# In The Matter Of:

### FREDERICK COUNTY GOVERNMENT'S MS4 PERMIT RENEWAL

\_\_\_\_\_

## PUBLIC MEETING August 28, 2014

\_\_\_\_\_

#### MERRILL LAD

1325 G Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC Phone: 800.292.4789 Fax: 202.861.3425

#### MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT

IN RE:

FREDERICK COUNTY GOVERNMENT'S MS4 PERMIT RENEWAL

PUBLIC MEETING

Frederick, Maryland

Thursday, August 28, 2014

10:00 a.m.

Job No.: 1-251521

Pages: 1 - 40

Reported by: Toni R. Thompson, RMR

	1 4 9 0 -
1	PUBLIC MEETING, held at the office of:
2	Frederick County Community Development
3	Division
4	30 North Market Street, Basement Level
5	Frederick, Maryland 21701
6	301.600.1153
7	
8	
9	Pursuant to agreement, before Toni R.
10	Thompson, RMR, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and
11	for the State of Maryland.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1		APPEARANCES
2	ON BEHALF	OF MDE
3		BRIAN CLEVENGER, HEARING OFFICER
4		MARIA WARBURTON
5		RAYMOND BAHR
6		ANDREW TAGOE
7		MICHELLE ARTHUR
8		CHRISTINA LYERLY
9	ON BEHALF	OF FREDERICK COUNTY GOVERNMENT-OSER
10		SHANNON MOORE
11		ERICA COOKE
12		DARLENE BUCCIERO
13		HEATHER MONTGOMERY
14		DANIEL SALTZBERG
15		EVELYN MICHAEL
16		SUZANNE CLIBER
17		LISA ORR
18	ON BEHALF	OF THE POTOMAC CONSERVANCY
19		AMANDA JOHN
20		CHRIS McGRAW
21	ON BEHALF	OF TROUT UNLIMITED
22		KEVIN ANDERSON
I		

1		APPEARANCES (cont'd)
2	ON BEHALF	OF THE MARYLAND STORMWATER CONSORTIUM
3		BRUCE GILMORE
4	ON BEHALF	OF CLEAN WATER ACTION
5		WILL FADELY
6	ON BEHALF	OF MARYLAND LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS
7		BRENT BOLIN
8	ON BEHALF	OF THE CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION
9		ELAINE LUTZ, ESQUIRE
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

		Page 5
1	CONTENTS	
2	OPENING REMARKS	PAGE
3	By Mr. Clevenger	6
4	PRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS	
5	By Ms. Moore	11
6	By Mr. Gilmore	23
7	By Mr. Fadely	31
8	By Ms. Lutz	32
9	By Ms. John	35
10	CLOSING REMARKS	
11	By Mr. Clevenger	38
12	ATTACHMENT	
13	Statement of Bruce A. Gilmore	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 MR. CLEVENGER: Good morning and welcome. 3 Today is Thursday, August 28th, 2014, it's about nine minutes after 10 o'clock. We're in Frederick County, Maryland, and we are going to conduct a Public 5 Hearing to take up Frederick County's Municipal 7 Separate Storm Sewer System Permit. The acronym is 8 MS4. My name is Brian Clevenger. I am the 10 Program Manager of the Maryland Department of the 11 Environment's Sediment, Stormwater and Dam Safety Program. I'll be the Hearing Officer today. 12 13 With me today from MDE, and I will 14 introduce them, is Ray Bahr to my left, who is the 15 Program Review Division Manager in the Sediment, 16 Stormwater and Dam Safety Program. Maria Warburton, 17 sitting between Ray and I, is the Permit 18 Administrator in our program. 19 Also we have Andrew Tagoe, Christina 20 Lyerly and Michelle Arthur with us as well. 21 First I'd like to thank Shannon Moore 22 from Frederick County for having us up, for setting

this room up and the hearing; Maria Warburton for

- 2 holding the Department of the Environment's end up so 3 well. And according to Maryland's Administrative Procedures Act, a tentative determination to issue this Frederick County Municipal Separate Storm Sewer 5 System, MS4 Permit, was advertised in the Frederick 7 News-Post on June 28th and June 30th, 2014. Department sent out announcements to MDE's interested 8 9 parties list and publicized the permit decision, 10 tentative determination to issue on the Department's 11 web page. 12 Anyone who signed up to speak will be 13
- given an opportunity. If you have not signed up to

  speak and wish to do so, we'll give you an opportunity

  at the end of the hearing to speak up. Also, if you

  want to be on the Department's interested parties list

  and you're not now you can sign up with us and you'll

  get notices of further actions with this, and probably

  all the other permits that we issue for MS4s.
- I have a prepared statement to read into
  the record, and after I get finished with that we'll
  call on the County to present what it wants to say,

1

1 and then we will give deference to any elected 2 officials that are here, and then the three people 3 that have suggested that they'd like to give public comment too, and the logistics of what happens next we'll talk about at the end. So I'll go ahead and 5 read this prepared statement, and then we'll go from 7 there. 8 The purpose of today's hearing is to 9 accept public comment on the MDE's tentative 10 determination to issue Frederick County an MS4 Permit. 11 This hearing is being held to honor a request submitted on July 11th, 2014, from Ms. Shannon Moore 12 13 representing Frederick County. This hearing allows 14 MDE to meet its obligation under Maryland's 15 Administrative Procedures Act. 16 For background, Maryland has been 17 delegated authority by the United States Environmental 18 Protection Agency, EPA, to administer the NPDES 19 program in the state. NPDES stands for National 20 Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. 21 Final stormwater regulations were adopted 22 by EPA in November of 1990 according to Section 402(p)

1 of the Clean Water Act. These regulations required, 2 in part, that owners of storm drain systems serving 3 populations greater than 100,000 apply for a Phase I NPDES municipal stormwater permit. Based on the 1990 Census and projections for growth, MDE designated 5 Frederick County as a Phase I municipality due to its 7 The County submitted a two-year, two-part application and was issued an initial MS4 Permit in 9 November of 1994. 10 The County's first permit laid the 11 foundation for a comprehensive approach to controlling 12 runoff. This was done by establishing necessary legal 13 authority, mapping storm drain system infrastructure, identifying sources of pollution, monitoring storm 14 15 events to characterize urban runoff, and enhancing 16 existing erosion and sediment control and stormwater 17 management programs, and establishing new programs for providing education and eliminating illegal storm 18 19 drain system discharges. This permit was reissued in 20 March 2002. For this reissued permit additional 21 requirements were included for assessing water quality 22 across the County, and for restoring 10 percent of the

County's impervious area that was not already managed 1 to the maximum extent practicable. 3 NPDES permits last for five years, and a reapplication is required to be submitted as part of 5 the County's fourth year annual report. Frederick County submitted its fourth year annual report on 7 March 8th, 2006. Since that time MDE has held numerous meetings and had many conversations with 9 individual citizens, environmental advocates, the EPA, 10 and other local government officials, including 11 Frederick County, that are affected by the MS4 Permit 12 The result of these meetings and program. 13 conversations is the draft permit that we take up 14 today. 15 Yet more significant conditions have been 16 added to this version of Frederick County's stormwater 17 permit, largely based upon EPA approved Total Maximum Daily Loads, or TMDLs, for impairments to local water 18 19 bodies within the County and for nutrients and 20 sediments in Chesapeake Bay. The most significant 21 permit condition is doubling of the impervious area 22 restoration requirement from 10 percent to 20 percent

- 1 that needs to occur within the five-year permit term.
- 2 These and all other remaining permit conditions have
- 3 been developed for abating the discharge of pollutants
- 4 from Frederick County's storm drain system and working
- 5 toward meeting the State's receiving water quality
- 6 criteria.
- 7 That ends the rather stuffy prepared
- 8 statement. So with that I will ask Shannon,
- 9 Ms. Shannon Moore of Frederick County to speak on
- 10 behalf of the County. Again, if you would like to
- 11 speak and you haven't signed our sign-up sheet please
- do so. We just had someone come in just recently, so
- if you want to speak let us know and we'll give you
- 14 another chance.
- 15 Shannon.
- MS. MOORE: Thank you, Brian. And thank
- 17 you for everyone who's here today. I appreciate your
- 18 dedication to the environment in Frederick County, as
- 19 well as all the areas that it drains to. And I've
- worked with many of you in the past, and I look
- 21 forward to working with you as we move forward with
- these challenges together in the future.

1 I wanted to just briefly update you about 2 Frederick County's MS4 Permit. Here's a couple of maps that we've done of restoration areas and 3 pollutant loadings. And I'm going to break my presentation down into three categories: One being 5 about Frederick County, the second one being an 7 overview of our current programs with a highlight on our budgeting and restoration efforts, and then the 9 third being some brief comments on the tentative 10 determination. 11 Just about Frederick County. It's 12 approximately 664 square miles and it has 1400 miles 13 of stream that go through five state watersheds, and 14 those include the Lower Monocacy and the Upper 15 Monocacy River, Catoctin Creek, Double Pipe Creek and 16 the Potomac River. 17 Our staff has subdivided those watersheds 18 into 20 smaller NPDES management units, and then 19 we've broken those down further into smaller branches 20 and catchments, and we do a lot of our loading 21 estimates and restoration work at the catchment 22 level.

1 The County is 35 percent forest, 58 2 percent agriculture, but only 5 percent urban. Most 3 of our urban land is within the municipalities and not the MS4. The non-municipal urban population as of August 1st, 2014, is 81,889. 5 The County has distinct places ranging 7 from small rural communities to more developed areas and has no ultra urban areas. Brian went over the list of our NPDES 10 requirements, so I'm not going to duplicate that. But suffice to say our existing NPDES Permit has a 11 12 substantial amount of work in monitoring, mapping, 13 identification and correction of impairments, and it 14 includes a requirement to reduce 10 percent of the 15 untreated urban impervious area in the County. 16 We also have a robust program to identify 17 and correct elicit discharges, as Heather Montgomery 18 knows, and we do a great deal of public education and 19 outreach, including the coordination of the Monocacy and Catoctin Watershed Alliance. We comply with 20 sediment erosion control regulations and we have 21 22 provided adequate funding.

1 On the financing and funding side, I 2 wanted to go over some financial items. Some of these I think may be a surprise to you, some of them 3 will not. 4 5 Frederick County is in compliance with the State's HB 987, the requirement to create a 6 7 stormwater utility financing mechanism, and that currently generates \$488 on average per year and is 8 9 assessed at a one penny rate. However, the majority 10 of the NPDES MS4 program is not funded through this 11 fee. In fact this fee has not been utilized yet. 12 The average cost of the permit execution 13 over the past ten years before FY 14 was \$2.5 million 14 The FY 14 budget was \$3.6 million, and the 15 current FY 15 budget is estimated at \$5.35 million. 16 And the reason why I say estimated is because there 17 are some budgets that are directly within our control that are broken out completely, and others where we 18 19 have to take a portion of other budgets from the 20 County, such as for erosion and sediment control and 21 street sweeping. 22 That last cost that we have there on the

1 table is the cost of the next MS4 Permit, and we're 2 currently in the process of finalizing our cost estimates on that permit but that order of magnitude 3 is about correct. So our estimate again is not 5 complete. As far as watershed planning and 7 restoration, which is one of our major activities, we're required to identify problems in watershed assessments and then develop a list of candidate 9 10 solutions to those problems. And we've completed 11 assessments for Ballenger, Lower Bush Creek, Lower 12 Linganore Creek, Bennett Creek, Upper Monocacy and 13 Lower Monocacy River watersheds, which is about 60 14 percent of the county. 15 The solutions are developed as part of 16 stream restoration and stormwater management facility 17 retrofit assessments, in addition to in many instances those watershed assessments. We've 18 19 conducted those for Ballenger, Lower Bush, Linganore 20 and Bennett. Those are not required by the permit, 21 but they are necessary to take projects through the 22 feasibility phase for project development.

1	Just some background about our watershed
2	assessments. In 2012 EPA recognized us as having one
3	of the four best watershed assessments in the nation
4	for the Lower Monocacy River. And also in 2012 we
5	had an inspection by EPA Region 3 of Frederick
6	County's MS4 compliance program, and some of the
7	things that they noted were the excellence of
8	Frederick County's GIS program, our robust program to
9	sample elicit discharges, the strength of our
10	watershed assessment program, and our public access
11	of permitting and inspection data.
12	In 2013 our MDE review of the MS4 Permit
13	states that the County is congratulated for its
13 14	states that the County is congratulated for its continued endeavors and commitment to the
	-
14	continued endeavors and commitment to the
14 15	continued endeavors and commitment to the implementation of the municipal stormwater program.
14 15 16	continued endeavors and commitment to the implementation of the municipal stormwater program.  And they noted two items in particular; one being the
14 15 16 17	continued endeavors and commitment to the implementation of the municipal stormwater program.  And they noted two items in particular; one being the completion of the restoration goal in the permit,
14 15 16 17 18	continued endeavors and commitment to the implementation of the municipal stormwater program.  And they noted two items in particular; one being the completion of the restoration goal in the permit, and, two, being maintenance of adequate budget.
14 15 16 17 18	continued endeavors and commitment to the implementation of the municipal stormwater program.  And they noted two items in particular; one being the completion of the restoration goal in the permit, and, two, being maintenance of adequate budget.  The goal that we currently have in the

currently -- the accounting standards for that kind 1 2 of hinge between early accounting prior to 2011 when 3 the accounting for stormwater requirements were developed and then post 2011, and then most recently we have a new guidance that was published in August 5 for how to account for those projects. 7 These projects include 125 acres of capital improvement projects, 129 acres of projects 8 9 completed by our Watershed Alliance Partners --10 several of you in the room have contributed to these 11 and we thank you greatly -- 55 acres of street 12 sweeping, and 413 acres of community restoration 13 projects sponsored through our office with our 14 partners. 15 Just a couple of examples of projects 16 that we've done that are capital. One is the 17 Ballenger Creek Stream Restoration Project. That one 18 restored the channel at the Ballenger Creek 19 Elementary School and provided multiple benefits 20 through coordinations with Frederick County Public Schools, our Division of Utilities and Solid Waste 21 22 Management, Parks. We stabilized banks, reduced

sediment, removed debris jams in the stream. 1 2 protected the sewer line from the stream. We created an area for the Ballenger Creek Trail and saved Parks 3 from having to install a pedestrian bridge to the tune of about \$415,000, and we improved habitat for 5 fish, birds and other organisms. 7 Pay attention to the picture on the bottom left. That's the before, that's the 8 immediately after, and that's after it started to 9 10 grow up. 11 We've also done at Urbana High School 12 stormwater retrofit. That was a bioretention type 13 project. We partnered with Frederick County Public 14 Schools on that. We treated -- the existing 15 stormwater pond treated for volume, but not quality. 16 We constructed bioretention facilities in the 17 courtyard and the bus lot to treat for quality. The facilities look like a landscaping feature, and we 18 also provided porous pavers at the emergency exits 19 20 which the school was very pleased about. 21 And so on the bottom left again is the 22 before picture in front of the pond, and then

immediately following it after the construction of 1 2 it. 3 Another project that I wanted to call your attention to is the Linganore Stream Restoration 4 Capital Improvement Project. This picture here on 5 the right is candidate sites for restoration from the 7 Linganore watershed's restoration and retrofit assessment, and then on the upper right-hand corner 8 9 is a detail from that assessment that showed 10 restoration opportunities. We do have a lot of these 11 kinds of publications and we are happy to share them 12 with you. Many of them are at the Watershed Alliance 13 website at www.watershed-alliance.com. 14 So in this particular project we selected 15 the Pinecliff Park Stream Restoration Project. We 16 addressed the degrading stream, sediment and nutrient 17 pollution, and we coordinated with Parks to protect 18 their assets, as well as a main water line and a road 19 cover. So that's kind of an overview of some of 20 21 the highlights of our program. There are many other

areas that we work in, but I thought it would be

22

1 important for us to talk about those because I think that that's an area where the County has spent a significant amount of work and maybe people are not 3 aware of it. 5 Some general comments on the tentative 6 determination. The first general category is in the 7 area of maximum extent practicability. The Clean Water Act, Section 402(p)(3)(b)(iii), establishes MEP 8 9 as a legal compliance standard for MS4 Permits. And 10 MDE has included MEP references in Parts III, IV.D., 11 IV.E. and VII of the draft permit that appropriately 12 reflect the MEP legal compliance standard. 13 We are finalizing our analysis of the 14 maximum extent practicable to execute the draft 15 permit and will commit to programs that are 16 determined in the analysis to be practicable. 17 concerned that some terms may not be achievable due to cost scheduling or other issues. 18 19 And I want to note that we're not alone 20 in having some of those concerns. I recently heard a 21 presentation from Bob Hoyt of Montgomery County to

the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

22

1 where he presented to Secretary Summers, and also 2 Nicholas DiPasquale, who is the head of the 3 Chesapeake Bay Program, and he was concerned that Montgomery County was not going to be able to meet its 20 percent retrofit within its permit term, and 5 so we echo the concerns of many other jurisdictions 7 on this particular item. 8 Part III of the draft permit states that implementation of Parts IV through VII will 9 10 constitute adequate progress towards water quality 11 standards compliance. Water quality standards are a 12 big issue for all of us. The County submits that 13 there's no legal requirement that an MS4 Permit 14 include any references to water quality standards or 15 TMDL wasteload allocations, but can support this 16 language as a reasonable compromise that has been 17 used elsewhere in Region 3, for example in the 2012 18 MS4 Permit issued to the District of Columbia. 19 We also have concerns that some of the 20 tests in the draft permit may be impossible to 21 accomplish even with unlimited funding and time, and 22 an example of that is the draft permit requires that

- 1 the County develop a litter and floatables program
- 2 with the goal of elimination of these materials.
- 3 Eliminating litter and floatables will never occur,
- 4 regardless of the County's efforts to address the
- 5 issue. And it's kind of similar to the issue of
- 6 policing where you are never able to completely
- 7 eliminate crime.
- 8 So my last comment is that Frederick
- 9 County has met its commitment under its current MS4
- 10 program, has more than doubled its program resources
- in anticipation of the next MS4 Permit, and is
- 12 committed to executing the draft permit to the
- 13 maximum extent practicable.
- So thank you very much, and I appreciate
- 15 your time today.
- MR. CLEVENGER: Thanks, Shannon.
- 17 At this time are there any elected
- 18 officials present that would like to speak?
- No one did, so we'll go with the three
- 20 speakers that have signed up. Actually it's only
- 21 two.
- Bruce Gilmore. Bruce, if you would

- 1 identify yourself and your affiliation, your
- 2 organization you're with, please.
- 3 MR. GILMORE: Yes, my name is Bruce
- 4 Gilmore, B-r-u-c-e G-i-l-m-o-r-e. I am associated
- 5 with as an advocate, stormwater abatement or a
- 6 stormwater management advocacy effort on behalf of
- 7 several nonprofit groups. They include the Anacostia
- 8 Watershed Society, and I am the coordinator for
- 9 Maryland Stormwater Consortium.
- 10 I'm here today to present a statement on
- 11 behalf of the Consortium, and as I had indicated to
- 12 Mr. Bahr last evening as I went to copy my statement
- and the attachment my abilities as a IT person were
- 14 revealed. And so I'm going to have to provide a
- 15 clear copy of the statement and the attachment. And
- so Mr. Bahr in turn very kindly informed me that if I
- 17 were to stop by tomorrow I would find the office
- 18 closed, and so I therefore have rescheduled my visit
- 19 and I will send something electronically to our
- transcriber also and then I'll provide a hard copy
- 21 care of Mr. Bahr. So that's my mea culpa for the
- 22 hearing.

1 MR. CLEVENGER: Ray's a nice guy, so 2 he'll be able to accommodate you. 3 MR. GILMORE: He is a very nice guy. Without exception the folks at MDE are nice people. 4 5 MR. CLEVENGER: You should ask around, by 6 the way, about that. 7 MR. GILMORE: Some of them used to work for my alma matter, the Department of Natural 8 9 Resources. That was a long time ago. 10 Okay. Let me see if I can get through 11 the statement. There are ten large Maryland counties 12 in Baltimore City for which Phase II MS4 Permits have 13 been issued for more than ten years. Actually there 14 is also a permit issued for the State Highway 15 Administration. 16 These same jurisdictions have substantial 17 population, have had substantial population growth 18 and the accompanying residential and commercial 19 development. Unfortunately for these same 20 jurisdictions stormwater runoff is a continuing 21 source of pollution and waterway damage. Frederick

County is among these jurisdictions that has severe

22

1 stormwater runoff problems which need to be abated. 2 Notice that I said abated, I didn't say 3 solved forever. Frederick County, like the nine other large Maryland jurisdictions, has the opportunity 5 through the reissuance of a strong MS4 Permit under 7 consideration today to restore its waterways to a level where its citizens can use them for enhanced 9 economic and recreational opportunities. In Maryland 10 clean water drives better health and recreation and 11 the resulting economic opportunity. An example of this is the total annual \$3 billion benefit of 12 13 recreational boating and fishing on Maryland state 14 and local economies. A good MS4 Permit vigorously 15 implemented will result in less stormwater borne 16 pollution and beneficially affect both the county's 17 waterways and Chesapeake Bay. 18 As the fact sheet accompanied the release 19 of this draft permit sets out, and as Ms. Moore 20 emphasized, Frederick County covers an area of 644 square miles and has approximately 250 major 21 22 outfalls. These outfalls, which are pipes or other

conveyances into which stormwater empties, discharge 1 2 polluted stormwater and substantial volumes into the Upper Potomac River Basin, which is one of the ten 3 major basins, one of the ten major tributaries to 5 Chesapeake Bay. Several stream segments in the Basin are adversely affected by fecal bacteria, sediments 7 and nutrients. TMDLs have been approved and wasteload allocations established for portions of Catoctin Creek, Double Pipe Creek, and the Lower and 10 Upper Monocacy River. These stormwater pollution 11 diets are very important, and the MS4 Permit is 12 critical toward meeting them. 13 The Maryland Stormwater Consortium 14 commends the Maryland Department of the Environment 15 for the work it has done to issue more complete draft 16 MS4 Permits to address the growing impact of 17 stormwater runoff. These more complete permit 18 iterations now contain a more specific text to 19 restore in each five-year term 20 percent of the 20 impervious cover, a clear statement that the permit 21 is the backbone to achieving the Chesapeake Bay WIP 22 and TMDL requirements, and the clear requirements to

track any stormwater plan waivers and implementation 1 2 of the Maryland Stormwater Management Act of 2007. 3 The Consortium now would like to present proposed changes to the Frederick County MS4 Permit 4 which will add to its completeness and strength. 5 These recommendations, if adopted, will result in a 7 permit of greater enforceability, accountability and high benefit to cost analysis for implementation. 8 9 Included with the statement are the recommended language changes which we hope will be adopted. 10 11 I now will review them for the record. 12 This whole packet will be introduced into the record 13 and then a better packet will be forthcoming. 14 Water Quality Standards. Frederick 15 County must be required to manage, implement and 16 enforce programs, plans and practices in this permit 17 which eliminate non-stormwater discharges into the 18 MS4, and eliminate pollutants in stormwater 19 discharges from the MS4. Compliance with these 20 requirements in Parts IV through VII of the permit 21 will constitute compliance by the county of the Clean 22 Water Act.

1 Restoration Plans, also known as TMDL 2 implementation plans. The permit should require 3 Frederick County to prepare plans as enforceable permit requirements to implement approved TMDL and 4 wasteload allocations with compliance schedules 5 containing the final date for meeting the applicable 7 WLA and interim milestones and numeric benchmarks. These deadlines and requirements must be consistent 8 9 with the Chesapeake Bay TMDL and the WIP. 10 Impervious Surface Restoration. 11 permit should require as part of the 20 percent 12 impervious surface restoration the use of an 13 environmental site design, unless it can show the 14 infeasibility for its use. At least 1 inch of 15 stormwater from a 24-hour storm must be retained on 16 site. 17 Maintenance, No. 4, Maintenance. permit must require the County to establish within a 18 19 set time frame a maintenance plan for county owned 20 and operated maintenance facilities, and other 21 facilities. 22 Monitoring, No. 5. The permit must

- 1 require the county within two years of the effective
- 2 date to establish a monitoring program sufficient to
- 3 assess compliance with all the provisions of the
- 4 permit, including TMDL restoration plans.
- 5 6. Public Participation in Restoration
- 6 Plans and Stormwater Management Programs. The permit
- 7 must require that public participation plans for
- 8 restoration and stormwater management programs
- 9 include any requested public hearing and continual
- 10 public outreach and public input into such plans and
- 11 30-day comment periods.
- 12 7. Maximum Extent Practicable. The
- permit should require that all stormwater discharges
- 14 to the MS4 be controlled to the maximum extent
- 15 practicable, and that periodic evaluations by MDE be
- 16 undertaken to assure such control is being met.
- 17 8. Other Management Programs. The
- 18 permit should require that exemptions under the
- 19 Stormwater Management Act of 2007 should be
- 20 justified, and that the associated pollutant loads
- 21 resulting from such granted exemptions be identified
- 22 and justified.

1 9. Completion of the Local Code Changes 2 So As Not to Block the Use of Environmental Site 3 The permit should be amended to require the new County government to change local land use and other ordinances within two years, to remove any 5 impediments to the use of the ESD and to the 7 implementation of the 2007 Stormwater Management Act. 8 The Maryland Stormwater Consortium urges 9 MDE to adopt these recommended changes during the 10 period of time after today's public hearing and the 11 issuance of the final permit text. We accompany our 12 request with our commitment to assist both MDE and 13 Frederick County in the full implementation of the 14 permit, particularly in reaching out to citizens for 15 their participation. We greatly appreciate the 16 opportunity to present our views at this public 17 hearing. 18 I'm going to introduce this flawed 19 statement, if I may, and I promise a better iteration 20 thereto. 21 Thank you. 22 MR. CLEVENGER: Mr. Gilmore submitted the

1 statement that he read from. Thanks, Bruce. 2 MR. GILMORE: Thank you. 3 MR. CLEVENGER: William Fadely. I hope I 4 pronounced that right. 5 MR. FADELY: Yep. My name is William Fadely and I'm from 6 7 Clean Water Action. We just want to take the opportunity to thank you guys today for the 9 opportunity to come here and having the meeting and 10 giving us an opportunity to speak. I'm not going to 11 be nearly as long as Bruce or nearly detailed. 12 Clean Water Action would just like to 13 advocate for the value and significance of a robust 14 MS4 Permit for Frederick County. We just want to 15 echo and support the Consortium's proposed changes to 16 the Frederick County MS4 Permit, which will add to 17 its completeness and strength. Like Bruce said, the recommendations if adopted will result in a permit of 18 19 greater enforceability, accountability and a higher 20 benefit to the cost for implementation. 21 Thanks. 22 MR. CLEVENGER: Thanks, William.

MR. FADELY: Thanks. 1 2 MR. CLEVENGER: I'm still writing what you just said. 3 Now, it's not clear whether these two 4 others but we'll call you anyway. Chris McGraw? 5 Don't want to? No, okay. Thanks. And Kevin 7 Anderson? 8 MR. ANDERSON: No testimony, thanks. 9 MR. CLEVENGER: No? Okay. 10 So that's it for those who signed it. 11 Anybody else? Elaine? Okay, we'll get to you next. 12 MS. LUTZ: Thanks for accepting these 13 comments. My name is Elaine Lutz, staff attorney 14 Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and my comments will be 15 brief and broad, and we'll be submitting more 16 detailed comments by the end of the formal comment 17 period. 18 Generally what we've been seeking in 19 Frederick County, and other counties subject to the 20 MS4 Permit, is greater accountability, transparency 21 and reassurances of progress, both for the County and 22 then the public and other stakeholders. And the way

we think that those goals are achievable is by 1 2 providing some deadlines and numeric benchmarks, or other interim status updates, for how the County is 3 proceeding over the five-year permit term. Federal and state law does require that when compliance 5 cannot be made within a year, which I think everyone fully understands that 20 percent restoration cannot be done within a year, the law does then require such 9 benchmarks and interim milestones to track progress 10 towards compliance. 11 On the 20 percent restoration, the 12 effectiveness of that number for reaching a, well, 13 any water quality standards or local or abated TMDLs 14 has not really been shown, and we are concerned that 15 at the end of five years this enormous undertaking of 16 20 percent restoration could be accomplished while 17 still being very far from clean waters in local 18 waters and in the Bay. 19 Then that takes me to my third point. 20 The monitoring we feel is not sufficient to 21 demonstrate water quality improvements across the 22 county, and to that point at the end of five years

and all this money and time spent in restoration, if 1 2 we cannot demonstrate that the results are taking us where we need to be then it's going to be impossible 3 to correct the course to get to wasteload allocations required under the Bay TMDL, and then many local 5 streams and rivers in Frederick County that have their own separate TMDLs, which he we think is equally important and required goal of the MS4 9 Permits. It's not just to reach the Bay TMDL, but 10 also the local TMDLs. And if the restoration plans 11 that guide these, this 20 percent restoration are 12 being done outside of public process but then putting 13 certain terms into the permit, that should be a major 14 modification that requires public participation, 15 comments and review. 16 For instance, if a restoration plan is 17 only addressing one watershed, then I think that stakeholders in another watershed would be interested 18 to see how that restoration plan is going to affect 19 20 their local waters when it's not being addressed. 21 So there are a couple of broad-view 22 points that we'll be elaborating on in some formal

- 1 comments. But basically the general goal I think for
- 2 the County, for CBF and for other stakeholders is to
- 3 be sure that we are making efficient and rapid
- 4 progress towards wasteload allocations in local and
- 5 Bay TMDLs, and we're just not confident that this
- 6 current iteration of the permit allows all these
- 7 parties to know what the goals are, know how to
- 8 achieve them, and determine whether they're being
- 9 reached.
- 10 So that's all I'll say for now. Thank
- 11 you.
- MR. CLEVENGER: Thanks, Elaine.
- And finally -- I'm sorry, I don't know
- 14 your name.
- MS. JOHN: Thank you. My name is Amanda
- John and I'm a Policy Manager for Potomac
- 17 Conservancy.
- 18 I wanted to say thank you to Shannon
- 19 Moore of Frederick County for calling this public
- 20 meeting today and for MDE for hosting. I think it's
- 21 really important to continue the public comment
- opportunities moving forward as the MS4 process

continues as we near final determination. 1 2 submit formal comments by the close of the formal 3 comment period, but I will just make a few brief comments and add that we support the previous statements from the Maryland Stormwater Consortium 5 6 and Chesapeake Bay Foundation. 7 Specifically, I would just like to request on behalf of the Potomac Conservancy and many 8 9 of our partners that MDE expeditiously work with 10 Frederick County to review the cost assessment of 11 this MS4 Permit. Previous efforts between the County 12 and MDE to determine discrepancies between the total 13 cost of the WIP implementation definitely slowed down 14 the process for stakeholder engagement and public 15 input. As the County finalizes its assessment I 16 would encourage MDE to meet them at the table and 17 look at the Maryland assessment and scenario tool to 18 seek the greatest amount of performance-based BMP 19 modeling, to seek the greatest cost effective 20 implementation planning around the MS4 20 percent 21 retrofit. 22 In terms of Frederick County's assessment

of ESD maximum extent practicability, I would also 1 note that Bruce's recommendation to encourage 3 biannual review of local codes and ordinances that create barriers to the implementation to environmental site design be included in the upcoming 5 permit. We have recently completed an assessment 7 with the Center for Watershed Protection of all nine Maryland counties within the Potomac Watershed to 8 9 review codified barriers to environmental site 10 design. We have a suite of 12 recommendations coming 11 out of our review of Frederick County's local codes 12 and ordinances with the complete cooperation of the 13 County's Planning Department for access to their 14 local codes, and we would like to see that the permit 15 encourage full adoption and removal of these barriers 16 that were completed with the Center for Watershed 17 Protection's patented codes and ordinance worksheet. 18 Frederick County is the second fastest 19 growing county in the State of Maryland. I think 20 there's a notable point about only 5 percent urban in 21 the MS4 area, but I think as we see growth in 22 population, and in the last few years there have been

1 22 large rezonings of agricultural properties, we 2 will also be seeing an increase in impervious surface as the infrastructure in roads and sewer lines will 3 need to accommodate the rapid rate of development. So I would encourage the full adoption of 5 6 the previous recommendations from the Maryland 7 Stormwater Consortium and from Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and we will be submitting more 9 comprehensive recommendations before the end of the 10 final comment period. MR. CLEVENGER: Thanks, Amanda. 11 12 Anybody else like to speak? 13 So everyone knows -- Bruce, you'll have 14 some time to submit your formal, you know, cleaned-up 15 copy. The public record is going to remain open 16 until the 29th of next month, September 29th, 2014. 17 You can submit any formal comments up until then to Ray Bahr, Maryland Department of the Environment, 18 19 Water Management Administration, Sediment, Stormwater 20 and Dam Safety Program. Our address is 1800 21 Washington Boulevard, Suite 440, Baltimore, Maryland, 22 21230. Ray's e-mail is Raymond.Bahr@Maryland.gov,

1 R-a-y-m-o-n-d.B-a-h-r@Maryland.gov. You can also get more information about 2 3 the general MS4 program and individual permits, evaluations, prior annual reports on the department's web page at www.mde.state.md.us. 5 After the comment period closes we will 7 develop a response to the comments we've received today and in writing until the 28th of September, and 9 that will be the basis of our final determination to 10 issue the Frederick County's permit. 11 Everyone that's here and signed up on the 12 interested parties -- again we've only got a few 13 If you want to be on the interested parties names. 14 list if you're not already please sign up. You'll 15 get notice of all the actions that we take subsequent 16 to this hearing, so keep that in mind. 17 I'd like to thank Shannon again and Toni for taking note of everything we uttered today, thank 18 19 you very much. If there's nothing else, then we can

MERRILL DEPOSITION SERVICES

(The public hearing concluded at 10:55

close the hearing formally. Thanks.

20

21

22

a.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER-NOTARY PUBLIC
I, Toni R. Thompson, RMR, Court Reporter,
the officer before whom the foregoing proceedings was
taken, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript
is a true and correct record of the proceedings; that
said proceedings were taken by me stenographically and
thereafter reduced to typewriting under my
supervision; and that I am neither counsel for,
related to, nor employed by any of the parties to this
case and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in
its outcome.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my
hand and affixed my notarial seal this 5th day of
September 2014.
My Commission Expires:
January 18, 2017
NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR
THE STATE OF MARYLAND

	İ	I	I
	Act	advocate	announcements
abated	7:4 8:15 9:1 20:8 27:2	23:5 31:13	7:8
25:1,2 33:13	27:22 29:19 30:7	advocates	annual
abatement	Action	10:9	10:5,6 25:12 39:4
23:5	4:4 31:7,12	affect	anticipation
abating	actions	25:16 34:19	22:11
11:3	7:18 39:15	affiliation	Anybody
abilities	activities	23:1	32:11 38:12
23:13	15:7	affixed	anyway
able	add	40:15	32:5
21:4 22:6 24:2	27:5 31:16 36:4	Agency	applicable
accept	added	8:18	28:6
8:9	10:16	ago	application
accepting	addition	24:9	9:8
32:12	15:17	agreement	apply
access	additional	2:9	9:3
16:10 37:13	9:20	agricultural	appreciate
accommodate	address	38:1	11:17 22:14 30:15
24:2 38:4	22:4 26:16 38:20	agriculture	approach
	addressed	13:2	9:11
accompanied 25:18	19:16 34:20	ahead	appropriately
	addressing	8:5	20:11
accompany	34:17	Alliance	approved
30:11	adequate	13:20 17:9 19:12	10:17 26:7 28:4
accompanying	13:22 16:18 21:10	allocations	approximately
24:18	administer	21:15 26:8 28:5 34:4	12:12 25:21
accomplish	8:18	35:4	area
21:21	Administration	allows	10:1,21 13:15 16:21
accomplished	24:15 38:19	8:13 35:6	18:3 20:2,7 25:20
33:16	Administrative	alma	37:21
account	7:3 8:15	24:8	areas
17:6	Administrator	Amanda	11:19 12:3 13:7,8
accountability	6:18	3:19 35:15 38:11	19:22
27:7 31:19 32:20	adopt	amended	Arthur
accounting	30:9	30:3	3:7 6:20
17:1,2,3		amount	
achievable	<b>adopted</b> 8:21 27:6,10 31:18	13:12 20:3 36:18	assess 29:3
20:17 33:1	· ·		
achieve	adoption	Anacostia	assessed
35:8	37:15 38:5	23:7	14:9
achieving	adversely	analysis	assessing
26:21	26:6	20:13,16 27:8	9:21
acres	advertised	Anderson	assessment
16:22 17:7,8,11,12	7:6	3:22 32:7,8	16:10 19:8,9 36:10,15
acronym	advocacy	Andrew	36:17,22 37:6
6:7	23:6	3:6 6:19	assessments
		l	

15:9,11,17,18 16:2,3	9:4 10:17	BMP	budgeting
assets	Basement	36:18	12:8
19:18	2:4	boating	budgets
assist	basically	25:13	14:17,19
30:12	35:1	Bob	bus
associated	Basin	20:21	18:17
23:4 29:20	26:3,5	bodies	Bush
assure	basins	10:19	15:11,19
29:16	26:4	BOLIN	B-r-u-c-e
attachment	basis	4:7	23:4
	39:9	borne	23:4
5:12 23:13,15			C
attention	Bay	25:15	$\frac{c}{c}$
18:7 19:4	4:8 10:20 21:3 25:17	bottom	3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1
attorney	26:5,21 28:9 32:14	18:8,21	call
32:13	33:18 34:5,9 35:5	Boulevard	7:22 19:3 32:5
August	36:6 38:7	38:21	
1:13 6:3 13:5 17:5	behalf	branches	calling
authority	3:2,9,18,21 4:2,4,6,8	12:19	35:19
8:17 9:13	11:10 23:6,11 36:8	break	candidate
average	benchmarks	12:4	15:9 19:6
14:8,12	28:7 33:2,9	BRENT	capital
aware	beneficially	4:7	17:8,16 19:5
20:4	25:16	Brian	care
a.m	benefit	3:3 6:9 11:16 13:9	23:21
1:14 39:22	25:12 27:8 31:20	bridge	case
	benefits	18:4	40:12
B	17:19	brief	catchment
backbone	Bennett	12:9 32:15 36:3	12:21
26:21	15:12,20	briefly	catchments
background	best	12:1	12:20
8:16 16:1	16:3	broad	categories
bacteria	better	32:15	12:5
26:6	25:10 27:13 30:19	broad-view	category
Bahr	biannual	34:21	20:6
3:5 6:14 23:12,16,21	37:3	broken	Catoctin
38:18	big	12:19 14:18	12:15 13:20 26:9
Ballenger	21:12	Bruce	CBF
15:11,19 17:17,18	billion	4:3 5:13 22:22,22 23:3	35:2
18:3	25:12	31:1,11,17 38:13	Census
Baltimore	bioretention	Bruce's	9:5
24:12 38:21	18:12,16	37:2	Center
banks	birds	BUCCIERO	37:7,16
17:22	18:6	3:12	certain
barriers	Block	budget	34:13
37:4,9,15		C	<b>CERTIFICATE</b>
based	30:2	14:14,15 16:18	40:2
Naisea.		l	.0.2

	ı	Ī	ı
certify	CLOSING	completeness	constitute
40:6	5:10	27:5 31:17	21:10 27:21
challenges	Code	completion	constructed
11:22	30:1	16:17 30:1	18:16
chance	codes	compliance	construction
11:14	37:3,11,14,17	14:5 16:6 20:9,12	19:1
change	codified	21:11 27:19,21 28:5	contain
30:4	37:9	29:3 33:5,10	26:18
changes	Columbia	comply	containing
27:4,10 30:1,9 31:15	21:18	13:20	28:6
channel	come	comprehensive	continual
17:18	11:12 31:9	9:11 38:9	29:9
characterize	coming	compromise	continue
9:15	37:10	21:16	35:21
Chesapeake	commends	concerned	continued
4:8 10:20 21:3 25:17	26:14	20:17 21:3 33:14	16:14
26:5,21 28:9 32:14	comment	concerns	continues
36:6 38:7	8:4,9 22:8 29:11 32:16	20:20 21:6,19	36:1
Chris	35:21 36:3 38:10	concluded	continuing
3:20 32:5	39:6	39:21	24:20
Christina	comments	condition	contributed
3:8 6:19	5:4 12:9 20:5 32:13,14	10:21	17:10
citizens	32:16 34:15 35:1	conditions	control
10:9 25:8 30:14	36:2,4 38:17 39:7	10:15 11:2	9:16 13:21 14:17,20
City	commercial	conduct	29:16
24:12	24:18	6:5	controlled
clean	Commission	conducted	29:14
4:4 9:1 20:7 25:10	40:17	15:19	controlling
27:21 31:7,12 33:17	commit	confident	9:11
cleaned-up	20:15	35:5	cont'd
38:14	commitment	congratulated	4:1
clear	16:14 22:9 30:12	16:13	conversations
23:15 26:20,22 32:4	committed	Conservancy	10:8,13
Clevenger	22:12	3:18 35:17 36:8	conveyances
3:3 5:3,11 6:2,9 22:16	communities	CONSERVATION	26:1
24:1,5 30:22 31:3,22	13:7	4:6	COOKE
32:2,9 35:12 38:11	community	consideration	3:11
CLIBER	2:2 17:12	25:7	cooperation
3:16	complete	consistent	37:12
close	15:5 26:15,17 37:12	28:8	coordinated
36:2 39:20	completed	Consortium	19:17
closed	15:10 16:21 17:9 37:6	4:2 23:9,11 26:13 27:3	coordination
23:18	37:16	30:8 36:5 38:7	13:19
closes	completely	Consortium's	coordinations
39:6	14:18 22:6	31:15	17:20

coordinator	courtyard	deadlines	2:2 15:22 24:19 38:4
23:8	18:17	28:8 33:2	diets
copy	cover	deal	26:11
23:12,15,20 38:15	19:19 26:20	13:18	DiPasquale
corner	covers	debris	21:2
19:8	25:20	18:1	directly
correct	create	decision	14:17
13:17 15:4 34:4 40:7	14:6 37:4	7:9	discharge
correction	created	dedication	8:20 11:3 26:1
13:13	18:2	11:18	discharges
cost	Creek	deference	9:19 13:17 16:9 27:17
14:12,22 15:1,2 20:18	12:15,15 15:11,12,12	8:1	27:19 29:13
27:8 31:20 36:10,13	17:17,18 18:3 26:9,9	definitely	discrepancies
36:19	crime	36:13	36:12
	22:7		distinct
Council		degrading	
20:22	criteria	19:16	13:6
counsel	11:6	delegated	District
40:10	critical	8:17	21:18
counties	26:12	demonstrate	Division
24:11 32:19 37:8	culpa	33:21 34:2	2:3 6:15 17:21
county	23:21	Department	Double
1:7 2:2 3:9 6:4,22 7:5	current	1:2 6:10 7:2,8 24:8	12:15 26:9
7:22 8:10,13 9:6,7,22	12:7 14:15 22:9 35:6	26:14 37:13 38:18	doubled
10:6,11,19 11:9,10	currently	department's	22:10
11:18 12:6,11 13:1,6	14:8 15:2 16:19,20	7:10,16 39:4	doubling
13:15 14:5,20 15:14	17:1	design	10:21
16:13 17:20 18:13		28:13 30:3 37:5,10	draft
20:2,21 21:4,12 22:1	D	designated	10:13 20:11,14 21:8
22:9 24:22 25:4,20	D	9:5	21:20,22 22:12 25:19
27:4,15,21 28:3,18	6:1	detail	26:15
28:19 29:1 30:4,13	Daily	19:9	drain
31:14,16 32:19,21	10:18	detailed	9:2,13,19 11:4
33:3,22 34:6 35:2,19	Dam	31:11 32:16	drains
36:10,11,15 37:18,19	6:11,16 38:20	determination	11:19
county's	damage	7:4,10 8:10 12:10 20:6	drives
6:6 9:10 10:1,5,16	24:21	36:1 39:9	25:10
11:4 12:2 16:6,8	DANIEL	determine	due
22:4 25:16 36:22	3:14	35:8 36:12	9:6 20:17
37:11,13 39:10	DARLENE	determined	duplicate
couple	3:12	20:16	13:10
12:2 17:15 34:21	data	develop	
course	16:11	15:9 22:1 39:7	E
34:4	date	developed	$\overline{\mathbf{E}}$
Court	28:6 29:2	11:3 13:7 15:15 17:4	3:1,1 4:1,1 5:1 6:1,1
2:10 40:4	day	development	early
<b>∠.</b> 10 ⊤0.⊤	40:15	actopinent	17:2
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

echo	36:16 37:2,15 38:5	9:12,17	facilities
21:6 31:15	endeavors	estimate	18:16,18 28:20,21
economic	16:14	15:4	facility
25:9,11	ends	estimated	15:16
economies	11:7	14:15,16	fact
25:14	enforce	estimates	14:11 25:18
education	27:16	12:21 15:3	Fadely
9:18 13:18	enforceability	evaluations	4:5 5:7 31:3,5,6 32:1
effective	27:7 31:19	29:15 39:4	far
29:1 36:19	enforceable	EVELYN	15:6 33:17
effectiveness	28:3	3:15	fastest
33:12	engagement	evening	37:18
efficient	36:14	23:12	feasibility
35:3	enhanced	events	15:22
effort	25:8	9:15	feature
23:6	enhancing	example	18:18
efforts	9:15	21:17,22 25:11	fecal
12:8 22:4 36:11	enormous	examples	26:6
elaborating	33:15	17:15	Federal
34:22	environment	excellence	33:4
Elaine	1:2 11:18 26:14 38:18	16:7	fee
4:9 32:11,13 35:12	environmental	exception	14:11,11
elected	8:17 10:9 28:13 30:2	24:4	feel
8:1 22:17	37:5,9	execute	33:20
electronically	Environment's	20:14	final
23:19	6:11 7:2	executing	8:21 28:6 30:11 36:1
Elementary	EPA	22:12	38:10 39:9
17:19	8:18,22 10:9,17 16:2,5	execution	finalizes
elicit	equally	14:12	36:15
13:17 16:9	34:8	exemptions	finalizing
eliminate	ERICA	29:18,21	15:2 20:13
22:7 27:17,18	3:11	existing	finally
eliminating	erosion	9:16 13:11 18:14	35:13
9:18 22:3	9:16 13:21 14:20	exits	financial
elimination	ESD	18:19	14:2 40:12
8:20 22:2	30:6 37:1	expeditiously	financing
emergency	ESQUIRE	36:9	14:1,7
18:19	4:9	Expires	find
emphasized	establish	40:17	23:17
25:20	28:18 29:2	extent	finished
employed	established	10:2 20:7,14 22:13	7:21
40:11	26:8	29:12,14 37:1	first
empties	establishes	e-mail	6:21 9:10 20:6
26:1	20:8	38:22	fish
encourage	establishing		18:6
		F	
	I	I	1

fishing	27:4,14 28:3 30:13	35:1	H
25:13	31:14,16 32:19 34:6	goals	habitat
five	35:19 36:10,22 37:11	33:1 35:7	18:5
10:3 12:13 33:15,22	37:18 39:10	going	hand
five-year	front	6:5 12:4 13:10 21:4	40:15
11:1 26:19 33:4	18:22	23:14 30:18 31:10	happens
flawed	full	34:3,19 38:15	8:4
30:18	30:13 37:15 38:5	good	happy
floatables	fully	6:2 25:14	19:11
22:1,3	33:7	government	hard
folks	funded	10:10 30:4	23:20
24:4	14:10	Governments	HB
following	funding	20:22	14:6
19:1	13:22 14:1 21:21	GOVERNMENT'S	head
foregoing	further	1:7	21:2
40:5,6	7:18 12:19	GOVERNMENT-O	health
forest	future	3:9	25:10
13:1	11:22	granted	heard
forever	FY	29:21	20:20
25:3	14:13,14,15	great	hearing
formal		13:18	3:3 6:6,12 7:1,15 8:8
32:16 34:22 36:2,2	G	greater	8:11,13 23:22 29:9
38:14,17	G	9:3 27:7 31:19 32:20	30:10,17 39:16,20,21
formally	6:1	greatest	Heather
39:20	general	36:18,19	3:13 13:17
forthcoming	20:5,6 35:1 39:3	greatly	held
27:13	Generally	17:11 30:15	2:1 8:11 10:7
forward	32:18	groups	hereunto
11:21,21 35:22	generates	23:7	40:14
foundation	14:8	grow	he'll
4:8 9:11 32:14 36:6	Gilmore	18:10	24:2
38:8	4:3 5:6,13 22:22 23:3	growing	high
four	23:4 24:3,7 30:22	26:16 37:19	18:11 27:8
16:3	31:2	growth	higher
fourth	GIS	9:5 24:17 37:21	31:19
10:5,6	16:8	guidance	highlight
frame	give	17:5	12:7
28:19	7:14 8:1,3 11:13	guide	highlights
Frederick	given	34:11	19:21
1:7,12 2:2,5 3:9 6:4,6	7:13	guy	Highway
6:22 7:5,6 8:10,13	giving	24:1,3	24:14
9:6 10:5,11,16 11:4,9	31:10	guys	hinge
11:18 12:2,6,11 14:5	go	31:8	17:2
16:5,8 17:20 18:13	8:5,6 12:13 14:2 22:19	G-i-l-m-o-r-e	holding
22:8 24:21 25:4,20	goal	23:4	7:2
	16:17,19,21 22:2 34:8		'
		I	1

	I	I	l
honor	21:20 34:3	40:12	jurisdictions
8:11	improved	interested	21:6 24:16,20,22 25:5
hope	18:5	7:8,16 34:18 39:12,13	justified
27:10 31:3	improvement	interim	29:20,22
hosting	17:8 19:5	28:7 33:3,9	
35:20	improvements	introduce	<u>K</u>
Hoyt	33:21	6:14 30:18	keep
20:21	inch	introduced	39:16
	28:14	27:12	Kevin
I	include	issuance	3:22 32:6
identification	12:14 17:7 21:14 23:7	30:11	kind
13:13	29:9	issue	17:1 19:20 22:5
identified	included	7:4,10,19 8:10 21:12	kindly
29:21	9:21 20:10 27:9 37:5	22:5,5 26:15 39:10	23:16
identify	includes	issued	kinds
13:16 15:8 23:1	13:14	9:8 21:18 24:13,14	19:11
identifying	including	issues	know
9:14	10:10 13:19 29:4	20:18	11:13 35:7,7,13 38:14
II	increase	item	known
24:12	38:2	21:7	28:1
III	indicated	items	knows
20:10 21:8	23:11	14:2 16:16	13:18 38:13
illegal	individual	iteration	
9:18	10:9 39:3	30:19 35:6	laid
immediately	infeasibility	iterations	9:10
18:9 19:1	28:14	26:18	land
impact	information	IV	13:3 30:4
26:16	39:2	21:9 27:20	landscaping
impairments	informed	IV.D	18:18
10:18 13:13	23:16	20:10	language
impediments	infrastructure	IV.E	21:16 27:10
30:6	9:13 38:3	20:11	large
impervious 10:1,21 13:15 16:21	initial	-	24:11 25:5 38:1
26:20 28:10,12 38:2	9:8	jams	largely
	input	<b>Janus</b>   18:1	10:17
<b>implement</b> 27:15 28:4	29:10 36:15	January	law
implementation	inspection	40:18	33:5,8
16:15 21:9 27:1,8 28:2	16:5,11	Job	LEAGUE
30:7,13 31:20 36:13	install	1:19	4:6
36:20 37:4	18:4	John	left
implemented	instance	3:19 5:9 35:15,16	6:14 18:8,21
25:15	34:16	July	legal
important	instances 15:18	8:12	9:12 20:9,12 21:13
20:1 26:11 34:8 35:21	interest	June	level
impossible	mieresi	7:7,7	2:4 12:22 25:8
iii possioie	l	'.','	l

	1	1	1
line	15:7 25:21 26:4,4	MDE	9:14 13:12 28:22 29:2
18:2 19:18	34:13	3:2 6:13 8:14 9:5 10:7	33:20
lines	majority	16:12 20:10 24:4	Monocacy
38:3	14:9	29:15 30:9,12 35:20	12:14,15 13:19 15:12
Linganore	making	36:9,12,16	15:13 16:4 26:10
15:12,19 19:4,7	35:3	MDE's	Montgomery
LISA	manage	7:8 8:9	3:13 13:17 20:21 21:4
3:17	27:15	mea	month
list	managed	23:21	38:16
7:9,16 13:9 15:9 39:14	10:1	mechanism	Moore
litter	management	14:7	3:10 5:5 6:21 8:12
22:1,3	9:17 12:18 15:16	meet	11:9,16 25:19 35:19
loading	17:22 23:6 27:2 29:6	8:14 21:4 36:16	morning
12:20	29:8,17,19 30:7	meeting	6:2
loadings	38:19	1:11 2:1 11:5 26:12	move
12:4	Manager	28:6 31:9 35:20	11:21
loads	6:10,15 35:16	meetings	moving
10:18 29:20	mapping	10:8,12	35:22
local	9:13 13:12	MEP	MS4
10:10,18 25:14 30:1,4	maps	20:8,10,12	1:7 6:8 7:6 8:10 9:8
33:13,17 34:5,10,20	12:3	met	10:11 12:2 13:4
35:4 37:3,11,14	March	22:9 29:16	14:10 15:1 16:6,12
logistics	9:20 10:7	Metropolitan	20:9 21:13,18 22:9
8:4	Maria	20:22	22:11 24:12 25:6,14
long	3:4 6:16 7:1	MICHAEL	26:11,16 27:4,18,19
24:9 31:11	Market	3:15	29:14 31:14,16 32:20
look	2:4	Michelle	34:8 35:22 36:11,20
11:20 18:18 36:17	Maryland	3:7 6:20	37:21 39:3
lot	1:2,12 2:5,11 4:2,6 6:5	miles	MS4s
12:20 18:17 19:10	6:10 8:16 23:9 24:11	12:12,12 25:21	7:19
Lower	25:5,9,13 26:13,14	milestones	multiple
12:14 15:11,11,13,19	27:2 30:8 36:5,17	28:7 33:9	17:19
16:4 26:9	37:8,19 38:6,18,21	million	municipal
Lutz	40:22	14:13,14,15	6:6 7:5 9:4 16:15
4:9 5:8 32:12,13	Maryland's	mind	municipalities
Lyerly	7:3 8:14	39:16	13:3
3:8 6:20	materials	minutes	municipality
	22:2	6:4	9:6
M	matter	modeling	
magnitude	24:8	36:19	N
15:3	maximum	modification	N
main	10:2,17 20:7,14 22:13	34:14	3:1 4:1 5:1,1 6:1
19:18	29:12,14 37:1	money	name
maintenance	McGRAW	34:1	6:9 23:3 31:6 32:13
16:18 28:17,17,19,20	3:20 32:5	monitoring	35:14,15
major			names
-	I	I	l

39:13	note	19:10 25:9 35:22	part
nation	20:19 37:2 39:18		9:2 10:4 15:15 21:8
16:3	noted	<b>opportunity</b> 7:13,14 25:5,11 30:16	28:11
<b>National</b>	16:7,16	31:8,9,10	participation
8:19	notice	order	29:5,7 30:15 34:14
Natural	25:2 39:15	15:3	particular
24:8	notices	ordinance	16:16 19:14 21:7
near	7:18	37:17	particularly
36:1	November	ordinances	30:14
nearly	8:22 9:9	30:5 37:3,12	parties
31:11,11	NPDES	organisms	7:9,16 35:7 39:12,13
necessary	8:18,19 9:4 10:3 12:18	18:6	40:11
9:12 15:21	13:9,11 14:10	organization	partnered
need	number	23:2	18:13
25:1 34:3 38:4	33:12	ORR	partners
needs	numeric	3:17	17:9,14 36:9
11:1	28:7 33:2	outcome	Parts
neither	numerous	40:13	20:10 21:9 27:20
40:10	10:8	outfalls	patented
never	nutrient	25:22,22	37:17
22:3,6	19:16	outreach	pavers
new	nutrients	13:19 29:10	18:19
9:17 17:5 30:4	10:19 26:7	outside	Pay
News-Post		34:12	18:7
7:7	О	overview	pedestrian
nice	0	12:7 19:20	18:4
24:1,3,4	5:1 6:1	owned	penny
Nicholas	obligation	28:19	14:9
21:2	8:14		people
nine	occur	owners 9:2	8:2 20:3 24:4
6:3 25:4 37:7	11:1 22:3	o'clock	
	office		percent
nonprofit	2:1 17:13 23:17	6:4	9:22 10:22,22 13:1,2,2
23:7	officer	P	13:14 15:14 21:5
non-municipal	3:3 6:12 40:5	P	26:19 28:11 33:7,11
13:4	officials	3:1,1 4:1,1 6:1	33:16 34:11 36:20
non-stormwater	8:2 10:10 22:18	packet	37:20
27:17	okay	27:12,13	performance-based
North		· ·	36:18
2:4	24:10 32:6,9,11	page 5.2.7.11.20.5	period
notable	open	5:2 7:11 39:5	30:10 32:17 36:3
37:20	38:15	Pages	38:10 39:6
notarial	OPENING 5.2	1:20	periodic
40:15	5:2	Park	29:15
Notary	operated	19:15	periods
2:10 40:21	28:20	Parks	29:11
	opportunities	17:22 18:3 19:17	
	I	ı	ı

permit	18:20	prepared	15:21 17:6,7,8,8,13,15
1:7 6:7,17 7:6,9 8:10	point	7:20 8:6 11:7	promise
9:4,8,10,19,20 10:11	33:19,22 37:20	present	30:19
10:13,17,21 11:1,2	points	7:22 22:18 23:10 27:3	pronounced
12:2 13:11 14:12	34:22	30:16	31:4
15:1,3,20 16:12,17	policing	presentation	properties
16:20 20:11,15 21:5	22:6	12:5 20:21	38:1
21:8,13,18,20,22	Policy	PRESENTATIONS	proposed
22:11,12 24:14 25:6	35:16	5:4	27:4 31:15
25:14,19 26:11,17,20		presented	protect
27:4,7,16,20 28:2,4	8:20 12:4 29:20	21:1	19:17
28:11,18,22 29:4,6	pollutants	previous	protected
29:13,18 30:3,11,14	11:3 27:18	36:4,11 38:6	18:2
		*	
31:14,16,18 32:20	polluted	prior	Protection
33:4 34:13 35:6	26:2	17:2 39:4	8:18 37:7
36:11 37:6,14 39:10	pollution	probably	Protection's
permits	9:14 19:17 24:21	7:18	37:17
7:19 10:3 20:9 24:12	25:16 26:10	problems	provide
26:16 34:9 39:3	pond	15:8,10 25:1	23:14,20
permitting	18:15,22	Procedures	provided
16:11	population	7:4 8:15	13:22 17:19 18:19
person	9:7 13:4 24:17,17	proceeding	providing
23:13	37:22	33:4	9:18 33:2
phase	populations	proceedings	provisions
9:3,6 15:22 24:12	9:3	40:5,7,8	29:3
picture	porous	process	public
18:7,22 19:5	18:19	15:2 34:12 35:22	1:11 2:1,10 6:5 8:3,9
Pinecliff	portion	36:14	13:18 16:10 17:20
19:15	14:19	program	18:13 29:5,7,9,10,10
Pipe	portions	6:10,12,15,16,18 8:19	30:10,16 32:22 34:12
12:15 26:9	26:8	10:12 13:16 14:10	34:14 35:19,21 36:14
pipes	post	16:6,8,8,10,15 19:21	38:15 39:21 40:2,21
25:22	17:4	21:3 22:1,10,10 29:2	publications
places	Potomac	38:20 39:3	19:11
13:6	3:18 12:16 26:3 35:16	programs	publicized
plan	36:8 37:8	9:17,17 12:7 20:15	7:9
_	practicability	, ·	
27:1 28:19 34:16,19	20:7 37:1	27:16 29:6,8,17	published 17:5
planning		progress	
15:6 36:20 37:13	practicable	21:10 32:21 33:9 35:4	purpose
plans	10:2 20:14,16 22:13	project	8:8
27:16 28:1,2,3 29:4,6	29:12,15	15:22 17:17 18:13	Pursuant
29:7,10 34:10	practices	19:3,5,14,15	2:9
please	27:16	projections	putting
11:11 23:2 39:14	prepare	9:5	34:12
pleased	28:3	projects	0

	I	I	I
quality	16:2	removal	39:7
9:21 11:5 18:15,17	recommendation	37:15	restoration
21:10,11,14 27:14	37:2	remove	10:22 12:3,8,21 15:7
33:13,21	recommendations	30:5	15:16 16:17,22 17:12
	27:6 31:18 37:10 38:6	removed	17:17 19:4,6,7,10,15
R	38:9	18:1	28:1,10,12 29:4,5,8
R	recommended	RENEWAL	33:7,11,16 34:1,10
1:21 2:9 3:1 4:1 6:1	27:9 30:9	1:7	34:11,16,19
40:4	record	report	restore
ranging	7:21 27:11,12 38:15	10:5,6	25:7 26:19
13:6	40:7	Reported	restored
rapid	recreation	1:21	17:18
35:3 38:4	25:10	Reporter	restoring
rate	recreational	2:10 40:4	9:22
14:9 38:4	25:9,13	REPORTER-NOT	result
Ray	reduce	40:2	10:12 25:15 27:6
6:14,17 38:18	13:14	reports	31:18
RAYMOND	reduced	39:4	resulting
3:5	17:22 40:9	representing	25:11 29:21
Raymond.Bahr@M	reduction	8:13	results
38:22	16:21	request	34:2
Ray's	references	8:11 30:12 36:8	retained
24:1 38:22	20:10 21:14	requested	28:15
reach	reflect	29:9	retrofit
34:9	20:12	require	15:17 18:12 19:7 21:5
reached	regardless	28:2,11,18 29:1,7,13	36:21
35:9	22:4	29:18 30:3 33:5,8	revealed
reaching	Region	required	23:14
30:14 33:12	16:5 21:17	9:1 10:4 15:8,20 27:15	review
read	regulations	34:5,8	6:15 16:12 27:11
7:20 8:6 31:1	8:21 9:1 13:21	requirement	34:15 36:10 37:3,9
really	reissuance	10:22 13:14 14:6	37:11
33:14 35:21	25:6	21:13	rezonings
reapplication	reissued	requirements	38:1
10:4	9:19,20	9:21 13:10 17:3 26:22	right
reason	related	26:22 27:20 28:4,8	19:6 31:4
14:16	40:11	requires	right-hand
reasonable	release	21:22 34:14	19:8
21:16	25:18	rescheduled	River
reassurances	remain	23:18	12:15,16 15:13 16:4
32:21	38:15	residential	26:3,10
received	remaining	24:18	rivers
39:7	11:2	resources	34:6
receiving	REMARKS	22:10 24:9	RMR
11:5	5:2,10		1:21 2:10 40:4
recognized	3.4,10	response	1.41 4.10 40.4
1 cognized			

road	6:11,15 9:16 13:21	SHORTHAND	source
19:18	14:20 18:1 19:16	40:2	24:21
roads	38:19	show	sources
38:3	sediments	28:13	9:14
robust	10:20 26:6	showed	
13:16 16:8 31:13		19:9	speak
	see 24:10 34:19 37:14,21	shown	7:12,14,15 11:9,11,13 22:18 31:10 38:12
room	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
7:1 17:10	seeing	33:14	speakers 22:20
runoff	38:2	side	
9:12,15 24:20 25:1	seek	14:1	specific
26:17	36:18,19	sign	26:18
rural	seeking	7:17 39:14	Specifically
13:7	32:18	signed	36:7
R-a-y-m-o-n-d.B-a	segments	7:12,13 11:11 22:20	spent
39:1	26:5	32:10 39:11	20:2 34:1
<u>S</u>	selected	significance	sponsored
	19:14	31:13	17:13
S 2 1 4 1 5 1 6 1	send	significant	square
3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1	23:19	10:15,20 20:3	12:12 25:21
Safety	sent	sign-up	stabilized
6:11,16 38:20	7:8	11:11	17:22
SALTZBERG	separate	similar	staff
3:14	6:7 7:5 34:7	22:5	12:17 32:13
sample	September	site	stakeholder
16:9	38:16 39:8 40:16	28:13,16 30:2 37:5,9	36:14
saved	serving	sites	stakeholders
18:3	9:2	19:6	32:22 34:18 35:2
scenario	set	sitting	standard
36:17	28:19 40:14	6:17	20:9,12
schedules	sets	slowed	standards
28:5	25:19	36:13	17:1 21:11,11,14
scheduling	setting	small	27:14 33:13
20:18	6:22	13:7	stands
school	severe	smaller	8:19
17:19 18:11,20	24:22	12:18,19	started
Schools	sewer	Society	18:9
17:21 18:14	6:7 7:5 18:2 38:3	23:8	state
seal	Shannon	Solid	2:11 8:19 12:13 24:14
40:15	3:10 6:21 8:12 11:8,9	17:21	25:13 33:5 37:19
second	11:15 22:16 35:18	solutions	40:22
12:6 37:18	39:17	15:10,15	statement
Secretary	share	solved	5:13 7:20 8:6 11:8
21:1	19:11	25:3	23:10,12,15 24:11
Section	sheet	sorry	26:20 27:9 30:19
8:22 20:8	11:11 25:18	35:13	31:1
sediment	11.11 43.10	33.13	J1.1

statements	submits	3:6 6:19	1:21 2:10 40:4
36:5	21:12	take	thought
states	submitted	6:6 10:13 14:19 15:21	19:22
8:17 16:13 21:8	8:12 9:7 10:4,6 30:22	31:7 39:15	three
8.17 10.13 21.8 State's	submitting	taken	8:2 12:5 22:19
11:5 14:6	32:15 38:8	40:6,8	
		takes	<b>Thursday</b> 1:13 6:3
status	subsequent		
33:3	39:15	33:19	time
stenographically	substantial	talk	10:7 21:21 22:15,17
40:8	13:12 24:16,17 26:2	8:5 20:1	24:9 28:19 30:10
stop	suffice	ten	34:1 38:14
23:17	13:11	14:13 24:11,13 26:3,4	TMDL
storm	sufficient	tentative	21:15 26:22 28:1,4,9
6:7 7:5 9:2,13,14,18	29:2 33:20	7:4,10 8:9 12:9 20:5	29:4 34:5,9
11:4 28:15	suggested	term	TMDLs
stormwater	8:3	11:1 21:5 26:19 33:4	10:18 26:7 33:13 34:7
4:2 6:11,16 8:21 9:4	suite	terms	34:10 35:5
9:16 10:16 14:7	37:10 38:21	20:17 34:13 36:22	today
15:16 16:15 17:3	Summers	testimony	6:3,12,13 10:14 11:17
18:12,15 23:5,6,9	21:1	32:8	22:15 23:10 25:7
24:20 25:1,15 26:1,2	supervision	tests	31:8 35:20 39:8,18
26:10,13,17 27:1,2	40:10	21:20	today's
27:18 28:15 29:6,8	support	text	8:8 30:10
29:13,19 30:7,8 36:5	21:15 31:15 36:4	26:18 30:11	tomorrow
38:7,19	sure	thank	23:17
stream	35:3	6:21 11:16,16 17:11	Toni
12:13 15:16 17:17	surface	22:14 30:21 31:2,8	1:21 2:9 39:17 40:4
18:1,2 19:4,15,16	28:10,12 38:2	35:10,15,18 39:17,18	tool
26:5	surprise	thanks	36:17
streams	14:3	22:16 31:1,21,22 32:1	total
34:6	SUZANNE	32:6,8,12 35:12	10:17 25:12 36:12
street	3:16	38:11 39:20	track
2:4 14:21 17:11	sweeping	thereto	27:1 33:9
strength	14:21 17:12	30:20	Trail
16:9 27:5 31:17	system	they'd	18:3
strong	6:7 7:6 8:20 9:13,19	8:3	transcriber
25:6	11:4	things	23:20
stuffy	systems	16:7	transcript
11:7	9:2	think	40:6
subdivided	9.2	14:3 20:1 33:1,6 34:7	
12:17	T	34:17 35:1,20 37:19	transparency 32:20
	$\frac{1}{T}$	37:21	
subject	5:1,1		treat
32:19	table	third	18:17
submit	15:1 36:16	12:9 33:19	treated
36:2 38:14,17	Tagoe	Thompson	18:14,15
	1 ague		

tributaries	33:3	7:16 11:13 20:19 31:7	13:9 23:12
26:4	upper	31:14 32:6 39:13	we'll
TROUT	12:14 15:12 19:8 26:3	wanted	7:14,21 8:5,6 11:13
3:21	26:10	12:1 14:2 19:3 35:18	22:19 32:5,11,15
true	urban	wants	34:22
40:7	9:15 13:2,3,4,8,15	7:22	we're
tune	37:20	Warburton	6:4 15:1,8 20:19 35:5
18:5	Urbana	3:4 6:16 7:1	we've
turn	18:11	Washington	12:3,19 15:10,18
23:16	urges	20:22 38:21	17:16 18:11 32:18
two	30:8	Waste	39:7,12
16:16,18 22:21 29:1	use	17:21	WHEREOF
30:5 32:4	25:8 28:12,14 30:2,4,6	wasteload	40:14
two-part	Utilities Utilities	21:15 26:8 28:5 34:4	William
9:7	17:21	35:4	31:3,6,22
two-year	utility	water	WIP
9:7	14:7	4:4 9:1,21 10:18 11:5	26:21 28:9 36:13
type	utilized	19:18 20:8 21:10,11	wish
18:12	14:11	21:14 25:10 27:14,22	
typewriting	uttered	31:7,12 33:13,21	WITNESS
40:9	39:18	38:19	40:14
		waters	WLA
U	V	33:17,18 34:20	28:7
ultra	value	watershed	work
13:8	31:13	13:20 15:6,8,18 16:1,3	12:21 13:12 19:22
understands	version	16:10 17:9 19:12	20:3 24:7 26:15 36:9
33:7	10:16	23:8 34:17,18 37:7,8	worked
undertaken	views	37:16	11:20
29:16	30:16	watersheds	working
undertaking	vigorously	12:13,17 15:13	11:4,21
33:15	25:14	watershed's	worksheet
Unfortunately	VII	19:7	37:17
24:19	20:11 21:9 27:20	waterway	writing
United	visit	24:21	32:2 39:8
8:17	23:18	waterways	www.mde.state.md.us
units	volume	25:7,17	39:5
12:18	18:15	way	www.watershed-alli
unlimited	volumes	24:6 32:22	19:13
3:21 21:21	26:2	web	
untreated	VOTERS	7:11 39:5	Y
13:15	4:6	website	year
upcoming	$\mathbf{W}$	19:13	10:5,6 14:8,14 33:6,8
37:5	waivers	welcome	years
update	27:1	6:2	10:3 14:13 24:13 29:1
12:1	want	went	30:5 33:15,22 37:22
updates	Wallt		Yep

31:5	14:15	28th	58
31.3	18	6:3 7:7 39:8	13:1
\$	40:18	29th	15:1
\$2.5			6
14:13	1800	38:16,16	$\begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & $
\$3	38:20	3	_   5:3 29:5
25:12	1990	$\frac{3}{3}$	_   3.3 29.3   <b>60</b>
	8:22 9:4		15:13
\$3.6	1994	16:5 21:17 28:10	
14:14	9:9	30	644
\$415,000	2	2:4	25:20
18:5		30th	664
\$488	20	7:7	12:12
14:8	10:22 12:18 21:5	30-day	672-acre
\$5.35	26:19 28:11 33:7,11	29:11	16:20
14:15	33:16 34:11 36:20	301.600.1153	7
1	2002	2:6	
	9:20	31	7
1	2006	5:7	29:12
1:20 28:14	10:7	32	713
1st	2007	5:8	16:22
13:5	27:2 29:19 30:7	35	8
1-251521	2011	5:9 13:1	$\frac{8}{8}$
1:19	17:2,4	38	
10	2012	5:11	29:17
6:4 9:22 10:22 13:14	16:2,4 21:17		_ <b>8th</b>
10:00	2013	4	10:7
1:14	16:12	4	81,889
10:55	2014	28:17	13:5
39:21	1:13 6:3 7:7 8:12 13:5	40	9
100,000	38:16 40:16	1:20	
9:3	2017	<b>402(p)</b>	9
11	40:18	8:22	30:1
5:5	21230	402(p)(3)(b)(iii)	987
11th	38:22	20:8	14:6
8:12	21701	413	
12	2:5	17:12	
37:10	22	440	
125	38:1	38:21	
17:7	23		_
129	5:6	5	_
17:8	24-hour	5	
14	28:15	13:2 28:22 37:20	
14:13,14	250 250	5th	
1400	250 25:21	40:15	
12:12	25:21 28	55	
15		17:11	
	1:13		