

CWEA 2015 Stormwater Seminar

Don't Get Swept Away in the Runoff: Meeting MS4 Challenges

(October 21, 2015)



The Challenges

- Implementation Timeline
- Contractor Pool
- Permitting Issues
- Costs
- Funding
- Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Requirements
- Litigation (all 10 Phase I MS4 counties)



Implementation Timeline & Contractor Pool

- Implementation Timeline
 - Five Years
 - 20% retrofit requirement
 - Challenge to plan, permit, fund, and complete projects
- Contractor Pool
 - Jurisdictions all vying for same contractors
 - Industry slowly responding
 - Training and education challenges statutory and regulatory requirements, current Best Management Practices (BMPs)



Permitting Issues

- Fast permit process critical for MS4 projects
- Current permitting system viewed as slow and cumbersome
- United States Army Corps of Engineers
 - Slow response times;
 - Inflexible
 - Unwilling to consider reforms?



Permitting Issues

- Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)
 - Permit reform proposals for stormwater restoration project permits by MACo, Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments, and MS4 counties
 - Positive response letter from MDE
 - 90-day permit review for most projects
 - "Checklist" of required information & pre-application meetings
 - Removal of wetlands program requirement for "alternative site analysis" for TMDL-driven restoration projects
 - Removal of mitigation requirements for most "restorative" projects
 - Quarterly meetings with counties and ongoing discussion on further reforms/issues



Costs

- Along with septic system upgrades, stormwater mitigation is most expensive of Bay TMDL sectors
- In Maryland, retrofit costs mostly borne by local governments (county costs are over a billion statewide)
- SB 863 of 2015 (stormwater fee/"rain tax" legislation) requires Phase I MS4 counties to have a financial assurance plan approved by MDE and penalties for non-compliance (up to \$5,000-10,000 per day)



Funding

- Both State and counties facing significant budget restraints
- State at debt limit for issuing bonds
- Other state-imposed or necessary funding mandates, such as public schools, public safety
- State reductions to local aid (~90% reduction in local highway user revenue)
- New funding avenue Bay Restoration Fund now able to be used for stormwater restoration projects



Chesapeake Bay TMDL Requirements

- TMDL efforts separate but influence MS4 requirements
- 2017 Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Milestone
- Changes to Bay Model
- New nutrient reduction goals?
- Maryland is an acknowledged leader
- EPA recognizes Pennsylvania and Conowingo Dam issues



- Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Montgomery, Prince George's Counties and Baltimore City
 - All before Maryland Court of Appeals
 - Montgomery is the original case, others now essentially moving with it
 - Suits originally brought by various in-state and out-ofstate environmental groups; MDE & Baltimore City now also petitioners
 - Issues: (1) Standard of Compliance (strict compliance or maximum extent practicable (MEP) and (2) sufficiency of permit benchmarks, deadlines & monitoring
 - Lower courts upheld MEP standard and generally found all but Montgomery County's permit sufficient in detail (essentially giving MDE 4 wins and 1 loss)
 - Court of Appeals hearings scheduled for November 5



- Howard County
 - Before the Maryland Court of Special Appeals
 - Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) challenged sufficiency of MDE's issued permit
 - Howard County made motion to dismiss for lack of standing and circuit court granted County's motion
 - CBF appealed to Court of Special Appeals and initial brief is due October 28



- **Use of the Country o**
 - Each case currently before Circuit Court
 - CBF (joined by Mattawoman Watershed Society in the Charles County case) challenged sufficiency for each county's issued permit
 - Each county also separately challenged the terms of their permit
 - Both cases for each county pending in Circuit Court but currently stayed pending higher court action for other counties



- Paul N. Chod v. Board of Appeals for Montgomery County
 - July 22 Circuit Court Decision that called into question Montgomery County's Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC)
 - Case was driven by a specific set of facts regarding the developer plaintiff and holding was based on statutory language from § 4-202.1 of the Environment Article
 - Court held: (1) the WQPC is per se invalid and (2) the WQPC is invalid as applied in this instance
 - Court held the fee must be related to stormwater services the county provides to a property owner and must take into account on-site mitigation efforts
 - Decision limited to current case but could potentially be used to establish much broader precedent for any jurisdiction with stormwater fee



Looking Forward

- Is the future dark and cloudy or bright and sunny?
- Still cloudy: outcome of litigation, effect of 2017 TMDL review, budget and economic uncertainties
- But chance of sun: MDE permit reform, increased availability of Bay Restoration Fund monies for stormwater restoration, more flexibility and best management practices
- Bottom line: Predicting the weather is hard



Contact Information

Leslie Knapp Jr.

Legal and Policy Counsel

Maryland Association of Counties

Iknapp@mdcounties.org

Phone: 410.269.0043