

State of Idaho
Clean Water State Revolving Fund
State Fiscal Year 2017
DRAFT Intended Use Plan

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
	Green Project Reserve Assistance Agreement Activity During State Fiscal Year 2017	4
	Assistance Agreement Fees.....	5
II.	List of Projects.....	5
III.	Long- and Short-Term Goals.....	6
IV.	Information on the Activities to be Supported	7
	A. Allocation of Funds/Assistance Terms.....	7
	B. Administrative Costs of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund	9
	C. Assistance Agreement Eligible Activities	9
	D. Sponsorship Agreements	9
V.	Assurances and Specific Proposals.....	10
	A. Environmental Reviews—Clean Water Act, Section 602(a) and Cross-Cutter Compliance, 40 CFR 35.3145.....	10
	B. Binding Commitments—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(3)	10
	C. Expeditious and Timely Expenditures—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(4)	10
	D. First-Use Enforceable Requirements—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(5)	10
	E. Compliance with Title II Requirements—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(6)	11
	F. State Matching Funds—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(2).....	11
	G. State Laws and Procedures—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(7).....	11
	H. Consistency with Planning	11
	I. Reporting	11
	J. Qualifications Based Standards for Selection of Professional Service Providers	11
	K. Transfers Between State Revolving Funds.....	11
VI.	Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds.....	12
	A. Program Administration	12
	B. CWSRF Priority List	12
	C. Fundable Projects	12
	D. Disbursements	13
	E. Federal Payments.....	13
	F. State Match.....	13
VII.	Additional Information Requirements.....	13
	A. Public Review and Comment	13

B. Bypass Procedures 13

ATTACHMENT I. Fundable List

ATTACHMENT II. Priority List

ATTACHMENT III. Guidance for Integrated Priority System: Water Quality Project Ranking

ATTACHMENT IV. EPA Payment Schedule

ATTACHMENT V. Public Notification and Involvement Strategy

ATTACHMENT VI. Description of Disadvantaged Assistance

ATTACHMENT VII. Decision-Making Strategy for Fundable Versus Non-fundable Portions
of the Priority List

ATTACHMENT VIII. Listing of Capitalization Grants—Reference for Potential Transfers
Between Funds

IDAHO CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND
INTENDED USE PLAN

MAY 11 and 12, 2016 BOARD PROPOSAL

I. Introduction

The State of Idaho, Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) proposes to adopt the following Intended Use Plan (IUP) for state fiscal year (SFY) 2017 (July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017) as required under the Clean Water Act, Section 606c.

The primary purpose of the IUP is to identify the intended use of the funds available in Idaho's Water Pollution Control Account. Projects on the IUP Priority List go through a review by the public in accordance with Idaho's Administrative Procedures Act (Idaho Code 67-52). DEQ is recommending that the State Board of Environmental Quality approve the SFY2017 IUP.

The IUP includes the following:

- ❖ Lists of assistance projects, including payment schedules for those most likely to qualify for assistance. Note: projects are technically funded via the purchase of debt but are referred to, for ease of reading, as "loan" "assistance" or "assistance agreement";
- ❖ Long-term and short-term goals;
- ❖ Assurances and specific proposals;
- ❖ Criteria and methods for distribution of funds; and
- ❖ Attachments relevant to the above.

Available funding for projects during the upcoming annual cycle is documented on the following page. The state will comply with the requirements of Title VI of the Clean Water Act. In carrying out the requirements of the Clean Water Act, Section 606(b)(8), the state will use accounting, audit, and fiscal procedures conforming to generally accepted governmental accounting standards.

Three assistance agreements are currently delinquent or in default (North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District assistance agreements 1899-09/16/18). The district, with oversight from the state, has preserved its priority position in the bankruptcy court system. At this time, negotiations are under way with the major debtor to arrange a comprehensive solution. Therefore, only a minority of these repayment dollars are anticipated to be available for the SFY 2017 IUP.

Resources:

Cash on Hand (Idle Cash and Investments) \$105,612,906

Transfers-In From Drinking Water SRF 10,000,000

EPA Capitalization Grant FFY 2016 6,264,000

State Match 1,305,000

Assistance Agreements Receivable:

SFY 2016 – March - June 2,005,221

SFY 2017 9,102,817

SFY 2018 9,100,990

Income on Cash and Investments:

SFY 2016 – March - June 561,766

SFY 2017 1,573,175

SFY 2018 1,234,375

Total Resources:

 \$146,760,251

Current Remaining Assistance Agreement (\$89,479,064)

Obligations:

(Assistance agreements in design/construction less disbursements and de-obligations that have already occurred)

Add back: 5% project shrinkage 4,473,953

(Some projects will de-obligate, or self-finance and reduce disbursement requests from the CWSRF)

Net Remaining Assistance Agreements Obligations:

 (\$85,005,111)

NET RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO PROVIDE

 \$61,755,140

ASSISTANCE

Key Assumptions:

Projects take 30 months to construct and close from date of assistance agreement signing. DEQ will use the **Total Resources** amount for the next 27 months to facilitate a conservative cash flow analysis. New assistance agreement obligations cannot exceed **Net Resources Available to Provide Assistance**. Projections are made quarterly. The next projection is scheduled to be made on July 1, 2016. The July 1, 2016, projection may be preempted if a future assistance agreement materially alters the amount available for assistance. The Green Project Reserve (GPR) goal will be \$652,500.

Green Project Reserve Assistance Agreement Activity During State Fiscal Year 2017

For SFY 2017, DEQ will draw upon previous experience in identifying and documenting goal setting for the GPR. A DEQ environmental engineer has been tasked to facilitate gathering and evaluating GPR information from assistance recipients and their consulting

engineers. Business cases or categorical documentation will be required to justify GPR eligibility and costs. Once this documentation is reviewed by DEQ, it will be posted at: www.deq.idaho.gov/water-quality/grants-loans/green-project-reserve.aspx. For SFY 2016, DEQ exceeded its 10% GPR goal and expects to use the same approach to meet its GPR goal in 2017.

Assistance Agreement Fees

To support administrative costs associated with operating the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) program or to otherwise facilitate the operation of the CWSRF effort, a fee program has been instituted. The fee will be 1% of the unpaid balance of the assistance agreement (unless the grand total of the interest rate and fee is less than 1%, in which case the fee will be reduced), payable when the regular repayments are made. Herein the term *effective interest* will be the sum of the fee and the true interest. The interest rate will be reduced by the corresponding percentage of the fee, so there is no net effect on borrowers. Fees are only being charged on new assistance agreements or on projects in progress for which an assistance agreement offer amendment is required.

For SFY 2015, the fee revenues were \$486,509, and for SFY 2016 the expected fee revenue should increase to about \$803,000. The fee revenue account balance, at the end of SFY 2015, was \$968,842. In the second half of SFY 2016, approximately \$330,000 of fee revenues will be used to fund CWSRF administrative and technical support costs incurred beyond the federal capitalization grant support level, wastewater planning grant support and operator training classes.

For SFY 2017, DEQ expects to expend approximately \$850,000 of fee revenues. Costs of approximately \$260,000 will be charged to support CWSRF administration. Costs of approximately \$90,000 will be charged to the direct support of operator training. Costs of approximately \$500,000 will be charged to support municipal wastewater planning grant efforts.

Support for wastewater planning grants will include direct support to municipalities for their plan development and the DEQ staff time to administer the grant support. The DEQ personnel costs will be drawn from each regional office and the state office in Boise. In each regional office, the personnel charging against the fee account will be engineering staff to support wastewater planning grants. In the state office, the personnel time will consist of financial and environmental review staff.

Surplus fee revenues will be transferred into the assistance agreement repayment account, to increase *available resources* for assistance agreements. Surplus fees will earn the same interest as regular repayment idle monies and will be periodically transferred to the fund corpus. Should a cash flow deficiency arise in the fund corpus, surplus fees would be transferred ad hoc.

II. List of Projects

Attachments I and II are the SFY 2017 CWSRF Fundable List and Priority List. Upon completion of the public comment period, a final project listing will be submitted for approval by the Board of Environmental Quality on May 11 and 12, 2016.

The first use requirement of the Clean Water Act [Section 602(b)(5)], relating to National Municipal Policy (NMP), does not apply in Idaho since all NMP needs have been met with separate funds in the form of state and federal grants and a separate state assistance agreement in FFY 1989.

III. Long- and Short-Term Goals

DEQ's long-term, basic SRF goals are as follows:

1. Protect public health and the waters of the state by offering financial assistance for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities. Financial assistance consists of below-market-rate interest on assistance agreements (e.g., 20-year repayments) and may include principal forgiveness for disadvantaged communities under limited circumstances.
2. Assist local communities as they strive to achieve and maintain statewide compliance with federal and state water quality standards.
3. Monitor the disparity and evaluate the impact of transferring money between the CWSRF and DWSRF, and use transfers between the two funds to balance funding with relative need. Section V.K. and Attachment VIII more fully discuss transfers.
4. Monitor EPA's evolving policy towards system sustainability. This evolution will likely continue, and at the least will require administrative changes. DEQ will monitor this evolution and make changes as needed. The policy may translate into specific capitalization grant requirements, such as user rate structures that incorporate capital replacement.
5. Administer Idaho's CWSRF account to ensure its financial integrity, viability, and revolving nature in perpetuity. DEQ will continue to strive to ensure the viability of the fund using two methods: (1) applying a minimum interest rate above 0% and (2) applying a 0.25% higher interest rate for assistance agreements that are repaid in 30 years.
6. Comply with all EPA grant conditions (e.g. Davis Bacon, Green Project Reserve, American Iron and Steel).

DEQ's short-term, basic SRF goals are as follows:

1. Ensure that FFY 2016 capitalization funding is disbursed to projects in a timely manner. With the exception of assistance agreement disbursement requests for projects that require the use of repayment funds (e.g., *recycled* assistance dollars will be used to match Federal funds), whenever practicable initial capitalization dollars will be used prior to repayment funds being used. This practice will ensure that initial capitalization funds are used in a timely manner.
2. Provide funding for nonpoint source (NPS) projects and improve marketing efforts directed at potential sponsors of NPS projects. To date there has not been a big enough demand upon SRF/§319 staff to impose an undue administrative burden, nor to materially degrade the long-term health of the fund.
3. Ensure clear tracking of fee revenues and expenditures while developing clear rules, policies, and procedures related to a maturing fee structure.
 - ❖ Financial statement disclosure has continued to change to meet State Legislative Service Office and United States Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA) concerns over disclosure adequacy. In the absence of generally accepted accounting principles for nonprimary government units, DEQ has chosen a limited, core financial statement disclosure approach.

4. Update guidance checklists in the CWSRF Handbook to incorporate recent capitalization grant changes.
5. Implement use of a *cradle-to-grave* assistance agreement checklist.
6. Incorporate population and unemployment trends into this year's Fundable List, to serve as a tiebreaker in case of Disadvantaged communities receiving the same Priority List rating and being in competition for the last, and remaining principal forgiveness allocation. This set of requirements is from the Water Resource Recovery and Development Act.
7. Work with software developers and stakeholders to develop and implement a new assistance agreement servicing software application. The software is expected to achieve reporting efficiencies, better serve DEQ project managers in their day-to-day administration of assistance agreement projects, allow State Office staff to better manage the CWSRF fund with long-term forecasting and reduce duplicate data entry. The software is being purchased with an equal mix of DWSRF and CWSRF assistance fees.
8. Commit \$3,000,000 of early repayment monies, received from the city of Soda Springs for loan WW0801, in a timely manner to new projects.

IV. Information on the Activities to be Supported

A. Allocation of Funds/Assistance Terms

The primary type of assistance to be provided by the CWSRF is expected to be low-interest assistance agreements for up to 100% of project costs. The rates are established to help offset the effects of inflation and to encourage communities to complete their projects in a timely manner. The effective rate of interest will vary from a ceiling of 2.75% and a floor of 1.5%, for 20-year assistance agreements awarded directly by DEQ (DEQ Policy Memorandum 14-01). If an assistance recipient prefers to repay their obligation over a 30-year period, the effective interest rate would be adjusted to a ceiling of 3.00% and a floor of 1.75%. All assistance agreements will need to be paid back over a period not to exceed 30 years. The average design life of the project must equal or exceed the repayment period. Principal and interest repayments must begin no later than 1 year after the initiation of operation.

To qualify for the interest rate floor, the system needs to be considered disadvantaged. CWSRF-specific disadvantaged assistance agreements will be directed to those communities that are ready to proceed and meet disadvantaged community criteria established in IDAPA 58.01.12.021. To automatically be considered for principal forgiveness, the system's annual user rates will need to exceed 2.00% of the community's median household income. To be considered for principal forgiveness, if user rates fall between 1.5% and 2.00% of median household income, the system will additionally need to show the following:

- the most recent census reports a decline in population for the community during the recent five year reporting period:

<http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t>

- unemployment exceeds the statewide average as posted on the Idaho Department of Labor's website, as of March 1, 2016:

<http://labor.idaho.gov/dnn/Default.aspx?alias=labor.idaho.gov/dnn/idl>

In some instances, which will be determined on a case-by-case basis, interest rates can be lowered below the floor. For example, if rates exceed 2.00% of the median household income then loan terms - including interest rate reduction, repayment term extension to 30 years, and principal forgiveness - can be amended to bring the user rates to 2.00% of the median household income. Additionally, the interest rate floor can be lowered for both twenty-year assistance and thirty-year assistance agreements, if the loan applicants sponsor a nonpoint source project.

Some 30-year disadvantaged assistance agreements could be available with effective interest rate lower than 1.75%. This determination will be made on a case-by-case basis. CWSRF-specific disadvantaged assistance agreements will be directed to those communities that are ready to proceed and that meet disadvantaged community criteria established in IDAPA 58.01.12.021. Principal and interest repayments must begin no later than 1 year after the initiation of operation date.

To the extent that entities on the Fundable List qualify for principal forgiveness, they will share equally, on an estimated final loan amount pro-rata basis, in the monies that are available for principal forgiveness. DEQ will continue to target its subsidy resources to disadvantaged communities. The FFY 2016 CWSRF capitalization grant requires that DEQ shall provide additional subsidy between the maximum amount of \$1,987,500 and a minimum amount of \$0 (i.e. principal forgiveness is allowed up to 30% of the capitalization grant amount but is not required). DEQ will provide principal forgiveness equal to 25% of the capitalization grant or \$1,656,250. Principal forgiveness is capped at the amount necessary to keep user rates at 1.50% of median household income. To the extent that growth is funded with subsidized loans or extended term financing, it will only be for reasonable, average growth.

Should entities that are slated for principal forgiveness on the Fundable List opt out of the SRF loan or extended term financing process, or if the final costs are less than the initial estimates, their remaining subsidies shall be set aside in a pool. When the federal capitalization grant is ready to be closed out (that is associated with the principal forgiveness allocated for SFY 2017), the pool balance will be allocated to those disadvantaged communities that meet both of the following requirements:

- ❖ Entered into loans with DEQ during the course of the year; and,
- ❖ Will pay user rates that exceed either 1.50% or 2.00% of the community's median household income (as discussed above), after taking into account the initial allocation of principal forgiveness.

B. Administrative Costs of the Clean Water State Revolving Fund

DEQ plans to reserve \$400,000 of the regular capitalization grant for administrative expenses plus the amount of any fees collected for such purpose.

C. Assistance Agreement Eligible Activities

CWSRF assistance agreements will provide for planning, design, and construction of secondary and advanced secondary wastewater treatment units, interceptors and appurtenances for infiltration/inflow correction, collector sewers and appurtenances, new interceptor sewers and appurtenances, combined sewer overflow correction, stormwater management programs, and recycled water distribution. CWSRF assistance will be provided to local communities, counties, sewer districts, and nonprofit sewer associations for the construction of publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities. Assistance agreements may also be provided to sponsors of NPS projects to implement water pollution control projects. Such projects must be consistent with the State Water Quality Management Plan and demonstrate a nexus or benefit to a municipality. Additionally, funding will be provided for GPR activities to meet the Federal requirement for fiscal year 2017 of 10%.

D. Sponsorship Agreements

Some of the traditional CWSRF assistance agreements may be leveraged to provide NPS project funding. At the time the IUP was written there were NPS projects actively seeking CWSRF project sponsorship. It is likely that sponsorship projects will be entered into, and these projects will be detailed in the SFY 2017 Annual Report. The effective interest rate charged on wastewater treatment/collection facility assistance agreements may be adjusted to accommodate NPS projects that have a nexus with the CWSRF assistance recipient community; however, even with a nexus, the NPS projects will have no direct impact on the sponsor's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The NPS projects will be administered jointly by the Clean Water Act, Section 319 grant staff within DEQ and the CWSRF staff. The NPS project will have the same administrative conditions as any Section 319 grant; however, CWSRF cost eligibility criteria will apply. Additionally, sponsorship projects will be strongly encouraged to complete their projects within the same timeframe as their point source counterparts. Since NPS sponsorship projects are not using point source solutions (i.e., Clean Water Act, Section 212), they will not need environmental reviews. See DEQ's website for details (right-hand side of page under "DEQ Resources" and "Important Information for FY2017 Loan Applicants": <http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water-quality/grants-loans/wastewater-system-construction-loans/>

When a sponsorship agreement is signed, the signatories will be the point source assistance agreement recipient, the DEQ Director and the NPS project manager. The amount of the point source assistance agreement will increase, but the interest rate will be reduced so that the point source assistance agreement recipient's rates will not be impacted by the NPS project.

Should any NPS project help to meet a municipality's NPDES permit requirements, the NPS project will be treated as if it were an integral part of the point source project, with the reporting requirements that go along with a point source project.

Unless the NPS project uses point source solutions (i.e. Clean Water Act, Section 212) it will not need environmental reviews. DEQ will also not apply Federal cross-cutters to the NPS sponsorship projects. NPS projects, in order to be selected, will have a completed, technically correct 319 grant application (and are therefore in compliance with 40 CFR 35.3115 et seq.), be located in the same (6 digit HUC) basin as their sponsor, and have their sponsor's support in the NPS effort.

V. Assurances and Specific Proposals

A. Environmental Reviews—Clean Water Act, Section 602(a) and Cross-Cutter Compliance, 40 CFR 35.3145

DEQ certifies that it will conduct environmental reviews of each Clean Water Act Section 212 project receiving assistance from the CWSRF. DEQ will follow its EPA-approved State Environmental Review Process (SERP) for conducting environmental reviews.

These procedures are outlined in the “Rules for Administration of Water Pollution Control Loans” (IDAPA 58.01.12.042). More detailed procedures are included in the *Clean Water State Revolving Fund Loan Handbook* (Chapter 5, Forms B and C). The Chapter 5 checklists may be found at www.deq.idaho.gov/media/651369-ww-loan-handbook.pdf.

DEQ agrees to comply with and to require recipients of assistance agreements from the CWSRF to comply with applicable federal cross-cutting requirements. DEQ will notify EPA when consultation or coordination by EPA is necessary to resolve issues regarding these requirements.

B. Binding Commitments—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(3)

DEQ will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each quarterly payment within 1 year of receipt of that payment. Binding commitment dates are listed in Attachment I of this IUP.

C. Expeditious and Timely Expenditures—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(4)

DEQ will expend all funds in the CWSRF in a timely and expeditious manner.

D. First-Use Enforceable Requirements—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(5)

DEQ certifies that all major and minor wastewater treatment facilities that the state has previously identified as part of the National Municipal Policy (NMP) meet one of the following:

- ❖ Are in compliance
- ❖ Are on an enforceable schedule
- ❖ Have an enforcement action filed
- ❖ Have a funding commitment during or prior to the first year covered by an IUP.

E. Compliance with Title II Requirements—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(6)

DEQ has met the specific statutory requirements for publicly owned wastewater treatment projects constructed in whole or in part before SFY 1995 with funds directly made available by federal capitalization grants. Therefore, DEQ no longer plans to use its federal capitalization grant and state match on *equivalency projects*. These projects meet the 16 specific statutory requirements provided by the Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(6) as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1987, Public Law 100-4 and are eligible under 201(b); 201(g)(1) and (2); 201(N); and 211.

F. State Matching Funds—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(2)

DEQ agrees to deposit into the CWSRF from state monies an amount equal to 20% of the capitalization grant on or before the date on which the state receives each grant payment from EPA. These funds will be transferred from Idaho's Water Pollution Control Account. DEQ draws administrative funding from 100% federal funds.

G. State Laws and Procedures—Clean Water Act, Section 602(b)(7)

DEQ agrees to expend all grant payments in accordance with state laws and procedures.

H. Consistency with Planning

DEQ agrees that it will not provide assistance to any wastewater treatment project unless that project is consistent with plans developed under the Clean Water Act, Section 205(j), 208, 303(e), 319, or 320.

I. Reporting

DEQ agrees to provide data or information to EPA as may be required for national reports, public inquiries, or Congressional inquiries. Capitalization grant-funded recipients will be monitored for Single Audit Act compliance and annual reports will be sent to assistance agreement recipients telling them the amount of federal monies they received during the past year.

DEQ will comply with reporting requirements of the EPA Order on Environmental Benefits and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act. Project information will be updated at least quarterly in the Clean Water Benefits Reporting System. An environmental benefits summary report for all funded projects will also be completed. A hard copy of the summary report will be provided to the EPA with the Annual Report.

J. Qualifications Based Standards for Selection of Professional Service Providers

DEQ is in compliance with the Clean Water Act's (Section 602(b)(14)) Federal procurement standard by its adherence to Idaho Code 68-2320.

K. Transfers Between State Revolving Funds

For SFY 2017, DEQ plans to transfer \$10 million from the DWSRF to the CWSRF. In the future, should additional transfers become needed, DEQ reserves the right to transfer surplus funds originating back to FFY 1997 capitalization grant awards. See Attachment VIII for listings of capitalization grants and related narrative. Per 40 CFR 35.3550 a state

may reserve the authority to transfer funds in future years. Funds may be transferred on a net basis, provided that the 33% transfer allowance associated with the DWSRF program capitalization grants received is not exceeded. Only repayments will be used for transfers.

VI. Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds

The following principles and procedures will be the basis for the administration, funding, allocation, and distribution of the CWSRF monies. The principles and procedures are designed to provide maximum flexibility for assistance and ensure long-term viability of the revolving program.

A. Program Administration

The \$400,000 allowed in the capitalization grants provided by EPA will be set aside to be used for program administration. Program administration costs will be met by capitalization grant allocations and by fee revenues (to the extent that the annual capitalization grant is insufficient to meet our needs).

B. CWSRF Priority List

Letters of interest were sent to all cities, counties, and water and sewer districts in the state. Completed letters of interest and priority list rating forms were sent to project engineers in DEQ regional offices to complete a rating of projects in each region. The result of the rating and ranking was the preliminary Priority List that is presented during the public review and comment period. Separate letters of interest were sent to potential NPS applicants. Projects are rated using the following criteria:

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Public health emergency certified by the DEQ Board or a Health District Board | up to 150 Points |
| 2. Regulatory Compliance Status | up to 100 Points |
| 3. Watershed Restoration | up to 100 Points |
| 4. Watershed Protection | up to 100 Points |
| 5. Preventing Impacts to Uses | up to 100 Points |
| 6. Sustainability | up to 50 Points |
| 7. Affordability | up to 10 Points |

Attachment III contains the guidance document that fully explains how DEQ staff applied the above criteria when rating individual projects.

C. Fundable Projects

The highest rated projects on the adopted Priority List that are ready to proceed are selected for funding and listed in Attachment I. DEQ staff starts at the top of the Priority List and continues to select projects ready to proceed until all of the available funds are used. In cases where a lower ranked project is selected, it is because higher ranked projects have not indicated a readiness to proceed, do not meet the eligibility requirements for available funds, or additional funding has become available. A project that is *ready to proceed* will have shown evidence of legal authority to enter into debt,

have a completed facility plan, be able to meet GPR and Additional Subsidization requirements and have expressed a willingness to proceed with the CWSRF process.

In some cases, the project amount on the Fundable List may be less than the project amount on the Priority List. The Priority List amount is the estimate of the total project cost, while the costs on the Fundable List are the amount that project applicants expect to borrow from the CWSRF. In each case, the difference will be provided from some other source, such as cash on hand or a grant from the Community Development Block Grant program administered by the Idaho Department of Commerce.

D. Disbursements

The estimated timing and amount of disbursements for the projects on the new IUP are added to the latest cash disbursement request projections for prior year funded and projected projects. The projections are normally provided to EPA in July each year. The projections are based upon estimated disbursement schedules submitted by assistance agreement recipients and projected timing of assistance agreements, adjusted for corrections by regional project engineers and state office staff. These disbursements are tracked on an ongoing basis to project needed cash from all capitalization grants and state match. All funds will be expended in an expeditious and timely manner.

E. Federal Payments

The Idaho CWSRF has cumulative binding commitments in excess of the amount required for the current capitalization grant. This allows for the entire Federal payment to be made in a timely manner. Attachment IV provides more detail.

F. State Match

Idaho's match for all capitalization grants is provided from funds that are drawn from the state Water Pollution Control Account. The Water Pollution Control Account derives its funding from a set amount of \$4.8 million from the state sales tax and is perpetually appropriated to DEQ under Idaho Code Title 63 Chapter 36.

VII. Additional Information Requirements

A. Public Review and Comment

See Attachment V.

B. Bypass Procedures

A project may be bypassed if any of the following occur:

- ❖ It does not support meeting GPR goals (if so designated on the Fundable List)
- ❖ It is not ready to proceed
- ❖ It voluntarily opts out of the SRF process
- ❖ The project does not meet eligibility requirements
- ❖ It does not allow for timely use of funds.

In place of the bypassed project, the next highest ranking project(s) that is ready to proceed will be used (IDAPA 58.01.12.020.04.c). DEQ will use Priority List ranking as much as possible when preparing the IUP. However, the lack of adequate funding; changes in project scope; failure to pass a bond election; or other unforeseen circumstances may require that a highly ranked project on the IUP be bypassed. If a project is bypassed, DEQ will offer assistance funds to the highest ranked, ready-to-proceed project from the most current approved Priority List. To date, in SFY 2016, the city of Kellogg has been bypassed (the city obtained funding through USDA - Rural Development). Should any projects be bypassed by June 30, 2016 (end of SFY 2016), those projects and reasons for being bypassed will be included in the SFY 2016 Annual Report.

ATTACHMENT I. Fundable List

**State of Idaho Clean Water State Revolving Fund
for the Period of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017
LIST OF FUNDABLE CLEAN WATER PROJECTS**

Rank	Project	Rating Points	Regional Office	Est. Project Cost	Est. Assistance Commitment Date and Est. Funding Terms	Ancillary Requirements	Est. Cost of Green Infrastructure	Needs Category (for EPA use)	NPDES or Land Application Permit #	Project Description
2	Star Sewer and Water District	220	Boise	\$1,000,000	December 2016 20 years at 2.75%	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions, Cross-cutting Requirements, American Iron and Steel, FFATA Reporting, Single Audit Act and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Compliance Reporting	\$0	II	ID-002359-01	Construct new lagoon/s and establish infrastructure for land application; initial year of funding to meet final planning and preliminary design costs
3	City of Ashton	195	Idaho Falls	\$5,000,000	May 2017 30 years at 1.75% with \$524,137 of principal forgiveness	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions, and American Iron & Steel	\$4,000,000	II, III-A	ID-002371-00 & M-047-003	Add new lagoon and land apply, also repair or replace collection lines
4	City of Blackfoot	192	Pocatello	\$8,000,000	May 2017 20 years at 2.75%	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions, Cross-cutting Requirements, American Iron and Steel, FFATA Reporting, Single Audit Act and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Compliance Reporting	\$1,650,000	I, II, III-B	ID-002004-04	Add pretreatment and aeration upgrades and replace main interceptor
5	City of Hagerman	145	Twin Falls	\$3,000,000	July 2016 30 years at 1.75% with \$314,482 of principal forgiveness	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions, and American Iron & Steel	\$0	II	ID-002594-01	Install new lift stations and add back-up power
6	Country Haven	143	Pocatello	\$2,609,000	May 2017 30 years at 1.75% with \$273,495 of principal forgiveness	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions, and American Iron & Steel	\$0	None	None	Add new total containment lagoons
7	City of Gooding	135	Twin Falls	\$5,000,000	May 2017 30 years at 1.75% with \$20,000 of principal forgiveness	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions, Cross-cutting Requirements, American Iron and Steel, FFATA Reporting, Single Audit Act and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Compliance Reporting	\$100,000	III-A, III-B	None	General rehabilitation of aging plant components
8	City of Basalt	132	Pocatello	\$1,000,000	May 2017 30 years at 1.75% with \$104,827 of principal forgiveness	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions and American Iron & Steel	\$0	III-A	None	Repair or replace collection lines
9	Sandpiper Shores Wastewater System	127	Coeur d'Alene	\$1,010,000	May 2017 30 years at 1.75% with \$104,827 of principal forgiveness	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions and American Iron & Steel	\$100,000	III-A, III-B	M-072-03	Repair and enlarge lagoon, repair or replace collection lines and repair or replace pumps

ATTACHMENT I. (CONT.)

10	City of Firth	117	Pocatello	\$3,000,000	May 2017 30 years at 1.75% with \$314,482 of principal forgiveness	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions and American Iron & Steel	\$0	II, III-A, III-B	ID-002495-08	Repair or replace collection lines, repair lift station, and construct new lagoons
11	City of Malad	103	Pocatello	\$5,000,000	May 2017 20 years at 1.50%	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions and American Iron & Steel	\$0	I, II	LA-000159-02	Add new lagoon and land apply, also add mechanical treatment
12	City of Bloomington	83	Pocatello	\$210,000	September 2016 20 years at 2.75%	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions and American Iron & Steel	\$0	III-A	None	Repair or replace collection lines
13	City of Kimberly	53	Twin Falls	\$5,000,000	May 2017 30 years at 1.75%	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions and American Iron & Steel	\$0	I, III-A, III-B	None	Replace segments of the collection system
14	City of Ammon	43	IFRO	\$1,600,000	May 2017 20 years at 2.75%	Davis Bacon Wage Provisions and American Iron & Steel	\$0	III-B	None	Rehabilitate lift stations and replace collection lines
<u>Assistance Total ==> \$38,429,000</u>					<u>Total Principal Forgiveness => \$1,656,250</u>	<u>GPR Total ==> \$5,850,000</u>				

ATTACHMENT II. Priority List

State of Idaho Clean Water State Revolving Fund for the Period of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017 COMPREHENSIVE LISTING OF CLEAN WATER PROJECTS

Rank	Project	Rating Points	Reg. Office	Est. Project Cost	Needs Category (for EPA use)	NPDES, Reuse or Land Application Permit #	Est. Cost of Green Infrastructure	Project Description
1	Elk City Water and Sewer Association	220	Lewiston	\$3,750,000	II, III-A, III-B	ID-002201-02	\$1,875,000	Repair or replace collection lines, replace lift station, rehabilitate lagoons, implement tertiary treatment process, purchase land
2	Star Sewer and Water District	220	Boise	\$24,000,000	II	ID-002359-01	\$24,000,000	Construct new lagoon/s and establish infrastructure for land application
3	City of Ashton	195	Idaho Falls	\$5,000,000	II, III-A	ID-002371-00 & M-047-003	\$4,000,000	Add new lagoon and land apply, also repair or replace collection lines
4	City of Blackfoot	192	Pocatello	\$8,000,000	I, II, III-B	ID-002004-04	\$1,650,000	Add pretreatment and aeration upgrades and replace main interceptor
5	City of Hagerman	145	Twin Falls	\$10,002,000	II	ID-002594-01	\$0	Install new lift stations and add back-up power
6	Country Haven	143	Pocatello	\$2,609,000		None	\$0	Add new total containment lagoons
7	City of Gooding	135	Twin Falls	\$5,000,000	III-A, III-B	None	\$100,000	General rehabilitation of aging plant components
8	City of Basalt	132	Pocatello	\$1,000,000	III-A	None	\$0	Repair or replace collection lines
9	Sandpiper Shores Wastewater System	127	Coeur d'Alene	\$1,010,000	III-A, III-B	M-072-03	\$100,000	Repair and enlarge lagoon, repair or replace collection lines and repair or replace pumps
10	City of Firth	117	Pocatello	\$3,000,000	II, III-A, III-B	ID-002495-08	\$0	Repair or replace collection lines, repair lift station, and construct new lagoons
11	City of Malad	103	Pocatello	\$5,000,000	I, II	LA-000159-02	\$0	Add new lagoon and land apply, also add mechanical treatment
12	City of Bloomington	83	Pocatello	\$210,000	III-A	None	\$0	Repair or replace collection lines
13	City of Kimberly	53	Twin Falls	\$22,233,000	I, III-A, III-B	None	\$0	Replace segments of the collection system
14	City of Ammon	43	Idaho Falls	\$1,600,000	III-B	None	\$0	Rehabilitate lift stations and replace collection lines
	Total =====>			\$92,414,000				

**ATTACHMENT III. Guidance for Integrated Priority System: Water Quality
Project Ranking**



Integrated Priority System
Water Quality Project Ranking
Idaho DEQ Water Pollution Control Loan Program

Score:
0

Project Name/City blank CWSRF loan	Total Estimated Project Cost	Estimated DEQ Amount
---------------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------

Description of Project/Problem(s)

State Office Reviewer	Regional Staff Reviewer	Review Date	LOI TRIM Number
-----------------------	-------------------------	-------------	-----------------

QA Comments

A. Public Health Emergency or Public Health Hazard*

IDAPA 58.01.12.020.02.a. Public health emergency or hazard certified by the Idaho Board of Environmental Quality, the Department, a District Health Department or by a District Board of Health – one hundred and fifty (150) points. (5-8-09)

	Possible	Awarded
<input type="checkbox"/> 1. There is no officially declared or designated public health emergency or hazard, or the proposed project will not resolve an officially declared or designated public health emergency or hazard. Enter 0 and proceed to Part B.	0	0
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. The proposed project will resolve an officially declared or designated public health hazard or emergency that is a documented health threat as certified by a Health District Board or the DEQ Board. Enter 150 at right and as the Section II Part A Subtotal.	150	0

A. Public Health Emergency or Public Health Hazard* SubTotal: 0

B. Regulatory Compliance Issues

IDAPA 58.01.12.020.02.b. Regulatory compliance issues (e.g., noncompliance and resulting legal actions relating to infrastructure deficiencies at a wastewater facility) -- up to one hundred (100) points.

For purposes of qualifying for points in this subsection (Regulatory Compliance Issues), the cause of noncompliance and resulting legal actions should be restricted to infrastructure deficiencies at a permitted point source facility. The purpose of this subsection is not to assign points for noncompliance resulting purely from system mismanagement or O&M deficiencies.

A point source wastewater facility is required to comply with state and federal rules and the terms of its permits (such as federal NPDES discharge permit or state subsurface discharge permit. For purposes of LOI evaluation, a facility will not receive points for noncompliance unless documented by agency correspondence, such as: warning letter, compliance agreement schedule, consent order, notice of violation, administrative order, permit compliance schedule or assessment of monetary penalties.

	Possible	Awarded
<input type="checkbox"/> Is the system in compliance with its existing NPDES and/or reuse (WLAP) permit? If NO, check one of the following: Low Level Noncompliance (0 pts) -- includes minor or undocumented permit violations. (No points)	0	0
<input type="checkbox"/> Moderate Level Noncompliance (50 pts) -- Includes a 1st State or EPA Warning Letter, notice of violation, or equivalent <i>that will be resolved by the proposed project</i>	50	0
<input type="checkbox"/> High Level Noncompliance (75 pts) -- includes 2nd State or EPA Warning Letter, compliance agreement schedule, consent order, permit compliance schedule, or equivalent <i>that will be resolved by the proposed project</i>	75	0
<input type="checkbox"/> Noncompliance Consequences Imposed (100 pts) -- Penalties assessed (e.g., monetary fines or incarceration) that are <u>directly related to the proposed project</u> and <i>noncompliance will be resolved by the completion of the proposed project</i> . Enter 100 and proceed to Part C.	100	0
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Is the system in compliance with its current permit, but has received a draft permit with which the system would be initially out of compliance, and <i>compliance will be achieved by the proposed project</i> ? Requires documentation , such as draft permit.	75	0

B. Regulatory Compliance IssuesSubTotal:

C. Watershed Restoration — All Projects

IDAPA 58.01.12.020.01.02.c. Watershed restoration (e.g., implementation of best management practices or initiation of construction at wastewater collection and treatment facilities as part of an approved total maximum daily load plan, implementation of nonpoint source management actions in protection of a threatened water, or is part of a special water quality effort) -- up to one hundred (100) points.

The project implements best management practices or initiates construction of wastewater collection and treatment facilities as part of an approved TMDL, protects threatened waters identified through Idaho's Nonpoint Source Management Program Plan, or is part of a special water quality effort (e.g., Governor's Bull Trout Conservation Plan).

	Possible	Awarded
3. Surface Water		
<input type="checkbox"/> a. Existing facility discharges to a 303(d) water body.	10	0
Name of 303(d) water body: http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water-quality/surface-water/monitoring-assessment/integrated-report.aspx		
<input type="checkbox"/> b. The proposed project is for a point source and is expected to reduce a pollutant of concern in the 303(d) listed water body.	10	0
List pollutants reduced:		
<input type="checkbox"/> c. The TMDL has been approved by EPA.	7	0
Name of TMDL document & approval date http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water-quality/surface-water/tmdls/table-of-sbas-tmdls.aspx		
<input type="checkbox"/> d. The proposed project is for a point source that is exceeding its waste load allocation listed in the approved TMDL.	8	0
List pollutants exceeding WLA:		
<input type="checkbox"/> e. The proposed project is for a non-point source and is expected to reduce a pollutant of concern in the 303(d) listed water body.	8	0
List pollutants reduced:		
<input type="checkbox"/> f. The proposed project will reduce two or more pollutants of concern for the 303(d)-listed water body.	5	0
List pollutants reduced:		

4. Ground Water

- a. The proposed project is expected to reduce pollutant concentrations in a sole-source aquifer (Eastern Snake River Plain, Spokane-Rathdrum or Lewiston Basin). 20 0

Identify SSA:

yosemite.epa.gov/r10/water.nsf/Sole+Source+Aquifers/ssamaps

- b. The proposed project is expected to reduce pollutant concentrations in a designated Nitrate Priority Area 5 0

Identify NPA:

www.deq.idaho.gov/water-quality/ground-water/nitrate.aspx

- c. The proposed project is expected to reduce pollutant concentrations in a designated Critical Groundwater Area 2 0

Identify CGWA:

www.idwr.idaho.gov/WaterInformation/GroundWaterManagement/

5. Threatened and Endangered Species

- a. The proposed project is expected to improve habitat for a threatened or endangered species 5 0

List species w/ improved habitat:

ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/reports/species-listed-by-state-report?state=ID&status=listed

6. Watershed Load Reduction

- Points are awarded according to the expected effectiveness of the project and the transferability of the demonstrated technologies to other parts of the State of Idaho. The proposed project will either restore designated or existing beneficial uses, reduce the severity of non-point source impacts, or will promote statewide non-point pollution reduction or remediation. More points will be awarded to projects that will have the greater overall reduction in pollutant load to the entire watershed (described by an 8-digit HUC). **If estimated reduction is greater than 25%, supporting calculation must be provided.** 0 0

a. The proposed project will not result in a load reduction or will not reduce impacts to surface water or ground water.

- b. The proposed project will result in an estimated 25% or less reduction in overall pollutant loading to the watershed. 15 0

List HUC name & number:

cfpub.epa.gov/surf/locate/

c. The proposed project will result in an estimated 26-75% reduction in overall pollutant loading to the watershed. 30 0

List HUC name & number and ATTACH SUPPORTING CALCS

cfpub.epa.gov/surf/locate/

d. The proposed project will result in an estimated >75% reduction in overall pollutant loading to the watershed. 50 0

List HUC name & number and ATTACH SUPPORTING CALCS

cfpub.epa.gov/surf/locate/

C. Watershed Restoration — All ProjectsSubTotal: 0

D. Watershed Protection from Impacts (NPS projects)

NOTE: For point source projects that plan to sponsor nonpoint source efforts as part of their loan

IDAPA 58.01.12.020.01.02.d. Watershed protection from impacts (e.g., improvement of beneficial use(s) in a given water body, evidence of community support, or recognition of the special status of the affected water body) -- up to one hundred (100) points.

	Possible	Awarded
1. Impacts to Beneficial Uses		
<input type="checkbox"/> To which of the five beneficial uses designated by the "Water Quality Standards" (IDAPA 58.01.02) §100 or Ground Water Quality Rule (IDAPA 58.01.11) will the proposed project reduce current or prevent future impacts?	8	0
a. Proposed project will prevent or reduce impacts to Aquatic Life (applies to undesignated surface waters WQS§101.01)		
adminrules.idaho.gov/rules/current/58/index.html		
<input type="checkbox"/> b. Proposed project will prevent or reduce impacts to Recreation (applies to undesignated surface waters WQS§101.01)	8	0
<input type="checkbox"/> c. Proposed project will prevent or reduce impacts to Water Supply (applies to all surface waters WQS§100.03 and all ground water IDAPA GWQR§007.03)	8	0
<input type="checkbox"/> d. Proposed project will prevent or reduce impacts to Wildlife Habitats (applies to all surface waters WQS§100.04)	8	0

<input type="checkbox"/> e. Proposed project will prevent or reduce impacts to Aesthetics (applies to all surface waters WQS§100.05)	8	0
--	---	---

2. Nexus/Benefit to municipality

<input type="checkbox"/> Commitment of other municipalities, governing agencies or other eligible entities (may include local landowners or citizen groups working through eligible entities) to <i>implement</i> or <i>fund</i> a portion of the proposed project:	0	0
---	---	---

a. No support letters

<input type="checkbox"/> b. One or two support letters	20	0
--	----	---

<input type="checkbox"/> c. Three or more support letters	40	0
---	----	---

3. State and National Priorities

<input type="checkbox"/> a. The project is a State Priority -- it helps meet the state's NPS management program objectives or reduces impacts to either:	10	0
--	----	---

- State park or state recreation area
- Designated Nitrate Priority Area
- Area of high groundwater vulnerability (based on Source Water Assessment)

Park/Rec.Area, NPA or PWS:

<input type="checkbox"/> b. The project is a National Priority -- NPS or statewide initiative project is expected to positively impact either:	10	0
--	----	---

- Threatened or endangered species
- Wilderness area
- Wild and Scenic River
- EPA-designated Sole Source Aquifer

T/E spp, Wilderness, WSR, SSA:

D. Watershed Protection from Impacts (NPS projects)SubTotal: 0

F. Sustainable ("Green") Infrastructure Efforts

IDAPA 58.01.12.020.02.f. Sustainability efforts (e.g., prospective efforts at energy conservation, water conservation, extending the life of capital assets, green building practices, and other environmentally innovative approaches to infrastructure repair, replacement and improvement) --up to fifty (50) points.

	Possible	Awarded
<input type="checkbox"/> 2. Applicant is willing to sponsor NPS project	10	0

2. Management-based efforts

- | | | |
|--|----|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Management-based efforts. Include documentation. | 5 | 0 |
| a. Project will implement a capital budget that is funded and supported by a capital improvement plan | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b. Project will implement usage-based full-cost pricing for wastewater. This means that (a) utility rates must be based on the flow and strength of wastewater treated, and (b) utility rates must generate revenue sufficient to cover both operating and capital costs. | 5 | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c. Project will Implement a formal asset management system using a tool such as EPA's Check Up Program for Small Systems [CUPSS]
Indicate which asset management system:
www.epa.gov/cupss | 5 | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d. Project will implement a sustainable infrastructure benchmarking program <i>described in supporting documentation</i>
www.epa.gov/region9/waterinfrastructure/benchmark.html | 10 | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e. System will <i>become</i> an EPA Green Power Partner
www.epa.gov/greenpower | 5 | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f. System will consolidate with another wastewater system
Identify consolidating system: | 10 | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> g. System will implement <i>green building management</i> , based on Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) operation and maintenance (O&M) criteria
Identify LEED professional:
www.usgbc.org/LEED/-rating | 10 | 0 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> h. Other (contact grant and loan program) | 10 | 0 |

3. Technology-based efforts

- | | | |
|---|----|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Technology-based efforts. Include documentation:
Categorically accepted (no justification required):
a. Project will implement green roof(s) | 10 | 0 |
|---|----|---|

<input type="checkbox"/>	b. Project will implement on-site energy generation, such as methane clean combustion, fuel cells, solar or wind	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	c. Project will implement wastewater reuse when other alternatives have been considered in the facility planning process Identify planning doc:	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	d. Project will implement decentralized system when other alternatives have been considered in the facility planning process Identify planning doc:	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	e. Project will implement Class A reclaimed water distribution system ("purple pipe")	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	f. Project will construct or renovate building(s) to meet LEED <i>design and construction</i> criteria Identify your LEED-certified professional: www.usgbc.org/LEED/-rating	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	g. Nonpoint Source project will utilize direct seeding www.directseed.org/about	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	h. Nonpoint Source project will implement hydromodification for riparian buffers	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	Draft business case required, showing energy savings and payback on capital and O&M costs that do not exceed asset lifetime: i. Project will use heat pumps that reclaim heat from treated effluent	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	j. Project will use efficient replacements for vacuum dewatering systems	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	k. Project will install supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA)	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	Environmentally innovative (contact G&L program): l. Project will implement phosphorus recovery for beneficial use	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	m. Project will significantly reduce or eliminate the use of chemicals in treatment	10	0
<input type="checkbox"/>	n. Project will significantly reduce or eliminate the volume or toxicity of treatment residuals	10	0

o. Project will implement ground water recharge by land application where there are other cost-effective alternatives 10 0

p. Other (contact grant and loan program) 10 0

F. Sustainable ("Green") Infrastructure EffortsSubTotal: 0

G. Affordability

Annual MHI Annual MHI Year Monthly User Charge Deflated Annual MHI

MHI Type Survey Info

Affordable

G. AffordabilitySubTotal: 0

Total Score: 0

ATTACHMENT IV. EPA Payment Schedule

SFY 2017 <u>Quarter Ending</u>	<u>Payments</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Source</u>
09/30/2016	\$6,264,000	\$6,264,000	FFY16 Cap Grant
12/31/2016	\$261,000	\$6,525,000	FFY16 Cap Grant

Payments are defined as increases to the amount of funds available from the Automated Clearinghouse (ACH). The EPA payment schedule assumes that the FFY 2016 award will occur after July 1, 2016. Capitalization grant money will be exclusively disbursed to projects at a ratio of 83.33% Federal to 16.67% State Match until the full amount of state match required by the capitalization grant has been disbursed. The remaining grant draws will be at 100% Federal.

ATTACHMENT V. Public Notification and Involvement Strategy

FOR STATE FISCAL YEAR 2017 CLEAN WATER AND DRINKING WATER PRIORITY LISTS

The public will be involved in the SFY 2017 Priority List development at several points in the process. Involvement for the drinking water and clean water lists was solicited directly from the systems through a survey of system interest that was mailed out by DEQ early in the Priority List process. Information on the completed letter of interest forms was used by state and regional office staff in preparing draft lists. A copy of the letter of interest form will be included as attachments in the final IUP. The DEQ SRF staff has found that combining information obtained directly from eligible entities with that provided by DEQ engineering staff results in the most accurate listing of infrastructure needs.

Notification that all four SFY 2017 Priority Lists are available for public review will be given in Idaho's six major (regional) newspapers for approximately 4 weeks. Notices will be published three times in each of the newspapers. Copies of proofs of publication will be included as attachments to the final IUP.

Notification of availability of the lists was also placed on DEQ's website from March 22 to April 19, 2016.

Approval packages related to the four lists will be sent to the Board of Environmental Quality prior to their meeting on May 11 and 12, 2016. Copies of the issue analyses for the CWSRF lists and the Board agenda will be included as attachments upon Board action. DEQ staff will make presentations at the Board meeting and answer questions about the lists. The Board will be asked to approve all lists on May 11 and 12, 2016.

ATTACHMENT VI. Description of Disadvantaged Assistance

The Department shall award assistance to applicants deemed disadvantaged using the following criteria, to the extent required by the most recent federal capitalization grant (under the recently passed Water Resource Recovery and Development Act legislation only municipal and non-profit type entities (e.g. cities, counties, districts) are eligible for principal forgiveness. To qualify for a disadvantaged assistance, an applicant must have an annual cost of wastewater service for residential customers that exceeds 1.5% of the median household income. The annual cost includes all operating, maintenance, replacement, and debt service costs, both for the existing system and upgrades being financed with state revolving funds. If the applicant's service area is not within the boundaries of a municipality, the applicant may use the census data for the county in which it is located, or may use a DEQ-approved income survey (which details the community's median household income).

First the assistance agreement interest rate will be reduced from the rate established by the Director for standard assistance agreements to a rate that results in an annual charge equal to 1.5% of median household income. The interest rate reduction may result in an assistance agreement interest rate of as low as 1.50% (in some instances the rate may be set at 0.00%).

Second, if a 1.50% interest rate and 20-year repayment assistance agreement terms and conditions result in the annual user charge exceeding 1.5% of median household income, then the length of the assistance agreement repayment will be extended in increments of 1 year up to a maximum of 30 years until the annual user charges equals 1.5% of median household income. Thirty-year assistance agreements will be charged a 0.25% higher interest rate than otherwise comparable 20-year assistance agreements.

Third, if at 1.75% interest and a 30-year repayment, the annual user charge still exceeds 1.5% of median household income, the principal which causes the user charge to exceed 1.5% may be reduced. The amount of principal reduction for all projects will be capped at \$1,656,250. The principal reduction will be based on the pool of qualifying disadvantaged communities (projects) receiving an equal share in the amount available for principal reduction. Principal forgiveness is for disadvantaged communities and is to be spread out amongst those communities and may not be provided to lower a community status to below 1.5% of the median household income.

- At the end of the state fiscal year any unallocated principal forgiveness (identified in the Fundable List – Attachment I), will be allocated to those disadvantaged entities that signed loans with DEQ during the state fiscal year and still qualify as disadvantaged. If a project's budget increases after the Fundable List is established, any year-end reallocation of unused principal forgiveness will take into account the project's new cost.
- If a disadvantaged community accepts principal forgiveness and their project is completed under budget, their remaining principal forgiveness will be allocated to those disadvantaged entities that signed loans with DEQ during the state fiscal year and still qualify as disadvantaged.
- If a project that has a claim to disadvantaged assistance (on the Fundable List) opts out of the loan process and the funding thereby goes to a lower rated project, that lower rated

project (if the community is disadvantaged) can lay claim to the disadvantaged assistance (however, the ratio of principal forgiveness to dollars loaned will remain consistent).

If a disadvantaged community's user rates exceed 2.00% of median household income there will be no more qualification requirements for that community in order to receive principal forgiveness. If the user rates fall in between 1.50% - 2.00% of median household income see requirements in Section IV.A (page 8).

ATTACHMENT VII. Decision-Making Strategy for Fundable Versus Non-fundable Portions of the Priority List

FOR STATE FISCAL YEAR 2017
CLEAN WATER AND DRINKING WATER PRIORITY LISTS

To develop the Fundable List, several factors were taken into account. These included, but were not limited to:

- the project's timeliness in completing the facility plan/engineering report,
- completing the Environmental Information Document,
- having the legal authority to incur debt; and,
- overall readiness to proceed.

The draft terms to be offered are given on the Fundable List; however, at the time of the offer these may be adjusted. The Idaho Department of Environmental Quality's Policy Memorandum 14-01 gives the Department's Director the ability to set effective interest rates for the CWSRF program. As noted in the memorandum, "there could be some 'disadvantaged loans' where the effective interest rate will be below 1.50%..." This determination is made on a case-by-case basis.

ATTACHMENT VIII. Listing of Capitalization Grants—Reference for Potential Transfers Between Funds

Drinking Water SRF

Federal Fiscal Year	Capitalization Grant Amount
1997	\$14,157,800
1998	7,121,300
1999	7,463,800
2000	7,757,000
2001	7,789,100
2002	8,052,500
2003	8,004,100
2004	8,303,100
2005	8,285,500
2006	8,229,300
2007	8,229,000
2008	8,146,000
ARRA	19,500,000
2009	8,146,000
2010	13,573,000
2011	9,418,000
2012	8,975,000
2013	8,421,000
2014	8,845,000
2015	8,845,000
2016	8,312,000
Total	\$195,573,500

Note: The Drinking Water SRF fund is used to measure how much in transfers may be made, between the two funds, because the Drinking Water fund has received the lesser of capitalization grants and is therefore the limiting factor.

Only one transfer may be made each year. For SFY 2017 \$10 million will be transferred from the Drinking Water SRF to the Clean Water SRF. Per 40 CFR 35.3550 a state may reserve the authority to transfer funds in future years. Funds may be transferred on a net basis, provided that the 33% transfer allowance associated with the DWSRF program capitalization grants received is not exceeded. Only repayments will be used for transfers. The SFY 2017 \$10 million transfer will be the third transfer for a total of \$30 million.

The recent past has highlighted an imbalance in demand between the two funds, with the CWSRF having a much higher demand than the DWSRF:

- Demand in SFY 2012 for DWSRF \$68m vs. CWSRF \$117m
- Demand in SFY 2013 for DWSRF \$27m vs. CWSRF \$149m
- Demand in SFY 2014 for DWSRF \$37m vs. CWSRF \$162m
- Demand in SFY 2015 for DWSRF \$45m vs. CWSRF \$69m
- Demand in SFY 2016 for DWSRF \$48m vs. CWSRF \$69m
- Demand in SFY 2017 for DWSRF \$23.6m vs. CWSRF \$92m

The two types of projects (DW vs. CW) have the same funding sources to apply to and so there is no offsetting relief for the CW entities to seek additional funds. Typically, CW projects are more expensive than DW projects (this year the ratio is \$6.6m: \$2.4m per project). The current expectation is that the transferred funds into the CWSRF will reside there for some period of years; however, the transfer may be reversed in the future if the relative needs changes.

The total amount of authority being reserved is 33% of \$195,573,500 or \$64,539,255. With the actual transfers of \$10,000,000 in both SFYs 2015 and 2016, and the proposed transfer of an additional \$10,000,000 in SFY 2017 there will remain \$34,539,255 of reserve that could be transferred from the Drinking Water SRF to the Clean Water SRF, until the reserve is increased by new Federal grants. The transfer will be taken from the fund corpus and will not affect set-asides. The potential for long-term diminution of DWSRF fund resources will be known as future, relative needs become known. DEQ will continue to monitor and conduct financial assessment/modeling to determine potential long-term impacts to the DWSRF fund.