MDEStat Meeting June 4, 2012



Table 1: Pending Wetlands Applications

| | As of 5/25/11 | | | | | As of 4/9/12 As of | | As of | As of 5/29/12 | | | | | |
|----------|----------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| | Total Pend- | % Over | Total Pend | % Over | Total Pend- | % Over | Total er Pend- | % Over | Total Pend- | # Over | % Over | Active Applications Only | | |
| | ing | due | -ing | due | ing | due | ing | due | ing | Due | due | Pending | Number Over due | Percent Overdue |
| Nontidal | 564 | 40% | 529 | 38% | 474 | 44% | 514 | 40% | 458 | 204 | 45% | 252 | 24 | 10% |
| Tidal | 433 | 45% | 228 | 25% | 189 | 15% | 190 | 12% | 242 | 30 | 12% | 229 | 19 | 8% |
| TOTAL | 997 | 42% | 757 | 34% | 663 | 36% | 704 | 33% | 700 | 234 | 33% | 481 | 43 | 9% |



Table 2: Active, Long-Term and Inactive Pending Wetlands Projects (Continued on next slide)

| PROJECT CLASSIFICATION | PENDING PROJECTS | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------|-------|--------|--|--|--|
| PROJECT CLASSIFICATION | NONTIDAL | TIDAL | TOTALS | | | |
| Active | 252 | 229 | 481 | | | |
| Long-Term | 20 | 2 | 22 | | | |
| Inactive | 186 | 11 | 197 | | | |
| TOTALS | 458 | 242 | 700 | | | |

Table 2: Active, Long-Term and Inactive Pending Wetlands Projects (Continued on next slide)

| DDOIECT CLASSIFICATION | PENDING LONG-TERM PROJECTS | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--|--|--|
| PROJECT CLASSIFICATION | NONTIDAL | TIDAL | TOTALS | | | |
| Aquaculture | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Highway | 8 | 0 | 8 | | | |
| Other | 5 | 0 | 5 | | | |
| Utility-Energy | 5 | 1 | 6 | | | |
| Technical processing issue | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | |
| Federal | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | |
| TOTALS | 20 | 2 | 22 | | | |

Table 2: Active, Long-Term and Inactive Pending Wetlands Projects

| | PENDING INACTIVE PROJECTS | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|--------|--|--|--|
| PROJECT CLASSIFICATION | NONTIDAL | TIDAL | TOTALS | | | |
| Attorney General Coordination | 5 | 1 | 6 | | | |
| Compliance | 7 | 0 | 7 | | | |
| Federal | 19 | 4 | 23 | | | |
| Legal | 0 | 4 | 4 | | | |
| Local | 10 | 0 | 10 | | | |
| Other | 1 | 0 | 1 | | | |
| State | 20 | 0 | 20 | | | |
| Technical Processing Issues | 124 | 2 | 126 | | | |
| TOTALS | 186 | 11 | 197 | | | |

Table 3: Percentage of Facilities Operating On Administratively-Extended WMA Permits

| | Target | 6/21/10 | 9/13/10 | 2/28/11 | 9/6/11 | 11/14/11 | 1/13/12 | 4/9/12 | 5/24/12 |
|--|---------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Surface Discharge Permit Major Facilities | 10% | 22% (19/85) | 19% (16/85) | 7% (6/85) | 8% (7/85) | 6% (5/85) | 8% (7/85) | 8% (7/85) | 9.4% (8/85) |
| Surface Discharge Major & Minor Facilities | 10% by 6/1/12 | | Not requested. | | | | | | |
| ENR Facilities | 10% | 13% (10/75) | 20% (15/75) | 4% (3/75) | 1 % (1/75) | 1% (1/75) | 1% (1/75) | 1% (1/75) | 1% (1/75) |
| Ground- water | 20% | 23% (54/ 231) | 21% (48/ 233) | 24% (55/ 230) | 20.3% (49/ 241) | 19.9% (48/241) | 19.4% (47/242) | 15.4% (37/240) | 19.8% (46/239) |



Table 4: National Inventory of Dams Condition Assessment

| NID Condition Assessment | NID Condition Description |
|---|---|
| Satisfactory - Meets applicable hydrologic and seismic regulatory criteria | No existing or potential dam safety deficiencies are recognized. Acceptable performance is expected under all loading conditions (static, hydrologic, seismic) in accordance with the applicable regulatory criteria. |
| Satisfactory - Meets applicable tolerable risk criteria | Acceptable performance is expected in accordance with tolerable risk guidelines. |
| Fair - No existing deficiencies under normal conditions. Rare or extreme events may result in deficiency. | No existing dam safety deficiencies are recognized for normal loading conditions. Rare or extreme hydrologic and/or seismic events may result in a dam safety deficiency. Risk may be in the range to take further action |
| Poor - More Analysis Needed | Uncertainties exist as to critical analysis parameters which identify a potential dam safety deficiency; Further investigations and studies are necessary. |
| Poor - Deficiency Recognized | A dam safety deficiency is recognized for loading conditions which may realistically occur. Remedial action is necessary. |
| Unsatisfactory - Recognized deficiency which requires remedial action. | A dam safety deficiency is recognized that requires immediate or emergency remedial action for problem resolution. Reservoir restrictions may be necessary until problem resolution. |
| Not Rated - Dam Has Not Been Inspected | The dam has not been inspected. |
| Not Rated - Not Under State Jurisdiction | The dam is not under state jurisdiction. |
| Not Rated - Other | The dam has been inspected, but its condition has not been rated. |

Table 5: MDE Condition Assessment

| General Condition | Description |
|--------------------------|---|
| ACCEPTABLE | Dam is maintained in an acceptable manner and there is no obvious distress or problems, |
| | no trees, etc. Gates are operable. |
| BREACHED | The dam cannot impound water, either because it failed, or a notch was intentionally cut |
| | through it so that no more than 3 feet of water is impounded during 100-year flood. |
| DRAINED | Drain gate has been opened fully and there is normally no water impounded. |
| EXCELLENT | Dam is more than 5 years old, well maintained, no obvious distress or problems, etc. Drain |
| | gates are fully operational. |
| FAIR | Dam embankment needs mowing or other minor repairs, concrete spalling or cracking. |
| GOOD | |
| | Dam is well maintained, no obvious distress or problems, no trees, etc. Gates are operable. |
| NEW Construction | Dam has recently been added to our inventory and is: a) under construction; b) under |
| | repairs; or c) under observation. |
| POOR | Poorly maintained, erosion, sinkholes, settlement, cracking, small trees, animal burrows, |
| | etc. Drain gates inoperable. Maintenance work is needed. |
| UNACCEPTABLE | Dam is in unsafe condition, poorly maintained, shows signs of distress, or is in imminent |
| | danger of failure |
| UNKNOWN | Dam has not been recently inspected by Dam Safety. |
| UNSAFE | Imminent danger of failure; poorly maintained, obvious signs of distress, seepage, erosion, |
| (Imminent Danger) | sinkholes, cracks, slumping, trees, debris, animal burrows, etc. |
| UNSAFE | Inadequate spillway capacity (dam cannot pass the current design storm, PMF or 1/2 |
| (Inadequate Spillway) | PMF). Dam may otherwise be in good or excellent condition. |
| UNSAFE | |
| (Pool Restricted) | Dam is in unsafe condition and pool has been drained or lowered. |
| UNSAFE | Poorly maintained, obvious signs of distress, seepage, erosion, sinkholes, cracks, |
| (Poor Condition) | slumping, trees, debris, animal burrows, etc. |
| UNSAFE | |
| (Temporarily Drained) | Drain gate has been opened fully and there is normally no water impounded. |
| VERY POOR | Poorly maintained, obvious signs of distress, seepage, erosion, sinkholes, cracks, |
| | slumping, trees, debris, animal burrows, etc. |