

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2004 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE
Revised

House Bill 555

(The Speaker and the Minority Leader, *et al.*)
(By Request – Administration)

Environmental Matters

Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs

**Water Pollution - Nutrients - State Waters - Chesapeake Bay Watershed -
Restoration**

This Administration bill establishes the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Restoration Fund (CBWRF) as a special, continuing, nonlapsing fund to be administered by the Maryland Water Quality Financing Administration (WQFA) within the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). CBWRF will provide financial assistance to owners of wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) and septic systems in an effort to reduce nutrient pollution to the Chesapeake Bay. As a revenue source for the fund, the bill establishes a surcharge on users of wastewater facilities and a surcharge on waste from septic systems that is discharged or pumped into such facilities. Of the revenue collected from septic system waste, 60% will be deposited into a separate account within CBWRF, while 40% will be deposited in the Maryland Agricultural Water Quality Cost Share (MACS) Program within the Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA) to provide financial assistance to farmers for cover crops. The bill also makes several changes to the Water Quality Improvement Act (WQIA) of 1998 in an effort to encourage farmers to develop and implement nutrient management plans.

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: Special fund revenue increase of \$54.38 million in FY 2005; future year estimates are annualized and reflect bond proceeds beginning in FY 2007. Special fund expenditure increase of \$12.38 million in FY 2005; future year estimates are annualized and reflect additional grant activity beginning in FY 2006 and debt service payments beginning in FY 2008. General fund expenditure increase of \$105,000 in FY 2005 and \$40,000 annually thereafter for the Comptroller. State expenditures (all funds) could increase significantly for the State's share of the surcharge.

(\$ in millions)	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009
SF Revenue	\$54.38	\$72.51	\$220.26	\$368.01	\$318.76
GF Expenditure	.10	.04	.04	.04	.04
SF Expenditure	12.38	41.97	189.51	396.61	321.72
GF/SF/FF Exp.	-	-	-	-	-
Net Effect	\$41.90	\$30.50	\$30.71	(\$28.65)	(\$3.00)

Note:() = decrease; GF = general funds; FF = federal funds; SF = special funds; - = indeterminate effect

Local Effect: Local grant revenues will increase by an estimated \$859.5 million between FY 2005 and FY 2009. Local administrative expenditures will increase to collect fees but will likely be offset by the bill's provision allowing a billing authority to retain 5% of the surcharge collected. Local expenditures could increase significantly for the local share of the surcharge. **This bill imposes a mandate on a unit of local government.**

Small Business Effect: The Administration has determined that this bill has a meaningful impact on small business (attached). Legislative Services concurs with this assessment. (The attached assessment does not reflect amendments to the bill.)

Analysis

Bill Summary: A “user” means any person discharging to a wastewater facility that has a State or National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharge permit. For each residential dwelling that receives an individual sewer bill, the surcharge is \$2.50 per month (\$30 annually). For a building or group of buildings under single ownership or management that contain multiple residential dwellings that do not receive individual sewer bills, or for a nonresidential user, the bill establishes the concept of an “equivalent dwelling unit” or EDU, which means a measure of wastewater effluent where one unit is equivalent to an average of 250 gallons of wastewater effluent per day or the flow that the local government or billing authority has established to be equivalent to the average daily flow discharged by a residential dwelling. For those entities, the surcharge is \$2.50 per month per EDU for each EDU up to 2,000 EDUs, and \$1.25 per month for each EDU over 2,000 and up to 5,000 EDUs. Based on this sliding scale and a cap on fees beyond 5,000 EDUs, the maximum surcharge is \$105,000 annually. The bill also provides that the maximum surcharge for a single site is \$105,000.

The surcharge on septic system waste that is pumped or discharged into a wastewater facility is \$0.08 per gallon.

The bill establishes specified exemptions from the surcharge. Subject to approval by WQFA, the bill also authorizes a local government to establish a program to exempt a residential dwelling able to demonstrate substantial financial hardship.

The surcharge will be collected by the wastewater facility or the billing authority for the wastewater facility on behalf of the State. For a wastewater facility without a billing authority, the Comptroller may collect the surcharge from the facility owner. The Comptroller must determine the method of collection. With the exception of 40% of the money collected from the surcharge on septic system waste, which the Comptroller must deposit with MACS in MDA, the Comptroller must deposit surcharge collections in CBWRF. The bill establishes provisions addressing collection and enforcement.

CBWRF will consist of revenue generated from the environmental surcharge (as described above), net proceeds of bonds issued by WQFA, interest or other investment income, and any additional money from any other sources. Money in the fund may not revert or be transferred to the general fund. The bill expands WQFA's current bonding authority to reflect the new fund.

Priority for funding a WWTP upgrade must be given to enhanced nutrient removal (ENR) upgrades at WWTPs with a design capacity of 500,000 gallons per day or more. The eligibility and priority ranking of a project must be determined by MDE based on criteria established in regulations. Funds in CBWRF shall only be used: (1) to award grants for up to 100% of eligible costs of projects relating to planning, design, construction, and upgrade of a wastewater facility for flows up to the design capacity of the facility to achieve ENR; (2) in fiscal 2005 through 2009, for a portion of costs relating to upgrading sewer infrastructure, up to \$5 million annually, and, beginning in fiscal 2010, for a portion of the operation and maintenance costs related to ENR technology, as provided by the bill; (3) as a source of revenue or security for the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued by WQFA; (4) to earn interest on accounts in the fund; (5) for the reasonable costs of administering the fund, which may not exceed 1.5% of the total surcharge collected annually; (6) for the reasonable administrative costs incurred by a billing authority, of which up to 5% of the total environmental surcharge collected by the billing authority may be retained by the billing authority; (7) for future upgrades of wastewater facilities to achieve additional nutrient removal or water quality improvement; and (8) for costs associated with issuing bonds.

Funds in CBWRF generated from the surcharge on septic system waste must be used only for: (1) grants or loans for up to 100% of costs attributable to upgrading a septic system with nitrogen removal technology or the cost difference between a conventional septic system and an upgraded septic system; and (2) for administrative costs. Priority for grants and loans must be given to failing septic systems located in the critical areas of the State.

The funding provided to MACS (40% of that which is collected from the surcharge on septic system waste) must be used to fund cover crop activities.

The bill establishes a 17-member advisory committee to be staffed by MDE, the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), and the Department of Budget and Management (DBM). The bill directs the committee to analyze and study a variety of items relating to costs of nutrient removal from WWTPs, additional funding sources, and collection alternatives. Beginning January 1, 2006, the committee must report annually to the Governor and the General Assembly.

With respect to the bill's changes to WQIA, the bill repeals the current right-of-entry authority of MDA and establishes provisions governing farm site visits; eases paperwork requirements for farmers; reduces the administrative burden on MDA relating to certifying and licensing nutrient management consultants; establishes a certification process specific to farmers; and increases flexibility for MDA regarding standards for plan development and the use of private nutrient management consultants to develop plans.

Current Law: WQFA was established by the General Assembly in 1988 to encourage capital investment for wastewater and drinking water projects pursuant to the federal Clean Water Act and the federal Safe Drinking Water Act. WQFA administers two loan funds. One of those loan funds, the Water Quality Revolving Loan Fund (WQRLF), was established in 1988 to provide low-interest loans for wastewater projects. Under existing authority, MDE also administers two grant programs (the Supplemental Assistance Program and the Biological Nutrient Removal (BNR) Program) that provide funding to local governments for improvements to wastewater collection and treatment systems.

Background: According to the Chesapeake Bay Program, nitrogen pollution is the most serious problem facing the Chesapeake Bay today. Each year, roughly 300 million pounds of nitrogen reach the bay. Nitrogen pollution results in excessive algae growth that clouds water, depletes oxygen, and impacts bay grasses, fish, and crabs. As part of the *Chesapeake 2000 Agreement*, Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia committed to reduce nitrogen to levels that will remove the bay from the federal impaired waters list.

Discharges from WWTPs account for about 20% of the nutrient pollution reaching the bay. The Administration advises that upgrades of the 66 major WWTPs will reduce nitrogen loading to the bay and its tributaries by 7.5 million pounds annually, approximately one-third of the additional reduction needed for Maryland to meet its commitments under the 2000 agreement. Although there are about 272 WWTPs with NPDES permits in the State, 195 of which are publicly owned, MDE advises that upgrades to the 66 largest facilities would cover over 95% of the discharge to the bay.

In March 2001, Governor Glendening appointed a 21-member task force to address the issues and costs associated with separating and upgrading combined sewerage systems in the State and installing additional nutrient removal technology at WWTPs. In its

December 2001 report to the Governor and the General Assembly, the task force identified a total estimated capital need of \$4.3 billion to upgrade sewerage systems including conveyance pipes and pumping stations, correction of combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows, and upgrades at WWTPs to maintain compliance, implement BNR, and provide capacity for existing and projected growth. Costs to address nutrient removal needs were estimated at approximately \$847 million of this total. According to MDE, upgrades to the State's 66 major WWTPs to reach ENR will total an estimated \$750 million to \$1 billion.

According to MDE, since 1985, under the BNR Program, \$190 million in State grant funds has been authorized to fund 60 projects; a total of \$11.5 million was authorized in fiscal 2004 to fund nutrient removal projects, of which \$10 million was used to fund 17 BNR projects and \$1.5 million was used to fund 13 ENR projects. To date, WQRLF has provided \$732 million in low-interest loans for sewerage system improvements; about \$570 million of this was directed for improvements at WWTPs. The Governor's proposed fiscal 2005 budget includes \$23.5 million in general obligation (GO) bonds for the BNR Program, \$5 million in GO bonds for the Supplemental Assistance Program, and \$70 million for WQRLF (\$32.8 million in special funds, \$30.8 million in federal funds, and \$6.4 million in GO bonds).

Runoff of nutrients from agricultural lands plays a major role in nutrient pollution. WQIA of 1998 provides for a variety of measures aimed at improving water quality throughout the State, including mandatory development and implementation of nutrient management plans by farmers. For a variety of reasons, many agricultural operations have not met the deadlines under WQIA for developing and implementing plans. This bill incorporates the Administration's proposal as introduced (SB 182/HB 291) to amend WQIA in an effort to encourage compliance. For a more complete discussion of WQIA and the proposal, consult the first-reader fiscal notes for these bills.

Under MACS, MDA provides grants to farmers to cover up to 87.5% of the cost to install best management practices (BMPs). Cover crops planted after the fall harvest to soak up unused fertilizers is one of the BMPs currently eligible for cost-share assistance. The Governor's proposed fiscal 2005 budget includes approximately \$1.7 million in general funds for cover crop activities. Both the Senate and the House reduced this amount to \$1.45 million. According to MDA, to reach its goal of planting 600,000 acres of cover crops statewide, funding needs are estimated to total \$12 million annually.

State Fiscal Effect: A summary of the estimated budget of CBWRF is shown in **Appendix 1**. A description of total State revenues and expenditures is provided below. **Appendix 2** provides a county-by-county breakdown of anticipated surcharge collections from users of WWTPs with NPDES discharge permits as well as preliminary estimates, by county, of costs to upgrade the major WWTPs in the State. Appendix 2 also provides estimated revenues, by county, of the surcharge assessed on septic system waste.

State Revenues:

Revenue from the Environmental Surcharge

Gross surcharge collections are estimated to total \$57.20 million in fiscal 2005 (\$48.78 million from WWTP users and \$8.42 million from septic system waste) and \$76.27 million annually thereafter (\$65.04 million from WWTP users and \$11.23 million from septic system waste). Fiscal 2005 estimates reflect the bill's October 1, 2004 effective date. These estimates do not reflect any exemptions that would be made by local governments for residential dwellings based on financial hardship. The estimates also assume that total flow from WWTPs and the number of septic systems in the State remain constant over time.

Net Surcharge Revenues to CBWRF in MDE

In fiscal 2005, an estimated \$51.18 million would be deposited into CBWRF, as shown in Appendix 1 and **Exhibit 1**. Beginning in fiscal 2006, an estimated \$68.24 million annually would be deposited in CBWRF.

Exhibit 1 **Estimated Revenues to CBWRF from Surcharge Collections** **(\$ in millions)**

<u>Revenue Source</u>	<u>Fiscal 2005</u>	<u>Fiscal 2006 and Subsequent Years</u>
Residential Users of WWTPs with NPDES Permits	\$35.84	\$47.79
Nonresidential Users of WWTPs with NPDES Permits	11.95	15.93
Industrial Dischargers	0.80	1.07
Users of WWTPs with Groundwater Discharge Permits	0.19	0.25
Septic System Waste (60%)	5.05	6.74
Less 5% for Billing Authorities	(2.65)	(3.54)
Net Revenues to CBWRF	\$51.18	\$68.24

For the surcharge assessed WWTP users, the estimates are based on 2002 WWTP flow data and assume that one EDU equals 250 gallons per day. For users of WWTPs with
HB 555 / Page 11

NPDES permits, the breakdown assumes that 75% of flow is from residential users and 25% is from nonresidential users. For industrial dischargers with their own discharge permits, the estimates reflect the bill's sliding fee scale and cap and assume that 223 of the 260 industrial facilities will be exempt.

For the surcharge on septic system waste, the estimates assume that 60% of net revenues will be paid into the fund, as required by the bill. The remaining 40% will be paid into MACS, as described below. The estimates of total surcharge collections from septic system waste reflect the following assumptions:

- an estimated 421,066 septic systems statewide;
- the average septic system is pumped once every three years; and
- on average, 1,000 gallons are pumped or discharged into a WWTP when a septic system is pumped.

Based on these assumptions, the surcharge per septic system will average approximately \$80 per pump-out. This fee would be charged to the hauler, but it is assumed that the hauler would pass the surcharge on to the septic system user. Annualized, the surcharge would equate to approximately \$27 per septic system.

Net Surcharge Revenues to MACS in MDA

In fiscal 2005, an estimated \$3.2 million will be deposited in MACS within MDA. Beginning in fiscal 2006, an estimated \$4.27 million annually will be deposited in MACS. These estimates reflect 40% of the estimated revenue generated from the surcharge on septic waste and are net of the 5% that would be retained by billing authorities.

Legislative Services notes that the amount of waste pumped from septic tanks on an annual basis is difficult to estimate. Recommended pumping frequencies vary depending on the size of the tank, the number of people in a given household, and the habits of each household. Garbage disposals and high water-use technologies also affect pumping frequencies. While some owners are diligent about following recommended pumping frequencies, others are not. In addition, some waste that is pumped from septic tanks is used as fertilizer on lands and is not discharged or pumped into WWTPs. Accordingly, revenues could vary significantly.

Net Bond Proceeds

Special fund revenues to CBWRF from bond proceeds (net of issuance costs, which are estimated at 1.5% of bond issuance) are anticipated to total an estimated \$147.75 million in fiscal 2007, \$295.50 million in fiscal 2008, \$246.25 million in fiscal 2009, and \$49.25 million in fiscal 2010, totaling \$738.75 million over the four-year period. These

estimates, which are based on the sale of \$750 million in bonds from fiscal 2007 through 2010, reflect the anticipated cost to upgrade only the major WWTPs to achieve ENR. It is unclear at this point to what extent MDE will need to issue bonds in future years to support upgrades to the smaller WWTPs.

State Expenditures:

Maryland Department of the Environment

Special fund expenditures from CBWRF, as shown in Appendix 1, will total an estimated \$9.19 million in fiscal 2005, which reflects the bill's October 1, 2004 effective date. This estimate reflects \$8.73 million in financial assistance and \$465,055 in administrative expenditures, which reflects the cost of hiring six new positions (one program manager to supervise and manage the new fund; one public health engineer to develop WWTP projects and coordinate program activity; one public health engineer to administer grants and loans to septic system owners; one accountant to provide overall accounting expertise; one office secretary to provide clerical support; and one Assistant Attorney General to develop regulations, grant agreements, and revenue bond indenture and to provide ongoing legal support). It includes salaries, fringe benefits, one-time start-up costs, and ongoing operating expenses, including contractual services for bond counsel, bond trustee services, financial advice, and independent audits.

Future year expenditures are annualized and reflect:

- additional grant activity, as shown in Appendix 1;
- annual debt service payments (assuming an interest rate of 5% over 20 years) beginning in the year following bond issuance;
- costs to hire four more employees (two administrators to prepare and administer grant agreements and to process payment disbursements and two public health engineers to conduct design review, environmental assessment, and construction monitoring activities);
- full salaries with 4.6% annual increases and 3% employee turnover; and
- 1% annual increases in ongoing operating expenses, as appropriate.

Under MDE's current timeframe, upgrades to the major WWTPs could be completed in 2011. To the extent revenues from the surcharge are lower than the estimated amount, construction of some projects may have to be pushed back to build up a fund balance to cover the costs associated with issuing the bonds.

Once upgrades to the major WWTPs are completed, it is possible that MDE would no longer need all 10 employees hired as a result of the bill. Clearly some positions would still be needed to manage the fund and oversee upgrades to the smaller WWTPs. It is

unclear at this point how many of the 10 positions would be needed for ongoing activities.

Maryland Department of Agriculture

Special fund expenditures within MDA for MACS could increase by an estimated \$3.19 million in fiscal 2005. This estimate is based on the anticipated revenue stream and reflects the bill's October 1, 2004 effective date. It includes \$3.15 million in grants to farmers for cover crop activities and an estimated \$36,000 in administrative costs, which reflects the cost to hire one soil conservation specialist to administer grants. It includes a salary, fringe benefits, one-time start-up costs, and ongoing operating expenses. Out-year expenditures, which are annualized and adjusted for inflation, are estimated to total \$4.26 million in fiscal 2006 and 2007 and \$4.27 million annually thereafter; these estimates include grants totaling \$4.20 million annually and increasing administrative costs, which reflect the cost to hire a part-time contractual employee beginning in fiscal 2006.

The bill's changes to WQIA are not anticipated to have a significant impact on MDA finances.

Comptroller

The bill does not explicitly allow the Comptroller to retain any portion of the fees to cover the costs of collecting the surcharge from billing authorities and facilities and remitting funds to MDE and MDA. General fund expenditures could increase by an estimated \$105,000 in fiscal 2005, which reflects the bill's October 1, 2004 effective date. The estimate includes \$75,000 in one-time programming costs and \$30,000 for return processing, taxpayer assistance, and auditing activities. Out-year costs, which are estimated to total \$40,000 annually, are annualized and reflect ongoing operating costs.

Costs to Pay Surcharge for State Government Facilities

As a user of wastewater facilities and as an owner of septic systems, State government facilities will be subject to the proposed surcharge. The State's share of flow from WWTPs is unknown. Although water consumption can be used as a proxy for wastewater generated, data on the State's total water consumption are not readily available. Also unknown is the number of State-owned facilities with septic systems. Accordingly, the total cost to the State cannot be reliably estimated at this time. However, given that the surcharge is expected to increase the average user's sewer bill by about 10%, State expenditures for facilities with sewer service could be significant.

Advisory Committee

Any expense reimbursements for committee members and staffing costs for MDE, DNR, and DBM are assumed to be minimal and absorbable within existing budgeted resources.

Local Fiscal Effect: Of the 272 WWTPs with NPDES permits, 195 are publicly owned. All 66 major WWTPs are publicly owned. Local grant revenues will increase significantly for: (1) combined sewer overflows abatement projects, sewer rehabilitation, and conveyance system upgrades; (2) capital costs for planning, design, and construction of ENR upgrades; and (3) operation and maintenance costs associated with ENR. Estimated total grant amounts are provided in Appendix 1.

Local governments, as billing authorities, will incur additional administrative costs associated with collecting the surcharge and remitting funds to the Comptroller. Costs would likely be offset by the bill's provision allowing billing authorities to retain up to 5% of the surcharge collected. Based on the anticipated revenue stream, an estimated \$2.82 million in fiscal 2005 and \$3.76 million annually thereafter would be retained by billing authorities (both local and private).

As users of WWTPs and owners of septic systems, local governments also will be subject to the surcharge. Because the local share of flow from WWTPs is unknown and the number of local facilities with septic systems is unknown, the total cost to local governments to pay the surcharge for local facilities cannot be reliably estimated at this time. However, costs could be significant. According to information provided by the Maryland Association of Counties, 20 of the 23 counties and Baltimore City report that total costs to pay the surcharge for facilities on sewers will be at least \$1.7 million annually. The estimates, which are based on water consumption, range from about \$4,000 for some counties to \$800,000 for Baltimore City. These estimates do not reflect all facilities within each county, nor do they reflect the surcharge assessed septic system waste.

Additional Information

Prior Introductions: No prior legislation proposed the establishment of a surcharge on WWTP users or septic system waste. Several bills were introduced during the 2002 and 2003 sessions to address WQIA implementation problems, all of which failed.

Cross File: SB 320 (The President, *et al.*) (By Request – Administration) – Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs.

Information Source(s): Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland Department of Agriculture, Maryland Department of Planning, Comptroller's Office,

University System of Maryland, Maryland Association of Counties, Montgomery County, Calvert County, Howard County, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Maryland Municipal League, Baltimore City, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Legislative Services (Office of Legislative Audits)

Fiscal Note History: First Reader - March 2, 2004
mh/ljm Revised - House Third Reader - April 1, 2004

Analysis by: Lesley Cook

Direct Inquiries to:
(410) 946-5510
(301) 970-5510

Appendix 1
Estimated Budget of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Restoration Fund
(\$ in thousands)

Fiscal Year	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>
Revenues							
Gross Revenues	53,833	71,777	71,777	71,777	71,777	71,777	71,777
Bond Sale Proceeds ¹	0	0	147,750	295,500	246,250	49,250	0
Less Collection for Billing Authorities	<u>(2,652)</u>	<u>(3,535)</u>	<u>(3,535)</u>	<u>(3,535)</u>	<u>(3,535)</u>	<u>(3,535)</u>	<u>(3,535)</u>
Net Revenues	51,181	68,242	215,992	363,742	314,492	117,492	68,242
Expenditures							
MDE Administrative Expenses	465	905	940	1,005	1,032	1,083	1,136
Sewer Infrastructure Grants	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0	0
ENR Capital Grants	0	26,500	174,000	369,000	270,000	35,500	0
ENR O&M Grants	0	0	0	0	0	6,087	6,087
Septic System Grants/Loans	4,728	6,304	6,304	6,304	6,304	6,304	6,304
Debt Service	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>12,036</u>	<u>36,109</u>	<u>56,170</u>	<u>60,182</u>
Total Expenditures	9,193	37,709	185,244	392,345	317,446	105,144	73,709
Fund Balances							
Debt Service Reserve	0	0	15,000	45,000	70,000	75,000	75,000
Beginning Balance ²	0	41,988	72,521	88,269	29,665	1,711	9,059
End-of-year Balance ²	41,988	72,521	88,269	29,665	1,711	9,059	3,592
Bonds Sold	0	0	150,000	300,000	250,000	50,000	0
Debt Outstanding	0	0	150,000	445,464	681,628	709,539	684,834

¹ Net of Bond Issuance Costs, estimated at 1.5% of bond issuance.

² Excludes Debt Service Reserve, which is estimated at 10% of bond issuance.

Appendix 2
County by County Breakdown
Estimated ENR Cost and Surcharge Revenue

<u>County</u>	<u>Estimated Cost ENR Upgrades (\$ in million)</u>	<u>Estimated Annual Revenue from Proposed Surcharge (WWTP users) (\$ in million/year)</u>	<u>Estimated Annual Revenue from Septic Waste (\$ in million/year)</u>
Allegany	\$13.06	\$1.58	\$0.11
Anne Arundel	40.13	4.45	1.18
Baltimore City	150.00	12.77	0.00
Baltimore	Included with Baltimore City	10.26	0.75
Calvert	1.00	0.08	0.20
Caroline	3.00	0.13	0.63
Carroll	9.00	0.87	0.84
Cecil	8.00	0.54	0.52
Charles	4.00	1.01	0.55
Dorchester	8.00	0.62	0.18
Frederick	18.00	1.70	0.91
Garrett	No plant discharge to bay	0.37	0.28
Harford	27.25	1.89	0.90
Howard	10.00	2.76	0.63
Kent	2.00	0.11	0.12
Montgomery	5.00	10.44	0.87
Prince George's	19.00	10.11	0.28
Queen Anne's	4.11	0.23	0.24
Somerset	3.00	0.13	0.14
St. Mary's	8.00	0.44	0.58
Talbot	11.00	0.24	0.21
Washington	10.00	1.24	0.46
Wicomico	8.00	0.69	0.50
Worcester	4.00	1.07	0.16
WSSC	377.20	Included with Montgomery and PG above	
Total	\$742.74	\$63.72	\$11.23

Note: Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

Total costs based on MDE's initial estimates for ENR upgrades.

Final costs will likely total between \$750 million and \$1 billion.

Costs represent costs to upgrade major WWTPs located in the counties shown above.

Estimated revenue from WWTP users based on annual revenue collected from WWTPs with NPDES permits.

Total annual revenues from WWTP users are estimated at \$65.04 million annually.

(The balance anticipated from industrial dischargers and users of WWTPs with groundwater discharge permits).

Estimated revenue from WWTP users adjusted to represent surcharge collected from users within counties shown above.

Estimated annual revenue from septic system waste based on data provided by the Maryland Department of Planning.

Source: Maryland Department of the Environment, Department of Legislative Services