FACILITIES PLAN CHECKLIST

(Revised 2014 - incorporating 40 year bond requirements)

Project Name:

Location:

Consultant:

Date Submitted:

General Description: 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.

<u>SECTION I – INTRODUCTION</u>	Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Pg.#</u>
Description of the planning area? The implementation authority? Detailed project history? Signed and sealed by a WV PE?			<u>Pg. #</u> <u>Pg. #</u> <u>Pg. #</u> <u>Pg. #</u>
Comments on Section I:			
SECTION II - CURRENT SITUATION	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Pg.#</u>
All information related to current wastewater disposal practices (e.q. septic tanks, direct discharges, public sewer) provided.			<u>Pg. #</u>
TMDL 303d list documentation provided.			<u>Pg. #</u>
The name and location of all current publicly owned, privately owned and industrial collection and treatment systems in project area.			<u>Pg. #</u>
An Infiltration/Inflow (I/I) analysis been conducted for all existing collection systems as applicable?			<u>Pg. #</u>

Physical inspection.			<u>Pg. #</u>
Flow monitoring of major subsystems.			<u>Pg. #</u>
Smoke testing.			<u>Pg. #</u>
TV monitoring.			<u>Pg. #</u>
When was the analysis performed?			
Does the I/I analysis results justify the scope of work?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Do the findings show the following?			
Domestic waste production.			<u>Pg. #</u>
Average and peak infiltration rates.			Pg. #
Inflow rates.			Pg. #
A detailed plan of operation to correct or			
treat the I/I problems.			<u>Pg. #</u>
A complete sewer map of existing systems impacted by			
the project.			<u>Pg. #</u>
Information on existing CSO/SSOs and the LTCP.			<u>Pg. #</u>
Has each receiving stream and major river			
basin been identified?			Pg. #
Were existing facilities evaluated and were their			
maximum performance levels determined?			<u>Pg. #</u>
A complete description of existing Wastewater Treatment Facilities including the following as applicable:			
Layout maps.			<u>Pg. #</u>
Schematic diagrams.			Pg. #
Physical condition and capacities.			Pg. #
Maintenance data.			Pg. #
Has effluent data for each discharge been provided?			Pg. #
Has stream designation for each receiving stream			
been provided?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Comments on Section II:			
SECTION III - FUTURE SITUATION	Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>A Pg.#</u>
Does this section include detailed population			
projections including historical growth rate?			<u>Pg. #</u>
projections meruding instorical growth rate:			<u>т с.</u> т
Have detailed supporting documents for those			
projections been provided?			<u>Pg. #</u>

Did the I/I analysis include the following as applicable?

Has non-residential flow been converted to equivalent dwelling units (EDU's and customer counts)?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Have detailed waste flow projections including the domestic water consumption of customers connected to collection systems been provided?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Have both average flow and peak daily flow been included in the projections?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Comments on Section III:			
SECTION IV - ALTERNATIVES	Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Pg.#</u>
Was a complete present worth analysis made of at least two alternatives that comply with the discharge limits in the wasteload allocation (WLA) to establish cost-effectiveness?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Was the no-action alternative discussed?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Was a detailed discussion of Non-Monetary Factors (e.q. maintenance requirements, flexibility for each treatment and service option, public acceptance) provided?			<u>Pg. #</u>
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?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Will the treatment works 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.)			<u>Pg. #</u>
Has a copy of the wasteload for each evaluated discharge location and any NPDES permit requirements been addressed in this section?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Was a complete list of Centralized versus Decentralized service areas provided?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Was sludge processing and its final disposal evaluated?			<u>Pg. #</u>

 Has sufficient design data been provided to make a decision on the feasibility and reliability of treatment works? Does the STP(s) design appear reasonable in light of discharge requirements? 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? 			<u>Pg. #</u> <u>Pg. #</u>
Does the STP(s) design appear reasonable in light of discharge requirements? Has a 1"=100' scale map for each site been provided? Does proposed treatment plant site conform to Buffer			
discharge requirements? Has a 1"=100' scale map for each site been provided? Does proposed treatment plant site conform to Buffer			<u>Pg. #</u>
Does proposed treatment plant site conform to Buffer			
			<u>Pg. #</u>
Zone Requirements in 47CSR31, App. B, Table E?			
			<u>Pg. #</u>
To the extent necessary, were the following collection system alternative	es evalua	ated?	
Gravity			<u>Pg. #</u>
Grinder pump/pressure			<u>Pg. #</u>
Utilization of existing collection system			<u>Pg. #</u>
NOTE: More than one collection system technology may be utilize system.	ed in th	ae recor	nmendeo
Has 1"=500' scale mapping of selected alternative been provided? (These maps shall also identify			
existing and projected customers.)			<u>Pg. #</u>
Comments on Section IV:			
SECTION V - PLAN SELECTION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Pg.#</u>
This section includes a brief discussion of factors			
influencing the choice of the selected plan.			<u>Pg. #</u>
At least one public meeting was held to discuss the chosen alternative as well as the reasons for rejecting			
other alternatives and to allow for comments. (Minutes of the meeting are included.)			<u>Pg. #</u>
Does the project scope match the scope of work in the IJDC approved PER?			<u>Pg. #</u>

SECTION VI - ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION	Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>A Pg.#</u>
Have environmental information documents been incorporated in the plan which evaluated the chosen alternative?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Will the entity implement all measures necessary to prevent adverse impact to the public health, safety, or welfare or to the environment?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Comments on Section VI:			
SECTION VII - PROJECT SUMMARY	Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>A Pg.#</u>
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 as applicable) have been provided in this section of the plan. Comments on Section VII:			<u>Pg. #</u>
<u>SECTION VIII - APPENDICES</u>	Yes	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Pg.#</u>
Project cost estimate			<u>Pg. #</u>
O&M summary			<u>Pg. #</u>
Debt information			<u>Pg. #</u>
User charge information			<u>Pg. #</u>
Were SRF Financial Information Worksheets provided?			<u>Pg. #</u>
Has a detailed project schedule been included?			<u>Pg. #</u>
A resolution of acceptance if needed from the implementing agency.			<u>Pg. #</u>
All governmentral agreements.			<u>Pg. #</u>
A copy of the current NPDES permit or waste- load allocation.			<u>Pg. #</u>

A statement of availability of proposed waste- water treatment works site.		<u>Pg. #</u>
All other pertinent correspondence and documents.		<u>Pg. #</u>

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

1.	<u>Air (</u>	Quality	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
	a.	Does documentation exist to indicate a possible violation of ambient air quality standards as a primary impact of the project?				<u>Pg. #</u>
	b.	Is incineration proposed?				<u>Pg. #</u>
	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?		\boxtimes		<u>Pg. #</u>

d.	Does documentation exist to indicate a possible violation of noise standards as a	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
	primary or secondary impact of the project?				<u>Pg. #</u>
Wate	er Quality	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
a.	Will the proposed discharge cause a violation of existing stream standards?				<u>Pg. #</u>
b.	Are present stream standards being legally challenged?				<u>Pg. #</u>
c.	A sediment and erosion control plan will not be submitted.				<u>Pg. #</u>
d.	Does documentation exist to indicate if existing or future development could affect the quality or quantity of groundwater (e.g. groundwater recharge area)?				<u>Pg. #</u>
Wate	er Supply	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible Adverse	Page #
a.	There is an existing or possible future public water supply downstream of the proposed discharge.				<u>Pg. #</u>
b.	The project will cause a significant amount of water to be transferred from on sub-basin to another (relative to the 7-day 10-year low flow of the diverted basin).				<u>Pg. #</u>
c.	There is an existing or proposed groundwater supply source (aquifer) to which the project is discharging.				<u>Pg. #</u>

2.

3.

Δ	Diala	~~ (*)	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
4.	<u>D1010</u>	<u>gy</u> (*)				
	a.	Endangered or threatened species are not included in the initial or future service areas.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	b.	Documentation exists to indicate wildlife and/or their habitat will be affected by treatment works location or future development.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	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).				Pg. #
			_	_		<u>- s.</u>
5.	Sonai	tive Areas	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
5.	501151	tive Areas				
	a. b.	The service area includes or is part of an area designated or considered sensitive by a local, state or federal agency(ies). The service area includes streams which have				<u>Pg. #</u>
		or are being considered for designation as a Wild and Scenic River.				<u>Pg. #</u>
6	Wath	nds (*)	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
6.	wena	unds (*)				
	a.	Wetlands, either fresh or salt water, are included in the service area.				<u>Pg. #</u>
LANI	b. D USE 1	Those wetlands in the service area will be affected directly or indirectly (related to land use) by either STP location or interceptor routing. PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT				<u>Pg. #</u>

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

		NZ	NT	Possible	D //
7.	Existing Land Use	<u>Yes</u>	<u>N0</u>	<u>Adverse</u>	<u>Page #</u>
	a. The project does not conform to existing land use plans or could cause significant changes to				
	existing land use patterns.				<u>Pg. #</u>
				Possible	
		Yes	<u>No</u>		
8.	Reserve Capacity				
	a. The STP or pump station will have an initial reserve capacity greater than				
	50% of its design average capacity.				<u>Pg. #</u>
				Possible	
0	Veccet I and	Yes	<u>No</u>	Adverse	Page #
9.	Vacant Land				
	a. Large areas of existing vacant land will be	_	_	_	D //
	subject to increased development pressure.				<u>Pg. #</u>
				Possible	
10.	Dopulation Changes	Yes	<u>No</u>	<u>Adverse</u>	Page #
	FODULATION CHANGES				
	Population Changes				
	Documentation exists which indicates that the proposed project will induce population changes or migration which could:				
	Documentation exists which indicates that the proposed project will induce population changes				<u>Pg. #</u>
(*)	Documentation exists which indicates that the proposed project will induce population changes or migration which could:				<u>Pg. #</u> <u>Pg. #</u>
(*)	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.				
(*)	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				<u>Pg. #</u>
(*)	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.				<u>Pg. #</u>
(*)	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				<u>Pg. #</u>

	The recommended project is documented as using	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
	more energy than other feasible alternatives considered.				<u>Pg. #</u>
SOCIO	D-ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT				
	The project will require the acquisition of residential properties.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	Parks or recreational areas will be acquired for or affected through development by STP construction or interceptor routing.				<u>Pg. #</u>
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	Possible <u>Adverse</u>	Page #
	A buffer zone does not exist between a plant or pump station and an existing or proposed park.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	Documentation exists which suggests the local populace cannot afford their local share of the proposed project.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	No buffer zone or effective barrier exists between the proposed project and existing residential areas.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	Interceptor routings do not provide for the use of existing roads or right-of-ways where feasible.				<u>Pg. #</u>
(*)	The project will affect known or potential archaeological sites as identified by the Federal Register, state preservation officer or other interested parties.				<u>Pg. #</u>
(*)	A registered historic site(s) exists in the service area.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	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.				<u>Pg. #</u>

The project threatens to violate a Federal, State	Yes	<u>No</u>	Possible Adverse	Page #	
	or local law or requirement, which was originally imposed to protect the environment.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	The project as proposed has developed a significant level of public controversy.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	Inadequate evidence of public participation in the project exists.				<u>Pg. #</u>
	Has a statement been received on the availability and estimated cost of proposed sites?				<u>Pg. #</u>
Comn	nents 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

Engineering Section Manager

Date