MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT
WATER AND SCIENCE ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM GENERAL PERMIT FOR DISCHARGES FROM SMALL MUNICIPAL SEPARATE STORM SEWER SYSTEMS

GENERAL DISCHARGE PERMIT NO. 13-IM-5500
GENERAL NPDES NO. MDR055500

Final Determination:	April 27, 2018
Effective Date:	October 31, 2018
Expiration Date:	October 30, 2023

This National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general permit covers small municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s) in certain portions of the State of Maryland. MS4 owners and operators to be regulated under this general permit must submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to MDE by October 31, 2018. An NOI serves as notification that the MS4 owner or operator intends to comply with the terms and conditions of this general permit.

APPENDIX D

Municipal Small MS4 Progress Report

Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
Small Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) General Permit

This Progress Report is required for those jurisdictions covered under General Discharge Permit No. 13-IM-5500. Progress Reports must be submitted to:

Maryland Department of the Environment, Water and Science Administration
Sediment, Stormwater, and Dam Safety Program
1800 Washington Boulevard, Suite 440, Baltimore, MD 21230-1708
Phone: 410-537-3543 FAX: 410-537-3553
Web Site: www.mde.maryland.gov

Contact Information

Permittee Name:	City of Takoma Park MD
Responsible Personnel:	Daryl Braithwaite
Mailing Address:	31 Oswego Avenue
	Silver Spring, MD 20910
Phone Number(s):	301-891-7615
Email address:	Darylb@takomaparkmd.gov
Additional Contact(s):	Ali Khalilian, P.E.
Mailing Address:	31Oswego Avenue
Phone Number(s):	301-891-7620 Cell 240-832-1128
Email address:	Alik@takomaparkmd.gov

Signature of Responsible Personnel

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Daryl Braithwaite	Daryl Braithwaite	10-30-202
Printed Name	Signature	Date

Reporting Period (State Fiscal Year): 10-1-2021 TO 10-1-2022

Due Date: 10/31/2022 **Date of Submission:** 10-31-22

Type of Report Submitted:

Impervious Area Restoration Progress Report (Annual): ☑

Six Minimum Control Measures Progress (Years 2 and 4): ☑

Both: ☑

Permittee Information:

Renewal Permittee: ☑

New Permittee: ☐

Compliance with Reporting Requirements

Part VI of the Small MS4 General Discharge Permit (No. 13-IM-5500) specifies the reporting information that must be submitted to MDE to demonstrate compliance with permit conditions. The specific information required in this MS4 Progress Report includes:

1. Annual: Progress toward compliance with impervious area restoration requirements in accordance with Part V of the general permit. All requested information and supporting documentation must be submitted as specified in Section I of the Progress Report.
2. Years 2 and 4: Progress toward compliance with the six minimum control measures in accordance with Part IV of the general permit. All requested information and supporting documentation shall be reported as specified in Section II of the Progress Report. MDE may request more frequent reporting and/or a final report in year 5 if additional information is needed to demonstrate compliance with the permit.

Instructions for Completing Appendix D Reporting Forms

The reporting forms provided in Appendix D allow the user to electronically fill in answers to questions. Users may enter quantifiable information (e.g., number of outfalls inspected) in text boxes. When a more descriptive explanation is requested, the reporting forms will expand as the user types to allow as much information needed to fully answer the question. The permittee must indicate in the forms when attachments are included to provide sufficient information required in the MS4 Progress Report.

Section I: Impervious Area Restoration Reporting Form

Section I: Impervious Area Restoration Reporting

1. a. Was the impervious area baseline assessment submitted in year 1?
☑ Yes ☐ No

   b. If No, describe the status of completing the required information and provide a date at which all information required by MDE will be submitted:

   c. Has the baseline been adjusted since the previous reporting year?
☐ Yes ☑ No

2. Complete the information below based on the most recent data:

   Total impervious acres of jurisdiction covered under this permit: 546.9

   Total impervious acres treated by stormwater water quality best management practices (BMPs): 80.21

   Total impervious acres treated by BMPs providing partial water quality treatment (multiply acres treated by percent of water quality provided): 4.51

   Total impervious acres treated by nonstructural practices (i.e., rooftop disconnections, non-rooftop disconnections, or vegetated swales): 0.1

   Total impervious acres untreated in the jurisdiction: 466.69

   Twenty percent of this total area (this is the restoration requirement): 109.38

   Verify that all impervious area draining to BMPs with missing inspection records is not considered treated. Describe how this information was incorporated into the overall analysis:

All BMPs in the 2022 report have current inspection records and are included in the treatment totals.

2. Has an Impervious Area Restoration Work Plan been developed and submitted to MDE in accordance with Part V.B, Table 1 of the permit or other format?
☑ Yes ☐ No

   Has MDE approved the work plan?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Section I: Impervious Area Restoration Reporting

If the answer to either question is No, describe the status of submitting (or resubmitting) the work plan to MDE and provide a date at which all outstanding information will be available:

Describe progress made toward restoration planning, design, and construction efforts and describe adaptive management strategies necessary to meet restoration requirements by the end of the permit term:

The City continues to develop and revise management strategies for implementing the restoration program. Outfall stabilization, stream restoration, and alternative BMPs remain our major implementation strategies. In the restoration activity schedule, future projects planned have been revised and refined to meet program objectives.

The City's efforts to install planned treatment facilities in 2021 and 2022 were delayed due to the pandemic and impacts on our staffing and contractor availability. Additionally, the City experienced a significant extreme rain event on September 19, 2020 that produced flash flooding resulting in private property impacts due to run-off from the public right of way. Subsequently, the budget and staff resources were redirected to develop and install additional stormwater capacity to address those impacted areas. The City provided additional infrastructure capacity at 3 locations and restored portions of a collapsed 48-inch boxed culvert that was damaged.

Once the flooding response work was completed, the City could resume work on the previously planned projects. This included the installation of permeable pavers and bioretention storage on Elson Place, an Outfall Stabilization project at Circle Woods, and the installation of a bioretention facility on Grant Ave and Holly Ave. Additionally, the City kicked off an enhanced tree planting program (Tree Takoma which is providing trees at no cost to City residents, focusing on areas with less canopy, multi-family, and commercial properties) and assisted MNCPPC by providing partial funding and design development of a bioretention facility at Hillwood Manor Playground.

In the upcoming year, the City intends to complete several major projects that were planned previously, including the Takoma Branch Stream Restoration and the Brashear's Run Outfall Stabilization. Additionally, the City will soon put into operation a new EV street sweeper, ordered in 2021, and intends to double sweeping operations as a result of the new, enhanced equipment.

Section I: Impervious Area Restoration Reporting

3. Has a Restoration Schedule been completed and submitted to MDE in accordance with Part V.B, Table 2 of the permit?
☑ Yes ☐ No

   In year 5, has a complete restoration schedule been submitted including a complete list of projects and implementation dates for all BMPs needed to meet the twenty percent restoration requirement?
☐ Yes ☑ No

   Are the projected implementation years for completion of all BMPs no later than 2025?
☐ Yes ☑ No
As a result of the revisions to the allowed credit for the alternative BMP contribution for street sweeping and storm drain vacuuming, as well as the delay of planned projects due to the need to address urgent flooding issues exposed in September, 2020, current projections show that the City will not reach the 20% treatment required until 2027.

   Describe actions planned to provide a complete list of projects in order to achieve compliance by the end of the permit term:

Our program plans include outfall stabilization and stream restoration in the upcoming years. We also plan to expand our street sweeping program frequency to increase the amount of credit, as well as increase tree planting.

   Describe the progress of restoration efforts (attach examples and photos of proposed or completed projects when available):

In 2022, the City completed a stormwater drainage improvement in conjunction with the outfall stabilization for a major pipeline relocation project on Cockerille Avenue that ends at Circle Woods. This project resolved a known flooding issue affecting private property.

Additional projects completed in 2022 included the installation of a 500 SF surface area bioretention pond at Holly Ave and Grant Ave and the installation of 1,750 SF of permeable paver on Elson Place, a dead-end street directly adjacent to Sligo Creek.

The Flower Avenue Green Street Project, a one-mile-long collaborative effort between SHA, Montgomery County, and the City of Takoma Park, which began in 2019, was completed in 2021. This project added seven (7) Bioretention facilities with a total of 2,906 SF of filter surfaces to our treatment inventory.

4. Has the BMP database been submitted to MDE in Microsoft Excel format in accordance with Appendix B, Tables B.1.a, b, and c?
☑ Yes ☐ No

   Is the database complete?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Section I: Impervious Area Restoration Reporting

If either answer is No, describe efforts underway to complete all data fields, and a date that MDE will receive the required information:

5. Provide a summary of impervious area restoration activities planned for the next reporting cycle (attach additional information if necessary):

A project at Brashear's Run, an outfall to Sligo Creek, includes 110 LF of outfall stabilization. The project is planned and permitted through MNCPPC and will be executed by the City of Takoma Park.

The design and MDE permit for the Takoma Branch Stream Restoration Project consisting of 100 linear feet of outfall and stream bank restoration, previously delayed, is scheduled to begin. This project is preparing for contract selection and will be constructed in FY2023

6. Describe coordination efforts with other agencies regarding the implementation of impervious area restoration activities:

The City jointly developed the design of a Bioretention facility for Hillwood Manor Park, a park owned by MNCPPC. The City contributed $50,000 towards construction and will be responsible for system maintenance.

The Takoma Branch Stream restoration is a joint effort with MNCPPC. The land is owned by MNCPPC. The project design was a collaborative effort between the City and MNCPPC. The City is funding this phase of construction.

Similarly, the Brashear's Run outfall stabilization was collaboratively designed by the City and MNCPPC, but will be financed by the City.

7. List total cost of developing and implementing the impervious area restoration program during the permit term:

Installation of BMP's since 2007 to date incurred an estimated total cost of $4,577,700 for both structural and alternative measures.

The annual budget is typically $700 - $750K and includes $250,000 for Capital Projects, $150,000 for maintenance and repairs, $120,000 for video inspections, pipe cleaning, and IDDE, and $80,000 for engineering assistance. The remainder is personnel costs for the 0.75 FTE's associated with the program.

The FY23 stormwater management budget is $1,300,000, increased to include funding toward purchase of the new EV street sweeper and $150K for implementation of a Stormwater Resiliency Study, as well as carry-over funding to complete projects originally planned for FY22.

In addition to the dedicated stormwater budget, the City funds several programs through the Public Works operating budget that supplements the stormwater program (leaf

collection, street sweeping, and tree planting), The City anticipates the budget to remain similarly allocated through the permit term.

Section II: Minimum Control Measures Reporting Forms

MCM #1: Public Education and Outreach

1. Does the permittee maintain a process and phone number for the public to report water quality complaints?
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

   Number of complaints received: 12

   Describe the actions taken to address the complaints:

   Feb 11, 2021, Takoma Park Fire Department was staged at the Takoma Park Middle School doing "some training and cleaning". This incident was investigated and found to introduce no pollution.

   Sediment-laden water at Brashears' run out-fall on Maple Avenue was reported on February 16, 2021. Staff visited the site to determine the source but was not able to identify it.

   March 8, 2021 incident was reported related to a water service line breach at 6633 Eastern Avenue which caused sediment from landscaping work to be washed into the roadway. City staff alerted WSSC, which made repairs.

   On Mar 30, 2021, the City received a report that the water in Long Branch creek was yellow. Staff investigated and determined the source was a water main break. WSSC was on site and made the repairs.

   On June 25, 2021, high turbidity pollution was reported in Brashear's Run. The source was identified as a water line break on Sherman Avenue that eroded soil under the roadway and into the creek. WSSC was onsite and made repairs.

   July 1, 2021, muddy water was reported at the end of the Baltimore Avenue stream culvert. Staff investigated and identified the source was a construction site at Montgomery College and a failure in their dewatering system filter. County S & E inspector responded, and the contractor was required to take remedial action.

   July 9, 2021, runoff from a construction site at 6922 Prince Georges Avenue was reported. The matter was investigated by Montgomery County Sediment and Erosion Control inspector. The contractor was advised to install a silt fence and confine run-off within the site.

   August 1, 2021, runoff was observed to transport sediment from the Montgomery College construction site. City staff notified Montgomery County S & E inspector, and he required upgrading and repair of control devices.

Aug 20, 2021, City staff conducted a site visit to the Montgomery College Construction site during a flash flood warning and heavy rainfall. Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC)measures were found to be working appropriately.

On February 12, 2022, a sewer backup from a storage tank overflowed in the parking lot of the City's Community Center. The sewage was discharged into the nearby stormwater drain in the parking lot. The overflowing tank was pumped out the following day, and the pumps were repaired.

February 23, 2021, we received a report of an exposed salt pile on the Washington Adventist Hospital campus parking lot, which is adjacent to Sligo Creek's steep banks. City staff visited the site and contacted College grounds management staff. The salt was removed.

July 16, 2022, a watermain breach was reported on the grounds of Washington Adventist Hospital. The incident was reported to the City, MDE, and WSSC. Substantial amounts of chlorinated water and sediments were transported to Sligo Creek. Hospital facility staff were able to shut off the water source, and the contractor repaired the system on July 18, 2022.

2. Describe training to employees to reduce pollutants to the MS4:

Supervisors of four operational areas within Public Work's, including Vehicle Maintenance, Sanitation, Gardens, and Right of Way, were collectively briefed on the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program to minimize pollution release from the Public Works facilities. This was done relative to quarterly inspections of the areas. The Department has in place a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for spills as well as Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

Supervisors for each of the Department Divisions took part in Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) training consisting of video, PowerPoint presentation, testing, and certification. This training was held on January 11, 2022

The Right Way, Gardens, Vehicle Maintenance, and Sanitation personnel were trained using site-specific PowerPoint and videos in both DPW spill prevention and general pollution prevention with respect to the MS4 program; the trainings were held on January 21, 2022, February 1, 2022 and February 11, 2022.

3. Describe the target audience(s) within the jurisdiction:
Internally, the target audience is the Public Works staff who are responsible for pollution prevention.
Externally, the target audience includes residents, businesses, and construction companies operating within the boundary of the City of Takoma Park.

4. Are examples of educational/training materials attached with this report?
☐ Yes ☑ No

Provide the number and type of educational materials distributed:
Describe how the public outreach program is appropriate for the target audience(s):

Internal training videos produced by Excel are used for internal training. These provide specific information for use by staff who work with materials that can cause pollution and who respond to spills and maintenance situations. The training materials have been previously included in the 2020 report.

Newsletter Articles, Direct Mail, Bus Shelter Ads, and the City's Stormwater Management pages of the website are intended for the general public. They provide information and reminders about the City's stormwater program and best practices for reducing water pollution.

5. Describe how stormwater educational materials were distributed to the public (e.g., newsletters, website):

1. ***Direct Mail – In January, 2021 the City mailed a letter to every single-family property notifying them of a Council Session to be held on February 10, 2021 to discuss a change to the Stormwater Utility Fee and provided information about the Stormwater Management Program and an interactive map showing impervious surface for each property. In June, 2021, the City sent a direct mail flyer to 3,600 single-family property owners with specific details about the updated fee structure and the fee for their property. (both are attached in the Appendix)***
2. ***The City website - http://takomaparkmd.gov/government/public-works/stormwater-management-program/ The website was updated in 2021 to include direct links to the impervious surface map, and a new FAQ about our stormwater management programs. The site also provides links to relevant information from the Maryland Department of Environment and the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The City's NPDES MS-4 compliance reports and Watershed Implementation Plan Phase II reports are also posted on the website.***
3. ***Takoma Park Monthly Newsletter – February 2021 City Newsletter included an article on the proposed change to the Stormwater Utility Fee structure, April 2021 City Newsletter included a notice of a Tree workshop, the October 2021 edition included information about a program to encourage the planting of trees on private property and provided rebates, the June 2022 edition included an article on the new Stormwater abatement credit program, and the August, 2022 edition included an announcement about the start of a household battery drop-off program.***
4. ***Bus Shelter Posters - The City has an arrangement with our bus shelter provider to use ten shelter ad spaces each month for public education efforts. The program includes posters for Stormwater, Anti-Litter, and Pesticide Restriction "Safe Grow Law" during this reporting period. The posters have been previously included in the 2020 report.***

5. ***City Council Work Sessions related to Stormwater Management issues were held on March 10, 2021, September 8, 2021, March 16, 2022, and July 13, 2022. The meetings are advertised on the City Website, Social Media and recorded and available for viewing and accessible on YouTube and the City's website. The coversheet of Agenda Items is attached in the Appendix)***

6. Describe how educational programs facilitated efforts to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff:

   The internal education and staff training efforts have improved our facility operations to reduce spills and improve the storage of materials that could potentially contaminate run-off if not managed correctly. Additionally, we have spill kits readily available, so if a spill happens, it is cleaned up immediately.

   The information provided from the direct mail to single-family residents included information about measures to take within the private property to add stormwater treatment and/or reduce run-off.

   The Ad campaigns provide regular reminders of the City's regulation banning the use of pesticides for cosmetic lawn care and public messages about not littering.

   Newsletter articles have encouraged tree planting, battery recycling and provided information about the stormwater management program.

7. Provide a summary of the activities planned for the next reporting cycle:

   - ***Public meetings: The Stormwater Resiliency Study will include a minimum of 4 public meetings to review the scope of the study, initial results, and provide information on measures property owners can take to reduce flooding and improve stormwater management.***
   - ***Prepare relevant Newsletter articles to inform and educate the public on environmental matters, including pollution prevention and stormwater management.***
   - ***Continue the bus shelter ad campaign and coordinate with City Television to air new versions of videos (if available) on public educational material.***
   - ***Continue the staff training on pollution prevention***

8. List the total cost of implementing this MCM over the permit term:
   An estimated cost is $10,000 over the permit term. This cost is limited to material expenditures

MCM #2: Public Involvement and Participation

1. Describe how the public involvement and participation program is appropriate for the target audience(s):

Given the limited staffing allocated to our Stormwater Management program in the City (.5 FTE engineer and .25 FTE Construction Manager), our ability to provide robust programs for the public is extremely limited.

During this reporting period, the City held several Council Work Sessions to discuss the Stormwater Management Program and the proposed changes to the Stormwater Utility Fee. These meetings were open to the public and were available to listen to remotely. The sessions were recorded and archived so residents could access them in the future.

We continue to rely on organizations such as the Friends of Sligo Creek to organize twice-a-year trash clean-up events for Sligo Creek.

The City's Urban Forest Management program has expanded the City's tree planting programs and is now offering tree planting on private property for no cost, with a focus on multi-family and commercial properties in areas with lower tree canopy. We plan to increase tree planting on private property in FY23. Part of the program includes consultation on the property and an explanation of the benefit of trees and proper species and location for the site. Additionally, the City coordinates with Tree Montgomery to provide a Tree Care workshop annually in the City.

The Mark A Drain campaign has been of interest by the Boy Scouts. They can earn merit badges for their participation, and we have had Eagle Scout projects organized around this program.

The Annual Household Hazardous Waste event is held annually and advertised in the City Newsletter ad website. Because it happens each year on the first Saturday in June, residents can plan for it and now rely on it to safely dispose of hazardous materials.

For this reporting period, activities were significantly impacted by the COVID pandemic.

2. Quantify and report public involvement and participation efforts shown below where applicable.

Number of participants at public events:	125
Quantity of trash and debris removed at clean up events:	unknown
Number of employee volunteers participating in sponsored events:	8

MCM #2: Public Involvement and Participation

Number of trees planted:	221
Length of stream cleaned (feet):	~0.5 miles
Number of storm drains stenciled:	0
Number of public notices published to facilitate public participation:	11
Number of public meetings organized:	8
Total number of attendees at all public meetings:	200+

Describe the agenda, items discussed, and collaboration efforts with interested parties for public meetings:

The agendas for the Council Work Sessions to discuss the Stormwater Management Program and the proposed revisions to the Stormwater Utility Fee are included in the appendix.

The City's annual Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) event took place on June 6, 2021 and June 4, 2022. Clean Harbors Inc. provided the services. Among the materials collected were over 160 pounds of flammable liquid and 2,240 pounds of liquid pesticides. At each event we had approximately 120 participants.

The Conservation Montgomery Tree Workshop allows 25 participants and is a field walk to discuss tree issues.

The Friends of Sligo Creek clean-up events are announced through their organization and coordinated by their volunteers.

Describe how public comments have been incorporated into the permittee's MS4 program, including water quality improvement projects to address impervious area restoration requirements:

As part of any capital project in the City, including sidewalk repair or installation, public comments are received on the plans, and issues related to stormwater management are identified. Mitigation measures are added to the plan when they are feasible.

When the City updated the Stormwater Utility Fee, the public requested the creation of a credit program, which went into effect for FY23. This enables those residents who have taken steps to manage and treat run-off on their property to receive credit by way of a reduced utility fee for approved measures. The City's **Credit Policy & Guidance Document** ***are at:*** ***Stormwater Utility Fee Credit Policy and Guidance Document***

Describe any additional events and activities if applicable:

The City has commissioned the Low Impact Development Center to conduct a Stormwater Resiliency Study for the City. This project includes a plan that will identify up to 20 flood-prone locations and develop concept plans to address the issue. Also included in the scope is the development of a Dashboard that will allow each resident to understand the impacts and potential solutions to reducing runoff and improving water quality on their property. The Study will include four public meetings to enable public comments and input. The end products, including the dashboard and list of stormwater management measures, will be made available through the City's website to help educate and inform the public.

3. Provide a summary of activities planned for the next reporting cycle:

Convene public meetings to review the progress of the Stormwater Resiliency Study and receive review and comments from the public

Continue the tree planting program – Tree Takoma, which includes onsite property survey and tree planting recommendations provide through a contract with Casey Trees.

Advertise and promote the Friends of Sligo Creek stream clean-up events

Support community clean-up and invasive removal volunteer days

Continue the Household Hazardous Waste Collection Day

Solicit volunteers for the Mark A Drain program

4. List the total cost of implementing this MCM for the permit term:

The annual cost has increased from $45,000 annually to $100,000 or roughly $350-$400K over the permit term. The cost of the tree planting is funded by the Urban Forest budget, and the Household Hazardous Waste Collection Day is funded by the Sanitation Division Budget. The only program listed funded by the Stormwater budget is the Mark A Drain Campaign.

Tree planting - The City previously provided a $100 rebate per tree. The new program covers the entire cost of a tree (originally $40,000 per year, expected to increase to $80,000 - $100,000
Household Hazardous Waste event $10,000
Mark Drain Campaign material - up to $3,000 plus personnel cost

MCM #3: Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE)

1. Does the permittee maintain a map of the MS4 owned or operated by the permittee, including stormwater conveyances, outfalls, stormwater best management practices (BMPs), and waters of the U.S. receiving stormwater discharges?
☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, attach the map to this report and provide a progress update on any features that are still being mapped. If No, detail the current status of map development and provide an estimated date of submission to MDE:

The City's GIS Stormwater infrastructure database was updated in September 2022 by KCI. The updated database schema includes structure condition assessment through multiple iterations of field assessment, and maintains historic condition assessment data. The database was updated to include stormwater BMP polygons and associated BMP drainage areas. A point feature class for permitted BMP was created and linked the BMP and drainage area(s). The data from the IDDE program - Dry Weather Outfall Test results obtained was associated with outfall locations and includes data from 2007, 2010, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2020, and 2021. The data from 2022 will be added in the future update.

2. Does the permittee have an ordinance, or other regulatory means, that prohibits illicit discharges?
☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, describe the means for enforcement utilized by the permittee (alternatively, a link may be provided to the permittee's webpage where this information is available). If No, describe the permittee's plan, including approximate time frame, to establish a regulatory means to prohibit illicit discharges:

The City of Takoma Park receives reporting of illicit discharges into the stormwater system or area waterways. Under the City Code section 16.04.270, "Unsafe Condition-Entry onto property", city staff is authorized to enter onto private property for the purpose of investigating the cause of the illicit discharge. During this reporting period, Public Works staff responded to twelve (12) such incidents described in detail under the minimum control measure section MCM#1, 1.

The City's response involved site visits to gather information and contact the Montgomery County Department of Environmental Protection (MCDEP) and informing the Maryland Department of Environment (MDE) as necessary. The City entered into an MOU with Montgomery, which authorizes the County to enforce IDDE within the City. MCDEP continues to provide enforcement where necessary for reported incidents within the City. If legal issuing of infractions and enforcement become necessary, the county staff undertakes the legal proceeding according to the MOU established by both City and Montgomery County in 2006.

MCM #3: Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE)

3. Describe the process the permittee utilizes for gaining access to private property to investigate and eliminate illicit discharges:

Under the City Code section 16.04.270 "Unsafe Condition-Entry onto property", city staff is authorized to enter onto private property for the purpose of investigating the cause of illicit discharge. In all cases, City Staff try to contact the property owner before accessing their property, but if unknown or non-responsive would proceed. Most investigations have taken place on public property within a stream or street surface.

4. Did the permittee submit to MDE standard operating procedures (SOPs) in accordance with Part IV.C of the permit?
☑ Yes ☐ No

If No, provide a proposed date that SOPs will be submitted to MDE. MDE may require more frequent reports for delays in program development:

Did MDE approve the submitted SOPs?
☑ Yes ☐ No

If No, describe the status of requested SOP revisions and approximate date of resubmission for MDE approval:

5. Describe how the permittee prioritized screening locations in areas of high pollutant potential and identify the areas within which screenings were conducted during this reporting period:

The City primary land use is residential. There is limited commercial areas and no industrial locations. For the purposes of prioritizing screening locations, we rely on past water quality testing results to determine which areas we will more closely investigate to identify the source of elevated pollutants identified during the annual testing. The annual dry weather analysis and outfall evaluation was performed by Bay Land Consultants & Designers, Inc. In 2021, 23 distinct outfalls were observed to have dry weather flow, and in 2022, 14 outfalls had dry weather flow. Water quality samples were obtained and tested for pollutants from these outfalls.

6. Answers to the following questions must reflect this two-year reporting period.

How many outfalls are identified on the map? 78

MCM #3: Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE)

How many outfalls were required to be screened for dry weather flows to meet the minimum numeric requirement (i.e., 20% of total outfalls, up to 100)? 16

How many outfalls were screened for dry weather flows? 78

Per the permittee's SOP, how frequently were outfalls required to be screened?

Annually -

In 2021, Samples were collected at 23 distinct outfalls with active flow after 72 hours of dry weather.

In 2022, samples were collected at 14 distinct outfalls with active flow after 72 hours of dry weather.

At what frequency were outfalls screened during the reporting period?

Annually -

In 2021, Nine (9) of the 23 outfalls had elevated levels of E. coli and/or enterococci. Also, fourteen (14) of the 23 outfalls displayed chlorine levels that were above the Maryland standards and/or EPA chronic and acute toxicity standards.

In 2022, Seven (7) of the 14 Outfalls had elevated levels of E. coli and/or enterococci. One (1) of the 14 outfalls displayed chloride levels above the EPA chronic and acute toxicity standards.

Five (5) of the 14 outfalls displayed pH levels below the Maryland standards and the EPA standards

How many dry weather flows were observed? 37-2 yrs

If dry weather flows were observed, how many were determined to be illicit discharges? 36-2yr

Describe the investigation process to track and eliminate each suspected illicit discharge and report the status of resolution:

In compliance with City's SOP for Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination, once elevated levels of pollutants are detected from outfall testing, an investigation takes place back up the system to try and detect the source. Manholes closest to the outfall are investigated first, then progressively moving up the pipe network and inspecting at manholes to determine the source. Indicators such as the presence of flow, colors, odors, floatable materials, or deposits or stains are used to trace the source. The City has contracted with Bay Land Consultants to performed the investigation.

In March and April 2021, the City contracted Bay Land Consultants to investigate possible illicit discharge source at three outfalls with levels of pollutants exceeding

EPA standards during 2019 and 2020 dry weather sampling. Chlorine, E. coli and enterococci were identified for Outfall #80; E. coli and enterococci for Outfall #212; and Enterococci, color, chloride and Chlorine for Outfall #1106. Tracking related to Outfall #80 included testing back up the line at three manholes. Sample results exceeded standards for E coli and Enterococci. The first manhole had elevated enterococci, the second manhole exceeded E. Coli and the third exceeded enterococci and Chlorine. The chlorine results in the third manhole suggest possible sanitary wastewater contamination.
Tracking related to outfall #212 included testing back up the line of 5 manholes. The levels of E coli and enterococci were low in all manholes except in the second manhole. Tracking related to outfall 1106 included testing back up the line at one manhole for Chloride, Chlorine and color. Results had elevated chloride which could be a result of sewage contamination and water softener discharges.
The City intends to follow up with WSSC requesting leak testing of sewer lines as well as include the storm lines in inspections program CCTV to assess the condition of the pipes for potential repairs.

In August 2022, one outfall was selected to be tracked to identify potential source of elevated E-coli. Outfall #1077 was tested for E. coli because it exceeded Maryland and EPA standards during the 2022 outfall screening. The potential source was identified and described as likely exfiltration occurring from the sanitary sewer pipes and getting into the storm drain system due to degrading integrity of the storm pipes. The City plans to CCTV from the outfall to the first manhole when a routine inspection is scheduled for this area.

7. Describe maintenance or corrective actions undertaken during this reporting period to address erosion, debris buildup, sediment accumulation, or blockage problems:

1. ***Video Pipe Inspection and Cleaning:***
   Every year Department of Public Works obtains contractual support to conduct closed circuit television (CCTV) investigations and cleaning of its stormwater infrastructure. During this reporting period, the CCTV inspection and cleaning took place in a portion of Sub-basin 5. The annual funding available for this work is $55,000 -$65,000.

   In FY21-1,119 linear feet of pipe were cleaned, as well as 62 inlets and 5.54 tons of debris was removed

   In FY22 – 8,109 linear feet of pipe was cleaned, as well as 124 inlets and 17 tons of debris was removed.

   After the pipe cleaning is complete the system is videoed and the City is provided with pipe and structure rating to identify any problems or issues that may need to be addressed.

2. ***Street Sweeping: Normally, the sweeping cycle runs from March through October each year. The City previously used a TYMCO Model 600 BAH sweeper mounted on a 2011 International 4300 DT10m Truck. The sweeper is operated by in-house staff. In***

addition to the sweeping route, storm drain pipes and inlets are also regularly inspected during and after rain, snow and storm events to ensure proper drainage. In this reporting period, the City sweeper collected 70.2 tons of debris. Street sweeping zones were visited 3 to 6 times during sweeping periods in spring, summer and fall. We have developed a spreadsheet to track street sweeping lane-mile coverage. The City's sweeper became inoperable in late 2021 and the ordered replacement was delayed, due to the pandemic and supply chain issues, for almost a year. Delivery is expected in Nov 2022.

3. ***Leaf Collection: The City operates a 5-week program for vacuum leaf collection. This program plays a significant role in keeping leaf debris out of the storm drain system and thus, we considered it an effective BMP as it reduces leaves from entering the storm drain system and significantly reduces the amount of decaying organic matter entering the stream. The City has tracked the weight of leaf materials collected annually since 2020, however, we have not incorporated this weight in our pollution reduction computations for treatment credit.***

4. ***One outfall stabilization project was executed in 2022 at Circle Woods. This outfall stabilization is included in City's Restoration Activities Schedule.***

5. ***Inlet and pipe clearing – In addition to the scheduled system inspection performed by a contractor, the City staff responds to reports of blocked inlets or standing water in the right of way. The City uses equipment to clear the blockage. In this reporting cycle, staff addressed systems blockages at Takoma Ave and Buffalo Ave inlet, Baltimore Avenue culvert, Maple Avenue and Tulip Avenue inlet, and Poplar Avenue inlet, across from Spring Park***

8. Is the permittee maintaining all IDDE inspection records and are they available to MDE during site inspections?
☑ Yes ☐ No

9. If spills, illicit discharges, and illegal dumping occurred during this reporting period, describe the corrective actions taken, including enforcement activities, and indicate the status of resolution:

Reports of spills or possible pollutant discharges are included in the response under MCM#1, Question 1.

10. Attach to this report specific examples of educational materials distributed to the public related to illicit discharge reporting, illegal dumping, and spill prevention. If these are not available, describe plans to develop public education materials and submit examples with the next Progress Report:

MCM #3: Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination (IDDE)

The City has information on our webpage to help the public determine whether they are seeing pollution or a naturally occurring condition in the stream. Weblink for the page: https://takomaparkmd.gov/government/public-works/stormwater-management-program/what-is-the-stuff-in-the-creeks/

11. Specify the number of employees trained in illicit discharge detection and spill prevention: 22

12. Provide examples of training materials. If not available, describe plans to develop employee training and submit examples with the next Progress Report:
The training material consisted of a presentation, video, and quiz purchased from the Excel Visual media called Rain Check - Stormwater Pollution Prevention for MS4s. Training materials can be viewed at:

    https://excalvisual.com/product-page/rain-check-stormwater-pollution-prevention-for-m-1

13. List the cost of implementing this MCM during this permit term:

    The annual budget is $120,000 for video inspection, cleaning and dry weather testing, as well as IDDE tracking. Over the 5-year permit term, the total is $600,000.

MCM #4: Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control

Erosion & Sediment Control Program Procedures, Ordinances, and Legal Authority

1. Does the permittee have an MDE approved ordinance?
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

   Has the permittee submitted modifications to MDE?
   ☐ Yes ☑ No

   Has the adopted ordinance been submitted to MDE?
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

   If No, is the adopted ordinance attached?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Does the permittee rely on the County, local Soil Conservation District, or MDE to perform any or all requirements for an acceptable erosion and sediment control program? ☑ Yes ☐ No

   If Yes, check all that apply:
   ☑ Plan Review and Approval
   ☑ Construction Inspections
   ☑ Enforcement

3. Does the permittee have a process to ensure that all necessary permits for a proposed development have been obtained prior to issuance of a grading or building permit?
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

   Explain how the permittee ensures all permits are in place:

   The City does not issue grading or building permits – those are issued by Montgomery County. The City and County have established a requirement for all Takoma Park permit applicants to provide a Municipality Letter from Takoma Park before they can receive a County permit. The applicants request the Municipality letter from the City and it includes information about the possible City permits that may be required including stormwater, tree protection plan and tree removal permit, and for any work in the Right of Way. The issuance of a Municipality Letter is provided by the City's Planning Department; however, the City Engineer and Urban Forest Manager receive copies so they are aware of the proposed project.

Erosion & Sediment Control Program Implementation Information

MCM #4: Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control

1. Does the permittee have a process for receiving, investigating, and resolving complaints from interested parties related to construction activities and erosion and sediment control?
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

   Describe the process:

Erosion and sediment control plan review, and inspection during construction, is performed by Montgomery County's Department of Permitting Services, Sediment and Erosion Control office. City staff actively observed work sites and worked closely with Montgomery County inspectors regarding identifying compliance issues.

List of complaints received and results for the permit term include:

Report of sediment run-off from an active construction site at 430 Ethan Allen Avenue – City staff visited the site, and notified the County E & S inspector. E & S inspector found site conditions to be within their permit requirements.

Report of sediment from 6822 Prince Georges Ave – active construction site – staff visited the site and notified the County E & S inspector who issued stop work and required installation of a silt fence.

Oct 2022, report of sediment run-off from 203 Lincoln Avenue– City staff visited the site, and notified the County E & S inspector. E & S inspector found site conditions to be within their permit requirements.

Provide a list of all complaints and summary of actions taken to resolve them:

2. Total number of active construction projects within the reporting period: NA

   Provide a list of all construction projects and disturbed areas:

   The City does not issue construction permits. Those are issued by Montgomery County.

   Does the permittee submit grading reports to MDE (only applies if the permittee has an MDE approved ordinance)?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No ☑ N/A

MCM #4: Construction Site Stormwater Runoff Control

3. Total number of violation notices issued related to this MCM within the permit area (report total number whether the permittee or another entity performs inspections):
   1

   Describe the status of enforcement activities:

   Enforcement is performed by Montgomery County

   Describe how the permittee communicates and collaborates with the enforcement authority for violations within the permit area. Include measures taken by the permittee such as suspending or denying a building or grading permit in order to prevent the discharge of pollutants into the MS4:

   City staff routinely observe construction sites for implementation of erosion and sediment control practices and their effectiveness, especially during storm events. In the event of violations, City staff notify the County E & S inspector. The Inspector then determines course of action and notifies the City of action taken. Since the construction permits are issued by the County, the City does not have authority to suspend building or grading permit.

   Are erosion and sediment control inspection records retained and available to MDE during field review of local programs?
   ☐ Yes ☑ No

   If No, explain:
   Inspection is performed by Montgomery County Inspectors and the inspection records are retained by the County.

4. Number of staff trained in MDE's Responsible Personnel Certification:
   0

5. Describe the coordination efforts with other entities regarding the implementation of this MCM:

   The coordination is limited to Montgomery County.

6. List the total cost of implementing this MCM over the permit term:

   The cost associated with this MCM is staff time and all staff are salaried. Hours spent on specific topics or inspection is not monitored.

MCM #5: Post Construction Stormwater Management

Stormwater Management Program Procedures, Ordinances, and Legal Authority

1. Does the permittee have an MDE approved ordinance? ☑ Yes ☐ No

   Has the permittee submitted modifications to MDE? ☐ Yes ☑ No

   Has the adopted ordinance been submitted to MDE? ☑ Yes ☐ No

   If No, is the adopted ordinance attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1. Does the permittee have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the County to perform any or all requirements for an acceptable stormwater program?
   ☐ Yes ☑ No

   If Yes, check all that apply:
   - ☐ Plan Review and Approval
   - ☐ First Year Post Construction Inspections
   - ☐ As-Built Plan Approval
   - ☐ Post Construction Triennial Inspections
   - ☐ Enforcement
   - ☐ BMP Tracking and Reporting

Stormwater Management Program Implementation Information

1. Has an Urban BMP database been submitted in accordance with the database structure in Appendix B, Tables B.1.a, b, and c as a Microsoft Excel file?
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

   Describe the status of the database and efforts to complete all data fields:

   The urban BMP database is complete and up to date in all fields. Of the BMPs reported, we have complete records for 89 Public facilities and 20 alternative BMPs, as well as issued 35 permits for 65 private facilities, bring the total number of BMPs to 174

2. Total number of triennial inspections performed: 33

   Total number of BMPs jurisdiction-wide: 174

   Are inspections performed at least once every three years for all BMPs?
   ☑ Yes ☐ No

If No, describe how the permittee will catch up on past inspections and remain on track to perform BMP inspections once every three years:

11 Public Filteras and Modular Wetland System facilities are inspected tri-annually, and the remaining public BMPs are inspected annually. The alternative BMP's including stream restoration projects are inspected tri-annually and Outfall Stabilization projects are inspected annually. Private facilities are required to be inspected tri-annually.

Are BMP inspection records retained and available to MDE during field review of local programs?
☑ Yes ☐ No

3. Total number of violation notices issued: 0

Describe efforts to bring BMPs into compliance and the status of enforcement activities within the jurisdiction:

During this reporting term all required inspections have been performed. For those private facilities that were non-responsive, the City completed the inspection.

4. Describe how the permittee coordinates and cooperates with the County to ensure stormwater BMPs are functioning according to approved standards. (Applicable for municipalities that rely on the County to perform stormwater triennial inspections):

This does not apply as the County does not perform Tri-annual inspections, except on County owned properties (playgrounds, fire station and schools)

5. Provide a summary of routine maintenance activities for all publicly owned BMPs:

Public SMW facilities including BMPs inspection and maintenance is performed by both DPW staff and contractors. During this reporting period, the City's contractor performed vegetation management, mulch replenishment, and litter and sediment removal. A new contract is now in place as of 2022 for a 3-year term. The contractor's efforts are augmented by the City's Gardening staff who perform plant replacement, weeding and structural repairs as needed. Records of all inspections and maintenance are scanned and stored on the City's records.

Number of publicly owned BMPs: 89

Describe how often BMPs are maintained. Specify whether maintenance activities are more frequent for certain BMP types:

MCM #5: Post Construction Stormwater Management

Public Bioretention facilities are inspected and maintained between 2 and six times per year. Modular wetland, permeable pavers, Filterra and stream restoration projects are monitored and maintained on as needed basis but at least tri-annually.
We have found that bioretention facilities require much more frequent maintenance than modular wetland, Filtera, or permeable pavement facilities.

Are BMP maintenance checklists and procedures for publicly owned BMPs available to MDE during field review of local programs?
☑ Yes ☐ No

Are BMP maintenance records retained and available to MDE during field review of local programs?
☑ Yes ☐ No

If either answer is No, describe planned actions to implement maintenance checklists and procedures and provide formal documentation of these activities:

6. Number of staff trained in proper BMP design, performance, inspection, and routine maintenance: 3

7. Provide a summary of activities planned for the next reporting cycle:

- ***Review of permitted facilities Inspection dates to ensure completion***
- ***Inspection and maintenance of all publicly owned BMPs; and any private facilities for which the property owner fails to respond in the required time frame***
- ***Ensure required as-built documents are submitted for all new private facilities***
- ***Implement a program to test infiltration rates on permeable surface facilities to determine when media replacement is required, based on performance***

8. List the total cost of implementing this MCM over the permit term:

The contractual costs for facility maintenance are currently about $75,000 annually, or an estimated $375,000 over the permit term. In-house maintenance performed by City staff is not included, nor are hours spent performing maintenance on these specific sites.

MCM #6: Pollution Prevention and Good Housekeeping

1. Provide a list of topics covered during the last training session related to pollution prevention and good housekeeping, and attach to this report specific examples of training materials:

MCM #6: Pollution Prevention and Good Housekeeping

1.Spill Prevention

2. Spill Recovery and impact mitigation. Spill cleanup kit

- ***Quarterly Yard Inspection for different areas.***
- ***Schedule of street sweeping***

3. Best Management Practices for Public Works operations

List all training dates within this two-year reporting period:
Supervisors - January 11, 2022
Staff - Rain Check MS4 on January 21, 2022, February 1, 2022 and February 11, 2022

Number of staff attended: 22

2. Are the good housekeeping plan and inspection records at each property retained and available to MDE during field review of the local program? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If No, explain:

Provide details of all discharges, releases, leaks, or spills that occurred in the past reporting period using the following format (attach additional sheets if necessary).

Property Name: Date:
Describe observations:
Describe permittee's response:

Property DPW Fuel Isle Date***:*** ***06/04/2021*** & ***06/17/2021***
Observations***: Vehicle overfilled Diesel Fuel***
Response: ***Absorbent used, fuel collected and disposed of with hazmat properly.***

Property *DPW* Date: ***09/14/2021***
Observations: ***Oil spill, approximately 5 gallons, when the oil filter was improperly installed***
Response: ***Mechanic contained spill with absorbent and disposed of properly.***

Property *DPW* Date: 10/4/2022
Observations: ***The fuel Tank in Tub Grinder developed a leak, and approximately 25 gallons released***
Response: ***Staff discovered the leak, the fuel tank was pumped, and absorbent was placed to collect spill. Nearby leaf mulch that was contaminated was disposed of properly.***

3. Quantify and report property management efforts as shown below, where applicable (attach additional sheets if necessary).

Number of miles swept: 335

MCM #6: Pollution Prevention and Good Housekeeping

Amount of debris collected from sweeping (indicate units): 147 Tons

If roads and streets are swept, describe the strategy the permittee has implemented to maximize efficiency and target high priority areas:

The City has split the City into 5 sweeping zones. From March through October, each zone is to receive sweeping at least two times per year. As the City is primarily residential, all streets are covered in a similar manner; there are no perceived target areas.

Number of inlets cleaned: 186

Amount of debris collected from inlet cleaning (indicate units): 22.54 Ton

Describe how trash and hazardous waste materials are disposed of at permittee owned and operated property(ies), including debris collected from street sweeping and inlet cleaning:

Trash and debris collected from street sweeping are stored in a contained area with a waterproof tarp cover. When sufficient material has been collected, staff load it into a roll-off box or large dump truck and take materials to the County Waste Disposal Facility.

For material collected in inlet cleaning operations, the materials are deposited on a paved surface and surrounded by hay bales to allow water to drain and the debris to dry out slightly. If rain is in the forecast, the material pile is covered with a waterproof tarp. Once sufficiently drained, the material is loaded into a roll-off or dump truck and disposed of at the Count waste facility

All hazardous waste materials dropped off at the annual Household Hazardous Waste Day are identified, loaded, and packaged by the Hazardous Waste vendor Clean Harbors. Any material dropped off outside the scheduled date, or left abandoned, is stored on pallets with spill containment in the truck parking bay until the next event.

Does the permittee have a current State of Maryland public agency permit to apply pesticides?

☑ Yes ☐ No

If No, explain (e.g., contractor applies pesticides):

Does the permittee employ at least one individual certified in pesticide application?

☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, list name(s):

MCM #6: Pollution Prevention and Good Housekeeping

Anna Mische John

If the permittee applied pesticides during the reporting year, describe good housekeeping methods (e.g., integrated pest management, alternative materials/techniques):

The use of pesticides is limited to invasive plants for which manual control is not effective. Pesticides are stored in fireproof and waterproof cabinets. Safety Data sheets are available for all materials. The City uses horticultural vinegar and propane torch burning, as well as hand pulling for weeds as the primary control measures.

If the permittee applied fertilizer during the reporting year, describe good housekeeping methods (e.g., application methods, chemical storage, native or low maintenance species, training):

No fertilizers were applied

If the permittee applied materials for snow and ice control during the reporting year, describe good housekeeping methods (e.g., pre-treatment, truck calibration and storage, salt domes):

Salt used for snow and ice control is stored in a waterproof facility with a domed vinyl roof. Prior to each salt truck deployment, the staff calibrates the spreaders to ensure they are working appropriately.
After weather events where road salt was used, the City runs the street sweeper over the streets to pick up excess piles and remove salt from the roadway surface whenever possible.

Describe good housekeeping BMP alternatives not listed above:

City's staff drive throughout the City during and after a rain event to identify issue such as clogged inlet.

In the Public Work facility, which has an industrial discharge permit, the City has implemented a number of good housekeeping measures to minimize exposure to precipitation and they are:
- ***The yard is checked and monitored weekly for trash or other potential pollutant issues***
- ***Recycled oil is picked up quarterly as the container is filled by FCC Environmental.***
- ***Drum disposal is picked up as needed by PCC Lubricants***
- ***Paved areas are swept bi-weekly.***
- ***Trash receptacles are placed at strategic locations in the yard to ensure no trash is thrown on the ground. Containers are checked and emptied on a daily basis.***
- ***Oil absorbent is maintained on site for use at the fueling station and parking area to mitigate fuel leaks. The used absorbent is placed in a plastic bag and disposed of in a trash receptacle.***

4. If applicable, provide a status update for permittee owned or operated properties

regarding coverage under the Maryland General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Industrial Activity or an individual industrial surface water discharge permit:

City's Public Work Facility has received an Industrial Discharge permit.

5. List the total cost of implementing this MCM over the permit term:

The cost associated with street sweeping averages $6K to $10K annually for brooms, disposal and maintenance. Staff time for the driver is salaried and not tracked. Absorbent supplies and associated materials are purchased account for less than $1,000 annually. Staff time associated with this measure is not tracked and staff are salaried. The estimated cost over the permit term is $40K.

Phase II MS4 Restoration Activity Schedule(Takoma Park No. 13-IM-5500)

Total Acreage (1337.6); Impervious Acre Baseline (546.9); 20% Restoration BASETarget (109.4 acres) -restored to date 119.9 acres

Type of Restoration Project	BMP Code[1]	BMP ID (Optional)	Cost ($K)[2]	Imperv Acres Treated	Imperv Acre Target and Balance 109.38	Project Status[3]	Year Complete or Projected Implementation Year (by 2025)	MD Grid Coordinates (Northing/Easting)		Cost ($) Cost ($)	
5 Cleveland Avenue- Bioretention	FBIO	TP07BMP000001	$ 30	0.20	109.18	C	2007	478983	1307647	$ 30,000	1
Holly Ave & Grant Ave	MMBR	TP08BMP000002	$ 19	0.06	109.12	C	2008	479651	1308869	$ 19,470	2
12 Cleveland Avenue Rainstore Storage Basin	MENF	TP09BMP000003	$ 61	0.38	108.74	C	2009	478994	1307568	$ 61,000	3
Philadelphia Ave Com Center Parking	MMBR	TP09BMP000005	$ 13	0.09	108.65	C	2009	478777	1309071	$ 13,000	4
Green Roof - City Building	AGRE	TP10BMP000006	$ 70	0.06	108.59	C	2010	478981	1310916	$ 70,000	5
Hancock Step pool outfall stablization	MMBR	TP10BMP000007	$ 36	0.86	107.73	C	2010	478965	1310950	$ 36,000	6
Hancock Bioretention	SPSC	TP10BMP000008	$ 23	0.24	107.49	C	2010	478939	1309509	$ 23,000	7
Linden Avenue - Modular wetland	MENF	TP10BMP000009	$ 216	0.89	106.61	C	2010	477496	1315521	$ 216,000	8
Westmoreland Avenue - Bioretention	MMBR	TP10BMP000010	$ 5	0.06	106.55	C	2010	476349	1309100	$ 5,000	9
Public Works Facility	MENF	TP10BMP000097	$ 45	0.82	90.49	C	2010	479940	1309800	$ 45,200	10
Kennewick & Kirklynn - Traffic Circle	MMBR	TP11BMP000011	$ 76	0.40	106.15	C	2011	481249	1315345	$ 75,961	11
Old Carroll Bioretention	MMBR	TP11BMP000012	$ 12	0.09	106.06	C	2011	479168	1312158	$ 12,000	12
Anne & Kennewick 1-SE LOC 15	MMBR	TP11BMP000013	$ 9	0.09	105.97	C	2011	481963	1314887	$ 8,500	13
Anne & Kennewick 2-NE LOC14	MMBR	TP11BMP000014	$ 9	0.17	105.80	C	2011	481984	1314839	$ 9,000	14
Anne & Wildwood 2 NE	MMBR	TP12BMP000015	$ 7	0.02	105.77	C	2012	481644	1314443	$ 7,000	15
Anne & Wildwood 1SW	MMBR	TP12BMP000016	$ 7	0.23	105.54	C	2012	481521	1314459	$ 7,122	16
Columbia & Poplar	MMBR	TP12BMP000017	$ 15	0.21	105.33	C	2012	477118	1310516	$ 15,375	17
Kirklynn & Lockney	MMBR	TP12BMP000018	$ 9	0.12	105.21	C	2012	481115	1315114	$ 8,878	18
Manor Circle triangle	MMBR	TP12BMP000019	$ 24	0.34	104.87	C	2012	477849	1311071	$ 23,668	19
Tulip Bio Swale	MMBR	TP12BMP000020	$ 18	0.10	104.77	C	2012	477292	1308242	$ 18,124	20
Wabash 1	MMBR	TP12BMP000021	$ 21	0.10	104.68	C	2012	483508	1311462	$ 21,268	21
Wabash 2	MMBR	TP12BMP000022	$ 20	0.22	104.46	C	2012	483479	1311441	$ 20,000	22
Wabash 3 Swale Filter	IBAS	TP12BMP000023	$ 9	0.02	104.44	C	2012	483550	1311385	$ 9,000	23
Wildwood & Haverford	MMBR	TP12BMP000024	$ 4	0.07	104.37	C	2012	479375	1315262	$ 4,440	24
Grant dead-end	FBIO	TP12BMP000025	$ 94	0.30	104.07	C	2012	480415	1315810	$ 94,470	25
Holton Lane	MMBR	TP13BMP000026	$ 24	0.17	103.90	C	2013	482880	1311097	$ 23,678	26
Hudson Avenue 1	MMBR	TP13BMP000027	$ 27	0.21	103.69	C	2013	482866	1311158	$ 27,115	27
Hudson Avenue 2	MMBR	TP13BMP000028	$ 14	0.08	103.61	C	2013	482831	1311197	$ 13,558	28
Hudson Avenue 3	MMBR	TP13BMP000029	$ 14	0.22	103.39	C	2013	478463	1312151	$ 13,558	29
Jackson & Lincoln 1	MMBR	TP14BMP000030	$ 14	0.11	103.28	C	2014	478402	1312145	$ 14,121	30
Jackson & Lincoln 2	MMBR	TP14BMP000031	$ 30	0.10	103.18	C	2014	478349	1312110	$ 29,697	31
Jackson & Lincoln 3	MMBR	TP14BMP000032	$ 18	0.15	103.04	C	2014	477130	1313308	$ 17,579	32
Elm & Lincoln	MMBR	TP14BMP000033	$ 20	0.12	102.91	C	2014	475857	1312863	$ 20,000	33
Prince Georges & Belford Pl	MMBR	TP14BMP000034	$ 23	0.09	102.82	C	2014	480448	1309840	$ 23,098	34
Ritchie Avenue -1	MMBR	TP14BMP000035	$ 21	0.13	102.69	C	2014	480462	1309863	$ 20,510	35
Ritchie Avenue - 2	MMBR	TP14BMP000036	$ 14	0.06	102.63	C	2014	480478	1309901	$ 13,825	36
Ritchie Avenue - 3	MMBR	TP14BMP000037	$ 12	0.05	102.59	C	2014	480522	1309830	$ 12,306	37
Ritchie Avenue - 4	MMBR	TP14BMP000038	$ 11	0.03	102.55	C	2014	480523	1309870	$ 11,183	38
Ritchie Avenue - 5	MMBR	TP14BMP000039	$ 18	0.03	102.53	C	2014	477906	1311988	$ 18,311	39
Boyd & Jackson	MMBR	TP14BMP000040	$ 20	0.11	102.42	C	2014	480683	1311333	$ 19,811	40
Maple- Modular Wetland System	MENF	TP14BMP000041	$ 57	0.74	101.68	C	2014	476159	1312677	$ 57,388	41
Prince George & Circle Pond	FBIO	TP14BMP000042	$ 122	0.15	101.53	C	2014	483244	1311041	$ 121,740	42
Roanoke Avenue - 8312- Filter	FUND	TP14BMP000043	$ 33	0.40	101.13	C	2014	479460	1307356	$ 32,783	43
Wetland behind Park Ritchie	WPWS	TP14BMP000044	NA	2.48	98.65	C	2014	479692	1309765	NA	44
Baltimore Ave Wet Pond	WPWS	TP15BMP000044	$ 42	0.71	97.94	C	2015	474794	1311647	$ 42,251	45
Fourth Ave 6500	MMBR	TP15BMP000045	$ 14	0.13	97.80	C	2015	474806	1311692	$ 13,736	46
Fourth Ave 6504	MMBR	TP15BMP000046	$ 13	0.07	97.74	C	2015	480652	1313285	$ 12,866	47
Garland Avenue Bioretention	MMBR	TP15BMP000047	$ 16	0.17	97.57	C	2015	480014	1310247	$ 15,781	48
Ritchie & PW	MMBR	TP15BMP000048	$ 17	0.15	97.42	C	2015	483364	1311410	$ 17,335	49
Roanoke and Eastridge	MMBR	TP15BMP000049	$ 46	0.27	97.15	C	2015	477561	1314396	$ 46,347	50
Glazewood Larch1	MMBR	TP16BMP000050	$ 36	0.25	96.90	C	2016	477527	1314424	$ 36,444	51
Glazewood Larch2	MMBR	TP16BMP000051	$ 31	0.25	96.65	C	2016	477578	1314442	$ 31,432	52
Glazewood Larch3	MMBR	TP16BMP000052	$ 6	0.04	96.61	C	2016	477578	1314442	$ 6,330	53
Maple Avenue Permeable Pavers	APRP	TP16BMP000054	$ 87	0.21	96.40	C	2016	478981	1310916	$ 87,290	54
Colby Avenue Park	MMBR	TP16BMP000084	$ 19	0.07	96.33	C	2016	478060	1313000	$ 19,131	55
Dog Park - Trench Drain & SWALE	MSWG	TP17BMP000055	$ 66	0.11	96.29	C	2017	480088	1309079	$ 65,500	56
Hayward Swale	MSWB	TP17BMP000056	$ 15	0.39	95.90	C	2017	477780	1313547	$ 14,833	57
Hayward - Permeable Pavers & S	APRP	TP17BMP000057	$ 15	0.10	95.80	C	2017	477780	1313547	$ 14,833	58
End of Colby Permeable Paver & S	FUND	TP17BMP000058	$ 74	0.12	95.68	C	2017	478259	1312764	$ 74,210	59
Wildwood Jackson Filtera LOC 19	MENF	TP17BMP000059	$ 20	0.12	95.56	C	2017	480755	1315136	$ 19,939	60

Wildwood Jackson Filtera LOC 20	MENF	TP17BMP000060	$ 20	0.13	95.43	C	2017	477787	1313549	$ 19,592		61
Park View Infiltration basin	IBAS	TP18BMP000058	$ 9	0.06	95.37	C	2020	479135	1311000	$ 9,164		62
Filtera 1 Cherry & Colby FILTER	MENF	TP18BMP000059	$ 23	0.15	95.22	C	2018	478035	1313035	$ 22,735		63
Filtera 2 Cherry & Colby	MENF	TP18BMP000060	$ 23	0.15	95.07	C	2018	478098	1313009	$ 22,735		64
Devonshire & Glazewood BIO #2	FBIO	TP19BMP000061	$ 17	0.19	94.88	C	2019	477231	1313961	$ 17,023		65
Devonshire & Glazewood BIO #1	FBIO	TP19BMP000062	$ 44	0.29	94.59	C	2019	477263	1313937	$ 44,435		66
MWS#1 Lincoln and Larch	MENF	TP19BMP000063	$ 48	0.31	94.28	C	2019	477530	1313100	$ 47,597		67
MWS#2 Lincoln and Larch	MENF	TP19BMP000064	$ 73	0.58	93.70	C	2019	477570	1313100	$ 73,429		68
MWS#3 Lincoln and Larch	MENF	TP19BMP000065	$ 53	0.45	93.25	C	2019	477710	1313500	$ 53,270		69
MWS#5 Lincoln & Elm CB1131	MENF	TP19BMP000066	$ 36	0.11	93.14	C	2019	477750	1313500	$ 36,316		70
MWS#4 Larch & Hayward at CB833	MENF	TP19BMP000067	$ 38	0.12	93.02	C	2019	477180	1313300	$ 38,285		71
Flower & Sligo Creek bioretention	FBIO	TP19BMP000068	$ 169	0.05	92.97	C	2019	478163	1312373	$ 168,688		72
Lincoln Aspen Bioretention	MMBR	TP19BMP000069	$ 109	0.00	92.97	C	2019	478160	1312400	$ 109,122		73
Grant & Holly Bio #2	MMBR	TP19BMP000070	$ 25	0.34	92.63	C	2021	479678	1308823	$ 25,000		74
Flower Avenue ESD#1 sha151229	MMBR	TP19BMP000110	$ 20	0.09	92.54	C	2021	483680	1311667	$ 20,000		75
Flower Avenue ESD#2@STA113+00	MMBR	TP19BMP000111	$ 15	0.20	92.34	C	2021	483680	1311667	$ 15,000		76
Flower Avenue ESD#4@sta116+75	MMBR	TP19BMP000112	$ 10	0.04	92.30	C	2021	483336	1311729	$ 10,000		77
Flower Avenue ESD#5	MMBR	TP19BMP000113	$ 10	0.03	92.27	C	2021	483280	1311700	$ 10,000		78
Flower Avenue ESD#6	MMBR	TP19BMP000114	$ 10	0.03	92.24	C	2021	483190	1311700	$ 10,000		79
Flower Avenue ESD#18	MMBR	TP19BMP000115	$ 35	0.08	92.16	C	2021	481220	1312200	$ 35,000		80
Flower Avenue ESD#20	MMBR	TP19BMP000116	$ 100	0.29	91.87	C	2021	480300	1312500	$ 100,000		81
Ethan Allen SWM-01A SHA BMP 150970 ST303	MMBR	TP19BMP000117	$ 50	0.15	91.72	C	2021	476683	1313739	$ 50,000		82
Ethan Allen SWM-03 SHA BMP 150971 ST 313	MMBR	TP19BMP000118	$ 50	0.06	91.66	C	2021	476602	1314427	$ 50,000		83
Glenside and Jackson RG0201	MMBR	TP19BMP000119	$ 12	0.02	91.64	C	2021	480350	1314400	$ 12,481		84
Glenside and Haverford RG501	MMBR	TP19BMP000120	$ 10	0.06	91.58	C	2021	479120	1314490	$ 10,151		85
Glenside and Merwood Drive RG401	MMBR	TP19BMP000121	$ 12	0.04	91.54	C	2021	479458	1314470	$ 12,118		86
Glenside and Ann Street Mbio	MMBR	TP19BMP000127	$ 11	0.03	91.51	C	2021	481214	1314166	$ 10,828		87
Permeable Pavers at Elson St Dead End to Sligo Creek	FBIO	TP22BMP000128	$ 74	0.20	91.31	C	2022	482171	1310864	$ 74,210		88
Hillwood Manor Neighborhood Park	MMBR	TP22BMP000136	$ 50	0.88	90.43	C	2022	477826	1315748	$ 50,000		89
										$ 3,019,174	Cost	
										19.84	Impervious Acres Treated	
PRIVATE AND INSTITUTIONAL PERMITTED FACILITIES												
121 Ritchie Avenue	MIDW	TP07BMP000104	$ 4	0.00	90.43	C	2007	480580	1309600	$ 4,000		90
Talahi of MD -1 (6432 5TH Ave.)	MIDW	TP07BMP000105	$ 5	0.00	90.43	C	2007	474020	1311400	$ 5,000		91
Talahi of MD -2 (6428 5TH Ave.)	MIDW	TP07BMP000106	$ 5	0.00	90.43	C	2007	474010	1311400	$ 5,000		92
123 Ritchie Avenue (125)	MIDW	TP07BMP000107	$ 4	0.00	90.43	C	2007	480610	1309500	$ 4,000		93
Montgomery County -Carroll Avenue Fire Station	FSND	TP07BMP000108	NA	0.34	90.09	C	2007	477420	1310300	NA		94
6411 Orchard Avenue	MMBR	TP07BMP000109	NA	0.04	90.05	C	2007	474190	1311800	NA		95
Takoma Park Elementary School	MENF	TP08BMP000100	$ 30	1.17	88.89	C	2008	479340	1308700	$ 30,164		96
Urciolo Properties	MENF	TP08BMP000101	$ 49	0.72	88.17	C	2008	476040	1308800	$ 48,966		97
Cristo Rey H S. 1010 Larch	MSWB	TP08BMP000102	$ 65	0.20	87.97	C	2008	477240	1315100	$ 65,300		98
MNCPPC-Piney Branch Park	MSWB	TP08BMP000103	NA	0.00	87.97	C	2008	479760	1309400	NA		99
Walgreen's - 1329 E. University	AGRE	TP10BMP000096	$ 95	0.20	87.77	C	2010	481080	1316200	$ 94,700		100
Washington Adventist University-7707 Greenwood	MENF	TP10BMP000099	$ 20	0.10	87.68	C	2010	480110	1313000	$ 20,000		101
Gateway Properties-8435 Piney Branch	APRP	TP11BMP000095	$ 30	0.08	87.60	C	2012	484810	1311300	$ 30,000		102
Montgomery Housing (MHP)- 7610 Maple	MENF	TP11BMP000098	$ 16	0.00	87.60	C	2011	479670	1310300	$ 16,000		103
Montgomery Housing (MHP) - Aspen Court	MIDW	TP12BMP000091	$ 27	0.09	87.51	C	2013	478410	1312800	$ 26,620		104
MNCPPC- 7515 Hancock	MILS	TP12BMP000092	$ 50	0.10	87.41	C	2013	478950	1311000	$ 50,000		105
6882 New Hampshire Avenue	MMBR	TP13BMP000088	$ 20	0.15	87.27	C	2013	476130	1313400	$ 20,000		106
127 Ritchie Avenue	MIDW	TP13BMP000089	$ 3	0.00	87.27	C	2013	480700	1309400	$ 3,000		107
6608 Poplar Avenue	MIDW	TP13BMP000090	$ 4	0.00	87.27	C	2013	474910	1312000	$ 4,000		108
6507 Highland Avenue	MIDW	TP13BMP000093	$ 4	0.00	87.27	C	2013	474850	1311100	$ 4,000		109
Cristo Rey High School	MMBR	TP13BMP000094	$ 20	0.13	87.14	C	2013	477380	1314900	$ 20,000		110
Montgomery College Pavilion	MMBR	TP14BMP000087	$ 41	0.13	87.01	C	2014	479560	1306300	$ 40,799		111
7020 New Hampshire Avenue	MIDW	TP15BMP000086	$ 3	0.00	87.01	C	2015	477390	1314500	$ 3,020		112
Washington Adventist University 7600 Flower*R	MSWB	TP16BMP000082	$ 18	0.19	86.83	C	2016	480050	1312600	$ 17,912		113
Taco Bell Takoma Park*R	MMBR	TP16BMP000083	$ 25	0.27	86.56	C	2016	481350	1315900	$ 25,000		114
121 Grant Avenue	MILS	TP16BMP000085	$ 10	0.00	86.56	C	2016	478500	1310000	$ 10,000		115
Sligo Mill Overlook Playground	MMBR	TP17BMP000079	$ 25	0.00	86.56	C	2017	474000	1311800	$ 25,000		116
7305 Jackson Avenue*R	FBIO	TP18BMP000074	$ 8	0.00	86.56	C	2018	477657	1312086	$ 8,144		117
7303 Jackson Avenue*N	FBIO	TP18BMP000075	$ 8	0.00	86.56	C	2018	477588	1311974	$ 7,817		118
17 Lee Avenue-Resubmision CCPC*N	FBIO	TP18BMP000076	$ 5	0.00	86.56	C	2018	478779	1310189	$ 5,000		119
7-11 Takoma Park*R	FBIO	TP18BMP000077	$ 10	0.09	86.48	C	2018	476696	1313921	$ 9,919		120
36 Philadelphia Avenue**N	MILS	TP18BMP000078	$ 7	0.00	86.48	C	2018	478240	1309700	$ 7,467		121
Takoma Park Middle School*R	FBIO	TP19BMP000072	$ 131	0.00	86.48	C	2019	480094	1308572	$ 130,900		122
6506 Kansas Lane**N	FBIO	TP19BMP000073	$ 29	0.00	86.48	C	2019	474749	1311362	$ 28,863		123
Enterprise RAC Company of MD, LLC	MMBR	TP21BMP000129	$ 30	0.21	86.27	C	2021	474404	1312260	$ 30,408		124
										$ 800,999	Cost	

											4.16	Impervious Acres Treated	
ALTERNATIVE BMPS													
Stream Restoration - New York & Baltimore	STRE	TP05BMP000122	$ 45	2.00	84.27	C	2005	479674	1306993	$ 45,313		125	
Outfall at Cristo Ray High School	OUT	TP08BMP000003	$ 3	0.20	84.07	C	2008	476915	1315324	$ 2,500		126	
Stream Restoration - Mississippi	STRE	TP08BMP000121	$ 43	2.28	81.79	C	2008	481264	1309339	$ 43,362		127	
Outfall stabilization at Linden Avenue	OUT	TP10BMP000011	$ 5	0.15	81.64	C	2010	477432	1315518	$ 5,000		128	
Stream Restoration -Circlewood	STRE	TP13BMP000120	$ 39	7.90	73.74	C	2013	475401	1311193	$ 38,964		129	
Stream Restoration - Hayward	STRE	TP16BMP000119	$ 67	3.78	69.96	C	2016	477904	1313550	$ 67,442		130	
Outfall & grouted step pool at Dog Park	OUT	TP17BMP000061	$ 40	0.70	69.26	C	2017	480950	1310900	$ 39,611		131	
Tree Planting FY17	FPU	TP17BMP000123	$ 30	0.38	68.88	C	2017	NA	NA	$ 30,000		132	
Street Sweeping - over the Permit Term	VVS	TP18BMP000001	NA	26.00	42.88	P	2023	NA	NA	NA		133	
Outfall stabilization at Hilltop	OUT	TP18BMP000061	$ 17	0.45	42.43	C	2018	480916	1310780	$ 16,674		134	
Tree Planting FY18	FPU	TP18BMP000124	$ 30	0.38	42.05	C	2018	NA	NA	$ 30,000		135	
Tree Planting FY19	FPU	TP19BMP000125	$ 30	0.57	41.48	C	2019	NA	NA	$ 30,000		136	
Storm Drain Cleaning - over the permit term	SDV	TP20BMP000008	NA	8.00	33.48	P	2023	NA	NA	NA		137	
Tree Planting FY20	FPU	TP20BMP000126	$ 30	0.76	32.72	C	2020	NA	NA	$ 45,000		138	
Glenside and Merwood swale & outfall stablization	OUT	TP20BMP000127	$ 74	0.52	32.20	C	2021	479430	1314630	$ 74,431		139	
Outfall Stablization Glenside and Haverford	OUT	TP20BMP000128	$ 69	0.19	32.01	C	2021	479011	1314894	$ 68,660		140	*As of 2022:*
Glenside and Jackson swale and outfall stablization	OUT	TP20BMP000129	$ 61	0.21	31.80	C	2021	480250	1314247	$ 60,578		141	*TOTAL COST* $ 4,577,707.50
Tree Planting FY21	FPU	TP21BMP000127	$ 25	0.59	31.21	C	2021	NA	NA	$ 30,000		142	*TOTAL CREDIT* 80.21
Outfall stabilization at Cockerille and Circlewoods	OUT	TP22BMP000125	$ 60	0.35	30.86	C	2022	475260	1311200	$ 60,000		143	*Credit Remaining* 29.15
Tree Planting FY22	FPU	TP22BMP000129	$ 25	0.80	30.06	C	2022	NA	NA	$ 70,000		144	
											$ 757,535	Cost	
											56.21	Impervious Acres Treated	
PLANNED BMPS THRU 2025													
Stream Restoration-Takoma Branch	STRE	TBD	$ 250	2	28.06	P	2023	474898	1312274	$ 250,000			
Maple Outfall Repair (Brashears Run)	OUT	TBD	$ 93	1	27.06	P	2023	479890	1311281	$ 92,800			
Tree Planting FY23	FPU	TBD	$ 30	1.1	26	P	2023	NA	NA	$ 93,000			
Filteras @ Houston Court & HoustonAvenue (4)	MENF	TBD	$ 80	1.0	24.92	P	2024	478631	1307108	$ 80,000			
Outfall structure number 1028(7113 Central Avenue)	OUT	TBD	$ 59	0.8	24.12	P	2024	479174	1314457	$ 59,000			
Outfall structure number 1221(7101 New Hampshire Ave)	OUT	TBD	$ 82	0.6	23.52	P	2024	477860	1315110	$ 82,000			
Jefferson Slope outfall stabilization	OUT	TBD	$ 30	3	20.52	P	2024	479560	1311900	$ 30,000			
Jefferson Bio swale	MSWB	TBD	$ 80	1.2	19.32	P	2024	479556	1311900	$ 80,000			
Albany @ Baltimore Curbside & Median	MENF	TBD	$ 70	0.9	18.42	P	2024	479508	1310836	$ 70,000			
Tree Planting FY24	FPU	TBD	$ 30	1.14	17.28	P	2024	NA	NA	$ 93,000			
Bioretention @ Gude & Poplar Ave	FBIO	TBD	$ 40	0.05	17.23	P	2025	475080	1312315	$ 40,000	*As of 2025:*		
Structure #273 – Outfall stabilization on Poplar	OUT	TBD	$ 40	0.7	16.53	P	2025	475013	1312308	$ 40,000	*TOTAL COST*	$ 5,771,507.50	
Filteras @ Kennebec	MENF	TBD	$ 60	0.2	16.33	P	2025	481651	1311360	$ 60,000	*TOTAL CREDIT*	101.27	Acres
Sligo Mill Rd Outfall Restoration	OUT	TBD	$ 150	6	10.33	P	2025	474585	1312161	$ 15,000	*Credit Remaining*	8.09	Acres
Tree Planting FY25	FPU	TBD	$ 30	1.3	9	P	2025	NA	NA	$ 109,000			
											$ 1,193,800	Cost	
											21.06	Impervious Acres Treated	
PLANNED BMPS 2026 & 2027													
Flower Ave & Cherry Ave OutFall stablization	SPSC	TBD	$ 60	1.2	8	P	2026	478812	1313147	$ 60,000			
Tree Planting FY26	FPU	TBD	$ 30	1.3	6.47	P	2026	NA	NA	$ 109,000			
Bioretention @ Franklin Apartment	FBIO	TBD	$ 65	1.1	5.37	P	2026	479778	1310570	$ 65,000			
Bioretention @ Essex Parking at Maple	FBIO	TBD	$ 45	0.8	4.57	P	2026	479625	1311164	$ 45,000			
Brasher Run Stream Restoration phase two	STRE	TBD	$ 150	3.8	0.77	P	2027	479754	1311618	$ 150,000			
Tree Planting FY27	FPU	TBD	$ 30	1.3	-0.56	P	2027	NA	NA	$ 109,000	20% Treatment Credit Achieved 2027		
FUTURE BMPS													
Outfall Stablization on NH Ave across from Elson	STRE	TBD	$ 100	2.0	-2.56		2028			$ 100,000			
Stream Restoration-Takoma Branch phase two	STRE	TBD	$ 250	10.0	-12.56		2028	474856	1311977	$ 250,000			
Washington McGlaughton stream stabilization	STRE	TBD	$ 150	8.0	-20.56		2029			$ 150,000			
Larch and Glaizewood stream stabilization	STRE	TBD	$ 200	5.0	-25.56		2030			$ 200,000			
OutFall Stabilization 1220 & 1221 New Hampshire	OUT	TBD	$ 100	0.5	-26.06		2031			$ 100,000			
Outfall Stabilization 861 end Hayward	OUT	TBD	$ 100	0.2	-26.26		2032			$ 100,000			