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HEARING OFFICER CLEVENGER: Good morning and welcome. We are in the Reagan Room of the Carroll County Government Office Building, Westminster, Maryland. It is about 10 o'clock on Monday, September 8, 2014, to have a public hearing regarding the Maryland Department of Environment's tentative determination to issue Carroll County a national pollutant discharge elimination system, NPDES, municipal separate storm system permit, MS-4. That is a mouthful, especially for a Monday morning.

My name is Brian Clevenger,
C-L-E-V-E-N-G-E-R. I am the program manager of the Maryland Department of Environment Sediment, Storm Water, and Dam Safety Program. I'll be the hearing officer for today.

Other MDE personnel in the room are, to my right, Ray Bahr, who is the division chief of the program review division, Maria Warburton,

Michelle Arthur, and Andrew Tagoe.
Thank you for the MDE staff, also to Tom and Phil for having us up this morning to take this permit up.

The State of Maryland has a tentative determination -- or $a$-- let me get this right. Administrative Procedures Act wherein we issue the tentative determination to re-issue Carroll County's MS-4 permit. These were announced -this action was announced in the Carroll County Times on June 27, and then again on June 30, 2014. We also sent out notice to the Department's interested parties list we maintain for all NPDES permits.

We have two folks signed up to speak this morning, both representing Carroll County. I have, today, prepared remarks that we would like to have read into the record formally. When we get finished with that, we will give the county a chance to provide comments for the record. And then we will ask if there is any elected officials
here, we'll give them a shot as well. Then we'll wrap things up at the end.

When you appear, please identify
yourself, please spell your name for Angie, and if there are any questions subsequent to all of this, we can take that off the record. This is to accept public testimony comments, it is not a question-and-answer period.

So, with that, I will read what is prepared formally, we'll move a little forward from that.

The purpose of today's hearing is to accept public comment on MDE's tentative determination to issue Carroll County an MS-4 permit. This hearing is being held to honor a request submitted on July 18, 2014 from Tom Devilbiss, representing Carroll County Government, Department of Land Use Planning and Development. This hearing allows MDE to meet its obligations under Maryland's Administrative Procedures Act.

For background, Maryland has been
delegated authority by the United States
Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, to
administer the NPDES program in the state. Final
storm water regulations were adopted by EPA in
November 1990 according to section 402-P of the
Clean Water Act. These regulations require that owners of storm drain systems serving populations greater than 100,000 apply for a Phase I NPDES municipal storm water permit.

Based on 1990 census data, Carroll
County was considered a Phase I median
municipality due to its population, which was over 120,000 at the time. The county submitted a twoyear, two-part application and was issued an initial MS-4 permit in November 1993. The county's first permit laid the foundation for a comprehensive approach to controlling runoff. This was done by establishing the necessary legal authority, mapping storm drain system infrastructure, identifying sources of pollution, monitoring storm events to characterize urban
runoff, enhancing existing source -- erosion and sediment control and storm water management programs, and establishing new programs for providing education and eliminating illegal storm drain system discharges.

This permit was reissued on May 30, 2000, and again on July 14, 2005. For both of these reissued permits, additional requirements were included for assessing water quality across the county and for restoring 10 percent of the county's impervious area that was not already managed to the maximum extent practicable.

NPDES permits last for five years, and a reapplication is required to be submitted as part of the county's fourth-year annual report.

Carroll County submitted its fourth year annual report on July 15, 2010. Since that time, MDE has held numerous meetings and had many conversations with individual citizens, environmental advocates, the EPA, and other local government officials that are affected by the $M S-4$ permit program, including

Carroll County.
The result of these meetings and conversations is the draft permit we take up today. Yet, more significant conditions have been added to this version of Carroll County storm water permit, largely based upon EPA recently approved total maximum daily loads for TMDLs, for impairments to local water bodies within the county, and for nutrients and sediments in the Chesapeake Bay.

The most significant permit condition is the doubling of the impervious restoration requirement from 10 percent to 20 percent. It needs to occur within the five-year permit term.

These and all other remaining permit conditions have been developed for abating the discharge of pollutants from Carroll County storm drain system and working toward meeting the state's receding water quality criteria.

Thanks for enduring that. That completes the prepared statement. Is there any
elected official present that would like to provide comments?

There being none, we will call the representatives of the county. Who wants to go first? Phil, you want to go first. Phil Hager, please spell your name for Angie, Phil. And take it away.

MR. HAGER: Good morning. My name is Phillip R. Hager, $H-A-G-E-R$. I have the honor of serving as the director of the Department of Land Use Planning and Development for Carroll County. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments regarding the proposed new permit.

I would like to welcome Mr. Clevenger and Mr. Bahr to Carroll County, and all the other staff members who are here from the Maryland Department of Environment. I noticed you have an umbrella on the table. I can assure you that you do not need that as it never rains in Carroll County. (Laughter.)

The new permit that is the topic of
today's hearing proposes to impose additional requirements and new conditions on Carroll County. While we have legitimate concern about some of these provisions, it would be wrong to question our resolve or our commitment to effective storm water management or our desire to pursue healthier conditions in our local waterways, or our role in improving the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay. Over the past decade, Carroll County has demonstrated our commitment. Our resource plans and the budgets to fulfill those plans demonstrate our intention to carry out these initiatives and to follow through on our share of the water quality challenges that we face. Of the 50 employees in this department, 22, which equates to approximately 44 percent, are involved in storm water management activities and water quality management activities on a daily basis. Three of these pursue storm water management on a full-time basis, eight on a part-time basis of more than 50 percent of their
time, and 11 on a part-time basis of less than 50 percent of their time. Again, that is 44 percent of the manpower resources of this department.

Since 2008, Carroll County's annual operating expenditures for this program have tripled from approximately $\$ 334,000$ annually to more than $\$ 1.1$ million annually.

From July 2005 to the present, we have invested over $\$ 10.1$ million in capital outlays. This does not include the more than $\$ 2$ million that we have received in grant funds from outside sources. These expenditures, and the fact that our elected officials were willing to prioritize this program to the extent they did, given the significant downturn in the economy in that period and the financial crisis of 2007. The hardships resulting from these economic conditions required budget cuts and staffing reductions in just about every other area of county government. This program is without precedent in Carroll County, as this program has seen continued increases in
spending, manpower, and resource commitment.
Carroll County has been aggressively pursuing permit compliance and has satisfied the impervious surfaces treatment threshold of 10 percent, as mandated under our current permit. However, we did not stop when we met that goal. In anticipation of a likely doubling of the required acreage of treatment, the county has continued to plan, design, fund, construct, and maintain storm water management facilities. Presently, the county has completed 60 storm water remediation projects, which equates to more than 14 percent of the county's impervious surface acres. This treatment threshold will increase to 19 percent under the current CIP cycle.

In that current CIP cycle, we have programmed $\$ 20.6$ million to continue to build upon these successes. For the 11 -year period from 2009 to 2020, Carroll County will invest more than $\$ 8.8$ million in operating expenses and more than $\$ 37.1$ million in capital expenditures for a grand total
of $\$ 45.9$ million. This total does not reflect any additional grant funds that we may receive. And I should point out this total equates to
approximately $\$ 4.1$ million annually within Carroll County's budget.

We may have reservations about certain aspects of the proposed NPDES permit, which Mr. Devilbiss is going to expound upon. And I am certainly hopeful that this process, including today's hearing, can help to address some of those reservations. However, we have no reservations when it comes to the importance of our program and its benefits to the natural resources of our region.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to provide comment. I look forward to continuing to work moving forward and working with your agency. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CLEVENGER: Thanks, Phil. Tom Devilbiss.

MR. DEVILBISS: Good morning. My name's

Tom Devilbiss, $D-E-V-I-L-B-I-S-S . \quad I$ serve as
Carroll County's deputy director of the Department of Land Use Planning and Development.

I would like to begin by extending Carroll County's sincere appreciation for the continuing support and assistance provided by the State's Water Management Administration, and, specifically, the Staff of Settlement, Storm Water, and Dam Safety Program. Their responsiveness, technical advice, and willingness to work cooperatively towards resolution of issues has been invaluable and allowed Carroll County's program to move forward in a very productive manner. All those entities involved in the NPDES MS-4 efforts would be very well served if these positive, strong-working relationships can continue in order to achieve our common goals of improved water quality.

Mr. Hager stressed the commitment of our past and current Board of Commissioners to support the County's storm water management program. As
evidenced by the fiscal and staff commitment, Carroll County is diligently working to address the requirements of our current permit. However, we are very concerned with the direction taken by some of the new requirements and/or language in the tentative permit. We believe that some of these items set a dangerous precedent for work or expected outcomes that either cannot be achieved or cannot be measured, particularly within the time frames associated with the permit.

The insertion of a new Part III Water
Quality in the draft permit appears to be very problematic both in the short and long term. It is unclear whether the attainment of applicable waste load allocations for each established or approved TMDL as well as effectively prohibiting pollutants in storm water is required within this permit cycle. This is especially troublesome considering many of the current TMDLs have been acknowledged by MDE to be technically infeasible to attain at this time. In addition, related to
the Chesapeake Bay TMDL effort USGS, United States Geological Survey, has acknowledged that the actual impact and results of all BMPs implemented for that effort, the Bay effort, may take decades to identify and measure.

If the most prominent scientific federal government organization in the U.S. cannot definitely predict the outcomes of practices involved by 2025 via the Bay effort, then why should a single county jurisdiction like Carroll be expected to set benchmarks for pollutant load reductions and deadlines that demonstrate progress toward meeting all applicable storm water waste load allocations. There certainly is no guarantee that, even when all BMPs predicted to achieve a reduction are in place, the anticipated reductions will incur. To continue with these expectations, attainment, benchmarks, and deadlines is regulatory requirements in the permit seems both unrealistic and purposefully jeopardizing the permittee's ability to comply. The tentative
permit also requires a description of a plan for implementing additional watershed restoration actions that can be enforced when benchmarks, deadlines, and applicable storm water waste load allocations are not being met or when projected funding is inadequate. If these restoration plans are intended to be iterative, as the language of the permit indicates, it is not feasible or practical to base enforcement actions or measures on a document that is intended to change and adapt to changing conditions and implementation measures. It also is not practical or prudent to require restoration plans to be completed before the watershed assessments have been completed. Therefore, critical consideration needs to be given as to the removal of references related to benchmarks and deadlines, as well as the re-insertion of the maximum extent practicable language as provided within previous permits. The permit should continue to address and require BMPs to be put in place that represent the reductions
that should result based on the sum of the recognized effectiveness values of those BMPs. It would then be appropriate for progress toward achieving the waste load allocations, through mitigation of impervious services, be demonstrated and reported annually.

MS-4 permits are intended to be individual permits, thus the conditions of the permit can and should be written to address issues specific to the permit holder. It is not necessary to apply a boilerplate approach to all Phase I permittees. Yet a requirement to address litter and floatables included in this tentative permit appears to be. This requirement is included in the permit despite there being no listing on TMDL for any water body related to trash or floatables in Carroll County. The county has performed numerous stream walks on an extensive number of streams and has not identified a significant issue related to litter or floatables. The inclusion of this requirement
within the Carroll County tentative permit should be strongly reconsidered.

This testimony is provided to highlight several of the more significant concerns related to the tentative permit. The County will be expanding on this testimony via written comments by the close of the comment period, which will provide details to the issues discussed today.

In closing, I would like to strongly urge all involved in the NPDES MS-4 process of the legal quagmire being created. Those permits issued prior to Carroll County have begun this time-consuming, fiscally-draining process. Rather than continuing the situation the State and regulated jurisdictions should be moving in a direction which ensures efforts related to NPDES implementation and water quality improvements are realistic, rational, and with expectations which are based on sound science and smart economics. When I was preparing this, actually yesterday, $I$ was also in-between doing a little
reading to kind of take my mind away from some of these issues. And I actually was reading an issue of Earth Magazine from September 2013. And within that magazine there was a comment section written by Professor Scott Tinker, who is director of the Bureau of Economic Geology, State Geologist of Texas. His comments were geared towards the energy industry, but I think some of the things he stated in here are very pertinent to where we are at with the NPDES efforts in Maryland. And his commentary was based on this -- what he calls the radical middle.

I would like to read you a few excerpts
from that. I think it is very pertinent. He says, one thing $I$ have learned from my considerable interactions with industry, government, academia, and the public is that groups of people, each armed with different knowledge, and with the courage to leave their corners and seek compromise, often arrive at workable solutions to seemingly intractable
problems. This common ground, what I call the radical middle, is where the solution to -- he says energy challenges lie, $I$ would say water quality improvements lie.

He goes on to say, what is clear is the issue won't be addressed properly unless the principles involved, industry, political parties, academics, nongovernmental organization, and the public, come out of their respective corners, open their minds to information compromise. Compromise is not a show of weakness, because barometer of personal confidence and respect for others' views. It also reviews the intention to get things done. And, finally, the most important, I encourage all groups to leave their corners and head towards the common ground of the radical middle.

I think, personally, that is where we are at right now. We need for this whole process to step back and go to a middle so we can get these things done.

Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN CLEVENGER: Thanks, Tom.
Does anyone else wish to give public
comment?
There being no hands raised, we will
keep the public record open until September 29,
2014. If anyone here wants to submit written comments, they can do so by writing, submitting them to Ray Bahr, B-A-H-R, Maryland Department of Environment, Water Management Administration, Sediment Storm Water and Dam Safety Program, 1800 Washington Boulevard, Suite 440, Baltimore, Maryland 21230. Or you can e-mail Ray at Raymond, R-A-Y-M-O-N-D, dot Bahr, B-A-H-R, at Maryland dot gov.

You can also find additional information about the entire NPDES storm water program on the Department's web page, website. The face of it is W-W-W dot M-D-E dot state dot M-D-E dot U-S. There is a blue panel on the upper left-hand corner of the web page. Click on water and
navigate from there.
After the comment period closes, the Department will develop a response to comments document that will support our final determination to issue Carroll County's permit as final. Anyone who signed up on our audience sheet -- attendance sheet today or gave testimony will receive notices from the Department about actions that take place with regard to this permit. We will keep you apprised, in other words.

I would again like to thank Phil and Tom for having us up and everybody who came out Monday morning.

There being no other business, we can close the hearing now. Thank you.
(The hearing concluded at 10:25 a.m.)
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