LEG. FINANCE - BILLS 1979 - 1980 1278

SB 131 cont.,

1278

The following reserve accounts will be established from the $40,342,471 estimated to be available for obligation to projects during FFY 80:

1)	Reserve for a State Management Assistance Grant to the Department of Environmental Conservation	$ 814,180
2)	Two percent of FFY 80 federal allocation plus FFY 79 Carryover to establish a reserve for increasing funding up to 85 percent for eligible projects incorporating alternative and innovative technology	772,817
3)	Four percent of the FFY 80 federal allocation plus FFY 79 Carryover to establish a reserve to fund alternatives to conventional treatment in communities with populations of 3,500 or less, or sparsley populated areas of larger communities	1,428,137
4)	Grant increase reserve	3,500,000
5)	Reserve for unidentified Step 1 & 2 projects that have a priority ranking high enough to place the project on the fundable portion of the Priority List	100,000
6)	Reserve established for State designation to fund project increases that occur prior to grant award.	3,248,337
	Total Reserves	$9,863,471

Therefore, $30,479,000 will be available for obligation to projects targeted for grant award during FFY 80. Funds not obligated during FFY 80 will be reprioritized for obligation on the FFY 81 Priority List.

STATE OF ALASKA

FFY 80
PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

Rank	Project	Score	EPA Project Number	Project Step	Target Award Date	Project Description *	Est. Eligible Cost $1,000	EPA Grant Amount $1,000	Cummulative Total $1,000	FFY 80 Cummulative Total $1,000
1	Seward	974.	C-020051-03	3	80	STP - INT	6,782	5,087	5,087	5,087
2	Bristol Bay Borough King Salmon	971	C-020081-02	2 & 3	80	STP - INT	2,762	2,072	7,159	7,159
3	Kodiak Island Borough Island Lake	920	C-020069-02	2	80	INT	325	244	7,403	7,403
4	Kodiak Island Borough Island Lake	910	C-020069-03	3	81	INT	4,837	3,628	11,031	------
5	Ketchikan - Phase II	880	C-020053-04	3	80	STP	8,750	6,563	17,594	13,966
6	Nome	860	C-020062-03	3	81	INT	2,378	1,784	19,378	------
7	Anchorage - 78" West Interceptor	840	C-020087-04	3	81	INT	7,500	5,625	25,003	------
8	Sitka - Phase II	819	C-020052-04	3	80	STP - INT	10,500	7,875	32,878	21,841

9	Kenai	818	C-020077-03	3	80	STP - INT	4,415	3,311	36,189	25,152
10	Fairbanks - Ballaine Lake	770	C-200083-02	2	80	INT	80	60	36,249	25,212
11	Wasilla	768	C-020073-02	2	81	STP - INT	450	338	36,587	------
12	Naknek	760	C-020082-02	2 & 3	82	STP - INT	2,762	2,072	38,659	------
13	Fairbanks - Ballaine Lake	760	C-020083-03	3	81	INT	800	600	39,259	------
14	Wasilla	758	C-020073-03	3	82	STP - INT	5,053	3,790	43,049	------
15	Fairbanks - Sludge Disposal Study	740	C-020088-02	2	80	UPGRADE	200	150	43,199	25,362
16	Sitka - Phase III	730	C-020052-05	3	82	INT	2,620	1,965	45,164	------
17	Fairbanks - Sludge Disposal Study	730	C-020088-03	3	81	UPGRADE	2,000	1,500	46,664	------
18	Petersburg - I/I Rehabilitation	730	C-020091-01	1	80	REHAB	40	30	46,694	25,392
19	Wrangell - I/I Rehabilitation	730	C-020092-01	1	80	REHAB	76	57	46,751	25,449
20	Eagle River Road Interceptor	730	C-020061-05	3	80	INT	900	675	47,426	26,124
21	Unalaska	711	C-020062-02	2	80	STP - INT	550	413	47,839	26,537

22	Petersburg - I/I Rehabilitation	720	C-020091-02	2 & 3	81	REHAB	240	180	48,019	------
23	Wrangell - I/I Rehabilitation	720	C-020092-02	2 & 3	81	REHAB	200	150	48,169	------
24	Skagway - I/I Rehabilitation	710	C-020090-01	1	80	REHAB	40	30	48,199	26,567
25	Unalaska	701	C-020064-03	3	81	STP - INT	7,200	5,400	53,599	------
26	Skagway - I/I Rehabilitation	700	C-020090-01	2 & 3	81	REHAB	160	120	53,719	------
27	Seldovia	682	C-020071-02	2 & 3	81	STP - INT	2,026	1,520	55,239	------
28	Barrow	680	C-020085-01	1	80	STP	100	75	55,314	26,642
29	Fairbanks - Airport Interceptor	680	C-020084-01	1	82	INT	40	30	55,344	------
30	Barrow	670	C-020085-02	2	82	STP	500	375	55,719	------
31	Fairbanks - Airport Interceptor	670	C-020084-02	2	83	INT	600	400	56,119	------
32	Anchorage - STP Expansion	670	C-020087-10	2	82	STP	1,150	863	56,982	------
33	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor O'Malley to E-4 Trunk	670	C-020087-03	2	80	INT	200	150	57,132	26,792
34	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor E-4 Trunk to E-6 Trunk	670	C-020087-06	2	81	INT	30	23	57,155	------

35	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor E-6 to ½ Mile So. of Huffman Rd	670	C-020087-13	2	82	INT	34	26	57,181	------
36	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor ½ Mi. So. of Huffman Rd to E-7 Trunk	670	C-020087-17	2	83	INT	77	58	57,239	------
37	Barrow	660	C-020085-03	3	83	STP	6,000	4,500	61,739	------
38	Fairbanks - Airport Interceptor	660	C-020084-03	3	84	INT	7,420	5,565	67,304	------
39	Anchorage - STP Upgrade	660	C-020087-02	3	80	UPGRADE	2,181	1,636	68,940	28,428
40	Anchorage - STP Expansion	660	C-020087-16	3	83	STP	16,550	12,413	81,353	------
41	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor O'Malley to E-4 Trunk	660	C-020087-05	3	81	INT	1,600	1,200	82,553	------
42	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor E-4 Trunk to E-6 Trunk	660	C-020087-09	3	81	INT	413	314	82,867	------
43	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor E-6 Trunk ½ Mi. So. of Huffman Rd	660	C-020087-14	3	82	INT	475	356	83,223	------
44	Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor ½ Mi. So. of Huffman Rd to E-7 Trunk	660	C-020087-18	3	83	INT	1,077	808	84,031	------
45	Pelican	630	C-020057-02	2 & 3	82	STP - INT	800	600	84,631	------
46	Ketchikan - Phase III	630	C-020053-05	3	81	INT	1,000	750	85,381	------
47	Homer STP Expansion	600	C-020093-01	1	80	STP	40	30	85,411	28,458

48	Eagle River - Fire Lake Int. - Phase I	600	C-020061-03	2	80	INT	110	83	85,494	28,541
49	Eagle River - N. Valley Int. - Phase I	600	C-020061-04	2	80	INT	250	188	85,682	28,729
50	Eagle River - Fire Lake Int. Phase III	600	C-020061-09	2	82	INT	200	150	85,832	------
51	Eagle River - N. Valley Int. Phase II	600	C-020061-06	2	81	INT	100	75	85,907	------
52	Cordova - Phase III(6)	590	C-020068-03	2 & 3	80	INT	374	281	86,188	29,010
53	Eagle River - Fire Lake Int. - Phase I	590	C-020061-07	3	81	INT	700	525	86,713	------
54	Homer - STP Expansion	590	C-020093-02	2	82	STP	300	225	86,938	------
55	Eagle River - N. Valley Int. - Phase I	590	C-020061-08	3	81	INT	1,937	1,453	88,391	------
56	Eagle River - N. Valley Int. - Phase II	590	C-020061-10	3	82	INT	900	675	89,066	------
57	Eagle River - Fire Lake Phase II	590	C-020061-11	3	83	INT	1,015	761	89,827	------
58	Homer STP Expansion	580	C-020093-03	3	83	STP	3,200	2,400	92,227	------
59	Anchorage - Outfall Extension	570	C-020087-15	2	82	STP	1,250	938	93,165	------
60	Anchorage - Outfall Extension	560	C-020087-19	3	83	STP	8,750	6,563	99,728	------

61	Dillingham	550	C-020066-02	2 & 3	80	STP	1,900	1,425	101,153	30,435
62	Anchorage - Pump Stations #2	540	C-020087-07	2	81	INT	180	135	101,288	-------
63	Anchorage - Fish Creek F.M. #2	540	C-020087-08	2	81	INT	120	90	101,378	-------
64	Wainwright	535	C-020094-01	1	80	STP - INT	58	44	101,422	30,479
65	Anchorage - Pump Station #2	530	C-020087-11	3	82	INT	1,320	990	102,412	-------
66	Anchorage - Fish Creek F.M. #2	530	C-020087-12	3	82	INT	680	510	102,922	-------
67	Wainwright	525	C-020094-02	2	81	STP - INT	300	225	103,147	-------
68	Wainwright	515	C-020094-03	3	82	STP - INT	3,600	2,700	105,847	-------
69	Soldotna Funny Road Interceptor	500	C-020095-01	1	81	INT	40	30	105,877	-------
70	Juneau - Channel Interceptor	490	C-020048-02	3	83	INT	600	450	106,327	-------
71	Soldotna - Funney R. Road	490	C-020095-02	2 & 3	82	INT	1,400	1,050	107,377	-------
72	Willow	455	C-020089-01	1	82	STP - INT	180	135	107,512	-------
73	Willow	445	C-020089-02	2	83	STP - INT	1,800	1,350	108,862	-------

74	Willow	435	C-020089-03	3	84	STP - INT	15,000	11,250	120,112	-------
75	Fairbanks - E. Farmers Loop	430	C-020078-01	1	82	INT	40	30	120,142	-------
76	Fairbanks - E. Farmers Loop	420	C-020078-02	2	83	INT	180	135	120,277	-------
77	Fairbanks - E. Farmers Loop	410	C-020078-03	3	84	INT	1,955	1,466	121,743	-------

*STP - Sewage Treatment Plant
INT - Interceptor Sewer
REHAB - Rehabilitation Project

Community	Probable Project	Est. Cost
Cordova	Baler & Balefill	$800 K
Yakutat	Landfill Upgrade	$25 K
Skagway	New Landfill, Incinr., or?	$150 K
Hoonah	New Landfill, Equip.	$266 K (PHS-$77)
Petersburg	Upgrade or New Disp. Sys.	$25-200 K
Wrangell	Upgrade or New Disp. Sys.	$25-250 K
Ketchikan	Landfill & Incin.	$900 K
Valdez	New Landfill & (?)	$100-1500 K
Kodiak	New Landfill, Sludge Disp.	650 K
Bristol Bay Borough	New Landfill	50 K
Bethel	?	N.A.
Nome	Landfill Upgrade	50-150
Barrow	Landfill and (?)	N.A.
Mat-Su Borough	New Landfill & Other Improvements	$400-800 K
Pelican	New Landfill	N.A.
Angoon	Upgrade Landfill	$25 K
Craig-Klawock	Upgrade Landfill	$25 K
Anchorage	Ft. Rich Boiler Upgrade, etc.	>$1 million
Large # of rural communities	Burning devices, disposal facility, sludge or honey bucket disposal, etc.	10-150 K each
Deadhorse	Additional Shredder	N.A.
Unalaska	New Landfill	N.A.
Kenai Peninsula Borough	Landfill Improvements	400,000

Bush Projects

Construction Grants

North Slope Borough
- Point Lay
- Barrow
- Wainwrigut
- Atkasook
- Anaktuvuk Pass
- Nuiqsut
- Point Hope
- Deadhorse

Nome
Bethel
Dillingham
King Salmon
Naknek
Sand Point
King Cove
Nenana
Tanana
Yakutat
Craig
Klawock
Kake
Saxman
Pelican
Unalaska

VSW

Pitkas Point
Chevak
Selawik
Council
Koyukuk
Alakanuk
Beaver
Tanana
Norhway
Kongiganak
Akiachak
Nulato

SB 449

Point Lay
Kipnuk
Hooper Bay
Kobuk
Bethel
Kotzebue
Cantwell
Shaktoolik
Kotlik
Koyuk
McGrath

THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA
ELEVENTH LEGISLATURE

FISCAL NOTE

Now SB131

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No. S.B. 342 As amended to include Solid Waste facilities
Title An Act providing for the issuance of G.O. bonds in the amount of
Requested by Rules Committee by request of the Governor Date 1-18-80

$25, 520,000, etc.

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected Department of Environmental Conservation
Program Category Affected Facility Construction and Operation
BRU, Program, or Subprogram(s) Affected Environmental Quality Operations
(Note: If more than one budget component is affected, separate line-item amounts and funding for each component in the analysis section.)

EXPENDITURES (Thousands of Dollars)

Assumes annual inflation of 8%

		FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
100	PERSONAL SERVICES	66.7	72.0	77.8	84.0	90.7	97.6
200	TRAVEL	8.0	8.6	9.3	10.1	10.9	11.8
300	CONTRACTUAL	4.5	4.9	5.2	5.7	6.1	6.6
400	COMMODITIES	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5
500	EQUIPMENT	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
600	LAND & STRUCTURES						
700	GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.						
	TOTAL	82.7	86.6	93.5	101.1	109.1	117.5

FUNDING (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
GENERAL FUND	82.7	86.6	93.5	101.1	109.1	117.5
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER (Specify Fund Source)						

POSITIONS

FULL TIME	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
PART TIME						
TEMPORARY						

III. ANALYSIS (See Fiscal Note Preparation Instructions, Section III)

This fiscal note applies only if SB 342 is amended to include construction funds for Solid Waste facilities. If AS 46.03.030 is not amended, passage of SB 342 will not have a fiscal impact on the Department's operating budget. Should AS 46.03.030 be amended to alter the funding percentages, this fiscal note does not apply and another note will be required.

IV. DATE February 8, 1980 PREPARED BY Keith Kelton
AGENCY Department of Environmental Conservation
PHONE 465-2610

Original: Legislative Finance
cc: Budget and Management
Prime Sponsor (First Legislator Named)

33-001 (Rev. 12/79)

MEMORANDUM State of Alaska

TO: Ron Lind
Director, Division of
Management and Budget
Office of the Governor

DATE September 26, 1979

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

ATTN: George Matz

FROM: Budget Analyst

SUBJECT:

Ernst W. Mueller
Commissioner
Department of Environmental
Conservation

1980 Capital Budget

Attached for your review and consideration is the Department's 1980 capital budget proposal. This submittal is in two parts; Village Safe Water and Construction Grants. With Departmental reorganization both programs are now located in the Facility Construction and Operation Section, Division of Field Operations.

Our analysis of budget needs indicates that $25,520.0 will be required to continue our construction programs at their current level of activity. Therefore, we respectfully request that you support our request for a 1980 bond proposition totaling $25,520.0.

The budget format does not exactly lend itself to our construction programs. Where differences occur we have attempted to explain our procedures on the budget forms. Please feel free to contact us if additional information clarity is required.

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
78-305	Anchorage - Production Well #12	60,935	18,281	42,654		Design
78-305	Anchorage - 36th Ave. Main	195,261	58,578	136,683		Construction
78-336	Anchorage - Railroad Bore Crossings	17,958	16,530	1,428		Completed Pending Audit
78-305	Anchorage - E 4th Ave. Main	28,359	28,359	-0-		Completed Pending Audit
78-156	Anchorage - Water Well #7	117,699	105,929	11,770		Completed Pending Audit
77-410	Anchorage - Water Improvement Unit #8	89,216	65,046	24,170		Completed Pending Audit
77-410	Anchorage - Test Wells	42,688	32,715	9,973		Complete
79-167	Anchorage - 3 Mis. Test Wells	58,375	-0-	58,375		Design
79-109	Anchorage - 5th Unga/ Gambell	620,037	-0-	620,037		Design
78-40	Anchorage - Airport Water	38,639	34,775	3,864		Completed Pending Audit
78-248	Barrow - Sewage Trucks	81,813	63,000	18,813		Delivered - Need Costs
78-336	Cordova - Upper "C" Sewage	26,200	23,580	2,620		Completed Pending Audit
78-156	Cordova - I/I	12,213	9,770	2,443		EPA Audit Needed
78-82	Cordova - Whiskey Ridge	190,727	152,582	38,145		Construction
78-305	Cordova - Industrial Park Water	83,267	66,614	16,653		Design

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction Operation

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-123	Cordova - Coast Guard Dock Water	7,183	2,155	5,028		Design
79-167	Cordova - APW Bypass	5,083	-0-	5,083		Design
79-191	Cordova - North Side Interceptor	43,614	-0-	43,614		Design
80-19	Cordova - Odiak Park Waterline	114,088	-0-	114,088		Design
80-19	Cordova - Cedar Street Sewer	10,219	-0-	10,219		Design
80-19	Cordova - Water Study	3,000	-0-	3,000		Design
76-267	Dillingham C-020066	2,960	-0-	2,960		Step I awarded
79-167	Fairbanks - Sludge Study	5,643	-0-	5,643		Step I Awarded
79-167	Fairbanks - Derby Tract Sewer	250,000	-0-	250,000		Design
78-248	Fairbanks - S. Water Addition	867,539	-0-	867,539		Construction
79-60	Fairbanks - Ballaine Lake	3,273	-0-	3,273		Step I Awarded
79-191	Fairbanks - Fairground W & S Ext.	157,288	125,836	31,452		Construction
79-191	Fairbanks Derby Tract Water Extension	400,000	-0-	400,000		Design
80-159X	Fairbanks - E. Slater Dr. Sewer Extension	170,000	-0-	170,000		Preliminary Design
80-159X	Fairbanks - E. Slater Dr. Water Extension	98,000	-0-	98,000		Preliminary Design

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

01-1030 (7/79)

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-95	Haines - Highland Oslund	21,000	-0-	21,000		Construction
80-159X	Haines - Tower Road Water & Sewer	3,175	-0-	3,175		Design
79-95	Haines - Small Tract Road Water	19,065	17,158	1,907		Completed Pending Audit
78-202	Haines - Battle Road Water and Sewer	22,500	-0-	22,500		Construction
78-40	Haines - Helms Loop	17,538	-0-	17,538		Construction
79-60	Haines - 1978 Service Connections	4,400	2,420	1,980		Construction
78-336	Haines - Tom's Sewer Extension	3,919	2,467	1,452		Completed Pending Audit
80-19	Homer - Bear Creek Sub. Water & Sewer	87,902	48,346	39,556		Construction
78-202	Homer - East Trunk Sewer	22,986	20,687	2,299		Completed Pending Audit
78-320	Homer - Ridgeview Water and Sewer	110,618	97,970	12,648		Completed Pending Audit
78-336	Homer - Bartlett Water and Sewer	62,616	53,138	9,478		Completed Pending Audit
79-167	Homer - Kachemak Lake, Bayview	264,748	211,798	52,950		Design
80-159X	Homer - Kachemak Bay Dr. Sewer	56,315	-0-	56,315		Construction
80-159X	Homer - Benson Subdiv. Hansen Ave. Imp. Dist.	61,600	-0-	61,600		Design
79-109	Homer - Spit #56	18,522	2,500	16,022		Construction

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1978	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	TUS
78-320	Juneau - Hospital Water	111,300	-0-	111,300		Design
78-21	Juneau - AJ Water	201,000	110,550	90,450		Construction Complete
77-443	Juneau - Lemon Creek	1,318,750	948,313	370,437		EPA Audit Pending
77-410	Kenai - STP Expansion	55,113	-0-	55,113		Design
77-294	Kenai - Water Reservoir	94,895	75,916	18,979		Pending EPA Audit
79-123	Kenai - Sewer Lift Sta.	30,000	-0-	30,000		Design
79-172	Kenai - Airport Way Sewer	143,500	43,050	100,450		Design
80-19	Ketchikan - Highlands Sub. Div. Phase I	197,500	-0-	197,500		Plans Approved
80-19	Ketchikan - Tongass View Resubdivision	86,000	-0-	86,000		Construction
80-19	Kodiak - Shelikof Water Lines	28,948	-0-	28,948		Construction
78-320 336	King Salmon #81	2,820	-0-	2,820		Step I Awarded
79-222	Kodiak Borough Island Lake 69	6,186	-0-	6,186		Step I Awarded
78-320	Nenana - Water & Sewer	220,779	-0-	220,779		Design
77-378	Petersburg - #47	52,243	1,519	50,724		Collectors Pending Audit
80-159X	Palmer West Interceptor	219,284	-0-	219,284		Step 2 & 3

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

01-1030 (7/79)

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-75	NSB - Sewage Vehicles	145,000	-0-	145,000		Purchased
78-156	Saxman - Water	34,000	-0-	34,000		Design
77-410	Seldovia - Water	40,000	32,000	8,000		Construction
80-159X	Seldovia - Sewerage 71	1,807	-0-	1,807		Step I Awarded
78-156	Seward - Bayview	76,000	68,400	7,600		Construction
78-202	Seward - Jesse Lee Hts.	22,574	-0-	22,574		Completed Pending Audit
78-54	Seward - Water Improvement	270,000	243,000	27,000		Construction
78-336 79-172	Seward - Sewer #51	57,331	10,018	47,313		Design Design
78-82	Sitka - Sawmill Ext.	318,000	254,400	63,600		Construction
79-191	Sitka Harris Is. Water Extension	37,500	-0-	37,500		Design
78-305	Ketchikan - Sewer #53	140,363	-0-	140,363		Design
79-222	Soldotna - Kobuk St. Water and Sewer	185,000	-0-	185,000		Construction
79-222	Soldotna - Sterling Street W & S	220,000	-0-	220,000		Construction
80-19	Wrangell St. Michael St. Water	10,072	-0-	10,072		Plans Approved
77-410	Wrangell - Sewer #45	12,415	-0-	12,415		EPA Audit Pending

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

01-1038 (7/7

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RPN	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1978	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
77-410	Nome STP	25,037	24,592	44		Design
78-54	~~Anchorage - 5th Ave~~	163,664	163,663	1		~~Construction~~
	TOTAL	20,706,262	4,479,056	16,227,206		

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

01-1030 (7/7

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-18	Anchorage - Camp Creek Force Main #2	205,000	44,793	160,207		Under Construction
79-18	Anchorage Camp Creek Pump Station	129,000	-0-	129,000		Under Construction
78-21	Anchorage - C Street Trunk Sewer	150,000	-0-	150,000		Construction Complete
77-443	Anchorage - LID 78 DeBarr	161,660	145,494	16,166		Complete Pending Audit
79-60	Anchorage - STP Exp.	85,000	-0-	85,000		Design
77-294	Anchorage - 78" W. Interceptor	1,120,000	-0-	1,120,000		Plans Approved
77-102 77-180	Anchorage - Girdwood	1,792,503	905,192	887,311		EPA Audit Pending
74-146	Anchorage - Phase I Water	930,530	770,470	160,060		Being Audited
79-18	Anchorage - E. 26th Avenue	32,672	31,186	1,486		Completed Pending Audit
79-18	Anchorage - Telemetering Phase II	49,500	-0-	49,500		Construction
77-267	Anchorage - Water Well #7	117,699	105,929	11,770		Completed Pending Audit
79-18	Anchorage - Dowling Road - Potter	112,185	89,748	22,437		Construction
77-443	Bethel - University Water & Sewer	247,500	136,125	111,375		Construction
78-320	Cordova - North Side Interceptor	564	-0-	564		Design
77-129	Cordova - I/I	2,500	2,500	-0-		EPA Audit Pending

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

01:1030 (7/79)

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
75-291	Cordova - Sewer 41	414,407	371,993	42,414		EPA Audit Pending
79-45	Cordova - Industrial Park Water	8,267	8,267	-0-		Design
76-267	Dillingham C-020066	2,888	-0-	2,888		Step I Awarded
77-180	Fairbanks - C-020039	2,475,653	1,874,300	601,353		EPA Audit Pending
79-60	Haines - Harbor Water	16,000	-0-	16,000		Construction
79-45	Homer - Lakeside Village	241,802	193,441	48,361		Construction
77-129	Haines - I/I	1,546	1,546	-0-		EPA Audit Pending
79-60	Anchorage - Inter. Airport Road Sewer	401,635	-0-	401,635		Design
76-190	Juneau - Express Crossing	9,300	8,370	930		Completed Pending Audit
76-291	Juneau - AJ Water	130,527	110,550	19,977		Completed
76-275	Juneau - Lemon Creek	270,000	169,250	100,750		EPA Audit Pending
77-275	Kenai - Anchor Point School	10,000	9,000	1,000		Completed Pending Audit
76-190	Kenai - Water System	223,200	153,620	69,580		EPA Audit Pending
77-26	King Salmon #81	3,000	-0-	3,000		Step I Awarded
75-291	Kodiak - #74 STP	985,318	742,910	242,408		EPA Audit Pending

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-45	Naknek - #82	3,665	-0-	3,665		Step I Awarded
77-180	Nome - STP	7,579	7,277	302		Design
76-315	North Slope Borough D.H.	2,250,000	918,750	1,331,250		Design - Construction
79-18	NSB - Water Vehicles	135,000	-0-	135,000		Purchased
79-18	NSB - Point Hope	336,935	-0-	336,935		Construction
79-18	NSB - Anaktuvuk Pass	246,200	-0-	246,200		Construction
79-60	Palmer - Water System Improvement	651,275	-0-	651,275		Construction
75-291	Petersburg - Sewer #47	780,285	778,174	2,111		Collectors Pending Audit
75-45	Seldovia - Water & Sewer	60,000	-0-	60,000		Design
77-180	Seward - Jesse Lee Hts.	180,813	162,732	18,081		Pending Audit
75-291	Seward - Sewer #51	11,875	11,875	-0-		Design
75-291 79-45	Sitka - Sewer #52	141,473	17,653	123,820		Design
75-291	Ketchikan - Sewer #53	29,375	29,375	-0-		Design
75-291	Skagway - #46	502,961	417,912	85,049		EPA Audit Pending
77-275	Soldotna - STP Expan. #76	3,500	3,500	-0-		Design

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

CH.#. SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
75-291	~~Valdez - Airport~~ and Sewer	210,184	168,147	42,037		EPA Audit Pending
75-291	Valdez - STP #49	973,675	741,925	231,750		EPA Audit Pending
77-267	Valdez - Zook Sub.	100,000	45,745	54,255		Completed Pending Audit
77-378	Wrangell - 12" Trans.	15,800	14,220	1,580		Completed Pending Audit
77-294	Wasilla - #73	6,375	6,278	97		Step I Awarded
77-129	Whittier - Sewer #80	166,599	-0-	166,599		Design Construction
75-291	Wrangell - #45	751,275	615,650	135,625		EPA Audit Pending
76-315	Unalaska Water	175,300	126,494	48,806		EPA Audit Pending
	Kodiak STP 130384	312,000	249,600	62,400		EPA Audit Pending
	Skagway Water	221,200	176,960	44,240		EPA Audit Pending
	Juneau-Airport Water	70,500	63,450	7,050		State Audit Pending
	TOTAL	18,673,700	10,430,401	8243,299		

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

01-1030 (7/79)

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
76-146	Kenai - WS Improvement and Expansion 75	124,700	124,700	-0-		EPA Audit Pending
77-102	Homer - Spit #56	2,500	2,500	-0-		Construction
77-443	Anchorage - Pressure Red. Station	70,000	40,000	30,000		Construction
76-146	Nome - STP	3,500	3,500	-0-		Design
78-305	Palmer - West Interceptor	3,438	-0-	3,438		Step I Awarded
76-292	Seldovia - Water	9,763	-0-	9,763		Delayed
76-292	Seldovia - Sewer 71	2,625	-0-	2,625		Step I Awarded
79-45	Soldotna STP 76	22,603	-0-	22,603		Design
76-146	Petersburg - Sewer	115,404	99,241	16,163		Collectors Pending Audit
75-291	Unalaska - Water	312,750	312,750	-0-		EPA Audit Pending
78-320	Unalaska - #64	4,350	-0-	4,350		Step I Awarded
N/A	Anchorage - Phase I Water	500,000	500,000	-0-		

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Condervation PROGRAM Facility Construction Operation

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

01-1030 (7/79)

CH./ SLA/ OR RPL	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
	Anchorage Phase II Wt.	104,477	100,459	4,018		State Audit Pending
	Palmer - Airport W & S	30,000	17,404	12,596		EPA Audit Pending
	TOTAL	1,306,110	1,200,554	105,556		

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

01-1038 (7/79)

REVISED DATE

Relation With Objectives

Alaska Statute 46.03.030 authorizes the Department to award grants to incorporated municipalities for the construction of water and sewerage facilities. These projects provide safe, dependable water supplies and reduce the chances of water-borne diseases and environmental degradation through the collection and treatment of sewage. Projects aided with construction grant funding enable the Department to progress toward meeting budget objectives 1 and 3 as outlined in the Policy Budget for FY81. These objectives call for the reduction in the number of people exposed to pollution related health hazards. These hazards may be the result of improperly treated domestic water supplies or the insanitary disposal of domestic wastes.

Need for capital construction

Alaska Statute 46.03.030 authorizes the Department of Environmental Conservation to grant to incorporated municipalities, as funds are available, up to a maximum of 50 percent of the non-federally financed costs of eligible water and sewerage projects. Grants awarded under this statute assist municipalities in constructing sewage treatment facilities complying with public law 95-217 and the Alaska Water Quality Standards. In addition, grants for water supply projects enable communities to provide adequate quantities of potable water to rapidly expanding residential areas. High construction costs and the rapid population increases make state construction grant assistance highly desirable, if not mandatory if state and federal laws are to be met.

The construction grant program has had a very successful history of accomplishment. Bond issues of $8, $32, $29.5 and $19.7 million have been approved in 1970, 1972, 1976 and 1978 respectively for a total of $89.2 million. These funds have aided in the construction of over 200 projects, many of which would not have been possible without State assistance. These facilities have greatly reduced the hazards of water borne disease outbreaks and protected the aquatic environment from water contaminants.

Expansion of water and sewerage services are essential to the organized development of communities. Many areas within the State lack soil conditions suitable for the development of closely spaced on-lot water and sewage disposal systems. In these areas housing density must be decreased if the health of the residents is to be protected. Since few people can afford large tracts of land, growth patterns generally result in subdivisions. Within an incorporated municipality, many communities are utilizing the water and sewerage grants to provide these services to newly developing areas, assessing the benefiting property owners for the remaining 50% of costs. In many areas developed without benefit of the grants, failing septic tank systems are now necessitating the con-struction of sewerage systems, there by resulting in double costs to the residents. The cost of the septic system can now be avoided and growth can proceed without fear of health hazard due to contaminated drinking water supplies.

Management Strategy

The Department awards grants from unobligated bond funds to communities on a first-come, first-serve basis as eligible projects are identified and approved by the Governor. The community is responsible for determining whether a project's in its best interest and meets local planning and zoning requirements. The Department reviews all plans and specifications for conformance with sound engineering standards.

Since projects are initiated by local government and proceed at a pace determined by local resources and politics it is impossible for the Department to attempt to forecast needs based on anticipated project development. Forescasting bond needs is also complicated by the provision in the statue that allows the Department to match federal funds. Since many federal funding programs are available it would be difficult to coordinate bond fund needs with their projects. In the past we have attempted to estimate bond fund needs by contacting municipal officals to determine their projected needs. Unfortunately, this has not proven very satisfactory. Since municipal priorities often change without our knowledge, thereby throwing off our projections. In addition, emergency or unplanned projects often arise which had not been anticipated.

Therefore, the Department's belief that we can best estimate our future bond needs by extrapolating past bond fund obligation rates to meet future needs. The present obligation rate is just slightly over $1.0 million per month. Unobligated bond funds from the 70, 72, 76 and 78 authorizations total approximately $23.325 million. Projecting current obligations from October 1979 through December 1982 with a construction inflation rate of 10% a year the following table was generated:

October - December 1979	$1.0 million X 3 months	=$ 3.0 Million
1980-	$1.0 million X 1.1 X 12 months	= 13.2 million
1981	$1.1 million X 1.1 X 12 months	= 14.5 million
1982	$1.2 million X 1.1 X 12 months	= 15.8 million
		$46.5 million

Subtracting the unobligated bond funds from the $46.5 million we are left with unmet needs totaling $23,175 million. Rounding this need down to the next whole number we estimate that $23.0 million will be required to maintain the construction grants program at its current level of activity. This estimate is consistent with the $24.0 million figure projected in the last capital budget submittal.

If funds are not available for construction grants projects because of failure of the bond proposition, a general fund capital appropriation could be considered. Without the funds for capital construction, the contribution it is impossible for the Department to attempt to forecast needs based on anticipated project development. Forecasting bond needs is also complicated by the provision in the statute that allows the Department to match federal funds.

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

AGENCY SUBMISSION						GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION Please Do Not Write In This Area			
AGENCY PRIORITY	OBJ. NO(S)	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AGENCY FUNDING YEAR 81-82	FUNDING SOURCE	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR_____	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR_____	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR_____	GOV'S PRIORITY
I	1 3	C E P O	All projects to be funded from 80 bond proposition ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = -0- EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____	 23,000.0 TOTAL	FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR= _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				

PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction and Operation

PROJECT TYPE CODES

C Bldg. Construction	L Land
I Other Improvement	P Professional Svcs.
E Equipment	O Other

34 PROPOSED SIX—YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

REVISED DATE _____

01-1034 (7/75)

AGENCY SUBMISSION						GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION Please Do Not Write In This Area			
AGENCY PRIORITY	OBJ. NO(S)	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AGENCY FUNDING YEAR 83-84	FUNDING SOURCE	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR_____	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR_____	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR_____	GOV'S PRIORITY
I	1 3	C E P O	All projects to be funded from 1982 bond proposition ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = -0- EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____	36,000.0	FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR= _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				

PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

CATEGORY NRMEC . AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

PROJECT TYPE CODES

C Bldg. Construction
I Other Improvements
E Equipment
L Land
P Professional Svcs.
O Other

34 PROPOSED SIX-YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

REVISED DATE _____

AGENCY SUBMISSION						GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION Please Do Not Write In This Area			
AGENCY PRIORITY	OBJ. NO(S)	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AGENCY FUNDING YEAR 85-8	FUNDING SOURCE	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR____	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR____	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR____	GOV'S PRIORITY
I	1/3	C E P O	All projects to be funded from 1984 bond proposition ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = -0- EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____	42,000.0	FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR= _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST= _____ EXPECTED YEAR=FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

PROJECT TYPE CODES

C Bldg. Construction
I Other Improvement
E Equipment
L Land
P Professional Svcs.
O Other

34 PROPOSED SIX—YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

REVISED DATE _____

PROJECT TITLE	LOCATION(S)	AREA SERVED	ELECTION DISTRICT(S)
Construction Grants (1980 Bonds)	State - Wide	State - Wide	All

OBJ. NO(S)	OPERATING BUDGET BRU(S)	NAME(S) BUDGET COMPONENT NUMBERS	START DATE	COMPLETION DATE
1& 3		Program Operation	January 1981	N.A.

PROJECT NARRATIVE

Projects are not known or defined at this time. Projects are identified by municipalities as the need develops. Applications are reviewed and project eligibility determined on a first-come, first-served basis up to the availability of funds. Eligible projects include water source development, treatment and distribution and sewage collection treatment and discharge. Projects occur state-wide and costs and project scope are determined by the grantee. Grants will be awarded up to the limit of bond authorization. The length of project time varies but probably averages 1.5 years.

PROJECT TYPE

- [X] Building Construction (C)
- [ ] Other Improvement (I)
- [X] Equipment (E)
- [ ] Land (L)
- [X] Professional Services (P)
- [X] Other (O)

APPROPRIATION REQUEST

1002	FED. RCPTS.	
1003	G/F MATCH	
1004	GEN. FUND	
1005	I/A RCPTS.	
	G.O. BONDS	23,000.0
	TOTAL	23,000.0

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

- [X] Totally New Facility
- [X] Addition to Existing Facility
- [ ] Renovation of Existing Facility
- [ ] Major Maintenance or Repair
- [ ] Supplement Previously Authorized Funds to Enable Completion
- [X] One of Several Phases
- [ ] Major External Funding Source
- [ ] Other

PROJECT PURPOSES

- [X] Protect Human Health & Safety
- [ ] Protect Capital Assets
- [X] Protect Natural Resources or Natural Environment
- [ ] Improve Efficiency & Economy of State Government
- [ ] Improve Services or Accommodate Increased Demand for Services
- [ ] Accommodate New Program Requirements
- [X] Respond to Legal or Policy Mandate
- [ ] Improve Efficiency & Economy of Alaskan Infrastructure
- [X] Other Reduce unemployment and stimulate economy

SITE FEATURES

NO	YES	
[X]	[ ]	Site Currently Owned?
[X]	[ ]	All Utilities Available?
[X]	[ ]	Access Already Available?

OPERATIONAL COST & NO. PERSONNEL N.A. INCREASE (DECREASE)		FIRST OPERATING YEAR ____	ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR ____	PREVIOUS YR–PRIORITY
FUNDING SOURCE	FED. RCPTS.			AGENCY PRIORITY
	GEN. FUND			
				GOVERNOR'S PRIORITY
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATIONAL COST				
POSITION (FTE)				

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

01-1035a (7/79)

35a PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT

REVISED DATE ____

CAPITAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES (CASH FLOW)	TOTAL	BUDGET YEAR 1981	BUDGET YEAR Plus 1 1982	BUDGET YEAR Plus 2	BUDGET YEAR Plus 3	BUDGET YEAR Plus 4	REMAINING COST
Planning and Engineering	3,840.0	1,848.0	1,998.0				
Land							
Construction	18,000.0	8,600.0	8,400.0				
Equipment	600.0	288.0	312.0				
Administration and Other	560.0	270.0	290.0				
Total Annual Expenditure (Capital Cost)	23,000.0	11,000.0	12,000.0				

CONTINUATION OF NARRATIVE

The grantee is responsible for project administration including: local planning and zoning requirements; determination of project scope, engineering agreements, grant administration, land and right-of-way acquisition; project inspection and operation and maintenance of the completed project. The Department awards the grant, reviews plans and specifications and monitors project development.

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

PROJECT TITLE

35b PROPOSED PROJECT ANALYSIS

REVISED DATE

01-1035b (7/79)

PROJECT TITLE	LOCATION(S)	AREA SERVED	ELECTION DISTRICT(S)

OBJ. NO(S)	APPROPRIATION REQUEST		OPTION 1	OPTION 2
	1002	FED. RCPTS.		
	1003	G/F MATCH		
	1004	GEN. FUND		
	1005	I/A RCPTS.		
		G.O. BONDS		
		TOTAL		

OPERATIONAL COST & NO. PERSONNEL INCREASE (DECREASE)		OPTION 1 ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR ____	OPTION 2 ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR ____	PREVIOUS YR-PRIORITY
FUNDING SOURCE	FED. RCPTS.			AGENCY PRIORITY
	GEN. FUND			
				GOVERNOR'S PRIORITY
TOTAL ANNUAL OPER. COST				
POSITION (FTE)				

NARRATIVE

This form does not apply to construction grants since the grantee identifies the project needed to provide a solution to a specific problem.

Form 38 Narrative

Since grantees proceed with projects at their discretion, the Department has no way to estimate the rate of payments or anticipated completion date. Therefore, the column for estimated expenditures gives only the most current expenditure for each project and the column for the estimated completion date has been left blank. The remainder of the form has been completed for each project that has been awarded a grant and is segregated by bond fund. There are some potential projects for which the Governor's authorization has been received but for various administrative or technical reasons of non-compliance by the grantee the grants have not been awarded. Therefore, the total for amounts authorized will not yield the same results as records kept by administration for bond fund balances.

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-222	Anchorage - E-3 Trunk Phase I	225,000	-0-	225,000		Design
79-75	Anchorage-E-3 Trunk Crossing	19,400	-0-	19,400		Plans Approved
79-95	Anchorage - S.E. Int. Crossing New Seward Hwy.	45,700	-0-	45,700		Design
79-95	Anchorage-S.E. Inter Crossing New Seward Hwy.	250,000	-0-	250,000		Design
79-109	Anchorage-S.E. Int. Crossing New Seward Hwy.	204,300	-0-	204,300		Design
79-109	Anchorage-S.E. Inter. Crossing Old Seward Hwy.	32,480	-0-	32,480		Plans Approved
79-75	Anchorage-S.E. Inter Diamond E-2	97,742	-0-	97,742		Construction
79-123	Anchorage-S.E. Inter E-2 O'Malley	837,500	-0-	837,500		Design
79-75	Anchorage-E1 Trunk Phase 1	615,000	-0-	615,000		Design
79-191	Anchorage-O'Mally at New Seward Hwy. Lat.	10,500	-0-	10,500		Final Design
79-109	Anchorage -E-1-1 Trunk Phase II	1,282,470	-0-	1,282,470		Preliminary Design
79-123	Anchorage - D-3 Trunk	112,500	-0-	112,500		Preliminary Design
79-75	Anchorage- E-2 Trunk Airport Road Sewer	124,022	-0-	124,022		Construction
79-60	Anchorage Inter'n	401,635	-0-	401,635		Final Design
78-40	Anchorage - Trunk Sewer A-2, Phase II	122,059	109,853	12,206		Completed Pending Audit

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction and Operation

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

01-1038 (7/7[illegible])

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
78-21	Anchorage - DeBarr Road Sewer	34,593	31,134	3,459		Completed Pending Audit
78-21	Anchorage - Pancho Villa Extension	8,753	7,878	875		Completed Pending Audit
78-82	Anchorage - "C" Street Trunk Sewer	35,750	-0-	35,750		Construction Completed
78-158	Anchorage - Roberts Subdivision	4,547	4,092	455		Completed Pending Audit
78-54	Anchorage - Mis. Lat. Extension 1977-1	23,374	21,036	2,338		Completed Pending Audit
78-82	Anchorage - LID 50-8	70,331	-0-	70,331		Construction
78-40	Anchorage - LID 75	138,166	138,166	-0-		Completed Pending Audit
77-294	Anchorage - LID 60 Westgate	204,425	183,983	20,442		Completed Pending Audit
77-294	Anchorage - LID 76 Pleasant Valley	98,430	98,430	-0-		Completed Pending Audit
77-294	Anchorage - LID 77 Creekside	51,016	51,016	-0-		Completed Pending Audit
77-294	Anchorage - LID 80 Lloyd	37,983	34,184	3,799		Completed Pending Audit
77-294	Anchorage - LID 81 McGill	81,082	72,974	8,108		Completed Pending Audit
78-54/40	Anchorage - LID 87	256,325	230,693	25,632		Completed Pending Audit
78-128	Anchorage - LID 89 Baxter	8,868	7,981	887		Completed Pending Audit
79-123	Anchorage - LID 90 Hyatt	53,800	-0-	53,800		Design

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction and Operation

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-123	Anchorage - LID 91 Campbell	257,500	-0-	257,500		Plans Approved
79-95	Anchorage - LID 92 Kelly	145,000	-0-	145,000		Plans Approved
79-75	Anchorage - LID 93 Homecrest	43,928	-0-	43,928		Bid Awarded
79-123	Anchorage - LID 94 Hathor	220,000	-0-	220,000		Design
79-123	Anchorage - LID 95 Marys	64,500	-0-	64,500		Design
79-222	Anchorage - LID 96 Timothy	67,000	-0-	67,000		Preliminary Design
79-222	Anchorage - LID 98 Shelikof	104,500	-0-	104,500		Preliminary Design
79-222	Anchorage - LID 100 Century	23,600	-0-	23,600		Preliminary Design
79-172	Anchorage - I/I Report	134,883	-0-	134,883		Step I Initiated
79-123	Anchorage - Girdwood	857,106	-0-	857,106		Sewer Construction
79-169	Anchorage - Girdwood					Sewer Construction
77-294	Anchorage - Phase I Water	188,000	188,000	-0-		Being Audited
79-109	Anchorage - Eagle River	725,000	-0-	725,000		Under Construction
80-159X	Anchorage - S Street 8" Water 14th to Scenic	15,210	-0-	15,210		Preliminary Design
80-27	Anchorage - 16" Water Main Dowling Rd.New Seward Hwy.	10,938	-0-	10,938		Preliminary Design

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction and Operation

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
79-222	Anchorage - Misc Water Main Extension	26,000	-0-	26,000		Preliminary Design
79-172	Anchorage - 10th Ave. Water	85,200	-0-	85,200		Pre-Design
79-172	Anchorage - Bluff & Richardson Water	44,186	-0-	44,186		Plans Approved
79-172	Anchorage - "A" Street Alley Water	29,930	-0-	29,930		Pre-Design
79-167	Anchorage - E 68th Avenue Water	70,740	-0-	70,740		Pre-Design
80-27	Anchorage - 36" Trans-Mission Main Dam to WTP	1,546,960	-0-	1,546,960		Preliminary Design
79-95	Anchorage - "A" St. Water Main	164,775	-0-	164,775		Bid Awarded
78-305	Anchorage - Willow Street Main	12,221	12,221	-0-		Completed Pending Audit
78-305	Anchorage - Improvement District #311	51,761	51,760	1		Construction Complete
80-19	Anchorage - Grumman Water District #313	45,150	-0-	45,150		Preliminary Design
79-179	Anchorage - Shelikoff Subdivision Water	91,563	-0-	91,563		Pre-Design
79-75	Anchorage - Lake Otis-Dowling	444,500	-0-	444,500		Design
79-95	Anchorage - Inter. Airport Road Water	337,348	-0-	337,348		Design
79-109	Anchorage - Auk. Power Well #4	76,250	-0-	76,250		Design
78-305	Anchorage - Well House #12	229,500	-0-	229,500		Design

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

01-1038 (7/

REVISED DATE

VILLAGE SAFE WATER

Relationship with Objectives

The Village Safe Water (VSW) Act (AS 46.07) calls for "the installation of ... at least one facility for safe water and hygienic sewage disposal in each village." According to the VSW Act a "facility shall include, at a minimum a source of clean water, such as a well with pumping facilities or utilization of surface water treated so it is safe and healthful for use, shower bath facilities, an adequate means of hygienic sewage disposal, and facilities for the washing of clothes."

When a VSW facility providing safe water supply and sewage disposal services has been completed in a village, progress toward budget objectives 1 and 3 has been made in the amount of the population of the village. Department activities other than VSW construction, such as enforcement of the drinking water regulations, also contribute to achieving objectives 1 and 3.

Need for Capital Construction

The Alaska Water assessment task force, chaired by the VSW program managers, did a cursory inventory of village sanitation facilities in 1976 and discovered that: 1) about 25,000 rural Alaskans (about half the village population) depend on domestic water supply methods in immediate need of improvements, 2) less than half of the industrial and institutional establishments in villages have adequate water supplies, and 3) in more than two-thirds of Alaska's villages, the environment is being unacceptably contaminated by human wastes. A copy of the task force report is enclosed.

The task force report also reveals that water supply and waste disposal methods in more than two-thirds of Alaska's villages are in violation of State and federal laws and regulations.

Nearly all of the more than 200 villages in Alaska lack the financial, technical and management resources to obtain adequate sanitation services and comply with legal environmental standards on their own.

Management Strategy

Imposing enforcement penalities on the villages would serve no useful purpose because most of the villages are unable to respond without outside assistance. Similarly, motivation and education programs alone do not help. Sanitation services of the kind defined in the VSW Act will not exist in the villages without money to build physical facilities.

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

31 ANALYTIC STATEMENT (Six-Year Capital Program)

REVISED DATE

01-1031 (7/79)

ANAYLTIC STATEMENT Continued (2)

The U.S. Public Health Service (PHS) administers a federal program for installing water supply and waste disposal systems in Native villages. But the federal program is currently confined to villages receiving housing projects, and not all villages satisfy the eligiblity criteria for PHS projects. Hence, it is only through the VSW program that many villages might hope for financial assistance in obtaining sanitation services.

The type of VSW facility built in a particular village depends on local conditions such as surface topography, soil conditions, availability of water sources, village layout, and the needs and desires of village residents. To date, VSW projects have consisted of a central community structure, usually wood frame, where people can go to get safe water, dispose of hand carried sewage, use rest rooms, take showers and do laundry. Pipe water distribution and sewage collection systems, either above or below ground, serving individual homes are also possible, as are vehicle haul systems for delivery to individual homes. But no such systems have yet been selected by villages receiving VSW projects.

Very few villages in Alaska have the financial, technical and management resouces to successfully operate and maintain any utility systems, including VSW facilities, without outside assistance. But there are no continuing programs though which such assistance is available. For the few (about a dozen) VSW facilities built so far, this Department has requested and received annual general fund appropriations to provide operation and maintenance assistance. But providing financial assistance for VSW operation and maintenance has not been adopted by the State as a continuing long term commitment. Until the operation and maintenance future of village utilities is more secure, the Department recommends limiting VSW construction to no more than two facilities per year. That means an annual construction budget of about $1,2000,000 at FY 81 prices.

Construction Priorities

VSW construction priorities are established jointly by VSW staff and the directors of the 12 regional native health corporations. The intention is to let village residents themselves, through their regional representatives, decide who is most in need of VSW services.

CONTINUATION FORM

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE

04-1033 (7/79)

REVISED DATE

ANALYTIC STATEMENT Continued (3)

Before a legislative session, during which bond funds are authorized (i.e., once every two years), each health corporation director is invited to select candidate village(s) from his region. The number of candidate villages from each region depends on the amount of construction money anticipated and until adequate operation and maintenance provisions are made a construction rate of one or two facilities per year is recommended. After the regional candidates are selected, the health corporation directors meet jointly with VSW staff to review the candidate villages and rank them in order of need for VSW services. Then the priority list is presented to the Legislature, along with a recommendation of how much construction money should be authorized.

The cost of a VSW facility can vary from less than $100,000 for a simple watering point in a small village, to more than $1,000,000 for a facility in a large village offering all the services authorized by the VSW Act. Estimating the cost of a particular VSW project is not feasible as part of the prioritizing because it is a long, involved and expensive process to negotiate the appropriate scope of the project in a village and to determine what that scope of project will cost for the local conditions that exist. It is not reasonable to ask a village to participate in that effort unless they have a funded project.

It is highly desirable to carry out a construction schedule established with the regional health corporations. A primary purpose of those corporations is to speak for the villages concerning sanitation utility problems. Their recommendations of how fast to build facilities and where to build them, made with the advice and assistance of VSW staff, should be persuasive. But no matter how construction priorities and expenditure rates are determined, no facility should be built unless its operation, maintenance and management future is provided for.

If funds are not available for VSW construction because a bond issue fails, a general fund capital appropriation could be considered. But without funds for capital construction, the contribution of VSW program activities toward achieving objectives 1 and 3 could not be made.

CONTINUATION FORM

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE

REVISED DATE

Q1-1033 (7/79)

AGENCY SUBMISSION						GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION Please Do Not Write In This Area			
AGENCY PRIORITY	OBJ. NO(S)	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AGENCY FUNDING YEAR 81	FUNDING SOURCE	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOV'S PRIORITY
	1 3	C, E P	Village Safe Water Project(s), Statewide ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = 142.0 EXPECTED YEAR = FY 85		FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND 2,520.0 G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				

PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

CATEGORY NRMFC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TYPE CODES	
C Bldg. Construction	L Land
I Oths. Improvement	P Professional Svcs.
E Equipment	O Other

34 PROPOSED SIX–YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

REVISED DATE _____

01-1034 7/79)

AGENCY SUBMISSION						GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION Please Do Not Write In This Area			
AGENCY PRIORITY	OBJ. NO(S)	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AGENCY FUNDING YEAR 83	FUNDING SOURCE	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOV'S PRIORITY
	1 3	C, E P			FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN FUND				
				3,040.0	G.O. BONDS				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = 171.1						
			EXPECTED YEAR = FY 87		TOTAL				
					FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN. FUND				
					G.O. BONDS				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____						
			EXPECTED YEAR = _____		TOTAL				
					FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN FUND				
					G.O. BONDS				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____						
			EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		TOTAL				
					FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN. FUND				
					G O. BONDS				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____						
			EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		TOTAL				
					FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN. FUND				
					G.O. BONDS				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____						
			EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		TOTAL				

PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TYPE CODES

C	Bldg. Construction	L	Land
I	Other Improvement	P	Professional Svcs.
E	Equipment	O	Other

34 PROPOSED SIX—YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

REVISED DATE _____

01-1034 (7/79)

AGENCY SUBMISSION						GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION Please Do Not Write In This Area			
AGENCY PRIORITY	OBJ. NO(S)	PROJECT TYPE	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AGENCY FUNDING YEAR 85	FUNDING SOURCE	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOV'S PRIORITY
	1 3	C, E P	ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = 206.6 EXPECTED YEAR = FY 89		FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND 3,670.0 G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = _____ EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS. GEN. FUND G.O. BONDS TOTAL				

PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TYPE CODES

C Bldg. Construction	L Land
I Other Improvement	P Professional Svcs.
E Equipment	O Other

34 PROPOSED SIX—YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

REVISED DATE _____

01-1034 (7/79)

PROJECT TITLE	LOCATION(S)	AREA SERVED	ELECTION DISTRICT(S)
VSW Projects (1980 bonds)	Alaska Villages	Alaska Villages	

OBJ. NO(S)	OPERATING BUDGET BRU(S)	NAME(S) BUDGET COMPONENT NUMBERS	START DATE	COMPLETION DATE
1, 3		Program Operation	January, 1981	December, 1983

PROJECT NARRATIVE

At the present time, there are four projects on the VSW priority list for 1980 bond funds. They are Circle, Portage Creek, Point Lay and False Pass. However, currently this priority list is being reevaluated and new candidate villages are being selected by the health corporation directors. It is anticipated that a new priority list will be complete by December 1979. After this, the appropriate scope of the project for each village will be negotiated with village residents, and a preliminary cost estimate made based on the scope of project and local conditions. This process will continue through the priority list until the $2,520,000 in 1980 construction bonds are used up. Past VSW construction experience suggests there will be money for about three projects.

Project Need -

Conditions in the first four villages on the VSW priority list which illustrate the need for improved sanitation services are summarized below:

1. Circle - 51 people, get water from trading post in summer, but most haul untreated water from Yukon River in winter. Privies and honey

PROJECT TYPE

- [X] Building Construction (C)
- [ ] Other Improvement (I)
- [ ] Equipment (E)
- [ ] Land (L)
- [X] Professional Services (P)
- [ ] Other (O)

APPROPRIATION REQUEST

1002	FED. RCPTS.	
1003	G/F MATCH	
1004	GEN. FUND	
1005	I/A RCPTS.	
	G.O. BONDS	2,520.0
	TOTAL	2,520.0

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

- [X] Totally New Facility
- [ ] Addition to Existing Facility
- [ ] Renovation of Existing Facility
- [ ] Major Maintenance or Repair
- [ ] Supplement Previously Authorized Funds to Enable Completion
- [ ] One of Several Phases
- [ ] Major External Funding Source
- [ ] Other

PROJECT PURPOSES

- [X] Protect Human Health & Safety
- [ ] Protect Capital Assets
- [X] Protect Natural Resources or Natural Environment
- [ ] Improve Efficiency & Economy of State Government
- [ ] Improve Services or Accommodate Increased Demand for Services
- [ ] Accommodate New Program Requirements
- [X] Respond to Legal or Policy Mandate
- [ ] Improve Efficiency & Economy of Alaskan Infrastructure
- [ ] Other

SITE FEATURES

NO	YES	
[X]	[ ]	Site Currently Owned?
[X]	[ ]	All Utilities Available?
[X]	[ ]	Access Already Available?

OPERATIONAL COST & NO. PERSONNEL INCREASE (DECREASE)		FIRST OPERATING YEAR 82	ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR 85	PREVIOUS YR–PRIORITY
FUNDING SOURCE	FED. RCPTS.			AGENCY PRIORITY
	GEN. FUND	52.8	142.0	
				GOVERNOR'S PRIORITY
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATIONAL COST		52.8	142.0	
POSITION (FTE)		0	0	

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

01-1035a (7/79)

35a PROPOSED CAPITAL PROJECT

REVISED DATE _____

CAPITAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES (CASH FLOW)	TOTAL	BUDGET YEAR	BUDGET YEAR Plus 1	BUDGET YEAR Plus 2	BUDGET YEAR Plus 3	BUDGET YEAR Plus 4	REMAINING COST
Planning and Engineering	252.0	70.0	110.0	72.0			
Land							
Construction	2,268.0		800.0	1,250.0	218.0		
Equipment							
Administration and Other							
Total Annual Expenditure (Capital Cost)	2,520.0	70.0	910.0	1,332.0	218.0		

CONTINUATION OF NARRATIVE

1. Circle Continued

   buckets for sewage disposal, and evidence of sewage surfacing from school sewage disposal system. No PHS project planned.

2. Portage Creek - 66 people, some get water from school during school year, otherwise use untreated water from river. Honey buckets for sewage with indiscriminate dumping. No PHS project planned.

3. Point Lay - 50 people, in summer haul untreated water from lake a mile away, in winter melt ice. Honey buckets for sewage with indiscriminate dumping. No PHS project planned. Village received $400,000 VSW capital appropriation from Legislature in FY 80 budget, but that's not enough because local conditions are so difficult (e.g., permafrost; flat, poorly drained tundra; lack of good quality water sources).

4. False Pass - 56 people, piped water service to homes from cannery system, no treatment but no evidence of contamination. Main problem is raw sewage discharged on ground and on beach. No PHS project for sewage disposal planned.

The scope of each VSW project will be tailored to alleviate the specific sanitation problems in the villages. Human health and safety will be protected by providing a safe, dependable drinking water source for all village residents. In all four villages there is sewage pollution of the natural land and water environment which jeopardizes the health and safety of village residents, and violates federal and State environmental regulations. Also, the Village Safe Water Act calls for adequate sanitation services in all villages in the State.

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE

Site features such as land ownership, utilities available, and access will be determined when project scope is negotiated with each village and preliminary estimates are made.

Project Decription -

The physical features of a VSW facility depend on the services to be provided in a particular village, and on local environmental conditions. Most projects involve developing a safe, dependable water source using a well if subsurface conditions make it possible; or a surface water source if ground water is not accessible. Unorthodox methods such as rain collection are sometimes used when water sources are unusually difficult to develop. Water treatment equipment is installed as necessary depending on the bacteriological and chemical quality of water sources available. Pumping, storage and dispensing equipment and structures, with appurtenant mechanical and electrical systems, are required for a simple watering point. Energy sources can be village AVEC systems, village owned electrical systems, school generators, and wind generators and waste heat recovery, if feasible.

When rest rooms, sewage disposal, and bathing and laundry services are also provided, more extensive structures and equipment are required. Nearly all building are wood frame so that village residents can do most of the constructing and handle maintenance. Rest rooms usually contain standard flush toilets, urinals and lavatory fixtures, with water saving devices used when appropriate. Bathing facilities include standard showers when sufficient water is available, and saunas where steambaths are a traditional method of bathing.

Laundry services are provided by standard washers, extractors and dryers with water saving devices used when appropriate.

Sewage treatment and disposal methods vary greatly depending on local conditions. Lagoons are used when possible to minimize operating problems. But primary and secondary treatment systems are sometimes necessary when subsurface disposal is impossible (e.g., due to permafrost) and effluent must be discharged to the land surface or a natural water body.

CONTINUATION FORM

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE _____

.01-1033 (7/79)

REVISED DATE _____

Documentation of Estimated Capital Cost -

The request for $2,520,000 in 1980 bonds is to fund $1,200,000 in VSW projects in SFY 81, and $1,320,000 worth of projects in SFY 82. The amount in SFY 82 includes a 10% inflationary increase over SFY 81 costs.

The scope and cost of individual projects have not yet been determined for reasons given earlier, and costs vary greatly. Based on previous VSW construction experience, however, it is estimated that for any group of three or four VSW facilities, construction costs will average about $800,000 per facility at SFY 81 prices. This estimate is based only on past projects and does not include any engineering estimates for actual projects on the priority list for 1980 bonds. The intention is to go as far down the priority list as $2,520,000 will allow, and it is expected that about three projects can be funded.

Analysis of Estimated Operational Expenses -

The operation, maintenance and mangement costs for a VSW facility depend on the extent and complexity of the physical plant, the inclination and ability of the village to manage the utility system, and such things as power, fuel and transportation costs that vary from village to village. Based on the operational experience of the eleven existing VSW facilities, ultimate annual operating costs are proving to be about 10% of construction costs. So for a facility constructed in SFY 81 for $800,000, the ultimate annual operating cost is expected to be $80,000 in SFY 81 dollars.

Money to pay operating costs for VSW facilities generally comes from three sources: 1) fees paid by village residents who use facility services, 2) fees paid by institutions (e.g., schools, FAA sites, health clinics) provided with VSW water and sewer services, and 3) operation and maintenance assistance grants from this Department. The amount of O&M grant assistance provided is the amount by which the other two revenue sources fall short of meeting approved operating expenses. The grant assistance can vary from none at all in a large village where the residents have money to use their facility frequently and where institutions agree to pay substantial fees, to 70 or 80 percent of operating costs in relatively poor

CONTINUATION FORM

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE

01-1033 (7/79)

REVISED DATE

small villages with no institutions paying fees. Over the 5 year operating history of the VSW program, O&M grant assistance from the State has averaged about 50% of total operating costs, and that figure is used for estimating the impact of the 1980 bond projects on the State operational budget.

The first year a VSW facility operates, the costs of operation, maintenance and management are higher than the ultimate annual operating costs. Plant operators and village administrators require special training and guidance until they learn the ropes; "bugs" in the physical plant must be worked out; and stocks of operating supplies, spare parts and standby equipment are accumulated. Based on past operational experience with VSW facilities, first year operating costs are estimated to average about 30 percent more than ultimate operating costs, or about 13 percent of construction costs.

The only increase expected in the Department's operating budget for SFY's 81 and 82 due to the 1980 VSW bond projects is for the O&M grants. Administration of the construction and O&M programs can be handled by existing staff.

Identification of Alternatives Considered -

There are several means by which villages can attain sanitation services, including PHS construction projects, Housing and Urban Development grants, Economic Development assistance grants and grants from the State Department of Community and Regional Affairs. Only the PHS program, however, is big enough to make visible improvements in village sanitation conditions.

For many, and perhaps most, of the more than 200 villages, the PHS program is the apprporiate source of assistance for sanitation services. They have more than 15 years of experience in rural sanitation, a multi-million dollar construction budget funded by the federal government, and a large relatively talented staff with established working relationships with villages throughout the State.

CONTINUATION FORM

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE _____

01-1033 (7/79)

REVISED DATE _____

The PHS program can serve only Native villages, however, and there are some Native villages likely never to receive PHS assistance because they do not meet eligiblity requirements for the federal program (e.g. technical feasibility and economic feasibility). Such villages usually lack the technical and management expertise it takes to parlay assistance like HUD community assistance grants and EDA development grants into sanitation services. Also, the VSW Act specifies that State assistance to villages for sanitation facilities will be provided through the VSW program.

Once it is determined that the VSW program will be the means for helping a village attain sanitation services, there are many methods for providing them. Selecting appropriate methods in determining the scope of the project. Among the possibilities are a piped water and sewer system serving individual homes, a central facility with vehicle haul service to individual homes, a central facility with no haul service, a simple watering point, several watering points scattered throughout the village, privies for sewage disposal, and several sewage dump sites scattered throughout the village with piped sewage collection to central treatment and disposal. After project scope is determined, there is a multitude of engineering choices to be made of ways to develop and build the facility.

Basically, it is village residents who select the "alternatives" that are most appropriate as the means for solving their sanitation problems, with advise and guidance from VSW staff. Factors considered in making those choices include minimizng construction costs, keeping the project as small and simple as possible, and minimizing operating requirements and costs. The engineering choices of how to build a facility according to a selected scope of project are recommended by professional engineers hired as design consulants. The consultants' recommendations including such things as floor plans, pump sizes and types, water and sewage treatment methods, floor covering, and type of foundation, are considered by VSW staff and village administrators, and either accepted or appropriately modified. The classical engineering criterion of attaining the desired service or function at the least cost is the basis for selecting among design alternatives.

CONTINUATION FORM

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE _____

01-1033 (7/79)

REVISED DATE _____

PROJECT TITLE	LOCATION(S)	AREA SERVED	ELECTION DISTRICT(S)

OBJ. NO(S)	APPROPRIATION REQUEST		OPTION 1	OPTION 2
	1002	FED. RCPTS.		
	1003	G/F MATCH		
	1004	GEN. FUND		
	1005	I/A RCPTS.		
		G.O. BONDS		
		TOTAL		

OPERATIONAL COST & NO. PERSONNEL INCREASE (DECREASE)		OPTION 1 ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR ____	OPTION 2 ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR ____	PREVIOUS YR-PRIORITY
FUNDING SOURCE	FED. RCPTS.			AGENCY PRIORITY
	GEN. FUND			
				GOVERNOR'S PRIORITY
TOTAL ANNUAL OPER. COST				
POSITION (FTE)				

NARRATIVE

An appropriate role for the VSW program in meeting rural sanitation needs has never been defined. Soon after the VSW act was passed the Department realized there was no rational basis for deciding how many VSW facilities should be built, how fast they should be built, how construction priorities should be established, how operation and maintenance needs should be met and other such questions. Hence the Department embarked on an ambitious comprehensive planning effort, the purpose of which was to prescribe a complete strategy for meeting all rural sanitation needs. The intention was to consider all existing programs and resources devoted to village sanitation, and involve all major participants in rural sanitation programs in the planning process, so that everyone would subscribe to the grand design and participate in its implementation.

After devoting more than three years to the comprehensive planning effort, it appears that completing the project as originally conceived is not feasible. A detailed report on work completed so far, is enclosed. Included in the report is a discussion of why it is not feasible to attain the original planning objectives according to the original schedule, and recommendations for redirecting the planning effort.

The revised planning effort will consist of concentrating on specific questions of immediate consequence to the VSW program, such as: 1) should financial, technical and management assistance for VSW facilities be accepted as a long-term service of the State, 2) how will it be determined whether a PHS or a VSW project is most appropriate for a given village, 3) how many VSW projects can be built per year without overtaxing

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

01-1037 (7/79)

37 POTENTIAL CAPITAL PROJECT

REVISED DATE

Department's management capacity for construction projects and in the O&M assistance program. At least until the narrowed planning effort reveals answers to some of these basic questions concerning the scope of the VSW program, the Department recommends that construction be limited to levels indicated on form 34 of this budget request.

It is conceivable, however, that planning results available before the term of the six year plans has expired might suggest an accelerated construction schedule. If so funds for those future projects would be included in a capital budget request at the appropriate time, and supported with VSW planning results.

CONTINUATION FORM

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

PROJECT TITLE

01-1033 (7/79)

REVISED DATE

Note: All CH 145 projects except the last one (Akiachak) were funded by the Legislature independent of a Department capital budget request.

CH.#, SLA# OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	ESTIMATED TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
CH 271 SLA 1976	Tanana VSW	746.5	746.5	746.5	7/79	Site cleanup and minor mechanical adjustments yet to complete.
79-225 79-1	Federal Contribution	560.0	560.0	560.0		
79-13	Contribution from REAA School	100.0	100.0	100.0		
CH 145 SLA 1978	Bethel VSW	2,000.0	2,000.0	2,000.0	6/80	Paid 120.0 to date. City will request remainder as they need it.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Cantwell VSW	50.0	0	(see status)		No useful purpose for funds has yet been discovered.
CH 145 SLA 1978	McGrath VSW	400.00	200.0	400.0	6/81	Paid 157.0 to date. City will request remainder as they need it.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Kotzebue VSW	1,800.0	0	900.0	6/81	City has not yet requested money, and is completing community planning.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Kobuk VSW	400.0	20.0	400.0	6/81	Project scope not yet negotiated with village.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Kotlik VSW	400.0	246.0	400.0	6/81	Paid 246.0 through RSA with DOTPF. Scope of rest of project not yet determined
CH 145 SLA 1978	Kipnuk VSW	400.0	40.0	400.0	6/81	Scope of project has been negotiated. Engineering design is next.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Kovuk VSW	400.0	20.0	400.0	6/81	Scope of project not yet negotiated with village.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Point Lay VSW	400.0	0	(see status)		Waiting for decision about village. Relocation to be made.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Shaktoolik VSW	400.0	20.0	400.0	6/81	Scope of project not yet negotiated with village.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Hooper Bay VSW	100.0	10.0	100.0	6/81	Scope of project not net negotiated with village.
CH 145 SLA 1978	Akiachak	1,000.0	40.0	1,000.0	6/81	Akiachak has been selected. Project scope not yet negotiated with village.

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

01-1038 (7/79)

Introduced: 2/12/79
Referred: Community & Regional Affairs and Finance

IN THE SENATE BY KERTTULA

SENATE BILL NO. 131

IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

ELEVENTH LEGISLATURE - FIRST SESSION

A BILL

For an Act entitled: "An Act providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of $8,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of sewerage systems construction; and providing for an effective date."

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA:

* Section 1. For the purpose of paying the cost of sewerage systems construction, general obligation bonds of the state in the principal amount of not more than $8,000,000 shall be issued and sold. The full faith, credit and resources of the state are pledged to the payment of the principal of and interest and redemption premium, if any, on these bonds. These bonds shall be issued under the provisions of AS 37.15 as those provisions read at the time of issuance.

* Sec. 2. If the issuance of these bonds is authorized by the qualified voters of the state, a special fund of the state to be known as the "1979 Sewerage Systems Construction Fund" shall be established, to which shall be credited the proceeds of the sale of the bonds described in sec. 1 of this Act except for the accrued interest and premiums. The amount of $8,000,000 is appropriated from the "1979 Sewerage Systems Construction Fund" to the Department of Environmental Conservation. The specific uses of the proceeds of the bonds shall be determined by the governor in accordance with AS 46.-03.030, except the grant percentage shall be 90 per cent of the eligible cost.

* Sec. 3. If the issuance of these bonds is authorized by the qualified voters of the state, the amount of $28,000 or as much of that amount as is

found necessary is appropriated from the general fund of the state to the state bond committee to carry out the provisions of this Act and to pay expenses incident to the sale and issuance of the bonds authorized in this Act. The amounts expended from the appropriation authorized by this section shall be reimbursed to the general fund from the proceeds of the sale of the bonds authorized by this Act.

* Sec. 4. The question whether the bonds authorized in this Act are to be issued shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the state at the next general election and shall read substantially as follows:

Proposition

State General Obligation Sewerage Systems Construction Bonds $8,000,000

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than $8,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of sewerage systems construction?

Bonds Yes [ ]

Bonds No [ ]

* Sec. 5. This Act takes effect immediately in accordance with AS 01.10.-070(c).