T&E COMMITTEE #2 February 27, 2014

Worksession

MEMORANDUM

February 25, 2014

TO: Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy & Environment Committee

FROM: Keith Levchenko, Senior Legislative Analyst

SUBJECT:

ECT: Worksession: FY15-20 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Conservation of Natural Resources:

- Stormwater Management
- Storm Drains

Council Staff Recommendations:

- Stormwater Management: Approve as Recommended by the County Executive. Highlights:
 - Continued ramp-up in scope and costs for projects to address retrofit work per the NPDES-MS4 permit
 - State Aid assumed at previously approved levels.

NOTE: the Stormwater Management CIP is funded entirely from Water Quality Protection Fund dollars (current revenue and bonds) and State aid. Therefore, changes in expenditures in this program <u>DO NOT</u> affect overall CIP Spending Affordability limits.

- Storm Drains: Approve as Recommended by the County Executive but with a twoyear appropriation recommended for the <u>Storm Drain General</u> project. Highlights:
 - No new "stand alone" projects
 - Wapakoneta Road Improvements project on schedule
 - CE recommends moving switching GO bond funding to Water Quality Protection Fund bonds.

The following officials and staff will be attending this meeting:

Stormwater Management CIP Discussion

Bob Hoyt, Director, Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Kathleen Boucher, Assistant Director (DEP) Steve Shofar, Chief, Division of Watershed Management (DWM), DEP Vicky Wan, Manager, Water Quality Protection Charge (DWM-DEP) Craig Carson, Manager, Watershed Management (DWM-DEP) Jim Stiles, Manager, Construction and Contracts (DWM-DEP) Mary Beck, CIP Coordinator, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Matthew Schaeffer, OMB

Storm Drains CIP Discussion

Holger Serrano, Deputy Division Chief, Transportation Engineering, Department of Transportation Michael Mitchell, Senior Engineer, Division of Transportation Engineering, Department of Transportation Brady Goldsmith, Office of Management and Budget

Note: Time permitting, Council Staff has asked both DEP and DOT staff to present the Committee with some "before/during/after" photographs of some typical work being done under both the Stormwater Management CIP and the Storm Drains CIP.

FY15-20 STORMWATER MANAGEMENT CIP

Summary

Stormwater management is a shared responsibility among several County departments and agencies. DEP plans and implements the stormwater management CIP program. The Department of Permitting Services reviews, approves, inspects, and enforces requirements for construction of privately-owned stormwater management facilities. DEP works with the County's Department of Transportation (DOT) to address storm drain outfall repair issues, as well as with the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) when WSSC infrastructure work is needed. DEP also inspects and provides structural maintenance for most Montgomery County Public Schools' (MCPS) and the Montgomery County facilities on Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) land.

An excerpt from the Executive's Recommended FY15-20 CIP is attached on O1-12. The Executive is recommending a significant increase in the six-year program (from \$304.9 million to \$363.7 million, or 19.3 percent). This follows very large increases in the program approved in the previous two CIP cycles (FY11-16 and FY13-18).

These prior increases were reflective of the County's efforts to implement its work associated with the County's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit (discussed in more detail later in this memorandum). This year's increase reflects a continued ramping up of work and revised cost estimates based on additional design work completed.

The following table shows the Executive's recommendation compared to the latest Approved FY13-18 CIP.

Stormwater Management CIP (in \$000s)											
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20		
FY13-18 Latest Approved	304,861	44,861	45,000	50,000	50,000	55,000	60,000	29° MARY 200	德国和学习		
FY15-20 CE Recommended	363,655 🌋	William State		53,345	56,724	70,368	60,612	60,666	61,940		
change from Approved	58,794	6 1. C. Marine		3,345	6,724	15,368	612	ACC AND	1921-11-12		
percent change from Approved	19.3% 🖉			6.7%	13.4%	27.9%	1.0%				

The bulk of the increased dollars are in the <u>Miscellaneous Stream Valley Improvements</u> project (\$26.1 million increase), SM Retrofit: Roads (\$22 million increase), and <u>SM Facility</u> <u>Major Structural Repair</u> (\$8.8 million increase) projects.

Overall, there are six ongoing projects and two new projects.

The sources of funds for the Approved FY13-18 CIP and the FY15-20 Recommended CIP are shown in the following chart.

	FY13-18	FY15-20	% of	Change from	FY13-18
	Total	Total	Total	\$\$	%
Six-Year Total	304,861	363,655		58,794	19.3%
State Aid	69,861	60,000	16.5%	(9,861)	-14.1%
Water Quality Protection Charge - Bonds	228,250	295,255	81.2%	67,005	n/a
Water Quality Protection Charge	6,750	8,400	2.3%	1,650	24.4%

Stormwater Management CIP Funding (in \$000s)

Four years ago, the Council approved the Executive's recommendation to use bonds paid for with Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC) revenue to cover the majority of spending in this program. According to OMB staff, these bonds are being treated like revenue bonds and therefore do not factor into the County's General Obligation Bond Spending Affordability limits. For FY15-20, most of the recommended increase in spending would be covered with additional Water Quality Protection Charge bonds.

The rest of the increase is covered by Water Quality Protection Charge current revenue. State aid is assumed to decrease overall by about \$9.9 million (-14.1 percent) during the six-year period. The new recommended amount (\$60 million) is close to the amounts received for FY13 and FY14 (\$19.8 million). If State aid ultimately received is lower than assumed, then the Council will need to consider whether to increase local funding or reduce the level of effort in projects.

National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Discharge (NPDES-MS4) Permit

Background

DEP is the lead agency for Montgomery County with regard to the NPDES Permit. The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) is the State agency responsible for approving NPDES permits, which are required as part of the Clean Water Act enforced by the Environmental Protection Agency. The first five-year permit was renewed in July 2001 and later modified in January 2004 to include six localities as "co-permittees." The County's permit covers all areas of the County, with the exception of the cities of Gaithersburg, Rockville, and Takoma Park, and lands under the control of State agencies (including the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission) or Federal agencies.

The current 5-year permit was issued by MDE on February 16, 2010. DEP is the lead department coordinating a multi-department/agency response to meet the permit's requirements.

Permit Requirements

The County's Coordinated Implementation Strategy (CCIS) (dated January 2012) provides the planning basis for the County to meet the following goals, as required in the County's NPDES-MS4 Permit:

- 1. Meet Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Wasteload Allocations (WLAs) approved by EPA.
- 2. Provide additional stormwater runoff management on impervious acres equal to 20 percent of the impervious area for which runoff is not currently managed, to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). This requirement continues to be the primary driver of CIP expenditure increases.
- 3. Meet commitments in the Trash Free Potomac Watershed Initiative 2006 Action Agreement, which include support for regional strategies and collaborations aimed at reducing trash, increasing recycling, and increasing education and awareness of trash issues throughout the Potomac Watershed.
- 4. Educate and involve residents, businesses, and stakeholder groups in achieving measurable water quality improvements.
- 5. Establish a reporting framework that will be used for annual reporting, as required in the County's NPDES-MS4 Permit.
- 6. Identify necessary organizational infrastructure changes needed to implement the Strategy.

Cost Implications

The cost implications for implementation of these changes are substantial. Overall, DEP estimates the permit costs to be about \$305 million through 2015 and nearly \$1.9 billion through

2030. Charts from the CCIS (attached on ©23-24) break out these estimated costs by watershed and type of work to be done.

Funding will be sought from Federal and State sources, as well as from local partners. However, as shown earlier, over 80 percent of the Stormwater Management CIP costs are expected to be funded with bonds supported by the County's Water Quality Protection Fund (WQPF).

The increase in Water Quality Protection Fund bond funding in the Recommended FY15-20 CIP is about \$67 million (over the six years) above what is programmed in the Amended FY13-18 CIP. The impact on FY15 is far less, however, and the Water Quality Protection Charge impact for FY15 will depend on a number of other impacts on the Fund. A full review of the Fund will be done as part of the Operating Budget review of the DEP Budget later this spring.

Water Quality Protection Fund

The Water Quality Protection Fund and charge were created in 2001 via Council legislation (Bill 28-00). Since its inception, the Water Quality Protection Fund has covered the costs for the County's inspection, maintenance, and rehabilitation of thousands of stormwater management facilities. Since the approval of the County's latest NPDES-MS4 permit in 2010, the Water Quality Protection Fund has become the major source of funding (for both current revenue and bond financing) for this work as well.

Last year, the Council approved major legislative and regulatory changes in the structure of the Water Quality Protection Charge. These changes included:

- Broadening the charge to include almost all property owners.
- Providing credits to property owners who have on-site or off-site stormwater management facilities and/or implement certain best practices.
- Providing a hardship exemption for residential property owners and qualifying non-profits.
- Providing for a supplemental grant program to offset the cost to eligible homeowners associations for WQPC assessments associated with private roads that meet certain conditions.
- o Phasing in any increased charges to property owners over three years.

These changes addressed requirements in State law while also making the charge more equitable and broader in the context of providing sufficient resources to meet the County's NPDES-MS4 permit requirements.

Implementation

DEP already has engineering and construction contracts in place that are being utilized now for current work. Additional contracts will be needed in future years to handle the significantly greater construction load. DEP plans to utilize contractors as much as possible to minimize staff increases. DEP has already started to ramp up with the addition of new staff in the last several budgets.

Issues

State Aid Assumptions

Council Staff asked Executive staff to elaborate on the \$10 million per year State aid assumption for FY15-20. Below is DEP's response:

In FY13 and FY14, we received commitments from the State for grants in the amount of \$19.8M. As this actual grant commitment amount (\$19.8M/2 years = \$9.9M per year) was very close to our previous assumption of \$10M per year, we decided to again utilize the \$10M per year assumption. We also wanted to use a number which indicates that the County still needs State Aid for this work.

The apportioning of projected State Aid was based on: 1) how the FY13-14 State Aid was distributed among projects and 2) our estimating where the State will provide Aid in the future.

While the Governor's office has indicated interest in providing additional State Aid, there has been little concrete information. The \$18.9M received in FY13/14 may be a maximum number – now that additional jurisdictions have similar permits to comply with.

If State Aid is received higher than current assumptions, work will increase accordingly to utilize this funding. If State Aid is received lower than current assumptions, the County Executive and County Council would need to decide the adjustments needed to the implementation schedule.

Receipt of the State aid will be a key factor in how much work DEP can implement in the CIP. From Montgomery County's perspective, Council Staff would argue that the local commitment of CIP dollars (already extremely high) should not have to increase further if the assumed State aid is not forthcoming.

Stormwater Management Retrofits

The biggest costs in the stormwater management CIP are for stormwater retrofit work. The permit goal is to retrofit 4,300 acres to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). DEP estimates that it has retrofitted 3,200 acres to date and will retrofit approximately 3,750 acres (87.2 percent of the permit requirement) by the end of the permit period (February 2015).

While below the permit goal, DEP's estimate of acres to be treated represents a massive ramp-up of work. DEP previously has noted that it has received positive feedback from MDE regarding its plans and that Montgomery County is a statewide leader in its permit implementation efforts to date.

Project Review

Facility Planning: SM (PDF on ©4)

Facility Planning: Stormwater Management										
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	
FY13-18 Latest Approved	6,750	1,150	1,150	1,150	1,100	1,100	1,100	、 医乳外输入器		
FY15-20 CE Recommended	8,400			1,150	1,250	1,350	1,450	1,550	1,650	
change from approved	1,650	対象にそれれ		-	150	250	350			
percent change from approved	24.4%		er state e	0.0%	13.6%	22.7%	31.8%			

This project funds evaluations of watershed needs and identifies alternatives to address these needs, including possible CIP projects. This project provides approximately 30 percent design completion to projects generated from this program. The project is funded with Water Quality Protection Fund current revenue dollars.

Annual facility planning costs are assumed to go up during the six-year period as DEP expects future stormwater management and stream restoration opportunities will require more effort and resources to meet future MS4 permit requirements. DEP has noted that, "future planning efforts will involve identifying projects to reduce waste loads allocations closer to the pollutant source (LID/ESD) rather than treating larger impervious areas by retrofitting existing stormwater management facilities."

As far as current work in the project, DEP provided the following project update:

The watershed implementation plans for Dry Seneca, Little Seneca, Upper Potomac Direct, Lower Potomac Direct, and Patuxent watersheds are currently underway and will be completed at the end of FY14. Completing these assessments meets the watershed assessment requirements outline in the County's MS4 permit.

DEP will complete the assessment of 61 schools to identify LID retrofit opportunities in FY14 and begin the final assessment of 80 schools for LID retrofit opportunities before the end of FY14.

The following items are efforts required by MDE or in preparation for future permit requirements

- Updating the CCIS baseline and wasteload allocations in preparation for permit reporting and future MS4 permit requirements (planned for FY15)
- Developing and updating the implementation plan for the impaired watersheds issued by MDE (ongoing based upon issuance from MDE)

		SM	Retrofit - C	ountywide					
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	151,805	14,005	24,200	25,100	24,500	29,500	34,500	같은 꽃을 걸린	
FY15-20 CE Recommended	146,470		الم الجود الم العالي	18,726	22,968	23,408	23,732	27,696	29,940
change from approved	(5,335)		1 A. 20	(6,374)	(1,532)	(6,092)	(10,768)	-	
percent change from approved	-3.5%		15 - L. J.	-25.4%	-6.3%	-20,7 %	-31.2%		

SM Retrofit: Countywide (PDF on ©5-6)

This project provides for the design and construction of stormwater management retrofit projects countywide. The list of projects to be done is summarized on the PDF with more detail and cost information provided on ©32-36. The project is funded with WQPF bonds and State aid (\$3.5 million per year assumed).

The Executive is recommending a total of \$146.5 million over the six-year period (a slight decrease from the FY13-18 CIP after very large increases in this project over the past two biennial CIP cycles).

Misc. Stream Valley Improvements (PDF on ©7-8)

		Misc Stre	am Valley	Improveme	ents				
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	16,456	3,656	3,070	3,070	2,220	2,220	2,220	Star March &	Statistics -
FY15-20 CE Recommended	42,573		en al la companya di seria di Seria di seria di seri	6,393	5,440	9,640	8,900	6,100	6,100
change from approved	26,117			3,323	3,220	7,420	6,680		
percent change from approved	158.7%		<u> </u>	108.2%	145.0%	334.2%	300.9%		

This project funds the design and construction of restoration and corrective measures to stream reaches having severe channel erosion, sedimentation, habitat degradation, and flooding problems. Priorities are based on watershed studies and data from the Countywide Stream Protection Strategy (see excerpt from 2003 update on ©12-13).

The Executive is recommending a total of \$42.6 million over the six-year period (an increase of nearly 160 percent from the approved six-year total of \$16.5 million). The PDF notes that costs are increasing due to an increase in the number of projects to be done¹, site conditions, and higher individual project costs. The projects to be done are summarized on the PDF, and more detail is attached on @30-31.

During its stream evaluations, DEP also identifies storm drain outfall repair needs and coordinates with DOT's <u>Outfall Repairs</u> project. Sewer issues are also identified and forwarded to WSSC.

The project is funded with Water Quality Protection Bonds and State aid. For FY15, the Executive is recommending the same annual level of State aid assumed in the FY13-18 CIP for years FY15 and beyond (\$1.0 million per year).

¹ DEP staff noted that "since the FY13-18 CIP budget submission, the State has provided guidance on equivalent IA which can be obtained via stream restoration projects. Preliminary analysis indicated that stream projects can be cost effective. Therefore, the Department is recommending an increase in the number of stream restoration projects."

SM Retrofit: Schools (PDF on ©9)

		SN	Retrofit - S	Schools					
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	20,100	1,270	1,010	3,270	4,850	4,850	4,850	http://www.com/actions/action	in the second
FY15-20 CE Recommended	24,930	i sui de production de la composición d Composición de la composición de la comp		3,470	6,280	3,480	3,900	3,900	3,900
change from approved	4,830	2 2 19 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	na distribut data Nganggi katalah	200	1,430	(1,370)	(950)		
percent change from approved	24.0%	a ng Kalend		6.1%	29.5%	-28.2%	-19.6%		

This project was split from the SM Retrofit: Government Facilities project two years ago.

The Executive is recommending a six-year total of \$24.9 million, funded entirely with WQPF bonds.² The project is recommended to increase by 24 percent over the six-year period primarily because of prior project delays.

Projects planned for construction are listed on the PDF, with further detail provided on ©25.

SM Retrofit: Roads (PDF on ©10)

		S	M Retrofit	- Roads					
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	76,425	20,515	9,910	11,500	11,500	11,500	11,500		
FY15-20 CE Recommended	98,420			12,740	14,080	26,320	16,010	15,170	14,100
change from approved	21,995			1,240	2,580	14,820	4,510		
percent change from approved	28.8%	1	· `	10.8%	22.4%	128.9%	39.2%		

This project was split from the SM Retrofit: Government Facilities project two years ago.

The Executive is recommending a six-year total of \$98.4 million, funded with WQPF bonds and State aid. The project is recommended to increase by almost 29 percent over the six-year period as a result of additional retrofit projects being added to the schedule.

DEP has provided the following information regarding the large spike in costs in FY16-FY18:

The increases result from two primary items: 1) As indicated on the spreadsheet, DEP has a fairly large number of road subprojects in design; the expected construction of these Roadway SWM projects is expected to occur in FY16 and FY17 – causing a "spike" in costs those years, and 2) Experience over the last 2 years indicate these types of projects are more expensive than previously assumed.

Projects planned for construction are listed on the PDF, with further detail provided on ©26-27.

 $^{^{2}}$ Unlike the other projects, no State aid is assumed for this project, because State legislative action would be required.

SM Retrofit: Government Facilities (PDF on ©11)

		SM Retro	fit - Govern	ment Facil	ities				
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	16,425	1,125	2,900	3,100	3,100	3,100	3,100	양 사람은 영화	Strates -
FY15-20 CE Recommended	17,732			3,026	2,816	2,820	3,270	2,900	2,900
change from approved	1,307		17. Alexandre	(74)	(284)	(280)	170		
percent change from approved	8.0%	2, 7, 7	17 JUL 18	-2.4%	-9.2%	-9.0%	5.5%		

This project provides for the design and construction of Environmentally Sensitive Design (ESD) and Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater management devices at County facilities. The Executive is recommending a six-year total of \$17.7 million, funded entirely with WQPC bonds. The project is recommended to increase by 8.0 percent over the six-year period. A detailed project schedule is attached on ©28-29.

Stormwater Management Facility Major Structural Repair (PDF on ©12)

		SM Facili	ty Major St	ructural Re	pair				
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	14,280	1,830	2,450	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	- New Service	
FY15-20 CE Recommended	23,070	a Part Se		7,530	3,540	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
change from approved	8,790			5,030	1,040	500	500		
percent change from approved	61.6%			201.2%	41.6%	20.0%	20.0%		

This project provides for the design and construction of major structural repairs to County maintained stormwater management facilities. Smaller, less complex projects are funded out of the Operating Budget.

The Executive is recommending a six-year total of nearly \$23.1 million (an increase of \$8.8 million). Most of the increase results from a large bump in FY15. The FY15 increase is a result of including the hydraulic dredging of two large lakes: Lake Whetstone in Montgomery Village and Gunners Lake in Germantown (each costing about \$3.0 million). DEP has noted that because this work requires a specialty contractor, there are economies gained from doing both lakes in FY15.

The project is funded with WQPF Bonds and some State aid.

A full list of projects to be done (and costs) by fiscal year is attached on ©37-38.

Watershed Restoration - Interagency (PDF on ©3)

Watershed Restoration - Interagency											
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY 15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20		
FY13-18 Latest Approved	2,620	1,310	310	310	230	230	230	医疗 了有关的关	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{i$		
FY15-20 CE Recommended	2,060 👘			310	350	350	350	350	350		
change from approved	(560) ⁽¹³			-	120	120	120				
percent change from approved	-21.4%		···	0.0%	52.2%	52.2%	52.2%				

This project is an ongoing series of subprojects that are being constructed in cooperation with the US Army Corps of Engineers. Expenditures by the Corps of Engineers do not show up in the PDF. The Corps pays 65 percent to 75 percent of the total costs.

For FY15-20, the Executive is recommending \$2.1 million in expenditures, which represents a 21.4 percent decrease from the FY13-18 Approved CIP. Apart from the completion of \$1.0 million in State-funded work completed in FY13, the project is showing annual increases in FY16 and beyond as a result of an increase in the number of projects expected to be done in the outyears.

FY15-20 STORM DRAINS CIP

Summary: Council Staff is supportive of the FY15-20 Storm Drains CIP projects recommended by the County Executive.

NOTE: For FY15-20, the County Executive is recommending that the Storm Drains CIP be funded from Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC) bonds and WQPC current revenue, consistent with the transition made over several years to move Storm Drain operating costs from the County's General Fund to the WQPC. Council Staff concurs with this funding change. Assuming this change, any potential expenditure changes in these projects do not affect the County's affordability calculations with regard to G.O. bonds or general current revenue.

Summary

The Department of Transportation (DOT) Division of Transportation Engineering manages the County storm drains program. Properly functioning storm drains remove excess water from the roads, ensuring safer road conditions while also protecting roads from water damage. Properly functioning storm drains also protect adjacent properties from water runoff damage. Work is identified through requests for assistance that come from property owners as well as from government agencies. DOT works in partnership with the State and other municipalities when State roads and/or municipal properties are involved. DOT staff will be available to provide a brief overview of the storm drains program. Some summary information from the DOT website is attached on ©21-22.

An excerpt from the Executive's Recommended FY15-20 CIP for storm drains is attached on @13-20. The Executive is recommending \$16.6 million for FY15-20. The following table shows the recommendation by fiscal year compared to the latest Approved FY13-18 CIP.

·		Stom	ndrains CIP	(in 000s)					
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	17,528	3,043	3,521	2,676	2,676	2,806	2,806		
FY15-20 CE Recommended	16,576	一个编辑书	教育的自治 的	2,676	2,676	2,806	2,806	2,806	2,806
change from amended	(952)			-	-	-	- [a fi sha sha	5 8 20
percent change from approved	-5.4%	2 ⁴² tasyatt	t filter for the second	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		

Last year, the Council approved two amendments to the Stormdrain CIP:

- Facility Planning: Stormdrains: Funding of this project switched from current revenue to Water Quality Protection fund dollars. The annual level of spending (\$250,000) was left unchanged.
- Storm Drain Culvert Replacement: New level of effort project added to the CIP (\$6.3 million total for FYs14-18, funded with G.O. Bonds).

For the FY15-20 CIP, the County Executive is recommending a decrease of \$952,000 (5.4 percent) over the latest Approved CIP. The six-year decrease in expenditures is primarily the result of the completion of two projects (<u>Maple Avenue Storm Drain & Roadway</u> <u>Improvement</u> and the <u>Town of Chevy Chase Storm Drain Improvements</u>). No new projects are recommended.

The sources of funds for the Stormdrains CIP are shown in the following chart.

	FY13-18	FY15-20	\$\$\$	%
	Total	Total	Change	Change
Total	17,528	16,576	(952)	-5.4%
GO Bonds	15,838	-	(15,838)	-100.0%
Water Quality Protection Charge	1,580	6,512	4,932	312.2%
Water Quality Protection Bonds	-	10,064	10,064	n/a
Intergovernmental	110	-	(110)	-100.0%

Stormdrains CIP (in \$000s)

As shown in the chart, the County Executive is recommending using Water Quality Protection Fund (WQPF) Bonds and WQPF current revenue for all ongoing projects. G.O. bonds, which were the primary funding source in the FY13-18 CIP, are zeroed out for the FY15-20 CIP. Some storm drain projects can involve State or other outside participation, although none of these sources are assumed in FY15-20 Recommended CIP at this time.

Project Review

Facility Planning: Stormdrains (PDF on ©15-16)

		Facility P	lanning: S	torm Drain	S				
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20
FY13-18 Latest Approved	1,580	250	250	250	250	290	290	いっきをたいだい	yeştirezi.
FY15-20 CE Recommended	1,660	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	i kingt vi k	250	250	290	290	290	290
change from approved	80	N. 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18	844 S 13	-	-	-	-		
percent change from approved	5.1%	가지는 가나 영국		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		

This project provides for the investigation and analysis of various storm drainage assistance requests initiated by private citizens and public agencies. Depending on the complexity of the project, in-house staff or consultants design projects to a 35 percent design level. At that point, projects that cost over \$500,000 become stand-alone projects if approved. Projects costing less than \$500,000 are constructed in the <u>Storm drain: General</u> project.

The County Executive is recommending \$250,000 in FY15 and FY16 and \$290,000 per year in FY17 through FY20, all with Water Quality Protection Charge current revenue funding. The FY15 through FY18 amounts are the same as approved.

A large portion of funds from this project covers the costs of responding to Drainage Assistance Requests (DARs), background research, data collection, survey, and concept alternative evaluation. Requests continue to be received on a regular basis.

Two projects are noted on the PDF (Linton St./Patton St. and Hollywood Ave. However, DOT has noted that a number of other projects have been added to the project since the PDF was developed last fall. These projects include:

19016 Jamieson Drive Blakeford Court at Falmouth Road 5504 Cornish Road 3005 Decatur Avenue 5506 Ridgefield 6215 Garnett Drive Piney Meetinghouse S. of Cavanaugh

Outfall Repairs (PDF on ©14)

Outfail Repairs												
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20			
FY13-18 Latest Approved	2,628	426	426	426	426	462	462	$(g_{i}, g_{i}) \in [g_{i}, g_{i}] \cap [g_{i}]$	1. jt., 10 (167 -			
FY15-20 CE Recommended	2,700	iyon (Karal)	. N. 91	426	426	462	462	462	462			
change from approved	72			-	-	-	-					
percent change from approved	2.7%		- * •	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					

This project provides for the repair of existing storm drain outfalls into stream valleys. The priorities for this project are developed in coordination with DEP. In addition to planned projects (see below), DOT also receives and coordinates efforts for one or two requests per month from various sources, including DOT-DHS, DEP, WSSC, and M-NCPPC.

For FY15-20, the County Executive recommends a total of \$2.7 million. The annual level of funding is the same as approved for FY15 through FY18. The FY19 and FY20 levels continue the slightly higher levels previously approved in FY17 and FY18.

DOT provided the following list of completed and pending (funded) work in this project:

<u>Completed in FY14</u> Falls Bridge Lane – Potomac Locksley Lane – Silver Spring (Sherwood Forest)

<u>To be completed in FY14</u> Holman Avenue – Silver Spring 11101 Schuylkill Road – Rockville Maple Leaf Drive – Montgomery Village Maple Leaf Court – Montgomery Village

FY15 and beyond

Dilston Place – Silver Spring (WSSC) Dartmouth Avenue – Silver Spring Pebble Hill Lane – Gaithersburg Hollyoak Drive – Bethesda Twig Road – Spencerville Southlawn Lane – Rockville

DOT also noted that additional outfall projects need further investigation and have scopes of work developed.

Storm Drain Culvert Replacement (PDF on ©17)

Storm Drain Culvert Replacement												
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20			
FY13-18 Latest Approved	6,300	-	1,500	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200		対対ない。自			
FY15-20 CE Recommended	7,200		14.14	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200			
change from approved	900			-	-	-	-					
percent change from approved	14.3%			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					

This project (approved last year as an amendment to the FY13-18 CIP) provides for the replacement of failed storm drain pipes and culverts which are less than 6 feet in roadway longitudinal length.³ The project does not make major changes to the location or size of the existing storm drain facilities.

For FY15-20, the County Executive recommends a total of \$7.2 million (\$1.2 million per year). The annual level of funding is the same as approved for FY15 through FY18. The FY19 and FY20 levels continue the FYs 15-18 approved funding levels.

A portion of the funding for this project is for an asset inventory and condition assessment, which DOT estimates will cost about \$200,000 per year over the next five years. So far, preliminary work has been done in coordination with DEP to identify existing storm drain records, and DOT is beginning to do field verification of the data.

³ Structures longer than 6 feet in longitudinal length would continue to be addressed in the Bridge Renovation Program project (No. 509753).

Storm Drain General (PDF on ©18-19)

Storm Drain General											
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20		
FY13-18 Latest Approved	4,908	800	800	800	800	854	854				
FY15-20 CE Recommended	5,016		an Alas de la	800	800	854	854	854	854		
change from approved	108			-	-	-	-				
percent change from approved	2.2%	t generative Statistics	and the state of the	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				

This project includes any storm drain projects costing less than \$500,000, as well as funding to address "spot" projects that can be addressed relatively quickly throughout the year. The annual level of funding in the project has fluctuated over the past several years within a \$600,000 to \$900,000 range, depending on whether there are specific projects assumed to move forward and the availability of funds in general. Projects are prioritized based on their public safety impact (if any), cost, readiness (i.e., facility planning must be completed), potential community benefits, and order the issue was first identified (if projects are of equal merit).

For FY15-20, the County Executive recommends a total of \$5.02 million (\$800,000 per year for FYs 15-16 and \$854,000 per year for FYs 17-20). The annual level of funding is the same as approved for FY15 through FY18. The FY19 and FY20 levels continue the slightly higher levels previously approved in FY17 and FY18.

DOT provided the following information on work to be done in FY15 and FY16:

Linton-Patton: construct new storm drain system in area with few existing closed drainage system where storm event runoff in addition to discharge runoff from an existing pond causes local inundation.

Hollywood Avenue: no existing storm drain system at the local sump of the road; runoff flows through some backyards and causes localized erosion. Construct new storm drain system and connect to existing system further south of subject location.

Jamieson Drive: construction of new road and sidewalk created a small local ponding area in two backyards. Construct local inlet and connect to existing drainage system.

Blakeford Court at Falmouth Road: near-continuous groundwater discharge causes icing at the intersection. Install under-drain and new storm drain system and connect to existing system further south of subject location.

Cornish Road: groundwater discharge causes icing along the road. Install new SD system and connect to existing system further down the road.

Decatur Ave: local runoff cuts through backyards and flows over sidewalk. Install new small system to capture this runoff. Connect to existing system.

5506 Ridgefield: lack of storm drain system in the area causes large flows during storms along surface and icing at intersection. Construct new storm drain system.

Garnett Drive: groundwater discharge causes icing along the road. Install new SD system and connect to existing system further down the road.

Piney Meetinghouse: groundwater discharge causes icing along the road. Install new SD system and connect to existing system further down the road.

Over the past four full CIP cycles, the Council has appropriated this project at a level sufficient to support the first two years of the program. This level of appropriation provides flexibility to DOT to bid and award contracts for work that may fall near the end of the first year of funding. The Recommended CIP assumes to only fund the first year of expenditures (\$800,000). According to OMB staff, including only a single year appropriation for FY15 was an oversight.

Council Staff recommends increasing the FY15 appropriation to \$1.6 million to continue the practice of funding the first two years of the program.

Wapakoneta Road Improvements												
	Six-Year	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20			
FY13-18 Latest Approved	1,563	255	363	945		•	-	$= \{ f_{i_1}^{(i_1)}, g_{i_2}^{(i_1)}, g_{i_3}^{(i_1)}, \dots, g_{i_n}^{(i_n)} \} \}$	- A.			
FY15-20 CE Recommended	915	159	459	915	-	-	=	-	-			
change from approved	(648)	A Press and	i.	(30)	-	~	-					
percent change from approved	-41.5%		`	-3.2%	#DIV/01	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!					

Wapakoneta Road Improvements (PDF on ©20)

Note: This project was approved in May 2010 in the FY11-16 CIP. However, because land acquisition was involved, the project was approved as a road project in order to avail the County of the "quick take" process and expedite the project implementation and minimize costs. Therefore, project costs are not reflected in the overall Storm Drains CIP cost totals noted earlier.

This project provides for reconstruction of pavement and storm drain improvements along Wapakoneta Road between Namakagan Road and Walhonding Road in Glen Echo Heights.⁴ Design is scheduled to start this summer. The project schedule, scope, and cost are unchanged from the Approved CIP, with completion scheduled for the summer of 2015. G.O. bonds are the primary funding source, with some intergovernmental revenue from WSSC also assumed.

Attachments

KML:f\levchenko\conservation of nat resources cip\fy15 20 cnr cip\t&e 2 27 14 sm and sd.doc

⁴ Glen Echo Heights was the subject of a comprehensive study that was completed in August 2007. The study identified a number of roadway and safety issues, as well as stormwater conveyance deficiencies. According to DOT staff, the Glen Echo Heights study area has some of the worst drainage problems in the County. However, the potential scale and cost of the recommended improvements was substantial, and there was disagreement within the Glen Echo Heights Community as to which improvements should be pursued. In addition to roadway and storm drain improvements, the report recommended a number of Low Impact Development (LID) efforts that DEP has included for study and implementation that are being pursued with Water Quality Protection Fund resources.

Stormwater Management

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Uncontrolled stormwater runoff from developed areas leads to erosion of stream banks, siltation and widening of stream channels, and localized flooding. Urbanization often destroys stream habitat, leading to dramatic declines in the diversity of fish and other aquatic species. Urban runoff also adds to downstream pollution in the Anacostia, Patuxent, and Potomac rivers and the Chesapeake Bay. Multi-state agreements as well as State legislation and programs emphasize the importance of watershed-based programs to protect aquatic habitat and reduce pollution in the Bay and its tributaries.

The objectives of the Stormwater Management program are protection of natural waterway environments; restoration of streams previously damaged by excessive erosion, sedimentation, and impaired water quality; and prevention or remediation of property damage caused by localized flooding. The County's Stormwater Management program is watershedbased and focuses on mitigating problems caused by development that was constructed prior to implementation of stringent stormwater management controls, and on proactive planning in the developing portions of the County.

The Stormwater Management capital program addresses problems caused by prior development through facility planning studies and the development of Watershed Restoration Action Plans, and through the design and construction of stormwater retrofit projects (including low impact development) and stream restoration projects. These projects reduce pollution in streams and manage peak runoff flows to reduce stream channel habitat and sedimentation damage from watershed development and urbanized areas. This prevents flooding and reduces erosive velocities affecting stream channels. Project implementation helps fulfill requirements specified in the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) municipal stormwater discharge permit. Stream restoration priorities are established through the Countywide Stream Protection Strategy (CSPS, February 2003).

Since FY04, the County has offered public maintenance services for qualified private stormwater facilities. All residential property and "associated non-residential" structures are eligible for County maintenance. Residential and Commercial property owners pay a Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC) to fund the maintenance of these privately-owned structures as well as County-owned facilities. This program will improve the long-term operational effectiveness of these facilities and increase their pollution removal efficiency. Inspection and routine maintenance of these facilities are funded in the operating budget, while major structural repairs

that require extensive engineering design and permitting are funded in the CIP.

The County was issued a five-year National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit in February 2010 to develop a storm water management program to prevent harmful pollutants from being washed or dumped into the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS-4).

The Stormwater Management program which was developed by the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to comply with the MS-4 permit continues to set precedent and act as a model for jurisdictions throughout the State. Beginning in 2013, counties throughout Maryland were required to develop and implement a Stormwater Management program and Montgomery County has worked with the State and other counties to assist in the first stages of many County Stormwater Management implementations throughout Maryland.

The FY15-20 CIP program for Stormwater Management continues Montgomery County's commitment to treat impervious surfaces within the County to the maximum extent possible, with total six-year program expenditures increasing \$58.8 million (19.3 percent) above the amended approved FY13-18 six-year program of \$304.9 million.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) is also assisting the DEP in implementing the MS-4 Permit by: (1) constructing Storm Water Management (SWM) retrofit projects which have been developed through DEP's MS-4 planning studies; (2) providing opportunities for curb bump-outs and road narrowing where feasible to permit implementation of low-impact development (LID) SWM provisions within the right-of-way; (3) seeking DEP guidance on prioritization of storm drain outfall repairs; (4) coordinating with DEP on storm drain projects developed in the Storm Drain General and Facility Planning - Storm Drain programs to identify opportunities for enhancements which would assist in meeting the requirements of the MS-4 permit; and (5) holding quarterly meetings with DEP and DOT staff looking for additional areas of cooperation in meeting the MS-4 permit requirements.

HIGHLIGHTS

 Continue the planning and implementation of stormwater controls, public outreach, stream monitoring, and other actions needed to comply with the County's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS-4) permit, which will significantly enhance the County's efforts to improve water quality in local streams and ultimately the Chesapeake Bay.

- Expand the design and construction of environmentally friendly stormwater management techniques known as environmental site design (ESD) or low impact development (LID) throughout the County, including County facilities.
- Construct new stormwater management facilities and retrofit old stormwater controls to prevent property damage, improve water quality, and protect habitat.
- Perform major structural repairs on public and private stormwater facilities accepted into the County's maintenance program.
- Continue to repair damaged stream channels and tributaries in stream valley parks and priority watersheds.
- Expand the County's efforts to prevent trash from polluting our streams and rivers.

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Jim Stiles of the Department of Environmental Protection at 240.777.7789 or Matt Schaeffer of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2751 for more information regarding this department's capital budget.

CAPITAL PROGRAM REVIEW

A total of eight ongoing projects are recommended for FY15-20 and described in detail in the Project Description Forms. The Recommended FY15-20 Stormwater Management Program totals \$363.7 million, an increase of \$58.8 million or 19.3 percent over the amended approved FY13-18 program of \$304.9 million. This increase will be funded primarily by long-term debt financing through the issuance of Water Quality Protection Bonds (WQPBs) secured by the Water Quality Protection Charge (WQPC). The bonds will cover expenditures incurred for the planning, design, and construction of additional stormwater facilities needed to comply with the requirements of the County's MS-4 permit. Also included in the funding of the stormwater management projects is an assumption of \$60 million in State Aid based on the State's expressed interest in supporting stormwater management efforts in the state.

Watershed Restoration - Interagency (P809342)

Sub Category Stormwa Administering Agency Environn	Conservation of Natural Resources Stormwater Management Environmental Protection (AAGE07) Colesville-White Oak					Requi	ast Modifie red Adequat ation Impact	cility	1/6/14 No None Ongoing			
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		T		EXPENDIT				1				
Planning, Design and Supervision		3,849	2,895	54	900	310	230	90	90	90	90	0
Land		4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		3,117	1,873	84	1,160	0	120	260	260	260	260	0
Other		2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total 6,972 4,774				138	2,060	310	350	350	350	350	350	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
G.O. Bonds		527	527	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Aid		506	506	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stormwater Management Waiver Fe	es	3,364	3,226	138	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection Bonds		2,545	485	0	2,060	310	350	350	350	350	350	0
Water Quality Protection Charge		30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	6,972	4,774	138	2,060	310	350	350	350	350	350	0
			OPE	RATING BU	DGET IMP	ACT (\$000s)					
Maintenance					105	5	10	15	20	25	30	
Net	Impact				105	5	10	15	20	25	30	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	0
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	350
Supplemental Appropriation Requ	Jest	0
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		6,038
Expenditure / Encumbrances		4,826
Unencumbered Balance		1,212

Date First Appropriation	FY 93	
First Cost Estimate		
Current Scope	FY 15	6,972
Last FY's Cost Estimate		7,038

Description

This project provides for the design and construction of stormwater management retrofits and stream restoration projects which manage stormwater runoff, enhance aquatic habitat, and improve water quality in County streams. The projects are executed under interagency agreements with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The first two agreements, which were signed in 1992 and 1997, were limited to subwatersheds within the Anacostia Watershed. In FY04, the USACE expanded project eligibility to include all County subwatersheds within the Mid-Potomac watershed. The feasibility study and the design and construction of the projects selected in Montgomery County are managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers with assistance from the Maryland Department of Environmental Protection and Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Cost Change

Increase due to additional number of budgeted projects and the addition of FY19 and FY20 to this ongoing project adjusted for prior project delays.

Justification

This project will improve local stream water quality, protect stream conditions, and enhance wildlife and aquatic habitats in Sligo Creek, Northwest Branch, Paint Branch, and Little Paint Branch tributaries within the interjurisdictional Anacostia River Watershed. The project supports the goals of the Chesapeake Bay initiatives, the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Agreement, and addresses the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit as detailed in the Montgomery County Coordinated Implementation Strategy (CCIS).

Fiscal Note

This project leverages Federal Aid with the Federal government paying for 75 percent of construction costs for projects designed under the Anacostia Phase I Feasibility Study, and 65 percent of construction costs for projects designed under the subsequent agreements. Program expenditures reflect County contributions to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for design/construction and in-kind services. The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Permitting Services, Department of Transporation, Maryland Department of the Environment, Facility Planning: SM (No. 809319), Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

Facility Planning: SM (P809319)

Sub Category Str Administering Agency Er	onservation of ormwater Man ivironmental P ountywide	agement				Requi	ast Modified red Adequal ation Impact	e Public Fa	cility	1/6/14 No None Ongoing		
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000						
Planning, Design and Supervi	sion	17,445	8,108	937	8,400	1,150	1,250	1,350	1,450	1,550	1,650	0
Land		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilitie	s	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		0	0	[,] 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.	0	о
	Total	17,497	8,160	937	8,400	1,150	1,250	1,350	1,450	1,550	1,650	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
Current Revenue: General		5,000	5,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Aid		140	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Stormwater Management Wai	ver Fees	797	797	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection Char	rge	11,560	2,223	937	8,400	1,150	1,250	1,350	1,450	1,550	1,650	0
	Total	17,497	8,160	937	8,400	1,150	1,250	1,350	1,450	1,550	1,650	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	1,150	Date First Appropriation FY 93	
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	1,250	First Cost Estimate	
Supplemental Appropriation Reque	st	0	Current Scope FY 15	17,497
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	15,312
Cumulative Appropriation		10.862	Partial Closeout Thru	0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		9,154	New Partial Closeout	0
Unencumbered Balance		1,708	Total Partial Closeout	0

Description

This project provides for facility planning and feasibility studies to evaluate watershed conservation needs and to identify remedial project alternatives for stormwater management, stormwater retrofit, Environmental Site Design (ESD)/Low Impact Development (LID), and stream restoration projects. Projects in facility planning may include the preparation of watershed plans assessing stream restoration, stormwater management retrofit projects, and LID and ESD projects to help mitigate degraded stream conditions in rural and developed watersheds. Water quality monitoring and analysis is required to quantify impacts of watershed development and projects implemented in Retrofit SM Government Facilities (No. 800900), SM Retrofit Roads (No. 801300), SM Retrofit Schools (No. 801301), SM Retrofit Countywide (No. 808726), and Misc Stream Valley Improvements (No. 807359). The projects generated in facility planning support the requirements in the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit. Facility planning represents planning and preliminary design and develops a program of requirements in advance of full programming of a project. This project also provides for operation of automated fixed monitoring stations as required by the MS4 Permit.

Cost Change

Increase due to an increase in the number of projects budgeted related to complying with requirements of the County's MS4 permit and the addition of FY19 and FY20 to this ongoing project adjusted for prior project delays.

Justification

The Facility Planning products support the requirements outlined in the MS4 Permit as detailed in the Montgomery County Coordinated Implementation Strategy (CCIS). This project establishes the facilities planning data and alternatives analysis needed to identify and set priorities for individual capital projects. Facility planning costs for projects which are ultimately included in stand-alone Project Description Forms (PDFs) are reflected here and not in the resulting individual project. Future individual CIP projects which result from facility planning will each reflect reduced planning and design costs.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Department of Transportation, Montgomery County Public Schools, SM Retrofit Government Facilities (No. 800900), SM Retrofit Roads (No. 801300), SM Retrofit Schools (No. 801301), SM Retrofit Countywide (No. 808726), Misc. Stream Valley Improvements (No. 807359).

SM Retrofit: Countywide (P808726)

Sub Category Administering Agency	Countywide					Date Last Modified Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact Status					1/6/14 No None Ongoing		
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Totai 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs	
		(otul)				DULE (\$000		••••					
Planning, Design and Supe	rvision	79,325	2,189	10,270	66,866	10,510	9,276	10,760	11,280	12,300	12,740	0	
Land		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Site Improvements and Util	ities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Construction		87,358	1,850	5,904	79,604	8,216	13,692	12,648	12,452	15,396	17,200	0	
Other		7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	Total	166,690	4,046	16,174	146,470	18,726	22,968	23,408	23,732	27,696	29,940	0	
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE_(\$000s)							
Federal Aid		299	0	299	0	0	0	0	o	0	0	0	
State Aid		25,490	0	4,490	21,000	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500	0	
Water Quality Protection Bo	onds	140,901	4,046	11,385	125,470	15,226	19,468	19,908	20,232	24,196	26,440	0	
	Total	166,690	4,046	16,174	146,470	18,726	22,968	23,408	23,732	27,696	29,940	0	
			OPE	RATING BU	DGET IMP	ACT (\$000s)						
Maintenance					90	0	6	12	18	24	30		
	Net Impact				90	0	6	12	18	24	30		

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	15,226	Date First Appropriation FY 87	
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	19,468	First Cost Estimate	
Supplemental Appropriation Requ	iest	0	Current Scope FY 15	166,690
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	159,855
Cumulative Appropriation		38,625	Partial Closeout Thru	19,239
Expenditure / Encumbrances		11,455	New Partial Closeout	4,046
Unencumbered Balance		27,170	Total Partial Closeout	23,285

Description

This project provides for the design and construction of new and/or upgrades of existing underperforming stormwater management facilities and devices under the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit as detailed in the draft Montgomery County Coordinated Implementation Strategy (CCIS). Compliance with the MS4 permit requires controlling 20 percent of impervious surfaces, or approximately 4,300 impervious acres, not currently treated to the maximum extent practicable to address the approved Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). Inventories of candidate projects have been conducted under the Facility Planning: SM project (PDF No. 809319) for the County's ten watersheds (Paint Branch, Rock Creek, Cabin John Creek, Hawlings River, Watts Branch, Great Seneca, Muddy Branch, Sligo Creek, Little Paint Branch, and Northwest Branch). Some of the most complex projects constructed under this project are assessed, and the preliminary plans are completed in the Facility Planning: SM project (No. 809319). Where feasible, the projects integrate wetland and habitat features consistent with the goals of the Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement. In small drainage areas, retrofit projects may also include biofiltration, bioretention, or stormwater filtering devices.

Cost Change

Increase due to the addition of FY19 and FY20 to this ongoing project and adjustments for prior project delays. Costs have also been offset by capitalization of prior expenditures.

Justification

This project is needed to comply with the new MS4 permitting requirements outlined in the County Coordinated Implementation Strategy (CCIS) and to implement the County's adopted water quality goals (Chapter 19, Article IV) and protect habitat conditions in local streams. In addition, the project supports the goals of the Chesapeake Bay tributary strategy initiatives and the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Agreement.

Other

Projects in design and construction include projects located in the Rock Creek Watershed, Watts Branch Watershed, Great Seneca Creek Watershed, Muddy Branch Watershed, Cabin John Creek Watershed, and Anacostia River Watershed.

Fiscal Note

While the State of Maryland has indicated a desire to provide funding, all indicated State Aid is preliminary and not committed. Funding may need to be revised based on actual State Aid commitments.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Department of Transportation, Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Permitting Services, Maryland Department of the Environment, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Facility Planning: SM (No. 809319), Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

Misc Stream Valley Improvements (P807359)

Category Sub Category Administering Agency Planning Area	Conservation of Stormwater Man Environmental P Countywide	Date Last Modified Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact Status					1/6/14 No None Ongoing					
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
	L					DULE (\$000						
Planning, Design and Supe	ervision	16,009	844	2,606	12,559	2,379	2,160	2,210	2,010	1,900	1,900	0
Land		42	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Uti	lities	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		32,860	694	2,152	30,014	4,014	3,280	7,430	6,890	4,200	4,200	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	48,913	1,540	4,800	42,573	6,393	5,440	9,640	8,900	6,100	6,100	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
State Aid		9,099	845	2,254	6,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	0
Stormwater Management V	Naiver Fees	233	0	233	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection B	onds	39,581	695	2,313	36,573	5,393	4,440	8,640	7,900	5,100	5,100	o
	Total	48,913	1,540	4,800	42,573	6,393	5,440	9,640	8,900	6,100	6,100	0
			OPE	RATING BU	DGET IMP.	ACT (\$000s)					
Maintenance					350	10	30	40	65	95	110	
	Net Impact		~		350	10	30	40	65	95	110	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	5,393	Date First Appropriation FY 73	
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	4,959	First Cost Estimate	
Supplemental Appropriation Reques	st	0	Current Scope FY 15	48,913
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	21,709
Cumulative Appropriation		10,007	Partial Closeout Thru	17,368
Expenditure / Encumbrances		3,321	New Partial Closeout	1,540
Unencumbered Balance		6,686	Total Partial Closeout	18,908

Description

This project provides for design and construction of habitat restoration or stabilization measures for stream reaches having severe channel erosion, sedimentation, and habitat degradation. Developed areas constructed without modern stormwater controls contribute uncontrolled runoff which results in severely eroded streambanks, excessive sediment, tree loss, and degraded habitat for fish and aquatic life. Stormdrain outfalls damaged from severe erosion are identified and, where possible, the outfalls are repaired as part of stream restoration projects - funded from the Outfall Repairs project (No. 509948). Stream deterioration can also adversely affect sanitary sewer crossings by exposing sewer lines and manholes, which in turn can be fish barriers and leak raw sewage into streams or allow infiltration of stream baseflow into the sewer system, potentially causing substantial increases in wastewater treatment costs.

Cost Change

Increase due to a an increase in the number of projects budgeted, site conditions, and higher individual project costs. Costs have also increased due to FY19 and FY20 being added to this ongoing project and are partially offset by capitalization of prior expenditures.

Justification

The project supports the requirements of the MS4 permit and addresses the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy Initiatives, Anacostia Watershed Restoration Agreement, and the County's adopted water quality goals (Chapter 19, Article IV). The project will stabilize and improve local stream habitat conditions where streams have been damaged by inadequately controlled stormwater runoff. Corrective measures constructed or coordinated under this project include stream bank stabilization, channel modifications, habitat restoration, storm drain outfall or sanitary sewer infrastructure repairs to improve fish and other biological resources, while reducing sediment and nutrient loadings caused by excessive streambank erosion. The Facility Planning: SM project (No. 809319) includes funds for watershed studies and identifies and prioritizes stream reaches in need of restoration and protection.

Other

The Department of Environmental Protection identifies damaged sewer lines as part of this project, and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission makes sewer repairs during project construction. Projects planned for design and construction include Bel Pre Creek I, Donnybrook Tributary, Hollywood Branch I, Breewood, Bedfordshire and Fallsreach, Muddy Branch I, Great Seneca (GSGN 205), Grosvenor Tributary, Stonybrook Tributary, Snakeden Branch II, and Whetstone Run.

Fiscal Note

While the State of Maryland has indicated a desire to provide funding, all indicated State Aid is preliminary and not committed. Funding may need to be revised based on actual State Aid commitments.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Department of Transportation, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Department of Permitting Services, Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

SM Retrofit - Schools (P801301)

Sub Category Administering Agency	Conservation of Stormwater Man Environmental P Countywide	agement				Requi	ast Modified red Adequat ation Impact	e Public Fa	cility	1/6/14 No None Ongoing		
		Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs		
				EXPENDIT	JRE SCHE	DULE (\$000	ls)					
Planning, Design and Supe	rvision	9,315	168	1,317	7,830	1,350	1,360	1,220	1,300	1,300	1,300	0
Land		O	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Util	ities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		17,140	0	40	17,100	2,120	4,920	2,260	2,600	2,600	2,600	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	26,455	168	1,357	24,930	3,470	6,280	3,480	3,900	3,900	3,900	0
				FUNDIN	<u>G SCHEDU</u>	LE (\$000s)						
Water Quality Protection Bo	onds	26,455	168	1,357	24,930	3,470	6,280	3,480	3,900	3,900	3,900	0
	Total	26,455	168	1,357	24,930	3,470	6,280	3,480	3,900	3,900	3,900	0
			OPE	RATING BU	DGET IMP	ACT (\$000s)					
Maintenance					771	7	7	124	163	211	259	
	Net Impact				771	7	7	124	163	211	259	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	7,161	Date First Appropriation FY 13	
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	3,440	First Cost Estimate	
Supplemental Appropriation Requ	lest	0	Current Scope FY 15	26,455
Transfer		. 0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	20,100
Cumulative Appropriation		2,280	Partial Closeout Thru	0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		1.048	New Partial Closeout	0
Unencumbered Balance		1,232	Total Partial Closeout	0

Description

This project provides for the design and construction of Environmental Site Design (ESD)/Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater management devices at Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) such as buildings, parking lots, and other impervious surfaces constructed prior to modern stormwater management controls. LID/ESD stormwater devices that may be implemented under this project include: Green roofs, bioretention areas, tree box inlets, porous concrete and other types of devices that promote water filtering and groundwater recharge.

Cost Change

Increase due to the addition of FY19 and FY20 to this ongoing project adjusted for prior project delays.

Justification

This project supports the requirements of the MS4 permit and addresses the goals of the Chesapeake Bay tributary strategy initiatives, and the County's adopted water quality goals (Chapter 19, Article IV). The County's MS4 permit requires that the County provide stormwater controls for 20 percent of impervious surfaces not currently treated to the maximum extent practicable, with an emphasis, where possible, on the use of LID/ESD devices. This project will be responsible for controlling stormwater on Montgomery County Public School (MCPS) properties largely through the use of LID/ESD practices needed to satisfy the permit requirements.

Other

A portion of these potential LID/ESD stormwater retrofits located at County schools were previously programmed under the FY11-16 Approved SM Retrofit - Government Facilities project (No. 800900). This stand-alone project includes LID/ESD projects located on MCPS property and allows for a more efficient implementation of projects in partnership with MCPS.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Montgomery County Public Schools, Department of Permitting Services, Maryland Department of the Environment.

SM Retrofit - Roads (P801300)

Category Sub Category Administering Agency Planning Area	Conservation of Stormwater Man Environmental P Countywide	agement				Requi	ation Impact	- te Public Fa	cility	1/6/14 No None Ongoing		
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
				EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000	ls)					-
Planning, Design and Sup	pervision	35,200	304	4,736	30,160	5,710	5,340	5,020	4,640	4,750	4,700	0
Land		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and U	tilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		76,615	88	8,267	68,260	7,030	8,740	21,300	11,370	10,420	9,400	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	111,815	392	13,003	98,420	12,740	14,080	26,320	16,010	15,170	14,100	0
				FUNDIN	<u>G SCHE</u> DU	LE (\$000s)						
State Aid		45,195	392	13,003	31,800	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	0
Water Quality Protection I	Bonds	66,620	0	0	66,620	7,440	8,780	21,020	10,710	9,870	8,800	0
	Total	111,815	392	13,003	98,420	12,740	14,080	26,320	16,010	15,170	14,100	0
			OPE	RATING BU	DGET IMP	ACT (\$000s	.)					_
Maintenance					5,874	282	496	550	1,110	1,524	1,912	
	Net Impact				5,874	282	496	550	1,110	1,524	1,912	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	7,440	Date First Appropriation FY 13	
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	19,570	First Cost Estimate	
Supplemental Appropriation Reques	st	0	Current Scope FY 15	111,815
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	76,425
Cumulative Appropriation		27,925	Partial Closeout Thru	0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		7,241	New Partial Closeout	0
Unencumbered Balance		20,684	Total Partial Closeout	0

Description

This project provides for the design and construction of Environmental Site Design (ESD)/Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater management devices along County roads constructed prior to modern stormwater management controls. ESD/LID stormwater devices include bioretention, curb extensions, porous concrete, tree box inlets and other types of devices that promote water filtering and groundwater recharge.

Cost Change

Increase due to an increase in the amount of retrofit projects beginning in FY15 and the addition of FY19 and FY20 to this ongoing project.

Justification

This project supports the requirements of the MS4 permit and addresses the goals of the Chesapeake Bay tributary strategy initiative, and the County's adopted water quality goals (Chapter 19, Article IV). The County's MS4 permit requires that the County provide stormwater controls for 20 percent of impervious surfaces not currently treated to the maximum extent practicable, with an emphasis, where possible, on the use of ESD/LID devices. This project will be responsible for controlling stormwater on County roads, largely through ESD/LID practices, as needed to satisfy the permit requirements.

Other

A portion of these potential ESD/LID stormwater retrofits on County roads were previously programmed under the SM Retrofit - Government Facilities project (No. 800900). This new stand alone project includes all the potential ESD/LID projects for County roads and allows for a more efficient implementation of projects of similar scope in partnership with the Department of Transportation (DOT). Planned and inconstruction projects include Amherst Avenue, Breewood Neighborhood Green Street, Dennis Avenue DOT Participation, Donnybrook LID Retrofit, Franklin Knolls DOT Partnership, and Sligo Park Hills Neighborhood Green Street.

Fiscal Note

While the State of Maryland has indicated a desire to provide funding, all indicated State Aid is preliminary and unappropriated in FY15-20. Funding may need to be revised based on the actual State Aid commitments.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Department of General Services, Department of Transportation, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Permitting Services, Maryland Department of the Environment, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

SM Retrofit - Government Facilities (P800900)

Category Sub Category Administering Agency Planning Area	Stormwater Man						ast Modifier ed Adequal ation Impact	1/6/14 No None Ongoing				
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
				EXPENDIT	JRE SCHE	DULE (\$000	s)					
Planning, Design and Su	pervision	13,529	4,728	1,979	6,822	2,246	826	1,000	950	900	900	0
Land		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and U	tilities	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		14,269	2,939	420	10,910	780	1,990	1,820	2,320	2,000	2,000	0
Other		18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	27,819	7, 6 88	2,399	17,732	3,026	2,816	2,820	3,270	2,900	2,900	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
State Aid		192	192	0	0	0	0	o	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection	Bonds	26,445	6,314	2,399	17,732	3,026	2,816	2,820	3,270	2,900	2,900	0
Water Quality Protection	Charge	1,182	1,182	o	0	0	o	o	0	о	0	0
	Total	27,819	7,688	2,399	17,732	3,026	2,816	2,820	3,270	2,900	2,900	0
			OPE	RATING BU	DGET IMP	ACT (\$000s)					
Maintenance					609	13	25	42	139	168	222	
	Net Impact				609	13	25	42	139	168	222	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	3,026	Date First Appropriation FY 09				
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	2,816	First Cost Estimate				
Supplemental Appropriation Requ	iest	0	Current Scope FY 15	27,819			
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	25,982			
Cumulative Appropriation		12,582	Partial Closeout Thru	0			
Expenditure / Encumbrances		9,587	New Partial Closeout	0			
Unencumbered Balance		2,995	Total Partial Closeout	0			

Description

This project provides for the design and construction of Environmental Site Design (ESD)/Low Impact Development (LID) stormwater management devices at County facilities such as buildings, parking garages, and parking lots constructed prior to modern stormwater management controls. ESD/LID stormwater devices include: Green Roofs, bioretention areas, tree box inlets, porous concrete, and other types of devices that promote water filtering and groundwater recharge. Implementing new stormwater devices in developed areas built with inadequate or no stormwater control is required in the County's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit as detailed in the Montgomery County Coordinated Implementation Strategy (CCIS). The Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in coordination with the Department of General Services (DGS) has identified candidate CIP projects that will be implemented jointly.

Cost Change

Increase due to the addition of FY19 and FY20 adjusted for prior project delays.

Justification

This project supports the requirements of the County's MS4 permit and addresses the goals of the Chesapeake Bay tributary strategy initiatives, and the County's adopted water quality goals (Chapter 19, Article IV), which require that the County provide stormwater controls for 20 percent of impervious surfaces not currently treated to the maximum extent practicable, with an emphasis, where possible, on the use of LID/ESD devices.

Fiscal Note

No State Aid is assumed for this project in FY15 to FY20. Funding schedule may need to be revised based on actual State Aid commitments.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Department of General Services, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Permitting Services, Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

SM Facility Major Structural Repair (P800700)

Sub Category Sto Administering Agency Env	nservation of rmwater Man vironmental P untywide	agement			Date Last Modified Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact Status					1/6/14 No None Ongoing		
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
-	-			EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000	is)					
Planning, Design and Supervis	ion	6,750	1,586	1,179	3,985	765	615	805	670	80	1,050	0
Land		о	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilities	s	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		24,985	3,223	2,677	19,085	6,765	2,925	2,195	2,330	2,920	1,950	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	31,735	4,809	3,856	23,070	7,530	3,540	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
State Aid		1,680	Ð	480	1,200	200	200	200	200	200	200	0
Water Quality Protection Bond	s	27,055	1,809	3,376	21,870	7,330	3,340	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800	0
Water Quality Protection Charg	e	3,000	3,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	31,735	4,809	3,856	23,070	7,530	3,540	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	7,631
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	3,239
Supplemental Appropriation Requ	lest	0
Transfer	0	
Cumulative Appropriation		8,930
Expenditure / Encumbrances		6,298
Unencumbered Balance		2,632

FY 07	
FY 15	31,735
	19,930
	0
	0
	0

Description

This project provides for the design and construction of major structural repairs to County maintained stormwater management facilities. The County is responsible for structural maintenance of over 2,600 stormwater management facilities. The project includes old facilities that require more extensive maintenance as ponds fill with sediment, pipes rust, concrete structures crack and deteriorate, and dam embankments develop leaks. Some of the existing stormwater facilities require extensive engineering analysis and design and may require retrofitting which is funded through the SM Retrofit: Countywide project (No. 808726).

Cost Change

Increase in FY15 is primarily due to the need to hydraulically dredge two large lakes (Lake Whetstone and Gunners Lake), the addition of the FY19 and FY20 to this ongoing project, and adjustments for prior project delays.

Justification

This project provides for major structural repairs in order to comply with the County's MS4 permit. It is limited to funding repairs at facilities that require extensive engineering design and permitting that cannot be accomplished within a single fiscal year due to the time required to obtain State and Federal permits.

Other

Projects include: Quince Orchard Manor (Quince Orchard Valley Neighborhood Park), Lake Whetstone, Chadswood, Hunters Woods, B'nai Israel, Brandermill, Gunners Lake, Colony Pond, and Persimmon Tree.

Fiscal Note

Indicated State Aid is preliminary and unappropriated. Funding may need to be revised based on actual State Aid commitments.

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Department of Transportation, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Permitting Services, Homeowners Associations, Montgomery County Public Schools, Department of General Services, Maryland State Highway Administration, SM Retrofit: Countywide (No. 808726), Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

Storm Drains

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The Department of Transportation (DOT) involvement in the County Conservation of Natural Resources program is mandated by Section 2-58A (c) of the County Code which requires DOT to be responsible for control, supervision, design, construction, and maintenance of all culverts and storm drainage systems under the jurisdiction of the County.

The DOT Storm Drains Capital Program consists of the construction of storm drainage structures such as curbs, gutters, drainage inlets, pipes (which provide for stream enclosure), and paved channels. Such networks are constructed to provide for the conveyance of stormwater from impervious surfaces into natural drainage swales and stream channels. This program is focused on storm drainage projects outside the scope of the larger DOT Roads program, which also installs storm drainage systems at the time of new road construction or existing road reconstruction or enhancement.

A second component of the storm drainage program involves County-developer and homeowner participation in the construction of storm drainage facilities. Construction of storm drainage facilities provides a public and environmental benefit by reducing drainage problems, flooding, property damage, and contributing to the orderly development of the County. In participation projects, the County and the developer or the homeowner agree to share the costs of storm drainage facilities in which the benefit of storm drainage extends beyond the developer's or homeowner's own property. The County pays only for that portion of the project which benefits properties other than the developer's or homeowner's, not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost. Homeowners can satisfy their portion of the cost-share through in-kind contributions.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT COORDINATION

In February 2010, the Maryland Department of the Environment issued the County a five year National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. This permit requires that the County develop and implement a storm water management program to prevent harmful pollutants from being washed or dumped into the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4). The DOT is assisting the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in implementing the MS4 Permit by 1) constructing Storm Water Management (SWM) retrofit programs which have been developed through DEP's MS4 planning studies, 2) providing opportunities for curb bump-outs and road narrowing where feasible to permit implementation of Low-Impact Development (LID) SWM provisions within the right-of-way, 3) seeking DEP guidance on prioritization of storm drain outfall repairs, 4) coordinating with DEP on storm drain projects developed in the Storm Drain General and Facility Planning Storm Drain programs to identify opportunities for enhancements which would assist in meeting the requirements of the MS4 permit, and 5) establishing quarterly meetings with DEP and DOT staff looking for additional areas of cooperation in meeting the MS4 permit requirements.

In recognition of the Stormwater Management value of the Storm Drains projects, the Storm Drains are funded through Water Quality Protection Bonds or the Water Quality Protection Charge.

PROGRAM CONTACTS

Contact Holger Serrano of the Department of Transportation at 240.777.7235 or Brady Goldsmith of the Office of Management and Budget at 240.777.2793 for more information regarding this department's capital budget.

CAPITAL PROGRAM REVIEW

The Storm Drainage program for FY15-20 includes four ongoing projects. The overall cost of the recommended six-year program is \$16.6 million, representing a \$0.9 million or 5.1 percent decrease from the FY13-18 Amended Program of \$17.5 million. This decrease is primarily due to the completion of the Maple Avenue Storm Drain and Roadway Improvements and Town of Chevy Chase Storm Drain Improvements projects.

(13)

Outfall Repairs (P509948)

Sub Category Administering Agency	Conservation of Storm Drains Transportation (. Countywide		ources		Date Last Modified Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact Status					12/23/13 No None Ongoing		
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
				EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000	is)					
Planning, Design and Supe	rvision	3,141	1,087	506	1,548	234	234	270	270	270	270	0
Land		10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utili	ities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		4,903	3,351	400	1,152	192	192	192	192	192	192	0
Other		3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	8,057	4,451	906	2,700	426	426	462	462	462	462	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
G.O. Bonds		5,357	4,451	906	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection Bo	onds	1,848	0	0	1,848	0	o	462	462	462	462	0
Water Quality Protection Ch	narge	852	0	0	852	426	426	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	8,057	4,451	906	2,700	426	426	462	462	462	462	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	426	Da
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	426	Fi
Supplemental Appropriation Requ	est	0	
Transfer		0	La
Cumulative Appropriation		5,357	Pa
Expenditure / Encumbrances		4,724	Ne
Unencumbered Balance		633	To

Date First Appropriation	1 FY 99	
First Cost Estimate		
Current Scope	FY 15	8,057
Last FY's Cost Estimate	э	7,133
Partial Closeout Thru		0
New Partial Closeout		0
Total Partial Closeout		0

Description

This project provides for the repair of existing storm drain outfalls into stream valleys. Design of corrective measures is included when inkind replacement of original outfall structures is not feasible. Candidate outfall repairs are selected from citizen and public agency requests. The Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) Miscellaneous Stream Valley Improvements project generates and assists in rating the outfalls, which are identified as that project expands into additional watersheds.

Cost Change

Increase due to the addition of FY19-20 to this on-going level of effort project

Justification

Collapsed storm drain pipe sections, undermined endwalls, and eroded outfall channels create hazardous conditions throughout the County. The course of drainage could be altered endangering private property or public roads and speeding the erosion of stream channels. Erosion from damaged outfalls results in heavy sediment load being carried downstream that can severely impact aquatic ecosystems and exacerbate existing downstream channel erosion. As part of its watershed restoration inventories, DEP identifies storm drain outfalls that are in need of repair in County stream valleys and respective watersheds. As this program expands to include additional watersheds, each outfall is categorized and, where damaged, rated. A functional rating and evaluation process is used to prioritize each outfall.

Other

The number of outfall locations being repaired per year varies based on the severity of the erosion and damage, the complexity of the design, and the complexity of the needed restorative construction work. Completed outfalls in FY12-13: Emory Grove Road, Bluehaven Court, Circle Drive at Spring Drive, Prathertown Road, Marseille Drive, Wayne Avenue at Sligo Creek Parkway. Scheduled for repairs (FY14 - beyond): 11101 Schuykill Road, 10668 Maple Leaf Drive, 20232 Maple Leaf Court, 1301 Dilston Place, 9112 Falls Bridge Lane.

Fiscal Note

Funding source changed from General Obligation Bonds to Water Quality Protection Charge (FY15 and FY16) and Water Quality Protection Bonds (FY17-20).

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Coordination

Department of Environmental Protection, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Maryland Department of the Environment, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, Utility Companies, Miscellaneous Stream Valley Improvements

Facility Planning: Storm Drains (P508180)

Category Sub Category Administering Agency Planning Area	Conservation of Storm Drains Transportation (a Countywide	tation (AAGE30)				Date Last Modified Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact Status				12/23/13 No None Ongoing		
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
				EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000	is)		·			
Planning, Design and Su	pervision	6,181	4,244	277	1,660	250	250	290	290	290	290	0
Land		142	142	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and U	Itilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		37	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	6,364	4,427	277	1,660	250	250	290	290	290	290	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
Current Revenue: Genera	al	4,103	4,103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G.O. Bonds		101	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection	Charge	2,160	223	277	1,660	250	250	290	290	290	290	0
	Total	6,364	4,427	277	1,660	250	250	290	290	290	290	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Unencumbered Balance		261	Total Partial Closeout	0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		4,443	New Partial Closeout	0
Cumulative Appropriation		4,704	Partial Closeout Thru	0
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	5,784
Supplemental Appropriation Requ	est	0	Current Scope FY 15	6,364
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	250	First Cost Estimate	
Appropriation Request	FY 15	250	Date First Appropriation FY 81	

Description

This project provides for the investigation and analysis of various storm drainage assistance requests initiated by private citizens and public agencies. These requests are related to the design, construction, and operation of public drainage facilities where flooding and erosion occur. This project includes expenditures for the preliminary and final design and land acquisition for storm drain projects prior to inclusion in the Storm Drain General project, or as a stand-alone project in the CIP. Prior to its inclusion in the CIP, the Department of Transportation (DOT) will conduct a feasibility study to determine the general and specific features required for the project. Candidate projects currently are evaluated from the Drainage Assistance Request list. As part of the facility planning process, DOT considers citizen and public agency requests and undertakes a comprehensive analysis of storm drainage issues and problems being experienced in the County. This analysis is used to select areas where a comprehensive long-term plan for the remediation of a problem may be required. No construction activities are performed in this project. When a design is 35 percent complete, an evaluation is performed to determine if right-of-way is needed. Based on the need for right-of-way, the project may proceed to final design and the preparation of right-of-way plats under this project. The cost of right-of-way acquisition will be charged to the Advanced Land Acquisition Revolving Fund (ALARF). When designs are complete, projects with a construction cost under \$500,000 will be constructed in the Storm Drain General project. Projects with a construction cost over \$500,000 will be constructed in the Storm Drain General project. Projects with a construction cost over \$500,000 will be constructed in the Storm Drain General project.

Capacity

Projects will be designed to accommodate the ten year storm frequency interval.

Cost Change

Increase due to the addition of FY19 and FY 20 to this on-going level of effort project

Justification

Evaluation, justification, and cost-benefit analysis are completed by DOT as necessary. In the case of participation projects, drainage studies and preliminary plans will be prepared by the requestor's engineer and reviewed by DOT. A review of impacts to pedestrians, bicyclists, and ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991) is being performed and addressed for each subproject in this project. Traffic signals, streetlights, crosswalks, bus stops, ADA ramps, bikeways and other pertinent issues are being considered in the design of the project to ensure pedestrian safety.

Other

Before being added as a sub-project, concept studies are evaluated based on the following factors: public safety, damage to private property, frequency of event, damage to public right-of-way, environmental factors such as erosion, general public benefit, availability of right-of-way and 5:1 cost benefit ratio. In the case of public safety or severe damage to private property, the 5:1 cost benefit damage prevented ratio can be waived. Drainage assistance requests are evaluated on a continuing basis in response to public requests. DOT maintains a database of complaints. Construction projects completed: Meadowood Dr, Chicago Ave, Dalton Rd-Westport Rd, Old Chester Rd, Easley St-Houston St, Whites Ferry Rd. Candidate Projects for FY15-16: Linton St-Patton St, Hollywood Ave.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Coordination

Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Maryland Department of the Environment, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, Utility Companies, Annual Sidewalk Program (CIP No. 506747)

Storm Drain Culvert Replacement (P501470)

Sub Category St Administering Agency Ti	torm Drains	ortation (AAGE30)				Date Last Modified Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact Status				12/23/13 No None Ongoing		
		Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
				EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000	is)					
Planning, Design and Superv	ision	1,305	0	225	1,080	180	180	180	180	180	180	0
Land		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and Utilitie	es	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		7,395	0	1,275	6,120	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	1,020	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	8,700	0	1,500	7,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
G.O. Bonds		1,500	0	1,500	0	0	o	0	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection Bon	ds	4,800	0	0	4,800	0	0	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	0
Water Quality Protection Cha	rge	2,400	0	0	2,400	1,200	1,200	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	8,700	0	1,500	7,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	1,200	Date First Appropriation FY 14	
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	1,200	First Cost Estimate	
Supplemental Appropriation Reque	est	0	Current Scope FY 15	
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	
Cumulative Appropriation		1,500	Partial Closeout Thru	
Expenditure / Encumbrances		0	New Partial Closeout	
Unencumbered Balance		1,500	Total Partial Closeout	

Description

This program will provide for the replacement of failed storm drain pipes and culverts. The County's storm drain infrastructure is aging and many of the metal pipe culverts installed from 1960 through the 1990's have reached the end of their service life. Currently no asset inventory with condition assessment exists; therefore no funding is programmed for systematic replacement of these pipes and culverts. This program will provide for emergency culvert replacement and provide for funding to assist in the development of an asset inventory program to better forecast future replacement needs. This program includes; storm water pipe and culvert replacement of both metal and concrete less than six (6) feet in roadway longitudinal length (structures greater than six feet roadway longitudinal length are repaired under the Bridge Renovation Program, CIP#509753), headwalls, end sections, replacement, or extension of culverts to assure positive flow of storm water and channeling of storm water into existing ditch lines or structures. Repairs also include roadside pipe and culvert end treatment safety improvements to eliminate safety hazards. This project will not make major changes to the location or size of existing storm drainage structures.

Cost Change

Increase due to addition of FY19 and FY12 to this ongoing level of effort project.

Justification

This program will address emergency pipe replacements of aging metal and concrete pipes that have reached the end of their service life. The result of these pipe failures has been deep depressions, sinkholes, sediment build up, open pipe joints and metal pipe inverts to an unacceptable levels. Existing storm drain conditions are extremely poor. Repairs are need to improve safety and reduce the potential for hazards and associated public inconvenience. Failure of a storm drain pipe will precipitate emergency repairs at much higher prices. Further, this program will provide some funding towards the development of an asset inventory of the storm drain system including pipe and culvert conditions for future funding forecasting.

Fiscal Note

Funding source changed from General Obligation Bonds to Water Quality Protection Charge (FY15 and FY16) and Water Quality Protection Bonds (FY17-20).

Disclosures

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

Coordination

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Washington Gas Company, Department of Permitting Services, Pepco, Cable TV, Verizon, Montgomery County Public Schools, Regional Service Centers, Community Associations, Commission on People With Disabilities, Maryland Department of Environment, Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection, Army Corps of Engineers

Storm Drain General (P500320)

Category Sub Category Administering Agency Planning Area	Conservation of Storm Drains Transportation (/ Countywide		ources		Date Last Modified Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact Status					1/6/14 No None Ongoing		
	[Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14	Total 6 Years	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
				EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000	s)					······
Planning, Design and Su	pervision	3,542	1,219	7	2,316	350	350	404	404	404	404	0
Land		63	63	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and U	tilities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		10,969	8,188	81	2,700	450	450	450	450	450	450	0
Other		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	14,575	9,471	88	5,016	800	800	854	854	854	854	0
				FUNDIN	G SCHEDU	LE (\$000s)						
G.O. Bonds		9,169	9,086	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intergovernmental		228	223	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
State Aid		162	162	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Quality Protection	Bonds	3,416	0	0	3,416	0	0	854	854	854	854	0
Water Quality Protection	Charge	1,600	0	0	1,600	800	800	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	14,575	9,471	88	5,016	800	800	854	854	854	854	0

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	800	Date First Appropriation FY 03	
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	800	First Cost Estimate	
Supplemental Appropriation Reques	st	. 0	Current Scope FY 15	14,575
Transfer		0	Last FY's Cost Estimate	12,867
Cumulative Appropriation		9,559	Partial Closeout Thru	0
Expenditure / Encumbrances		9,492	New Partial Closeout	0
Unencumbered Balance		67	Total Partial Closeout	0

Description

This project provides the flexibility to construct various sub-projects that might otherwise be delayed for lack of funds or difficulty in acquiring right-of-way. This project provides for right-of-way acquisition and construction for storm drain projects resulting from the Drainage Assistance Request program. Individual projects range from retrofitting existing storm drainage systems to developing new drainage systems required to upgrade the existing systems in older subdivisions. Projects formerly handled through the Neighborhood Storm Drain Improvements project are usually small, unanticipated projects initiated by requests from citizens whose homes and properties are subject to severe flooding or erosion and where there is a demonstrated need for early relief. Potential new storm drain projects are studied under the Facility Planning: Storm Drain project. Concept studies are evaluated based on the following factors: public safety, damage to private property and frequency of event, damage to public right-of-way, environmental factors such as erosion, general public benefit, availability of right-of-way and 5:1 cost benefit damage prevented ratio. After the completion of facility planning, projects with construction estimated to cost less than \$500,000 are included in this project. Prompt relief is frequently achieved by the use of Department of Transportation (DOT) personnel to construct and provide construction management. The project also facilitates financial participation with developers up to 50 percent share of construction cost for storm drainage projects where such construction would yield a public benefit to properties other than that of homeowner or developers. Right-of-way is acquired under the Advanced Land Acquisition Revolving Fund (ALARF).

Capacity

Projects will be designed to accommodate the ten year storm frequency interval.

Cost Change

Increase due to the addition of FY19-20 to this on-going level of effort project

Other

For participation projects, cost sharing between the County and either homeowners or developers varies and is based upon a signed letter of understanding. Some funds from this project will go to support the Renew Montgomery program. Completed Projects in FY 12 and FY 13: Meadowood Dr, Chicago Ave, Old Chester Rd, Easely St-Houston St, Accord Ct, Brickyard Rd, Whites Ferry Rd, Woodrow PI, Tournay Rd, Falstone Ave, McArthur Blvd, Hurst St, Newport Mill Rd, Maryland Ave, Clarksburg Rd-Barnes Rd, Lilly Stone Dr, Leighton Ave-Worth Ave, Rowen Rd, Stoneybrook Dr, Mcneil Ln, Harrington Dr, Hempstead Rd, Overbrook Rd, Dalton Rd-Westport Rd, Merivale Rd Potential future projects: Linton St-Houston St, Hollywood Ave

Fiscal Note

Funding source changed from General Obligation Bonds to Water Quality Protection Charge (FY15 and FY16) and Water Quality Protection Bonds (FY17-20).

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis will be performed during design or is in progress.

Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

The Executive asserts that this project conforms to the requirements of relevant local plans, as required by the Maryland Economic Growth, Resource Protection and Planning Act.

Coordination

Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection, Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission, Maryland Department of the Environment, United States Army Corps of Engineers, Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, Utility Companies, Annual Sidewalk Program

Wapakoneta Road Improvements (P501101)

Category Sub Category Administering Agency Planning Area	Transportation Roads Transportation (/ Bethesda-Chevy	,	Required Adequate Public Facility Relocation Impact							1/6/14 No None Preliminary Design Stage		
	. [Total	Thru FY13	Est FY14		FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY 19	FY 20	Beyond 6 Yrs
				EXPENDIT	URE SCHE	DULE (\$000)s)					······
Planning, Design and Sup	pervision	528	158	243	127	127	0	0	0	0	0	0
Land		217	1	216	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Site Improvements and U	tilities	10	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction		808	0	0	808	808	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	1,563	159	459	945	945	0	0	0	0	0	0
				FUNDIN	<u>G SCHEDU</u>	LE (\$000s)						
G.O. Bonds		1,533	159	459	915	915	0	0	0	0	0	0
Intergovernmental		30	0	0	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	1,563	159	459	945	945	0	0	0	0	0	0
			OPE	RATING BU	DGET IMP	ACT (\$000s	i)					-
Maintenance					5	0	1	1	1	1	1	
	Net Impact				5	0	1	1	1	1	1	

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA (000s)

Appropriation Request	FY 15	0
Appropriation Request Est.	FY 16	0
Supplemental Appropriation Reque	0	
Transfer		0
Cumulative Appropriation		1,563
Expenditure / Encumbrances		239
Unencumbered Balance	1,324	

Date First Appropriation	FY 13	
First Cost Estimate		
Current Scope	FY 13	1,563
Last FY's Cost Estimate		1,563

Description

This project provides for reconstruction of full-depth pavement and construction of storm drain improvements along Wapakoneta Road from Namakagan Road to Walhonding Road (approximate length of 900 linear feet). The specific improvements will include reconstruction and resurfacing of the roadway, curb and gutters within a 24-foot roadway section, storm drain system (inlets and drain pipes), and bio-retention facilities. Storm drain improvements will extend beyond properties along Wapakoneta Road. Wapakoneta Road south of Namakagan Road has curb and gutters, a storm drain system, and a reconstructed pavement.

Estimated Schedule

Design completed in Fall 2013. Property acquisition started in Spring 2013 and will conclude by Spring 2014. Construction is expected to start by Winter 2015 and will be completed by Summer 2015.

Justification

A number of the properties experience severe flooding of their dwellings during rain storms and the lack of a drainage system or roadside ditches also causes erosion of shoulders and inundation of the roadway in this older community. The residents of this segment of Wapakoneta Road have submitted a petition requesting installation of curb and gutters, storm drain improvements, and reconstruction of the road. This project is to alleviate erosion of road shoulders and inundation of the roadways and private properties along the west side of the street. The installation of the proposed storm drain improvements will be followed by the reconstruction/resurfacing of the pavement section. The project would benefit all residences in this part of Wapakoneta Road by reducing flooding. A review of impacts of pedestrians, bicycles and ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991) is being performed and addressed by this project. Traffic signals, streetlights, crosswalks, bus stops, ADA ramps, bikeways, and other pertinent issues are being considered in the design of the project to ensure pedestrian safety.

Other

Intergovernmental represents the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission's share of utility relocation costs.

Disclosures

A pedestrian impact analysis has been completed for this project.

Coordination

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Department of Transportation, Department of Permitting Services, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Washington Gas, Pepco, Verizon

Montgomery County Department of Transportation

Division of Transportation Engineering



DRAINAGE PROGRAMS

The Montgomery County Department of Transportation (MC-DOT) has two assistance programs pertaining to drainage issues associated with surface runoff from roads and other property owned and maintained by Montgomery County. One is for maintenance of existing storm drain systems and the other is for addressing communities' requests for drainage improvements.

DRAINAGE SYSTEM MAINTENANCE REQUEST

For drainage concerns on existing storm drain systems where maintenance is needed, such as clearing of debris from inlets, storm drain pipes, and/or drainage channels, re-establishment of drainage channels which may have eroded or silted up over time, water ponding on roads (puddles, potholes), or reconstruction of roadside curbs, please contact Montgomery County's Main Line at 3-1-1 (from outside Montgomery County dial 240-777-0311). e-mail address: mailto:Mcdot.Highway@MontgomerycountyMD.gov

DRAINAGE ASSISTANCE REQUEST (DAR) PROGRAM

The Division of Transportation Engineering (DTE) administers and manages the County's Drainage Assistance Request Program. The purpose and goal of this program is to solve drainage problems where there is no storm drain system or the existing system is failing or is inadequate. Through this program, the Design Section receives and addresses requests for assistance to correct drainage problems where the runoff water originates from the public Right-of-Way.

PROCEDURE FOR REQUESTING DRAINAGE ASSISTANCE

A request for assistance can be initiated by completing the Drainage Request Form (click below) a telephone call, e-mail, FAX or letter to the Design Section of the Division of Transportation Engineering (DTE). A County staff knowledgeable in surface runoff issues will review the request in a timely manner. After the review has been completed, you will receive an explanation of the review findings and proposed action.

e-mail address: mailto:michael.mitchell@montgomerycountymd.gov

MCDOT Division of Transportation Engineering - Drainage Assistance

Phone Number: 240-777-7262

Online Application: Drainage Assistance Request Form

OTHER WATER RUNOFF RELATED REFERRALS

- Nuisance Drainage Problems such as neighbor's fence blocking yard ditch, house gutter spouts drain on neighbor yard, minor ponding in yard, swimming pool discharges on land Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs--Code Enforcement Division- 240-777-3785
- Flooding and drainage from State Roads State Highway Administration (District 3) - 301-513-7300
- Permit for construction on County Right-of-Way (such as driveway culverts), waterway construction permits, sediment control/storm water management
 Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services--Land Development Division- 240-777-6259
- Stream erosion on private land, stream valley improvements, swimming pool discharges in waterways, private pools and hot tubs, storm water management ponds, watershed management, water quality/pollution, fish kills
 Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection— Division of Environmental Policy & Compliance - 240-777-7770
- Stream erosion on park land Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission—Parks Department- 301-495-2500
- Drainage issues within City of Rockville City of Rockville DPWT - 240-314-8567
- Drainage issues within City of Gaithersburg City of Gaithersburg DPWT- 301-258-6370
- Broken water main or sanitary sewer problems Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission- 301-206-4002



1		Total Potential	Total Restoration	% implementation in	Impervious Treated	ESD (%	Cost (Million	1					r	1 7
Watershed	Strategies	Cost	Potential (acres)	Permit Cycle	(acres)	Impervious)	\$}	ESD (% Cost)	Nitrogen	Phosphorus	Sediment	Bacteria	Trash	
	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$15.8	315	100.0%	315	9%	\$16	30%	5.8%	5.9%	1.9%	6.2%	5.5%	3
	Low Priority Projects	\$5.1	194	100.0%	194	8%	\$5	61%	2.0%	2.1%	0.7%	2.2%	2.7%	<u>"'</u> ا
	Other Potential Projects	\$249.2	2,217	33.0%	732	20%	\$82	24%	7.7%	8.0%	2.6%	8.4%	10.0%	14
Ļ	Public ESD Retrofits	\$237.8	956	10.0%	96	100%	\$24	100%	1.1%	1.1%	0.4%	1.2%	1.4%	1^{\prime}
Anacostia	Private ESD Retrofits	\$213.0	857	10.0%	86	100%	\$21	100%	1.0%	1.0%	0.3%	1.0%	1,3%	10
ļ	Riparian Reforestation	\$1.4	6	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1 /
Ļ	Stream Restoration	\$93.7	· · ·	11.7%		0%	\$11	0%	5.0%	6.6%	38.1%	0.0%	0.0%	1 1
Ļ	Programmatic Practices	\$3.6	-	25.0%	· · · ·	0%	\$0.9	0%	2.2%	2.1%	2.6%	2.0%	20.4%	4
	Subtotal	\$819.6	4,544	31.3%	1,421	26.3%	\$160	45.4%	24.8%	26.8%	46.6%	21.0%	41.3%	4
4	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$13.3	585	100.0%	585	1%	\$13	13%	4.0%	5.0%	6.0%	5.5%	6.0%	-
ŀ	Low Priority Projects	\$8.8	665	100.0%	665	1%	\$9	7%	3.9%	3.9%	6.2%	4.9%	7.0%	4
ŀ	Other Potential Projects	\$2.0	193	25.0%	48	0%	\$1	0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	-
hub bud	Public ESD Retrofits	\$247.1	1,020	10.0%	102	100%	\$25	100%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.3%	1.5%	-
Rock Creek	Private ESD Retrofits	\$341.2	1,407	10.0%	141	100%	\$34	100%	1.7%	1.7%	1.9%	1.8%	2.0%	4
Ļ	Riporian Reforestation	\$23.8	119	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
ŀ	Stream Restoration	\$20.1	·	21.8%	·	0%	\$4	0%	2.0%	1.5%	21.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4
ŀ	Programmatic Practices Subtotal	\$1.2		100.0%	-	0%	\$1	0%	11.0%	11.0%	0.0%	7.5%	0.0%	4
		\$657.6	3,989	38.6%	1,541	16.5%	\$87	70.4%	24.1%	24.7%	37.8%	21.4%	17.0%	4
-	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$1.6	88	100.0%	88	2%	\$2	19%	2.9%	3.0%	3.3%	3.2%	2.5%	-
ŀ	Low Priority Projects	\$1.6	10	100.0%	10	78%	\$2	98%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	-
-	Other Potential Projects	\$0.1	5	25.0%	1	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
h	Public ESD Retrofits	\$87.8	403	10.0%	40	100%	\$9	100%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	1.3%	4
Cabin John	Private ESD Retrofits	\$103.1	473	10.0%	47	100%	\$10	100%	1,2%	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.5%	-
ŀ	Riparian Reforestation	\$7.8	39	0.0%		0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-
ŀ	Stream Restoration	\$16.2		0.0%	·	0%	\$0	0%	0,0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
-	Programmatic Practices Subtotal	\$0.5	·	100.0%		0%	\$0	0%	15.3%	14.4%	0.0%	9.9%	0.0%	-
		\$218.7	1,018	18.4%	187	52.0%	\$23	92.0%	20.7%	19.9%	6.0%	15.7% 0.0%	5.6% 5.0%	4
ŀ	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$4.4	211	100.0%	211	1%	54	8%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%			-
ŀ	Law Priority Projects	\$2.0	26	100.0%	26	33%	\$2 \$0	84%	0.2%	0.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.2%	-
ŀ	Other Potential Projects	\$0.0 \$0.0		0.0%	·	0%	\$0 \$0	0	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%		4
	Public ESD Retrofits			0.0%		100%				-	·		ļ	4
Muddy Watts	Private ESD Retrofits	\$0.0	·	0.0%		100%	\$0 \$0	100%				-		4
Ļ	Riparian Reforestation	\$0.0	·····	0.0%		0%		0%		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-
Ļ	Stream Restoration	\$24.2 \$0.0	-	100.0%		0%	\$0 \$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-
ŀ	Programmatic Practices Subtotal		-	100.0%			50		·				6.2%	4
		\$30.6 \$18.9	237	100.0%	237	4,3%	\$19	31.6%	6.2%	6.3% 20.0%	7.2%	0.0%	26.0%	4
ŀ	Completed and High Priority Projects		800	100.0%	800	1%		6%	20.0%	and the second se		0.0%		4
ŀ	Low Priority Projects Other Potential Projects	\$6.6 \$0.2	87	25.0%	87	15%	\$7 \$0	41%	3.7%	3,7%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%	4
ŀ	Other Potential Projects Public ESD Retrofits	\$0.2 \$0.0	53	0.0%		100%	\$0 \$0	100%	0.6%			[0.7%	+
: Seneca (inclusive of			-		·	100%					-		<u> :</u>	+
Clopper Lake)	Private ESD Retrofits Riparian Reforestation	\$0.0 \$0.0	-	0.0%	<u> </u>	100%	\$0 \$0	100%	· · · · ·					+
ŀ	Stream Restoration	\$25.9	-	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-
ŀ	Programmatic Practices	\$25.9		100.0%	<u> </u>	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	U.U76	0.0%	U.U70	0.0%	-
ŀ	Programmatic Practices Subtotal	\$51.6		95.8%	901		\$0 \$26	15.2%	74 74	24.3%	26.0%	0.0%	31.0%	1
			941	and the second se	·	2.2%	\$26		24.3%	24.376	20.0%	0.0%	51.0%	4
ŀ	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$0,0		100.0%	· · ·	0%		0%				ļ	· · · · ·	4
Ļ	Low Priority Projects	\$0.0		100.0%		0%	\$0			· · · ·				4
ŀ	Other Potential Projects	\$0.0	-	0.0%	· · · · ·	0%	\$0	0%			-			4
per Lake (subshed of	Public ESD Retrofits	\$0.8	12	0.0%		100%	\$0	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-
Great Seneca)	Private ESD Retrofits	\$0.5	8	0.0%	·	100%	\$0	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
· ·	Riparian Reforestation	\$0.2	2	0.0%	·	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0,0%	4
l l	Stream Restoration	\$0.0	•	0.0%	×	0%	\$0	0%			· · · ·	-		4
	Programmatic Practices	\$0.01	-	100.0%	-	0%	\$0.01	0%	61.0%	30,0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1

County wide Courdinated

FY2015 Permit Cycle

		Total Potential	Total Restoration	% Implementation in	Impervious Treated	ESD (%	Cost (Million			1			
Watershed	Strategies	Cost	Potential (acres)	Permit Cycle	(acres)	Impervious)	\$)	ESD (% Cost)	Nitrogen	Phosphorus	Sediment	Bacteria	Trash
	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$0.0	-	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%		-	-	-	-
	Low Priority Projects	\$0.0		0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	-		~	-	-
	Other Potential Projects	\$0,0	-	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	-	-	-	-	-
	Public ESD Retrofits	\$8.6	40	0.0%		100%	\$0	100%	0.0%	0,0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lower Monocacy	Private ESD Retrofits	\$2.9	13	10.0%	1	100%	\$0	100%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%
	Riparian Reforestation	\$1.1	5	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Stream Restoration	\$7.3	-	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Programmatic Practices	\$0.1	-	0.0%	-	0%	\$0.0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Subtotal	\$20.0	58	2.3%	1	100.0%	\$0.29	100.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%
	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$0.4	5	100.0%	5	27%	\$0	77%	0.7%	0.7%	0,8%	0.8%	1.0%
	Low Priority Projects	\$0.9	5	100.0%	5	100%	\$1	100%	8.4%	8.2%	8.3%	8.2%	11.6%
[Other Potential Projects	\$2.0		25.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Public ESD Retrofits	\$31.2	179	0.0%	-	100%	\$0	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Patuxent (Rocky Gorge)	Private ESD Retrofits	\$18.6	106	1.0%	1	100%	\$0	100%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%
	Riparian Reforestation	\$2.5	12	0.0%		0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Stream Restoration	\$19.1	-	2.5%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%
[Programmatic Practices	\$0.1	-	100.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	38.0%	8.2%	0.3%	4.7%	2.0%
	Subtotal	\$74.7	307	3.6%	11	64.5%	\$3	54.5%	47.5%	17.4%	10.4%	13.8%	14.8%
	Completed and High Priority Projects	\$0.0	-	100.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	-	-	-	•	- 1
	Low Priority Projects	\$0.4	2	100.0%	2	100%	\$0	100%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%	1.0%
	Other Potential Projects	\$0.0	-	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	•			-	-
	Public ESD Retrofits	\$4.1	17	0.0%	-	100%	\$0	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Patuxent (Triadelphia)	Private ESD Retrofits	\$4.7	19	5.0%	1	100%	\$0	100%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0,3%	0.5%
1 [Riparian Reforestation	\$0.1	1	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Stream Restoration	\$0.0	-	0.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%		-	-	-	-
	Programmatic Practices	\$0.01	-	100.0%	-	0%	\$0	0%	23.4%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Subtotal	\$9.3	38	7.6%	3	100.0%	\$0,6	99.1%	24.2%	4.3%	0.9%	0.8%	1.6%
Соц	Intywide Totals 🔆 🗄 🖓 👘	\$1,884	11,154	38.6%	4,302	17.9%	\$305	53.4%	17.8%	17.1%	22.7%	10.5%	18.0%
				High and Low Priority:	2,993		$\overline{\mathbf{\nabla}}$						

Assumptions:

1. 100% Completed and High Priority Projects

2. 25-33% Other potential projects

3. 100% of Public Outreach Potential for all TMDL watersheds

4. 10% of ESD potential in urban watersheds, ~1 acre ESD goal for rural watersheds

S. No riparian reforestation, Completed stream restoration

6. Used watershed area weighing to calculate countywide total pollutant removais

20% Targeted Impervious:

4,292

Chesapeake Bay TMDL, Urban MS4 Reductions (2017): Chesapeake Bay TMDL, Uppan MS4 Reductions (2020):

Total Potential Cort \$ 1.884B

\$305 Million current permit cycle

801301 - SM Retrofit - Schools

		THRU		TOTAL 6							
WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	FY13	EST. FY14	YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTAL
	TO 08-07: Cold Spring ES	ی اید مربق اید. ۲۰۰۱ - ۲۰۰۱ - ۲۰۰۱ - ۲۰۰۱ - ۲۰۰۱	40	0	در در میشد میشود. مرم از در در میشود مرم از داران است از در از	ور بیند محمد ا در ایند بیادر ایندر در	<mark>nan a</mark> se ses caso 1 - Color de Caso 2 - Color de Caso	angeneration and and and and and and and and and an		ang panalang ing mang men Sang tang pang mengahan sang pang pang pang pang pang pang pang p	40
	TO 12-12: Rosa Parks MS & Olney Elem.					- 19 J. 1					
والمراجع والمتكاف والمراجع والمراجع		د. دومده از العرق ربعد	300	220	180	40	ية فن بن بينويده	na selar las anti-arte nel	er in de la companya des casas	Proving - Minimum - M	520
	TO 12-12: Rosa Parks MS & Olney Elem.										
	School		i para	1560	530	1030	5,44				1560
	TO 12-13: White Oak MS, Strathmore ES &					· , ` .					
و و د د د میر	Oak View ES	21.984 - 1.944 - 1.	460	290	220	70	an she a a a a a	L.) Kalendari kan dia ka	and contraction and	e	750
•,	TO 12-13: White Oak MS, Strathmore ES &	· · · ·								E. State	
	Oak View ES			2250	750	1500				n de la comune La comune	2250
	FY 14 Projects		580	690	480	210	e de la del composition	a la			1270
	FY 14 Projects			2540	840	1700					2540
	FY15 Projects			1040	470	390	180			dia dia 1970.	1040
	FY15 Projects	19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 - 19 -		2080		690	1390			9206/19 mile 2 - 17 1	2080
	FY16 Projects		1. 1.	1300		650	390	260			1300
a na a sha ana a	FY16 Projects	المامين الماسون إيداع	a fa fara a di	2600	ang senin arang. Turung sening	a a Alana a ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang an	870	1730		komentandipangan na sa . Nga Kangaran	2600
	FY17 Projects	•	A., Z. 1	1300	•		650	390	260	per presenta de la deserva. Angle de la deserva de la d	1300
e e e e e e	FY17 Projects	ang taong	1993 Brits P.	2600	na panganan pananan k	and a second s	and a second second Second second second Second second	870	1730	angen ersterne erster Ersterne ersterne erst	2600
	FY18 Projects	· · · · ·	•	1300				650	390	260	1300
· · ·	FY18 Projects	19 10 IS		2600		n an gana a Na san sa	interaction and End of the second se	المعادية من المحادث المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة المحادثة الم المحادثة المحادثة الم	870	1730	2600
· · · · · ·	FY19 Projects	ан аланан ал Ал		1040	• • •		1		650	390	1040
an a	FY19 Projects	e e se se se se	a george and a strange and a	870	ې مايېد، ايانان ر ۲	alah karangan Karang	م بيدين في يدين روم م مركز من المركز المركز	يديد مير المراجع مراجع	en e	870	870
	FY20 Projects		10 A.A.A.A.	650		• . • •	en des de la composition de la composit La composition de la c	an an taon an Ang	i e estas	650	650
	···										26,310
	TOTAL		1,380	24,930	3,470	6,280	3,480	3,900	3,900	3,900	26,310
	PDS TOTAL		1,340	7,830	1,350	1,360	1,220	1,300	1,300	1,300	
	CONSTRUCTION TOTAL		40	17,100	2,120	4,920	2,260	2,600	2,600	2,600	
			-10	1.,200	-,0	.,	_,	2,000	2,000	2,000	
		THRU		TOTAL 6							
WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	FY13	EST. FY14	YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTAL



801300 - SM RETROFIT ROADS 8.8.13

6

;

WATERSHED		THRU FY 13	EST. FY14	TOTAL 6 YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTAL
	Sligo Park Hills (DOT)		445	0			•		an ang ma	• . ··· ·	445
د. محالهم د مربع	Sligo Park Hills (DOT)	ester al State	2312	្រុំ	eren en ensen en en en	en el segue de la companyación	and the second	and the second secon	an a	nansa na singing na sa Na Sangarang Sangarang Sangarang Na Sangarang Sangarang Sangarang Sangarang Sangarang Sangarang Sangarang Sangar	2312
×	Sligo Park Hills II (DOT)	1 a 1		200	200	and a second second	t total a second			251일 : 영국교육은 가 1971년 - 1971년 - 1971년 - 1971년 - 1971년 - 1971년 - 1971년 - 1971년 1971년 - 1971년 - 1971년 1971년 - 1971년 -	200
y 4	Sligo Park Hills II (DOT)		in a state of the Marcold Con- Congregation of the Marcold Congregation of the Marcold	2300	2300	A MIRAN R	ا د به مربع بیسی را بس در به ک	and her grade her a sec sector of the here a sector	ne a la companya da angla da a Tangga da angla da ang	n na na na na na na na na na na Na na	2300
1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -	Dennis Ave (DOT)		· · ·	100	100	n ster briter. L	1 1 1 1 1	e se gale de l'agénération A	RQD (HALL) (H	Centre de la composición de la composi Composición de la composición de la comp	100
1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 19 19	Dennis Ave (DOT)	2 N 19 8 - 4	2410	600	600	$ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \max_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i} \\ i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}} \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathcal{I}_{i}}} $	n a maga na manangan Ang sa	n ng mangang ng mangang sa	and any and a start of the second s	re og system og som en	3010
	TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls		300	210	210		e in the second seco		1993년 4월 - 19 1997년 - 1997년 - 1997년 1997년 - 1997년	per sa an	51(
· •••	TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls	general e par e	1940	2060	2060	на пратикански слоди ста С	ana a mengeran i pan An i s	web looged proventing the g	الم تعريف ويعم ويعم. معرفي أن	en Martin (S. 1997).	400
	TO 08-06: Donnybrook (Street LID portion) (13)	* - 40 -	50	50	50					ي د	100
• • • • •	TO 08-06: Donnybrook (Street LID portion) (13)		800	200	200	inan munging jarah munga T	n alt on the state of the second s	n ann an t-anna - t-anna - Congo an t-anna - C	ารสีมาร์ - ปุรสาว มารสุดสามาระ 	n a data mga gu gu ana an Marang sa	1000
-	TO 08-07: Breewood and Amherst		· · · · · · · · · · ·			- 61 - 19 - 19 10 - 19 - 19					
	(Tenbrook)			120	120		and the second				12
en e	TO 08-07: Breewood and Amherst	د مدور در در م د	ا المعلى بخط يعلو الإخطوطي المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ المحافظ الم			n an	دور ما درو تمریزی بر می رودند. مربع از مریز در این از این افغان ایر این از این از این	paran ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang a	a da in Saparison	alindaansaa minin Alindaansaa minin Alindaansa	
	(Tenbrook)		800	200	200		, 신과 전문				100
e e - 1 e e - 1 e e	TO 08-12: Spring Street		s construction of the	300	150	150	e generale e e color. L	a i di ia di ƙwa	is on sponsifi S		30
and the second	TO 08-12: Spring Street	6 A. 3. 19 A.	and the second s	1800	900	900	یا ایک ورینده بالای د. استان ایک ایک ایک ایک ایک	n i shekarar	ه وسر کار بر رایش ا کار کار با د	ter an phy role of the sec	180
100 - 100	TO 08-14: Breewood (Roads) (11)			100	100		in the second	er e gistri de la com e e gistri de la com	in in a christel	1.1	10
	TO 08-14: Breewood (Roads) (11)	in ser a ser	60	770	770	kan salah selah selah selah yang gi Kan salah selah selah yang gi	موسم رجانت ايرونيرو - رسان 	an eastaire i narair line. An eastaire i narair line e	ردو میں جام یہ بری ہے گا۔ در آب	ا دونه این دفت و معروف در از میشود. دون از میشود دون از میشود	83
Paint Branch	TO 12-14: Springbrook/Homestead (Tanley)		480	720	360	240	120	is a star (s. 1)	(8) میں در اور اور اور اور اور اور اور اور اور او	in the second	120
Paint Branch	TO 12-14: Springbrook/Homestead (Tanley)		مرکز شمین میشود. مرکز این از این	3000	er men andre er in de ser er in d	1500	1500	Nyser, anto potensien y ne Nyser, anto potensien y ne	na ang aga pang Ng Sang ang aga pang ang ang ang ang ang ang	nan fan syn syn en en en sen en ei De genere en ei	300
Anacostia	TO 12-15: Anderson Burkhard Clifton; Cannon Ro	ad	400	650	320	210	120				105
Anacostia	TO 12-15: Anderson Burkhard Clifton; Cannon Ro	1 1 14 4	an a contra i	3500	•	1580	1920	nge ganveration of a solution of	THE CONTRACTOR OF MARKING TO	n dalisala kuna a ana	350
Rock Creek	TO 12-16: Judson Henderson (Glenmont Forest)		490	750	380	250	120	en la composició	n an an an Araban An Araban		124
Rock Creek	TO 12-16: Judson Henderson (Glenmont Forest)	Fr. e. 1 mar. 1 m. m	ne a tart a see a second se	3720		1700	2020	ni, mengenaking generali Second	in any synap	na na parta conseguir a na secu La superiori	372
Rock Creek	TO 12-17: Wheaton Woods Area ROW LID		700	1160	570	370	220	1979 BALE AL 2011			186
Rock Creek	TO 12-17: Wheaton Woods Area ROW LID	1 - mar - mar - m	استاد الديني والسويس مراجع مرود. الم الأراف الأراف ال	5580	an program i de trans 1	2000	3580	er in monistration is an instrument of the	nagen in angenerie State	na kongana ata sana ara na sa Sana sa	558
	FY14: Rock Creek ROW		400	650	320	210	120	ang sa sa sa sa sa sa sa	الاست بر بر الحالي المالية الم	n par et an et a	105
a sugara se merekaran	FY14: Rock Creek ROW		negara garagaran Agira. Ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang a	3150		290	2860	مورة الأصريحة ليحد برواوي والمهمه المرا	an in in more property	<mark>Magawan</mark> a Kusa ay buu Aysan laha Kusa Kusa	315
	FY14: Anacostia ROW	ŕ	1500	2050	1080	710	200	[10] [198] [10] [10] [10]		4 	355
e 19 j. j.	FY14: Anacostia ROW	e sa d	an an an an an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna an Anna Ann Anna Anna	10650		770	9120	- Helps prevent extension of the second		n an guine an ann an	1065
	FY15: Rock Creek ROW			1050	400	320	210	and the second		an an taon an t	105
a k solar je čatov Star Star	FY15: Rock Creek ROW		يې رو د تونې و. د د د	3150	i a se ar ar ar i i i i		300	化自动动动运动 化二氟乙烯合物	i en la construcción de la constru Construcción de la construcción de l	n av hann i ann an sin an sin An sin an sin	315
	FY15: Anacostia ROW			3550	1350	1080	710	360	50)	355
	FY15: Anacostia ROW	· · · · · ·	e general de la construcción de la	7100			and the second	6080	1020		710

ی د در بار در در روز در باری میرد روز در مریز مرد در در	FY16 Projects FY16 Projects FY17 Projects FY17 Projects FY18 Projects		العامية المحمد المراجع المحمد المحمد الم المحمد المحمد المحم المحمد المحمد المحم المحمد المحمد المحم المحمد المحمد المحم المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحمد المحم المحمد المحمد المحم محمد المحمد المحمد ومحمد المحمد الم	4700 9400 4700 9400 4100	a Angelander og en gener Angelander og en gen	1800	1400 1800	900 - 1680 1400 1800	600 7720 900 1680 1400	600 7720 900	4700 9400 4700 9400 4100
	FY18 Projects	an a	n para ang	1680			이가 국가관한다. 1997년 - 1997년 1월	, 2019년 1월 1991년 1월 1991년 1월 1991년 1월 1991		1680	1680
· · · · · ·	FY19 Projects			3200					1800	1400	3200
	FY20 Projects	and the termination and the second	1000-183 Kp - 418 - 13	້		and for the state of the state of the		الم	an a	an an tha an Tha an tha an	0
	FY20 Projects			1800						1800	1800
											111,507
	TOTAL PDS TOTAL CONSTRUCTION TOTAL		13,087 4,765 8,322	98,420 30,160 68,260	12,740 5,710 7,030	14,080 5,340 8,740	26,320 5,020 21,300	16,010 4,640 11,370	15,170 4,750 10,420	14,100 4,700 9,400	111,507
WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	THRU FY13 E	ST. FY14	TOTAL 6 YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19 •	FY20	TOTAL

.



800900 - SM Retrofit - Government Facilities 8.8.13

	THRU		TOTAL 6					,		
PROJECT NAME	FY13	EST. FY14	YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTAL
TO 08-06: Donnybrook	· · · ·	56	0						e., * e.	56
TO 08-06: Donnybrook	مىلى مۇرىدە ۋە يىلى تەرى 	ا المعنى في معنى من المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعنى المعني المعني المعني المعني المعني المعني	0	a second se	a series and	en digen en en die Gebeure		nd significant and state of the second s Second second second Second second	a anango go ta sa sa Na santa sa	Ċ O
TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook)	· · · ·	140	140	140		an an an a' sao an a An a' sao an a' sao a	1. 3 . 17.			280
TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook)	na an granna - a an	الله المراجع ا المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع	0	na an a	مردی در بولی میکردی میدرد. این در ایک ایک ایک در را را با در ایک ایک	بر ایک حققین بادیکار میراد ایک حققین بادیکار کارا	enned soft data were set	and a second s	and the second s	Ö
Dennis Avenue & other DOT	·	370	370	370	n far ski k vi L	1997 - 1997 -	e Ministration (* 19 19 - Antonio Antonio (* 19 19 - Antonio Antonio (* 19			740
Dennis Avenue & other DOT		160	0.		e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	engegiseer Aller en en geel in The Third Real of the Control of the Third Real of the Control of the Cont	er sygerier styre - distance 		a Anna a' Anna ann a' Chuirean a' - a	160
Sligo Park Hills		133	133	133			이가 가려낸다. 	en e		266
and the second	an a	- 1945 B 194 8, 194 8, 194 9 194 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0	ang	paj - intraksje i manje i n 2017 - E	an geographic sparae in the so- an an a	المهادي و در موجوعين المراجعين المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع	ng ser geforen johne og som 1977 – Standard State og som 1978 – State og som	م در المعالي مورود مواريخ الحراري الم	C
	s / ·	205		205	an the second	and setting	1999年後後後日1984年 1月1日日 - 1月1日日 1月1日日 - 1月1日日	nggan de Torres de La Record	ise en la sur Te	410
the set of		e kanska Talifi.			index of the second s		n hand de service de s	and the second sec	en en anna an an an a' star a' Tha a' star a' s	C
		378		378			n Conce The Carlos Carlos and The Carlos and Carlos a		* * ***	756
1. Constraints in the balance of the second state of the second	a	an an an 1977. An 1995	0	والمتعادية المتعادية	and and a state of the second			an a	n og slænder som en som en Som en som en	0
		179	-	179	ang sa sa sa sa sa	lation (n. 1996). Second	and a find the second of	anta di N	in Table II, N	358
the second se		ан алар (18-36 а. 1977 — Прински страници, 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 1977 — 19			e an teachara an tao. Taon an tao an	and and a second and a second s	and the second	د برزدی برد بورد به دهی د ۲۰۰۱ م رود میرد ۲۰۰۱ م رود می	A TAU CARA AND	(
and the second		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-		an a	ang kanal sa	and a serie the series the series of a	gueise (d. 1954) Su	a kapagi ita di di	-
		194	194	194						388
and the property of the second s	na ang sana na sa Na sana sa	المرياقي والمحمد المعالم فال		1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 . 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	یه بو هوستانه است. دارچ کمر	ngana nangan karana. Kar	an sharan (i) inning (a	in de la companya de La companya de la comp	and the second	400
		191 ⁻¹ -1						ada an an taon Na kata an taon	- 5- -	
		150	123	67	56	$(1,1,2,\dots,n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n}$		ter et en e		273
and the control of the second control and the second metal the second second second to be a second of the	e en	de l'agreere agrètere : Mars al capter		in stranger	موجد بین کار په درونه در در کار در در جوی در در	ngen maar o nt erse in soors Soort of the soort of the	en en fan de fan de Fan de fan de	and the second sec	بد مرضد والمدور بدين الدر الدين. الدر الدري الذي الدر الدين	/_
たったが、 たいに シート・コント しない あいから 加速 レート そうしょう かん		a shekarar Mar	550	380	170					550
그는 것은 말에 집에 집에 주셨다. 것은 것은 것은 것을 하는 것은 것을 하는 것은 것을 가지?		100	0			신인 값을 쓴		s The	na Xelling y Classifi	100
			0		ter i se					80
			-	200	200	20	0 200	20(200	
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• * * * *	(1) 201 (1999) 111		200	200
ers in a wearge to party to the industry of the state of the state of the second of the product one parts in the	ana ang sa	n far de la Contraction	-		the second second second second	when constrained a	and an analysis and the second	ng politicady i gran additionality i na ang politicadi	en Saatske representation op 1999 - 1999 Na Saatske sterene op 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999 - 1999	- 600
そうかい 愛い いいんかんじゅう たかわかい ひょうか 海豚 ビューボール 手下放火 しゃくい		70		70	a she was the second	18 - 20 C - 19 C - 19 C	a sector designed as a sector of the sector	and the second second	Containing and the	220
a control to the second s	د ردومه مستند از این م	a the second	5	ويرجعني المعامسيين والترويب	and the second advances in the second second	CLARK LANDAR - MAL	ىيى مەرومۇ بېرىۋەرمۇر قۇرۇر ئۇرى	n de la companya de Norma de la companya d	ية الذي يوفق معرد معرد مع ما الذي التي ال	660
コント・コート こうかいれんちゃくれん 御家 一環 (みち)語 小田 いい 龍田 アビー・アー	Sector 199	70		70	计算法 网络新闻教师			Print Carrowsky Statesty	en de la composition	220
a a colorization o construction de la seconda de la seconda de la construction de la seconda de la seconda de s	jangan ang sana sang sang sang sang sang	n na stan in s Stan in stan in	2	يې د ۸ د مېرو کې د و هې د وه د د. در د ۸ د مېرو کې د و هې د وه د د	a consideration and the restored	and a same part of my a	e a wateringenedate familie	and the second	د. په درې د د روخو مېږو کې د د د و د د و خو	660
· 동네에 관계 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		140	r	140	なり ビー・ジャン つい	Summer Street and the	コークボロ・オート やー・・	이는 것이 같이 있는 것이 같이 같이 많이		44(
(4) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1		T.4 0		THO.	وحرابها سالتأ وترهج وتريك الرابع	an e serve e la	· Server appropriate and the server	Artiget of new mages	بالمنافع والمعاقم والم	1320
	99 - 12 ^{- 1}			120	and a star in the		그 영양에 가 있는 그 사람들이 한	110 - 114 북 1		340
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	a page a const	n gener generale andere se men en se		12U	 		a second second second second	ent of an ended of the	د در پر مورده در مر د	680
	TO 08-06: Donnybrook TO 08-06: Donnybrook TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook) TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook) Dennis Avenue & other DOT	PROJECT NAMEFY13TO 08-06: DonnybrookTO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook)TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook)Dennis Avenue & other DOTDennis Avenue & other DOTSligo Park HillsSligo Park HillsTO 08-12: Spring StreetTO 08-13: Franklin Knolls (Four Corners)TO 08-14: BreewoodTO 08-15: Upper County Pool, Meadowvaleand Montgomery VillageTO 08-15: Upper County PoolTO 08-23: Little Falls Library & Bushy Dr RecCntrPlum Gar NRC (DGS)Scotland NRC (DGS)DGS Participation (TBD)FY14: Colesville Park & RideFY14: Greencastle Park & RideFY14: Greencastle Park & RideFY14: Germantown MARC Park & RidesFY14: Germantown MARC Park & RidesFY14: Longwood & Potomac CRCFY14: Longwood & Potomac CRCFY14: Longwood & Potomac CRCFY14: Longwood & Potomac CRCFY15: Abandoned Vehicles Facility	PROJECT NAMEFY13EST. FY14TO 08-06: Donnybrook56TO 08-06: Donnybrook140TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook)140TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook)140Dennis Avenue & other DOT370Dennis Avenue & other DOT160Sligo Park Hills133Sligo Park Hills133Sligo Park Hills205TO 08-12: Spring Street205TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls (Four Corners)378TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls (Four Corners)378TO 08-14: Breewood179TO 08-14: Breewood179TO 08-15: Upper County Pool, Meadowvale194and Montgomery Village194TO 08-23: Little Falls Library & Bushy Dr Rec100Cntr150TO 08-23: Little Falls Library & Bushy Dr Rec100Scotland NRC (DGS)80DGS Participation (TBD)200FY14: Greencastle Park & Ride70FY14: Greencastle Park & Ride70FY14: Germantown MARC Park & Rides70FY14: Germantown MARC Park & Rides70FY14: Longwood & Potomac CRC140FY14: Longwood & Potomac CRC140FY14: Longwood & Potomac CRC140FY14: Longwood & Potomac CRC140FY14: Longwood & Potomac CRC140	PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0 0 0 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0 0 0 TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook) 140 140 TO 08-07: Breewood (Tenbrook) 0 0 Dennis Avenue & other DOT 370 370 Dennis Avenue & other DOT 160 0 Sligo Park Hills 133 133 Sligo Park Hills 0 0 TO 08-12: Spring Street 0 0 TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls (Four Corners) 378 378 TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls (Four Corners) 0 0 0 TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls (Four Corners) 0 0 0 0 TO 08-13: Franklin Knolls (Four Corners) 0 0 0 0 0 0 TO 08-13: Upper County Pool, Meadowvale 194 194 194 194 194 194 194 10 0 0 0 00 0 00 100 0	PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0 <td< td=""><td>PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0</td><td>PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0</td><td>PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0</td><td>PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 FY19 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0</td><td>PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 FY19 FY20 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 56 0<</td></td<>	PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0	PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0	PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0	PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 FY19 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 0	PROJECT NAME FY13 EST. FY14 YEARS FY15 FY16 FY17 FY18 FY19 FY20 TO 08-06: Donnybrook 56 0<

(G)

• • • • • • •	FY15: Damascus Park & Ride FY15: Damascus Park & Ride FY15: Potomac CRC	an systematic systematics		140 280 280	40 80	40 80	30 60	30 280 60	an the state of the	a di senara Internationalitatione de la compositione de la compositione de la compositione de la composition	140 280 280 560
	FY15: Potomac CRC FY16 Tasks			560 / 900	- 4	360	270	560 180	90		900
and the Page	FY16 Tasks	ara ny polo ina polo Ny INSEE dia mampina Ny INSEE dia mampina	- د مهرو در میرود. - را د مهرو در میرود. - د د رود در در د	1800	موتعيدم وترجح رئيني ري	50 0		600	1200	an a	1800
	FY17 Tasks		and the second se	900	an an ann an am an Araba	an a	360	270	180	90	900
	FY17 Tasks		an angar sa	1800					600	1200	1800
	FY18 Tasks	•		810				360	270	180	810
	FY18 Tasks			600				170		600	600
	FY19 Tasks			630					360	270	630
	FY19 Tasks	n Sandaran da ka		0		 Market a betracking to be from the second secon			aka, ang		0
	FY20 Tasks			360			, y			360	360
· · · · · · · ·	FY20 Tasks	· · · · · ·		0	المتريم والمراجع	n na	e gerne staarse ge	an stadiogram a static sta	ana ang sa	and an end of the second s	0
											20,437
	TOTAL		2,705	1 7 ,732	3,026	2,816	2,820	3,270	2,900	2,900	20,437
	PDS TOTAL		2,145	6,822	2,246	826	1,000	9 50	900	900	
	CONSTRUCTION TOTAL		560	10,910	780	1,990	1,820	2,320	2,00 0	2,000	
WATERSHEI	D PROJECT NAME	THRU FY13	EST. FY14	TOTAL 6 YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTAL

807359 - STREAM VALLEY IMPROVEMENTS 8.7.13

		THRU		TOTAL 6							
WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	FY13	EST. FY14	YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTALS

тс	0 08-01: Hollywood Branch	71
тс	08-01: Hollywood Branch	600
	108-05: Stream Monitoring	40
тс	0 08-06: Donnybrook Stream	114
тс	0 08-06: Donnybrook Stream	760
TC	0 08-08: Fallsreach & Bedfordshire	170
्राट	0 08-08: Fallsreach & Bedfordshire	320
тс	0 08-14: Breewood Stream Restoration	59
тс	0 08-14: Breewood Stream Restoration	344
тс	0 08-20: Muddy Branch (Flints Grove) Stream	70
тс	0 08-20: Muddy Branch (Flints Grove) Stream	
тс	D 12-07: Cinnamon Woods Stream	90
тс	D 12-07: Cinnamon Woods Stream	
тс	D 12-09: Lower Snowdens & Falling Creek	470
тс	D 12-09; Lower Snowdens & Falling Creek	
тс	D 12-10: Stonybrook Tributary	290
тс	D 12-10: Stonybrook Tributary	
тс	D 12-11: Great Seneca - Gunners Branch GSGN 205)	310
тс	0 12-11: Great Seneca - Gunners Branch GSGN 205	•
FY	14: Grosvenor Tributary	300
Fγ	14: Grosvenor Tributary	
FY	14: Cold Spring	100
FY	14: Cold Spring	
FY	/14: Bel Pre Creek I	120
	/14: Bel Pre Creek I	
FY	(15: Old Farm 6 (Neilwood Drive)	
FY	15: Old Farm 6 (Neilwood Drive)	
FY	15: Snakeden I & III	
FY	15; Snakeden I & III	
FY	(15: Muddy Branch	e North March
FY	(15: Muddy Branch	
F	(15: Lower Potomac	
F١	(15: Lower Potomac	
F١	(15: Great Seneca (GSGN xxx)	

142	142	ار. فرود می ربطی ۲۰۰ روفه او با داده	د. مەربەر بىرىمىزىكى بىرىمىر ئەت تەربى	an jener restricted and and and	new warmer and the second	213	
1200	1200					1800	
600	100	100	(), (Q)()	MORA .	T 1 ((()	100 640	
108	108					222	
380	380			에서 14명 NOTES	and the second sec	1140	
170	170					340	
920 ¹	920	na na serie de la companya de la co La companya de la comp La companya de la comp	a den norme presentation de la desta d La desta de la d	ine print and an and a second	in interaction	1240	
59	59	in diastri internet del in Contra del Contra del Internet del Internet del Contra del Contra del Contra del Contra del Contra del Contra d Contra del Contra del Co		Managari Kanadari Kanadari Managari Kanadari Managari Kanadari Kan		118	
344	344	and a second s	ېږېد هم يو د و مې يون او د . اړ در د او او او او د	the week in the property of the second	i juli di nanganan kata kata kata s	688	
70	70		nan an an Alda T	لاحليان مير الحجو الكان اليون. التري	n an	140	
1000	850	150	an a	 March 1997 (1998) Karal March 1997 (1998) 	a designation and a second	1000	
90	60	30	terre en lever	en e		180	
400	320	80	محجن بين محمر ، ميد ما مريد از اين از اير ا ^{رد} ما	میرود مرجوع وی میرود. ایرون میکند آرمان	and a second s	400	
460	180	180	100	and for each of the second	la na Maria an Araba. Tanàna	930	
3000	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1500	1500	an a	n Alfred an ann an An An Ann an Ann	3000	
290	100	1500	80	, interaction	and the second sec	580	
1200		760	440	مى بەربىر ئېيىر ئېيىرى 10- ئېرىق ئېيىنى	n haar na gaga na ar an	1200	
	130	90	a as ee a' a' a'	an a			
300	130 	ر الرواب الراج المتعري ومعهده	80	Martine (1997)	د رو در	610	
1440	n an	790	650	a and a last		1440	
740	260	240	180	60 (1994) - Handida San and Andrew San Andrew S	an a faith an a san a Ta ta	1040	
3000	in in the second	이는 것은 가슴이 가슴 가슴 것은 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 다. 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이 가슴이	2770	230		3000	
230	100	70	60	n na sana ang sang sa ang sa	ي. در و ده د روه دهروده ورد هروردا در ور	330	
940	n an		940			940	
270	140	80	50	a de la constante de la constante	i .	390	
1130			1130			1130	
260	110	50	50	50		260	
760	n an	ال المراجع من من المراجع المراجع الم المراجعة من معرفة من من من الم	nan an san san san san san san san san s	760	αία. 	760	
400	200	70	70	60		400	
1140	الالم الالدين الدينية المناسمة. الأرابي المالية التي ورابيا		روپ ويو دي ويو ميروسيون اور آور و د مېږي	1140	na pravaljen svjet pravljen Politika Svjet pravljen svjet pravljen	1140	
390	150	80	80	80	ng berta distancia di successi Si secondo di successi di s	390	
1120	محمولة بما متحموه ومراجع	igenselsengendnarpane om Spillingen	in addition of the state of the	1120	n in the second s	1120	
390	150	80	80	80	e en	390	
1120	1910) N. N. N. N. N. N.	an a true and in the		1120	ya ina waxa ya wangi '	1120	
390	150	80	80	80		390	
550	100					550	

میں ہوتا ہے۔ مرکز کی ہوتا ہے۔ اور ہوتا ہے۔	FY15: Great Seneca (GSGN xxx)	a source and a source of a s	na construction and a construction of the second	1120	אראה אלאליין ויאר או ראש רייקן רייקן רייקן	and a state of the	angen an einer strangen all and State of the strangen all and State of the strangen all and strangen State of the strangen all and strangen all	1120		nang tagata bang tanan saya. Sang tagata bang tanan saya. Sang tagata bang tanan saya.	1120
	FY16 Projects			1800		900	300	300	300		1800
A second s	FY16 Projects	Consistent of Consistent of Statements	and a state of the second s The second se The second se	4200				1400	2800		4200
	FY17 Projects			1800			900	300	300	300	1800
1 27 1 1 T 1 HOUSE BEEN BEEN BEEN BEEN BEEN BEEN BEEN BE	FY17 Projects	and the second second	ana tang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang	4200					1400	2800	4200
	FY18 Projects			1500				900	300	300	1500
a set a s Set a set	FY18 Projects	an a		1400	and the second second	a sender he en Silver a sera				1400	1400
	FY19 Projects			1200			ta provinsi Tanggar ang sa		900	300	1200
	FY19 Projects			0							0
1 1 1 1 1	FY20 Projects			900	·.		altan da a			900	900
											46,801
	TOT 1		4 0 0 0	40 570	c 2 02		0.040	0.000	C 100	6 400	46.004
	TOTAL		4,228	42,573	6, 3 93	5,440	9,640	8,900	6,100	6,100	46,801
	PDS TOTAL		2,204	12,559	2,379	2,160	2,210	2,010	1,900	1,900	14,763
	CONSTRUCTION TOTAL		2,024	30,014	4,014	3,280	7,430	6,89 0	4,200	4,200	32,038
		THRU		TOTAL 6							
WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	FY13	EST. FY14	YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTALS

.

W

808726 - SM RETROFIT COUNTYWIDE

8.7.	13
------	----

WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	THRU FY13	EST. FY14	TOTAL 6 YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	τοτα
معارية المعار	TO 08-04: Brookville (50%)	ar i i i j i i i an i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	66	0.,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	بهرزامردی د برزی با آست. رش	ی ادار ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰ - ۲۰۰۰ - ۲۰۰۰ - ۱۹۹۰	n i san i san i san i Sin si sa ina sa ina A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	er anven stanovist-starte	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
	TO 08-04: Brookville (60%)		795	0							7
	TO 08-05: Monitoring		20	330	30;	40	50	60	70	80	3
	TO 08-08: Fallsreach, Fallsberry,Claggett Farm &					n an	galanting Salah				
a the second spectrum	Bedfordshire	n in the two states to a	302	156	156	en en el composition de la composition Reference de la composition de la compos	t a mini u ministraciónem t	Constanting of the second data	and a substantial data	والمنافر والمروان وماله	
	TO 08-08: Fallsreach, Fallsberry, Claggett Farm &		i vy jetričelov Vrtenovali								
	Bedfordshire		1574	394	394				a geolafia (d. P.) di selati (d. P.) di selati (d.)		1
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TO 08-10: Oxford, Naples & Georgian	Anno anno anno a	300	47	47	and a second a sound for	n en	والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع	almania in an anazara		
	TO 08-10: Oxford, Naples & Georgian		1100	142	142						1
	TO 08-11: Metro Park, Montgomery Manor	in an	238	68	68	s San an a	and the second sec		and and a measure to be	n n n Na stationaria and an an and a	
	TO 08-11: Metro Park, Montgomery Manor		394	112	112						
		· .					1			, .	
eat Seneca	TO 08-15: Meadowvale and Montgomery Village		13	50	50	artation over theme are	an station offician forms	and the second	. Part in 191 belonders de la re-	-	
at Seneca	TO 08-15: Meadowvale and Montgomery Village	n in	660	1320	1320	1773. 	in an		- 1996 - 1920 - 203 Alexandro - Alexandro California - Alexandro - Alexandro - Alexandro	e de la composición d Referencemente de la composición de la c	
	TO 08-16: Quail Valley, Hunters Woods and Goshen					1997 - 1997 -			a de la companya de La companya de la comp		
oin John	Estates		438	300	300	99 			ne en e	·	
	TO 08-16: Quall Valley, Hunters Woods and Goshen			£7	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		a i no o postario de la			Sa anna a'	
	Estates			1000	1000					ta da ser en el como de la como d Recente de la como de la	
	TO 08-17: Magruder Branch Regional Pond		90	101	101						
	TO 08-17: Magruder Branch Regional Pond		a career ar constraint.	1036	1036	oon oo waxaa ahaa dahaa daha	n an	a state a state a state for an	and the second secon		
	TO 08-18: Seneca Whetstone, Seneca Park, Plumgar & M.						a corr ann ann an a'	elevent terrene in de la composition. La composition de la c	Second to a second		
	Village PEPCO		477	477	397	80	1 A. 4				
	TO 08-18: Seneca Whetstone, Seneca Park, Plumgar & M.	n in the second s	and the second s	* '	er innen filter fan fan en er	Angeline Little niger filter in filt pr	and the second sec		The Same of May around	Solution a north of a solution of the solution	
	Village PEPCO			1500	1200	300					
ه رد تعدید ه شر .	TO 08-19: The Plantations, Airpark Regional		200	386	350	36	angersen over date: 1. juli:	an a	line and the second	,	
ينه ريان جار ر	TO 08-19: The Plantations, Airpark Regional	، ، ، مردر المحرد ال	أسامها الايمان معارية المراجع	1100	1000 -	100	n an a suite anternation 	and the Grandward Constraints	aline and and a second of a	n a national and a second s Second second	
· • • •	TO 08-20: Shady Grove Dev. Park, Potomac Chase, Mills	* 1 . F			n ne en en liej. L	an tang nagina bar Sili		n sa na sangan sa na	ana an ingenin. T	· · · · ·	
*	Farm, Fox Hills & Flints Grove		220	400	280	120			en en generale. En en en generale		
ود راه را الادر و ما راه ر	TO 08-20: Shady Grove Dev. Park, Potomac Chase, Mills	fransis natur sist. Ng	e nadi dalam nga katalapata nga nata Nga katalapatan nga natalapatan nga natalapatan nga natalapatan nga natalapatan nga natalapatan nga natalapatan		n nin siteren neede Stationer	nother source and the second	ngeninan kenanggan A	e providu i nagova se ter dan Se da se da se Se da se	استان المركزين والاقتصادين المانين 1917 - مركزين مركزين المانين 1917 - مركز مركز مركز مركز	langund i schurr (1946) an gubber a An an Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna A	
an Anna ann an Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna	Farm, Fox Hills & Flints Grove		1년 1 2 2 2	1685	1167	518			전시험		
e en tita	TO 08-21: Greencastle Lakes	e da Arren Tr	430	170	110	60	an de para 1974 y	anger - Karalan an Alfridaen Karalan anger Karalan anger	Artisting from the first of the		
an ann an tao ann an ta Tao ann an tao ann an ta	ေးက ရက်က်ကွေးမှာကေးကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်က ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြေ ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြောက်ကြေ	nyanja pa resur Sula			sustain in time grapes	na dan series and some of	n ny karatangka <mark>alan</mark> Ny kanga dia ka		renge og og som høre set og Som som som som som som som som som som s	an a	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	TO 08-21: Greencastle Lakes			440	290	150					
and the second second	TO 12-01: Potomac Ridge (4)	1999 - 1999 1	310	550	240	190	120	ng mending di s	ales de la service		
, car e	TO 12-01: Potomac Ridge (4)	· · · · · · · ·		1720		1400	320	let arrive i e	and the second s	a - 5	:

	TO 12-D2: Cinnamon Woods (4)	300	540	240
	TO 12-02: Cinnamon Woods (4)	a and a second	1680	
	TO 12-03: Watkins Meadow, Northlake Apts, Gunners			
	Lake Village & Germantown View	320	560	250
 A state of the sta	TO 12-03: Watkins Meadow, Northlake Apts, Gunners	li ¹ awy 200 i gene	,	ا درماند و درمه این میشود. از این این ۲۰ این این این از این این این این
	Lake Village & Germantown View		1760	
	TO 12-04: Woodrock, Pine Knoll & Fox Hills	310	550	240
	TO 12-04; Woodrock, Pine Knoll & Fox Hills	Sec. 1	1720	
	TO 12-05: Longmeade, Gaywoods & Bel Pre Manor	260	390	200
and the second	TO 12-05: Longmeade, Gaywoods & Bel Pre Manor	a an	1300	an and the second s
	TO 12-06: Stonehedge, Kemp Mill, Dumont Oaks &		,	
	Columbia Towers	310	450	190
	TO 12-06: Stonehedge, Kemp Mill, Dumont Oaks &		, e . e . e	111 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
i. Artista	Columbia Towers	at a	1700	
···· · · · ·	TO 12-07: Cinnamon Woods, Germantown Park	370	600	270
	TO 12-07: Cinnamon Woods, Germantown Park	n na har an an an an an Araba Taonach Taonach	1940	an S. Marine and an American Street
	TO 12-08: Wash Sci Cntr, Tuckerman Lane Regional, Old			an a
	Georgetown Village & Mill Creek South	310	550	250
in and in an an	TO 12-08: Wash Sci Chtr, Tuckerman Lane Regional, Old	a antana sa sa a Si ini Na ini a sa sa sa	- 4.4 -	an a
1997 - 19	Georgetown Village & Mill Creek South		1720	
1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -				and the second
Great Seneca	FY14: The Plantations, Chadsworth & Stewartown Homes	220	440	170
Great Seneca	FY14: The Plantations, Chadsworth & Stewartown Homes		1320	n (an an a
Great Seneca	FY14: Quail Valley 2 & Goshen Estates	160	280	130
Great Seneca	FY14: Quail Valley 2 & Goshen Estates		880	
Cabin John	FY14: Executive Blvd & Cabin John Shopping Center	80	180	80
1	eneral en la contra de la deserver en la contra de la contr	n - CO		n primine in the internet of the second s
Cabin John	FY14: Executive Blvd & Cabin John Shopping Center		500	a a barra
	FY14: Rossmor Leisure World, Tivoti Pond, Briggs Chaney			· ·
Anacostia	Shopping Center, Verizon SWM & Rolling Acres	420	680	340
n an	1. A start in a constrained of the start and the start and s	a higo for way, stated at		and a set of the set o
	FY14: Rossmor Leisure World, Tivoti Pond, Briggs Chaney		1	
Anacostia	Shopping Center, Verizon SWM & Rolling Acres		2200	
Great Seneca	FY14: Williamsburg Square (7 facilities)	600	940	460
Great Seneca	FY14: Williamsburg Square (7 facilities)	2	3080	an anging ng n
Great Seneca	FY14: Stoneridge (Community Council Corp.)	70	150	70
Great Seneca	FY14: Stoneridge (Community Council Corp.)	ين . كەنتەتلەرلىرىت	440	د د بار به روسی میکرد. در این این میکرد این میکرد این در این این میکرد این میکرد.
	FY14: Tamarack Park (Valley Mill Pond)	60	0	n strandischer die seinen die seine sein
	FY14: Rossmoor Leisure World (Leisure World Comm			
	Corp TR)	60	0	
	FY14: North Bonifant Woods HOA	60	0	

10	240	180	120	840
30		1370	310	1680
	್ ಎಟ್. ತಿರಿಗಳು			1000
50	250	190	120	880
	ېږې وړ ه ولي و لي ور			
50	一般に対象	1440		1760
50	240	160	150	860
20	an an an Anna 1996 an Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna A	1250	470	1720
90	200	110	80	650
00	gal no Marine Million Million and	950	350	1300
,		- 201 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -		
50	190	160	100	760
			2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2. 2	
00 (1240	460	1700
00	270	190	140	970
40	an an an Arrana. Airtean an Airtean	1410	530	1940
50	250	160	140.	860
			이가 많은 것 같은 것같은 것은 것이 가지 않는 것 같아요. 가지 않는 것 같아요. 같이 같은 것이 같아요. 또한 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것이 같아요. 것이 같아요. 것이 같아요. 같이 있는 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것은 것이 같아요. 것이 같아요. 것이 같아요.	
20		1250	470	1720
40	170	160	110 An an will a service state the state of the	660
	and the second			
20		360	960	1320
80	130	90	lan nan Jarol I. An Mit Schamer Price particular for the property of the property of the scheme of the	440
80		290	590	880
80	80	50		260
00	مين مينين مين هي المراجعة	170	330	500
		· ·		
~~				4400
80	340	220	120	1100
	na. Ata			
~~ ⁻				
00		500	1700	2200
40 	460	310	170	1540
80 i	70	470 40	2610 40	3080
50 40	70	化氨基苯基苯基苯基 化碘化物合金	化结构 化丁酸氨酸化丁酸酯医醋酸医糖医糖 化合物进行 化合物 网络静静静静静脉 经经济公司 化二十二十二十二十二	220
40 0	an a	100	340 340	440
U		24 1. 1.		60
0				60
0				60
0				

 (\mathfrak{A})

	FY14: Greencastle Lakes (CA)	60
	FY14: Oak Spring I (Upper Pond)	60
	FY14: MLK Recreation Park and Pond	60
atuxent	FY14: Hallowell (HOA)	60
	FY14: Good Hope Estates	60
nacostia	FY14: George Meany Center for Labor (3)	180
	FY14: Edgewood Pond (SS Country Club)	60
	FY14: Colesville Depot	60
	FY14: Aspen Hill Racquetball Club (2)	120
	FY14: Argyle Village HOA	60
	FY14: Westleigh (Muddy Branch SVU)	70
	FY14: Westleigh (Muddy Branch SVU)	n na na na mara mara mara na ma
	FY14: Dufief Home Association	70
··· · · ·.	FY14: Dufief Home Association	n da konstructuren erreten e
	FY14: Thomas Choice Retrofit	60
	FY14: Thomas Choice Retrofit	ا موطف یا در از مرکسی ارداند. ا
	FY14: Pueblo (60%)	
	FY14: Pueblo (60%)	375
	FY15: Clearspring Manor	
	FY15: Clearspring Manor	na na kara ya ya kwa na kwa kwa kwa kwa kwa kwa kwa kwa kwa kw
-	FY15: Chesney	
	which is a comparison of the contract of the c	
	FY15: Chesney	
	FY15: Chesney FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2)	
··· • /	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
••••× ••• •••	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2)	
· · · · · · ·	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor	
معدد المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2)	
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor	
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor	
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor	
۲۰۰۰ ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰ ۱۹۹۰ - ۲۰۰۰	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc)	
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park)	
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Ouince Orchard Valley (Ouince Valley HOA)	
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA) FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA)	
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA) FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA)	그 문제 국가의 유민이가 있습니다.
	 FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA) FY15: Quail Ridge Townhouse Assoc. FY15: Quail Ridge Townhouse Assoc. 	그 문제 국가의 유민이가 있습니다.
	 FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA) FY15: Quail Ridge Townhouse Assoc. FY15: Quail Ridge Townhouse Assoc. 	그 문제 국가의 유민이가 있습니다.
	FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2)FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2)FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2)FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2)FY15: Garfield ManorFY15: Garfield ManorFY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc)FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc)FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park)FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park)FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA)FY15: Qual Ridge Townhouse Assoc.FY15: Qual Ridge Townhouse Assoc.FY15: Beech Tree Place (Landmark Station HOA)	그 문제 국가의 유민이가 있습니다.
	 FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: Greenhills (Magruder Branch SVU) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: County View (Duvall Manor) (2) FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Garfield Manor FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Churchill Town Sector (Waters Landing Assoc) FY15: Willow Ridge (Orchard Neighborhood Park) FY15: Quince Orchard Valley (Quince Valley HOA) FY15: Quail Ridge Townhouse Assoc. FY15: Quail Ridge Townhouse Assoc. 	그 문제 국가의 부장님께서 좋아요.

0				· · · · ·		60
0						60
0				to the second		60
0					-	60
0			1			60
0			5 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 14 - 1			180
0						60
0		5. A		the state of the second		60
ŏ		and a second	1		an a	120
õ				an a	p	60
150	70	50	30			220
440	an ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang a	100	340	an a		440
150	70	50	30 30	in Print and		220
440		100	340	ې و در در وجونه مو ونو	and the second	440
100	40	30	30			
320	40	40	280	ed evelopies of the second	المراجع المراجع فلامر فالمراج	160
0	4 - A 4	40	200	M 7 4	· · · ·	320
375	375	an part	د سی هم افتارید دارد مرکزه	and the second	e general en la calencia de	0
					and the form of the	750
260	80	80	50	50	gebruckschipt fig i in sin chambler i in s	260
520			170	350	t ta ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang an	520
260	80	80	50	50	we get a weget a set of the	260
520		1-9 	170	350	n an an an an Arrana. An an Arrana	520
520	160	160	100	100	and paper for the second second	520
1040			280	760	en de la colorada	1040
520	160	160	100	100	المحاد بالمعارية المسترة بريهاد الالحام الماجو	520
1040		an a	280	760	e en	1040
260	80	80	50	50	n na	260
520	n di Sant Sant		120	400		520
260	80	80	50	50	ر روی می میشود می از این می می مراجع این می میشود می این می میشود می	260
520	د از از در از در از در ا		120	400	an a	520
260	80	80	50	50	for a film of the second second	260
520			120	400		520
260	80	80	50	50		260
520			120	400	na je stanova na provinskom stanova s provenska se	520
260	80	80.	50	50		260
520	 provide control of local grant (regard) provide control of		120	400	an a	520
260	80	80	.50	50	regenza de la composition de la compos	260
520	na internet or graphing	n na serie de la serie de l La serie de la s	120	400	an a	520
780	240	240	150	150		780
· · · · ·	بار باهرایی ا ^{ر ب} ریز میر موهندهی		n en en son en	n se producen e composition se terres. La produce de la produce de La produce de la produce de	د پې دي د دود روه د او کا کارو (د وړ سواوو . او د کې	-
1560			120	1440		1560

.

 $\begin{pmatrix} \ddots \\ - \end{pmatrix}$

and a second sec

÷

FY15: Walnut Creek Townhouse Association	60 60	. м
FY15: Watkins Mill HOA (2)	120 120	1
FY15: M/A Comm DCC (Hughes Network Systems, Inc.)	60 60	
FY 15: Hunting Hills Woods	60 60	
FY 15: Arbor Landscapers	60 60	ing a Sinagan ang sinagan sina
FY 15: Ashton Village	60 60	
FY 15: Olney Town Center Regional	60 60	t.
FY 15: Avenel Golf Course (TPC at Avenel) (5)	300 300	3
FY15: Bedforshire	60 60	, ·
FY 15: Potomac Oaks	60 60	
FY15: Palatine Oak (HOA)	60 60	
FY15: Stonebridge Regional	60 60	
FY15: Pond Ridge HOA	60 60	
FY15: Kensington Ridge HOA	60 60	
FY 15: Strathmore Court at White Flint (HOC)	60 60	
FY15: Crabbs Branch Regional	60 60	
FY 15: Needwood Estates (Crabbs Branch SVP)	60 60	
FY15: Gude Drive North Regional	60 60	н
FY15: Bel Pre Farms (B'nai B'rith Homecrest House)	60 60	
FY15: Rockville Fuel & Feed	60 60	
FY15: Norbeck Estates (Norbeck Meadows Neighborhood	00 00	
Park)	60 60	
FY15: Oakmont Roberts Oxygen	60 60	
FY15: Hoover Farm HOA	60 60	
FY15: Sequoyah Elementary School(Bowie Mill Park)	60 60	
FY15: Islamic Center of Maryland	60 60	
FY15: Potomac-Pond HOA	60 60	
FY15: Congressional Country Club	60 60	
FY15: Wexford (Wexford HOA)	60 60	
FY15: Kings Local Park	60 60	•
FY15: Theater Pond, Montgomery Village	60 60	
ו ודב. והכמנכו רטות, מוטונגסטווכיץ שוומפכ		
FY15: Montgomery Village (East Villiage Homes Corp)	60 6 0	
FY15: Montgomery Village Golf Course (2)	120 120	
FY15: Partridge Place	60 60	1
FY15: Montgomery County Airpark	60 60 co	
FY15: Olney Manor Recreation Park		
		en name an
FY16 Tasks	0400 0000	1100
3. An it is not at the state of the section of the section is the section of t	دواسه از ورابع ومرووي وروي مراجع والمرور من الأبار والمراجعة من الكر والات المريون مراجع والدرامية الدارية	8,4
FY16 Tasks	14600 6200	3400 14,6

(4)

n na san na san san san san san san san	FY17 Tasks	a ila bertana ana sama	 A company and the property of a company of a company. A company of a company of a company. A company of a company of a company. 	16400	n na an	angerer a geogr Ali	an ar an	non nonen en	6800	9600	16,400
	FY18 Tasks			9320				4860	2970	1490	9,320
سر و اور این اور آیر ا	FY18 Tasks	en de regeleradore A de la constanción de Constanción de la constanción de la cons	a ang a ngay ngay nganangan. Ngang ngang nga	7400						7400	7,400
	FY19 Tasks			7830					4860	2970	7,830
	. FY19 Tasks	and the standard of the standa	Construction of the second sec	ົ	e un paralele en el canado	in an			and a standard stand Standard standard stan		0
	FY20 Tasks			4860						4860	4,860
و ورد می در در در می در در می در میشون می می در م	FY20 Tasks	an a	an a	0							0
	BBC MS4 Management (BBC TO 3 & 4)		1400	10500	1500	1600	1700	1800	1900	2000	11,900
	Construction PM (BBC TO 2)	n an	176	1140	180	184	188	192	196 .	200	1,316
	Dashboard (BBC TO 6)		450	13 1	131						581
	Monitoring		20	120	20	20	20	20	20	20	140
											161,408
	TOTAL		14,938	146,470	18 ,726	22,968	23,408	23,732	27,696	29,940	161,408
	PDS TOTAL		•		-	9,276	•	11,280	12,300	2 <i>3,3</i> 40 12,740	76,730
			9,864	66,866	10,510	-	10,760	•	-	•	-
	CONSTRUCTION TOTAL		5,074	79,604	8,216	13,692	12,648	12,452	15,396	17,200	84,678
		THRU		TOTAL 6							
		FY13	EST. FY14	YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTAL

. . . .

35

800700 - MAJOR STRUCTURAL REPAIR

8.7.13

WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	THRU FY13	EST. FY14	TOTAL 6 YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTALS
1	TO 08-04: Brookville Depot (50%)		98	0		n de de seren	а. т. н. н. Так с. П	ر در منه در از معتقد می به کار از از آن از از	in and a second second		98
a a maggaria a sa	TO 08-04: Brookville Depot (40%)	د. این است. هر است. با به محمد بود از سرد با با	530	0	an an an in stranger and an in an in the		i sin sanatan karangan karang Karangan karangan kar			sales, te course disconnent f	530
	Auto Park Dam		163	0	in a constant Constant	a san ing pananan Ang bina			27 - 27 전 전 일 전 전 전 전 전		163
and the contracting intervention of	Auto Park Dam	a 1. an an Andrew State State Construction in	1628	0	ۇرىلىرى ئەمىرى بەربەيدى بەربەر <mark>ب</mark> ەمەر يە	an a	elana altanti energia. Altanti energia	معطور مراجع المحافظ ال محافظ المحافظ ال	a finishti alla Afrika da Marka se Marka sa Marka sa Mar	an san an a	1628
	Pueblo (Quince Orchard Manor)	an a	50	0		,	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	n je ve in here Nationalise	, North States and the states of the states		50
and the second	Pueblo (Quince Orchard Manor) (40%)	alfano de la traca estas	375	• 375	375	anna tha a' marit a' far a a' f	الاروب المعومين مرد المرد . المراجع : الارتباع :		t den se de la se	and a second	750
	Thomas Choice SWM Facility Repair			0				ana ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang			C
· · · · · · · · · · · ·	Thomas Choice SWM Facility Repair	and a second sec	156	0	an ag air an a' chuir air. Tha	and the second	t de la contra para. La	in an internet of the second	an a		156
	JV TO 10 - Anchor	· · · ·	137	40	20	20			and manifest the		177
	Gunners Lake		226	150	75	75	and a second at			e Anno 111 - Ale	376
	Gunners Lake			3000	3000		1		a in ann suidh deal ann an sa	anni i she ki i Si si	3000
4	Whetstone	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	150	150	150	1997 - 1997 -					300
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Whetstone		250	3000	3000				an da an	n an thair an thair an thair Sinn an thair an thair an thair Sinn an thair an thai	3250
	ICC Filter Dia	· · · · · · ·	30	0							30
	Chadsworth Sliplining		65	0		a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	i sa ing		na an 's an an anns a sao		65
	Chadsworth Sliplining			425		425			an a shire a su a s		42!
	Hunters Woods (Blue Smoke Ct)	endersone - versee		260		160	100	Na ka anaka ka ka ka ka ka	دیک بر اندونیونیونیو از این دارد.	NUMBER OF STREET	260
	Hunters Woods (Blue Smoke Ct)			625				625			625
a cara sa a carata na	B'Nai Israel	nandige samples market at a Caratabase s = marke	water awarded payment and social a space-15	260	160	100	na ta manga aki kwa avionawa na aki	manager - Miller scores and the		New York - Lense - Minches-	260
	B'Nai Israel			750			750	an a		· · · · ·	750
	Brandermill		Gan taur si Awinn - Ba	260	160	100		An dia manana dia dia manana			260
	Brandermill	·····		625			625				62
F = 61 1	Persimmon Tree		160	100	100	a and a state of the	******		and is she is she with the state	en marine con constances	260
	Persimmon Tree			820		820				n i ni	820
	Colony Pond	a selection of the second s	160	100	100		·	an a	a contra de contra de		260
	Colony Pond			625		625					62
	Wheaton Branch	a da silikandi ing dide ong deti ma Mari ang maringa	an old role and inclusion of	0	und the dat follow or taken of because it	an a	اینک و بودوست می در مورد م	and a second second second second	an a sharar waa ka ka katala shirada	- Antonio antoni	(
	Wheaton Branch	n na serie de la companya de la comp		425		425					42
	ICC - PB48 Rework	s s s s NAME aromatic Product Fit di Mariana	60	0	n managemente de la competencia de	n or man to channels of factors to	2 P.M. (19 1941) - (19 19 19 19	i Anna i cha ann ann			60
a for an and parts	ICC - PB48 Rework			520	140	380					520
د . به مسجد می بهرونیونر می و د ر	Oaks Landfill Ponds	د محمد مردو برد که این اید رو در است.	n Na kata na kata	260	محاط حمين والحول المحار فر	160	100	e Na na na mbana na mana ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang	د. استعمادها رسی در امراک دادیس	منابعة من مندم	26
	Oaks Landfill Ponds			500				500			50
	Railroad Branch	د	· · · • • • • · ·	260	د. میں داری میں و		160	100	n . Na san tana sa sa		26
	Railroad Branch			1250					1250		125

contraction of the second s



	Home Depot (Aspen Hill)			260	an an Taolor an		160	100			260
a na katalan ka	Home Depot (Aspen Hill)			1250	a se a Re Standard and an anna se anna se				1250		1250
	Retrofit Sliplining	ية. من تعريق و منه المالية المراجع ا	25	600	100	100	100	100 *	*, 100	i. 100 .	625
-	Dredging Projects		50	900	150	150	150	150	150	150	950
ومروعه وموجد والمروح والم	Other Projects			1885			285	470	80.	1050	1885
	Other Projects			3395	alan danak di sina di sana di s	an a	570	955	170	1700	3395
	TOTAL PDS TOTAL CONSTRUCTION TOTAL		4,313 1,269	23,070 3,985	7,530 765	3,540 615	3,000 805	3,000 670	3,000 80	3,000 1,050	27,383 27,383 5,254
	CONSTRUCTION TOTAL		3,044	19,085	6,765	2,925	2,195	2,330	2,920	1,950 [.]	22,129
				TOTAL 6							
WATERSHED	PROJECT NAME	THRU FY13	EST. FY14	YEARS	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19	FY20	TOTALS

ι

•

