FACILITIES PLAN CHECKLIST
40 year Extended Bonds
(Revised 12/03)

Project Name: ____________________________________________________________

Location: ________________________________________________________________

Consultant: ______________________________________________________________

General

Provide general description of the scope of the Facilities Plan.
________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

NOTE: In completing checklist, all items should have a checkmark in the yes box except when the question is not applicable to the scope of the project. If a yes cannot be checked, then additional information is required. Comment section provided to explain N/A or any specific comments.

Yes N/A Pg.#

SECTION – 40 YEAR EXTENDED BOND BASIC REQUIREMENTS

What is the useful life of the facility? _______ _______ _______

What is the financing time period? _______ _______ _______

What is the length of time necessary to overcome the threshold at which the project becomes affordable to the community? _______ _______ _______

Has detailed information concerning expected increases in O&M costs from (20 to 40) years been included? _______ _______ _______

Has a schedule for the repair and replacement of all facility units/components including equipment been included? _______ _______ _______

Has there been a historical decline in population in the project area? _______ _______ _______

Yes N/A Pg.#
Has information been included concerning the composition of the population base such as age and income characteristics, trends in the tax base, number of jobs and housing starts?  

Has the DEP project engineer conducted an onsite tour of the project area and conducted interviews with local citizens and officials as to the purpose, need and financial assumption the proposed project?  

How many potential new customers are being projected?  

Has 90% of new potential customers been used for revenue projection and rate setting purposes?  

Are existing customers already served by a collection system included in the 90% of new potential customers?  

Does the projected average annual sewer rate (for 4,500 gallons/month) exceed 2% of the annual median household income?  

SECTION I - INTRODUCTION  

Description of the planning area?  

The implementation authority?  

Detailed project history?  

Comments on Section I:
All information related to current wastewater disposal practices (e.g. septic tanks, direct discharges, public sewer).

The name and location of all current publicly owned, privately owned and industrial collection and treatment systems in project area.

An Infiltration/Inflow (I/I) analysis been conducted for all existing collection systems?

Did the I/I analysis include the following?
- Physical inspection.
- Flow monitoring of major subsystems.
- Smoke testing.
- TV monitoring.

Does the analysis finding show the following?
- Domestic flow production.
- Average and peak infiltration rates.
- Inflow rates.
- A detailed plan of operation to correct or treat the I/I problems.
- A complete sewer map of each existing system.
- A calculation of the percentages of homes not currently sewered.
- A detailed description of the population (this should include the source of the data provided).
- A detailed customer count with non-residential customers shown as equivalent dwelling units (EDU's).

A complete description of existing Wastewater Treatment Facilities including the following:
- Layout maps.
Schematic diagrams. ____________________________________________________________

Physical condition and capacities. ________________________________________________

Maintenance data. ______________________________________________________________

Has each receiving stream and major river basin been identified? ______________________

Has effluent data for each discharge been provided? _________________________________

Has stream designation for each receiving stream been provided? _____________________

Comments on Section II _________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

SECTION III - FUTURE SITUATION

Does this section include detailed population projections including historical growth rate? ___________ ___________ ___________

Have detailed supporting documents for those projections been provided? ___________ ___________ ___________

Has commercial/industrial flow been converted to equivalent dwelling units (EDU’s and customer counts)? ___________ ___________ ___________

Have detailed waste flow projections including the domestic water consumption of customers connected to collection systems been provided? ___________ ___________ ___________

Have both average flow and peak daily flow been included in the projections? ___________ ___________ ___________

Has a copy of the wasteload for each selected treatment alternative and any NPDES permit requirements been addressed in this section? Yes N/A Pg.#
### Comments on Section III

---

### SECTIONS IV - ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Pg.#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were existing facilities evaluated and were their maximum performance levels determined?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a complete list of Regional/Versus Multiple service areas provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the extent necessary, were the following evaluated cost-effectively:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Aerated Lagoon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Extended Aeration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Oxidation Ditch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Sequencing Batch Reactors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was a detailed discussion of Non-Monetary Factors (e.g. maintenance requirements, flexibility for each treatment and service option, public acceptance) provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a schematic diagram of the proposed STP(s) been included?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has sufficient design data been provided to make a decision on the feasibility and reliability of treatment works?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the STP(s) design appear reasonable in light of discharge requirements?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have alternative treatment plant sites been examined for each proposed treatment works with special consideration given to the aesthetics and costs associated with each alternative site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has a 1"=100' scale map for each site been provided?  

Does proposed treatment plant site conform to Buffer Zone Requirements in 47CSR31, App. B, Table E?  

NOTE: The treatment works shall remain accessible during the 25 year flood and be completely free from damage during a 100 year flood. Sites not meeting this criterion shall be eliminated from consideration.

To the extent necessary, were the following collection system alternatives evaluated?

- Gravity
- Vacuum
- Grinder pump/pressure
- Small diameter system
- Other

NOTE: More than one collection system technology may be utilized in the recommended system.

Has 1"=500' scale mapping of selected alternative been provided?  

Comments on Section IV

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

SECTION V - PLAN SELECTION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

This section includes a brief discussion of factors influencing the choice of the selected plan.

Yes  N/A  Pg.#

A public participation program has been completed to discuss the proposed project and a ranking of the various alternatives. Were the meetings properly advertised (i.e. 30 days Class II)?

__________________________________________________________
SECTION VI - ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION
Have environmental information documents been incorporated in the plan which evaluated the chosen alternative? Yes  N/A  Pg.#
Were the following areas addressed?

Any unavoidable adverse impacts?

Mitigative measures to limit environmental impact?

Comments on Section VI

SECTION VII - PROJECT SUMMARY
A summary of the proposed project, including detailed descriptions of all project facilities, systems, and appurtenances (e.g., the length and size of pipes, pumping station capacities) has been provided in this section of the plan.

Comments on Section VII
SECTION VIII - APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Pg.#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were SRF Financial Information Worksheets provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a detailed project schedule been included?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A resolution of acceptance if needed from the implementing agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All intermunicipal agreements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A copy of the existing NPDES permit or waste-load allocation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A statement of availability of proposed wastewater treatment works site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other pertinent correspondence and documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on Section VIII

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

SECTION IX - ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING CHECKLIST

The following questions are each followed by a series of three (3) boxes in which to respond. A negative response to each question in a category will justify the decision of "no significant impact". The statements are phrased to include both primary and secondary impacts and were based upon criteria for an impact statement (40 CFR Part 6). The Section on "Land Use Planning and Management" should determine secondary impacts due to development.
If a definite negative response cannot be made then the "possible adverse" block should be checked and that particular category discussed in the Environment Assessment (FONSI). The Environmental Assessment, when written, should summarize beneficial impacts and discuss possible adverse impacts and mitigating measures.

The phrasing "Does documentation exist . . ." was used for several questions due to the difficulty in being specific and thus possibly not relating to all situations. The Environmental Screening Checklist is worded generally to invoke in the reviewer the responsibility to deeply consider each item rather than routinely check blocks.

The items which require correspondence from environmental agencies are indicated with an asterisk(*). Other items may be answered based upon the reviewer’s knowledge of the project.

### NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>Page #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Does documentation exist to indicate a possible violation of ambient air quality standards as a primary impact of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Is incineration proposed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Is significant or excessive development planned or expected, which could yield a possible violation of ambient air quality standards as a secondary impact of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Does documentation exist to indicate a possible violation of noise standards as a primary or secondary impact of the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><strong>Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Will the proposed discharge cause a violation of existing stream standards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Are present stream standards being legally challenged?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. A sediment and erosion control plan will not be submitted.

   _____ _____ _____ _____

d. Does documentation exist to indicate if existing or future development could affect the quality or quantity of groundwater (e.g. groundwater recharge area)?

   _____ _____ _____ _____

3. Water Supply

a. There is an existing or possible future public water supply downstream of the proposed discharge.

   _____ _____ _____ _____

b. The project will cause a significant amount of water to be transferred from one sub-basin to another (relative to the 7-day 10-year low flow of the diverted basin).

   _____ _____ _____ _____

c. There is an existing or proposed groundwater supply source (aquifer) to which the project is discharging.

   _____ _____ _____ _____

4. Biology (*)

a. Endangered or threatened species are not included in the initial or future service areas.

   _____ _____ _____ _____

b. Documentation exists to indicate wildlife and/or their habitat will be affected by treatment works location or future development.

   _____ _____ _____ _____

c. Documentation exists to indicate aquatic life will be affected by the proposed treatment works (i.e. discharge is located near or adjacent to a shellfish harvesting area).

   _____ _____ _____ _____

5. Sensitive Areas
a. The service area includes or is part of an area designated or considered sensitive by a local, state or federal agency(ies).

b. The service area includes streams which have or are being considered for designation as a Wild and Scenic River.

6. **Wetlands (*)**

   a. Wetlands, either fresh or salt water, are included in the service area.

   b. Those wetlands in the service area will be affected directly or indirectly (related to land use) by either STP location or interceptor routing.

**LAND USE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT**

A negative response to all questions will indicate minimal secondary impacts due to development.

7. The project does not conform to existing land use plans or could cause significant changes to existing land use patterns.

8. **Reserve Capacity**

   a. The STP or pump station will have an initial reserve capacity greater than 50% of its design average capacity.

   Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Adverse</th>
<th>Page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Large areas of existing vacant land will be subject to increased development pressure.

   Documentation exists which indicates that the proposed project will induce population changes or migration which could:

   Overload sewerage facilities.
Affect demand or availability of energy sources.  

(*) Prime agricultural land will be lost for its natural uses due to interceptor routing or subsequent development.  

Flood plains will be open to development due to interceptor routing.  

Sludge disposal will occur in an area with inadequate sanitary landfill(s) or on land unsuitable for land application.  

The recommended project is documented as using more energy than other feasible alternatives considered.  

SOCIO-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

The project will require the acquisition of residential properties.  

Parks or recreational areas will be acquired for or affected through development by STP construction or interceptor routing.  

A buffer zone does not exist between a plant or pump station and an existing or proposed park.  

Documentation exists which suggests the local populace cannot afford their local share of the proposed project.  

No buffer zone or effective barrier exists between the proposed project and existing residential areas.  

Interceptor routings do not provide for the use of existing roads or right-of-ways where feasible.  

(*) The project will affect known or potential archaeological sites as identified by the Federal
Register, state preservation officer or other interested parties.  

(*) A registered historic site(s) exists in the service area.  

A local historic site(s) eligible for federal registration exists in the service area as defined by the state historic preservation officer or other interested parties.  

The project threatens to violate a Federal, State or local law or requirement, which was originally imposed to protect the environment.  

The project as proposed has developed a significant level of public controversy.  

Inadequate evidence of public participation in the project exists.  

Has a statement been received on the availability and estimated cost of proposed sites?  

Comments on Section IX  


SECTION X - REVIEW SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS  

What portions of the project have already proceeded or could proceed to design or building while deficiencies are corrected?
Recommendations (specify conditions, if any, on approval):

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Engineer ___________________________ Date __________________

Engineer Branch Manager ___________________________ Date __________________