




**Washington State  
Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund**

---

**Final Intended Use Plan  
FY 2001**

**August 31, 2000  
Publication No. 00-10-057**

 *Printed on Recycled Paper*

For additional copies of this document, contact:

Department of Ecology  
Publications Distribution Center  
P.O. Box 47600  
Olympia, WA 98504-7600

*The Department of Ecology is an equal opportunity agency and does not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, disability, age, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, disabled veteran's status, Vietnam Era veteran's status, or sexual orientation.*

*If you have special accommodation needs or require this document in an alternative format, please call Donna Lynch at (360) 407-7529. The TDD number is (306) 407-6006. E-mail can be sent to [dlyn461@ecy.wa.gov](mailto:dlyn461@ecy.wa.gov).*

## **Table of Contents**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>I. Funds Available for Projects</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Goals</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. Uses and Terms of Financial Assistance</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>IV. Assurances and Certifications</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>V. Compliance With Title II Requirements</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VI. Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>VII. Distribution of Funds</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>VIII. Allocation of Funds Among Projects</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>IX. Descriptions of Projects Proposed for Funding</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>X. Proposed SRF Payment Schedule</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>XI. Public Review and Comment</b>	<b>9</b>

## **List of Attachments**

- 1. List of Projects Considered and Proposed for Funding**
- 2. Project Summaries**
- 3. Proposed Schedule of Payments From EPA to the State of Washington**
- 4. Estimated Schedule of Binding Commitments**



## I. Funds Available for Projects

This Final Intended Use Plan (IUP) describes how the state of Washington plans to use the moneys available to the Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund (SRF) during state fiscal year 2001 (FY 2001). Total funds available for this year's IUP will be \$68,245,512. This total is based on receiving the federal fiscal year (FFY) 1999 and 2000 Title VI capitalization grants from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the required 20 percent state match to the federal grants from Washington State's 1999 - 2001 biennial appropriations, principal and interest repayments from previous funding cycle loan recipients, and deobligated funds from previous funding cycle loan recipients. Four percent of the federal Title VI capitalization grants are designated for the Department of Ecology's (Ecology) eligible administration costs. The remaining \$66,375,156 will be available as loans for water pollution control projects.

The following table illustrates SRF funds available for FY 2001.

Federal Fiscal Year 1999 Title VI Grant	\$23,419,143
State Match (20%) to Federal Fiscal Year 1999 Federal Title VI Grant	\$4,683,829
Federal Fiscal Year 2000 Title VI Grant	\$23,339,745
State Match (20%) to Federal Fiscal Year 2000 Federal Title VI Grant	\$4,667,949
Principal and Interest Repayments from Previous Funding Cycle Recipients	\$7,496,718
Deobligated Funds from Previous Funding Cycle Recipients	<u>\$4,638,128</u>
Total SRF Funds	\$68,245,512
Less (4%) of Federal Fiscal Year 1999 Title VI Grant for SRF Administration	(\$936,766)
Less (4%) of Federal Fiscal Year 2000 Title VI Grant for SRF Administration	<u>(\$933,590)</u>
Advertised SRF Funds Available for Projects	\$66,375,156

Total demand for SRF funds this funding cycle exceeds the amount available. The SRF program received 94 funding requests for over \$228 million. The state of Washington is proposing to offer approximately \$66.3 million in low-interest loans to 29 local governments for 35 high-priority water quality projects.

## II. Goals

Ecology has both long-and short-term goals that guide the administration of the SRF program. These goals are:

### A. Short-Term Goals

1. Work with Ecology's Water Quality Financial Advisory Council to revise and update the SRF rule (Chapter 173-98 WAC "Uses and Limitations of the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund") that includes but is not limited to:

- Priority rating and evaluation system
  - Financial hardship criteria
  - Program eligibility
  - Use of local priorities in the rating system
2. Continue the process to integrate, within federal and state laws, the SRF with the Centennial Clean Water Fund (Centennial), and the federal Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Program (Section 319) to maximize limited state and federal grant and loan funds to improve and protect the water quality of the state of Washington.
  3. To continue to develop and implement the SRF Program so that financial assistance for water pollution control needs is available in perpetuity to communities statewide.
  4. To provide low-interest loans to local governments for 19 water pollution control facility projects.
  5. To provide low-interest loans to local governments for 9 nonpoint source pollution control projects
  6. To provide low-interest loans to local governments for two comprehensive estuary conservation and management projects.
  7. To provide five low-interest loans to local governments to refinance debt obligations for municipally-owned water pollution control facilities.
  8. To administer the SRF program and provide technical and financial assistance to loan recipients and potential applicants.
  9. To continue working with EPA in implementing the SRF and to develop the FY 2002 IUP and capitalization grant agreement.

## **B. Long-Term Goals**

1. To integrate, to the greatest extent possible, the SRF with the Centennial Clean Water Fund (Centennial), and the federal Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Program (Section 319) to maximize limited state and federal grant and loan funds to improve and protect the water quality of the state of Washington.
2. To provide financial assistance to communities to achieve compliance with state and federal water pollution control requirements, implement nonpoint source

pollution control programs, and develop and implement estuary conservation and management programs.

3. To protect public health and water quality, and to achieve overall improvement and protection of the environment.
4. To encourage local governments to develop and implement projects which will prevent water quality degradation, including wetland protection projects.
5. To assist communities with financial difficulties in meeting required public health and water quality standards while maintaining the health and perpetuity of the SRF according to federal law and guidance.
6. To provide the type and amount of financial assistance most advantageous to communities, consistent with the long-term health of the fund.
7. To administer the SRF program to ensure that the financial integrity, viability, and revolving nature are maintained.
8. To integrate local watershed planning legislation passed during the 1998 legislature in evaluating and prioritizing water quality project proposals. The local watershed planning approach to water quality management involves:
  - Phase 1 - the establishment of a watershed planning unit that includes representatives of state, county, and tribal governments located in one or more of the 62 water resource inventory areas of Washington State.
  - Phase 2 – development of watershed assessments that address, where applicable, water quantity, instream flows, and habitat.
  - Phase 3 – development of a watershed plan based on recommendations of watershed assessment and begin to implement water quality protection and prevention projects.

### **III. Uses and Terms of Financial Assistance**

#### **A. Uses**

Details of specific uses of SRF moneys are contained in the state regulation (Chapter 173-98 WAC "Uses and Limitations of the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund"), program guidelines (revised December, 1999), and the Operating Agreement (dated September 11, 1989.) In summary, SRF moneys can be used to support projects in three funding categories: water pollution control facilities category, nonpoint source pollution control category, and comprehensive estuary conservation and management category.

SRF moneys can be issued for the following purposes:

1. To make loans, at or below market interest rates, to applicants in order to finance the planning, design, implementation, development and construction of facilities and activities.
2. To buy or refinance the debt obligations, for construction of water pollution control facilities, incurred after March 7, 1985.
3. To guarantee or purchase insurance for local obligations to improve credit rating.
4. To provide security or a source of revenue for State SRF issued bonds.
5. To finance reasonable costs incurred by Ecology in administering the SRF program.

## **B. Terms**

The terms of SRF financial assistance are established and included in Chapter 6 of the program guidelines. However, after the guidelines were published Ecology evaluated the current SRF loan portfolio to determine if loan interest rates and terms could be reduced from the current level and still maintain the fund in perpetuity in accordance with federal law. The analysis showed that the fund was very robust and could remain so with much lower rates for FY 2001. In addition, the lower rates will have a positive impact on the water quality of the state, the fiscal health of small towns struggling to fund projects, and lower interest rates helped market the program. For example, during the SRF FY 2000 funding cycle approximately \$25 million was requested for projects by local governments and this funding cycle over \$228 million was requested.

For FY 2001, the following terms are offered to applicants:

<b>Repayment Period</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>
Up to five years:	0.5 percent
15 to 20 years:	1.5 Percent

In order to formally offer these lower interest rates, Ecology made minor changes to the rule governing the SRF program (Chapter 173-98 WAC). These changes created a simplified schedule for determining each year's interest rates and also allow the agency to further lower those rates when analysis shows that lowering the rates will not adversely affect the health of the SRF loan portfolio.

Applicants may be considered for financial hardship terms if their proposed projects would cause user charges to exceed 1.5 percent of the median household income. If Ecology determines that financial hardship exists, it may structure SRF agreements with terms to help keep user charges



below the financial hardship level, if possible. Hardship terms may include lengthening the repayment period to a maximum of 20 years and/or adjusting the interest rate to as low as 0 percent.

Ecology proposes to provide SRF financial hardship assistance to the following local governments:

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>
FP01069	<b>Skamokawa Water &amp; Sewer District</b> Skamokawa Community Sewer Project	0%	20	\$819,400
FP01028	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> WW Treatment Plant Expansion	0%	20	\$2,370,000
FP01030	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> 1999 Comprehensive Sewer Plan (Refinancing)	0%	20	\$95,610
FP01027	<b>Centralia, City of</b> Centralia WW Treatment Plant	0%	20	\$26,998,953
FP01057	<b>Skagit County</b> Additional Subsurface Effluent Disposal Field	0%	20	\$40,000
FP01037	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens County</b> Waitts Lake Sewer System Loan Financing	0%	20	\$1,855,742
FP01081	<b>Pe Ell, Town of</b> Sewer System Improvements	0%	20	\$114,397
FP01080	<b>Pe Ell, Town of</b> WW Treatment Facility Design	0%	20	\$275,000

#### **IV. Assurances and Certifications**

The necessary assurances and certifications required by Title VI of the Clean Water Act, as amended by the Water Quality Act of 1987, and the EPA have been included in the Operating Agreement between the state of Washington and EPA.

Section IV.C of the Operating Agreement states "The Department of Ecology shall transfer into the SRF a state match consisting of either cash or a letter of credit, which equals 20 percent of each federal grant payment, on or before the date when the state of Washington receives the federal grant payment." To further clarify this, Washington State will provide EPA with a "Letter of Commitment" which shows that the required state match has been committed. Washington's matching share will be deposited into the SRF account when an actual draw is made for the federal share of SRF moneys.

## V. Compliance With Title II Requirements

The following projects will be required to comply with Title II Requirements:

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>
FP01069	<b>Skamokawa Water &amp; Sewer District</b> Skamokawa Community Sewer Project
FP01176	<b>Goldendale, City of</b> Goldendale WW Facility Improvements
FP01028	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> WW Treatment Plant Expansion
FP01030	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> 1999 Comprehensive Sewer Plan (Refinancing)
FP01116	<b>Lynden, City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Upgrade/Expansion
FP01100	<b>Cheney, City of</b> WW Treatment/Reclamation Project (Refinance)
FP01058	<b>Prosser, City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Improvements
FP01027	<b>Centralia, City of</b> Centralia WW Treatment Plant
FP01189	<b>Elma, City of</b> Elma WW Treatment Plant Construction
FP01177	<b>Farmington, Town of</b> Farmington Sewer System Rehabilitation
FP01217	<b>Oroville, City of</b> Oroville WWTF Improvement Project
FP01102	<b>Enumclaw, City of</b> WWTP Improvements - Planning
FP01001	<b>Pomeroy, City of</b> WW Facilities Improvements
FP01057	<b>Skagit County</b> Additional Subsurface Effluent Disposal Field
FP01174	<b>Quincy, City of</b> Water Reclamation Facility Design
FP01037	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens County</b> Waitts Lake Sewer System Loan Financing (Refinance)

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>
FP01193	<b>Tonasket, City of</b> WW Treatment Facility Reconstruction
FP01188	<b>Woodland, City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Improvements
FP01081	<b>Pe Ell, Town of</b> Sewer System Improvements
FP01080	<b>Pe Ell, Town of</b> WW Treatment Facility Design
FP01039	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens County</b> Valley Sewer System Loan Financing (Refinance)
FP01180	<b>Connell, City of</b> WW System Improvements (Construction)
FP01117	<b>Long Beach, City of</b> WWTP Upgrade Design Phase 2 & 3
FP01153	<b>Bremerton, City of</b> Anderson Cove CSO Reduction Facilities (Refinance)

## **VI. Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds**

The following approach was used to develop the proposed distribution of \$66,375,156 to local governments from the SRF:

### **A. Applications for Funding**

Information about the SRF program, workshops and the application period for SRF assistance were distributed to local governments and interested persons statewide. During January 2000 four public workshops were held statewide in Tacoma, Everett, Spokane, and Yakima. At the workshops, information on the SRF program and the application process was presented.

Three additional workshops were held during February 2000, in Spokane, Bellevue, and Chelan to provide applicants technical assistance and to answer one-on-one, specific project and application questions.

Applications for funding were accepted during the application period, from January 3, 2000, through February 29, 2000. Based on information provided in the applications, projects were evaluated and prioritized. A detailed description of the application and project evaluation process is found in Chapter 2 of the Water Quality Financial Assistance Programs Guidelines. A summary of the process is described below.

## **B. Project Evaluation**

Ecology used a new evaluation process during the FY 2000 funding cycle. This process was refined for the SRF FY 2001 funding cycle. The process incorporates changes from previous funding cycles, suggested by Ecology's external group the Water Quality Financial Advisory Council (Council). The Council comprised of representatives from many stakeholder groups which includes loan and grant recipients. The Council reviewed the previous evaluation and ranking process and identified areas where changes were needed. Ecology used these recommendations to develop the evaluation system used for the FY 2001 funding cycle.

In their most important guidance, the Council recommended to continue using evaluation criteria with assigned point values. Ecology had used points in the past but had not used them for several funding cycles. In the revised system, evaluators assigned points for answers provided by applicants to questions in five categories. An additional category at the beginning of the questionnaire requests the applicant discuss the overall water quality problem and how the problem will be solved or addressed by the project. No points are assigned, but the answer serves as frame of reference for applicants and evaluators. The categories are:

- Overall water quality problem and how the problem will be solved or addressed by the project.
- Specific public health and water quality impairments caused by the problem and pollution prevention aspects. (Category total: 340 points)
- How the project addresses the water quality problem/ measures of success. (Category total: 340 points)
- Local initiatives taken to make the proposed project a success. (Category total: 120 points)
- State of Washington or Federal mandates that this proposed project addresses. (Category total: 100 points)
- Local Priority-Setting Process. (Category total: 100 points)

Ecology evaluated the proposals, assigned points, and used the points to develop a statewide priority list in numerical order. At their discretion, other state agency staff involved in water pollution control and public health provided funding recommendations to Ecology evaluators.

## **VII. Distribution of Funds**

Chapter 173-98 WAC, *Uses and Limitations of the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund*, updated in 1999, requires Ecology to distribute money according to the following category allocations: Eighty percent of the fund is to be used for water pollution control facilities, 10 percent of the fund is reserved for nonpoint source pollution control, and 10 percent is allocated

for comprehensive estuary conservation and management. Unless the demand for funds is limited, not more than 50 percent of each funding category allocation can be awarded to any one applicant. In addition, if requests for SRF assistance in one category do not result in the offer of all available funds, any remaining funds are transferred to other categories. Loans may be provided for up to 100 percent of the total eligible project cost.

Loan offers that will be identified on the Final IUP will be effective for up to one year from the date of the offer or until the issuance of the next year's Final IUP. All SRF loan offers that do not result in a signed SRF loan agreement within the effective offer period are automatically terminated. Funds reserved for SRF loan agreements that are not signed within the effective period may be carried over and made available for the next year's funding cycle or offered to applicants who did not receive all funds requested or to other applicants on the Final IUP who did not receive funding offers.

### **VIII. Allocation of Funds Among Projects**

This Final IUP contains a list of all local governments with projects considered for funding and those that are proposed to receive assistance during this funding cycle. This list was established based on the total amount of funds available for each category and after the eligible applicants projects have been evaluated and prioritized. The list of local governments considered for funding and those with projects offered funding is included as Attachment 1.

### **IX. Descriptions of Projects Proposed for Funding**

All projects considered and offered funding are described in Attachment 2.

### **X. Proposed SRF Payment Schedule**

The proposed schedule of payments from EPA to the state of Washington are shown on Attachment 3.

### **XI. Public Review and Comment**

#### **A. Funding Cycle**

The SRF Draft IUP for FY 2001 was available for public review and comment from June 30, 2000, to August 2, 2000. Ecology requested comments on both the contents of the Draft IUP and the list of projects proposed for funding. Comments received during the public review and comment period were carefully assessed. Modifications were made to the list of projects proposed for funding as a result of comments received on the Draft IUP, applicants declining proposed loan offers, and the addition of \$4,638,128 deobligated from previous funding cycle recipients.

Two public meetings were held statewide to discuss the preparation of the Draft IUP. The public meeting were held in Tacoma and Spokane. Ecology staff discussed the Draft IUP along with the process used to prepare it. The Centennial, SRF, and Section 319 Draft Offer and Applicant List for FY 2001 were also discussed at the public meetings.

## **B. Local Prioritization Process**

The local prioritization process used during the FY 2001 application cycle was the second year of a pilot process. It was similar to the first year, with certain changes and simplifications. One major change was to use only Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) as local prioritization areas, eliminating the confusing choice of WRIAs or counties. Another major change was to allow local watershed planning groups organized under the Watershed Planning Act to act as the local prioritization group. The third major change was a simpler and shorter list of required signatures. More detailed information about the local prioritization process may be found in the *Water Quality Program Financial Assistance for Fiscal Year 2001: Guidelines (Volumes One and two)*, available on request from Ecology.

## **C. Evaluation Process**

The FY 2001 Project Priority System and Evaluation Process was developed to provide a tool to rank all projects submitted on a statewide basis. This ranking included both point source and nonpoint source facilities and activities project proposals (both remediation and prevention based proposals). The system placed all project proposals on an initially equal footing based on water quality and public health criteria.

At least two Ecology staff with water quality proficiency conducted a complete review of each application:

- An Ecology Regional Office evaluator (from the same geographic area as the applicant), and
- A “functional evaluator” with expertise in the specific water quality field of the proposal.

All evaluations were based on information provided in the proposal. However, as one would expect, different evaluators offered unique perspectives. Regional office evaluators may have some level of direct knowledge regarding the water quality problem(s) to be addressed and may be further aware of projects proposed in their region. Functional evaluators often needed to rely solely on information provided in the proposal and their expertise in the subject area. Functional evaluators had a larger statewide view of project proposals. Many scores were consistent, but these different perspectives were reflected in some scores. Furthermore, information provided in proposals varied greatly, as did how applicants addressed “application tips.” Evaluators were often challenged by relatively “creative” answers.

Among the question areas where the difference in evaluator perspective was particularly apparent were II-D (Impaired aquatic species, particularly endangered or threatened), and II-I and II-J (Water Quality Standards violated and in jeopardy of being violated). These questions were designed to allow the evaluators to use their professional judgement of the information provided in the proposal to assign priority points. Likewise, throughout Question Area III (Solution and measures of success), point spreads of 20 between evaluators was not uncommon (and were acceptable) because of the aforementioned perspectives.

When independent evaluations resulted in scores that varied substantially, a third staff member conducted a re-evaluation, based on the information provided in the proposal, of only those question areas where there was a substantial spread of points. In most cases, the third evaluator used point assignments from one of the evaluations.

Ecology staff treated all applicants equally and all applications were processed consistently. Ecology staff explained the approach to the evaluation and prioritization process at the public meetings held during the public comment period on the Final IUP.

Ecology would like to thank all of the applicants that participated in the SRF's twelfth funding cycle. Because the SRF is a revolving loan program, it will provide a long-term source for financing publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities, nonpoint source pollution control projects and comprehensive estuary conservation and management programs. We look forward to working with those local governments identified in the fundable portion of the Final IUP and with others in future funding cycles.

#### **D. Responses to Comments**

**Department of Ecology Initiated Comments:** Ecology is aware of several changes which are needed to correct minor errors in the Draft IUP. Specific changes are noted below.

- Ecology notes that adjustments in the loan amounts offered to three projects can be made due to proposed funding offer declines and existing loan deobligations and one ineligible project that was proposed for funding on the Draft IUP. The total loan amount offered to the City of Centralia (FP01027) is \$26,998,953, the total loan amount offered to the City of Bremerton (FP01153) is \$959,573, and the total loan amount offered to the Rosa-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control (FP01051) is \$10,000,000.
- Because of issues associated with project prerequisite approvals, three projects shown on the Draft IUP, Kitsap County (FP01142), Kitsap County (FP01145), and Thurston County (FP01185), are not eligible for funding consideration and are shown in the not-ranked portion of the list.
- The Thurston County (FP01185) Cooper Point Wastewater Facilities Construction Project was determined to be ineligible for funding due to compliance issues associated with the Growth Management Act. The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board has ruled that this project does not comply with Thurston County's Comprehensive Plan. Thurston County has indicated that it will appeal the Hearings Board decision and the project will remain ineligible for funding consideration until resolution of this issue occurs.
- Kitsap County Public Works (FP01142) - During the public review and comment period a citizens group appealed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the project and consequently the County is going to prepare a Supplemental EIS. Because the environmental is incomplete the Ecology rescinded the approval of the facilities plan.
- Kitsap County Public Works (FP01145) - This project was deemed approvable by Ecology prior to the close of the application period. However, during the public review and comment period a citizens group appealed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the project and consequently the County is going to prepare a Supplemental EIS. Because the

EIS was appealed and the County is now going to prepare a supplemental EIS the Ecology did not approve the facilities plan.

- Four projects received 10 additional local prioritization points due to the determination that a higher priority project in WRIA 13 was ineligible. Local prioritization points were adjusted for the City of Lacey (FP01205; FP01208, FP01209; FP01210) projects.
- Two projects received local prioritization points due to a reconsideration of local prioritization points for WRIA 6. Local prioritization points were awarded for the Town of Coupeville (FP01028; FP01030)
- Two projects not proposed for funding on the Draft IUP are offered SRF loan funding on the Final IUP. SRF loan funds became available when a previously proposed project was determined to be ineligible for funding, two applicants declined proposed loans, and the addition of deobligated funds from previous funding cycle recipients. The two projects are FP01030 (Coupeville 1999 Comprehensive Sewer Plan, Refinancing) and FP01094 (Clinton Water Dist. Comprehensive Sewer Plan).

## **E. Comments From External Parties**

**Bremerton, City of, Lynn Horton, Mayor, project numbers FP01150, FP01151, FP01153, and FP01154, comment:** The City wrote two letters to Ecology. One of the letters acknowledged acceptance of the proposed loan funding for the Anderson Cove CSO Reduction Facilities Project. However, the loan amount was less than the full request and the City is hopeful that the full amount can be provided. Concern was also raised regarding the City's ability to comply with the combined sewer overflow reduction schedule identified in a current Ecology consent decree considering a reduced level of funding for the proposed project. The second letter from the City asks that Ecology reconsider the assignment of priority points for the four submitted projects in light of what was believed to be an inappropriate point spread in several question areas.

**Response:** The City has expressed its willingness to accept a reduced level of funding for the Anderson Cove CSO Project (FP01153). Staff are pleased to note that the applicant will be offered partial funding of \$959,573 for the project. Additional SRF funding may be available and may be offered to the applicant in the future based on its present rank among proposals statewide.

Ecology staff carefully reviewed the proposals and point assignments. Staff will be working to limit scoring variability, wherever possible, during subsequent funding cycles. However, staff found that information provided by the applicant for the two projects where detailed comments were provided, that scores were within the range of acceptable variation, given the different perspectives of evaluators (discussed in the Public Review and Comment section item C); or information in the proposal supported the lower of the two evaluation scores. Among the question areas where the difference in evaluator perspective was particularly apparent were II-D (Impaired aquatic species, principally endangered or threatened), and II-I and J (Water Quality Standards violated and in jeopardy of being violated). These questions were designed to allow the evaluators to use their professional judgement of the information provided in the proposal to assign priority points.



Regarding Question area II-K the Mayor agreed with evaluator's comment that Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) actions are not identified yet. Where such was the case, priority points should not have been assigned by either evaluator. However, in fairness to all applicants, staff decided not to lower any applicant's score based on the reconsideration of scores requested.

Regarding proposed special financial assistance consideration for enforcement related projects, throughout the life of these funding programs; staff have, and appropriately continue, to separate enforcement actions from the provision of financial assistance. The priority system addresses this issue by assigning equal weight to remediation and prevention project proposals. The applicant received full credit for addressing the Consent Decree in all four projects in question.

Although no specific information was provided regarding two of the proposals (FP01150 and FP001154), staff reviewed the respective scores and found the priority points assigned were very consistent.

No priority point adjustments were made for any of these four proposals reconsidered.

**Cooper Point Alliance, Jolene Unsoeld, project number FP01185, comment:** The District wrote to ask Ecology not to fund the Cooper Point Wastewater Facilities Construction Project because of compliance issues with the Growth Management Act.

**Response:** Ecology has determined that Cooper Point Wastewater Facilities Construction Project is ineligible until issues associated with the Growth Management Act have been resolved and the project is ready to proceed.

**Coupeville, City of, Larry Harmon, Public Works Director, project number FP01028, comment:** The City wrote to Ecology to request a reconsideration the priority points in light of actions between the Town and Ecology staff, as it relates to the City's longer term financial assistance strategy. The City is also requesting a reconsideration of the points awarded relative to the 1999 Comprehensive Plan, and question area II-C (Primary Contact Recreation), and Question area IV-B (Pollution Prevention), and the Local Priority-Setting Process.

**Response:** Ecology staff carefully reviewed the proposals and point assignments. Staff believe it is not surprising to see a comprehensive planning project proposal receive more points than one of the projects called for in the plan, as most comprehensive planning projects address numerous water quality problems and set the stage for several implementation projects to be developed.

As Question II-C parenthetically explains, primary contact recreation is limited to swimming and water skiing. Regarding point assignments for pollution prevention, points were assigned the way other proposals were evaluated by both evaluators.

Local prioritization points for this project, along with others in WRIA 6, were re-evaluated (see response for Island County Public Works). With the addition of local prioritization points for this project, Ecology staff are pleased to note that the applicant will be offered full funding.

**Enumclaw, City of, Chris Searcy, Public Works Director, project number FP01102, comment:** The City wrote to ask Ecology for prior authorization associated with the proposed funding for the Enumclaw WWTP Improvements – Planning Project

**Response:** Ecology is unwilling to approve the request for prior authorization in the absence of a final funding offer list. Because funding amount adjustments become necessary, projects are not assured of funding until a final funding list is prepared. Applicants proposed for SRF loans can proceed with incurring loan eligible costs for their projects as the SRF program does allow for refinancing of eligible project costs provided all federal requirements are met.

**Granger, Town of, David Leach, Mayor, project number FP01026, comment:** The City wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the awarding of priority points in light of what was believed to be an inappropriate point spread in several question areas. The letter acknowledges that Question II-K (Implementation of a TMDL) was answered incorrectly, but requested that points be assigned for this question.

**Response:** Ecology staff carefully reviewed the proposal and point assignments and agree that the answer to Question IV-D (financing project follow up needs) was adequate for the assignment of points. An additional 20 points were assigned to the final score and the project was re-ranked accordingly. Reconsideration of the other questions shows that point assignments were within the range of acceptable variation given the different perspectives of evaluators (discussed in the Public Review and Comment section item C). Before the start of the evaluation process, the evaluators reached a consensus that they would not add substantive information to that provided by applicants. One of the evaluators initially did so on this project, but as the project was re-evaluated (because of the initial point spread), points were assigned by a third evaluator based on the information provided in the proposal.

**Island County Public Works, Larry Kwarsick, Director, project number FP01028 and FP01030, comment:** The County wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the denial of local prioritization points for the projects submitted for funding in WRIA 6.

**Response:** For local prioritization points to be awarded in WRIA 6, seven signatures (Island County, City of Oak Harbor, Whidbey Island Conservation District, Holmes Harbor Sewer District, Swinomish Tribe, Tulalip Tribe, and the Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe) were required on a Statement of Agreed Priority. Appendix Q of the FY 2001 Funding Program Guidelines references that if required signatures are missing, points will not be awarded, unless “written proof of reasonable and prudent efforts to notify that group” is provided to Ecology.

Signatures from the Swinomish Tribe and the Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribes were not included in the Statement of Agreed Priority. However, a signature from the Skagit System Cooperative was provided. Upon further investigation, the Cooperative represents the Swinomish Tribe and the WRIA 6 prioritization committee understood the Cooperative represented the Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe, as well. Upon learning that it did not, a signature was provided by the Point No Point Treaty Council, on behalf of the Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe, to support the priorities established for WRIA 6. Ecology concurs with this explanation and local prioritization points will be awarded to the projects in WRIA 6.

**King County, Wastewater Treatment Division, Don Theiler, Manager, project numbers FP01113, FP01155, and FP01157, comment:** The County wrote Ecology to request a funding reconsideration for the Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control; Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control – Design (Refinance); Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control – Construction projects.

Reconsideration was requested in light of what was believed to be an inappropriate point spread in several question areas, particularly Questions II-D and IV-A (Impaired Aquatic Species Habitat and Project Prerequisites, respectively) for all three project proposals. The applicant also asked that general guidance be provided for establishing a local prioritization process.

**Response:** Based on comments from the applicant and many others, staff will be providing in regulation (through the rulemaking process) and guidelines, general guidance for local prioritization processes. Guidance will not be overly prescriptive, as it must be a local process.

Regarding what the applicant believes is an inappropriate disparity of scores, Ecology staff carefully reviewed the proposals and point assignments. Staff will be working to limit scoring variability, wherever possible, during subsequent funding cycles. However, staff found that information provided by the applicant for these three projects, that scores were within the range of acceptable variation, given the different perspectives of evaluators (discussed in the Public Review and Comment section item C); or information in the proposal supported considerably less than the requested maximum score available. Among the question areas where the difference in evaluator perspective was particularly apparent was Question II.D (Impaired aquatic species, principally endangered or threatened). Furthermore, all evaluators agreed to use general criteria, e.g. spawning and rearing habitat, area of impairment directly linked to the problem to be addressed, etc, in the assignment of these points, and applying these criteria to the information in your proposal, it appears that evaluators were relatively liberal in assigning points to your proposal. However, in fairness to all applicants, staff decided not to lower any applicant's score based on the reconsideration of scores requested.

Regarding Question IV-A (Project Prerequisites), the applicant unnecessarily provided information in all boxes (see "Special Note" at the beginning of the question). In so doing, we believe from the evaluation comments, that the applicant may have substantially confused evaluators, especially because the approval status of the various project contracts was very unclear from the information provided. Any future submittals should clarify this information, and special care should be taken to use all instructions and application tips.

No priority point adjustments were made.

**Lynden, City of, Daryl Brennick, Mayor, project number FP01116, comment:** The City wrote to Ecology to express its appreciation for proposed funding for the Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade/Expansion Project.

**Response:** Ecology is pleased to be able to provide funding for this project.

**Mason Conservation District, Michael Madson, District Manager, project numbers FP01190, FP01211, FP01212, and FP01213, comment:** The District wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the denial of local prioritization points for the projects submitted for funding in WRIA 14.

**Response:** For local prioritization points to be awarded in WRIA 14, five signatures (Mason County, City of Shelton, Mason Conservation District, Squaxin Tribe and Skokomish Tribe) were required on a Statement of Agreed Priority. Appendix Q of the FY 2001 Funding Program Guidelines references that if required signatures are missing, points will not be awarded, unless “written proof of reasonable and prudent efforts to notify that group” is provided to Ecology. Although copies of correspondence were provided reflecting efforts to include the Squaxin Tribe, no documentation on efforts to include the Skokomish Tribe was provided. The District’s request for reconsideration acknowledged the missing signature yet no provision was made for its absence. Failure to include a required entity without explanation does not constitute reasonable or prudent efforts and therefore no local prioritization points will be awarded to the projects in WRIA 14.

**Mason County Commissioners, project numbers FP01190, FP01211, FP01212, FP01213, comment:** The County Commissioners wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the denial of local prioritization points for the projects submitted for funding in WRIA 14.

**Response:** For local prioritization points to be awarded in WRIA 14, five signatures (Mason County, City of Shelton, Mason Conservation District, Squaxin Tribe and Skokomish Tribe) were required on a Statement of Agreed Priority. Appendix Q of the FY 2001 Funding Program Guidelines references that if required signatures are missing, points will not be awarded, unless “written proof of reasonable and prudent efforts to notify that group” is provided to Ecology. Although copies of correspondence were provided reflecting efforts to include the Squaxin Tribe, no documentation on efforts to include the Skokomish Tribe was provided. The District’s request for reconsideration acknowledged the missing signature yet no provision was made for its absence. Failure to include a required entity without explanation does not constitute reasonable or prudent efforts and therefore no local prioritization points will be awarded to the projects in WRIA 14.

**Pullman, City of, Mark Workman, Public Works Director, project number FP01012, comment:** The City wrote to Ecology to decline the SRF loan amount proposed for the Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan Project. The City is unable to proceed with the project without grant assistance.

**Response:** Ecology accepts the City’s decision and hopes that an application for this project will be re-submitted during the next funding cycle for this project.

**Redmond, City of, Jon Spangler, Public Works Department, project number FP01169, comment:** The City wrote Ecology to indicate its willingness to accept SRF loan funding for Idylwood Park Stream Restoration Project.

**Response:** Ecology is pleased that the City will be able to proceed with this project using SRF loan funding.

**Rosa-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control, James Trull, Treasurer, project number FP01051, comment:** The Board wrote to Ecology to express its willingness to proceed with the On-Farm Irrigation Conversions Project based upon a reduced level of funding as shown on the draft offer list.

**Response:** Ecology is pleased that this project will be completed with the SRF funding proposed. Due to eligibility issues, declined funding related with other projects, and the inclusion of funds deobligated from previous funding cycle recipients, Ecology is able to offer the Board the full amount requested on the funding application. An SRF loan in the amount of \$10,000,000 is identified on the Final IUP for this project.

**Spokane County Conservation District, Rich Baden, District Administrator, project number FP01085, comment:** The District wrote to Ecology indicating its willingness to accept SRF loan funding for the Hangman Creek Clean Water Program Project.

**Response:** Ecology is pleased that the City will be able to proceed with this project using SRF loan funding.

**Squaxin Island Tribe, James Peters, Natural Resources Director, project number FP01190, comment:** The Tribe wrote Ecology in support of the North Bay/Case Inlet Water Reclamation Facilities Project as the #1 priority for WRIA 14

**Response:** Ecology is pleased to hear from the Tribe regarding the importance and merits of this project. Tribal support and project endorsement is highly desired and plays a major role in the local prioritization process. It is unfortunate that the Squaxin Tribe did not sign the original Statement of Agreed Priority which was submitted for WRIA 14. Signatures by both the Squaxin and Skokomish Tribes were needed to support the priorities established for all of the WRIA 14 projects to allow local prioritization points to be assigned. No priority point adjustments were made for any of the project proposals in the WRIA.

**Sultan, City of, Roy Bysegger, City Administrator, project number FP01196, comment:** The City wrote to Ecology to express its willingness to accept SRF loan funding for the Surface Water Quality Management Plan Project.

**Response:** Ecology is pleased to be able to provide SRF funding for this project.



## **Attachment 1**

### **List Of Projects Considered And Offered Funding**





**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01069	2	<b>Skamokawa Water &amp; Sewer District</b> Skamokawa Community Sewer Project	N/A	1/1/01 - 12/31/03 (24 Months)	\$909,700	\$819,400	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	1
FP01051	3	<b>Roza-Sunnyside BJC</b> On-Farm Irrigation Conversions	N/A	11/1/00 - 11/1/02 (24 Months)	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	
FP01176	5	<b>Goldendale City of</b> Goldendale WW Facility Improvements	WA0021121A BOD 45 mg/l TSS 45 mg/l	10/1/00 - 7/1/02 (21 Months)	\$1,711,000	\$1,711,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	2 & 3
FP01116	6	<b>Lynden City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Upgrade/Expansion	WA0022578 BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	8/1/00 - 4/1/02 (20 Months)	\$6,521,932	\$6,521,932	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	4
FP01044	13	<b>Jefferson County</b> Septic Repair Revolving Loan Fund	N/A	7/1/00 - 6/30/02 (24 Months)	\$150,000	\$150,000	Estuary	1.5%	20	
FP01100	14	<b>Cheney City of</b> WW Treatment/Reclamation Project	WA0020842 BOD 15 mg/l TSS 15 mg/l	11/1/92 - 2/1/96 (40 Months)	\$2,529,629	\$2,529,629	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	
FP01058	15	<b>Prosser City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Improvements	WA0020800B BOD 100 mg/l TSS 100 mg/l	1/1/01 - 11/1/01 (10 Months)	\$811,425	\$811,425	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	4
FP01027	17	<b>Centralia City of</b> Centralia WW Treatment Plant	WA0021083B BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	11/1/00 - 12/31/04 (50 Months)	\$28,000,000	\$26,998,953	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	5 & 6
FP01189	19	<b>Elma City of</b> Elma WW Treatment Plant Construction	WA0023132 CBOD 25 mg/l TSS 75 mg/l	10/1/00 - 3/31/02 (17 Months)	\$2,760,880	\$2,760,880	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	4
FP01177	21	<b>Farmington Town of</b> Farmington Sewer System Rehabilitation	ST5534 BOD N/A TSS N/A	12/1/00 - 6/1/02 (18 Months)	\$12,500	\$12,500	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	4

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01217	22	<b>Oroville City of</b> Oroville WWTF Improvement Project	WA0022390 BOD 30mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	4/1/00 - 8/1/00 (4 Months)	\$294,000	\$294,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0.5%	5	
FP01102	25	<b>Enumclaw City of</b> WWTP Improvements - Planning	WA0020575C BOD 30mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	8/1/00 - 3/1/01 (8 Months)	\$116,250	\$116,250	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0.5%	5	4
FP01001	26	<b>Pomeroy City of</b> WW Facilities Improvements	WA0021164 BOD 24.5mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	6/1/00 - 12/31/02 (18 Months)	\$1,194,200	\$1,194,200	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	2 & 4
FP01057	28	<b>Skagit County</b> Additional Subsurface Effluent Disposal Field	WA0030597 BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	7/1/00 - 11/1/01 (14 Months)	\$200,000	\$40,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	5 & 7
FP01174	35	<b>Quincy City of</b> Water Reclamation Facility Design	ST0005278A BOD N/A TSS N/A	1/1/01 - 12/1/03 (12 Months)	\$650,000	\$650,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0.5%	5	
FP01028	37	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> WW Treatment Plant Expansion	WA0029378 BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	1/1/00 – 2/1/02 (26 Months)	\$2,370,000	\$2,370,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	5
FP01037	41	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens Co.</b> Waitts Lake Sewer System Loan Financing	WA0020672B BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	2/1/98 - 2/1/00 (24 Months)	\$1,855,742	\$1,855,742	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	5
FP01030	46	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> 1999 Comprehensive Sewer Plan (Refinancing)	WA0029378 BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	10/1/97 – 11/1/99 (24 Months)	\$95,610	\$95,610	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	5
FP01208	48	<b>Lacey City of</b> Fones Road Regional Stormwater Facility	N/A	3/1/01 - 2/1/02 (12 Months)	\$220,000	\$220,000	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	
FP01193	49	<b>Tonasket City of</b> WW Treatment Facility Reconstruction	ST0009104B BOD 60 mg/l TSS 145 mg/l	7/1/00 - 4/1/01 (6 Months)	\$522,500	\$522,500	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	2 & 4

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01188	53	<b>Woodland City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Improvements	WA0020401A BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	7/1/99 - 12/1/01 (14 Months)	\$1,652,500	\$1,652,500	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	4
FP01081	56	<b>Pe Ell Town of</b> Sewer System Improvements	WA00002192 BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	6/1/00 - 12/1/00 (7 Months)	\$125,000	\$15,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	5 & 7
FP01080	58	<b>Pe Ell Town of</b> WW Treatment Facility Design	WA00002192 BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	7/1/00 - 2/1/01 (8 Months)	\$275,000	\$275,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	0%	20	5
FP01039	63	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens Co.</b> Valley Sewer System Loan Financing	WA0020672B BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	10/1/97 - 12/1/99 (26 Months)	\$279,812	\$279,812	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	2
FP01180	64	<b>Connell City of</b> WW System Improvements (Construction)	ST5342 BOD 19 mg/l TSS N/A	9/1/00 - 1/1/02 (16 Months)	\$1,208,000	\$1,208,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	
FP01117	67	<b>Long Beach City of</b> WWTP Upgrade Design Phase 2 & 3	WA0022489 BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	8/1/00 - 2/1/01 (8 Months)	\$304,000	\$304,000	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	
FP01153	69	<b>Bremerton City of</b> Anderson Cove CSO Reduction Facilities	WA0029289D BOD 30 mg/l TSS 30 mg/l	10/1/98 - 10/1/00 (24 Months)	\$1,600,000	\$959,573	Water Pollution Control Facilities	1.5%	20	2 & 8
FP01079	70	<b>Spokane County</b> Refinancing of OSS Elimination Projects	N/A	N/A	\$28,800,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01150	71	<b>Bremerton City of</b> Private Sewer System Rehabilitation Activities	N/A	N/A	\$500,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01119	72	<b>Sumner City of</b> WW Treatment Upgrade & Expansion Design	N/A	N/A	\$890,800	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01105	75	<b>Stanwood City of</b> WW Facilities Design	N/A	N/A	\$978,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01155	76	<b>King County Department of Natural Resources</b> Denney Way/Lake Union CSO Design (Refinance)	N/A	N/A	\$13,567,124	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01026	77	<b>Granger Town of</b> WW Treatment Improvements Design & Construction	N/A	N/A	\$532,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01157	81	<b>King County Department of Natural Resources</b> Denney Way/Lake Union CSO – Construction	N/A	N/A	\$19,233,705	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01077	82	<b>Brewster City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Design	N/A	N/A	\$155,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01085	88	<b>Spokane County Conservation District</b> Hangman Creek Clean Water Program	N/A	9/1/00 - 9/1/03 (36 Months)	\$250,000	\$250,000	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	9
FP01046	90	<b>Fairfield Town of</b> WW Treatment Facility Improvements	N/A	N/A	\$576,895	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01053	91	<b>Mansfield Town of</b> Sewer System Operating Permit Requirements	N/A	N/A	\$50,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01181	93	<b>Toledo City of</b> Sewer System Improvements	N/A	N/A	\$753,600	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01205	94	<b>Lacey City of</b> 15th Avenue Stormwater Treatment Acquisition	N/A	1/1/01 - 6/1/01 (6 Months)	\$502,750	\$502,750	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01212	95	<b>Shelton City of</b> WWTP Headworks/Aeration Retrofit	N/A	N/A	\$1,116,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01060	96	<b>Conconully Town of</b> WW Facility Plan	N/A	N/A	\$55,600	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01002	98	<b>San Juan County Health/Community Services</b> San Juan On-Site Failure Repair	N/A	6/1/00 - 5/1/02 (24 Months)	\$250,000	\$250,000	Estuary	0.5%	5	
FP01115	99	<b>South Bend City of</b> Inflow & Infiltration Abatement Project	N/A	N/A	\$1,000,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01143	100	<b>Medina City of</b> Regulatory Compliance, Funding, & Planning	N/A	N/A	\$395,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01113	106	<b>King County Department of Natural Resources</b> Denney Way/Lake Union CSO Control Project	N/A	N/A	\$12,338,864	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01096	107	<b>Spokane City of</b> Cochran Basin I/I Facility Plan	N/A	N/A	\$790,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01034	108	<b>Clark Public Utilities</b> La Center I/I Facility Plan	N/A	N/A	\$50,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01196	110	<b>Sultan City of</b> Surface Water Quality Management Plan	N/A	10/1/00 -6/1/02 (21 Months)	\$140,000	\$140,000	Nonpoint	1.5%	20	10
FP01097	112	<b>Spokane City of</b> Cowley Creek Diversion	N/A	N/A	\$430,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01038	114	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens County</b> Clayton Sewer System Loan Refinancing	N/A	N/A	\$804,584	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01190	115	<b>Mason County Community Development</b> North Bay/Case Inlet Water Reclamation	N/A	N/A	\$362,416	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01154	118	<b>Bremerton City of</b> East Bremerton Inflow/Infiltration Study	N/A	N/A	\$130,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01062	120	<b>Mansfield Town of</b> Refinancing of Sewer Line Replacement	N/A	N/A	\$290,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01065	122	<b>Concrete Town of</b> WW Collection & Treatment Improvement Design	N/A	N/A	\$233,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01066	123	<b>North Bend City of</b> Sewer System Improvements (Phase 2)	N/A	N/A	\$650,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01186	124	<b>Thurston County</b> Grant Mound Sewer Facilities Construction	N/A	N/A	\$5,527,681	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01151	126	<b>Bremerton City of</b> Pine Road CSO Reduction Project	N/A	N/A	\$750,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01169	127	<b>Redmond City of</b> Idylwood Park Stream Restoration	N/A	8/1/00 - 10/1/03 (38 Months)	\$330,000	\$330,000	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	9
FP01048	129	<b>Colfax City of</b> Colfax I/I Removal - Phase 2	N/A	N/A	\$237,300	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01211	130	<b>Shelton City of</b> Shelton WWTP Modifications	N/A	N/A	\$2,061,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01209	131	<b>Lacey City of</b> College Ditch Stormwater Treatment Facility	N/A	3/1/01 - 2/1/02 (12 Months)	\$80,000	\$80,000	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01008	133	<b>Garfield Town of</b> Rural Development Loan Transfer to SRF Loan	N/A	N/A	\$911,770	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01067	135	<b>Klickitat County</b> Local OSS Loan Program	N/A	1/1/01 - 1/1/06 (60 Months)	\$225,000	\$225,000	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	
FP01012	136	<b>Pullman City of</b> Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan	N/A	N/A	\$80,000	\$0	Nonpoint	N/A	N/A	12
FP01061	139	<b>Toppenish City of</b> WW System Improvements (Refinance)	N/A	N/A	\$3,303,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01063	141	<b>Okanogan County</b> Lakes WW System Refinance	N/A	N/A	\$227,296	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01075	142	<b>Winthrop Town of</b> Comprehensive Sewer & Stormwater Plans	N/A	N/A	\$52,500	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01156	144	<b>King County Department of Natural Resources</b> Renton Enlargement Construction (Refinance)	N/A	N/A	\$25,395,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01167	146	<b>Yelm City of</b> Yelm Sewer Project Loan Refinance	N/A	N/A	\$1,763,002	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01123	152	<b>Zillah City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Bond Refinance	N/A	N/A	\$565,552	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01141	154	<b>Eatonville Town of</b> WWTP & Sewer Improvement Construction	N/A	N/A	\$2,250,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01099	155	<b>Kennewick City of</b> Ultra Violet Disinfection Facility	N/A	N/A	\$694,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01213	158	<b>Shelton City of</b> Goldsborough Creek Sanitary Sewer Crossing	N/A	N/A	\$100,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01022	163	<b>Granite Falls City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Design & Construction	N/A	N/A	\$550,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01121	165	<b>Benton County Public Works</b> Study of Stormwater Infiltration in Benton County	N/A	N/A	\$7,500	\$0	Nonpoint	N/A	N/A	12
FP01152	166	<b>Stanwood City of</b> WW Activities Projects	N/A	N/A	\$150,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01107	174	<b>Kittitas Water Dist. #6</b> Develop Comprehensive Sewer Plan	N/A	N/A	\$20,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01009	176	<b>Uniontown Town of</b> WW Facilities Plan Amendment	N/A	N/A	\$80,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01171	179	<b>Ridgefield City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Expansion	N/A	N/A	\$1,172,323	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01017	180	<b>Skagit County Sewer Dist. No. 1</b> Refinance of ULID	N/A	N/A	\$762,220	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01095	182	<b>Cowlitz County</b> CSOB System Improvements Project	N/A	N/A	\$5,000,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01074	185	<b>Walla Walla County Water District No. 2</b> Touchet Sewer Facility Plan	N/A	N/A	\$32,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01210	187	<b>Lacey City of</b> Yelm Wetland Acquisition	N/A	1/1/01 - 6/1/01 (6 Months)	\$229,500	\$229,500	Nonpoint	0.5%	5	
FP01045	188	<b>Reardan Town of</b> Reardan WW Facilities Design	N/A	N/A	\$130,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11



**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
List of Projects Considered and Offered Funding**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Rank</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Permit Number &amp; Effluent Limits</b>	<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Funds Requested</b>	<b>Funds Offered</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interest Rate</b>	<b>Term In Years</b>	<b>Footnotes</b>
FP01098	194	<b>Spokane City of</b> Refinance Existing Sewer Bond Debt	N/A	N/A	\$3,907,819	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01019	197	<b>Colton Town of</b> Colton WW Treatment Plant Design	N/A	N/A	\$125,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01090	201	<b>Snohomish City of</b> Amendment to CSO Reduction Plan	N/A	N/A	\$60,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01165	202	<b>Monroe City of</b> Eastside Interceptor	N/A	N/A	\$1,619,113	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01006	206	<b>Dayton City of</b> Dayton Sewer Bond Defeasance	N/A	N/A	\$2,000,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	11
FP01185		<b>Thurston Co.</b> Cooper Point WW Facility Construction	N/A	N/A	\$1,283,471	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	13
FP01142		<b>Kitsap County Public Works</b> Kingston WW Treatment Plant Outfall	N/A	N/A	\$4,234,000	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	13
FP01145		<b>Kitsap County Public Works</b> Kingston WW Treatment Plant	N/A	N/A	\$10,279,050	\$0	Water Pollution Control Facilities	N/A	N/A	13

Totals: \$228,390,114 \$66,375,156

**Footnotes:**

1) The applicant requested that Ecology staff conduct a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was prepared and Ecology has determined that financial hardship exists. The applicant is offered SRF financial assistance at 0 percent interest with a term of 20 years. "Funds Offered" are less than "Funds Requested" since the applicant is also offered a Centennial Clean Water Fund grant that is identified on the FY 2001 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund Final Offer and Application List.

**Footnotes Continued:**

- 2) The applicant requested that Ecology staff perform a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was conducted and Ecology has determined that financial hardship cannot be shown.
- 3) The applicant is also offered a Centennial Clean Water Fund Small Community Grant that is identified on the FY 2001 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund Final Offer and Application List.
- 4) The applicant is also offered a Centennial Clean Water Fund grant that is identified on the FY 2001 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund Final Offer and Application List.
- 5) The applicant requested that Ecology staff prepare a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was conducted and Ecology has determined that financial hardship can be shown. The applicant is offered SRF financial assistance at 0 percent interest with a term of 20 years.
- 6) The “Funds Offered” column shows less than “Funds Requested” column because the amount requested exceeds the ceiling amount (\$26,998,953) in the Water Pollution Control Facilities category.
- 7) The “Funds Offered” column shows less than “Funds Requested” column because the applicant is offered a Centennial Clean Water Fund grant and a supplemental hardship grant that is identified on the FY 2001 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund Final Offer and Application List.
- 8) The “Funds Offered” column shows less than “Funds Requested” column because the amount requested exceeds the remaining funds available in the Water Pollution Control Facilities category.
- 9) The amount offered reflects a grant request shown on the FY 2001 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund (SRF) /Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund Final Offer and Application List. No grant funds remain available after higher priority projects have been identified for funding. The applicant indicated on its application that it would accept a loan for the project if grant funds were not available. The project is offered loan funding from the SRF.
- 10) The amount offered reflects a grant and loan request shown on the FY 2001 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund Final Offer and Application List. No grant funds remain available after higher priority projects have been identified for funding. The applicant indicated on its application that it would accept a loan if grant funds were not available for its project. The offered loan amount is for the full project.
- 11) No SRF funds remain available in the Water Pollution Control Facilities Category after higher priority projects were proposed for funding.
- 12) The applicant declined its proposed SRF loan offer.
- 13) The project was determined to be ineligible for FY 2001 funding after the publication of the Draft IUP (see responsiveness summary).

## **Attachment 2**

### **Project Summaries**



**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

**FP01001: Pomeroy, City of: Wastewater Facilities Improvements:** The project consists of high-priority collection system improvements, upgrade and improving existing treatment facilities including construction of new aeration treatment components to provide efficient BOD, TSS, and ammonia removal. New treatment facility will include a new influent lift station, mechanical screen, selector tanks, aeration basins, secondary clarifiers, and ultraviolet light disinfection equipment.

**FP01002: San Juan County Health and Community Services: San Juan On-Site Failure Repair:** This project will continue to provide revolving loan funds to property owners in San Juan County for the repair of failing on-site septic systems. Eligible recipients will be identified through marketing and through education of on-site septic system contractors (designers, installers, pumpers, O&M). Nonpoint Source Plan: On-site revolving loans, see page 171 of the nonpoint plan.

**FP01006: Dayton, City of: Dayton Sewer Bond Defeasance:** The City has issued several million dollars in revenue bonds to help pay for a sewer plant rehabilitation at about 5 percent average interest. A low-interest loan would allow us to defeasance these bonds and consequently charge a much lower utility rate to a low-income community.

**FP01008: Garfield, Town of: Rural Development Loan Transfer to SRF Loan:** The Wastewater Facilities Improvement project is now complete and consisted of converting the existing trickling filter process to an activated bio-filter process. The town of Garfield is requesting to refinance their Wastewater Facilities Improvement project from a Rural Development 4.5 percent loan to an Ecology 1.5 percent, 20-year loan.

**FP01009: Uniontown, Town of: Wastewater Facilities Plan Amendment:** The date of the town of Uniontown's Wastewater Facilities Plan, is June 1977. This 1977 Plan is out of date. The Town needs to complete an amendment to the 1977 plan in order to define their needs, options for improvements, and set goals for future planning.

**FP01012: Pullman, City of: Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan:** The project includes preparation of a Comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan, meeting the requirements of the DOE Basic and Comprehensive Program, which identifies stormwater quality problems and evaluates structural and non structural means of improving and protecting the water quality of the South Fork of the Palouse River and tributaries in Pullman. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development.

**FP01017: Skagit County Sewer District No. 1: Refinance of ULID: Sanitary System Improvements, new pumps, etc., transmission line to town of La Conner, hook up fee to town of La Conner, buy in capacity from La Conner, inflow/infiltration repair.**

**FP01019: Colton, Town of: Colton Wastewater Treatment Plant Design:** Design of an extended aeration treatment facility to replace existing facultative lagoons. Replacement needed to meet state water quality criteria for ammonia. Discharge to Union Flat Creek, Class A by default,

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

with Summer 7Q10 flows of 0.1 cfs. Approved facility plan recommends construction of extended aeration treatment plant.

**FP01022: Granite Falls, City of:** Wastewater Treatment Plant Design & Construction: The city of Granite Falls is upgrading and expanding its wastewater treatment facility. The project includes the addition of submersible mixers and a clarifier to increase the operational efficiency of the facility and conversion from chlorine to ultraviolet disinfection in order to comply with the City's new NPDES permit.

**FP01026: Granger, Town of:** Wastewater Treatment Improvements Design and Construction: Design and construct improvements to the town of Granger wastewater treatment facility, including new oxidation ditch aeration equipment, a new emergency generator, and UV disinfection. Projects will improve plant reliability and allow more stringent effluent limits to be met for residual chlorine and ammonia to protect water quality in the Yakima River.

**FP01027: Centralia, City of:** Centralia Wastewater Treatment Plant: Approved wastewater facilities plan, general sewer plan and EIS recommend construction of a new wastewater treatment plant to comply with a TMDL. This project is design, permitting, and construction of the wastewater treatment plant and outfall to be located on the Flying T site owned by the city of Centralia.

**FP01028: Coupeville, Town of:** Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion: The project will improve wastewater treatment plant reliability, flow capacity, solids loading capacity, and incorporate improved disinfection technology. Project components include: Effluent pumping capacity; Standby generator for all treatment functions; Second clarifier; Second oxidation ditch with selector tank; UV disinfection. The project will preserve and enhance Penn Cove water quality.

**FP01030: Coupeville, Town of:** 1999 Comprehensive Sewer Plan (Refinancing): The plan is a two-part document – the Comprehensive Sewer Plan and Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities Plan. The plan, last completed in 1981, identifies a capital improvement plan for the system. The plan meets a NPDES permit requirement for a plan and schedule to maintain wastewater treatment plant capacity.

**FP01034: Clark Public Utilities:** La Center Sanitary Sewer System Infiltration & Inflow Study: Clark Public Utilities owns and operates the La Center sanitary sewer system. CPU proposes to conduct a study of the wastewater collection system to determine the locations at which extraneous water (also termed infiltration and inflow - I/I) enters the system, the amount of I/I entering the system at these locations, and the methods that might be used to control I/I. Lower Columbia River Estuary Program: Action Item 33: Reduce the bacterial contamination sometimes found in the Columbia River and its tributaries to limit human exposure to contaminated water. Action Item 34: Develop maximum pollutant loads for streams that do not meet water quality standards.

**FP01037: Public Utility District No. 1 of Stevens County:** Waitts Lake Sewer System Loan Financing: Construct a complete public sewer system for the existing unincorporated community of Waitts Lake. The system consists of a septic tank/effluent pump (STEP) collection system, and

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

aerated facultative lagoon treatment with storage lagoon, and spray irrigation final disposal. The treatment plant also serves the unincorporated community of Valley. There was no existing public sewer system. The new system replaced existing on-site sewers. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 15: Expand the use of Memoranda of Agreement with local governments to address the needs for expansion of sewer services to areas of actual or projected high population density.

**FP01038: Public Utility District No. 1 of Stevens County:** Clayton Sewer System Loan Refinancing: Construct a complete public sewer system for the existing unincorporated community of Clayton. The system consists of a septic tank/effluent pump (STEP) collection system, and recirculating sand (gravel) filter treatment system with a pressure drainfield for final disposal. There was no existing public sewer system. The new system replaced existing on-site sewers. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 15: Expand the use of Memoranda of Agreement with local governments to address the needs for expansion of sewer services to areas of actual or projected high population density.

**FP01039: Public Utility District No. 1 of Stevens County:** Valley Sewer System Loan Financing: Construct a complete public sewer system for the existing unincorporated community of Valley. The system consists of a septic tank/effluent pump (STEP) collection system, and aerated facultative lagoon treatment with storage lagoon, and spray irrigation final disposal. The treatment plant also serves the unincorporated community of Waitts Lake. There was no existing public sewer system. The new system replaced existing on-site sewers. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 15: Expand the use of Memoranda of Agreement with local governments to address the needs for expansion of sewer services to areas of actual or projected high population density.

**FP01044: Jefferson County:** Septic Repair Revolving Loan Fund: This project will continue the successful ongoing program to provide low interest loans to qualified homeowners to repair and upgrade on-site sewage disposal systems. Continued implementation of the program will assure that failing and substandard systems do not cause degradation of water quality and endanger public health. Nonpoint Source Plan: On-site revolving loans, see page 171 of the nonpoint plan.

**FP01045: Reardan, Town of:** Reardan Wastewater Facility's Design: This project is to complete the design for the upgrade to our wastewater treatment plant.

**FP01046: Fairfield, Town of:** Wastewater Treatment Facility Improvements: The current treatment facility consists of two facultative lagoons, and has been labeled non compliant by DOE. This is a facility construction project, which includes: Purchase of 15 acres of land; new aerated lagoon; constructed wetlands; flow equalization; influent screening; effluent disinfection; two lift stations; site piping, fencing, roads, landscaping.

**FP01048: Colfax, City of:** Colfax I/I Removal - Phase 2: The project is located in an area identified in the City's Comprehensive Sewer Plan/Wastewater Facilities Plan as being a major contributor of I/I to the City's Sanitary Sewage Collection System. The City has identified the following approach to eliminating the I/I in this area. Video tape the existing line - this will allow the City to quantify the effectiveness of the repairs. Replace/repair existing failing manholes which contribute to the I/I in the area. Install a PVC liner inside the existing sanitary sewer line.

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

**FP01050: Cowiche Sewer District:** Cowiche WWTP Improvements: The Cowiche Sewer District WWTP Improvement Project proposes to construct facility improvements that will allow the WWTP to produce Class A stream water quality effluent. The Sewer District is under WSDOE Notice of Violation and is required to meet water quality standards. Treatment facilities include extended aeration activated sludge with a single aeration basin, floating mixer/aerator, and two concrete-lined sequencing decant basins.

**FP01051: Roza-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control:** On-Farm Irrigation Conversions: RSBOJC proposes irrigation conversion projects to reduce sediment and associated pollutants in the Yakima River. This reduction in sediment delivery will be achieved by converting erosive methods of irrigation to best management practices. Irrigation water management, as well as nutrient and pesticide management, will also be achieved from the converted acreage. The water quality below the Parker Reach of the Yakima River will be improved by reducing the amount of turbidity, nutrients, pesticides, and bacteria associated with sediment loads. The reduction of sediment in the Yakima River will enhance fish and wildlife habitat. Nonpoint Source Plan: Agricultural Activities 7: Study feasibility of converting open gravity canals and other current delivery systems to more efficient systems, including pressurized pipe.

**FP01053: Mansfield, Town of:** Sewer System Operating Permit Requirements: This project is to complete the requirements of the town of Mansfield State Waste Discharge Permit #ST-9109 for the operation of its sewage collection and treatment system. A number of the actions were initially identified in the Town's Sewer Collection and Treatment System Engineering Report (April 1995).

**FP01057: Skagit County:** Additional Subsurface Effluent Disposal Field: Additional disposal area is needed for disinfected effluent from sewage treatment facility for Edison, located in a shellfish protection district. Additional absorption area would create a larger dispersal subsurface area, preventing effluent entering adjacent waterbody, which flows to Samish Bay, and shellfish growing area.

**FP01058: Prosser, City of:** Prosser Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements: The city of Prosser is proposing to construct improvements to its wastewater facilities to meet stringent wastewater discharge requirements, and reduce suspended solids loading to the Yakima River. Major system improvements include headworks, intermediate clarifier, effluent pumping system modifications, installation of a polymer feed system, and anaerobic digester repairs.

**FP01060: Conconully, Town of:** Wastewater Facility Plan: Prepare a wastewater facility plan that contains a treatment system assessment, sprayfield management plan, public health protection, and ground water monitoring plan. The plan includes analysis and update of operation and maintenance procedures and the sewer use ordinance. The plan will comply with Conconully's new state waste discharge permit.

**FP01061: Toppenish, City of:** Wastewater System Improvements (Refinance): Refinance USDA-RD loan for design and construction of improvements to wastewater treatment facilities and rehabilitation of a portion of the existing collection system to provide facilities with adequate capacity to treat current and future loadings, and to protect ground water and domestic water sources



**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

from contamination due to exfiltration.

**FP01062: Mansfield, Town of:** Refinancing of Sewer Line Replacement: This proposal involves the refinancing of an existing Rural Development loan which the Town secured as partial funding for improvements on their sewage collection system. The project replaced over 18,000 linear feet of collection line using a pipe bursting technique. The old concrete pipe was replaced with high-density polyethylene.

**FP01063: Okanogan County:** Conconully Lakes Wastewater System Refinance: This project is complete. Funding is necessary to refinance high-interest General Obligation Bonds used to construct a STEP sewer system. The interest savings will save the project \$8,000 per year and directly benefit the rate payers. The original project was required to meet the requirements of a Federal Order and to remove an identified health hazard caused by untreated household sewage entering the waters of the Conconully Lakes.

**FP01065: Concrete, Town of:** Wastewater Collection and Treatment Improvements (Design Only): The project will construct improvements to the Town's three sewage lift stations and replace the existing wastewater treatment facility to provide wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal facilities that meet Department of Ecology's standards for water quality and operational reliability.

**FP01066: North Bend, City of:** Sewer System Improvements (Phase 2): The city of North Bend conducted an I/I study that identified unsound sewer lines contributing excessive I/I to the collection system. The I/I study recommended that improvements to the collection system be conducted in two phases. The Phase 1 improvements were constructed during the Summer of 1998 and replaced approximately 6,000 lineal feet of sewer mainlines and associated side sewers from the main to the property line. The Phase 2 project represents a continuation of the overall project to further reduce I/I. Approximately 2700 lineal feet of sewer main and 1100 feet of side sewer will be replaced.

**FP01067: Klickitat County:** Local OSS Loan Program: This local on-site sewage disposal system loan program would provide homeowners and others assistance in repairing failing systems that otherwise would have a negative impact on surface water, ground water, and public health. While the program will be available countywide to individuals who meet eligibility requirements, priority will be given to known problem areas that have high fecal coliform bacteria counts in surface water. Nonpoint Source Plan: On-site revolving loans, see page 171 of the nonpoint plan.

**FP01069: Skamokawa Water & Sewer District:** Skamokawa Community Sewer Project: In accordance with steps outlined in the Skamokawa Sewer and Water District's Capitol Facilities Plan the District is seeking funds for design and construction of a STEP system and purchase of an existing wastewater treatment facility for 60 additional hook-ups. LCREP: Action Item 33: Reduce the bacterial contamination sometimes found in the Columbia River and its tributaries to limit human exposure to contaminated water. Action Item 34: Develop maximum pollutant loads for streams that do not meet water quality standards.

**FP01074: Walla Walla County Water District No. 2:** Touchet Sewer Facility Plan: Walla Walla County Water District #2 is seeking funding to hire an engineering firm to prepare a facility plan.

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

The District will use the plan to schedule repairs and upgrades to the sewer collection and treatment system determined in the plan.

**FP01075: Winthrop, Town of:** Comprehensive Sewer and Stormwater Plans: The project involves preparation of two plans: 1) an update of the 1987 Comprehensive Sewer Plan and 2) a Stormwater Drainage Plan. The plans represent a focused step forward in addressing concerns about the Town's ability to meet NPDES permit requirements and to prevent any future degradation of water quality in the Methow and Chewuch Rivers. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development.

**FP01077: Brewster, City of:** Wastewater Treatment Plant Design: The City needs to replace outdated and marginally functioning components of Brewster's wastewater treatment plant, bringing the system into compliance with state and federal water quality regulations. The project is preparation of approved, construction-ready engineering design and related documents for improvements to the headworks, oxidation ditch, clarifier, chlorination system, and biosolids management. The intent of the project is to prepare the City for Step 3 in Ecology's Step system.

**FP01079: Spokane County:** Refinancing of Spokane County Septic Tank Elimination Projects: Loan proceeds will be used to repay LTGO bonds sold in 1998 and 1999. These bonds cover the cost to design and construct sewer projects to remove septic systems from above the Spokane-Rathdrum sole source aquifer. The projects were constructed in 1996 through 2000 and are part of the Extended Payment Grant Agreement with DOE. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 15: Expand the use of Memoranda of Agreement with local governments to address the needs for expansion of sewer services to areas of actual or projected high population density.

**FP01080: Pe Ell, Town of:** Wastewater Treatment Facility Design: The project involves design of a new wastewater treatment plant, as proposed in the Town's approved Facility Plan. Design will also include a new outfall, biosolids handling facilities, an office, and laboratory.

**FP01081: Pe Ell, Town of:** Sewer System Improvements: The project involves design, construction, construction inspection, and construction management of sewer system improvements to reduce infiltration and inflow, including replacement of selected sewer lines as well as rehabilitation of additional sewer lines.

**FP01085: Spokane County Conservation District:** Hangman Creek Clean Water Program: The Hangman Creek Clean Water Program entails working with the entire watershed, but focuses on critical subwatersheds. The Rattler's Run watershed has been chosen due to its' high delivery rate of suspended sediment and nutrients to the mainstem of Hangman Creek. This project is designed to reduce sediment and nutrient loading by planning and constructing series of sediment basins, grassed waterways, riparian buffers and other eligible best management practices. Nonpoint Source Plan: General Activities 2: Expand the development of local watershed plans under chapters 75.46 & 90.82 RCW and other related acts.

**FP01087: Clark County Department of Public Works:** De-Watering Facility for Vector Waste -

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

Phase 2: Clark County intends to upgrade and expand its existing Whatley Stormwater Decant Facility. The facility is designed to treat and manage street or vector waste. These wastes include liquid and solid wastes collected during maintenance of stormwater catch basins, detention/retention ponds and similar stormwater treatment and conveyance structures. The proposed upgrade is the second phase of the development of the facility and, hence, the project is referred to as Phase 2.

**FP01090: Snohomish, City of:** Amendment to CSO Reduction Plan: This project is an Amendment to the City's adopted and approved 1993 CSO Reduction Plan, as required in the 1999 draft NPDES Permit for the Snohomish WWTF. The facilities will consist of a trunk line to intercept two combined sewer overflows and treat the flows in the former wastewater treatment lagoon.

**FP01095: Cowlitz County:** CSOB System Improvements Project: Construction of improvements of the regional wastewater collection and treatment system to eliminate raw sewage overflows and provide capacity for growth. Lower Columbia River Estuary Plan: Action Item 27: Implement the Estuary Program information management plan. Action Item 28: Implement the Estuary Program long term monitoring plan.

**FP01096: Spokane, City of:** Cochran Basin I/I Facility Plan: Cochran Basin was separated during the CSO projects of the 1980's. During development of the current Wastewater Facilities Plan, grossly excessive I/I was detected in the Cochran Basin. This project will identify the sources, and has the potential of reducing peak interceptor flows by 13 MGD or more.

**FP01097: Spokane, City of:** Cowley Creek Diversion: Cowley Creek emerges from ground water springs near Sacred Heart Hospital. It is currently connected to the combined sewer. This project will intercept approximately 150,000 gpd, and by using recently abandoned water mains and some new construction, route the flow separately approximately 1 1/3 miles to the Spokane River.

**FP01098: Spokane, City of:** Refinance Existing Sewer Bond Debt: The projects financed by the proceeds of the City's series 1989 sewer bond issue consisted of CSO sewer separation projects, and sewer construction for the elimination of septic tanks situated over the City's sole source aquifer.

**FP01099: Kennewick, City of:** Ultra Violet Disinfection Facility: This project would replace the current chlorination system for the Wastewater Treatment Plant effluent. This Ultra Violet disinfection system would address issues with disinfection byproducts in the effluent and mitigate effects on the important Columbia River quality.

**FP01100: Cheney, City of:** Cheney Wastewater Treatment/Reclamation Project: In 1988, in response to an order from the WSDOE, the city of Cheney began the process of planning, designing, and constructing the \$17.8 million Cheney Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Project, which, upon its completion in 1995, has enabled the City to comply with the Clean Water Act discharge parameters. Nonpoint Source Plan: Agricultural Activities 12\*: Actively engage agricultural producer groups in developing and implementing new BMPs.

**FP01102: Enumclaw, City of:** Enumclaw WWTP Improvements - Planning: The project consists

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

of planning efforts as the first step towards the implementation of improvements to the City's WWTP. The improvements will serve to replace aging existing facilities. Planning for the facilities will take into account the potential need for future improvements to comply with nutrient removal requirements.

**FP01105: Stanwood, City of:** Wastewater Facilities Design: To address existing deficiencies and accommodate anticipated growth, capital improvement projects were identified in the Facilities Plan for the wastewater collection system and the treatment plant. This project consists of increasing the size of various gravity trunk mains and upgrading the existing lagoon facility to an activated sludge process.

**FP01107: Kittitas Water District #6:** Develop Comprehensive Sewer Plan: The wastewater treatment plant owned and operated by Kittitas Water District #6 (Vantage, WA) experiences hydraulic and organic slug loadings due to transient population fluctuations. A comprehensive sewer plan is needed to provide a recommended solution, meet county GMA guidelines, and qualify the District for funding.

**FP01113: King County Department of Natural Resources:** Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control Project: The Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control Project is a joint effort of King County and the city of Seattle to control combined sewer overflows to Lake Union and Elliott Bay, including the Denny Way CSO, which is the largest CSO in the King County system. The project will control Lake Union and Denny Way CSOs by 1) storing CSO flows during moderate storms and transferring them to the West Point Treatment Plant after the storm subsides; and 2) providing at-site treatment at the Elliott West site, with discharge of treated flows through a new outfall during heavy rain conditions.

**FP01115: South Bend, City of:** Inflow and Infiltration Abatement Project: To reduce/eliminate I/I of storm/ground water into sewer system per Order #DE-98WQ-J296 from DOE (4/23/99). Major elements: (1) Replace/seal failing sewer mains; (2) Seal leaking manholes; (3) Separate storm inlets from sewer lines; (4) Correct sidesewer leakage; (5) Inspect for open/interconnected yard drains.

**FP01116: Lynden, City of:** Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade/Expansion: This project will complete the improvements and expansion of the Lynden wastewater treatment plant, including, but not limited to, the following: Schedule D-Liquid Stream. New headworks with influent pumps, mechanical fine screens, grit removal, and septage receiving facility; New anoxic selector/denitrification tanks; Two new 65-foot diameter secondary clarifiers; New ultraviolet light disinfection facility to replace chlorination; New laboratory/operations/training building; Convert old secondary clarifiers to aerobic sludge digesters; Convert old headworks structure to a sludge thickener building.

**FP01117: Long Beach, City of:** WWTP Upgrade Design Phase 2 & 3: Prepare design documents - Phase 2/3 WWTP improvements. Phase 2: Convert aerobic digester to secondary clarifier; Plant drain pump station and non potable water system; Aerobic digester, thickening and truck loading station. Phase 2: Force main – main pump station to WWTP; Grit removal; Bioselectors, diffusers -

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

aeration basins; Laboratory/MCC building.

**FP01119: Sumner, City of:** Wastewater Treatment Upgrade and Expansion Design: The project involves design of the upgrade/expansion of the Sumner WWTP to meet water quality and biosolids standards, NPDES permit limits, TMDL recommendations, and to serve existing and future growth. The upgrade will be designed to address the removal of ammonia, Chlorine, and BOD to protect water quality in the White and Puyallup Rivers.

**FP01121: Benton County Public Works:** Study of Stormwater Infiltration in Benton County: The project shall evaluate site conditions and existing infiltration facilities and conduct field scale investigations at two selected sites. Field investigations include site characterization and water quality monitoring over a two-year period. Analysis of the data collected will address site specific technical issues that affect stormwater contaminant transport from the facility to the underlying ground water. The results will be used to evaluate the adequacy of best management practices and the need for enhanced treatment to remove contaminants. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 5: Research stormwater technology design, cost benefit and know-how to effectively address stormwater problems.

**FP01123: Zillah, City of:** Wastewater Treatment Plant Bond Refinance: Capacity and wastewater quality improvements to the city of Zillah wastewater treatment facility in 1994. Facility improvements include rehab, add-on of fixtures and a modest expansion of capacity.

**FP01141: Eatonville, Town of:** WWTP & Sewer Improvement Construction: Build a new two-cell sequential batch reactor WWTP for a maximum month's average daily flow of 0.53 mgd, BODs and TSS load of 940 pounds per day, and ammonia treatment for a load of 134 pounds per day. Build sewers on Mashell and Orchard Avenues and in the Ohop Valley.

**FP01142: Kitsap County Public Works:** Kingston Wastewater Treatment Plant Outfall: Construction of a new outfall for the Kingston wastewater treatment plant to replace the existing outfall damaged in 1990 during dredging operations conducted by the Washington State Ferries. The new outfall will extend 5,290 feet into Appletree Cove, terminating at a depth of 165 feet MLLW.

**FP01143: Medina, City of:** Regulatory Compliance, Funding, and Planning: This project's objective is to develop and implement an adaptive Stormwater Management Program for the city of Medina to meet the requirements of the Puget Sound Water Quality Plan, and the anticipated requirements of the NPDES Phase 2 permit and the ESA's 4(d) rule. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development.

**FP01145: Kitsap County Public Works:** Kingston Wastewater Treatment Plant: This project consists of a new wastewater treatment plant serving Kingston, located off of West Kingston Road. The plant would be designed to treat 0.29 MGD, utilizing UV disinfection, oxidation ditches, and a secondary clarifier facility.

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

**FP01147: Skamania County:** Carson Stormwater Facilities Planning: This project will develop a comprehensive stormwater facilities plan for Carson, WA that: Protects the health, safety, and welfare of the residence by controlling stormwater drainage; limits property damage by reducing flooding and landslides; and protects the lower Wind River and two endangered-salmon species by improving runoff quality and velocities. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development. LCREP: Action Item 8: Reduce the volume and velocity and improve the water quality of stormwater runoff in developed areas.

**FP01150: Bremerton, City of:** Private Sewer System Rehabilitation Activities: This program will provide home and business owners of Bremerton with a low-interest loan option for funding separation of stormwater from their sanitary sewer services. Offering this loan as part of the Combined Sewer Overflow Reduction Program will encourage participation in our effort and help ensure its success. Nonpoint Source Plan: On-site revolving loans, see page 171 of the nonpoint plan.

**FP01151: Bremerton, City of:** Pine Road CSO Reduction Project: This project develops a facility plan for Pine Road Basin and designs a wastewater treatment plant to treat CSO flows in East Bremerton that would otherwise overflow. The CSO treatment facility will reduce CSO events as required by state regulations, court orders, and the improvement of Puget Sound water quality. \$650,000 of this request is for new financing and \$100,000 is for refinancing.

**FP01152: Stanwood, City of:** Wastewater Activities Projects: This project consists of performing water quality monitoring at the treatment plant and in the Stillaguamish River to help develop TMDL allocations for the City's wastewater treatment plant. Another component of this project is the development of sewer ordinances and user charges to ensure system users are being charged appropriately.

**FP01153: Bremerton, City of:** Anderson Cove CSO Reduction Facilities: This project is facility planning, design, and construction of Anderson Cove CSO separation facilities. The facilities constructed in this project will reduce CSO events as required for compliance with state regulations, court orders, and improvement of Puget Sound water quality. This project will construct all facilities within Anderson Cove, except upgrading pump station CW-4 and the associated flow diversion.

**FP01155: King County Department of Natural Resources:** Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control Project – Design (Refinance): The Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control Project will control Lake Union and Denny Way CSOs by 1) storing CSO flows during moderate storms and transferring them to the West Point Treatment Plant after the storm subsides; and 2) providing at-site treatment at the Elliott West site, with discharge of treated flows through a new outfall during heavy rain conditions.

**FP01156: King County Department of Natural Resources:** Renton Enlargement 3 - Construction (Refinance): The objective of the East Section Reclamation Plant in Renton (ESRP),

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

Enlargement 3 program was to increase average wet-weather flow capacity from 76 mgd. Improvements were made to both liquid and solids stream treatment facilities and to effluent transfer capacity, as well as improving odor control, enhancing site aesthetics, and implementing water reclamation.

**FP01157: King County Department of Natural Resources:** Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control Project – Construction: The Denny Way/Lake Union CSO Control Project will control Lake Union and Denny Way CSOs by 1) storing CSO flows during moderate storms and transferring them to the West Point Treatment Plant after the storm subsides; and 2) providing at-site treatment at the Elliott West site, with discharge of treated flows through a new outfall during heavy rain conditions.

**FP01165: Monroe, City of:** Eastside Interceptor: Installation of a 24-inch gravity sanitary sewer interceptor to serve the developing north-central area of the City and relieving pressure on the existing 179th Avenue pump station.

**FP01167: Yelm, City of:** Yelm Sewer Project Loan Refinance: Yelm requests a \$1,763,002 SRF loan to refinance the balance remaining of our 1994 Revenue Bond with U.S. Rural Development, saving \$1,400,000 over the life of the loan. Completed in 1993, the project consisted of a septic tank effluent pump collection system and an aerated lagoon treatment facility.

**FP01169: Redmond, City of:** Idylwood Park Stream Restoration: This grant application requests activity type funds to repair and restore approximately 800 feet of stream channel located in a beachside park adjacent to Lake Sammamish. The work consists of stream channel widening, stream bank stabilization, fisheries habitat enhancement, fencing to discourage park-user intrusion, and interpretive signage. Nonpoint Source Plan: Loss of Aquatic Ecosystems 2: Coordinate restoration projects on a watershed basis to provide more effective results.

**FP01171: Ridgefield, City of:** Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion: Increase funding for project funded in FY 98. Funds are needed because the facility will be built on a contaminated site, complicating construction which has been delayed by protracted land negotiations. The FY 98 costs were based on using an existing tank which has been removed as part of contamination cleanup. Lower Columbia River Estuary Plan: Action Item 36: Require all permitted discharges to surface water to use alternatives to chlorine, to protect aquatic life where such alternatives provide equivalent removal and treatment of bacteria. Present costs are based on final construction plans which include features not provided in FY 98.

**FP01174: Quincy, City of:** Water Reclamation Facility Design: Design a water-reclamation facility to achieve Class A water-reclamation standards and allow ground water recharge by surface percolation. The design will include an activated sludge system with nitrogen removal, chemical coagulation, filtration and high level disinfection along with biosolids stabilization and dewatering systems to produce Class B biosolids.

**FP01176: Goldendale, City of:** Goldendale Wastewater Facility Improvements: The project will upgrade the existing wastewater treatment facility in accordance with the DOE's compliance order

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

and NPDES permit no. WA-002112-1. The modifications include constructing a biolac treatment facility, provide mechanical screening of the influent, UV disinfection of the effluent, and upgrading the main pump station.

**FP01177: Farmington, Town of:** Farmington Sewer System Rehabilitation: This comprehensive planning project, in accordance with WAC 173-240 040 and 050, will: Investigate and identify the sources of severe infiltration and inflow into the sewer collection system; evaluate alternatives for the rehabilitation of the sewer pump station in order to improve its reliability, efficiency, and safety; present feasible options and costs for lining the existing lagoons in order to eliminate wastewater from leaking to ground and surface water and perform a water balance to identify the need for additional treatment capacity.

**FP01180: Connell, City of:** Wastewater System Improvements (Construction): Connell will construct collection system improvements and a new wastewater treatment system, including a three-mile-long force main, two 800-gpm lift stations, a 1.8-acre aerated lagoon, 60 million gallons in active lagoon storage capacity, a disinfection system, a 90-acre irrigation system, and associated facilities. Treated wastewater will be irrigated on alfalfa.

**FP01181: Toledo, City of:** Sewer System Improvements: The proposed project involves the repair and/or replacement of approximately 5,500 linear feet of six twelve-inch diameter concrete gravity sewer main and side sewer on public property with PVC pipe, to reduce infiltration and inflow into the collection system. The project area lies primarily between First, Fifth, Alder, and Cowlitz Streets. Lower Columbia River Estuary Plan: Action Item 33: Reduce the bacterial contamination sometimes found in the Columbia River and its tributaries to limit human exposure to contaminated water.

**FP01185: Thurston County:** Cooper Point Wastewater Facilities Construction: Transfer wastewater flows from two small Cooper Point wastewater treatment plants to the regional LOTT treatment facilities. Decommission existing shoreline facilities and marine outfalls. Install four pump stations with emergency power and approximately five miles of limited-capacity sewer lateral and interceptor pipe to convey wastewater to the regional treatment facilities.

**FP01186: Thurston County:** Grand Mound Sewer Facilities Construction: The Grand Mound wastewater facilities replaced the existing Maple Lane Institution's raw-sewage lagoon, in the Chehalis flood plain, on-site system for two DOT Rest Areas and other commercial, industrial and high density residential development within the Urban Growth Area. All future development is required to use the sewer system.

**FP01188: Woodland, City of:** Woodland Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements: Woodland will construct a new secondary wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) designed in accordance with Ecology design criteria. The new plant will provide improved effluent water and biosolids quality and increased reliability. This project will allow Woodland to remove a sewer hook-up moratorium (implemented in 1998) required by Ecology Administrative Order No. DE 98WQ-S122. Lower Columbia River Estuary Plan: Action Item 36: Require all permitted discharges to surface water to use alternatives to chlorine to protect aquatic life where such alternatives provide equivalent removal



**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

and treatment of bacteria.

**FP01189: Elma, City of:** Elma Wastewater Treatment Plant Construction: This project is to construct a Biolac wastewater treatment plant in accordance with the Ecology-approved design plans and specifications and to meet the requirements of Ecology's Administrative Order DE 99WQ-S154. The construction of this plant will produce an effluent that exceeds secondary treatment standards and will improve the water quality in the Chehalis River.

**FP01190: Mason County Community Development:** North Bay/Case Inlet Water Reclamation Facilities: The proposed project consists of construction of water reclamation facilities located on property owned by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources approximately one mile west of the town of Allyn. The components of the project include a headworks facility, a sequencing batch reactor sized for a design flow of 0.304 MGD, effluent filters, UV disinfection, storage ponds, and sprayfield facilities.

**FP01193: Tonasket, City of:** Tonasket Wastewater Treatment Facility Reconstruction: The subject of this application is the replacement of an obsolete lagoon-type treatment system that currently discharges to ground water with a modern activated-sludge extended-aeration system that will discharge treated effluent to the Okanogan River.

**FP01196: Sultan, City of:** Surface Water Quality Management Plan: Development of a surface water quality management plan, which will be the basis for the formation of a surface water utility for the city of Sultan. Work will include characterization of existing watershed conditions, identification of hydrological and water quality problems, development of surface water controls and public involvement. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development.

**FP01205: Lacey, City of:** 15th Avenue Stormwater Treatment Acquisition: The project involves the purchase of property along 15th Avenue NE, near Lacey, WA for the purpose of developing a regional stormwater treatment facility. The facility would lower pollutant loadings to Woodland Creek and Henderson Inlet by intercepting untreated stormwater currently discharging into Woodland Creek from Olympia, Lacey, and Thurston County. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development.

**FP01208: Lacey, City of:** Fones Road Regional Stormwater Facility: The project involves design of a regional stormwater treatment facility to treat and attenuate stormwater from a highly urbanized area. This cooperative effort between the cities of Lacey and Olympia will improve the quality and quantity of stormwater discharging to the headworks of Woodland Creek at the Taylor wetland. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development.

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001  
Project Summaries**

**FP01209: Lacey, City of:** College Ditch Stormwater Treatment Facility: The project involves the final design of a regional constructed wetland to treat stormflows from an urbanized environment. High flows that enter College Ditch impair the quality of Woodland Creek, Lacey's main drainage basin. The city of Lacey funded the preliminary design in 1999. Nonpoint Source Plan: Urban Activities 4: Develop a Stormwater Management Strategy which includes updating the stormwater manual and helping local governments implement the manual to address stormwater impacts on habitat and water quality of new development.

**FP01210: Lacey, City of:** Yelm Wetland Acquisition: This project involves the purchase of property near Lacey, WA to be used to expand an existing wetland to remedy health and safety concerns associated with the area. Localized flooding and illicit dumping result in property damage, inundation of local septic systems, and potential contamination of several drinking water wells. Nonpoint Source Plan: Loss of Aquatic Ecosystems 6: Implement, maintain, and update the Puget Sound Plan and biennial work plans for the Puget Sound Basin.

**FP01212: Shelton, City of:** Shelton Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks/Aeration Retrofit: The project consists of design and construction of improvements to the City's WWTP. These improvements include: 1) construction of new screening facilities to replace existing comminutors; 2) grit chamber modifications to improve grit removal efficiency; and 3) replacement of the oxidation ditch rotors with mixers and fine bubble diffuser aeration.

**FP01213: Shelton, City of:** Goldsborough Creek Sanitary-Sewer Crossing: The proposed project will evaluate alternatives for removing a gravity-sanitary-sewer pipeline and force main from Goldsborough Creek, or for protecting the pipeline and force main if removal is not feasible. The City is under mandate from the Department of Fish and Wildlife to remove the gravity sewer pipelines from the creek by 2003.

**FP01217: Oroville, City of:** Oroville WWTF Improvement Project: Modify the two existing chlorine contact tanks in WWTP to accommodate ultraviolet treatment system using the other contact tank for treatment while modifications are completed, then, the second contact tank will be used as a settling tank before UV treatment. Also, install rotating screen at headworks to filter out inorganic materials for disposal as solid waste.

## **Attachment 3**

### **Proposed Schedule of Payments From EPA to the State of Washington**



**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Draft Intended Use Plan  
Proposed Schedule of Payments from EPA to the State of Washington**

<b>Federal Quarter</b>	<b>Requested FFY 2000 Title VI Grant Payments</b>
<b>10/1/00</b>	\$0
<b>1/1/01</b>	\$15,586,296
<b>4/1/01</b>	\$15,586,296
<b>7/1/01</b>	\$15,586,296
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$46,758,888</b>



## **Attachment 4**

### **Estimated Schedule of Binding Commitments**





**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
Estimated Schedule of Binding Commitments**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Funds Proposed</b>
FP01100	<b>Cheney, City of</b> WW Treatment/Reclamation Project	12/1/00	\$2,529,629
FP01039	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens County</b> Valley Sewer System Loan Financing	12/1/00	\$279,812
FP01037	<b>PUD No. 1 of Stevens County</b> Waitts Lake Sewer System Loan Financing	12/1/00	\$1,855,742
FP01153	<b>Bremerton, City of</b> Anderson Cove CSO Reduction Facilities	12/1/00	\$959,573
FP01188	<b>Woodland, City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Improvements	12/1/00	\$1,652,500
FP01217	<b>Oroville, City of</b> Oroville WWTF Improvement Project	12/1/00	\$294,000
FP01001	<b>Pomeroy, City of</b> WW Facilities Improvements	12/1/00	\$1,194,200
FP01081	<b>Pe Ell, Town of</b> Sewer System Improvements	12/1/00	\$114,397
FP01002	<b>San Juan County Health/Community Services</b> San Juan On-Site Failure Repair	12/1/00	\$250,000
FP01044	<b>Jefferson County</b> Septic Repair Revolving Loan Fund	12/1/00	\$150,000
FP01057	<b>Skagit County</b> Additional Subsurface Effluent Disposal Field	12/1/00	\$40,000
FP01193	<b>Tonasket, City of</b> WW Treatment Facility Reconstruction	12/1/00	\$522,500
FP01080	<b>Pe Ell, Town of</b> WW Treatment Facility Design	12/1/00	\$275,000
FP01116	<b>Lynden, City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Upgrade/Expansion	12/1/00	\$6,521,932

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
Estimated Schedule of Binding Commitments**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Funds Proposed</b>
FP01102	<b>Enumclaw, City of</b> WWTP Improvements – Planning	12/1/00	\$116,250
FP01117	<b>Long Beach, City of</b> WWTP Upgrade Design Phase 2 & 3	12/1/00	\$304,000
FP01169	<b>Redmond, City of</b> Idylwood Park Stream Restoration	12/1/00	\$330,000
FP01030	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> 1999 Comprehensive Sewer Plan (Refinancing)	12/1/00	\$95,610
FP01180	<b>Connell, City of</b> WW System Improvements (Construction)	12/1/00	\$1,208,000
FP01085	<b>Spokane County Conservation District</b> Hangman Creek Clean Water Program	12/1/00	\$250,000
FP01176	<b>Goldendale, City of</b> Goldendale WW Facility Improvements	12/1/00	\$1,711,000
FP01189	<b>Elma, City of</b> Elma WW Treatment Plant Construction	12/1/00	\$2,760,880
FP01196	<b>Sultan, City of</b> Surface Water Quality Management Plan	12/1/00	\$140,000
FP01028	<b>Coupeville Town of</b> WW Treatment Plant Expansion	12/1/00	\$2,370,000
FP01051	<b>Roza-Sunnyside BJC</b> On-Farm Irrigation Conversions	12/1/00	\$10,000,000
FP01027	<b>Centralia, City of</b> Centralia WW Treatment Plant	12/1/00	\$24,731,652
FP01177	<b>Farmington, Town of</b> Farmington Sewer System Rehabilitation	12/1/00	\$12,500
FP01069	<b>Skamokawa Water &amp; Sewer District</b> Skamokawa Community Sewer Project	3/1/01	\$819,400

**Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund  
State Fiscal Year 2001 Final Intended Use Plan  
Estimated Schedule of Binding Commitments**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Name/Project Title</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Funds Proposed</b>
FP01058	<b>Prosser, City of</b> WW Treatment Plant Improvements	3/1/01	\$811,425
FP01174	<b>Quincy, City of</b> Water Reclamation Facility Design	3/1/01	\$650,000
FP01205	<b>Lacey, City of</b> 15th Avenue Stormwater Treatment Acquisition	3/1/01	\$502,750
FP01067	<b>Klickitat County</b> Local OSS Loan Program	3/1/01	\$225,000
FP01210	<b>Lacey, City of</b> Yelm Wetland Acquisition	3/1/01	\$229,500
FP01208	<b>Lacey, City of</b> Fones Road Regional Stormwater Facility	3/1/01	\$220,000
FP01209	<b>Lacey, City of</b> College Ditch Stormwater Treatment Facility	3/1/01	\$80,000