**Maryland Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies, Inc.**
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission
14501 Sweitzer Lane, 7th Floor
Laurel, MD 20707
Tel: 301-206-7008



March 11, 2026

The Honorable Marc Korman
Chair, Environment and Transportation Committee
250 Taylor House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

**Re: OPPOSE -- HB 1268 (Environmental Permits – Requirements for Burden Analysis, Issuance and Renewal, and Public Participation (Cumulative Harms for Environmental Restoration for Improving Shared Health – CHERISH Our Communities Act))**

Dear Chair Korman:

On behalf of the Maryland Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies (MAMWA), I am writing to **OPPOSE HB 1268**, which would apply extensive and burdensome requirements on certain entities applying for a permit from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE).

MAMWA is a statewide association of local governments and wastewater treatment agencies that serve approximately 95% of the State's sewered population. Although MAMWA supports some aspects of the bill - for example, the requirement for increased outreach and notice to overburdened communities and public hearings and public comment opportunities relating to the reissuance of covered general permits (p. 16, l. 4-6) - MAMWA's concerns with other aspects of HB 1268 are so significant that we are compelled to oppose the bill.

Many of MAMWA's members: (i) have locally owned facilities covered by the industrial stormwater general permit targeted by the bill; (ii) work with private entities that provide needed sewage sludge storage when land application is not available or practicable; and/or (iii) work with private entities that serve as sewage sludge distribution facilities. The bill would subject the third parties in (ii) and (iii) to extensive and expensive requirements to develop Baseline Understanding of Risk, Disparities, and Environmental Needs (BURDEN) reports each time they seek MDE approval to install, alter, or extend one of these structures.

MAMWA objects to the bill for the following reasons:

**(1) Having Coverage Under MDE's Industrial Stormwater General Permit or Individual Permit Coverage for Sewage Sludge Storage or Distribution Does Not Mean There Is an Increased Potential for Adverse Community Environmental and Public Health Impacts. (p. 3, l. 18-19, p. 4, l. 6-9)**

HB 1268's underlying premise is that there may be environmental and public health burdens imposed on at-risk communities associated with facilities covered by MDE's 20-SW-A (General Permit for Discharges from Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activities) or covered by individual permits associated with sewage sludge storage and distribution facilities.

In fact, many of the county and municipally owned facilities covered by 20-SW-A provide significant societal benefits with no increased risk to the environment or public health. Wastewater treatment plants provide a critical public health benefit by treating residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial waste. Local and highway passenger transportation facilities provide local citizens with bus services and other passenger travel. Water transportation facilities provide local citizens with water taxis. Air transportation facilities provide airport and terminal services. Department of public works and highway maintenance facilities provide essential maintenance for snowplows and trash trucks. School bus maintenance facilities ensure the safety of our students on local buses.

HB 1268 also covers individual permits for the storage or distribution of sewage sludge. Sewage sludge storage facilities provide a location for temporary storage of these highly treated materials before they are land applied on farms across the State. Sewage sludge distribution facilities include things like local hardware stores that sell highly treated Class A sewage sludge to individual residential and commercial customers.

MAMWA does not see the connection between these beneficial facilities and an increased risk to at-risk communities.

**(2) The Bill is Unnecessary; MDE Already Reviews Impacts Associated with Facilities Covered by the Industrial Stormwater General Permit and Sewage Sludge Storage and Distribution Facilities.**

Current State law directs MDE to consider public and environmental health before it issues an NPDES permit, like 20-SW-A (Md. Code ENV §9-302(b), (c)(1)).

In addition, current State law directs MDE to deny a sewage sludge utilization permit, including storage and distribution permits, if MDE finds that the applicant cannot utilize the sewage sludge without "Causing an undue risk to the environment or public health, safety, or welfare;" (Md. Code ENV §9-245(1)(i)).

MDE takes this responsibility very seriously. 20-SW-A includes extensive requirements for a covered facility including Chesapeake Bay restoration requirements for certain facilities, requirements for on-site control measures to minimize pollutant discharges, good housekeeping, maintenance of industrial equipment and systems, spill prevention and response procedures, erosion and sediment controls, salt storage, and employee training. Permittees must develop and update a document called a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) to address these requirements.

Similarly, an applicant for an individual sewage sludge storage facility must submit a laundry list of information, all intended to protect the environment and public health. For example, a sewage sludge storage applicant must submit a "detailed operation plan" and extensive information on how it will protect water resources. COMAR 26.04.06.28. MDE may not permit a storage facility unless it finds the facility complies with all zoning and local land use regulations of the host county. MDE may not permit a storage facility unless there is either a minimum 1,000-foot buffer zone between the facility and nearby homes or

adequate odor control. COMAR 26.04.06.27. An applicant for an individual distribution facility faces comparable requirements. COMAR 26.04.06.33 - .36.

**(3) The Requirements for a BURDEN Report Are Unfair and Highly Burdensome (p. 11, l. 19 - p. 13, l. 13)**

HB 1268 requires that an applicant for a covered individual permit provide a BURDEN Report with its application. MAMWA has multiple concerns with the BURDEN Report requirements.

First, the requirement would unfairly impact the first applicant in line. The first applicant near an at-risk census tract would have to do an extensive and expensive analysis of pollution that they are not even responsible for in the community. Later, nearby applicants would be able to use this documentation for free when they apply.

Second, the BURDEN Report requires applicants to study completely unrelated issues. A sewage sludge distribution facility does not create any risk for ambient air impacts. It makes no sense to have an applicant review that issue. The same can be said for traffic volume and contaminated drinking water supplies.

Third, the BURDEN Report would require an applicant to look far beyond the at-risk census tract. The BURDEN Report must include a comprehensive list of each existing pollution source impacting the community. Assuming this includes air pollutants, these pollutants are often carried by wind from far away (including from areas out-of-state). Unless an applicant hires a consultant to model air deposition, it is unclear how it would be able to identify these sources.

Lastly, the BURDEN Report would require an applicant to provide information on undefined "existing environmental and public health stressors." Smoking, drinking alcohol, and not getting regular exercise are all stressors to public health and it is unreasonable to require applicants for environmental permits to assess them.

**(4) The 1.5 Mile Radius Makes No Sense in Many Situations (p. 2, l. 18 – p. 3, l. 2)**

The definition of at-risk census tract includes a geographic area within a 1.5-mile radius of a census tract with an EJ score at or above the 75% statewide, a census tract with six or more identified health indicators, or a census tract with proximity to specific facilities. MAMWA is perplexed by the reasoning behind extending the requirements to properties 1.5 miles outside of an EJ area (in many cases, a community 1.5 miles outside of an EJ area would not itself be an EJ community). If the bill moves forward, requirements should be limited to a review of the EJ census-tract itself.

In addition, many permit applicants are in rural areas. There could be facilities in rural parts of the state that are within 1.5 miles of an at-risk community. Those communities could have a small number of residents. It makes no sense to require the extensive level of study required by this bill for 10 people.

**(5) Increasing Penalty Amounts by 75% is Punitive (p. 18, l. 13 – 16)**

HB 1268 increases penalties for violations within an at-risk census tract by 75%. MDE already has significant authority to assess civil penalties. There is no justification for increasing those already high penalties by 75% simply because the action occurred in an at-risk census tract.

**(6) Requiring Online Information on Enforcement Raises Privacy and Fairness Questions (p. 18, 17-21)**

HB 1268 mandates that MDE make information on enforcement actions against a permitted facility available on-line. MAMWA submits that publicly identifying a potential violation, which has not yet been investigated and/or adjudicated, could cause a permittee unwarranted and unfair reputational damage.

In addition, MAMWA would be surprised if MDE would want to publicly identify its investigations until they are completed.

**(7) Sending 25% of Fines to At-Risk Communities with No Guardrails Could Encourage Fraud (p. 18, 25-29)**

HB 1268 states that MDE's goal should be to use at least 25% of any revenue from an enforcement action within an at-risk census tract to assist (undefined) the affected tract.

MAMWA strongly supports guardrails. It is bad public policy to establish a system for contributions to a local community with no controls in place. There should be basic usage, accounting, and auditing rules in place. If rules are not in place, money can be used on items that are problematic. A good example is in the February 21, 2025, Baltimore Sun (*State accountability on grants, nonprofits has 'fallen through the cracks,' former audit chair says*). The article notes that in 2020, state auditors found that a nonprofit had spent $750,000 meant to combat opioid addition on the purchase of a former country club and golf course.

In our experience, MDE is even reluctant to manage the money for supplemental environmental projects (SEPs). For example, in the recent Back River/Patapsco Consent Decree, MDE directs the money for SEPs to the Chesapeake Bay Trust (CBT), with funding reverting to MDE if it is not used.

The bill also lacks any detail on how 25% of a large fine would be used if the impacted community is small.

For example, if there are 10 residents near a concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO), and the CAFO is fined $4 Million, the community would receive $1 Million (or $100,000 per resident) from the enforcement action. Again, there are no details for how this money would be used to "assist" (undefined) these communities.

**(8) Limiting MDE's Ability to Issue Future Permits Is Unwise (p. 16, l. 8-20)**

HB 1268 prohibits MDE from reissuing a future covered individual or general permit with less stringent conditions unless there was a technical or legal error or a less stringent condition is necessary because of events out of a permittee's control.

This is a much more limited subset of the well-known anti-backsliding language in Clean Water Act Section 402. HB 1268 leaves out, for example, an exception for information that was not available at the time of permit issuance that, if known, would have justified a less stringent effluent limitation.

MAMWA disagrees that this antibacksliding language is necessary given the federal limitations. In addition, MAMWA submits that MDE should be allowed to change future permits based on the knowledge

it gains during permit implementation. If 20-SW-A includes a requirement that MDE discovers is not working well, why would we not want MDE to strike it in a future permit?

**(9) Requiring MDE to Report Back on Broadening the Scope of the Bill Is Problematic (p. 20, l. 8 – 18)**

HB 1268 directs MDE to report back to the General Assembly on whether to expand the scope of the requirements to include any discharge permit issued under §9-323 of the Environment Article and permits for the utilization of sewage sludge issued under §9-231.4 or 9-238 of the Environmental Article.

Including wastewater treatment plants and other types of sewage sludge permits would raise many of the issues MAMWA commented on in 2025 in response to HB 1484 (attached).

For the reasons above, MAMWA urges the Committee to **Vote NO** on HB 1268.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions at Lisa@AquaLaw.com or 804-716-9021.

Sincerely,

Lisa M. Ochsenhirt
MAMWA Deputy General Counsel

cc: Environment and Transportation Committee Members, HB 1268 Sponsors

**Maryland Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies, Inc.**
Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission
14501 Sweitzer Lane, 7th Floor
Laurel, MD 20707
Tel: 301-206-7008



March 7, 2025

The Honorable Marc Korman
Chair, Environment and Transportation Committee
250 Taylor House Office Building
Annapolis, MD 21401

**Re: OPPOSE -- HB 1484 (Environmental Permits – Requirements for Public Participation and Impact and Burden Analysis (Cumulative Harms to Environmental Restoration for Improving Shared Health – CHERISH Our Communities Act))**

Dear Chair Korman:

On behalf of the Maryland Association of Municipal Wastewater Agencies (MAMWA), I am writing to **OPPOSE HB 1484**, which would apply extensive and burdensome requirements on certain entities applying for a permit from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE).

MAMWA is a statewide association of local governments and wastewater treatment agencies that serve approximately 95% of the State's sewered population. Many of MAMWA's members would be directly and negatively impacted by HB 1484. MAMWA objects to the bill for the following reasons:

**(1) The Bill is Unnecessary; MDE Already Reviews Impacts Associated with NPDES, Potable Reuse, and Sewage Sludge Permits**

Current State law directs MDE to consider public and environmental health before it issues a NPDES permit (Md. Code ENV §9-302(b), (c)(1)), a potable reuse permit (Md. Code §9-303.2), and a sewage sludge utilization permit (COMAR 26.04.06.11).

In addition, for the installation, expansion, or modification of a sewerage system, MDE requires a construction permit which ensures "that infrastructure projects throughout the State are designed on sound engineering principles" and that they will "comply with State design guidelines to protect water quality and public health." For major sewerage systems, permit applications must include complete plans and specifications prepared by, signed by, and sealed by a professional engineer. MDE reviews these documents and regularly requests changes to address any identified concerns. COMAR 26.03.12.04.

**(2) The Bill Inappropriately Applies to Renewal Permits**

As noted above, HB 1484 would directly impact MAMWA's publicly owned wastewater treatment plants by identifying them as "covered projects" (many wastewater plants have anaerobic digesters (p. 4, l. 26), energy-generating facilities (p. 5, l. 1-2), and/or sludge processing structures (p. 5, l. 22)). These are built-out systems that represent millions of

dollars, if not more, of investment by local citizens. In addition, all existing facilities have been through the public permitting process multiple times. If the bill moves forward, renewal permits must be stricken from the text.

**(3) MDE Cannot Reasonably Deny a Permit for a Wastewater Treatment Plant (p. 9, l. 9-14)**

Permits are required by law. A wastewater treatment plant must have a permit to discharge into a receiving waterbody. Similarly, potable reuse and sewage sludge permits are required by State law. Refusing to issue a wastewater treatment plant a needed permit is not an acceptable outcome from the permitting process.

**(4) Having an NPDES, Reuse, or Sewage Sludge Permit Does Not Mean There Is an Increased Potential for Adverse Community Environmental and Public Health Impacts. (p. 3, l. 5-21)**

Anaerobic digesters, energy-generating facilities, large wastewater treatment plants, and sludge processing facilities are environmentally beneficial. MAMWA is baffled by why they would be considered covered projects subject to additional requirements when they all have societal benefits. Anaerobic digesters break down waste and create renewable energy; they are far preferable to landfilling residuals, with associated increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Wastewater treatment plants with energy-generating facilities take residuals and create green energy that can be used to meet energy-needs at the plant and/or to provide energy to the transmission grid. Large wastewater treatment plants treat residential, commercial, institutional, and industrial waste and generate highly treated wastewater and biosolids.

Other publicly owned and managed covered projects are similarly beneficial and MAMWA is perplexed why these thoroughly regulated sites are included in this bill.

**(5) The Requirements for an Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) Are Highly Burdensome (p. 3, l. 5-21)**

Many small facilities do not have the expertise to develop an EIA. Although a large, new project may be able to complete an EIA, a lot of small facilities would also be impacted by this bill (e.g., a small wastewater treatment plant, scrap metal yard, or sawmill). These small facilities would have to find and hire multiple consultants (environmental and public health experts), likely at a high cost, to complete this analysis, assuming there are an adequate number of technical experts in the marketplace who are able and willing to do this work.

Unfortunately, MAMWA members would be forced to pass along any increased costs associated with an EIA, a Proposed Existing Burden Report (PEBR), and with a cumulative impacts mitigation fund to local wastewater customers. This bill could increase wastewater rates significantly across the State.

On a related note, it is very difficult to assess the full impacts of the bill right now because MDE's Environmental Justice (EJ) screening tool is unavailable. We understand that MDE is currently working to get this tool back on-line and that this is related to the federal Administration pulling its EJ tools from the web. Nonetheless, we cannot currently use the tool.

**(6) The PEBR Requirements Are Highly Burdensome (p. 6, l. 28 – p. 8, l. 6)**

First, the PEBR would unfairly impact the first applicant in line. The first applicant near an at-risk census tract would have to do an extensive and expensive analysis of pollution that they are not even responsible

for in the community. Later nearby applicants would be able to use this documentation for free when they apply.

Second, the PEBR requires applicants to study completely unrelated issues. A wastewater treatment plant does not create any risk for lead exposure. It makes no sense to have a plant review that issue. The same can be said for traffic volume and contaminated drinking water supplies.

Third, the PEBR would require an applicant to gather information from private residents. A wastewater treatment plant does not know if there is lead-based paint in individual homes in the census tract. It is unclear, absent local citizens voluntarily providing that information, how a plant could even gather it.

Fourth, the PEBR would require an applicant to look far beyond the at-risk census tract. The PEBR must include a comprehensive list of each existing pollution source impacting the community. Assuming this includes air pollutants, these pollutants are often carried by wind from far away (including from areas out-of-state). Unless a wastewater treatment plant hires a consultant to model air deposition, it is unclear how it would be able to identify these sources.

Lastly, the PEBR would require an applicant to provide information on undefined "existing environmental and public health stressors." Smoking, drinking alcohol, and not getting regular exercise are all stressors to public health and it is unreasonable to require applicants for environmental permits to assess them.

**(7) Requiring Payments into a Cumulative Impacts Mitigation Fund Could Result in Fraud or Poor Use of the Funds (p. 10, l. 1-12)**

First, it is bad public policy to establish a fund with no controls in place. There should be basic fund usage, accounting, and auditing rules in place. If rules are not in place, money can be used on items that are problematic. A good example is in the February 21, 2025 Baltimore Sun (*State accountability on grants, nonprofits has 'fallen through the cracks,' former audit chair says*). The article notes that in 2020, state auditors found that a nonprofit had spent $750,000 meant to combat opioid addition on the purchase of a former country club and golf course.

MDE does not even want to manage the money for supplemental environmental projects (SEPs). For example, in the recent Back River/Patapsco Consent Decree, MDE directs the money for SEPs to the Chesapeake Bay Trust (CBT), with funding reverting to MDE if it is not used. CBT is in a better position than MDE to ensure the funding is properly used.

Second, it is unclear how an agreement could benefit "all residents" in the at-risk census tract. This is too high a bar and would be unnecessary if funds were managed by CBT.

Third, the bill lacks any detail on how much the mitigation fund would be. What are the anticipated amounts a permittee would have to pay? If the impacted community is small, would the mitigation amount be scaled down? These are fundamental questions that are entirely unanswered by the bill.

**(8) It May be Excessive to Require That 25% of Revenue from Enforcement to Be Sent Back to Affected Communities (p. 10, l. 19-22)**

For example, if there are 10 residents near a concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO), and the CAFO is fined $4 Million, the community would receive $1 Million (or $100,000 per resident) from the enforcement action. Again, there are no details for how this money would be used to "assist" (undefined) these

communities (and in fact, the bill does not even require that the funding go to the CAFO impacted community, just to "affected communities.")

**(9) The 1.5 Mile Radius Makes No Sense in Many Situations (p. 6, l. 28 – p. 7, l. 2)**

Many permit applicants are in rural areas. There could be CAFOs or landfills in rural parts of the state that are within 1.5 miles of an at-risk community. Those communities could have a small number of residents. It makes no sense to require the extensive level of study required by this bill for 10 people.

MAMWA urges the Committee to **Vote NO** on HB 1484.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions at Lisa@AquaLaw.com or 804-716-9021.

Sincerely,

Lisa M. Ochsenhirt
MAMWA Deputy General Counsel

cc: Environment and Transportation Committee Members, HB 1484 Sponsor