

WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

FACILITIES PLAN CHECKLIST

Project Name: _____

Location: _____

Consultant: _____

Date Submitted: _____

General Description:

Note: In completing this 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.

Section I - Introduction

	<u>YES</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>PG. #</u>
1. Description of the planning area?	_____	_____	_____
2. The implementation of authority?	_____	_____	_____
3. Detailed project history?	_____	_____	_____
4. Signed and sealed by a WV PE?	_____	_____	_____

Comments on Section I:

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Section II - Current Situation

	<u>YES</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>PG. #</u>
1. All information related to current wastewater disposal practices (eg. septic tanks, direct discharges, public sewer) provided?	_____	_____	_____
2. TMDL 303d list documentation provided?	_____	_____	_____
3. The name and location of all current publicly owned, privately owned and industrial collection and treatment systems in project area?	_____	_____	_____
4. Has an Infiltration/Inflow analysis been conducted for all existing collection systems as applicable?	_____	_____	_____
Did the I/I analysis include the following as applicable?			
Physical Inspection	_____	_____	_____
Flow monitoring of major subsystems	_____	_____	_____
Smoke testing	_____	_____	_____
TV monitoring	_____	_____	_____
When was the I/I analysis performed? _____			
Does the I/I analysis justify the scope of work?	_____	_____	_____
Do I/I findings show any of the following?			
Domestic waste production	_____	_____	_____
Average and peak infiltration rates	_____	_____	_____
Inflow rates	_____	_____	_____
A detailed plan of operation to correct or treat the I/I problems	_____	_____	_____
5. A complete sewer map of existing systems impacted by the project?	_____	_____	_____
6. Information on existing CSO/SSO's and the LTCP?	_____	_____	_____
7. Has each receiving stream and major river basin been identified?	_____	_____	_____
8. Were existing facilities evaluated and were their maximum performance levels determined?	_____	_____	_____
9. A complete description of existing Wastewater Treatment Facilities including the following as applicable?			
Layout Maps	_____	_____	_____
Schematic Diagrams	_____	_____	_____
Physical Condition and Capacities	_____	_____	_____
Maintenance Data	_____	_____	_____
Has effluent data for each discharge been provided?	_____	_____	_____
10. Has stream designation for each receiving stream been provided?	_____	_____	_____

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Comments on Section II:

Section III - Future Situation

	<u>YES</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>PG. #</u>
1. Detailed population projections with historical growth rates included? Have detailed supporting documents for those projections been provided?	_____	_____	_____
2. Have non-residential flows been converted to equivalent dwelling units (EDU's and customer counts)?	_____	_____	_____
3. Have both average flow and peak daily flow been included in the projections?	_____	_____	_____

Comments on Section III:

Section IV - Alternatives

1. Was a complete present worth analysis made of at least two alternatives that comply with the discharge limits in the waste load allocation (WLA) to establish cost-effectiveness?	_____	_____	_____
2. Was the no-action alternative discussed?	_____	_____	_____
3. Was a detailed discussion of Non-Monetary Factors (eg. maintenance requirements, flexibility for each treatment and service option, public acceptance) provided?	_____	_____	_____
4. 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?	_____	_____	_____
5. 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.)	_____	_____	_____

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

- | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|
| 6. Has a copy of the waste load for each evaluated discharge location and any NPDES permit requirements been addressed in this section? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. Was a complete list of Centralized versus Decentralized service areas provided? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. Was sludge processing and its final disposal evaluated? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. Has a schematic diagram of the proposed STP(s) been included? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 10. Has sufficient design data been provided to make a decision on the feasibility and reliability of treatment works? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 11. Does the STP(s) design appear reasonable in light of discharge requirements? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 12. Has a 1"=100' scale map for each site been provided? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 13. Does proposed treatment plant site conform to Buffer Zone Requirements in 47CSR31, App. B, Table E? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 14. To the extent necessary, were the following collection system alternatives evaluated? | | | |
| Gravity | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Grinder pump/pressure | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| Utilization of existing collection system | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| <i>Note: More than one collection system technology may be utilized in the recommended system.</i> | | | |
| 15. Has 1"=500' scale mapping of selected alternative been provided? (These maps shall also identify existing and projected customers.) | _____ | _____ | _____ |

Comments on Section IV:

Section V - Plan Selection and Public Participation

- | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Includes a brief selection of factors influencing the choice of the selected plan? | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. 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. (with meeting minutes included) | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Does the project scope match the scope of work in the IJDC approved PER? | _____ | _____ | _____ |

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Comments on Section V:

Section VI - Environmental Information

YES

N/A

PG. #

1. Have environmental information documents been incorporated in the plan which evaluated the chosen alternative?

2. Will the entity implement all measures necessary to prevent adverse impact to the public health, safety, or welfare or to the environment?

Comments on Section VI:

Section VII - Project Summary

1. 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:

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Section VIII - Appendices

- | | | | |
|--|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Project Cost Estimate | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. O&M Summary | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Debt Information | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. User Charge Information | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 5. Detailed Project Schedule | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 6. Resolution of acceptance if needed from the implementing agency | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 7. All governmental agreements | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 8. A copy of the current NPDES permit or waste load allocation | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 9. A statement of availability of proposed wastewater treatment works site | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 10. All other pertinent correspondence and documents | _____ | _____ | _____ |

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 (RK) of the project.*

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Natural Environment

Air Quality	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>POSSIBLE ADVERSE</u>	<u>PG. #</u>
1. Does documentation exist to indicate a possible violation of ambient air quality standards as a primary impact of the project?	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Is incineration proposed?	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. 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?	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Does documentation exist to indicated a possible violation of noise standards as primary or secondary impact of the project?	_____	_____	_____	_____

Water Quality

1. Will the proposed discharge cause a violation of existing stream standards?	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Are present stream standards being legally challenged?	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. A sediment and erosion control plan will not be submitted.	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Does documentation exist to indicate if existing or future development could affect the quality or quantity of groundwater (e.g. groundwater recharge area)?	_____	_____	_____	_____

Water Supply

1. There is an existing or possible future public water supply downstream of the proposed discharge.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. 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)?	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. There is an existing or proposed groundwater supply source (aquifer) to which the project is discharging.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Biology (*)

1. Endangered or threatened species are not included in the initial or future service areas.	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Documentation exists to indicate wildlife and/or their habitat will be affected by treatment works location or future development.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Sensitive Areas

1. The service area includes or is part of an area designated or considered sensitive by a local, state or federal agency(ies).	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. The service area includes streams which have or are being considered for designation as a Wild and Scenic River.	_____	_____	_____	_____

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Wetlands (*)

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

2. 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.

Existing Land Use

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

Reserve Capacity

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

Vacant Land

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

Population Changes

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

1. Overload sewerage facilities.

2. Affect demand or availability of energy sources.

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

4. Flood plains will be open to interceptor routing

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

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

Socio-Economic Environment

1. The project will require the acquisition of residential properties

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

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

**WEST VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DIVISION OF WATER AND WASTE MANAGEMENT**

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

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

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

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

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

9. 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.

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

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

12. Inadequate evidence of public participation in the project exists.

13. 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

Engineering Section Manager

Date