5,251	0310	, 0,20 112	010.0	<i>\$151,250</i>	, i uning	2023		Credit averages are based on FY16-FY18 data (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic
Septic System Pumping	SEPP	А	6,214	186.4	0	0	\$0) Design	2019		effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
			-					, in the second s			Credit averages are based on FY16-FY18 data (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic
Septic System Pumping	SEPP	Α	6,214	186.4	Ö	0	\$0) Planning	2020		effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
											Credit averages are based on FY16-FY18 data (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic
Septic System Pumping	SEPP	А	6,214	186.4	0	0	\$0) Planning	2021	-	effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
											Credit averages are based on FY16-FY18 data (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic
Septic System Pumping	SEPP	A	6,214	186.4	0	0	\$0) Planning	2022		effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
Contin Custom Duranian	SEDD		6 34 4	100	_			Dianning			creait averages are based on FY16-FY18 data (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic
Septic System Pumping	SEPP	A	0,214	186.4	U	, 0	ŞU	rianning	2023	<u>'</u>	Periori to show compliance in maintenance of these credits. Credit averages are based on EV16-EV18 data (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the came level of programmatic
Sentic System Pumping	SEPP	Δ	6 2 1 4	186 /	ň		Śn	Planning	2024	L	effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits
a contraction of a cont			0,217	100.4		, in the second se	γu		2024		Credit averages are based on FY16-FY18 data (program maturity). The County will demonstrate the same level of programmatic
Septic System Pumping	SEPP	А	6,214	186.4	0	0	\$0	Planning	2025	j	effort to show compliance in maintenance of these credits.
Subtotal Operations ³					250,675.6	2,089.0	\$6,886,565	5			Number of BMPs is not additive for annual operational practices. Subtotal not applicable.
Capital Projects (Proposed to	Replace Annual Obli	igations)									-
											The County plans to maintain its annual operation programs (and associated credits) at current levels and does not propose
		<u> </u>									replacement with capital projects at this time.
Subtotal Capital			0	0	0	0	\$0				
Other (Proposed to Replace A	nnual Obligations)		1	1					1	1	
										1	I ne county plans to maintain its annual operation programs (and associated credits) at current levels and does not propose
Subtotal Other		1					60				replacement with other projects at this time.
Total of Obligations from De-	vious Pormit That	1	U	Ű	0	0	şü				
Must Be Continued	wous Perifit Inat		0	425.1	250,675.6	2,089.0	\$6,886,565				These credit values represent the maintenance of credits achieved under the previous permit term
mast be continued		1	·							L	
Operational Programs ⁴								•			
	1	1								1	The County does not plan any additions to its operations programs to meet its obligations under the previous permit
Subtotal Operations ⁵			0		0	0	\$0	1	1		
	······							• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	

Capital Projects											
AA17ALN000018	SHST	А	1	0.0	186,764.0	69.3	\$2,879,500	Under Construction	2025	4.2	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
AA16ALN000008	STRE	Α	1	0.0	277,720.0	403.7	\$1,400,202	Design	2021	145.8	Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA19ALN000029	STRE	А	1	0.0	625,486.0	736.3	\$1,031,065	Design	2021	328.0	Sediment TMDL for the Little Patuxent River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA19ALN000003	STRE	Α	1	0.0	2,120.0	91.9	\$397,724	Design	2023	5.9	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA19RST000010	PWED	S	1	45.7	26,057.8	324.3	\$592,000	Design	2023	42.4	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
AA16RST000069	SPSC	S	1	4.7	3,415.5	67.4	\$1,114,290	Design	2023	6.6	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River
AA19RST000007	SPSC	S	1	1.0	2.362.6	85.9	\$165,531	Design	2024	5.4	
AA19RST000008	SPSC	S	1	1.0	2.121.7	106.2	\$163.893	Design	2024	5.5	
AA17ALN000017	SHST	A	1	0.0	247.141.0	0.0	\$1,670,948	Design	2024	0.0	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor. Climate Adaptation. Recreation
AA19RST000012	WEDW	S	1	9.2	6.987.6	98.7	\$680.846	Design	2024	11.7	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor. Flood Risk Mitigation
AA19ALN000007	STRF	Δ	1	0.0	24 975 0	100.2	\$2 453 562	Design	2025	113.2	Sediment TMDL for the Little Paturent River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
AA1885T000047	PW/ED	s	1	11.0	12 575 4	205.8	\$557.002	Design	2025	21.0	
AA1885T000049	PWED	Š	1	0.3	316.9	8.2	\$12 920	Design	2020	0.6	
AA18R51000049	PW/ED	5	1	21.5	22 216 9	200.0	¢1 500 266	Dosign	2020	20.7	
AA1785T000034	SPSC	c	1	2.5	3 595 /	73.2	\$1,505,200	Design	2020	67	
AA17R31000024	STRE	^	1	2.5	98,000,0	2 655 0	¢7 0.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Dosign	2020	420.9	Healthy Watersheds Elevel Dick Mitigation
AA10ALN000035	STRE	A .	1	0.0	38,000.0	2,033.3	\$7,048,937 \$177.054	Design	2020	420.3	Healthy Watersheds, Hood Risk Mitigation
AAI9ALN000023	SINC	A F	1	0.0	2,037.0	13.2	\$177,034	Design	2020	12.0	realing watersneus, nood kisk witigation
	ESD	с с	1	0.2	107.4	4.0	\$9,590	Planning	2023	0.4	
	MIBR	E	1	0.1	138.7	4.5	\$9,590	Planning	2023	0.3	
	IVIIBR	E	1	0.0	224.8	11.7	\$9,590	Planning	2023	0.6	Codinana TMADI Seatha Nea Tidal Couth Diver Cland Dial Mitiantian
	FBIO	S	1	0.4	585.9	14.8	\$47,331	Planning	2023	1.2	Seament IMDL for the Non-Iridal South River, Flood Risk Witigation
	WEDW	S	1	1.8	3,220.4	80.4	\$204,750	Planning	2024	6.4	Nutrient I MUL for the Baltimore Harbor, Flood Risk Mitigation
	SHST	A	1	0.0	32,880.0	18.0	\$1,127,079	Planning	2024	16.3	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Climate Adaptation, Recreation
	SPSC	S	1	7.5	6,616.0	123.1	\$629,500	Planning	2025	12.6	
	ESD	E	1	10.7	7,894.7	91.5	\$900,000	Planning	2025	13.7	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor
	STRE	A	1	0.0	11,850.0	59.3	\$1,395,000	Planning	2025	53.7	Nutrient TMDL for the Baltimore Harbor, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
	STRE	A	1	0.0	13,500.0	67.5	\$4,616,121	Planning	2025	61.2	Sediment TMDL for the Non-Tidal South River, Healthy Watersheds, Flood Risk Mitigation
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$1,550,000	Planning	2020	0.0	Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs
									2020		Stormwater/flood control projects not eligible for water quality credit (includes culvert and closed storm drain rehabilitation;
											emergency storm drain repairs; and stormwater management or infrastructure projects designed to relieve ponding or
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$8,117,000	Planning		0.0	flooding). Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$1,550,000	Planning	2021	0.0	Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs
									2021		Stormwater/flood control projects not eligible for water quality credit (includes culvert and closed storm drain rehabilitation;
											emergency storm drain repairs; and stormwater management or infrastructure projects designed to relieve ponding or
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$8,117,000	Planning		0.0	flooding). Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$1,550,000	Planning	2022	0.0	Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs
									2022		Stormwater/flood control projects not eligible for water quality credit (includes culvert and closed storm drain rehabilitation;
											emergency storm drain repairs; and stormwater management or infrastructure projects designed to relieve ponding or
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$8,117,000	Planning		0.0	flooding). Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$1,550,000	Planning	2023	0.0	Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs
								-	2023		Stormwater/flood control projects not eligible for water quality credit (includes culvert and closed storm drain rehabilitation;
											emergency storm drain repairs; and stormwater management or infrastructure projects designed to relieve ponding or
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$8.117.000	Planning		0.0	flooding). Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$1,550,000	Planning	2024	0.0	Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs
		.,,,,		0.0	0.0	0.0	\$2,550,000		2024	0.0	Stormwater/flood control projects not eligible for water quality credit (includes culvert and closed storm drain rehabilitation:
1		1							2024		emergency storm drain repairs; and stormwater management or infrastructure projects designed to relieve nonding or
	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$8,117,000	Planning		0.0	flooding), Climate Adaptation, Flood Risk Mitigation
 	N/A	N/A	Ν/Δ	0.0	0.0	0.0	¢1 EEN 000	Planning	2025	0.0	Annual Operations & Maintenance Costs
H	IN/A	IN/A	IN/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$1,550,000	riaiiillig	2025	0.0	runniar operations a maintenalite COSIS Stormwater/flood costrol projects on a bigible for water quality credit (includes culvert and closed storm drain robabilitations
									2025		emergency storm drain renairs: and stormwater management or infrastructure projects decigned to reliave panding or
	N/A	NI/A	NI/A				ĆQ 117 000	Planning			Enorginal Climate Adaptation Flood Bick Mitigation
Subtotal Capital	IN/A	IN/A	IN/A	0.0	0.0	0.0	\$8,117,000	r iallillig	1	0.0	וויטטעווקן. כווווענג העמטנמנוטון דוטטט וווא וווונצמנוטוו
		L	27	128	1,621,711	5,905	\$ 88,981,336	I	L		
Other	1	1	1	1		г т		1	1		The County does not also any water quality improvement projects does the destination of the disc
Subtatal Other		<u> </u>					4-		L		The county uses not plan any water quality improvement projects classified as "Other" at this time.
Subtotal Other		1	0	0	0	0	\$0				
Total for Next Permit			27	127.6	1,621,711.2	5,904.9	\$88,981,336				
Total for Remaining Obligatio	ns from The										
Previous Permit and Prosed A	ctivities for the		128	2,676	1,621,711.2	5,904.9	\$207,497,096				TSS and TN metrics only apply under the next permit, therefore totals for these metrics only include the obligations to be
Next Permit											met under the next permit.

Check with MDE Geodatabase:

Rest BMP ID, type, class, number of BMPs, impervious acres, built date, implementation cost should match the various geodatabase tables for BMPs (AltBMPLine, AltBMPPoint, AltBMPPoint, and RestBMP)- aggregated by type and status.

Notes:

1 Use BMP types and classes from the MDE Geodatabase.

		Financial Capacity Spreadsheet
1	County/City Name	Anne Arundel County
2	Cost As A Percent Of Household Inco	me
2a	Median Household Income (MHI)	
2b	Total Number Of Households In Jurise	diction
2c	Average Annual Cost For Public Storr	nwater Related Management Programs
2d	Annual Cost For Public Stormwater R	elated Management Programs Per Household
2e	% Of MHI Spent On Public Stormwate	er Related Management Programs
2f	Total Annual Stormwater Remediation	Fee Per Household
2g	% Of MHI Spent Annually On Stormy	vater Remediation Fee
3	Cost Of Impervious Surface Restoration	on As A Percent Of Household Income
3a	Total In Previous Permit Term Spent C	On The Impervious Surface Restoration Plan (ISRP)
3b	Average Annual Cost Of The ISRP Du	aring The Previous Permit Term
3c	Annual Cost Of The ISRP Per Househ	old During The Previous Permit Term
3d	% Of MHI Spent On The ISRP During	g The Previous Permit Term
3e	Total Projected Cost For Restoration P	Portfolio
3f	Projected Annual Cost For Restoration	n Portfolio
3g	Projected Annual Cost For Restoration	n Portfolio Per Household
3h	% Of MHI Spent On Projected Cost O	f Restoration Portfolio
4	Cost For Low-Income Residential Cus	tomers As A Percent Of Household Income
4a	Percentage Of Households With Annu	al Income <\$25,000
4b	% Of Income For Low Income House	nolds Spent On Public Stormwater Related Management
4c	% Of Income For Low Income Househ	nolds Spent On Stormwater Remediation Fees
4d	% Of Income For Low Income House	nold Spent On The ISRP
4e	% Of MHI For Low Income House Sp	ent On Projected Cost Of Restoration Portfolio
5	Key Socioeconomic Indicators	
5a	Percentage Unemployed	
5b	Median Household Income	
5c	Percent Of Individuals (All People) Be	elow Poverty Level
6	Financial Capacity Indicators	
6a		Bond Rating – GO^1 Bonds
6b	Debt Indicators	Bond Rating – Revenue Bonds
6c	1	Net Debt As A % Of FMPV ²
6d		Property Tax Revenues As % Of FMPV
6e	Financial Management Indicators	Property Tax Revenue Collection Rate
6a 6b 6c 6d 6e	Debt Indicators Financial Management Indicators	Bond Rating – GO ¹ Bonds Bond Rating – Revenue Bonds Net Debt As A % Of FMPV ² Property Tax Revenues As % Of FMPV Property Tax Revenue Collection Rate

Notes:

1. GO = General Obligation

2. FMPV = Full Market Property Value

¢.	04.502
\$	94,502
<i>*</i>	189,711
\$	37,241,629.88
\$	196.31
	0.21%
	\$71.75
	0.08%
\$	69,165,553.98
\$	13,833,110.80
\$	72.92
	0.08%
	\$207,497,096.00
	\$29,642,442.29
\$	156.25
	0.17%
	9.01%
	0.79%
	0.29%
	0.29%
	0.63%
	5.22%
\$	94,502
	5.78%
Aaa	
Aaa	
	1.34%
	0.78%
	99.84%
	JJ.0 F/0

Moody's	Aaa
	Aa
	Α
	Ваа
	Ва
	В
	Caa
	Ca
	С
S&P	AAA
	AA
	A
	BBB
	BB
	В
	CCC
	CC
	R
	SD
	D

Parameter from 2017 ACS	2	017 Value
National Average MHI	\$	57,652.00
National Percent Unemployed		4.1%
National Percent of Individuals Below Poverty Level		14.6%