

LEG. FINANCE - BILLS 1979 - 1980 1361
SB 436 cont., thru CSSB 438 1361

<u>Regional Health Corporation</u>	<u>Village</u>	<u>Priority</u>
Yukon Kuskokwim Health Department	Newtok	1
Copper River Health Department	Copper Center	2
Aleutian Pribilof Island Association	Nelson Lagoon	3
Copper River Health Department	Chistochina	4
Bristol Bay Health Department	Portage Creek	5
Tanana Chiefs Health Authority	Eagle Village	6
Tanana Chiefs Health Authority	Rampart	7
Tanana Chiefs Health Authority	Ruby	8
Yukon Kuskokwim Health Department	Chefornak	9
Bristol Bay Health Department	Kokhanok	10
Yukon Kuskokwim Health Department	Stoney River	11
Bristol Bay Health Department	Pedro Bay	12
North Slope Borough Health Department	Point Lay	13
Copper River Health Department	Cantwell	14
Mauneluk Association	Selawik	15

This list reflects the relative need for improved sanitation services in each village, with special emphasis on the need for safe drinking water. For example Newtok, a community of 154 people, was placed at the top of the list because residents can only use rainwater for drinking, and it is only seasonally available. Water can be obtained at the BIA School, but residents are limited to 5 to 10 gallons per family per day. While the regional school district plans to drill a well to serve a new high school in Newtok, there are no provisions to extend service to the village. In addition, PHS does not plan to improve sanitation services in this community.

Copper Center, population 275, is number two on the list. In this interior community some residents obtain their drinking water from individual home wells drilled by PHS in 1965. However, of the original 29 wells, 10 are not operating, and most of the others produce water of poor chemical quality. Iron and manganese concentrations exceed drinking water standards and create taste, color and odor

problems. Due to community growth since 1965, there are now about 75 homes in need of an acceptable water supply. With Copper Center anticipating electrical service from a hydroelectric system, the difficulty of powering sanitation systems may be less than in some other villages.

At Nelson Lagoon, which is number three on the list, residents must travel 16 miles to obtain drinking water. The shallow, hand driven wells in the village produce brackish water suitable only for washing clothes. Also Nelson Lagoon has excellent potential for the use of wind power to generate electricity. It is very likely that a VSW facility in this village could be powered by wind energy.

The fourth village is Chistochina, population 33, where residents obtain their drinking water from Sinona Creek, which is littered with dead salmon during the summer months. Water and sewer systems installed by PHS in 1970 have failed.

Number five on the list is the Bristol Bay community of Portage Creek, where water is available from the school. Eleven of 13 families use this source. However, the school is closed for the summer months, and in the winter the well occasionally runs dry.

In Eagle Village, sixth on the list, residents must drive three miles in the summer to the City of Eagle for drinking water. In the winter months the Yukon River is the preferred source of supply. This community has no water system and there are no prospects for improvements from other agencies.

Rampart, with a population of 58, is seventh on the list. Village residents haul water from a nearby creek except for a two week period during breakup.

In Ruby (eighth) and Chefornak (ninth) there is critical need for sanitation improvements, but PHS plans projects in those villages in the near future.

In Kokhanok, Stoney River and Pedro Bay (tenth, eleventh and twelfth respectively), good sources of drinking water are available to residents, but sewage disposal problems may exist.

Point Lay was placed thirteenth on the priority list because \$400,000 in VSW Funds have already been authorized for sanitation improvements there. Also, the North Slope Borough assembly has apparently appropriated an additional \$100,000 for this purpose.

Cantwell and Selawik were placed at the bottom of the list because water and sewer facilities already exist in those communities, and additional improvements are scheduled in the near future by the PHS.

More detailed background information on each of these communities can be found in the enclosed village data summary.

Estimating the cost of Village Safe Water projects in specific villages is nearly impossible at the time a bond bill is being considered. Costs can vary from \$100,000 to more than \$1 million depending on what services are to be included, and local factors such as availability of water, type of treatment required, waste disposal options, power availability, and soil conditions.

What services will be provided by a VSW facility (i.e. the scope of the project) is largely a matter of choice by the village receiving it. Choices authorized by the VSW Act are water supply, sewage disposal, bathing and laundry services. The project scope must be negotiated with the village after funding for their facility has been approved in a bond election.

After project scope is established, the cost of providing the selected services can be estimated based on local conditions and preliminary engineering investigations. At this time alternate sources of energy to power the VSW facility are investigated. The technical and economic feasibility of appropriate alternate energy sources are evaluated, and incorporated into the design of the facility whenever possible.

To accommodate the problem of having to identify funds for VSW projects before their costs are known with any accuracy, the Department recommends a "group funding" approach. This technique is based on the assumption that the cost of groups of five projects varies much less than the cost of individual projects. From past construction experience in the VSW program, the total cost of several randomly selected groups of five projects was determined in 1981 construction dollars. The average cost of these groups of five projects is \$6.5 million in equivalent 1981 dollars, or \$1.3 million per project.


Because VSW facilities, and virtually any other village utilities project will fail prematurely without some degree of technical, management and financial assistance, this Department has been requesting and receiving general fund

December 12, 1979

appropriations for operation and maintenance assistance to villages receiving VSW facilities. An inevitable consequence of constructing more VSW facilities is the need for larger appropriations for operation and maintenance assistance as the facilities are completed.

If you have any questions on the VSW priority list or desire additional background information on any of the communities involved, please contact me.

Sincerely,



Ernst W. Mueller
Commissioner

Enclosure

VILLAGE CANDIDATE SELECTION - VSW

VILLAGE	POP/HOMES TREND	TERRAIN	WATER SUPPLIES	ADEQUACY	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	SEWAGE DISPOSAL	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATIONS
NEWTOK (CALISTA) PRIORITY #1	154/25 up	Flat, poorly drained tundra	Rain water used for drink- ing when available Centrally located BIA well/most residents get drinking water here	Only seasonally available Good quality water produced/ quantity limited residents limited to 5 gallons per day	New REPA H.S. planned for 1980/plan to drill well/ no intention to serve village	Indiscriminate dumping of honey buckets	Al Johnson BIA 543-1121 Jordan Suhr 543-2500	Increase village water supply and improve waste disposal and additional services pending negotiat- ion with village
UPPER CENTER (ANTHA) PRIORITY #2	275/100 down	Sandy, rocky soil, some perma- frost	29 individual wells drilled by PHS in 1969 Community Hall well	10 wells not operating remainin, wells produce water of poor chemical quality/iron and manganese exceed state drinking water standards/taste and odor problems/very hard water Iron concentra- tions exceed state drinking water standards	none	Individual septic tanks most working	Bill Giles PHS 279-6661 Copper River Health Dept. 822-3333	Renovate abandoned wells, provide treat- ment to operat- ing wells/drill approximately 75 new wells for residents and provide treatment where necessary
NELSON LAGOON (ANUPILAN/PRII) PRIORITY #3	61/17 up	Village built on porous sand spit adjacent to Bering Sea	Nine hand dug wells 6-10' deep Deep well drilled by PHS 1973 hit salt water School has 8' deep well 16 Milo Lake	Water brackish/ used only for washing clothes Water meets state standards but salty taste unacceptable to villagers Most residents haul water for drinking/route to lake blocked by ice in winter lake produces excellent quality water	none	Indoor toilets sewage to septic tanks	Rory Mayra PHS Sanitarian 279-6661 Aleutian/ Pribilof Island Association 276-2700	Watering point with treatment plus additional services pending negotiations with village
CHISIOCHINA (ANTHA) PRIORITY #4	33/14 down	Soil composed of sand and gravel/ flat terrain adjacent to flood plain	PHS piped water system built in 1970/ well was source of supply Sinona River	Quality and quantity of water good/ system failed in 1974 due to O&M problems Undeveloped unprotected source littered with dead fish in summer	none	Sewer system failed/privies used	Bill Giles PHS Sanitarian 279-6661	Renovate village water system and additional serv- ices pending negotiat- ion with village

VILLAGE CANDIDATE SELECTION - VSW

VILLAGE	POP/HOMES TREND	TERRAIN	WATER SUPPLIES	ADEQUACY	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	SEWAGE DISPOSAL	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATIONS
PORTAGE CREEK (BRISTOL BAY) PRIORITY #5	66/13 stable	Village on hill area well drained	School has 80' well/ 11/13 families use school as watering point	Untreated water, slight iron taste/well runs dry in winter School shuts off supply June-mid August	none	Honey buckets used by village/ school has 1,500 gallon septic tank and drainfield	Ron Perkins PHS 842-5201	Central watering point, bathing, laundry and sewage disposal service
EAGLE VILLAGE (DEVON) PRIORITY #6	54/21 up	On west bank of Yukon River/ poorly drained, subject to flooding	Single community well Eagle City Well Yukon River	Generator and well pump out of order/well no longer used People travel 3 miles to Eagle City well and haul water back Water hauled from Yukon in winter, untreated, un- protected source	none	Outhouses	Ethe' Beck Health Aide 729-8001 Tanana Chiefs Conference 452-8251	Community well and water treat- ment
RAMPART (DEVON) PRIORITY #7	50/31	Hilly terrain but poorly drained in spots	Nearby creek provides water for all residents School hauls from same creek as village	Water quality fine but supply is untreated and unprotected/ water turbid for 2 week per period during breakup/haul distance 2 1/2 miles on good road Two 500 gallon storage tanks, plus chlorina- tion			Rampart Resident 358-8001 George King Principal 358-8001	and sewer system
RUBY (LOVCH) PRIORITY #8	220/74 up	Hilly terrain but poorly drained in spots	Primary source is spring, 2,000 gallon storage tank, log spring house 3 mile spring (along highway) 10 mile spring (along highway) Ruby Roadhouse School 235' well	Spring closed by ADEC summer 1979 because of reported episodes of bacteria contamination Unprotected source Unprotected source Residents can buy for 5¢ per gallon Quality good, quantity limited A few residents haul water from school	PHC has plans to drill community well in late 1979 or early 1980	Outhouses School has septic tank/ leachfield	Dan Rogness PHS 279-9628 Stan Justice ADEC 452-1714 City Clerk Ruby 989-8001	Water and sewer system and perhaps other services

VILLAGE CANDIDATE SELECTION - VSW

VILLAGE	POP/HOMES TREND	TERRAIN	WATER SUPPLIES	ADEQUACY	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	SEWAGE DISPOSAL	SOURCES OF INFORMATION:	RECOMMENDATIONS
CHEFOVNAK (CGLISTA) PRIORITY #9	204/33 up	Flat, marshy tundra	Rain water collected off roofs River water	Only seasonally available Quality of river water varies with tides/silt and salt problems noted	REMA to complete new school July, 1980/plan to drill well and treat water but no provisions to serve village 28 HUD Houses proposed for 1981 PHS sanitation services to follow	Indiscriminate dumping of honey buckets	Mike Frank Bill Adams LSKD 543-2871 Jordan Suhr 543-2500 Steve Haver PHS 543-2251 Pete Tom Chefovnak 878-8001 Earl Chase YKHC 543-2506	Need watering poi- nt closer to village that produces good quality drinking water and facility to dispose of liquid waste
TOVNAK (NORTH BAY) PRIORITY #10	60/15 stable	Terrain very rocky	Water hauled from Iliamna Lake	Source of supply produces good tasting drinking water but no treatment provided	none	Honey buckets	Frank Williams PHS 279-6661	Central watering point, bathing laundry and sewage disposal service
STONE RIVER (CGLISTA) PRIORITY #11	69/14 stable	Rolling hills soils probably of sand and gravel	5 or 6 families use hand driven well points with pitcher pumps Rest haul from river in winter and use neighbor's wells in summer months	Good quality Good quantity Water produced River turbid in summer months/ good quality in winter	none	Indiscriminate dumping of honey buckets	Bob McHenry Kuspuk School 675-4320 Jordan Suhr 543-2500	Water supply not pressing problem/ waste disposal system needed
PEDRO BAY (DUNSTON BAY) PRIORITY #12	65/11 stable	Rocky, well drained	Residents haul or pump water from Lake Iliamna	Supply not treated but good tasting water available year round	HUD Houses tentatively scheduled for 1981/PHS sanitation improvement to follow	Honey buckets	Frank Williams PHS 279-6661	Central watering point, bathing laundry and sewage disposal facility
PT. JAY (NORTH SLOPE) PRIORITY #13	72/63 stable	Flat poorly drained tundra	Freshwater lake	Village hauls water 1/2 mile/ ice used in winter/un- protected source not treated	\$100,000 in NSB funds earmarked for improvements \$400,000 in State funds available for sanitation improvements NSB plans to move village to new site in March, 1980	Indiscriminate dumping of honey buckets big problem	Art Wyback PHS 452-8251 Amos Agnasagga IRA Council 824-8001	Centralized washateria/ laundronat at new village site

December 1979

VILLAGE CANDIDATE SELECTION - VSW

VILLAGE	POP/HOMES TREND	TERRAIN	WATER SUPPLIES	ADEQUACY	PLANNED IMPROVEMENTS	SEWAGE DISPOSAL	SOURCES OF INFORMATION	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>CANTWELL (AHTNA) PRIORITY #14</p>	<p>62/14 stable</p>	<p>Silt and gravel along river/ scattered perma- frost</p>	<p>Individual wells</p>	<p>Good quality Good quantity water produced</p>	<p>20 HUD Houses proposed for 1900/PHS sanitation improvements to follow</p>	<p>Septic tanks/ outhouses</p>	<p>Dan Rogness PHS 279-9628 Jessie Erberich Elenor Dementi Cantwell 768-2282</p>	
<p>SELEWIK (MANA) PRIORITY #15</p>	<p>500/100 up</p>	<p>Flat poorly drained tundra</p>	<p>Complete village safewater facility</p>	<p>Quality of water is ok/residents prefer nearby creek for drinking water</p>	<p>PHS proposes rain catchment system for 18 new HUD houses/ dumpsite for trash and sewage lagoon for VSW effluent</p>	<p>Village Safe Water facility has wastewater treatment plant/ residents dispose of waste in honey buckets</p>	<p>Rich Haskins Mauneluk 442-3311 Greg Drexler PHS 279-9628</p>	<p>Village request funds for solid waste disposal site</p>

C&RA

MAR 4 1980

Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 131 presently reflects:

1. Title and body contents of SB 342
2. \$10 million G.O. Bond increase - covering solid waste facilities, plus new wording when relating to same.
3. \$ 6 million G.O. Bond increase - raising State share from 50% to 75%

C&RA

Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 436 presently reflects:

1. Page 1, line 10, section 1 - new wording (per Dept. Environmental Conservation request) to incorporate the raising of the State share from 50% to 75%
2. Amending typewriter error, page 1, line 28 to read (d) instead of (e)
3. Page 2, Line 21, Section 5 - adding a new paragraph stating "solid waste" definition as stated in HB 353, (per D.E.C. request and in answer to Mr. Baldwin's concern, our bill drafter.)

Issue Paper
Water and Sewer Construction Grants
December 1979

The Department, through the Facilities Construction and Operation section, administers a grant program which is directed toward providing incorporated communities with assistance in the construction of water and sewerage services. Two basic grant programs are administered: the State general obligation bond water and sewer grant program authorized by AS 46.03.030; and the federal wastewater pollution control program authorized by the Clean Water Act of 1977.

Under the State water and sewer grant program, incorporated municipalities may apply for grants to fund up to 50 percent of project costs for new water and sewerage facilities. If federal funding is involved in a project, State grants are limited to half the non-federal share of eligible project costs. Funded projects include facilities needed for community expansion as well as facilities needed to correct existing public health and environmental problems.

The Department performs the following administrative responsibilities in support of this program:

- review of grant applications
- review of project plans and specifications
- analysis of project construction and operating costs

- processing of grant offers and payment requests
- inspection of projects during construction and following completion
- preparation of project audit reports to ensure that grant funds were properly utilized by grantees.

Eligible projects are presently funded as need arises, after a review to ensure that projects are capable of meeting the need identified at an acceptable life cycle cost. The source of funding for these grants is general obligation bond funds which have been periodically authorized by the voters. Presently, approximately \$18,112,626 are available for obligation to projects through this program.

Since July, 1976, \$37,358,030 has been obligated to water and sewage projects throughout the state. Of this total, \$14,465,180 (38.7%) was for community water supply projects; \$9,450,000 (25.3%) was for sewage treatment and interceptor facilities (matching EPA funding); and \$13,442,850 (36.0%) was for sewage collection facilities. These grants have supported projects in major communities in all regions of the state. The program is not heavily used by bush communities because the Public Health Service and the State Village Safe Water programs are addressing utility needs of remote areas. It is also usually difficult for small remote communities to raise the 50 percent matching requirements. In some instances, however, projects in remote areas are funded through the program in conjunction with other federal, state, or local funding sources.

The grant program for construction of sewage treatment facilities is administered under the authorization of the federal Clean Water Act of 1977. This Act mandates that community sewage treatment works achieve secondary treatment by 1983, except those communities capable of discharging effluent into marine coastal waters which receive good tidal mixing may be allowed to follow less stringent requirements. Secondary treatment is a broad term for many methods of treating sewage through the use of biological processes, and usually results in removal of 85% of the pollutants. Depending upon congressional appropriations from year to year, Alaska is allocated \$16-25 million annually. These funds are then available to communities to finance 75 percent of the cost of sewage treatment and interceptor projects. The State water and sewage grant program mentioned above contributes an additional 12 1/2 percent toward such projects leaving only 12 1/2 percent to be funded locally.

The Clean Water Act assigns the Environmental Protection Agency the responsibility for this grant program. The Act also stipulates that EPA may delegate the administration of the program to the states, and makes funding available to those states which assume administration of the program. Alaska assumed responsibility for a major portion of the program in December of 1978 (one of the first states to do so) and was awarded a grant of \$245,349 to cover costs of administration through June, 1980. EPA has reserved funding to defray State administration expenses in subsequent fiscal years.

In order to reduce the significant delays in grant processing which occurred under EPA administration, and to better ensure that projects are consistent with the unique requirements of Alaska, the Department assumed responsibility for the following administrative tasks:

- preparation of annual project priority list
- review of grant applications
- review of consultant agreements
- review and approval of plans and specifications
- review and approval of project change orders
- review and approval of O & M manuals.

Under agreement with EPA, State certification of these items will be accepted as if performed by EPA staff (subject to periodic audit). It is expected that additional administrative tasks will be delegated to the state, including:

- facility plan approval
- interim and final project inspections
- eligibility determinations
- review and approval of planning documents
- preparation of necessary environmental assessments
- issuance of numerous other technical approvals required for each project.

Since 1975, grants averaging \$20,000,000 a year have been awarded to 30 communities throughout the state. As with the State water and sewer grant program, mainly the larger communities have benefitted from the program. Recent modifications of the Clean Water Act present opportunities for making funding available to smaller communities for innovative, individual, or non-conventional sewage handling facilities.

VILLAGE SAFE WATER

The Village Safe Water Act of 1970 was passed for the purpose of providing safe water and hygienic sewage disposal facilities in remote Villages of the State. In order to accomplish this objective, the VSW Program is organized into three activities: Construction, operation & maintenance and planning. Currently, two people are employed in the program: A program administrator and a planner,

CONSTRUCTION:

Twelve VSW facilities have been constructed to date. Villages served range in size from 50 in council to nearly 500 in Selawik. Projects consist of central sanitation facilities where residents can obtain drinking water, dispose of sewage, bathe and do laundry. No piped water distribution or sewage collection systems have been constructed, except for service lines to schools. Since 1976, these facilities have been designed and constructed by engineering firms selected by the villages working under the direction of VSW program administrator.

OPERATION and MAINTENANCE:

The VSW Program also offers technical management, and financial assistance to villages with VSW facilities. If the community accepts this offer, technical and management assistance is provided by a field engineer and business advisor under contract to the community but working under the direction of the VSW program administrator. The VSW operation & maintenance support program has made it possible for all completed VSW facilities

to serve the public as intended.

PLANNING:

The planning element of the VSW Program includes the following activities: Screening candidate villages where new VSW facilities can be built; annually updating the village sanitation inventory; developing a VSW Program Plan; and liaison with organizations involved in rural sanitation including the Public Health Service, Regional Health Corporations and bush caucus. The planner also is charged with administering 11 projects mandated by the legislature in SB 449, the 1978 Water & Sewer Bond bill.

GC/lr

Water and Sewer Construction Grants

The Department of Environmental Conservation administers a grant program which provides incorporated communities with assistance in the construction of water and sewerage services. Two basic grant programs are administered: the State general obligation bond water and sewer grant program and the federal water pollution control program.

Under the State water and sewer grant program, incorporated municipalities may apply for grants to fund up to 50 percent of project costs for new water and sewerage facilities or one-half the non-Federal share of eligible costs if federal funding is involved. Funded projects include facilities needed for community growth as well as facilities needed to correct existing public health and environmental problems.

Eligible projects presently are funded as need arises. The source of funding for these grants is general obligation bond funds which have been authorized by the voters. Presently, approximately \$18 million is available for obligation to projects through this program.

These grants have supported projects in major communities in all regions of the state. The program is not heavily used by bush communities because the Public Health Service and the State Village Safe Water programs are addressing utility needs of remote areas and it is usually difficult for small remote communities to raise the 50 percent matching requirements. In some instances, however, projects in remote areas are funded through the program in conjunction with other federal, state, or local funding sources.

The grant program for construction of sewage treatment facilities is administered under the authorization of the federal Clean Water Act of 1977. Depending upon congressional appropriations from year to year, Alaska is allocated \$16-25 million annually. These funds are then available to communities to finance 75 percent of the cost of sewage treatment and interceptor projects. The State water and sewage grant program mentioned above contributes an additional 12 1/2 percent toward such projects leaving only 12 1/2 percent to be funded locally.

The Environmental Protection Agency is responsible for this grant program. However, EPA may delegate the administration of the program to the states, and make funding available to those states which assume administration of the program. In order to reduce the delays in grant processing which occurred under EPA administration, Alaska assumed responsibility for a major portion of the program in December of 1978 (one of the first states to do so).

Since 1975, approximately \$20 million of Federal funds a year has been awarded to 30 communities throughout the State. As with the State water and sewer grant program, the larger communities have benefitted the most from the program. Recent changes to the Clean Water Act present opportunities for making funding available to smaller communities for innovative, individual, or non-conventional sewage handling facilities.

Village Safe Water

The Village Safe Water Act calls for at least one facility for safe water and hygienic sewage disposal in each village in Alaska.

Since 1972, eleven VSW facilities have been constructed. They are in the villages of Northway, Chevak, Alakanuk, Selawik, Nulato, Koyukuk, Beaver, Pitkas Point, Kongiganank, Tanana and Council. A facility is being designed for Akiachak and will be constructed during the summer and fall of 1980.

In these eleven villages the VSW projects consist of sanitation facilities to which village residents can come to obtain water supply and sewage disposal services; with bathing and laundry services available in all except Council. No piped water-distribution or sewage collection systems are involved except for water and sewer service lines to schools.

Construction methods used so far have included: 1) competitive bid construction contracts administered by what was then the Alaska Department of Public Works, 2) competitive bid construction contracts administered by the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC), and 3) force account construction by the village through construction management contracts with engineering consultants.

The force account/construction management method of construction has been the most satisfactory of the three methods used. Facilities constructed that way have been built cheaper and faster than those built under competitive bid construction contracts; the quality of construction has been better; and the villages have been more intimately involved in, and satisfied with, their projects.

VSW facilities have cost from \$118,000 at Council for a project begun in FY 78, to over \$1,400,000 at Tanana, of which \$755,000 were VSW funds. Villages served have ranged in size from 60 (Council) to over 550 (Selawik).

Experience in the VSW project has proved that financial, technical, and/or management assistance to the villages is necessary to ensure that the facilities continue to operate. ADEC provides technical and management assistance to the eleven villages. The VSW operation and maintenance support program has made it possible for all completed VSW facilities to serve the public as intended. It is instructive to note that the operation and maintenance cost per village has been decreasing in actual dollars (i.e., ignoring inflation) over the last few years.

ADEC has been working on a comprehensive planning effort intended to define the roles of State and federal agencies and other groups involved in providing rural sanitation services. The Department has sought close cooperation with the U.S. Public Health Service and the regional Native health corporations in carrying out the planning. In fact the Directors of the health corporations have served as an advisory board for the VSW program.

An early step in the planning was to inventory all village sanitation facilities. The inventory is updated annually and is widely viewed as the single most complete and dependable source of information on village sanitation.

Current plans are to investigate certain questions concerning how the VSW program should operate over the long term. Among the questions to be investigated are: 1) What services should VSW facilities provide (e.g., solid waste, piped service to individual homes, saunas)?; 2) Should there be village eligibility criteria for VSW program assistance?; 3) How should construction priorities be set?; 4) How fast should VSW facilities be built (i.e., how much construction money over what period of time)?; 5) What funding sources other than water and sewer bonds can be coordinated into VSW projects? and 6) What should the State's role be in operation and maintenance of VSW facilities, and perhaps other village sanitation facilities as well?

Authority: 46.07

Alaska

MUNICIPAL

League

TELEPHONES
(907) 586-1325
586-6526

204 N. FRANKLIN ST.
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99801

*The C&RA committee sub-
accomplishes this - SB 131*

The Alaska Municipal League urges amendment of CSSB 131 to provide for up to 75% state funding of municipal water and sewer projects that are not already receiving 75% EPA funding.

Currently EPA participates only in sewer interceptors and treatment plants. Sewerage collection and water distribution systems do not receive federal funding except for a few projects that have small EDA grants of 10%.

Equity: The state increasing the percentage of state support for those projects will go a long way toward reducing the inequitable burden that property owners must bear in paying for necessary basic water and sewer services. As it stands now, the property owner pays anywhere from 12.5% to 50%, depending on the nature of the project.

Relief for Property owners and Tax Payers: As I'm sure you are aware, the local share of water and sewer projects is paid by assessments on local property. Increasing the state share will provide direct relief to property owners and tax payers by reducing local improvement district assessments.

Price of Land: A big issue for the last couple of years has been the high cost of land. One reason for the high prices in developable suburban areas is the high cost of installing water and sewer systems. Increasing state participation in providing those systems will help to lower the cost of making land available for use.

I realize there is a problem with language in the bill to incorporate the proposed change. Because we are not advocating increasing the state share on EPA funded projects, we cannot simply change the 50% in the current law to 75%. I'm sure, however, if the committee accepts the concept, the professional bill drafters will be able to find acceptable language.

CRITERIA SYSTEM
for
Allocation of Federal Water Pollution Control Grant Funds

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) as amended by the Clean Water Act of 1977 (PL 95-217) provide grant funds to assist municipalities with facility plans (Step 1), engineering designs (Step 2) and project construction (Step 3) for water pollution control facilities. These funds are allocated to the State of Alaska for obligation through the Department of Environmental Conservation. The Department develops an annual Priority List for determining which projects will receive grants.

The project Priority List is developed using a criteria system to assign a numerical ranking to eligible projects in accordance with EPA requirements. These requirements stipulate that the type of project, severity of pollution, project step and continuity, receiving water usage, existing population affected, public health and environmental hazards, and the effect on water quality standards be considered in developing the Priority List.

The point values for the criteria system have been revised in accordance with PL 95-217 and have been used to prepare the Priority List for allocation of available federal funds. Each project appearing on the Priority List has been assigned appropriate points in each of nine categories. The points for each category are summed and the total used to determine the project rank on the Priority List. The project with the highest point total will be the highest priority project.

In developing the criteria system, the State can not consider "readiness to proceed" as a category for ranking projects. However, "readiness to proceed" can be a reason for moving a project into the fundable portion of the priority list if a higher ranking project will be unable to proceed on schedule, before the end of the fundable year.

When it appears that a project on the fundable portion of the priority list will not be ready to proceed within the fundable year, the State, with EPA concurrence, will notify the applicant that their project is being by-passed in favor of the highest ranking project on the extended portion of the Priority List that is ready to proceed. The applicant being by-passed may appeal this decision to the Department by requesting an adjudicatory hearing conducted under the Administrative Procedure Act. Projects that are by-passed will retain their relative priority rating for consideration on future Priority Lists.

The estimated completion schedules for projects on the fundable portion of the Priority List, by-passed for not being ready to proceed, will be compared with the schedules for compliance contained in the NPDES permit. In those cases where significant delays have occurred, appropriate State and/or EPA enforcement action will be recommended to achieve compliance with permit conditions.

Any projects on the extended portion of the priority list that are by-passed due to not being ready to proceed will be notified and given the opportunity to appeal. After agreement is reached with the applicants proposed for by-pass, the State will certify to EPA that those projects not ready to proceed may be by-passed to reach a project that will be ready during the fundable period.

In addition to funds obligated to specific projects, reserve accounts from each fiscal year's federal allocation will be set aside for the following purposes:

- 1) Up to two percent of each year's allocation or \$400,000, whichever is greater, may be reserved and granted to the State to manage the grants program and other specified portions of the Water Pollution Control Program.
- 2) Two percent of the federal allocation for FFY 79 and 80 and three percent for FFY 81 shall be reserved for projects incorporating alternative and innovative technology, and may be used to increase a federal grant up to a maximum of 85 percent. A minimum of 0.5 percent of the federal allocation for FFY 79, 80 & 81 shall be for projects using innovative technology.
- 3) Four percent of each year's allocation shall be reserved for alternatives to conventional treatment for communities with populations of 3,500 or less, or sparsely populated areas of larger communities.
- 4) A reserve of not less than five percent of each year's allocation will be maintained for funding grant increases.
- 5) A reserve may also be established to fund Step 1 & 2 projects that may or may not appear on the Priority List. To be funded, these projects must have a priority ranking high enough to appear on the fundable portion of the Priority List.
- 6) A state designation reserve may also be established for funding of project increases that occur prior to grant award.

The amounts set aside in these reserve accounts will vary from year to year depending on the federal allocation to Alaska and on the need for the particular reserve within the limitations described above. The specific amounts to be set aside in these reserves will be designated in the annual Priority List, which is subject to public review and comment.

This criteria system and the Priority List developed using these criteria are subject to annual review and comment at public hearings held for this purpose. These hearings are announced through individual mailings and public notice in newspapers of general circulation a minimum of 45 days prior to the first scheduled hearing. Public input regarding the preparation of the Priority List is welcomed.

Project priority rankings are determined according to the following nine categories. Appropriate points are assigned to arrive at a point total and priority ranking for each project:

I. Project Component

In determining the relative priority of the various project components the Department emphasizes the importance of maximizing the benefits to be achieved from limited federal funds. Project components required to achieve compliance with State water quality standards and protect public health will receive higher consideration than project components required by federal law which may provide treatment beyond what is required to protect health or the environment.

Hence, secondary or advanced treatment projects, when required only to satisfy an NPDES permit or other portions of federal law, may be phased on the Priority List so that the initial phase would meet water quality and health considerations, and the final phase would be constructed at a later date, subject to availability of funds. Projects for collection sewers, storm sewers and correction of combined sewer overflows are not considered eligible project categories for use of funds allocated to Alaska.

Projects are assigned a point total by multiplying the point value of the project component by the percentage of cost that a specific component bears to the total eligible project cost and then summing the point values computed for the components.

<u>Component</u>	<u>Points</u>
a) Initial phase(s) of treatment into marine water required to protect public health or achieve water quality standards; secondary treatment for discharge into fresh water; or any treatment required prior to discharge to groundwater.	300
b) Rehabilitation or expansion of treatment facilities or correction of infiltration/inflow in sewage collection systems where existing conditions are disrupting the efficiency of existing treatment facilities.	250
c) Rehabilitation and correction of infiltration/inflow of sewage collection systems where the required corrections are done in conjunction with a new treatment facility.	200

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| d) | Construction of new interceptor sewers, pump stations and appurtenances. | 150 |
| e) | Upgrading existing treatment facilities to secondary or advanced wastewater treatment levels when required for reasons other than meeting water quality standards or protection of public health. | 100 |

II. Project Water Quality Need

To date the Department has not completed an approved water quality management plan. However, information that will be the basis for this plan was taken into consideration in allocating points to projects in this category.

Points awarded for one section only.

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| a) | Project necessary to treat or eliminate a discharge contributing to a documented violation of the Alaska Water Quality Standards. | 400 |
| b) | Project necessary to minimize or eliminate documented "non-point source" contamination of groundwater or surface waters resulting from subsurface sewage disposal systems. | 300 |
| c) | Project necessary to prevent potential water pollution problems or where the environment may be adversely affected due to the impact of accelerated development or industrial growth. | 200 |
| d) | Project only necessary to comply with the effluent limitations contained in an NPDES permit for a point source discharge. | 100 |

III. Regulatory Emphasis for Violation of Water Quality Standards

- | | | <u>Points</u> |
|----|---|---------------|
| a) | Notice of Violation issued by Department of Environmental Conservation or EPA | 50 |
| b) | Compliance order issued by Department of Environmental Conservation or EPA | 80 |
| c) | Charges filed by State Attorney General or legal counsel for EPA | 100 |

IV. Public Health Emphasis

Points

Verification from a state or local health official that a project is necessary to avert or correct a public health hazard.

100

V. Receiving Water Usage - Affected By Existing Discharge

Points

a) Freshwater/Groundwater

- 1) Drinking and food processing 100
- 2) Propagation of fish and shellfish used as a food source 50
- 3) Water contact recreation 20

b) Marine water

- 1) Propagation of fish and shellfish as a food source 50
- 2) Water contact recreation 20

VI. Project Continuity

Points

- a) Award of a Step 1 grant or approval of a facility plan developed without a grant qualifies the project for 100 points to help insure sufficient funding to complete the project. 100
- b) Award of a Step 2 or 2 & 3 grant or approval of plans and specifications completed without a grant award qualifies the project for an additional 100 points to help insure sufficient funding to complete the project. 100
- c) Step 3 projects, where construction is phased over several years or where rehabilitation or corrective measures are required to improve the efficiency of existing sewerage facilities constructed under a previous grant shall qualify for an additional 50 points. 50

PROJECT PRIORITY LIST FOR THE ALLOCATION OF
 FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL GRANT FUNDS FOR FFY 80

The FFY 80 "Project Priority List" consists of sewage system improvements required in the five year period 1979-1984. The list prioritizes 76 projects, each awarded a numerical score derived in accordance with procedures established in the Criteria System. The fundable portion of the Priority List is represented by those projects targeted for grant award during FFY 80. The remaining projects represent the extended portion of the Priority List and will be funded from future federal appropriations.

In addition to the \$44,984,482, the state must obligate \$6,443,343 from the FFY 78 appropriation by October 1, 1979 or lose it to reallocation. It is anticipated that the following projects will receive grants prior to October 1, 1979:

Palmer-West Interceptor Step 4	\$1,315,703
Soldotna - Step 3	2,175,000
Sitka - Step 3 - Phase I	3,675,000
Eagle River - Step 3	3,765,000
State Management Assistance Grant	154,651

\$11,085,354

Program funding available for FFY 80 is estimated at \$46,984,482 and is comprised from the following Congressional appropriations:

1) FFY 77 Supplemental Carryover	\$ 3,162,861
2) Title III - Public Works Employment Act of 1976	4,263,723
3) FFY 79 Appropriation*	20,527,414
4) FFY 80 Appropriation (based on \$3.8 billion)	17,000,000
5) FFY 76-73 Carryover	30,484
	<u>\$44,984,482</u>

If the above grants are awarded by October 1, 1979 the FFY 78 appropriation will be depleted and the FFY 79 appropriation will be reduced by \$4,642,011 to \$15,885,403. Therefore, the dollars available for obligation during FFY 80 may be reduced to \$40,342,471. These projects do not appear on the attached priority list since it is expected that they will be awarded prior to October 1, 1979. However, in the event that any of these projects do not receive grant awards by the expiration date of the FFY 79 priority list, they will be placed on the fundable portion of the FFY 80 priority list to be awarded grants from available funds.

For planning purposes the Department assumes that annual federal appropriations to Alaska will be \$22,500,000, through 1984. The total five year funding available is estimated at \$132.5 million. The five year project list, adjusted for inflation, estimated at \$121.7 million will likely exceed the available funding resources, since reserve accounts must be established from these funding sources.

*This balance may be reduced by additional grant awards prior to the adoption of the Priority List, effective October 1, 1979.

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 sparsely 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	<u>\$9,863,471</u>

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

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
Seward	974	C-020051-03	3	80	STP - INT	6,782	5,087	5,087	5,087
Bristol Bay Borough King Salmon	971	C-020081-02	2 & 3	80	STP - INT	2,762	2,072	7,159	7,159
Kodiak Island Borough Island Lake	920	C-020069-02	2	80	INT	325	244	7,403	7,403
Kodiak Island Borough Island Lake	910	C-020069-03	3	81	INT	4,837	3,628	11,031	-----
Ketchikan - Phase II	880	C-020053-04	3	80	STP	8,750	6,563	17,594	13,966
Nome	860	C-020062-03	3	81	INT	2,378	1,784	19,378	-----
Anchorage - 78" West Interceptor	840	C-020087-04	3	81	INT	7,500	5,625	25,003	-----
Sitka - Phase II	819	C-020052-04	3	80	STP - INT	10,500	7,875	32,878	21,841

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

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

Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor E-6 to ½ Mile So. of Huffman Rd	670	C-020087-13	2	82	INT	34	26	57,181	-----
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	-----
Barrow	660	C-020085-03	3	83	STP	6,000	4,500	61,739	-----
Fairbanks - Airport Interceptor	660	C-020084-03	3	84	INT	7,420	5,565	67,304	-----
Anchorage - STP Upgrade	660	C-020087-02	3	80	UPGRADE	2,181	1,636	68,940	28,428
Anchorage - STP Expansion	660	C-020087-16	3	83	STP	16,550	12,413	81,353	-----
Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor O'Malley to E-4 Trunk	660	C-020087-05	3	81	INT	1,600	1,200	82,553	-----
Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor E-4 Trunk to E-6 Trunk	660	C-020087-09	3	81	INT	418	314	82,867	-----
Anchorage - S.E. Interceptor E-6 Trunk ½ Mi. So. of Huffman Rd	660	C-020087-14	3	82	INT	475	356	83,223	-----
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	-----
Pelican	630	C-020057-02	2 & 3	82	STP - INT	800	600	84,631	-----
Ketchikan - Phase III	630	C-020053-05	3	81	INT	1,000	750	85,381	-----
Homer STP Expansion	600	C-020093-01	1	80	STP	40	30	85,411	28,458

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

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

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

- Sewage Treatment Plant
- Interceptor Sewer
B - 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
Wainwright
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

Now SB131 FISCAL NOTE

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

	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
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)

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:

1980 Capital Budget

Ernst W. Mueller
Commissioner
Department of Environmental
Conservation

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 RPI	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 Rave 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 Mls. 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 NRMECAGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAMFacility Construction Operation

CH./, SLA/ OR RPI	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1970	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 - Odjak 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

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS



CH./, SLA/ OR RPN	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 RPI	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1979	PLANNED EXPENDITURES THROUGH COMPLETION	EST. COMPL. DATE	STATUS
78-320	Juneau - Hospital Water	111,300	-0-	111,300		Design
78-21	Juneau - AI 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

CH./ SLA/ OR RP#	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1970	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	-J-	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	Seward - Sewer #51	57,331	10,018	47,313		Design
79-172						Design
78-82	Sitka - Sawmill Exr.	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

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY
APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED
DATE

CH.#, SLAK OR RPI	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 - R. 26th Avenue	32,672	31,186	1,486		Completed Pending Audit
79-18	Anchorage - Telemetry 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



CH./ SLA/ OR RPI	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1970	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
77-267	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 RPI	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1970	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 - Anaktuyuk 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 Hrs.	180,813	162,732	18,081		Pending Audit
75-291	Seward - Sewer #51	11,875	11,875	-0-		Design
75-291 70-45	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.I. SLA/ OR RPI	PROJECT TITLE AND LOCATION	AMOUNT AUTHORIZED	TOTAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH JUNE 1970	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	249,500	62,400		EPA Audit Pending
	Skagway Water	221,200	176,960	44,240		EDA Audit Pending
	Juneau-Airport Water	70,500	63,450	7,050		State Audit Pending
	TOTAL	18,673,700	10,430,401	8,243,299		

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY
APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED

CH., SLAB OR RPT	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 - Spilt #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	Soldorna 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

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

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 construction of sewerage systems, thereby 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.

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS CONTINUED

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. Forecasting bond needs is also complicated by the provision in the statute 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 officials 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	= <u>15.8</u> million
		\$46.5 million

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

31 ANALYTIC STATEMENT
(Six-Year Capital Program)

REVISED DATE _____

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS CONTINUED

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 <u>81-82</u>	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 = <u>-0-</u> EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN FUND				
				<u>23,000.0</u>	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				

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM Facility Construction and Operation PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

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 _____

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 <u>83-84</u>	FUNDING SOURCE	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOVERNOR'S FUNDING YEAR	GOV'S PRIORITY
I	1	C E	All projects to be funded from 1982 bond proposition ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = <u>-0-</u> EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN FUND				
	3	P O		36,000.0	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				

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

PROJECT TYPE CODES	
C Bldg. Construction	L Land
I Other Improv.	P Professional Svcs.
E Equipment	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 <u>85-86</u>	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 = <u>-0-</u> EXPECTED YEAR = FY _____		FED. RCPTS.				
					GEN FUND				
				<u>42,000.0</u>	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	L Land
I Other Impr. ment	P Professional Svcs.
E Equipment	O Other

34 PROPOSED SIX-YEAR CAPITAL PROGRAM

REVISED DATE _____



PROJECT TITLE Construction Grants (1980 Bonds)		LOCATION(S) State - Wide	AREA SERVED State - Wide	ELECTION DISTRICT(S) A11																
OBJ. NO(S) 1 & 3	OPERATING BUDGET BRU(S) Program Operation	NAME(S)	BUDGET COMPONENT NUMBERS	START DATE January 1981																
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		APPROPRIATION REQUEST																
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building Construction (C) <input type="checkbox"/> Other Improvement (I) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Equipment (E) <input type="checkbox"/> Land (L) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Services (P) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (O)		<table border="1"> <tr><td>1002</td><td>FED. RCPTS.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1003</td><td>G/F MATCH</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1004</td><td>GEN FUND</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>1005</td><td>I/A RCPTS.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>G.O. BONDS</td><td>23,000.0</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">TOTAL</td><td>23,000.0</td></tr> </table>	1002	FED. RCPTS.		1003	G/F MATCH		1004	GEN FUND		1005	I/A RCPTS.			G.O. BONDS	23,000.0	TOTAL
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		PROJECT PURPOSES																
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Totally New Facility <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addition to Existing Facility <input type="checkbox"/> Renovation of Existing Facility <input type="checkbox"/> Major Maintenance or Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement Previously Authorized Funds to Enable Completion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One of Several Phases <input type="checkbox"/> Major External Funding Source <input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protect Human Health & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Protect Capital Assets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protect Natural Resources or Natural Environment <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Efficiency & Economy of State Government <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Services or Accommodate Increased Demand for Services <input type="checkbox"/> Accommodate New Program Requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Respond to Legal or Policy Mandate <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Efficiency & Economy of Alaskan Infrastructure <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Reduce unemployment and stimulate economy																
		SITE FEATURES																		
		NO YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Site Currently Owned? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> All Utilities Available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Access Already Available?																		
		OPERATIONAL COST & NO. PERSONNEL N.A.	FIRST OPERATING YEAR _____	ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR _____																
		INCREASE (DECREASE)																		
FUNDING SOURCE	FED. RCPTS.																			
	GEN. FUND																			
		TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATIONAL COST																		
		POSITION (FTE)																		
				PREVIOUS YR-PRIORITY																
				AGENCY PRIORITY																
				GOVERNOR'S PRIORITY																

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM FACILITY CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION

CAPITAL PROJECT EXPENDITURES (CASH FLOW)	TOTAL	BUDGET YEAR 1981	BUDGET YEAR 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

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

OBJ. NO(S)	APPROPRIATION REQUEST		OPTION 1	OPTION 2	OPERATIONAL COST & NO. PERSONNEL INCREASE (DECREASE)	OPTION 1 ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR	OPTION 2 ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR	PREVIOUS YR-PRIORITY
	1002	FED. RCPTS.					FED. RCPTS.	
1003	G/F MATCH				GEN. FUND			
1004	GEN. FUND							
1005	I/A RCPTS.							
	G.O. BONDS							
	TOTAL				TOTAL ANNUAL OPER. COST POSITION (FTE)			GOVERNOR'S PRIORITY

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.#, SLAB 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 I	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

CH./ SLA/ OR RPI	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

38 STATUS OF CURRENTLY
APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED
DATE

CH.#, SLA# OR RPI	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	182,000	-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

CAMBRY NRMEC

AGENCY Environmental Conservation PROGRAM

Facility Construction and Operation

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY
APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED
DATE

CH.#, SLAF 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

38: STATUS OF CURRENTLY APPROVED CAPITAL PROJECTS

REVISED DATE

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 penalties 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 NRMECAGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation

31

ANALYTIC STATEMENT
(Six-Year Capital Program)REVISED
DATE _____

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 eligibility 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 \$1,200,000 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 _____

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 _____

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 <u>81</u>	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 = <u>142.0</u> EXPECTED YEAR = FY <u>85</u>	2,520.0	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 & Operation

PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

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 _____

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 <u>83</u>	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 = <u>171.1</u> EXPECTED YEAR = FY <u>87</u>	3,040.0	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 & Operation PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

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 _____

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 <u>85</u>	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				
				3,670.0	G.O. BONDS				
			ULTIMATE ANNUAL OPERATING COST = <u>206.6</u> EXPECTED YEAR = FY <u>89</u>		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				

CATEGORY NRMEC AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation PROPOSED FUNDING YEAR _____

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 _____

PROJECT TITLE VSW Projects (1980 bonds)		LOCATION(S) Alaska Villages	AREA SERVED Alaska Villages	ELECTION DISTRICT(S)		
OBJ. NO(S) 1, 3	OPERATING BUDGET BRU(S) Program Operation	NAME(S) Program Operation		BUDGET COMPONENT NUMBERS		
PROJECT NARRATIVE		PROJECT TYPE		START DATE January, 1981		
<p>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.</p> <p>Project Need -</p> <p>Conditions in the first four villages on the VSW priority list which illustrate the need for improved sanitation services are summarized below:</p> <p>1. Circle - 51 people, get water from trading post in summer, but most haul untreated water from Yukon River in winter. Privies and honey</p>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building Construction (C) <input type="checkbox"/> Other Improvement (I) <input type="checkbox"/> Equipment (E) <input type="checkbox"/> Land (L) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Professional Services (P) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (O)		COMPLETION DATE December, 1983		
				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		PROJECT PURPOSES				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Totally New Facility <input type="checkbox"/> Addition to Existing Facility <input type="checkbox"/> Renovation of Existing Facility <input type="checkbox"/> Major Maintenance or Repair <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement Previously Authorized Funds to Enable Completion <input type="checkbox"/> One of Several Phases <input type="checkbox"/> Major External Funding Source <input type="checkbox"/> Other		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protect Human Health & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Protect Capital Asset <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protect Natural Resources or Natural Environment <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Efficiency & Economy of State Government <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Services or Accommodate Increased Demand for Services <input type="checkbox"/> Accommodate New Program Requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Respond to Legal or Policy Mandate <input type="checkbox"/> Improve Efficiency & Economy of Alaskan Infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Other				
NO YES SITE FEATURES						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Site Currently Owned? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> All Utilities Available? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Access Already Available?						
OPERATIONAL COST & NO. PERSONNEL		FIRST OPERATING YEAR	ULTIMATE ANNUAL YEAR	PREVIOUS YR-PRIORITY		
INCREASE (DECREASE)		82	85			
FUNDING SOURCE	FED. RCPTS.			AGENCY PRIORITY		
	GEN. FUND	52.8	142.0			
TOTAL ANNUAL OPERATIONAL COST		52.8	142.0	GOVERNOR'S PRIORITY		
POSITION (FTE)		0	0			

CATEGORY NRMEC

AGENCY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION

PROGRAM Facility Construction & Operation