November 15, 2018

D. Lee Currey, Director
Water and Science Administration
Maryland Department of the Environment
1800 Washington Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21230

Dear Mr. Currey,

Enclosed please find two copies of Montgomery County’s 2018-2027 Comprehensive Water Supply and Sewerage Systems Plan. This plan was approved by the Montgomery County Council on October 2, 2018 and represents a comprehensive update from the prior plan. An electronic copy of the entire plan is available online at: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/water/supply/county-water-plan.html. Approval Resolution 18-1257 is included as Attachment 2 in the new plan and is also available online at: https://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/COUNCIL/Resources/Files/res/2018/20181002_18-1257.pdf.

Section 9-507 of the Environmental Article of the Maryland Code provides that the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) has 60 days to review a county governing body’s action to amend the county’s Water and Sewer Plan. Upon notice to the county, MDE may extend that review period for another 45 days if necessary. At the conclusion of this review period, if no specific action is taken by MDE on any amendment in the resolution approved by the County Council, that amendment is approved by default.

If you have any questions regarding the enclosed documents, please contact Keith Levchenko of Council Staff at (240) 777-7944 or at: keith.levchenko@montgomerycountymd.gov.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Hans Riemer
Council President

HR:kl
Enclosure

cc: Robert McCord, Acting Secretary, Maryland Department of Planning
    Teresa Wong, EIT, Regulatory and Compliance Engineer, Water & Science Administration, Maryland Department of the Environment
COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Lead Sponsor: County Council

SUBJECT: Ten-Year Comprehensive Water Supply and Sewerage Systems Plan, 2018-2027

Background

1. Section 9-501 et seq. of the Health-Environmental Article of the Maryland Code requires the governing body of each county to adopt and submit to the State Department of the Environment a comprehensive County Plan, and on a triennial basis comprehensively review its Plan.

2. In accordance with the State law on December 30, 1969, by Resolution No. 6-2563, the County Council adopted a Comprehensive Ten-Year Water Supply and Sewerage Systems Plan, which was approved by the State Department of the Environment.

3. The County Council has from time to time amended the Plan.


5. Recommendations on these amendments were solicited from the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission staff, and affected municipalities.

6. A public hearing was held on June 13, 2017.

7. The Transportation, Infrastructure, Energy and Environment Committee discussed these amendments on June 22, July 20, October 5, and November 9, 2017, and July 16, 2018, and made recommendations to the Council.

8. The County Council held worksessions on February 27, March 6, March 20, April 17, and September 11, 2018.
Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following resolution:

The County Executive’s March 2017 Recommended Montgomery County 2017-2026 Comprehensive Water Supply and Sewerage Systems Plan is approved with the following changes, as shown in the attachments to this resolution.

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Megan Davey Limarzi, Esq.
Clerk of the Council
In preparing the final version of the Approved 2018 - 2027 Water and Sewer Plan, the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) made numerous revisions and updates to the March 2017 draft Plan text. Many of these changes were minor in nature, including editing corrections and minor wording revisions. In addition, DEP updated several of the GIS-generated maps appearing throughout the text. The following table provides a summary of the policy and other major revisions to the draft text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROVED 2018 - 2027 WATER AND SEWER PLAN</th>
<th>Policy Revisions for the County Executive Recommended March 2017 Draft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section/Figure/Table Revised*</td>
<td>Initiated By</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Summary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pgs. ES-2 to ES-3, ES-4 &amp; ES-7)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 1: OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I.A.: Plan Goals and Objectives (pg. 1-7)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.A.: County Water and Sewer Systems &amp; Figure 1-F5 (pgs. 1-19 to 1-20)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.A.: County Water and Sewer Systems (pg. 1-19)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.E.1: Development Plan Review (pg. 1-24)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.F.: General Policies for Water and Sewer Service (pg. 1-25) &amp; Section II.F.1.: Consistency with Comprehensive Planning Policy (pg. 1-26)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.F.2.b.: Low-Density Residential Estate Development (pg. 1-27)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.F.3.a.: Rural Neighborhood Cluster (RNC) Zone (pg. 1-28)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.F.5.: Service Policies for Employment and Industrial Development (pg. 1-29)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.F.6.: Service Policies for Agricultural Development (pg. 1-29)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.1: Master Plan Recommended Exceptions (pg. 1-33)</td>
<td>public input</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Page references refer to the Executive's draft Plan text.
### APPROVED 2018 - 2027 WATER AND SEWER PLAN

Policy Revisions for the County Executive Recommended March 2017 Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Figure/Table Revised*</th>
<th>Initiated By</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.2.: Community Service for to Relieve Onsite System Concerns (pgs. 1-34 to 1-35)</td>
<td>County Council</td>
<td>Clarified the approval process required for individual cases under this policy. Revised the section (and subsections) to address the Council’s actions affecting the consideration of area-wide health problems in areas outside the planned community sewer envelope. The actions require that DPS must document an on-site system failure with no reasonable on-site remedy before an areawide septic survey can be initiated. The section was restructured to address separately properties within and outside planned community service areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.3 and II G 3 a.: Community Service for Properties Abutting Community Service Mains (pg. 1-35 through 1-38)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Clarified DEP’s current practice for consideration for approval of non-abutting connections in some limited circumstances under this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.4.: Community Service for Private Institutional Facilities (pgs. 1-38 to 1-41)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Added text clarifying current practice that the PIF Policy cannot be utilized in cases where a Master Plan specifically recommends against the use of public water/sewer for PIF uses or any use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.4.b.: PIF Sites Outside the Planned Community Service Envelopes (pg. 1-39)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Clarified the Council’s options for granting conditional approvals for PIF-based category change requests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.4.e: PIF Policy Application Requirements (pg. 1-40)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Added text revising the application process to require the PIF applicant to submit a concept plan to M-NCPPC for review by the Development Review Committee (DRC) prior to submission of the category change request to DEP. The category change application must include a copy of the concept plan and DRC comments on the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.4.f.: County Council Reconsideration of PIF Concept Plan Changes</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Added text noting that if a PIF applicant makes any significant concept plan changes, as determined by M-NCPPC, from the concept plan considered by the Council at the time of the Council’s action, reconsideration of the PIF approval action by the County Council is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section II.G.11.b.: Piney Branch Restricted Sewer Service Policy (pg. 1-43)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Removed the text regarding the conditions required for the consideration of sewer service and text that instead refers to the same conditions noted in Appendix C, Section II. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III.A.5 b.: Interagency Coordination (pgs. 1-48 to 1-49)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Added language noting the County’s participation in the facility planning process for WSSC’s capital improvements program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III.C.2.: Individual Sewerage Systems (pg. 1-53)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Revised the text concerning the use of Best Available Technology (BAT) systems to clarify the conditions for requiring BAT systems outside of Bay Critical areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III.C.4.a.: Individual Systems Failures (pg. 1-53)</td>
<td>public input</td>
<td>Expanded the information provided about possible mitigation actions to address a failing septic system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Page references refer to the Executive’s draft Plan text.
**APPROVED 2018 - 2027 WATER AND SEWER PLAN**

Policy Revisions for the County Executive Recommended March 2017 Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Figure/Table Revised*</th>
<th>Initiated By</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section III.C.4.b.: Aging Individual Systems (pg. 1-55)</td>
<td>public input</td>
<td>Revised to better reflect the County’s priority to repair or replace failed septic systems, if possible, rather than the further extension of community water and sewer service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III.C.4.c: Individual Water and Sewerage Systems Problems</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Revised the text regarding how onsite system failures can affect public and environmental health and that potential public health problems can be identified where onsite systems may not be capable of providing adequate water supply or wastewater disposal in the future. Moved descriptive text in this section to the Appendix A: Glossary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III.C.4 d.: Rural Sanitation Planning Program (pg. 1-56 to 1-57)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Revised the recommendations in this section to focus on the development of a functioning onsite systems database that will inventory and maintain ongoing records of the existing wells and septic systems throughout the County and the development of an initial education and outreach effort to property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section III.G.3.a: Community Service for Properties Abutting Community System Mains: General Requirements (pg. 1-36)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Added language regarding abutting mains and clarified the language for non-abutting service connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section V.B.: Triennial Water and Sewer Plan Comprehensive Update Process (pg. 1-67)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Updated the MDE initial review period requirements from 90 to 60 days and its review extension period from 60 to 45 days consistent with the enactment of SB1040 during the 2017 State legislative session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section V.D 3.: State Consideration of Interim Amendments (pg. 1-73)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>See revision comments for Section V.B., preceding. Also added text noting the County’s 180-day period in which to appeal an amendment disallowed by MDE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section V.E.3.: Deferred Amendments (pg. 1-75)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Revised the timeframe which triggers the Council providing notice of a meeting on a deferred request with no significant changes from 120 days (as recommended by the County Executive) to 90 days.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 2: GENERAL BACKGROUND**

Note: No policy revisions for the County Executive’s Recommended Draft

**Chapter 3: WATER SUPPLY SYSTEMS**

| Section II.F.2.a: Projected Source Water and Treatment Facility Needs (pgs. 1-32 to 1-33) | public input | Revised in partial response to community group requests for projected facility needs for the Potomac Water Filtration Plant, specifically for the submerged channel raw water intake and drought management. |

**Chapter 4: SEWERAGE SYSTEMS**

Note: No policy revisions for the County Executive’s Recommended Draft

* Page references refer to the Executive’s draft Plan text.
## APPROVED 2018 - 2027 WATER AND SEWER PLAN
Policy Revisions for the County Executive Recommended March 2017 Draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Figure/Table Revised*</th>
<th>Initiated By</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Available Technology (BAT) System (pg. A-1)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Revised text to correctly reflect regulation changes for BAT systems outside of Critical Areas made by MDE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Envelopes and Service Areas (pg. A-1)</td>
<td>public input</td>
<td>Added text addressing and comparing planned community service envelopes and existing community service areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Systems Failures (pg. A-3)</td>
<td>DEP &amp; Council Staff</td>
<td>Added text (some moved from other Plan Chapter 1 text sections) to address the characteristics of and relief measures for the failure of onsite systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Problems – Existing and Potential (pg. A-3)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Added text to address the terms existing and potential health problems (similar to that in Chapter 1, Section III.C.4.c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Water or Sewer Service Area (pg. A-4)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Added text to address the designations of special water or sewer service areas to address existing and potential area-wide public health problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water/Sewer Service Connection (pgs. A-3 to A-4)</td>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>Added and relocated text to clarify abutting service connections versus non-abutting service connections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX B:**
Note: No policy revisions for the County Executive’s Recommended Draft

**APPENDIX C: EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE POLICIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section II.E: Glen Hills Study Area (pgs. C-4 to C-6.)</th>
<th>T&amp;E Committee &amp; County Council</th>
<th>Added:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Text concerning the revised sewer policies for the Glen Hills Study per Council Resolution 18-423 and concerning subsequent revisions to the consideration of area-wide public health problems as adopted by the approval of this Plan update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information about the special sewer service area approved for the South Overlea Drive survey area, summarized changes to the area-wide health problems policy as approved by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Text allowing for the use of the Potomac peripheral sewer service policy with the Glen Hills area, but still excluding that properties within the Piney Branch Special Protection Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section II.L: Piney Branch Watershed (pg. C-13) | DEP | Added text clarifying the public health problems provision of the Piney Branch sewer service policy to allow community sewer service for properties within a Council-designated special sewer service area. |

* Page references refer to the Executive’s draft Plan text.
### APPROVED 2018 - 2027 WATER AND SEWER PLAN

**Policy Revisions for the County Executive Recommended March 2017 Draft**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Figure/Table Revised*</th>
<th>Initiated By</th>
<th>Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section II.M: Potomac Area RE-1 and RE-2-Zoned Properties &amp; Figure C-F13 (Pgs. C-14 to C-16)</td>
<td>T&amp;E Committee</td>
<td>Revised this section to remove the Glen Hills Study area from being excluded from the Peripheral Sewer Policy. NOTE: The areas within the Glen Hills study area which is also within the Piney Branch Watershed is still excluded from consideration under the Peripheral Sewer Policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX D:**

Note: No policy revisions for the County Executive’s Recommended Draft

**APPENDIX E:**

Note: No policy revisions for the County Executive’s Recommended Draft

Other revisions involving Water and Sewer Plan technical corrections as raised by the County Council, DEP, and other agencies, and from public input are not included here.

---

* Page references refer to the Executive’s draft Plan text.
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ABUTTING MAINS POLICY AND NON-ABUTTING SERVICE CONNECTIONS

Revisions developed from requests from community groups and the T&E Committee for clarification about the terms for and use of abutting vs. non-abutting service connections.

CHAPTER 1
II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE

Starting on draft page 1-19
II.A.: County Water and Sewer Systems

The following provides a brief introduction to the types of water supply and sewerage systems used in Montgomery County. More-detailed information on these systems is available in later parts of this chapter and in Chapters 3 and 4.

Service connections and hookups are two parts of the same pipe that ties a structure to water or sewer service mains. The service connection runs from the local water or sewer main to the customer's property line and is installed, owned and maintained by WSSC. The service hookup runs from the property line to the structure being served and is installed, owned and maintained by the property owner. Some policies in this Plan restrict the provision of community water and/or sewer service to a single service hookup only. In these cases, the term hookup functions as shorthand for and includes both the service connection and hookup together (see Figure 1-F5).
Note that a single service connection/hookup may serve more than one structure on a property. This can occur on properties where ancillary buildings (guest house, pool house, workshop, etc.) are allowed under the County's Zoning Ordinance. However, this applies only to more than one building on a single property.

Abutting service connections comprise the vast majority of water and sewer service connections in the county. These connections, installed at a 90-degree angle to the service main, intersect the customer's property line. Some abutting sewer connections are provided from sewer manholes, allowing them to be constructed perpendicular to the manhole but at an angle of other than 90 degrees to a sewer main. WSSC's Development Services Code (see the link below) provides examples detailing under what conditions these sewer connections are considered abutting.

Non-abutting connections provide water and/or sewer service to properties that do not directly abut a water or sewer main. In some cases, the non-abutting connection runs further than usual through the public or WSSC right-of-way to reach the customer's on-site service hookup. In other cases, the non-abutting connection provides service access to the customer's hookup that crosses another, intervening property by way of a private easement in order to reach the customer's property. Some non-abutting sewer connections are provided from sewer manholes, allowing them to be constructed perpendicular to the manhole at an angle of other than 90 degrees to the sewer main. Additional details concerning the use of abutting and non-abutting service connections are provided in WSSC's Development Services Code (https://www.wsscwater.com/business-construction/development-construction-services.html). The use of abutting and non-abutting service connections in the context of the Plan's special service policies is explained further in Section II.G.3.

Figure 1-F5: Sample House Connections and Hookups
(Source: DEP-WWPG)

== The figure shown at right replaces the original figure from the CE's draft Plan. ==
II.G.: Special Policies for Water and Sewer Service

II.G.3.: Community Service for Properties Abutting Community System Mains

Starting on draft page 1-36

II.G.3.a.: Community Service for Properties Abutting Community System Mains: General Requirements

Non-Abutting Service Connections

A non-abutting water or sewer connection may allow for the provision of community service under this policy. A non-abutting connection is typically located within either a public road right-of-way or a WSSC main easement. The associated service hookup must be located on only the customer’s property receiving community service. The use of an offsite service hookup in an easement crossing another intervening property is not allowed. Non-abutting service connections require specific approval from WSSC.

Policies for the use of non-abutting service connections differ between this Plan’s policies and WSSC’s. In this Plan, the preceding policy concerning non-abutting service connections will determine whether a property qualifies for community service under this abutting mains policy. Most often, such a property is located outside the planned community service envelope and is considered for community service only because it satisfies this special service policy. WSSC’s policy for non-abutting service connections addresses cases involving access to a community system main where the County has already approved the property for community service. Typically, the property is within the planned community service envelope. In summary:

- The Water and Sewer Plan’s policy concerning non-abutting service connections affects decisions about which properties may receive community service.
- WSSC’s non-abutting connection policy affect decisions about the best way to serve a property once the Plan has established that property for community service.

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY

On draft pages A-3 and A-4

Non-abutting Service Connection

A non-abutting service connection is used by WSSC in cases where an existing community system water or sewer main does not directly abut a user’s property. They are typically used in cases where an intervening property blocks access to the main, or where a service connection, built at a 90-degree angle to the main providing service, will not intersect with the user’s property line. Additional information and an illustration are provided in Chapter 1, Section II.A & Figure I-F4.

Water/Sewer Service Connection

The portion of the service connection for a structure located between the local service main and the property line, or between the main and the sanitary easement for the main. Within the WSSD, the house connection is the responsibility of the WSSC. Additional details concerning the use of abutting and non-abutting service connections are provided in WSSC’s Development Services Code (https://www.wsscwater.com/business-construction/developmentconstruction-services.html).

Abutting Service Connection: A service connection constructed at a right angle to a service main running directly to the customer’s property line. Some abutting sewer connections are provided from sewer manholes, allowing them to be constructed perpendicular to the manhole but at an angle of other than 90 degrees to the sewer main.

Non-Abutting Service Connection: A service connection used by WSSC in cases where an existing community system water or sewer main does not directly abut a customer’s property. They are typically used in cases where an intervening property blocks access to the main, or where a service connection, built at a 90-degree angle to the main providing service, will not intersect with the user’s property line. Some abutting sewer connections are provided from sewer manholes, allowing them to be constructed.
perpendicular to the manhole and not at an angle of 90 degrees to the sewer main. Additional information and an illustration are provided in Chapter 1, Section II.A, & Figure I-F4.

ADDRESSING AGING ONSITE SYSTEMS

Language requested by community groups to reflect the County’s priority to repair or replace failed septic systems, if possible, rather than the further extension of public sewer service.

CHAPTER 1

II.: GENERAL POLICIES FOR WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS FACILITIES

III.C.: Individual Systems

III.C.4.: Individual Water and Sewerage Systems Problems

Starting on draft pg. 1-55.

III.C.4.b.: Aging Individual Systems

As housing stock and their individual, onsite systems age, the County makes every reasonable effort to transition these houses to new onsite systems to continue the use of onsite system service. This is consistent with master plan service recommendations and this Plan’s service policies. This may place limitations on expansions and other property improvements. However, some areas may face a potential problem in sustaining specific homes and businesses and perhaps entire neighborhoods that currently use these systems. Some of these neighborhoods, built in the 1950s and 1960s, were created using standards that allowed the use of individual systems:

• For lots that are now too small to support both wells and septic systems under current regulations.
• On soils inappropriate for septic systems under today’s testing standards because of high water tables and shallow fractured rock.
• With sanitary system technologies that no longer satisfy current regulations, such as hand-dug wells, septic seepage pits and lagoons, and septic overflow pipes.

ALTERNATIVES FOR THE MITIGATION OF SEPTIC SYSTEM FAILURES

Language requested by community groups to better explain alternatives for the mitigation of septic system failures other than replacement of a system or the provision of community sewer service.

CHAPTER 1

III.: GENERAL POLICIES FOR WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS FACILITIES

III.C.: Individual Systems

III.C.4.: Individual Water and Sewerage Systems Problems

Starting on draft page 1-53

III.C.4.a.: Individual Systems Failures

When an individual, onsite system fails to function properly, the owner of that individual system has the responsibility for having it repaired or replaced. In some situations, the property owner becomes aware of a problem very quickly, such as when sewage backs up into the house. In other situations, a problem, such as a septic system installed partly within the water table, may go unnoticed for a longer period of time. A failure does not always require a system replacement to resolve; in some cases, other mitigation actions are sufficient to resolve a problem:

• A repair, such as replacing a broken pipe or a broken baffle in a septic tank.
• Improved maintenance, such as more-frequent pumping of the septic tank.
• User changes, such as better awareness of what can and cannot be put into the septic system and of clothes washing and bathing scheduling.
is sufficient. The repair and replacement of individual onsite systems needs to occur in accordance with County and State regulations, as administered by DPS.

COUNCIL CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED AMENDMENTS

A revision recommended by County Council staff to reduce the number of days elapsed for a deferred Plan amendment before its reconsideration requires a new public hearing.

CHAPTER 1

V.: PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTING AND AMENDING THE WATER AND SEWER PLAN

V.E: Plan Amendment Actions

Starting on draft pg. 1-75

V.E.3: Deferred Amendments

Process Options Following Deferral

Upon resolution of the reason for a deferral, an amendment may be brought back for further consideration by the Council. To promote an orderly public process, whenever possible a previously deferred amendment should be submitted resubmitted to the Council as part of a semiannual amendment packet from the County Executive. If a previously deferred amendment is resubmitted to the Council outside of the Executive’s semiannual amendment transmittal process, then the Council shall proceed according to the following processes, as appropriate:

- **Deferred Amendments with No Significant Changes:** If the details of the proposed amendment have not changed since the item last went to public hearing (for example, the water and/or sewer alignment is the same and the applicant’s plans for use of the property to receive service have not changed), then the Council is not required to hold a new public hearing. A Committee or Council meeting on this request must be listed on the Council agenda at least ten days before the meeting. In addition, if more than 90 days have elapsed since a prior Council meeting on the amendment, then the Council must provide a notice of the new meeting to the reviewing agencies, to the applicant, and to all parties that submitted either oral or written testimony on the amendment at the prior public hearing. Although an additional public hearing is not required, the Council President can choose to hold a public hearing for this deferred request.

COUNTY INVOLVEMENT IN WSSC FACILITY PLANNING

Additional language developed by DEP addressing WSSC and County coordination concerning the WSSC facility planning process.

CHAPTER 1

III.: GENERAL POLICIES FOR WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS FACILITIES

III.A.: Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission Community Systems

III.A.5.: Facility Planning

Starting on draft page 48.

III.A.5.b.: Interagency Coordination

An important and essential part of the facility planning process involves WSSC’s coordination with Montgomery County agencies, primarily through DEP. The County actively participates in the WSSC facility planning process to ensure that the WSSC capital program meets the County’s need to provide community service consistent with Water and Sewer Plan policies, land use planning goals, and environmental protection.

WSSC produces a preliminary scope of work, conducts the consultant selection process; and, once selected, oversees the consultant’s work. WSSC organizes a planning team and works with the team to achieve consensus of the draft Facility Plan. The planning team consists of a WSSC project team, the interagency Policy Review Group (PRG), and the technical consultant.
DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW – COMMUNITY SERVICE LIMITATIONS

Additional language to clarify DEP’s review comments for plan review provided to the DRC. In some cases, although community service is approved for a project site, that approval comes with limitations or restrictions that could affect the proposed development plan.

CHAPTER 1
II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE
II.E.: Water and Sewer Service Planning in the Development Review Process

Starting on draft page 1-24.

II.E.1.: Development Plan Review
The M-NCPPC Development Applications & Regulatory Coordination Division manages the County’s Development Review Committee (DRC), an interagency group which meets regularly to review and evaluate proposed development plans. DEP is the lead agency in the DRC with regard to water and sewer service planning issues. DEP staff report to the DRC on the consistency of the water and sewer service components of development proposals with respect to the County’s Water and Sewer Plan. In order for a development proposal to proceed to the Planning Board for consideration, DEP staff need to confirm for M-NCPPC the consistency of the development plan with the policies and service area designations in the Water and Sewer Plan. DPS and WSSC staff also participate in this process with a focus on on-site and community water and sewerage systems design, respectively.

Note that certain service policies in this Plan limit or restrict the provision of community service to:

• The use of specific cluster development options (RE-1, RE-2C, and RNC Zones, for example).
• The use of TDR development options (RE-1 and RE-2 Zones, for example).
• The development of specific uses, such as for private institutional facilities (PIFs).
• A single water or sewer hookup only for a property and may further restrict the subdivision of such properties from more than one building lot where using community service.

GLEN HILLS SEWER SERVICE POLICIES

Revised to include additional text to:

• Include more of the information from Resolution No. 18-423 in the discussion of sewer service policies for the Glen Hills area, as requested by community groups
• Remove the Glen Hills study area, outside of the Piney Branch watershed, from those areas excluded from use of the Potomac peripheral sewer service policy, as agreed to by the T&E Committee and approved by the Council.
• Note Council’s approval of one Glen Hills special sewer service area, resulting from the South Overlea Drive Septic Survey.
• Note the change in the consideration of area-wide public health problems in locations outside the planned community sewer envelope, consistent with the Council’s revision to the community service for area-wide health problems policy.

APPENDIX C

Starting on draft page C-4
II.E: Glen Hills Study Area

Sewer Service Policy Area: Established by Council Resolution No. 18-423 (3/8/16)
Subject Area: Residential development zoned RE-1 as identified in the Glen Hills Area Sanitary Study.
Service Recommendation & Comments: In March 2016, the County Council adopted Resolution No. 18-423 that established sewer service policies for the Glen Hills area, as shown below (see Figure C-F4). These service policies resulted from a study of general septic system suitability in the area conducted by DEP. This study had been recommended by the 2002 Potomac Subregion Master Plan. Pending the Council’s consideration of the
study’s results, the provision of new community sewer service in the Glen Hills area was limited to properties with septic system failures documented by DPS.

The Council’s 2016 resolution established the following sewer service policies for the study area:

- Individual, on-site septic systems are the primary wastewater disposal method consistent with the area’s standard-type development under the RE-1 Zone.
- Community sewer service can be considered only under the following conditions for:
  - Properties in need of relief from public health problems resulting from documented septic system failures (Sections II.G.2.a.).
  - Properties included within a specifically designated public health problem special sewer service area (Sections II.G.2.b.). The sanitary septic system survey process used to establish these areas is outlined in the Council’s resolution and in Chapter 1, Section II.G.2.b: Area-Wide Public Health Problems. The research conducted for the Glen Hills Area Sanitary Study will allow DEP to streamline the survey process for properties in these neighborhoods. Once DEP has established a survey area, an Executive recommendation for the Council concerning that area is expected within approximately three (3) months. A decision by the Council is generally expected within three months after that.
  - DEP will give a higher priority for surveys that include properties located within Review Areas (RAs) established in the Glen Hills Study and those with documented septic system problems. DEP will give a lower priority to survey areas outside of RAs or where DPS has not identified existing septic problems.

The County has approved one special sewer service area in Glen Hills for part of the South Overlea Drive Septic Survey Area. The County Council under CR 18-888 (July 25, 2017) acted to include 16 of 24 properties surveyed by DEP and DPS within a special sewer service area.

The County Council’s 2018 action to approve this Plan update changed the County’s approach to the consideration of area-wide health problems where located outside the planned community service envelope. Establishing a septic system survey requires the inclusion of at least one property that has a DPS-documented septic system failure (see Chapter 1, Sections II.G.2.b. and c.)

- Properties that abut existing or planned sewer mains and that satisfy the requirements of the “abutting mains” policy (Section II.G.3.)
- Properties at the edge of the Potomac Master Plan planned public sewer envelope that abut and/or confront properties within the envelope, consistent with the Potomac area peripheral sewer service policy. (Consistent with this policy however, properties at the periphery of the planned sewer envelope within the Piney Branch watershed are excluded.)

Note that this service condition was subsequently added to the Glen Hills study area in 2018 by the County Council’s action to approve this update of the Plan.

- Properties within the study area and within the Piney Branch subwatershed that satisfy the requirements for community sewer service under the Piney Branch restricted sewer service policy (Section II.G.11.b.).

Property owners: Applicants shall not use the provision for a single sewer hook-up under any of the four Glen Hills area sewer policy provisions cited above to support subdivision or resubdivision of these existing properties into more than one lot.
APPENDIX C

Starting on draft page C-14

II.M.: Potomac Area RE-1 and RE-2-Zoned Properties

Note that the 2002 master plan specifically recommends excluding properties within or at the edge of the planned sewer envelope within the following neighborhoods areas from the use of this policy (see Figure C-F13):

- The Glen Hills neighborhoods
- The Piney Branch subwatershed
- The Palatine of Potomac neighborhood
- The Greenbriar Estates neighborhoods.

The preceding exclusion areas previously included the Glen Hills neighborhoods. The 2002 master plan recommended reconsideration of this exclusion following the completion of the Glen Hills Area Sanitary Study. However, the recommendations provided with the study did not address this policy. The 2017 Water and Sewer Plan update removes the Glen Hills area exclusion, except for those properties at the periphery of the planned sewer envelope within the Piney Brach watershed.
MASTER PLAN EXCEPTIONS TO WATER AND SEWER SERVICE POLICIES

Added a citation for Council Resolution No. 18-423, for the Glen Hills study area sewer service policies, as requested by community groups.

CHAPTER 1
II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE
II.G. Special Policies for Water and Sewer Service

Starting on draft page 1-33
II.G.1. Master Plan Recommended Exceptions

The previous discussions of the Water and Sewer Plan's service policies have noted that in order to implement specific development and land use strategies, master plans may make recommendations for water and/or sewer service that vary from this Plan's general policies. Where a master plan makes such a recommendation, it must also include an appropriate justification for the recommended departure from the general service policies. DEP coordinates closely with M-NCPPC with regard to the water and sewer service recommendations developed in local area master plans. Exceptions to the general service policies are recommended in the following master plan areas:
• Burtonsville Crossroads Neighborhood Plan (2012)
• Cloverly Master Plan (1997)
• Damascus Master Plan (2006)
• Fairland Master Plan (1997)
• Olney Master Plan (2005)
• Potomac Subregion Master Plan (2002): This master plan had recommended substantial and unique restrictions on community sewer service in the RE-1-zoned area referred to as Glen Hills. Following the County’s study of septic system and community sewer use in this area, the Council in March 2016 acted under Resolution No. 18-423 to restore sewer service policies for Glen Hills to those typical for similarly-zoned communities in the master plan area.
• Upper Rock Creek Watershed Master Plan (2004)

Refer to Appendix C for details about the exceptional service policy recommendations included in each of the preceding master plans.

MDE CONSIDERATION OF CWSP AMENDMENTS

A revision to address recent changes in State law affecting MDE’s consideration of Comprehensive Plan amendments.

CHAPTER 1

V.: PROCEDURES FOR ADOPTING AND AMENDING THE WATER AND SEWER PLAN

Starting on draft page 1-67

V.B.: Triennial Water and Sewer Plan Comprehensive Update Process

Following the Executive’s review, copies of the Approved Plan are provided to the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) for State agency review, including the Department of Planning (MDP) and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Within 90 days of its receipt of the Council’s Approved Plan, MDE must approve the Plan, disallow the Plan either in whole or in part, or request a 90-declare a 45-day review extension. MDE may also require a second 45-day review extension that would require a notice from MDE to the County, the County’s delegation to the General Assembly, and the Governor. If MDE has not acted nor declared the need for a review extension by any of these three deadlines [by either the initial 90-day or the extended 180-day deadline], the Plan is approved as adopted by the County Council by default. If MDE disallows any part of the Plan, the County has 180 days from the date of MDE’s notification to formally challenge MDE’s decision.

Starting on draft page 1-73

V.D: Scheduling for Interim Amendment Review and Consideration

V.D.3: State Consideration of Interim Amendments

The Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) reviews the County’s interim amendments to the Water and Sewer Plan and coordinates a review by the Maryland Department of Planning and by other State agencies, as appropriate. Within 90 days of its receipt of the interim amendments, MDE must approve the amendments, disallow the amendments either in whole or in part, or request a 90-declare a 45-day review extension. MDE may also require a second 45-day review extension that would require a notice from MDE to the County, the County’s delegation to the General Assembly, and the Governor. If MDE has not acted nor declared the need for a review extension by any of these three deadlines [by either the initial 90-day or the extended 180-day deadline], the amendments are approved as adopted by the County by default. If MDE disallows any amendment or part of an amendment to the Plan, the County has 180 days from the date of MDE’s notification to formally challenge MDE’s decision. This State review process applies to amendments either approved or conditionally approved by the County; the State generally neither reviews nor comments on deferred and denied amendments.
MOE REQUIREMENTS FOR SEPTIC SYSTEMS USING BEST AVAILABLE TECHNOLOGY (BAT)

Revisions developed by DEP to address recent changes in the State's regulations for the use of best available technology (BAT) systems for nitrogen removal in onsite septic systems.

CHAPTER 1

III.: GENERAL POLICIES FOR WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS FACILITIES

IIl.C.: Individual Systems

Starting on draft page 1-53

IIl.C.2. Individual Sewerage Systems

To address nitrogen contributions to the Chesapeake Bay from septic systems, the State had previously implemented a program that uses best available technology (BAT) for nitrogen removal all new and replacement septic systems. BAT systems are installed in the septic tank and typically use an aeration process, needing electricity to run. The State requires homeowners with BAT systems to have a contract with a maintenance company to help ensure proper operation of the system.

In November 2016, the State revised the BAT program to require universal BAT system installation only in Bay Critical Areas. No Critical Areas exist in Montgomery County. Outside of Critical Areas, BAT systems will still be required for:

- All multiuse septic systems with a design capacity of 5,000 or more gallons per day.
- Any septic system as required by a local government in order to protect public health or the waters of the State.

State requirements for maintenance contracts and system warranties remain in effect for all BAT systems.

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY

Best Available Technology (BAT) System
An aeration system used in a septic tank to improve Nitrogen removal from septic systems. The Maryland Dept. of the Environment (MDE) regulations require installation of BAT systems for new septic system service and for some replacement septic systems within Bay Critical Areas. Within Montgomery County, located outside of any established Critical Areas, the County’s Dept. of Permitting Services determines the need for BAT systems for new and existing septic systems.

ONSITE SYSTEMS – LIFE-CYCLE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Revisions resulting from community input and from Council decisions to modify the draft program proposal.

CHAPTER 1

III.: GENERAL POLICIES FOR WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS FACILITIES

IIl.C.: Individual Systems

IIl.C.4.: Individual Water and Sewerage Systems Problems

Starting on draft page 1-56

Section IIl.C.4.d.: Rural Sanitation Planning Program

The County has seen a shifting emphasis in community planning from major new development expansion to infill and redevelopment of existing neighborhoods. Accordingly, a similar approach—changing emphasis from major expansion of the community service envelopes towards more neighborhood-based efforts—will be required to address the sustained use of individual systems in the Water and Sewer Plan. This will be important in areas where potential sanitation problems from aging individual systems have the potential to affect older neighborhoods and to affect rural neighborhoods where water supply and wastewater disposal service is presumed to use individual, onsite systems, rather than community water and sewerage systems. Onsite wells and septic systems all need routine maintenance to promote sustainability.
At present, the County has no proactive programs in place to promote the long-term sustainability of individual onsite wells and septic systems. There are minimal opportunities for public education, and there are no regular maintenance reminders, inspections, or testing. In Montgomery County, once a well or septic system is installed and operating, there will very likely be no further contact between the owner and the County government regarding that system until it fails. The Plan will need to start placing an increased emphasis on addressing the needs of older communities that may find their future options limited using individual, on-site systems.

Improving the way in which the County government addresses rural sanitation issues and public health problem cases resulting from the failure of wells and septic systems will require approaches from several fronts. The combined efforts of several agencies will be needed, including DEP, DPS, M-NCPPC, WSSC, and MDE. While DPS maintains the responsibility for permitting and regulating individual systems in the County, that agency is not charged with performing systematic, long-range planning for rural sanitation systems management. Other than the designation of areas intended for service from individual systems and addressing public health cases, recent versions of the Water and Sewer Plan have had little to say about rural sanitation planning. This Plan update is taking the first steps towards addressing that oversight.

### Water and Sewer Plan Recommendation: Individual Onsite Systems Management

The County needs to assemble a work group with the purpose of considering the creation and implementation of appropriate programs to manage individual onsite systems use. This will be important in areas where potential sanitation problems from aging individual systems have the potential to affect older neighborhoods and where rural neighborhoods are located outside the effective reach of community water and sewerage systems. Onsite wells and septic systems all need routine maintenance to promote sustainability.

The County first needs to work on the development of a functioning onsite systems database that will inventory and maintain ongoing records of the existing wells and septic systems throughout the county.

Once a functional database exists, the need for additional aspects of a long-term management program can be evaluated.

- An education and outreach program to onsite system owners, particularly concerning system use and maintenance, with distribution either handled directly or through service providers. This would be a logical next step in a management program.
- Proactive, periodic on-site systems maintenance and inspection programs coordinated with the preceding public outreach and education on individual systems maintenance.

An onsite systems management program will be important in areas where 1) potential sanitation problems from aging individual, onsite systems have the potential to affect older neighborhoods, 2) and where rural neighborhoods are located outside the effective reach of community water and sewerage systems.

Addressing the concerns of neighborhoods that rely on individual onsite systems may require new and innovative solutions beyond just the potential provision of community water and/or sewer service. These may include, but are not limited to:

- Distribution of onsite system use and maintenance information to property owners either directly or through service companies.
- Proactive, periodic on-site systems maintenance and inspection programs.
## Water and Sewer Plan Recommendation: Individual Onsite Systems Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated with public outreach and education on individual systems maintenance;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative community distribution, collection and treatment systems;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared water and/or sewerage systems, owned by local communities and operated by authorized agencies or utilities (see Section III.D.);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative financing for relief systems (community or otherwise), including but not limited to special assessment subdistricts, grants or loans from government resources, or utility subsidies;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs to assist lower-income individuals and communities in financing required relief systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PIF POLICY ISSUES – CONCEPT PLAN CHANGES

A revision concerning the review of revised development plans for PIF cases as agreed to by Council staff, DEP, and M-NCPPC. This change places the consideration of revised plans with M-NCPPC as the agency responsible for development plan review.

### CHAPTER 1

#### II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE

#### I.G.: Special Policies for Water and Sewer Service

##### I.G.A.: Community Service for Private Institutional Facilities

Starting on draft page 1-41

#### II.G.4.f.: County Council Reconsideration of PIF Concept Plan Changes

The discussion of the review of PIF policy cases (Section II.G.4.b) explains the Council's consideration of a concept development plan for the proposed PIF use, which in part is the basis for a category change approval action. However, if the PIF user makes significant changes (prior to service being provided to the approved PIF use) to the development plan from the plan considered at the time of the Council’s action, DEP and the County will require reconsideration of the original approval action by the County Council. DEP will determine when a concept plan warrants the Council's reconsideration. The M-NCPPC Planning Department will evaluate the revised concept plan with respect to the original plan and report its findings to DEP and the Council concerning significant changes that would warrant the Council's reconsideration.

### PIF POLICY ISSUES – CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW AND CONDITIONAL APPROVALS

Revisions that require PIF users seeking category changes to provide a concept plan for the project to M-NCPPC for consideration by the County’s Development Review Committee prior to filing a category change request.

### CHAPTER 1

#### II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE

#### II.E.: Water and Sewer Service Planning in the Development Review Process

Starting on draft page 1-24

#### II.E.1.: Development Plan Review

The M-NCPPC Development Applications & Regulatory Coordination Division manages the County’s Development Review Committee (DRC), an interagency group which meets regularly to review and evaluate proposed development plans. DEP is the lead agency in the DRC with regard to water and sewer service planning issues. DEP staff report to the DRC on the consistency of the water and sewer service components of development proposals with respect to the County’s Water and Sewer Plan. In order for a development proposal to proceed to the Planning Board for consideration, DEP staff need to confirm for M-NCPPC the consistency of the development plan with the policies and service area designations in the Water and Sewer Plan. DPS and WSSC staff also participate in this process with a focus on on-site and community water and sewerage systems design, respectively. At the request of the County Council, the DRC also reviews and comments on concept plans for private institutional facilities seeking service area category changes in areas located outside the planned community service envelopes.
II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE

II.G. Special Policies for Water and Sewer Service

II.G.4.: Community Service for Private Institutional Facilities

Starting on draft page 1-39

II.G.4.b.: PIF Sites Outside the Planned Community Service Envelopes

Some circumstances will result in properties that are specifically excluded from the application of this policy; see Section II.G.4.c., below.

In cases where the County Council supports a requested category change for a PIF use, the Council will typically choose to condition a category change approval on either:

- The Planning Board’s approval of a preliminary subdivision plan that the Board finds to be in conformance with local area master plan recommendations; or
- The Planning Board’s approval of a preliminary subdivision plan which conforms substantially with the concept plan reviewed by the County Council.

Please refer to Section V.E.2. for additional information concerning conditionally approved Water and Sewer Plan amendments, including the five- to -ten-year sunset provisions for final approval actions.

Starting on draft page 1-40

II.G.4.e.: PIF Policy Application Requirements

Applicants seeking category change approvals under the PIF policy need to provide the following information in addition to the category change application form:

- Name of and contact information for the proposed institutional use, if that institution is not already the owner of the property.
- Statement of the institution’s non-profit, federal tax-exempt status from the U.S. Internal Revenue Service.
- Conceptual development A concept plan for the site of the proposed institutional use showing: that has been considered by the M-NCPPC Development Review Committee (DRC) under that agency’s concept plan review process. The concept plan needs to include:
  - Proposed activities, seating capacity, and auxiliary uses (day care, private school, etc.).
  - Proposed building footprints, parking and driveway areas, and other paved surfaces in sufficient detail to estimate impervious surface area.
  - Concepts for water and/or sewer main extensions, as needed.

The category change application needs to include a copy of the concept plan and a copy of the comments for the plan provided by the DRC agencies.
PINEY BRANCH RESTRICTED SEWER POLICY

Revisions developed by DEP to avoid redundancy of the Piney Branch Restricted Sewer Policy between Chapter 1 and Appendix C. Also, a clarification to the policy in Appendix C to address Council-designated special sewer service areas resulting from septic system surveys of neighborhoods within the watershed.

CHAPTER 1
II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE
II.G. Special Policies for Water and Sewer Service
II.G.11. Special and Restricted Community Service Areas

Starting on draft page 1-43
II.G.11.b. Piney Branch Restricted Sewer Service Area

This restricted sewer service area was established in 1991 to minimize the potential effects of sewer-dependent development in the Rural Estate-zoned areas in the lower Piney Branch Watershed. The policy was reexamined and updated in the context of interrelated land use, zoning, and sewer service recommendations in the 2002 Potomac Subregion Master Plan.

In order to be eligible for community sewer service, properties within the Piney Branch watershed must satisfy at least one of [the following] six conditions: related to issues such as sewer service staging, trunk sewer easements, and septic system problems. These conditions are detailed in Appendix C, Section II.L. All other properties within the Piney Branch watershed are restricted from community sewer service, whether from the Piney Branch sewerage system or from other adjacent sewerage systems.

- **Master Plan Sewer Staging**: Properties designated as Sewer Stages I or II in the 1980 Potomac Subregion Master Plan;
- **Trunk Sewer Right-of-Way**: Properties that the Piney Branch Trunk Sewer right-of-way either traverses or abuts, including properties adjacent to and commonly owned with these abutted or traversed properties as of December 3, 1991;
- **Prior Sewer Category Approvals**: Properties with approval or conditional approval for sewer categories S-1 or S-3 as of December 3, 1991;
- **Public Health Problems**: Properties, with documented public health problems resulting from failed septic systems, and properties within Council-approved public health problem areas, where the provision of public sewer service is logical, economical, and environmentally acceptable;
- **Abutting Sewer Mains**: Properties that abut existing or approved sewer mains and which satisfy the abutting mains policy requirements for Section II.G.3.b. Applicants shall not use the provision of a single sewer hookup to support subdivision or resubdivision of these properties into more than one lot. (This condition does not restrict sewer service provided to properties satisfying the "trunk sewer right-of-way" condition, preceding.)
- **Cluster Development**: Properties zoned RE-2C located in the southeast corner of the intersection of Boswell Lane and Piney Meetinghouse Road which develop using the cluster method.

All other properties within the Piney Branch watershed are restricted from community sewer service, whether from the Piney Branch sewerage system or from other adjacent sewerage systems.

Developers seeking to subdivide parcels into building lots using community sewer service in the Piney Branch subwatershed are required to record, as a covenant running with the properties, the Piney Branch Sewer Agreement Recommendations. Recordation of this covenant is a condition for the approval of sewer categories S-1 or S-3. Properties established prior to 1998, and for which only a single sewer connection is sought, are exempt from this requirement. Contact DEP Water and Wastewater Policy Group staff (see Appendix D) for a draft covenant and the required recommendations, and for additional information.
APPENDIX C

Starting on draft page C-13
II.L: Piney Branch Watershed

This restricted access policy was recently reexamined in the context of interrelated land use, zoning, and sewer service recommendations in the 2002 Potomac Subregion Master Plan; the following conditions reflect the policy changes recommended by the new master plan. In order to be eligible for community sewer service, properties within the Piney Branch watershed must satisfy at least one of the following six conditions:

- **Master Plan Sewer Staging:** Properties designated as Sewer Stages I or II in the 1980 Potomac Subregion Master Plan.
- **Trunk Sewer Right-of-Way:** Properties that the Piney Branch Trunk Sewer right-of-way either traverses or abuts, including properties adjacent to and commonly owned with these abutted or traversed properties as of December 3, 1991;
- **Prior Sewer Category Approvals:** Properties with approval or conditional approval for sewer categories S-1 or S-3 as of December 3, 1991;
- **Public Health Problems:** Properties with documented public health problems resulting from failed septic systems, and properties included within a Council-designated special sewer service area, where the provision of public sewer service is logical, economical, and environmentally acceptable; or
- **Abutting Sewer Mains:** Properties that abut existing or approved sewer mains and which satisfy the policy requirements for Section II.G.3. Community Service for Properties Abutting Community System Mains – Single Hookups for Only One Property. Applicants shall not use the provision of a single sewer hookup to support subdivision or resubdivision of these properties into more than one lot. (This condition does not restrict sewer service provided to properties satisfying condition ii., preceding.)
- **Cluster Development:** Properties zoned RE-2C located in the southeast corner of the intersection of Boswell Lane and Piney Meetinghouse Road which develop using the cluster method.

PLANNED COMMUNITY SERVICE ENVELOPES

Revisions requested by community groups to sections of Chapter 1 and Appendix A to clarify and compare terms related to planned service envelopes and existing service areas.

CHAPTER 1

Starting on draft page 1-19
II.A: County Water and Sewer Systems

Non-abutting connections provide water and/or sewer service to properties that do not directly abut a water or sewer main. In some cases, the non-abutting connection runs further than usual through the public or WSSC right-of-way to reach the customer’s on-site service hookup. In other cases, the non-abutting connection provides service access to the customer’s hookup that crosses another, intervening property by way of a private easement in order to reach the customer’s property.

Community Service Envelopes and Service Areas

Planned Community Water/Sewer Service Envelopes: Those areas intended for community service under the County’s Water and Sewer Plan’s general service policies and local area master plans recommendations. Generally, this includes properties currently approved for such service and designated as categories W-1, S-1 or S-1, S-3. Areas planned for future community service (W-4, W-5, and S-4, S-5) are included in the planned service envelopes. Some properties that have not been considered under the service area category change process, and still designated as categories W-6 and/or S-6, may also be included in the planned service envelope.
Existing Community Water/Sewer Service Areas – Those properties approved for and with access to community water/sewer service, designated as categories W-1 and/or S-1.

Planned Service Envelopes vs. Existing Service Areas – A category W-1 and/or S-1 does not always identify properties included in the planned community service envelopes. Properties located outside the planned service envelopes are typically approved for community service using one of the special service policies in the County’s Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan (abutting mains, private institutional facilities, onsite system failures, etc.). As such, these properties, although designated as categories 1 or 3, are exceptions to the Plan’s general service policies and do not become part of the planned service envelopes.

The Plan’s Glossary (Appendix A) provides additional information on these and other terms.

APPENDIX A

Starting on draft page A-1

Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

Provides for the programming of planning, design, land acquisition, and construction on a yearly basis for major water and sewerage facilities. These facilities include projects such as water filtration plants, sewage treatment plants, major water and sewer transmission mains, pumping stations, and storage facilities. The adopted WSSC CIP is incorporated annually into the County’s CIP when approved by the Montgomery and Prince George’s County Councils. Community system capital budgets are available as follows:

- **WSSC** The current CIP budget document, and those for some prior years, are available through WSSC’s budget webpage at [https://www.wsscwater.com/budget](https://www.wsscwater.com/budget).
- **Town of Poolesville** Capital program information is available at [http://www.poolesvillemd.gov/296/Budget](http://www.poolesvillemd.gov/296/Budget).

Community Service Envelopes and Service Areas

Planned Community Water/Sewer Service Envelopes – Those areas intended for community service under the County’s Water and Sewer Plan’s general service policies and local area master plans recommendations. Generally, this includes properties currently approved for such service and designated as categories W-1, S-1 or S-3. Areas planned for future community service (W-4, W-5, and S-4, S-5) are included in the planned service envelopes.

Note that not all properties located within the planned community service envelope are currently approved for such service and designated categories 1, 3, 4 or 5. Most requests for service area category changes seeking community service are granted through a case-by-case consideration. As a result, some properties designated as W-6 and S-6 may also be within the planned service envelopes because they have never had requests filed for a category change. Also see the “Planned Service Envelopes vs. Existing Service Area” discussion following.

Existing Community Water/Sewer Service Areas – Those properties approved for and with access to community water/sewer service, designated as categories W-1 and/or S-1.

A variation of the existing service areas could be considered as an approved service area. This would add those properties designated as service area categories W-3 and S-3 to the Existing Service Areas.

The majority of properties within existing service areas are connected to community systems. However, some properties continue to use individual, onsite systems even though community service is available. Note that some properties within existing service areas are located outside of the planned service envelopes; please see the following discussion.
Planned Service Envelopes vs. Existing Service Areas – Every property that is approved for and has access to community service (W-1, S-1) becomes part of the existing water/sewer service areas. However, a category change approval for such a property does not necessarily make it part of a planned service envelope.

Properties located outside the planned service envelopes are typically approved for community service (categories 1 or 3) through one of the special service policies in the County’s Comprehensive Water and Sewerage Plan (abutting mains, private institutional facilities, onsite system failures, etc.) or under another justification as determined by the County Council. As such, these properties, although designated as categories 1 or 3, are exceptions to the Plan’s general service policies and do not become part of the planned service envelopes.

This distinction is important in the Potomac Subregion Master Plan area where the master plan recommends the use of a peripheral sewer service policy, addressing properties located at the edge of the planned sewer envelope. Again, properties approved for S-1 or S-3 under this service policy do not add to or become part of the planned service envelope. This was intended to avoid a domino effect that could eventually extend sewer service well beyond the limits of the planned service envelope.

**POTOMAC WFP SOURCE WATER AND TREATMENT NEEDS**

Revisions in partial response to changes requested by community groups for discussions of projected facility needs for the Potomac Water Filtration Plant, specifically for the submerged channel raw water intake and drought management.

**CHAPTER 3**

Starting on draft page 1-32.

II.F.2.a - Projected Source Water and Treatment Facility Needs: The following sections include brief descriptions of major WSSC’s current and planned studies and facilities needed to meet the projected treatment capacity at each of its water treatment plants.

- **Potomac Submerged Channel Raw Water Intake:** This study is to develop alternatives and examine the construction of a new submerged channel raw water intake in the Potomac River. This raw water intake would serve as an alternate to the existing Potomac intake at the river channel’s bank below the plant at the C&O Canal National Park. The implementation of this project would provide for several objectives including:
  - The Submerged Intake would provide an additional barrier against drinking water contamination (particularly Giardia cyst and Cryptosporidium oocysts) by drawing better quality raw water,
  - as well as enhancing plant reliability [and reducing treatment costs] by avoiding the current problems associated with ice and vegetation blocking the existing bank withdrawal,
  - Provide desired operational redundancy during emergency situations,
  - Provide significant treatment cost reduction associated with solids handling and transportation, chemical use, and energy consumption.

Its use would also help to avoid heavy sodium chloride runoff from the Watts Branch that occurs when road salt application is followed by heavy rain or rapid snow melt. The project is expected to pay for itself over time based upon the reduced chemical usage, reduced solids handling, and reduced energy costs. This project is consistent with the industry’s recommended multiple barrier approach and operational reliability and redundancy.
• **Drought Planning:** WSSC continues to maintain the Little Seneca Reservoir, which can supplement the raw water supply in the case of drought. The County recognizes that increased siltation and contamination in Little Seneca Lake may occur from the increased impervious surface coverage (new roads, sidewalks, houses, etc.) in the three main tributaries feeding the reservoir. In order to slow the rate of increase of runoff pollution entering the reservoir, the County has placed caps on imperviousness for new developments planned in the Ten Mile Creek watershed, along with reforestation goals. WSSC is investigating the use of the Travilah Quarry as an additional raw water supply for the system.

---

**PRESUMPTION OF ONSITE SEPTIC SYSTEM SERVICE IN LOW-DENSITY AND AGRICULTURAL AREAS**

Revisions requested by community groups to several sections of Chapter 1 to emphasize the presumption of the use of onsite septic systems in areas planned for low-density residential and agricultural uses.

**CHAPTER 1**

I.: INTRODUCTION

Starting on draft page 1-7

I.A.: Plan Goals and Objectives

- Support the State of Maryland Smart Growth initiatives that direct State funding for public services and infrastructure to identified growth areas and promote the use of onsite water supply and wastewater disposal systems to limit development density in the Agricultural Reserve and lower-density wedge areas.

- Identify specific public health problems related to water supply and wastewater disposal throughout the county and recommend appropriate solutions, including community water and/or sewerage systems and capital projects if required. However, the cost and potential impacts of the extension of new community systems, especially in environmentally-sensitive, low-density areas, requires that the County maintain an emphasis on the repair or replacement of existing onsite systems with standard onsite conventional or alternative technologies.

Starting on draft page 1-25

II.F.: General Policies for Water and Sewer Service

This Plan recognizes that some rural and low-density areas of the county with have moderate-density residential, employment, or industrial zoning. These areas are planned to remain outside of community service envelopes and [beyond the logical and economical reach of existing or planned community service. These areas] will be served by individual, onsite water and sewer systems. Property owners and developers will need to recognize that the use of onsite systems may not allow these properties to achieve the maximum development density theoretically allowed under these zones.

Starting on draft page 1-26

II.F.1.: Consistency with Comprehensive Planning Policy

This Plan intends that water and sewer service decisions should follow and implement the land use and development guidance established in the County’s General Plan and local area master and sector plans. A variety of factors influence policy decisions concerning the density or type of development for a particular area: overall land use guidance; transportation and school capacity; environmental protection; local and county-wide housing and commercial demand; compatibility with existing development; and suitability for individual, on-site systems. The proximity of water and/or sewer mains to an area of the county, also one of these factors, should not serve as the primary driver of these water and or sewer service policy decisions.
Community water and sewerage systems provide service in areas of moderate- to high-density residential development, and to commercial, mixed use, and industrial development. The density of this development does not allow the space on individual lots needed for the use of individual, onsite wells and septic systems. The vast majority of developed properties in rural and low-density areas are served by onsite water supply and wastewater disposal systems, wells and septic systems. In support of the County General Plan and Master Plans, the presumption is that all of these areas will continue to be served using onsite systems consistent with this Plan’s service policies.

II.F.2.: Service Policies for Residential Development
Starting on draft page 1-27
II.F.2.b.: Low-Density Residential Estate Development
The RE-1 Zone (residential estate one-acre), RE-2 Zone (residential estate two-acre), and RE-2C Zone (rural estate two-acre cluster) provide for low-density residential development. These zones are most often intended presumed to use individual, on-site systems. Land zoned for residential estate development is often located in areas that function as the transition between areas planned for higher-density residential development and areas planned for rural or agricultural development. The presumed use of individual, onsite systems, especially septic systems, supports master plan goals for these areas. In addition to providing buffers for rural development and agricultural areas, they serve to protect high-quality streams, including those used for public water supply. The distances between residences in low density areas results proportionate increases in the cost of extending community service to each lot proportionately increases, making the use of individual systems more cost effective.

II.F.3.: Rural Residential Development
Starting on draft page 1-28
II.F.3.a.: Rural Neighborhood Cluster (RNC) Zone
Properties zoned RNC have two alternative development options: standard cluster and optional cluster. The choice between these options affects whether a project uses community or individual water and sewer service. The local area master plan will provide direction on the use of these cluster options.

Standard Cluster Method
The standard cluster method of development results in lower density neighborhoods on large lots. Development under the standard cluster method is generally presumed to use individual onsite systems, as established for the RNC Zone in the zoning ordinance. Service from the community water system may be considered if the project satisfies the requirements for community water service for large-lot development (see Section II.F.2.b.).

Starting on draft page 1-29
II.F.5.: Service Policies for Employment and Industrial Development
Most areas zoned for employment or industrial development are intended to develop at a density that will require the use of community water and sewer service, rather than individual, onsite systems. However, some commercial and industrial zones are located in rural communities beyond the limits of the community water and/or sewer service envelopes. These areas are presumed to use individual, onsite water supply and wastewater systems. Designations for the provision of community service or the use of individual onsite systems will be generally consistent with the type of service used for adjacent or nearby residential development, as guided by master plan development recommendations.

Starting on draft page 1-29
II.F.6.: Service Policies for Agricultural Development
Areas zoned for agricultural development, the twenty-five-acre agricultural or AR Zone (formerly Rural Density Transfer), are intended for service by individual, onsite water supply and sewer wastewater treatment systems. This includes residential properties within these zones. The size of lots in these zones, the distances between
loads, and the density and scale of development, and the distances between lots and from existing community service, makes these areas suitable for the use of individual, onsite wells and septic systems. For development within the AR Zone, this Plan limits the size of individual on-site septic systems (see Section II.C.5.c.).

PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEMS SERVICE POLICY

Revision to policy as approved by the County Council. The entire Public Health Problems Service Policy sections, now the “Community Service to Relieve Onsite System Concerns” policy, is presented here, as much of the existing text was rewritten and reorganized. The significant changes agreed to by the Council affect primarily the section addressing area-wide onsite system concerns in locations outside the planned community service envelopes and subsequent sections addressing onsite system surveys. In this revised section of the policy, the initiation of an onsite system survey requires at least one property with a DPS-documented onsite system failure where no reasonable onsite relief is feasible. Some text from individual, onsite systems discussions in Section III.C.4.c. has been relocated to new terms added to the Glossary in Appendix A. Text was also added at the request of community groups to clarify the timing for the onsite system survey process in general, and specifically as it applies to the Glen Hills study area.

CHAPTER 1

Starting on draft page 1-34
II.: POLICIES FOR THE PROVISION OF WATER AND SEWERAGE SERVICE
II.G. Special Policies for Water and Sewer Service
II.G.2.: Community Service to Relieve Onsite System Concerns

Public health concerns can result from failures of individual, onsite water supply or wastewater disposal systems, including the failure of those systems. Onsite systems usually—but not exclusively—serve properties located outside the planned community service envelopes, where development is intended for service using wells and septic systems. This is consistent with the planning for and designation of lower-density residential, rural, and agricultural areas.

As a result, most properties using individual, onsite systems are often in areas where relief of failures using community service is neither logical nor economical. In these cases, first consideration for mitigation of a failure will focus on onsite relief measures. A feasible onsite remedy must satisfy onsite systems permitting requirements, as verified by DPS. However, some failures do occur in areas within or near areas served by community systems. Issues involving concerns with and failures of individual water supply and sewerage systems are addressed in more detail in Section III.C.4.a.

II.G.2.a.: Single Property Onsite Systems Concerns

In the majority of onsite systems failures reported to DPS, relief is provided by an onsite repair or replacement. However, community water and/or sewer service may be provided to an improved property to resolve an onsite systems failure, upon documentation of that failure by the Director of DPS or a designee. If a water or sewer main extension is required or if the availability of service is unclear, DEP, in coordination with WSSC, will evaluate whether the provision of community service is feasible. In cases where DEP determines that the provision of community service is not feasible, DEP will report this back to the DPS Well and Septic Section. DPS then determines the best possible onsite solution for the onsite systems failure. Note that the State of Maryland, typically through MDE, may also direct the use of community service to relieve an onsite system failure.

Unless a case requires consideration by the County Council, DEP may direct WSSC to begin and expedite the process to provide community service regardless of the existing service area category. The utility does not
need to wait for the County to grant a service area change approval to plan, design, and implement community service. DEP will follow up this action with the needed category change through the administrative delegation process. The inability of an unimproved property to allow for a permitted septic system does not provide justification to allow the provision of community service to that property alone under this policy.

In cases addressed by this policy, community service will generally be limited to a single water and/or sewer hookup for existing properties. The provision of community service under this policy shall not be used as justification for the connection of intervening or nearby lots or parcels if they would not otherwise be entitled to connect to community systems.

Within the planned community service envelopes, where DPS determines that an existing onsite system failure occurs, the property involved may already have a category 1 or 3 service area designation. This allows WSSC to proceed with expediting the provision of community service. However, where a property lacks an appropriate category designation for community service, DEP may direct WSSC to proceed with the provision of service, as explained previously. Because the provision of community service is for a property located within an area already planned for community service, DEP may act to approve related service area changes through the administrative delegation process, under the “Consistent with Existing Plans” policy, Section V.D.2.a.

Outside the planned community service envelopes, first consideration for relief of an existing onsite systems failure will focus on onsite mitigation measures. However, some cases occur where DPS determines that onsite measures cannot relieve the failure. In cases involving documented failures, with no reasonable onsite relief measure and with readily available community service, DEP may act to approve related service area changes through the administrative delegation process, under the “Community Service for Public Health Problems” policy, Section V.D.2.a. Readily available community service is that which allows for community service for a property using either a directly abutting or a WSSC-approved non-abutting service connection, not a main extension. Otherwise, onsite system failures found outside the planned community service envelopes and related service area category changes will be addressed by the County Council. Depending on the circumstances affecting such cases, the County Executive may transmit appropriate recommendations to the Council outside the usual semi-annual cycle of Plan amendments.

In areas planned to use onsite water and/or sewer systems, the County’s decisions to provide community water and/or sewer service and approval for related service area changes are not intended to change existing development patterns originally based on the suitability of onsite systems use. To this end, properties outside the planned service envelopes cannot be subdivided into more than one lot where approved for public water and/or sewer service under this policy.

II.G.2.b.: Area-Wide Onsite Systems Concerns

In some situations, the number and/or the pattern of onsite systems failure cases could indicate broader-scale concerns rather than just an isolated, individual case. A function of this Plan is to survey and identify, as necessary, areas where future, long-term use on individual, onsite systems may be constrained, and to recommend solutions for those concerns. All special community service areas recommended for action under this policy require consideration and approval by the County Council. Upon the approval of a special community service area, the Council may also approve category changes for community water and/or sewer service for that special service area under this policy.
The County’s designation of a special community service area will allow property owners within these communities to take advantage of WSSC’s expedited service process and main construction subsidies. Individual properties within an existing or pending special service area that are documented by DPS as having onsite systems failures may still be addressed using the procedures outlined in Section II.G.2.a., above.

In addition to onsite systems survey requests from individual property owners (see outside the planned service envelopes in the following section), DPS may also identify and recommend to DEP potential onsite systems survey areas.

In areas planned to use onsite water and/or sewer systems, the County’s establishment of special community service areas and approval for related service area category changes is not intended to change existing development patterns originally established on the suitability of onsite systems use. To this end, properties outside the planned service envelopes cannot be subdivided into more than one lot where approved for community water and/or sewer service under this policy. The provision of community service under this policy shall not be used as justification for the connection of intervening or nearby lots or parcels if they would not otherwise be entitled to connect to community systems.

II.G.2.c: Establishing Onsite Systems Survey Areas

Within planned community service envelopes, the need for onsite system surveys for properties is limited as the area involved is already intended for community service. Surveys are sometimes conducted to establish an area eligible for public health subsidies from WSSC to help cover the cost of the extension of a water/sewer main and to expedite the planning and construction of needed main extensions.

Outside planned community service envelopes, onsite systems surveys are typically initiated by an individual property owner, or a group of owners, who identify an area of concern for DEP to investigate. At least one property owner requesting a survey must demonstrate that the existing onsite system has failed, as verified by DPS. DPS must also find that the onsite system failure cannot reasonably be resolved by an onsite repair or permitted replacement of that system. This determination may require an onsite system inspection by DPS and a qualified contractor. A previous inspection may also satisfy this requirement, if acceptable to DPS.

In cases involving septic systems, DPS must determine that the onsite system failure cannot be addressed reasonably by using a conventional replacement system (deep trench, shallow trench, or sand mound), by innovative and alternative onsite replacement systems, or by new technologies as they are approved for use by the State and County (e.g. graywater systems and waterless toilets). Note that in the case of septic systems, reasonable relief methods do not include the use of a holding tank.

The inability of an unimproved property to allow for a permitted well or septic system does not provide a property owner with justification to request an onsite system health survey. DEP may include unimproved properties within a survey area as appropriate, except where an unimproved property is at the outside limit of a draft survey area.

Once DEP accepts qualified properties for an onsite systems survey, staff will evaluate conditions of other properties in the immediate vicinity for inclusion in the survey area. For establishing a survey area, DEP considers factors such as similar zoning, lot size, and onsite system type and age; logical community service areas and main extension alignments; and physical conditions (such as streams, soils, slopes, and topography). Based on this evaluation, DEP will formally designate a draft survey area.
Once DEP establishes a draft survey area, staff will notify all property owners prior to the beginning of the survey process. At this point, any owner may choose to formally withdraw their property from inclusion in the survey. An owner’s withdrawal of a property requires a written and signed notification from the owner to DEP. Once withdrawn from a survey, the subject property will not be recommended for inclusion in either any special service area or related service area category change. However, DEP may use and present the results of the research gained for withdrawn properties as part of the overall survey evaluation. DEP may also consider an owner’s request to withdraw a property after a survey commences on a case-by-case-basis.

II.G.2.d: Conducting Onsite Systems Surveys to Address Area-Wide Health Problems

The survey begins with DEP’s final determination of the survey area. All participating property owners (i.e., those who have not withdrawn their properties from the survey) will be required to provide access to their properties for purposes of a DEP/DPS site visit. DEP and DPS staff will contact owners in advance of a scheduled site visit. DEP and DPS may also request that owners provide any available documentation of onsite systems inspections or maintenance. Staff will not pursue a site visit from those owners who choose to withdraw from the survey. DEP cannot require the owners of properties that DEP has added to a survey area to conduct septic system inspections by DPS.

DEP will hold a public meeting for the property owners and other interested individuals and public interest groups, prior to finalizing its survey findings. Following coordination with other agencies, as needed, DEP will present its findings and recommendations in a report for consideration by the County Executive. This report will include DEP’s recommendations for special community service areas and related category changes, as appropriate. The Executive will transmit any survey findings to the County Council for consideration.

The anticipated time frame for an onsite system survey starts with DEP’s final designation of a well or septic system survey area and concludes with MDE’s decisions concerning the County Council’s action regarding the survey results and recommendations. This process is generally expected to take no more than one year, depending on agency workload, including work on other onsite system surveys. An exception to this schedule is for surveys in the Glen Hills Study Area where research conducted for the Glen Hills Area Sanitary Study already provides some background information concerning existing conditions. For those areas of Glen Hills that qualify as “higher priority areas” (see Appendix C, pg. C-4), the schedule for transmittal of an Executive recommendation to the Council is three (3) months after DEP’s designation of the survey area.

Standard procedures for onsite system surveys are available on DEP’s website at Private Well and Septic Systems | Department of Environmental Protection, Montgomery County, MD.

III.: GENERAL POLICIES FOR WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE SYSTEMS FACILITIES

III.C.: Individual Systems

III.C.4.: Individual Water and Sewerage Systems Problems

Existing public health problems (as defined in this Plan) can result from the failure or anticipated failure of existing individual onsite systems. In addition, potential public health problems can occur where the County determines that onsite systems may not be capable of providing adequate water supply or wastewater disposal service in the future. Onsite system failures may result in problems that can affect public and environmental health due to contact with inadequately treated sewage or contaminated drinking water, or due to an inadequate
drinking water supply. Existing health problems resulting from onsite well failures typically result from an inadequate water yield or groundwater contamination. Existing health problems resulting from onsite septic system failures are typically characterized by inadequately treated sewage on the surface of a yard or backing up into a building. Additional information on these subjects is provided in the Glossary in Appendix A, page A-3.

Existing Public Health Problems: Individual systems can fail due to causes such as age, damage, contamination, or insufficient maintenance. The following circumstances are among the most common that constitute an existing public health problem:

- The presence of inadequately treated sewage rising to the surface of the ground or backing up into a building. Or an excessive need to pump out a septic system in order to keep the preceding from happening, usually on the order of several times in a year. Proper septic system operation typically requires tank pumping every two to five years for preventative maintenance.
- Evidence of a septic system discharging inadequately treated sewage into ground or surface waters. This includes problems such as drainfields constructed within the water table, constructed on fractured bedrock, and constructed with an overflow pipe that allows the surface discharge of inadequately treated sewage from the septic tank.
- A well with inadequate water quantity yield. (State minimum standard is 1 gallon per minute.)
- A well with inadequate water quality, resulting from either an inflow of surface water or contamination of the groundwater source.
- A well that does not satisfy current regulatory standards, including hand dug wells, wells without adequate sleeves/casing, etc. A structural failure of the well may result, such as a side wall collapse.

Anticipated Public Health Problems: The expectation that existing onsite wells and/or septic systems cannot be replaced and will not support existing development once they fail can present anticipated public health problems. Early identification of areas or neighborhoods where these conditions exist may result in corrective measures that will prevent actual individual systems failures that will result in health problems.

Health Problem Relief Measures: Typically, properties served by individual systems are located in low-density development areas where access to community systems is not considered logical or economical. In many cases of individual system failures reported to DPS, relief is provided by an onsite repair or replacement, rather than by community service. However, in some cases where individual systems have failed, owners may not be able accomplish a repair or replacement consistent with current regulations, as determined by DPS. Changes to individual systems regulations over the past decades have resulted in improved standards for human and environmental health. However, these regulatory changes can have the potential to hinder efforts to replace existing individual systems with new systems that satisfy current standards. Section 11.G.2. of this chapter discusses the conditions where community service can be used to relieve public health problems resulting from individual systems failures.

Inclusion of additional terms used in the Plan text.

APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY
Starting on draft page A-3

Municipal Well
A groundwater well that provides water for a community water supply system. In Montgomery County, only the Town of Poolesville uses municipal wells to provide a potable water supply to its customers.

Onsite System Failures
Individual, onsite system failures can result from causes such as age, contamination, insufficient maintenance, or structural problems. The following situations are among the most common that constitute an onsite systems failure:
• The presence of inadequately treated sewage rising to the surface of the ground or backing up into a building, resulting from a hydraulic overload of the septic tank and/or the drainfield. Proper septic system operation typically requires tank pumping every two to five years for preventative maintenance.

• Evidence of a septic system discharging inadequately treated sewage into ground or surface waters. This includes problems such as drainfields constructed within the water table, constructed on fractured bedrock, or constructed with an overflow pipe. Overflow pipes typically allow the discharge of inadequately treated sewage from the septic system into a drainage feature such as a swale, pond, or stream. Failures may also result from structural problems involving the septic tank or drainfields.

• A well with inadequate water quantity yield. (State minimum standard is 1 gallon per minute.)

• A well with inadequate water quality, resulting from either an inflow of surface water or contamination of the groundwater source.

• A well that does not satisfy current regulatory standards, including hand-dug wells, wells without adequate sleeves/casing, etc. A structural failure of the well may result, such as a side wall collapse.

An excessive need to pump out a septic tank, usually on the order of several times in a year, to keep the septic overflows or backups from happening, can also signal a septic system failure. Other excessive actions indicating a septic failure may include curtailing the use of laundry, kitchen, and/or bathroom facilities to prevent overflows or backups. These situations can be considered as temporarily mitigated failures in that the property owner has intervened to prevent the failure from causing a public health problem (see below).

Relief measures for individual, onsite system failures generally fall into one of three categories:

• Onsite Repair – The repair of an onsite well or septic system typically involves a straightforward process that does not require DPS to issue a permit. Repairs can include replacing a broken pipe or septic tank baffle, clearing a clogged pipe, or replacing a pump. Repairs may also involve an improved maintenance schedule or the use of practices compatible with onsite systems.

• Onsite Replacement – An onsite systems replacement occurs where a major component of the well and/or septic system no longer functions as intended. A replacement will require DPS to issue a new permit for a new well, septic tank, and/or septic drainfield. Some septic system drainfield replacements can be considered as single replacements, where one new drainfield is feasible, but without the identification of reserve areas for future use. A full replacement for a septic system includes a new drainfield and an approved reserve area for future drainfields.

• Community Service – Community service is provided, if feasible, and where consistent with community service policies in Chapter 1 of this Plan.

Public Health Problems – Existing and Potential

Individual, onsite well and septic system failures may result in problems than can affect public and environmental health due to contact with inadequately treated sewage or contaminated drinking water, or due to an insufficient drinking water supply.

Existing Public Health Problems: The determination by DPS that a property suffers from the failure of an onsite well or septic system to function as originally designed. Solutions for failed onsite systems may require a new well or septic system permit. New septic system permits are required for the replacement of the septic tank.
and/or drainfield or pit. In other cases, a repair, such as the replacement of a broken pipe, or change in use or maintenance, may suffice to address the failure.

Potential Public Health Problems: The expectation, based on a determination by the County, that the replacement of existing onsite wells and/or septic systems may not be capable of supporting existing development, resulting in future public health problems. Early identification of areas or neighborhoods where these conditions exist may result in corrective measures that will help to avoid future individual systems failures.

Sanitary District
The entire area where the responsibility of providing community water and sewer service as identified in this plan falls to a single agency. The Washington Suburban Sanitary District (WSSD), which encompasses most of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, is served by the WSSC. Two areas within the County are excluded from the WSSD:

**SPECIAL WATER OR SEWER SERVICE AREAS**

_Inclusion of additional terms used in the Plan text._

**APPENDIX A: GLOSSARY**

Starting on draft page A-4

**Sewer Service Area**
That area served, or potentially served, by a system of sanitary sewers connected to a treatment plant, or, in a very large system, sub-areas as delineated by the County.

**Special Water or Sewer Service Area**
An area designated by the County Council where the provision of community water and/or sewer service is approved to provide relief for existing failures and/or potential health problems. Special service areas may be located either within or outside the planned community service envelopes.

**Systems Development Charge (SDC)**
A fee paid by new users of the WSSC's water and sewerage systems which WSSC uses to finance the capital cost of system growth and improvement.

**UPDATES FOR THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

_Revisions resulting from changes elsewhere to the draft text._

_Draft pages ES-2 to ES-3_

**Special Policies for Water and Sewer Service (Section II.G.)**

_Community Service for Area-Wide Health Problems:_ This update provides more detailed information about the health area survey process, much of which was developed for the Glen Hills sewer policy text amendment approved under CR 18-423. Areas zoned AR are excluded from the survey process.

_Community Service to Relieve Onsite System Concerns:_ This update rewrites this service policy with a focus on procedures for addressing onsite system failures both within and outside the planned community service envelopes. In addition, the procedures and requirements for initiating an onsite systems survey are revised from those adopted following the Glen Hills Study under CR 18-423. This update provides more detailed information about the onsite systems survey process.

_Private Institutional Facilities (PIFs):_ This update restructures the PIF policy, largely from prior text, to create a more logical organization and provide additional background information on its rationale. The update
Approved 2018 - 2027 Water and Sewer Plan: Policy Revisions

also provides an explanation regarding why dedicated low-pressure sewer main do not have the potential to serve other abutting properties. This addresses an aspect of the PIF policy under which the Council has operated for many years, but that was not specifically covered in Plan text. This update adds a requirement for PIF applicants to submit a concept plan for the project for review and comment by the M-NCPPC Development Review Committee (DRC) prior to filing the category change request with DEP; the concept plan and DRC comments are provided as part of the category change application. This update also includes language that requires the County Council’s reconsideration of a category change approval in the event that a concept development plan, considered and accepted by the Council as part of a PIF-based action, is subsequently and significantly revised.

Draft page ES-4
Adopting and Amending the Water and Sewer Plan (Section V.)

Triennial Comprehensive Update and Interim Amendment Processes: These revised sections more clearly address the triennial and interim Plan amendment processes, and better establish interim amendments as separate from, but contributing to the triennial update process. The Plan also updates schedules for MDE’s consideration of triennial Plan updates and interim Plan amendments based on recent changes to state regulations.

Draft page ES-7
APPENDICES

The Plan’s glossary has been moved to Appendix A. Capital program projects, previously summarized in Appendix A, are included in the Plan by reference to available documentation online. In appendix B, inventories of the County’s multiuse systems (large-capacity, individual, onsite water and sewerage systems) have been combined into a single table including both multiuse water and sewer systems. Appendix C includes information on exceptional water and sewer service policy areas, moved there from Chapter 1. Information in Appendix C also includes updates for the Glen Hills study area based on the sewer service policies resulting from the 2015 “Glen Hills Area Sanitary Study” and from policy revisions for onsite system surveys adopted in this Plan update. Appendix D includes updated municipal, county, state, and regional agency contact information. Appendix E, an addition to the Plan, includes an inventory of major public and institutional facilities in the county.