



Clean Water and Drinking Water SRF Update

Agenda Item E

State Water Infrastructure Authority Meeting

March 2014

Outline

- Intended Use Plan (IUP) Public Meeting
- CWSRF Priority Rating Criteria
- DWSRF Priority Rating Criteria
 - Suggested modifications
- SWIA Action Item

IUP Public Meeting – March 5, 2014

- Covered both CWSRF and DWSRF IUPs
- Included Priority Rating Systems (drafts approved by SWIA at February meeting)
- Posted IUPs on website
- 2 non-DENR attendees
- 1 comment on DWSRF at meeting
- Public comments accepted through March 17
 - None received on CWSRF
 - Three received on DWSRF (written)

CWSRF IUP and Priority Rating Criteria

- No comments from the public
- Staff has no suggested changes to CWSRF Priority Rating System

DWSRF IUP and Priority Rating Criteria

- Staff suggested changes
- Review of public comments and suggested changes
 - Not all comments resulted in suggested changes
 - Some changes address multiple comments

DWSRF Priority Rating Criteria Changes

- Make Line Item 2 and 2.1 Language Consistent
 - “Rehabilitate” to include “replace” and “repair”
 - Change improves clarity
- Make Line Item 14 Identical to CWSRF Item
 - More applicant-related than project related
 - System management regionalization – 5 points
- New Line Item after Line 8 – Identical to old Line Item 14
 - More project-related than applicant related
 - Keeps priority related to long range planning
 - Same points (5)

DWSRF IUP Public Comments

- Request points for addressing NOVs
 - Discussion in Feb meeting (proactive vs. reactive)
 - DWSRF – compliance with SDWA
 - Add new Line Item 5b to provide 20 points for addressing NOVs (slightly lower than potential violations points for 5a)
- Request points be provided for improving quality of treated water
 - Add new Line Item 6b to provide 15 points for projects that improve quality without expansion

DWSRF IUP Public Comments

- Request points for treatment to address contaminated sources
 - Add phrase “or provides new treatment to” to line item 6a
- Generally, provide more public health consideration
 - May be some misinterpretation of categories (e.g., project points and (not or) public health points)
 - Moving to a priority based system (rather than RTP) enhances public health consideration
 - No additional changes recommended by staff

DWSRF IUP Public Comments

- Some comments reflect need to provide more detail in guidance
 - For example, what is a failing system
- Some comments reflect need for training
 - Training will be provided prior to application submittal

DWSRF IUP Public Comments

- Request to continue the previous ready-to-proceed (RTP) system for applications near RTP for last round
 - Provide a transition period
- Staff suggests addition to priority system:

“In establishing rank and eligibility, the State Water Infrastructure Authority may also consider the project’s ready to proceed status if the application was filed before Sept. 30, 2013 and became ready to proceed shortly afterwards.”

SWIA Action Item – DWSRF

- Make Line Item 2 and 2.1 language consistent
- Add new Line Item 5b to provide 20 points for projects that address NOVs
- Add phrase “or provides new treatment to” to Line Item 6a
- Add new Line Item 6b to provide 15 points for projects that improve quality without expansion
- Move old Line Item 14 to a new line item (after Line Item 8) under Category II – Public Health Benefits
- Revise Line Item 14 to be identical to CWSRF item

SWIA Action Item – DWSRF

- Add bypass language:

“In establishing rank and eligibility, the State Water Infrastructure Authority may also consider the project’s ready to proceed status if the application was filed before Sept. 30, 2013 and became ready to proceed shortly afterwards.”

SWIA Action Item – CWSRF

- Staff recommends that SWIA approve the CWSRF Priority Rating System with no changes