

EPA SRF's Up

A NEWSLETTER FOR THE CLEAN WATER AND DRINKING WATER SRF PROGRAMS

ON THE NATIONAL SCENE

G. Tracy Mehan, III Appointed Assistant Administrator

President Bush has appointed G. Tracy Mehan III, former Director of Michigan's Office of the Great Lakes and former member of Michigan Governor John Engler's cabinet, to the position of Assistant Administrator for Water at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. He previously served as an Associate Deputy Administrator in the EPA Administrator's office (1992) and as Director of Missouri's Department of Natural Resources from 1989 to 1992.

Mr. Mehan was named Director of the Office of the Great Lakes in the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality in 1993. Governor Engler also appointed him as Michigan's representative to the executive committee of the Great Lakes Commission. Mr. Mehan also served on the board of the regional Great Lakes Protection Fund, and he was Michigan's representative in matters pertaining to the International Joint Commission (IJC), established under the Boundary Waters Treaty for the protection of the Great Lakes.

As an Associate Deputy Administrator of the EPA, Mr. Mehan coordinated policy issues for the agency and represented the Deputy Administrator in interactions with federal, state and local agencies.

Mr. Mehan holds a bachelor's degree in history and a law degree from St. Louis University. He will be responsible for the implementation of both the federal Clean Water Act and the federal Safe Drinking Water Act.

Drinking Water Needs Survey and Allotment of DWSRF Funds

Every four years EPA is required to conduct a survey of national drinking water infrastructure needs. The second Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey was released in February 2001 and identified a 20 year infrastructure need of \$150.9 billion (www.epa.gov/safewater/needs.html). State needs ranged from \$146 million for the State of Hawaii to \$17.5 billion for the State of California. The Safe Drinking Water Act requires that EPA use the results of the most recent survey to allot the annual DWSRF appropriation with

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

these farms can be a large source of nonpoint source pollution. Through studies we have determined that approximately 80% of the pollutant loading in the Beaver Reservoir watershed and the Illinois River watershed comes from nonpoint

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

SRF's Up

NATIONAL SCENE *from page 1*

version of the appropriations bill extended the flexibility permanently, while the Senate version extended the provision for

SRF's Up

STATE ACTIVITIES AND TRENDS *from page 3*

sources. If we are to improve the quality of water in this area, we will have to address nonpoint source water pollution.

We decided that the best approach to this problem would be to partner with other established agencies in the area, agencies that have the contacts necessary to be able to implement a nonpoint source program immediately. We determined that the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) would be an ideal partner agency since they were already working on this problem. NRCS works with local Conservation Districts to help local landowners develop conservation plans and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs). NRCS also administers the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), a grant program that helps farmers implement BMPs. Although conservation districts review numerous plans, the money for the EQIP is very limited, and additional funding is needed. The Arkansas Revolving Loan Fund seemed perfect for this task.

How did we develop this program? Our personnel first contacted the NRCS office in Little Rock to discuss our ideas. They invited us to a meeting of the Arkansas Association of Conservation Districts and gave us the opportunity to speak and explain what we wanted to do. From this meeting, we set up appointments with district conservationists and some of their staff. After explaining the program to them, we then set up further meetings not only with the conservationists but also with local banks.

We targeted banks within each county that had traditionally supported the agricultural community. Every county has them and they are quite easy to identify. We set up meetings with these bankers and explained the basic elements of the program. One of our main objectives was to make this program as simple as possible for the banks. We also wanted to make it as simple as possible for farmers to obtain a loan. The development of this program was truly a joint effort by all parties involved.

How does this program work? The basic elements of the



program for each bank are: 1) for each loan made to a landowner, the Arkansas Revolving Loan Fund deposits an amount equal to the loan in a non-interest bearing account with the bank; 2) the bank's loan to the landowner has an interest rate of 3 percent; and 3) loans are made for water quality improvements only.

The basic elements for a landowner are: 1) the landowner contacts the Conservation District and together they come up with a Conservation Plan composed of specific conservation practices; 2) the plan is presented to the Conservation Board for approval; 3) if the Board approves the plan, the applicant receives a Certificate of Qualification; 4) the applicant presents the Certificate to a participating Bank and completes a loan application; and 5) the bank conducts its normal credit review; and 6) if the landowner is creditworthy, the bank issues the loan.

We have signed agreements with seven banks in the four-county area. These seven banks have made over \$500,000 in loans to local farmers to implement best management practices such as stacking sheds, fencing, compost sheds and trenching. We are also receiving calls from banks and conservation districts in other areas of the state asking us to implement the program in their areas.

As you can see, this program benefits everyone. The banks earn interest on their loans, and they are able to provide a benefit to their communities by helping to improve

4



SRF's Up

A NEWSLETTER FOR THE CLEAN WATER AND DRINKING WATER SRF PROGRAMS

ON THE NATIONAL SCENE

G. Tracy Mehan, III Appointed Assistant Administrator

President Bush has appointed G. Tracy Mehan III, former Director of Michigan's Office of the Great Lakes and former member of Michigan Governor John Engler's cabinet, to the position of Assistant Administrator for Water at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. He previously served as an Associate Deputy Administrator in the EPA Administrator's office (1992) and as Director of Missouri's Department of Natural Resources from 1989 to 1992.

Mr. Mehan was named Director of the Office of the Great Lakes in the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality in 1993. Governor Engler also appointed him as Michigan's representative to the executive committee of the Great Lakes Commission. Mr. Mehan also served on the board of the regional Great Lakes Protection Fund, and he was Michigan's representative in matters pertaining to the International Joint Commission (IJC), established under the Boundary Waters Treaty for the protection of the Great Lakes.

As an Associate Deputy Administrator of the EPA, Mr. Mehan coordinated policy issues for the agency and represented the Deputy Administrator in interactions with federal, state and local agencies.

Mr. Mehan holds a bachelor's degree in history and a law degree from St. Louis University. He will be responsible for the implementation of both the federal Clean Water Act and the federal Safe Drinking Water Act.

Drinking Water Needs Survey and Allotment of DWSRF Funds

Every four years EPA is required to conduct a survey of national drinking water infrastructure needs. The second Drinking Water Infrastructure Needs Survey was released in February 2001 and identified a 20 year infrastructure need of \$150.9 billion (www.epa.gov/safewater/needs.html). State needs ranged from \$146 million for the State of Hawaii to \$17.5 billion for the State of California. The Safe Drinking Water Act requires that EPA use the results of the most recent survey to allot the annual DWSRF appropriation with

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

NATIONAL SCENE *from page 1*

the condition that each state receive a minimum of one percent of the funds made available to states.

The release of the second Needs Survey report means that EPA must adjust the allotments for each state to reflect the results of the survey. EPA has posted the new allotment percentages associated with the new survey on its website at www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf/allot02.html. This revised allotment will be used for the fiscal year 2002 through 2005 appropriations. The website includes an estimate of the grant amount for each state based on the President's budget request of \$823,185,000 for fiscal year 2002 (less national set-asides for American Indian and Alaska Native Village water systems, monitoring for unregulated contaminants and operator certification expense reimbursement grants). EPA will notify each State of their allotment from a specific fiscal year's appropriation after that year's final budget has been passed.

Budget Update

As of the writing of this newsletter, EPA was operating under a continuing resolution pending passage of the fiscal year 2002 budget. The budget, which has had versions passed by both the Senate and the House, was still under negotiations by conferees from both houses. For fiscal year 2002, the President's budget requested \$823 million for the DWSRF program and \$850 million for the CWSRF program — levels that were generally consistent with the fiscal year 2001 request (FY2001 CWSRF request was \$800 million). The House and Senate versions of the appropriations bill increased the DWSRF appropriation to \$850 million. The House bill increased the CWSRF appropriation to \$1.2 billion and the Senate bill increased the CWSRF appropriation to \$1.35 billion.

As part of its budget request EPA asked Congress to permanently extend to states the flexibility to transfer funds between their DWSRF and CWSRF programs. To date, more than 10 states have used this flexibility to address their most pressing public health and environmental needs. The House

version of the appropriations bill extended the flexibility permanently, while the Senate version extended the provision for only one year. While it looks like transfers will be extended into the future, the duration of the extension will not be known until the bill is finalized.

Security and Terrorism

This newsletter comes on the heels of the terrorist attacks in September which have focused attention on the potential vulnerability of the nation's infrastructure to acts of terrorism. Although there is a heightened awareness of the issue at this time, the water industry has always had to ensure that facilities are secured against vandalism. EPA is working collaboratively with states and organizations representing the water industry to develop information tools and training to ensure that the utilities are putting measures into place to protect public health and the environment.


The SRF programs may be able to help utilities address the infrastructure improvements they need to make to ensure security of their facilities. Many of the types of infrastructure improvements a water system would need to make to ensure security are also eligible for SRF funding and have likely been included within the scope of infrastructure projects funded through the program to date. States may also be able to use the SRF program to provide assistance to public water systems and wastewater treatment plants to allow them to complete vulnerability assessments and contingency and emergency response plans.

EPA encourages state water programs and SRF programs to continue to work with utilities to help them identify their vulnerability to security threats and vandalism and take steps to ensure protection of the health of their customers and the environment.

Policy Memorandum Notes Wider CWSRF Project Eligibilities in Estuary Study Areas

EPA recently issued a policy memorandum clarifying the eligibility of certain types of projects for CWSRF funding in





National Estuary Program (NEP) study areas. Almost all activities identified in an estuary program's Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan are eligible for CWSRF funding. For this reason, two sources of nonpoint source pollution that are not typically eligible for CWSRF funding – concentrated animal feeding operations and stormwater flows in larger municipalities – can be addressed in NEP study areas. The only significant type of water quality project in an NEP study area that cannot receive CWSRF funding is a privately owned wastewater treatment plant.

For additional information or questions, please call Cleora Scott of EPA Headquarters at (202) 564-0687.

STATE ACTIVITIES AND TRENDS


Arkansas Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program

Mike Chandler, Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission

How can a nonpoint source loan program covering the whole state be implemented? This was the challenge facing the Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission, the state agency that administers the Arkansas Revolving Loan Fund. After much consideration and study we decided to attack this problem much like you eat an elephant – one bite at a time.

Since 1989, the Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission has used the Arkansas Revolving Loan Fund to address point source pollution. We have a loan portfolio of approximately 80 loans totaling 280 million dollars, and we have another 130 million dollars of loans ready to come into the program this year. Although we felt we were doing a good job addressing point source pollution, we also realized that we were not doing enough to reduce nonpoint source pollution. In reviewing state water quality information, we found that two of the top three priority watersheds in Arkansas, the Beaver Reservoir watershed and the Illinois River watershed, were located in the northwest corner of the state. We therefore decided that the four-county area in northwest Arkansas would be a good place to start tackling our nonpoint source pollution problems.

The four-county area in northwest Arkansas covers more than 2 million acres, an area roughly the size of Yellowstone National Park. According to the Bureau of the Census, this area is the sixth fastest growing metropolitan area in the United States. According to data from the Department of Agriculture, this area also contains more than 7000 farms – these farms can be a large source of nonpoint source pollution. Through studies we have determined that approximately 80% of the pollutant loading in the Beaver Reservoir watershed and the Illinois River watershed comes from nonpoint



SRF's Up

STATE ACTIVITIES AND TRENDS *from page 3*

sources. If we are to improve the quality of water in this area, we will have to address nonpoint source water pollution.

We decided that the best approach to this problem would be to partner with other established agencies in the area, agencies that have the contacts necessary to be able to implement a nonpoint source program immediately. We determined that the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) would be an ideal partner agency since they were already working on this problem. NRCS works with local Conservation Districts to help local landowners develop conservation plans and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs). NRCS also administers the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), a grant program that helps farmers implement BMPs. Although conservation districts review numerous plans, the money for the EQIP is very limited, and additional funding is needed. The Arkansas Revolving Loan Fund seemed perfect for this task.

How did we develop this program? Our personnel first contacted the NRCS office in Little Rock to discuss our ideas. They invited us to a meeting of the Arkansas Association of Conservation Districts and gave us the opportunity to speak and explain what we wanted to do. From this meeting, we set up appointments with district conservationists and some of their staff. After explaining the program to them, we then set up further meetings not only with the conservationists but also with local banks.

We targeted banks within each county that had traditionally supported the agricultural community. Every county has them and they are quite easy to identify. We set up meetings with these bankers and explained the basic elements of the program. One of our main objectives was to make this program as simple as possible for the banks. We also wanted to make it as simple as possible for farmers to obtain a loan. The development of this program was truly a joint effort by all parties involved.


How does this program work? The basic elements of the

program for each bank are: 1) for each loan made to a landowner, the Arkansas Revolving Loan Fund deposits an amount equal to the loan in a non-interest bearing account with the bank; 2) the bank's loan to the landowner has an interest rate of 3 percent; and 3) loans are made for water quality improvements only.

The basic elements for a landowner are: 1) the landowner contacts the Conservation District and together they come up with a Conservation Plan composed of specific conservation practices; 2) the plan is presented to the Conservation Board for approval; 3) if the Board approves the plan, the applicant receives a Certificate of Qualification; 4) the applicant presents the Certificate to a participating Bank and completes a loan application; and 5) the bank conducts its normal credit review; and 6) if the landowner is creditworthy, the bank issues the loan.

We have signed agreements with seven banks in the four-county area. These seven banks have made over \$500,000 in loans to local farmers to implement best management practices such as stacking sheds, fencing, compost sheds and trenching. We are also receiving calls from banks and conservation districts in other areas of the state asking us to implement the program in their areas.

As you can see, this program benefits everyone. The banks earn interest on their loans, and they are able to provide a benefit to their communities by helping to improve





water quality. Farmers receive low interest rates on their loans. Conservation districts implement best management practices on a larger number of farms. And the Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission impacts the nonpoint source pollution problem, thereby improving the quality of the state's waters and the quality of life of the state's citizens. We all win because we have brought varied groups together to increase people's awareness of environmental needs, taken action to address specific sources of water pollution, and made a positive difference for the environment.

For additional information contact Mike Chandler, Arkansas Soil and Water Conservation Commission, (501) 682-0547 or email mike.chandler@mail.state.ar.us.

State Focus on Value Engineering through the DWSRF— Iowa's Use of the Technical Assistance Set Aside for Small Drinking Water Systems

Based on a presentation for the 2001 State Revolving Fund Program Management Workshop – Dennis Alt, Water Supply Section Supervisor of the Iowa Environmental Protection Division

The Value of Value Engineering

Value Engineering (VE) is a systematic approach maximizing facility performance while minimizing unnecessary life cycle and up front construction costs. Value engineering works to

identify cost-saving alternatives, without sacrificing quality, reliability or efficiency.

The Feasibility of Funding Value Engineering through the DWSRF

In an effort to determine if value engineering is "of value" to small public water systems, Iowa recently completed a demonstration project of value engineering studies for four small drinking water projects funded by the DWSRF Technical Assistance Set-Aside. After the four public water systems assess the results of their value engineering studies and move forward, construction costs will be supported by DWSRF loans.


Iowa's Water Supply SRF Program (<http://www.state.ia.us/government/dnr/organiza/epd/wtrsuply/wtrsup.htm>) selected an experienced engineering firm to provide value engineering services to the following four drinking water projects:

- Project 1 – Upgrade Treatment & Storage
- Project 2 – New Treatment Plant
- Project 3 – Upgrade Treatment and Distribution System
- Project 4 – New Clearwell

The value engineering process is conducted with a team. VE team members must have project-specific experience and collectively possess a varied background in areas such as process design, structural or architectural design, electrical or mechanical engineering, and knowledge in operations or project construction.

Once the team was established, Iowa set out with assistance from the engineering contractor to test the feasibility of the seven-phase Value Engineering process. These stages are information collection, functional definition, alternative generation, alternative analysis (screening), final recommendation, proposal presentation and final implementation. In working through this process for each of the four drinking water demonstration projects, Iowa looked to answer the following three questions:

- Is there a benefit to completing value engineering on smaller drinking water projects?



STATE ACTIVITIES AND TRENDS *from page 5*

- What is a reasonable cost for the process?
- Would this process improve public water system capacity?

Case Studies in Value Engineering

Following completion of Iowa's demonstration project, the four drinking water projects are expected to achieve a savings of 10% overall with a total VE contract cost of \$50,000 (between \$16,000 and \$17,000 per project). (See figure 1.) Two of the four case studies are described in detail below. For additional case study information, please refer to the contact information provided following the project descriptions.

| Project | 1st Cost Savings | Life Cycle Savings | Other Savings | Project Costs |
|---------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1st | \$74 | \$66 | \$36 | \$334 |
| 2nd | \$192 | \$180 | \$117 | \$1,500 |
| 3rd | \$154 | \$425 | \$74 | \$795 |
| 4th | \$350 | \$360 | | \$5,000 |
| Total | \$770 | \$1,031 | \$227 | \$7,628 |
| As % | 10% | 13.5% | 3% | |
| VE Cost | \$50 | | | |

All Costs in \$1,000

Figure 1

Project 1 – Upgrade Treatment and Storage

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Population: | 500 |
| Project Costs: | \$334,000 |
| First Cost Savings: | \$74,000 |
| Life Cycle Savings: | \$66,000 |
| Other Savings: | \$36,000 |

Project one had an initial estimate of project costs of \$334,000 to upgrade existing treatment and storage facilities including the installation of a new well, a new rehab treatment building, new aeration, detention and filtration systems, a new chemical feed system, a new high service pumping



facility, a new emergency generator and new water mains for looping and extension purposes.

The value engineering process recommended twelve full service alternatives that would reduce first costs by \$74,000 (or 22% of total project costs) and life cycle costs by \$66,000. Two reduced function alternatives would reduce first costs by \$36,000.

Recommendations included using alternate building materials and treatment system equipment, changing the building layout and/or size, and changing the location of new water mains.

The engineer and the public water system owner adopted many of the recommended suggestions, and they believe the effort has designed a better project through VE-related cost savings.

Project 2 – New Treatment Plant

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Population: | 2000 |
| Project Costs: | \$1.5 M |
| First Cost Savings: | \$192,000 |
| Life Cycle Savings: | \$180,000 |
| Other Savings: | \$117,000 |



SRF's Up

Project two had an initial cost estimate of \$1.5 million for the construction of a new treatment plant including the installation of new wells, new aeration and detention facilities, new filters, a new chemical feed system, new clearwell and high service pumps, a new backwash reclamation system, and a new building.

The value engineering process recommended eleven full service alternatives predicted to reduce first costs by \$192,000 (or 13% of the total costs) and life cycle costs by \$180,000. In addition, two reduced function alternatives were predicted to reduce first costs by \$117,000.

Full function recommendations included relocating the aerator and detention facilities outdoors, using two rather than three filters, using alternate building materials, changing building layout and/or size and changing the treatment system equipment (e.g. changing to unitized aeration/detention/filtration). Reduced function recommendations included replacement of the backwash recovery tank with lagoon and waste backwash water, elimination of pumped backwash and a reduction of the clearwell size.

Conclusion: Is Value Engineering of Value?

In the past, value engineering was not often viewed as a viable option due to the small number of engineering firms qualified to assist with such an undertaking. However, these circumstances are no longer present today with increases in the num-

ber of qualified engineering firms available to assist on such projects. Although value engineering remains a difficult sell to individual water systems, it is important to explore the benefits of such methods, as cost savings realized may be significant.

The cost savings realized through the implementation of VE recommendations free funds for other SRF projects. In addition, VE cost savings reduce the need for project subsidies and free local funds for other services such as wastewater management, solid waste treatment and education. Through this demonstration project, Iowa has proven that VE cost savings can be recovered several times over, even on fairly small drinking water system projects. Iowa hopes to use the value engineering process with at least 10 more projects in its SRF program.

For further information, please contact Dennis Alt, Water Supply Section Supervisor of the Iowa Environmental Protection Division at (515) 725-0275.

State Activities and Trends Briefs


Wisconsin Makes CWSRF Loans to Brownfields

The State of Wisconsin passed legislation that allocates \$20 million of its CWSRF funding to municipal projects that address brownfield site impacts on water quality. The CWSRF program offers loans with interest rates that are 55 percent of the municipal bond market rate. To date, Wisconsin has funded two brownfield cleanup projects for \$1.9 million.

One site that used CWSRF funding was the City of Plymouth landfill. Plymouth used this site for the disposal of construction debris, commercial waste, and industrial waste from 1955 through 1990. A \$1.3 million CWSRF loan supported investigation and remediation of the site. The city capped and covered the landfill and installed groundwater monitoring equipment. The low-interest CWSRF loan will save the city hundreds of thousands of dollars.

New Mexico Starts Brownfield Funding through the CWSRF

New Mexico's Voluntary Remediation Program was introduced in July 1999. This program hopes to use CWSRF funding to encourage the voluntary cleanup of brownfield sites. Two projects



7



STATE ACTIVITIES AND TRENDS *from page 7*

are currently planned. The City of Santa Fe plans to use CWSRF funds for site assessment, remediation and water quality monitoring, and the City of Deming plans to use CWSRF funds for site assessment and soil remediation.

In 1995, the City of Santa Fe purchased an idle railyard/industrial site of 50 acres that was initially developed in the 1880s. The city plans to improve the water quality of the Acequia Madre (an irrigation canal that runs through the site) and redevelop the property with a mixture of uses. The city is completing a comprehensive environmental assessment for the property with the support of an EPA Brownfields Pilot Grant. CWSRF funding will support water quality monitoring, environmental studies, risk assessment, and remediation activities that address water quality.

This project is expected to cost \$21 million. The city plans to finance approximately \$4 million (20 percent of the project cost) with a CWSRF loan. A three-percent CWSRF loan will allow the project to remain financially viable and will help keep future lease rates attractive to developers. The city will use residential and retail lease payments to repay the loan.

The Peru Hill Mill site in Deming, NM covers 1,320 acres of abandoned zinc mining lands. Uncontained tailings (refuse that remains after ore has been processed) in a 104 acre impoundment and windblown tailings on 161 adjacent acres have caused elevated levels of lead, arsenic, cadmium, cobalt, copper, iron, manganese and zinc in soils on the site. These contaminants threaten the City of Deming's drinking water — groundwater that runs underneath the property. The project will include site investigation and remediation activities. The city has applied for a \$300,000 CWSRF loan to assist with cleanup of the site. If this application is approved, the CWSRF loan will have a 20-year term and an interest rate of one percent.

Missouri — Capacity Development Grants through the DWSRF

In an effort to increase the involvement of small water systems in the DWSRF, Missouri has created a grant program to fund

engineering contract services through the Technical Assistance Set Aside of the DWSRF. Grant funds through this program are used to help small water systems achieve and maintain technical, managerial, and financial capacity. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources has been successful in increasing the number of small drinking water systems that apply for DWSRF funding.

Since inception three years ago, this grant program has funded nearly 40 capacity development projects for small drinking water systems. A competitive application process for ranking projects ensures the most pressing system problems are addressed first. Priority ranking is based on items in such areas as system compliance, source water information, distribution information, storage information, and consolidation options. Grants funded through the DWSRF technical assistance set-aside may be used for up to 90 percent, or \$10,000, per report for engineering services to small water systems. These grants are paid directly to the contracted engineering firm and each firm is directly chosen by the individual water system rather than at the state level. The remaining 10 percent, or any amount exceeding \$10,000, is eligible for financing under the DWSRF, and is to be paid directly by the water system.

8



IN THE WORKS

EPA Preparing Response to Peer Review of Gap Analysis

In the last two years, the American Water Works Association, the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies, the Water Environment Federation, and the Water Infrastructure Network issued three separate reports with a similar conclusion – current levels of wastewater and drinking water infrastructure spending will not meet future needs. These organizations suggest that the nation will require multi-billion dollar increases to its annual infrastructure investments.

EPA reviewed these reports and recently completed a study of its own to quantify the difference between historic wastewater and drinking water infrastructure spending and estimated needs for the next twenty years. This “gap analysis” suggests that wastewater and drinking water systems may require significant additional investments to meet projected needs.

EPA is using a peer review process to evaluate its findings. Peer reviewers from varying backgrounds including economics, public finance, statistics, engineering and infrastructure management have reviewed the gap analysis report. EPA is reviewing the comments provided by the reviewers and hopes to produce a final report later this year.

DWSRF Products in the Works

The DWSRF program continues to work on a report to Congress on the status of state DWSRF programs through fiscal year 2001. The report will include information from the DWSRF National Information Management System and will include descriptions of each of the programs for the fifty states and Puerto Rico. EPA expects to release the document in the early part of 2002.

The DWSRF program is also working to develop a series of fact sheets on new rules which highlights the types of infrastructure improvements that may be needed to help systems

comply with the regulations. The 1996 SDWA Amendments included a demanding schedule for rule development that will require many systems to come into compliance with new regulations during the period between 2000 and 2006. It is hoped that the fact sheets will help state DWSRF programs market their services to utilities that will need to address their infrastructure needs in the next several years.

GAO Reports


During the past year and a half, the General Accounting Office (GAO) has been busy responding to Congressional requests by developing reports that directly or tangentially address the SRF programs. In August 2000, the GAO released a report, *Drinking Water: Spending Constraints Could Affect States' Ability to Implement Increasing Program Requirements* (GAO/RCED-00-199). In reporting on states' ability to fund and maintain drinking water programs, the report investigated state usage of DWSRF set-aside funds and challenges that states were having in utilizing funds.

In July 2001, GAO released *U.S. Infrastructure: Agencies' Approaches to Developing Investment Estimates Vary* (GAO-01-835). As part of the report, GAO reported on the methods used for the Drinking Water and Clean Water Infrastructure Needs Surveys.

Two additional reports are pending for this fall. The first is reviewing EPA's oversight of state DWSRF programs and state utilization of provisions intended to assist disadvantaged communities. The second is reviewing funding of water and wastewater infrastructure in the nation over the past ten years - from federal, state and local sources.

New SRF State Activity Updates in Development

EPA Headquarters regularly publishes activity updates that highlight innovative activities in SRF programs. Whereas SRF fact sheets provide one-page overview descriptions of a topic (e.g., funding estuary projects with the CWSRF), state activity updates provide more detailed discussions of topics (e.g.,



IN THE WORKS from page 9

New Jersey's cross-collateralization structure). EPA is developing four new state activity updates. One will highlight CWSRF programs that support private borrowers addressing nonpoint sources of pollution. A second report will discuss how a few forerunning states use CWSRF funds to address water pollution from brownfield sites. A third report will highlight how states have integrated SRF application processes with the application processes of other state and federal funding programs. A fourth report will discuss financial planning in SRF programs.

Released Reports, Factsheets, and Updates

The DWSRF and CWSRF programs have released many reports and factsheets in the past year. To download these documents, please visit the DWSRF and CWSRF websites.

(www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf.html, www.epa.gov/owm/finan.htm)

- *Implementation of Transfers in the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Programs — Report to Congress, October 2000*
- *Accelerated Loan Commitment in the SRF Program, October 2000*
- *Potential Roles for Clean Water State Revolving Fund Programs in Smart Growth Initiatives, October 2000*
- *The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund: Financing America's Drinking Water, November 2000*
- *Development, Selection, and Pilot Demonstration of Preliminary Environmental Indicators for the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Program, March 2001*
- *Integrated Planning and Priority Setting in the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program, March 2001*
- *Financing America's Clean Water Since 1987 — A Report of Progress and Innovation, May 2001*
- *Using Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) Set-Aside Funds for Capacity Development and Technical Assistance — Examples of Requests for Proposals, June 2001*

FAXBACK FORM

Please fax to EPA Headquarters:

CWSRF PROGRAM (Attn: S. Platt) • 202-501-2403

or

DWSRF PROGRAM (Attn: V. Blette) • 202-401-2345

Comments on Current Newsletter:

Suggestions for Articles or Event Announcements in Future Newsletters:

If you wish to receive future newsletters, please complete the following to be added to the mailing list:

Name:

Title:

Address:

email:



EVENTS

1. American Water Works Association Water

Sources Conference & Exhibition: Reuse, Resources, Conservation

Location: Las Vegas, Nevada

Date: January 27 – 31, 2002

Information: www.awwa.org/02Sources

2. Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Agencies Mid-Year Meeting

Location: Alexandria, VA

Date: March 10 – 13, 2002

Information: www.asiwpca.org

3. Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies Legislative and Regulatory Conference

Location: Washington, D.C.

Date: March 18 – 20, 2002

Information: www.amwa.net/features/meetings

4. Council of Infrastructure Financing

Authorities Annual Legislative Conference

Location: Washington, D.C.

Date: May 2 – 3, 2002

Information: www.cifanet.org/conf.html

5. Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies National Environmental Policy Forum & 32nd Annual Meeting

Location: Washington, D.C.

Date: May 18 – 22, 2002

Information: www.amsa-cleanwater.org/meetings

6. Managing Extremes- Floods and Droughts, EWRI 2002 Conference on Water Resources Planning & Management

Location: Roanoke, VA

Date: May 19 – 22, 2002

Information: www.asce.org/conferences/eventsmore.cfm

SRF LINKS

1. CWSRF/DWSRF@EPA

Both SRFs maintain pages on the EPA website with information on the programs. Both sites contain guidance, policy documents and contact lists for state and regional staff.

The URLs are as follows:

- CWSRF: www.epa.gov/owm/finan.htm

- DWSRF: www.epa.gov/safewater/dwsrf.html

The DWSRF site includes a link to a Local Drinking Water Information page, which has state by state information on drinking water systems and programs. Where available, this page includes a link to state DWSRF programs.

2. National Associations

- American Water Works Association: www.awwa.org

- Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies: www.amsa-cleanwater.org

- Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies: www.amwa.net

- Association of State Drinking Water Administrators: www.asdwa.org

- Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Agencies: www.asiwpca.org

- Council of Infrastructure Financing Authorities: www.cifanet.org

- National Association of Water Companies: www.nawc.org

3. State Programs

Many SRF programs have websites that are used to provide program information and application materials. This newsletter places a spotlight on Washington.


- Washington State Department of Ecology:

www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/funding/2002 (CWSRF)

- Washington State Department of Health

www.doh.wa.gov/ehp/dw/Our_Main_Pages/

DWSRE.htm (DWSRF)





United States
Environmental Protection
Agency
Washington, DC 20460

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use
\$300

IN THIS ISSUE.....

12

On the National Scene

- G. Tracy Mehan, III Appointed Assistant Administrator
- Drinking Water Needs Survey and Allotment of DWSRF Funds
- Budget Update
- Security and Terrorism
- Wider CWSRF Project Eligibilities in Estuary Study Areas

State Activities and Trends

- Arkansas Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program
- State Focus: Value Engineering through Iowa's DWSRF
- Wisconsin Makes CWSRF Loans to Brownfields
- New Mexico Starts Brownfield Funding through the CWSRF
- Missouri — Capacity Development Grants through the DWSRF

In the Works - Report on Ongoing SRF Activities

- Peer Review of Gap Analysis
- DWSRF Products in the Works
- GAO Reports
- New SRF State Activity Updates in Development
- Released Reports, Factsheets, and Updates

SRF Fax Back • Events • SRF Links

