# WPCRLF Facilities Plan Checklist

**Post-Equivalence**

**Section 212-Wastewater Projects**

Loan Applicant:

Project Name/No.:

Plan Title/Date:

Plan Author:

Project Manager:

Plan Reviewed - Comments

Project Manager - Date Engineering Coordinator - Date

Environmental Document [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Appendix B] Issued Cleared

Plan Approved

Project Manager - Date

This guidance checklist has been prepared in accordance with WPCRLF Regulation Rule 7.3.A for preparation and review of a Facilities Plan that will meet all WPCRLF requirements. These checklist items represent what is considered a minimum level of information to be included in the plan. Blanks to the far right-hand side of the page are for entering the page number in the plan where the associated information may be found.

Is the plan stamped by a Professional Engineer registered in Mississippi? [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A(1)] \_\_\_\_\_\_

**I. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations (self-explanatory)**

If the submittal is an update to an existing plan, are portions of the old plan which are still valid referenced specifically? \_\_\_\_\_\_ Are other relevant portions updated appropriately? \_\_\_\_\_\_

**II. Need For The Project** \_\_\_\_\_\_

The plan must give a general description of the need for the project in terms of bypasses, overflows, other infiltration/inflow (I/I) problems, failing individual systems, developmental needs, NPDES permit limits, or other water quality/public health problems.

Does the plan adequately document the existing and/or future water pollution problem or threat to be addressed by the project? [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(b)]

**III. Existing Situation**

Note that this section applies to the planning area in general. For specific information on the site of the wastewater collection and treatment facilities, see Section VI. The plan must describe the planning area in terms of the characteristics described below, including maps as needed.

A. Planning area location and boundaries. \_\_\_\_\_\_

B. Population served. \_\_\_\_\_\_

C. Surface waters affected by and/or improved by the proposed project. \_\_\_\_\_\_

D. Organizational context (city only, city-county, intercity, etc.). \_\_\_\_\_\_

E. Location, description, and performance of existing facilities. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(a)] \_\_\_\_\_\_

F. Identification of significant users (generally 5% or more of POTW capacity), if project will provide capacity for such users. \_\_\_\_\_\_

G. Identification of unsewered areas and on-site systems. \_\_\_\_\_\_

**IV. Waste Flow and Load**

Note that minimum planning and design periods are 20 and 5 years, respectively, unless justified otherwise. Documentation of the source/rationale behind all population, flow, and loading data must be included. Sufficient flow monitoring and/or estimation of wastewater, infiltration, and inflow quantities (as well as any other necessary technical data) must be documented to provide the basis for preliminary design. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(c)]

A. Residential flow. \_\_\_\_\_\_

Are population projections consistent with those from the local Planning and Development District, Mississippi Development Authority, the Census Bureau, and/or the Bureau of Economic Analysis?\_\_\_\_\_\_ If not, are they reasonable; do they include sound justification?

B. Commercial/industrial/significant user flow: If the project will provide capacity for them, the plan must include an indication that significant users have been contacted to determine their needs (see III.E). Note that, if the Department determines a user to be overly significant, additional assurances may be required (see VII.B). Undocumented future industrial flows should not be in excess of 5% of total design flow (10% for small communities). \_\_\_\_\_\_

C. Infiltration/ Inflow: Note that all projects must be sized to handle the design return storm (typically 2 to 5 year, 24 hour) without bypasses or overflows occurring in or downstream of the project. \_\_\_\_\_\_

D. Total flow/load: Note that only those loading parameters specified in the WLA need to be evaluated with regard to treatment facilities. \_\_\_\_\_\_

Do all projections, flows, peaking factors, loads, etc. appear reasonable? \_\_\_\_\_\_ For treatment projects, is the design flow the same as that used in the WLA?

**V. Alternative Selection**

A cost-effectiveness analysis is optional if the selected plan is included on the following lists. Circle the technologies selected.

A. Unsewered areas. \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Use of existing on-site systems with no changes or with necessary upgrading, rehabilitation, and/or management by public authority.
* Use of other on-site systems such as mound systems, individual package systems, etc.
* Central collection and treatment (see V.B.2 and V.D).
* Any reasonable combination of the above.

B. Collection.

1. Rehabilitation: The plan must include documentation of sufficient evaluation of the existing system to support any proposed rehabilitation. (NOTE: To qualify for

the Bypass/Overflow Priority System Category, the plan must also include documentation that the bypasses/overflows occur during a 2-year, 24-hour rain event and that the appropriate reporting has been submitted in accordance with the loan recipient’s NPDES permit. If the rehabilitation will solve more than one type of problem, the plan must document which portions of the project qualify for this category.) \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. New sewers. \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Conventional gravity sewers
* Conventional pump station/force main
* Small diameter gravity
* Septic tank effluent pumping
* Grinder pump/pressure system
* Vacuum sewers
* Any reasonable combination of the above (including septic tank/absorption fields, where satisfactory)

C. Interceptors. \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Conventional gravity sewers
* Conventional pump station/force main
* A reasonable combination of the above

D. Treatment system: The treatment system technologies listed below are considered appropriate for the given population categories. The utilization of systems with higher than suggested complexity is discouraged and may result in comments regarding the ability of the applicant to operate the facilities.

1. Population (or equivalent) less than 10,000. \_\_\_\_\_\_

* Lagoon (facultative, aerated, sludge, etc.)
* Hydrograph controlled release lagoon
* Intermittent sand filter
* Land treatment (overland flow, spray irrigation, etc.)
* Aquatic systems
* Constructed wetlands
* Single-stage activated sludge
* Oxidation ditch
* Abandonment of existing inadequate treatment facility and connection of flows to adequate facility
* Discharge at locations where effluent limitations are less stringent
* Chlorination/dechlorination
* Ultraviolet disinfection
* Post-aeration
* Sludge drying beds
* Sludge landfarming
* Sludge landfilling
* Any reasonable combination of the above

2. Population (or equivalent) 10,000 or greater. \_\_\_\_\_\_

* All of the above, plus
* Trickling filter
* Rotating biological contactor
* Sequencing batch reactor
* Aerobic digestion
* Anaerobic digestion
* Two-stage activated sludge
* Ozonation
* Any reasonable combination of the above

Are the stated NPDES permit limits correct? \_\_\_\_\_\_ Can the selected treatment technologies meet the limits? \_\_\_\_\_\_ If advanced treatment is indicated, has the possibility of seasonal limits been explored? \_\_\_\_\_\_ Note that limits for a given parameter may vary for different treatment methods at the same discharge flow and location. If the OPC/Environmental Permits Division (EPD)/Municipal and Private Facilities Branch (MPFB) had any concerns with permit limits (e.g., outfall siting) have they been addressed? \_\_\_\_\_

**VI. Selected Plan**

Facilities included in the selected plan are as detailed below. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(d)]

A. General Information

1. Description: List treatment, collection, rehabilitation, and any other facilities to be constructed as well as any existing facilities to be abandoned/demolished: \_\_\_\_\_\_

Item of work Approximate Quantity/Size

2. A planning area map showing the location of proposed facilities. \_\_\_\_\_\_

3. A demonstration that minorities are not being systematically excluded from receiving treatment works improvements. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(e)] \_\_\_\_\_\_

4. If the project includes treatment facilities, wastewater discharge, large pumping stations, etc. which may adversely affect public health or the environment (not including aesthetics), a determination of whether or not the facilities are located in a minority or low-income area and, if so, documentation that the siting of the facilities is nondiscriminatory. [Re: EO 12898, Environmental Justice] Note that additional guidance on this EO may be forthcoming from EPA, so the planning requirements may change. \_\_\_\_\_\_

5. Preliminary design criteria/calculations for collectors, interceptors, pump stations, and unit processes. \_\_\_\_\_\_

6. For treatment projects, a site plan including the layout of existing and proposed facilities and either 1) a buffer zone (minimum150 feet from water's edge), 2) documentation that the adjacent property is zoned or used for commercial or industrial use, or 3) a schedule to acquire waivers from adjacent landowners and to request a Permit Board variance from the buffer zone requirement through EPD/MPFB. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Appendix J, Item A and 11 Miss. Admin. Code Pt. 6, Rule 1.1.1.C(2)(a)] \_\_\_\_\_\_

7. For new collectors, identification of those to serve existing buildings as opposed to those which are strictly developmental (see III.F). \_\_\_\_\_\_

Are all facilities eligible [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Appendix A]? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

B. Environmental Information

1. Description of how the proposed facilities will address the existing and/or future water pollution water quality problems as stated in Section II. \_\_\_\_\_\_

2. For projects which will result in increased loads (new collection, redirection, etc.), a demonstration that adequate capacity exists or will exist in the downstream transportation and treatment facilities. \_\_\_\_\_\_

Has adequacy of treatment been reviewed and approved by EPD/MPFB? \_\_\_\_\_\_ If downstream facilities are owned by an entity other than the applicant, is documentation of concurrence included (see VII.B)? \_\_\_\_\_\_

3. Treatment Projects Only:

a. Description and location of any surface supplies of potable water or recreational areas downstream of discharge (include on map). \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Description of the sludge management system in sufficient detail to determine feasibility. If sludge lagoons are proposed, the plan must demonstrate that the lagoons have reasonable capacity (i.e., at least 10 years) and must describe the ultimate disposal method (e.g., landfill, land farm, etc.), including a brief description of lagoon closure after being taken off-line. Such on-site treatment issues are generally handled through the NPDES Permit (EPD/MPFB). Where sludge is to be taken/treated off-site, input regarding solid waste permitting requirements must be solicited from the OPC/EPD/Solid Waste and Mining Branch. \_\_\_\_\_\_

Will a Solid Waste Permit be required? \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. A soil/groundwater evaluation for earthen impoundments or land application if required by Attachment 1. If no liner is proposed, this evaluation must be reviewed by the Office of Land and Water Resources/Water Resources Management Division/Assessment and Protection Branch (OLWR/WRMD/APB). \_\_\_\_\_\_

Is a liner proposed to meet the leakage limit? \_\_\_\_\_\_ If not, has a full soil/groundwater evaluation been done, or is further work required during design? \_\_\_\_\_\_ For land treatment projects, is groundwater monitoring required? \_\_\_\_\_\_ Other precautions? \_\_\_\_\_\_

4. Brief description of the nature (permanent or temporary) and extent of, and mitigative measures for, impacts such as noise, dust, odor, and erosion/siltation. \_\_\_\_\_\_

5. A specific indication that each applicable intergovernmental review (IGR) agency has been contacted, any adverse comments, and an indication of all permits/survey clearances that will be required. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(f)] \_\_\_\_\_\_

Is a Mississippi Department of Archives and History archaeological/cultural resources survey required?

Is a Mississippi Natural Heritage Program vegetative/wildlife survey required?

Is a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 10 or 404 permit application required?

Is a Mississippi Department of Marine Resources permit application required (coastal county projects only)?

Are U.S. Forest Service comments on Wild/Scenic River impacts required (projects in Wild/Scenic River basin only)?

6. Floodplains: The plan must document whether or not the project is located in the 100-year flood hazard boundary. If so, alternative sites must be considered and/or mitigative measures given for protection of the flood plain and protection of the project from flooding. \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Environmental Impacts: The plan must contain a comparative evaluation of the “no action” alternative and the proposed alternative which specifically accounts for existing and future beneficial and adverse consequences that each alternative would have on the resources listed below. Note: A generic statement that “The no action alternative is unacceptable because…” is not sufficient. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(g) and Appendix B, Section A]

1. Surface/groundwaters \_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Archaeological/historical/cultural resources \_\_\_\_\_\_

3. Vegetative/wildlife \_\_\_\_\_\_

4. Wetlands/navigable waterways \_\_\_\_\_\_

5. Floodplains \_\_\_\_\_\_

6. Coastal zones (Jackson, Harrison, and Hancock Counties only) \_\_\_\_\_\_

7. Wild/Scenic Rivers (projects in Wild/Scenic River basin only) \_\_\_\_\_\_

8. Air quality \_\_\_\_\_\_

**VII. Financial Analysis**

The majority of the required financial information is included in the “Financial Capability Summary” (Attachment 2) which can be completed and incorporated directly into the plan. Additional information should be added as necessary to include the following [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(h)]:

A. The cost of the selected plan must be given [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(d)] in sufficient detail to determine reasonableness and to separate allowable/unallowable (see WPCRLF Reg. Appendix A), priority category, and needs category amounts. \_\_\_\_\_\_

B. Where interlocal entities are involved and/or capacity is being provided for significant users (see III.E, IV.B, and VI.B.2), the plan must outline the various responsibilities for financing, constructing, operating and maintaining the treatment works. Districts or other authorities which do not control the local water system must obtain an interlocal agreement with the local water system owner to shut off water for nonpayment of sewer bills. Otherwise, the Department may not award a loan unless other adequate security for loan repayment is demonstrated. Note that any required interlocal agreements will be due with the loan application. \_\_\_\_\_\_

C. An explanation of how non-WPCRLF funded costs will be financed (See Attachment 2, Items 2 and 3). \_\_\_\_\_\_

D. Calculations showing the necessary user charges.[Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A.(2)(k)]. \_\_\_\_\_\_

E. Where user charges are to be subsidized with general funds (county government ad valorem or city sales tax), the plan must include clear details of this approach, mechanisms to collect user charges and subsidy revenue, and plans for addressing nonpayment. \_\_\_\_\_\_

F. Average annual cost per household compared (as percentage) to the Median Household Income (MHI) (See Attachment 2, Item 8): The MHI may be determined from The Sourcebook of Zip Code Demographics (latest year’s edition). Other credible sources are available and may be used. Also, adjustments to these sources, to more accurately reflect the MHI, may be made when justified. \_\_\_\_\_\_

Are user charges and other dedicated revenue sufficient to cover operation, maintenance, (minor) replacement, WPCRLF repayment, and any other debt retirement? \_\_\_\_\_\_ Do all costs, interest rates, and other financial arrangements appear reasonable? \_\_\_\_\_\_

If any of the existing debt is with the Rural Utilities Service (RUS), has RUS Community Programs been notified of the estimated WPCRLF loan and repayment amounts? \_\_\_\_\_\_

(E-mail Bettye.Oliver@ms.usda.gov or Patricia.McDowell@ms.usda.gov or call 601-965-5460.)

Is the project high cost? \_\_\_\_\_\_ If so, have remedial actions been considered such as staged construction, value engineering, and careful review of the alternative selection, growth, and design features? \_\_\_\_\_\_

**VIII. Public Participation**

To document public input on the plan, it must include/address the items listed below. [Re: WPCRLF Reg. Rule 7.3.A(2)(i) and(j)] For projects that are likely to be controversial (entirely new systems, new or substantially increased discharges, high cost or substantially increased user charges, etc.) the loan recipient should consider bypassing directly to the public hearing process in the interest of time. Additional notice (direct mail, through billing, etc.) is encouraged (but not required) for all projects.

1. Proof of Publication for Proposed Project/Hearing

**Was the notice published *after* IGR responses were included/addressed in the plan (not necessarily after permits/clearances were issued; see VI.B.5)?** \_\_\_\_\_\_

Did the notice indicate where the plan could be examined during the notice period? \_\_\_\_\_\_

Was the public informed regarding how/where/when to submit comments? \_\_\_\_\_\_

For county government projects described in VII.E above, was the notice in enough newspapers to “cover” the entire county?\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Routine Projects (only public notice required)

1. Proof that the public notice period/location was adequate (generally 30 days in local newspaper). \_\_\_\_\_\_

2. Any comments received from the public. \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Controversial (as determined by the Department) Projects (public hearing required)

1. Proof that the notice of public hearing was published in a local newspaper of general circulation at least 30 days prior to the hearing date. \_\_\_\_\_\_

2. A transcript of the public hearing. \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. A description of how all comments were addressed. \_\_\_\_\_\_

Have all adverse comments been adequately addressed? \_\_\_\_\_\_

Has there been any significant change in the project site, cost estimates, or user charge estimates since the public notice/hearing? \_\_\_\_\_\_ If so, another notice/hearing may be required.

ATTACHMENT 1

Soil/Groundwater Review

WPCRLF Facilities Planning

This procedure applies to newly constructed earthen impoundments and land application fields to receive wastewater or sludge and additions to such facilities already in place. It does not apply to basins formed with concrete, fiberglass, etc., nor to pre-existing earthen facilities not being enlarged or deepened. If the selected plan includes a liner, then Items I.A.1through I.A.3 of the soil/groundwater evaluation (see below) must be included in the facilities plan. If a preliminary determination is made that no liner is required, then two options are available: 1) The plan may include the entire soil/groundwater evaluation, or 2) it may contain only the information required by Item I.A.1 below, and the remainder of the evaluation will be required during design. See Section VI.B.3.c of the Facilities Plan Checklist (NPELF20) and the Plans and Specifications Checklist (NPELF40) for further details. The soil/groundwater evaluation must be sealed, signed, and dated by the Mississippi Professional Engineer responsible for its preparation. If an OLWR/WRMD/APB review will be necessary, the applicant should submit an extra copy of the evaluation along with the facilities plan. Project managers should discuss this attachment at the pre-planning conference where earthen facilities are being considered.

I. Earthen Impoundments: MDEQ design guidelines indicate that leakage through the bottom of the impoundment shall be no greater than 500 gallons per acre per day.

A. Where a liner is proposed to meet the leakage limit, the soil/groundwater evaluation may be limited to the following:

1. General review of the local geology, hydrology, and current and potential groundwater resources, including information from published literature (soil maps and cross sections, etc.) and applicable files and data bases at the USGS and the MDEQ.

2. Brief description of the proposed liner (material type, thickness, hydraulic conductivity, etc.).

3. Statement that with the proposed liner the leakage limit will not be exceeded.

If the Construction Branch (CB) accepts the evaluation determinations that a liner is necessary, then no further study or review is required.

B. Where a liner is determined in the report to be unnecessary to meet the leakage limit due to the characteristics of in-situ material, the soil/groundwater evaluation must include the following:

1. The information listed in I.A.1 above.

2. A USGS topographic map (1:24,000 scale) with the project site and a one-mile radius area of review denoted. The location and depth of all recorded water wells within the area of review must be shown. An effort must be made to determine if residences within the area of review have private wells that may not be listed on inventories maintained at the OLWR or the USGS.

3. Soil borings of sufficient depth and number to characterize the soil/groundwater conditions below the planned excavation and to demonstrate that an in-situ competent liner is present. These borings must be continuous and extend to a depth of 25 feet below the bottom of the impoundment. Permeability tests (either lab or field) must be conducted on undisturbed samples taken from the interval that will serve as the natural liner. ASTM procedures or acceptable similar methods should be followed for all tests. The table below specifies the minimum number of borings and permeability tests based on impoundment size.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Impoundment Acreage | Minimum # Borings | Minimum # Perm. Tests |
|  |  |  |
| <10 | 5 | 3 |
| >10 to 20 | 7 | 4 |
| >20 to 30 | 10 | 5 |
| >30 | 15 | 7 |

If a shallow aquifer is encountered, groundwater levels from at least 3 temporary piezometers must be monitored to determine flow direction and rate. Boring logs and cross-sections showing thickness, lateral continuity, and lithology should be submitted as part of the evaluation.

4. Well drillers’ logs (available from OLWR) and geophysical logs (available from the USGS and the Office of Geology) for the water wells within the one-mile radius area of review. Information to be included with the logs are identification number, location, date drilled, depth, use, pumping rate, casing size and screen length.

5. Statement that given the documented conditions the leakage limit will not be exceeded.

This evaluation must be routed to the OLWR/WRMD/APB who will review and provide written comments or acceptance to CB.

II. Land Application Fields: Due to the potential for groundwater contamination, the following must be included in the soil/groundwater evaluation for all land treatment projects:

A. The information listed in I.A.1 and I.B.2 through I.B.4 above.

B. A statement that groundwater quality will not be significantly impacted and a determination as to the necessity of a groundwater monitoring program.

This evaluation must be routed to the OLWR/WRMD/APB who will review and provide written comments or acceptance to CB.

ATTACHMENT 2

FINANCIAL CAPABILITY SUMMARY

Loan Recipient \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Project Description\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

The following figures are total estimated costs for construction (includes construction related costs) and operation and maintenance of the proposed facilities. Amounts must agree with the facilities plan. See WPCRLF Reg. Appendix A for allowable cost information.

**1. Estimated Construction Costs**

Planning/Application Phase Services $

Design/Land Acquisition Phase Services $

Land/Easement Purchase $

Construction $

Construction Phase Services $

Construction Contingency $

Other ( ) $

TOTAL $

**2. Funding Sources**

WPCRLF Loan $

Other Loans/Bonds ( ) $

CDBG Grant $

Other Grant ( ) $

Other ( ) $

TOTAL (must equal 1 TOTAL) $

**3. New Debt Retirement**

Financing Interest Term of Annual Debt

Method Amount Rate Maturity Payment

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

WPCRLF $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_yrs $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other Loan $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_yrs $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Bonds $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_yrs $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_yrs $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

TOTAL $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**4. Estimated Annual Operation, Maintenance and Replacement (OM&R) Costs**

Annual OM&R (new facilities)

Labor $

Utilities $

Materials $

Outside Services $

Equipment Replacement $

Miscellaneous $

a. Subtotal $

b. Existing OM&R (to remain) $

c. TOTAL OM&R (4.a + 4.b) $

**5. Total Estimated Annual Costs**

Existing Debt Service

RUS $

Other $

New Facilities Debt Service (from 3) $

Total Annual OM&R (from 4.c) $

TOTAL $

**6. User Charges**

Existing Monthly Rates

Usage (1000 gal) Class 1 Class 2 Class 3

First (or flat fee) $

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal

Over \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal

Proposed Monthly Rates (if increase is proposed)

Usage (1000 gal) Class 1 Class 2 Class 3

First \_\_\_\_ (or flat fee) $

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal

Over \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_$/1000 gal

Proposed Revenue

Avg. Use (1000 gal/mo) Avg. Bill ($/mo) No. of Users Revenue ($/mo)

Class 1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Class 2 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Class 3 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Subtotal \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

ANNUAL TOTAL (Revenue Subtotal x 12) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**7. Sources of Annual Revenue**

User Charges (6. ANNUAL TOTAL) $

Connection Fees $

Other ( ) $

TOTAL (must exceed 5 TOTAL) $

**8. Annual User Charge Per Household and High Cost Comparison**

a. Total annual user charges (6. ANNUAL TOTAL) $

b. Non-residential share of total $

c. Residential share of total (8.a-8.b) $

d. Existing households to be served

e. Average per household (8.c/8.d) $

f. Median household income $

Percentage (8.e/8.f x 100) %

High cost threshold\* for community %

Is this a high cost project?

\*A project is considered high cost if the average total annual sewer bill per household (including all OM&R and debt retirement costs) exceeds the following thresholds: 1% of the community's Median Household Income (MHI) where the MHI is <$10,000, 1.5% for $10,000 to $17,000, and 1.75% for MHI > $17,000. Where water and sewer amounts can not be accurately separated, add 1.5% to these thresholds.