### **Prince George's County**

Table 2. Preliminary scenario for urban impervious retrofits to meet County MS4 permit by 2017

	Impervious area	Pervious area	Estimated cost per impervious acre	Estimated total cost				
BMP type	(acres)	(acres)	(\$/acre)					
County	1	Т		I a				
Bioretention areas	305	1,728ª	\$100,000	\$30,500,000				
Filtering practices	379	2,148ª	\$100,000	\$37,900,000				
Infiltration practices	1,124	6,369ª	\$100,000	\$112,400,000				
Filtration ponds	725	4,108ª	\$35,000	\$25,375,000				
Wetland restoration	251 <sup>b</sup>	199 <sup>b</sup>	\$82,669°	\$20,750,000				
Stream restoration	645 <sup>b</sup>	3,655ª	\$55,764°	\$35,968,000				
Forest buffer	484ª	939e	\$11,763°	\$5,693,273				
Dry pond retrofits	1,222b	3,477b	\$15,712°	\$19,200,000				
Urban nutrient management	1,000 <sup>d</sup>	11,108e	Minimal	\$100,000				
Impervious area disconnect	975e		\$30,000	\$29,235,000				
State phosphorus fertilizer reduction	tbdf	tbd	Minimal	Minimal				
Sum for County	7,109	33,732	\$44,607	\$317,121,273				
Municipal without Bowie								
Bioretention areas	75	175ª	\$100,000	\$7,500,000				
Filtering practices	89	208ª	\$100,000	\$8,900,000				
Infiltration practices	329	768ª	\$100,000	\$32,900,000				
Filtration ponds	216	504ª	\$35,000	\$7,560,000				
Urban nutrient management	111ª	1,232e	Minimal	Included in above				
Impervious area disconnect	108e		\$30,000	\$3,240,000				
State phosphorus fertilizer reduction	tbd	tbd	Minimal	Minimal				
Sum for Municipal without Bowie	928	2,886	\$64,771	\$60,100,000				
County and Municipal (without Bowie)								
Total	8,037	36,618	\$46,936	\$377,221,273				

Notes:

a. Pervious area estimated from amount of impervious land treated.

b. Known number of acres.

c. Estimated cost per acre is based on known total projected project cost.

d. Impervious area is calculated from equivalent impervious acres per MDE's June 2011 draft document, Accounting for Stormwater Wasteload Allocations and Impervious Acres Treated.

e. Estimated/assumed amount.

f. These amounts will be determined by the state.

#### Table 3. Preliminary additional BMP scenario for urban impervious retrofits for 2017–2020

	Impervious area	Pervious area	Estimated cost per impervious acre	Estimated total cost		
BMP type	(acres)	(acres)	(\$/acre)			
County		1				
Bioretention areas	691	3,916ª	\$85,000	\$58,735,000		
Filtering practices	275	1,558ª	\$85,000	\$23,375,000		
Infiltration practices	675	3,825ª	\$85,000	\$57,375,000		
Filtration ponds	1,265	7,168ª	\$35,000	\$44,275,000		
Wetland restoration	502	398	\$82,669 <sup>b</sup>	\$41,500,000		
Stream restoration	1,290	7,310	\$55,764 <sup>b</sup>	\$71,936,000		
Forest buffer	484	2,743	\$11,763 <sup>b</sup>	\$5,693,273		
Impervious area disconnect	975¢		\$30,000	\$29,235,000		
Sum for County	6,157	26,918		\$332,124,273		
Municipal without Bowie		_				
Bioretention areas	165	385ª	\$85,000	\$14,025,000		
Filtering practices	85	198ª	\$85,000	\$7,225,000		
Infiltration practices	216	504ª	\$85,000	\$18,360,000		
Filtration ponds	716	1,671ª	\$35,000	\$25,060,000		
Impervious area disconnect	108°		\$30,000	\$3,240,000		
Sum for Municipal without Bowie	1,290	2,758		\$67,910,000		
County and Municipal (without Bow	vie)					
Total	7,447	26,918	\$53,721	\$400,034,273		
Notes:		•				

a. Pervious area estimated from amount of impervious land treated.

b. Estimated cost per acre is based on known total projected project cost from 2017 scenario.

c. Estimated/assumed amount.

Urban nutrient management was represented in Table 2. Once installed, structural BMPs and impervious disconnection will begin performing toward required pollutant reduction with appropriate maintenance. Urban nutrient program is an institutional control that should continue to be implemented continuously to meet required pollutant reduction and needs to be input into the model/MAST only once, as reported in Table 2.

### SECTION 3: 2012 - 2013 MILESTONES

Ann	e Arundel Cour	ntv Gov	ernmer	nt WIP	Two	Year M	ileston	es (201	2 - 201	.3)			
IMPLEMENTATION ACTION MILESTONES (2012-2013)	BMP Type	# of Projects	TN Efficien cy <sup>(2)</sup>	TP Efficiency <sup>(2)</sup>	TSS Efficiency <sup>(2)</sup>	Units	Un its Available	TN Load Reduction	TP Load Reduction	TSS Load Reduction	Impervious Acres Treated	Unit Cost (\$/lbs of TN)	Line Item Cost
			Urban and	d Suburbar	Stormwa	ter <sup>(1)</sup>							
Connect incised perennial streams to floodplain using instream weirs Restore perennial degraded and severely degraded Restoring zero order ephemeral streams and pipe outfalls with Step Pool Storm Conveyance (filtering systems) Retrofit pre-2002 ponds as Shallow Wetland Street Sweeping (closed section road) Inlet cleaning Stormwater to the MEP for County Schools Watershed Organization Projects <sup>(3)</sup> Stormwater to the MEP for County Facilities Upland Tree Plantings	Stream Conventional Stream Wetland Ephemeral Filtration Pond wetland/filtration Street Sweep Inlet Clean SW to MEP LID NGO LID Facilities Plantings	4 5 17 11 TBD 3 N/A 16 N/A	0.02 40 50 40 4 10 50 50 50 66	0.0035 60 60 60 4 2 60 60 60 60 77	2.55 85 90 85 22 56 90 90 90 90 57	Linear Feet Acres Acres Acres Acres Acres Acres Acres Acres Acres Acres Acres	10016 587 1015 280 967 2371 35 1045 41 60	200 678 516 210 349 2137 156 4709 185 357	35 131 93 38 349 427 187 5650 222 416	13 14 11 3 1918 11966 281 8475 333 308	244 227 399 84 967 1660 14 418 16 N/A	\$ 31,475 \$ 13,629 \$ 24,266 \$ 14,123 \$ 1,663 \$ 534 \$ 4,604 Cost not inc \$ 4,604 \$ 9,430	\$ 2,968,946 \$ 580,043 \$ 1,141,326 \$ 719,075 urred by County \$ 850,608
	TOTAL		Waste V	Vater Treat	ment Facil	itios		9,496	7,549	23,322			\$ 29,523,941
ENR Upgrade to Annapolis WRF	ENR	1			N/A	N/A	N/A	158,388	47,524	0	N/A	\$126	\$20,000,000
	TOTAL							158,388	47,524	0	N/A		\$20,000,000
				Septic Sys									
Reduction Act of 2009 <sup>5</sup> Implementataion of the Bay Restoration Fund Program Implement Ancounty Code (Subdivision and Development Code in Critical Areas & Bog Protection Areas <sup>6</sup> Groundwater Protection Plan (Outside Critical Areas) <sup>7</sup>	Residential Septic Residential Septic Residential Septic Residential Septic	360 260 72 60	50 50% 50%	0	( (	each each each	360 260 72 60	4,378 3,162 547 456	0 0 0	0	c c	\$12,500 \$12,500	\$4,500,000 \$3,250,000 \$900,000
			OSDS Public										\$750,000
Connection to Public Sewer via Petition Project (Deale Road Wastewater Extension Petition Project) <sup>8</sup> PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT ACTION MILESTONES (2012-2	Residential Commercial TOTAL 013)	35 14			0		35		0	0	C		
Establish MOU with SHA for implementation of urban stormwater projects Draft & adopt legislation to create a stormwater utility enterprise fund Coordinate with Fed/State regulators to reduce permitting time Continue investigating options for nutrient trading as a tool to offset future loads from new development.													
Refine costs for design/construction of pump station upgra	des		waste w	Vater Treat	ment Faci	ities							
In 2012, revise Water and Sewer Master plan to incorporate areas outside of the Sewer Service Areas that are intended to be connected as part the WIP. Develop new requirements and boundaries for the proposed Cluster Treatment Areas to incorporate them into the Water and Sewer Master Plan. Develop Policies and Procedures to promote public sewer in management areas designated as high priority and for capital improvement projects. Septic Systems									ter Treatment				
Request FY12 County budget appropriation for Septic Implementation Plan Execute contract for Septic Implementation Plan Continue to refine sewer extension and cluster treatment system implementation plans and cost estimates. Determine long term funding methods to pay for connection of existing OSDS to public sewer and cluster treatment systems. Develop mechanisms and policies to achieve funding, may require legislation actions. Begin planning for long term implementation of these funding policies. Continue researching more cost effectives alternatives to serve the proposed cluster treatment areas. Initiate a pilot project to serve a cluster treatment area in 2013.								planning for long					
Develop a tracking and reporting system to follow the progress of OSDS conversion and upgrades. Develop Policies and Procedures for handling Operation and Maintenance for upgraded OSDS Develop Poproach for prioritization of OSDS upgrades. Determine Staffing requirements and receive position authorizations. Develop polices to reduce nutrient loading due to future growth of OSDS. Review and Clarify legal and administrative policies to connect existing OSDS to public sewer and cluster treatment systems. Review and Clarify permitting requirements to connect existing OSDS to public sewer and cluster treatment systems. Develop Countywide Public Relations Strategy													
Footnotes (1) Urban Stormwater pollutant reduction strategy reported for FY-12 and FY-13 is based on currently programmed County CIP projects and does not imply that all projects will be fully constructed by the end of FY13. These project are													
currently in various levels of implementation from concept design and project initiation to under construction. Construction completion is contingent upon permitting, right of way, availability of capital and grant funds, and other factors. <sup>(2)</sup> All Urban and Suburban stormwater strategy efficiencies with the exception of wetland creation systems are based on MDE's June 2011 document "Accounting for Stormwater Wasteload Allocations and Impervious Acres Treated." In this document MDE utilizes a similar efficiency for wetland creation and wet ponds, which deviates from efficiencies reported in earlier publications. The pollutant reduction computations reported in this spreadsheet are based on TN = 40%, TP=60%, and TSS= 85%, which is consistent with "Center for Watershed Protection. 2007a. National Pollutant Removal Performance Database. Version 3. Ellicott City, MD. September 2007. Available at: http://www.cwp.org/Downloads/bmpwriteup_092007_v3.pdf". <sup>(3)</sup> Watershed Organization Projects represents the total pollutant reduction from all type of restoration strategies (Stream, outfalls, ponds, LID, plantings, shoreline stabilization, etc.). Refer to the specific project list table for Watershed Organization projects for more detail on the individual BMP efficiencies and reductions. <sup>(4)</sup> reserved													
(5) This includes both new, repaired, and replaced OSDS (6) Assumes that this only includes those OSDS within the Bog Protection Areas and outside of the Critical Area, those in the Critical Area would be under the Chesapeake Bay Nitrogen Reducing Act of 2009 (7) Assumes that these areas are within the 50% Delivery Ratio													
(8) Assumed that average flow rate for commercial properties = 1300 gpd. This equals approximately 1300/250 = 5.2 EDUs per Commercial Property. TN Load Reductions will be included in the Broadwater WRF capacity													

# **Howard County WIP**

# **III.2013** Milestones

- Milestones for fiscal years FY2012 and FY2013
- □ Complete Feasibility Study for stormwater utility
- □ Establish Watershed Stewards Academy and hold first round of classes
- □ Develop plan for enhanced education and outreach program for septic system pump outs and urban nutrient management Seek increased funding to expand County sponsored watershed enhancement grant program
- Construct stormwater pond retrofits to treat a drainage area of approximately 70 acres
- □ Construct stream restoration projects for approximately 10,000 feet of stream
- □ Complete stormwater retrofit evaluation of County owned buildings and begin implementation of identified retrofit projects
- □ Seek additional funding for providing economic incentives to septic system owners to encourage retrofit of BAT systems
- □ Continue street sweeping and reforestation programs at current levels
- □ Resolve the discrepancy between the MAST model and County Health Department records regarding the number of septic systems in the County