

April 13, 2004

Agency of Natural Resources
Department of Environmental Conservation
Municipal Pollution Control Projects Priority List for State FY 2004 and
Clean Water Intended Use Plan for Federal FY 2003

Municipalities and Interested Parties:

On November 17, 2003, the Department published notice of the availability of the Draft Municipal Pollution Control Projects Priority List for state fiscal year 2004 and the Draft Clean Water Intended Use Plan for federal fiscal year 2003 for review and comment, and of the public hearing held on December 10, 2003. Copies of the draft documents were mailed to municipalities and other interested parties under cover letter dated November 17, 2003. A Public Responsiveness Summary has been prepared to address the oral and written comments received by the Department at the public hearing and through the comment period. The Public Responsiveness Summary is attached.

Pursuant to the authority provided in the State of Vermont Municipal Pollution Control Priority System, the Department of Environmental Conservation has adopted the priority list as it appears on the following sheets. The *FY 2004 Pollution Control Projects Priority List* indicates those projects the Department anticipates will be receiving state or federal funding through the end of state fiscal year 2004 and until the FY 2005 list is adopted. The 2003 Clean Water Intended Use Plan, which sets forth how the federal fiscal year 2003 Clean Water Capitalization Grant for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) will be used, is attached to the Priority List, as is a Department planning document entitled *Pollution Control Projects by Fiscal Year*. This listing, also known as the planning list or 'P-list' presents those projects potentially fundable from grant programs or the revolving loan program over the next five state fiscal years, and is based on anticipated federal and state appropriations.

If you have any questions or desire clarification of any of the content of these documents, please contact Larry Fitch (802-241-3742) at the Facilities Engineering Division.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Wennberg, Commissioner
Department of Environmental Conservation

**VERMONT AGENCY OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION**

State FY 2004 Municipal Pollution Control Project Priority List
and Federal FY 2003 Clean Water Intended Use Plan

General Notes

1. Project priority points awarded in accordance with the department's Municipal Pollution Control Priority System are listed in the far-right column of the FY 2004 Pollution Control Project Priority List. The points have no significance for the phased-grant projects as the language in the 2003 Capital Bill effectively grants these projects equal elevated priority for 2004 or 2005 funds - whichever year they go to construction, and for subsequent years to complete the grants which they are eligible for.
2. Priority points on the planning list or 'p-list' for future years do indicate the priority in which construction projects will be funded. Whether all construction projects ready to proceed in a particular year will be funded depends on the amount of funds allocated to the program by the Vermont legislature and the through the federal capitalization grant for the Clean Water State/EPA Revolving Loan Fund (CWSRF). Planning projects are not funded in order of their priority, but rather at a rate necessary to bring sufficient projects to the implementation phase to use all of the anticipated grant and loan funds each year.
3. Prior to issuance of the draft state FY 2005 Pollution Control Project Priority List and federal FY 2004 Clean Water Intended Use Plan, all pending project points will be updated based on the 2000 census and income figures.
4. Appearance of projects on the Project Priority List indicates eligibility for funding assuming all other requirements are met. The dollar amounts may change from those listed as project cost changes affect the pro-rating of available grant amounts.
5. Some questions and answers included in the Hearing and Public Responsiveness Summary are very similar. We have opted to include them to provide the broadest understanding possible.

Content of this packet:

- Cover letter, general notes, adopted Project and Planning Priority Lists - 4 pages.
- Clean Water Intended Use Plan - 7 pages.
- Priority List / Intended Use Plan - Hearing and Public Responsiveness Summary - 8 pages.
- 5-year extended Planning List or 'p-list' - 9 pages.

P-LIST ABBREVIATIONS AND NOTATIONS

The P-list is divided into three principal sections: the first section shows the anticipated funding sources; the second section lists construction projects and those planning (step 1 and step 2) projects anticipated to receive planning money through the SRF and are designated with a 1 or 2 in the project cost column to help distinguish them from the construction projects; and the third section shows planning projects which are expected to receive funding via state planning advance rather than the SRF.

“**REF**” stands for **refurbishment**. When a facility’s NPDES permit is renewed for the five year period within which its twentieth year of operation falls, the permit includes a requirement to perform an evaluation of the facility to identify the improvements and renovations that are necessary to enable the facility to continue to operate efficiently and meet its discharge standards for another twenty to twenty-five year design period.

“**CSO**” stands for **combined sewer overflow** abatement projects. Combined sewers carry both wastewater and stormwater and become hydraulically overloaded during rainfall events. This results in overflows to surface waters that are in violation of state and federal standards.

“**PO4**” stands for **phosphorus** removal projects. State statute prohibits any discharge to the drainage basins of Lake Champlain and Lake Memphremagog that contains a phosphorus concentration in excess of 0.8 milligrams per liter on a monthly-average basis.

“**DWF**” represents **dry weather flow** projects. These are projects which abate pollution that occurs during dry weather periods, when systems are not stressed by rainfall events (see CSO discussion). Examples are the construction of a collection system and new treatment facility to eliminate direct discharges to surface waters, or the extension of a sewerage system to collect the flows from failing septic tank or leach field systems and convey them to an existing treatment facility.

“**ENL**” stands for **enlargement** of current facilities to handle increased wastewater flows resulting from municipal growth. These projects receive relatively low priority.

“**SCH**” designation is for **school** projects. School districts can obtain planning advances to evaluate the most effective means to provide water supply and wastewater treatment for new or expanding schools, or to investigate how best to correct current problems. These projects receive increased priority for the necessary planning. Construction is typically funded through the Department of Education.

“**OTH**” stands for **other**, and represents projects that do not neatly fit into the primary categories.

“**STW**” stands to **stormwater**, and represents stormwater management projects that can be funded through the CWSRF.

**Vermont Agency of Natural Resources
Department of Environmental Conservation
Adopted
FY 2004 Pollution Control Construction / Implementation Projects Priority List**

Type / Municipality / Description (opt.)	Estimated Project Cost	State Grant		Reclaimed Planning	SRF Loan	Points
-Dry Weather Flow Pollution Abatement-						
Pownal - Contracts 3 & 4	12,054,903	415,917	1	-	-	42.82
Rochester - New Disposal System	1,990,519	209,519	1	-	394,982	16.39
Warren - C1 Community System	2,773,000	978,000		72,398	730,000	25.28
Warren - C2 Cluster System - Partial Grant	1,633,000	100,000	1	-	100,000	25.28
-Phosphorus Removal-						
Ludlow - Part of Phosphorus Grant	1,010,600	241,380	1	-	-	24.24
Northfield	6,863,000	2,105,000		64,250	-	35.60
Richmond	3,000,000	1,800,000		29,000	1,521,600	21.71
Richmond - Part of Grant Increase	575,000	199,293	2	-	-199,293	21.71
Springfield - Part of Phosphorus Grant	2,035,000	705,325	1	-	1,329,675	24.23
-Enlargement-						
Putney - WWTF REF/ENL	638,000	-		-	584,000	12.23
-Combined Sewer Overflow Abatement-						
Montpelier - contract 03-10	400,000	64,900		-	110,000	11.56
Montpelier - contract 03-09	952,000	280,800		-	421,260	11.56
Rutland City - Segment 2A	6,400,000	1,600,000		118,635	2,840,000	19.51
Springfield - Phase 2, Contract 4	2,800,000	242,618	1	40,000	457,382	11.10
St. Johnsbury - Phase A&B - Partial Grant	2,546,508	153,854	1	115,496	1,290,035	20.40
-Refurbishment-						
Randolph Sewer Rehabilitation	1,300,000	-		-	1,300,000	5.24
-Other-						
Bolton Fire District- System Purchase	212,000	-		-	212,000	12.71
Burlington Digester Rehab - North & East	2,500,000	433,246	1	9,144	2,066,754	12.08
Colchester - Loan Prog. for Onsite Systems	150,000/year	-		-	150,000	12.28
Cold Brook FD 1 - Lagoon Lining	420,000	-		-	420,000	14.06
Shelburne - Rte. 7 Sewer Relocation	750,000	-		-	750,000	3.77
Warren - On-site Pilot Program	30,000	-		-	30,000	3.07
-Stormwater-						
Burlington - Englesby Ravine	500,000	-		-	500,000	4.59

Note: Above entries may change as adjustments are made to available funds, project costs, and eligibility determinations.

1: These are the projects appearing on the "Wastewater Project Phase-In List from the Captial Bill Conference Committee; 2003 Legislative Session".

2: The grant increase needed for this project was not subject to the 'split funding', but the municipality has agreed to delay a portion of its needed grant increase to afford optimum project implementation of those that were affected.

Vermont Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
Adopted
FY 2004 Pollution Control Planning Projects List

Project Type	Municipality	Description	Preliminary Engineering		Final Design		Points
			(EPA)	(SRF)	(EPA)	(SRF)	
CSO	Montpelier	Contract 9	-	-	-	54,740	11.56
CSO	Springfield	Phase II	-	-	-	254,900	11.10
CSO	St. Johnsbury	Phase C	-	-	-	138,138	20.40
CSO	St. Johnsbury	Phase D	-	-	-	48,400	20.40
CSO	St. Johnsbury	Phase E	-	-	-	8,660	20.40
DWF	Clarendon	Feasability Study	20,000	-	-	-	-
DWF	Georgia	Feasability Study	30,000	-	-	-	-
DWF	Grafton	-	-	40,000	-	-	29.84
DWF	St Johnsbury	East St J.	-	-	38,000	-	13.10
DWF	Washington	Feasability Study	20,000	-	-	-	2.97
DWF	Weston	Feasability Study	45,000	-	-	-	-
DWF	Wolcott	Feasability Study	30,000	-	-	-	-
ENL	Hinesburg	-	-	25,000	-	-	4.58
EXT	Bradford	Sewer Lower Plains	-	-	-	75,000	3.40
EXT	Milton	Sewer to Catamount	-	-	-	90,000	25.49
EXT	Morristown	Sewer Extension	-	-	-	40,000	5.11
EXT	West Windsor	Brownsville Ext	3,000	-	-	6,000	-
OTH	Lyndon	I/I, Sludge Dewat	-	55,000	-	-	3.73
OTH	Richmond	Sewer Rehab	-	30,000	-	-	5.33
OTH	Waitsfield	Collection/Treatment	-	-	-	207,000	12.70
PHOS	Richford	LC TMDL	-	12,000	-	-	3.34
PHOS	Troy/Jay	LC TMDL	-	12,000	-	-	3.30
REF	Brandon	WWTF Improvements	-	-	-	50,000	12.75
REF	Brattleboro	-	-	35,000	-	-	4.09
REF	Chester	-	-	-	-	103,800	12.28
REF	Enosburg	-	-	6,000	-	-	13.98
REF	Lyndon	-	-	-	-	145,000	3.73
REF	Newport City	-	-	-	-	135,000	13.89
REF	North Troy	-	-	5,000	-	20,000	2.86
REF	Pawlet	-	-	20,000	-	-	3.12
REF	Randolph	-	-	40,000	-	-	12.07
REF	South Burlington	Airport Pkwy Facility	-	-	-	690,000	11.91
STW	South Burlington	-	-	60,000	-	48,000	5.11

Note 1: Planning projects may be added or deleted from the list, or funding shifted between EPA and SRF without formal amendment.

Note2: Priority Points assigned to projects during early planning are subject to significant change.

VERMONT
CLEAN WATER INTENDED USE PLAN
- ADOPTED -
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2003

A. Introduction

Vermont has agreed to submit to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as part of its annual application for a Clean Water Capitalization Grant under Title VI of the Water Quality Act of 1987, (the Act), a Clean Water Intended Use Plan (CWIUP) which meets requirements of Section 606(c) of the Act and the Clean Water Capitalization Grant Agreement. The CWIUP serves as the planning document to explain how each fiscal year's appropriation for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) will be used.

B. Short Term Goals and Objectives

Vermont holds the following short term goals and objectives for use of the CWSRF.

- (1) To coordinate NPDES permit schedules with anticipated award of CWSRF loans such that projects are brought into preliminary and final planning in time to assure their readiness to proceed to construction when capitalization grant funds become available.
- (2) To develop any rules, guidance or procedures necessary to implement the Vermont - EPA pollution control revolving fund.
- (3) To provide local government with low cost financial assistance.
- (4) To coordinate state funded programs for wastewater treatment facilities with activities of the CWSRF.
- (5) To provide effective program management to insure integrity of the CWSRF.

C. Long Term Goals and Objectives

The primary long term goal of the CWSRF is to provide financial assistance to Vermont municipalities to fund the completion of all known enforceable requirements of the Act.

The second long term goal of the CWSRF is to insure the fund operates in perpetuity to provide continuing financial assistance to Vermont municipalities for future pollution control needs to include new wastewater treatment facility construction, existing facility enlargement or refurbishment, sewer extensions, combined sewer overflow abatement, sludge and septage treatment and disposal, stormwater management facilities, advanced waste treatment determined necessary to meet water quality standards, and other projects deemed necessary for pollution control.

Combined sewer overflow abatement projects presently receive a CWSRF loan in the amount of 50% of the total eligible project cost, and a 25% construction grant from state funds. The remaining 25% of project funds comes from local bond issues. Certain sludge and septage treatment and disposal projects presently qualify for a mix of 50% CWSRF loan and 50% state grant on eligible project cost. If, in the future, sufficient state capital funds cannot be secured to provide the grants, it may become necessary to fund CSO and sludge and septage projects with a loan on the total project in order to assure the most beneficial use of the federal loan funds.

Other eligible projects will receive CWSRF loans on 100% of eligible project cost. Such eligible projects include: sewer extensions, facility enlargement and refurbishment, and sludge and septage treatment improvements and disposal that do not qualify for state grant funding. State grants may still be awarded to projects that insure other public benefit by using federal matching funds which would otherwise be lost to the state's overall pollution control program.

Although the CWSRF may be used for the refinancing of local debt obligations incurred after March 7, 1985, Vermont does not intend to use the fund in this way until all necessary pollution control projects have been constructed, unless there is compelling public benefit to be secured. The interest rate on CWSRF loans issued to refinance debt has been set at eighty percent of the average rate on marketable obligations of the state. All other CWSRF loans are currently issued at zero percent interest. An administrative fee of up to two percent on construction loans took effect on July 1, 1999. The fee is charged for all new construction loans, with the exception of CSO projects and those projects which the state has committed to funding with no interest or fee. Fee proceeds will be deposited into a dedicated account separate from the CWSRF account, referred to as the administrative account. In the future, if funds held in the administrative account are in excess of that necessary to fund the state's administration of the CWSRF program, some of those funds may be transferred to the CWSRF account for project funding.

D. CWSRF Capitalization Grants for Federal Fiscal Year 2003 and Future Years

The federal fiscal year 2003 capitalization grant allotment available to Vermont is \$6,467,800, as authorized by Title VI of the Clean Water Act. We will apply for the grant on a schedule as determined appropriate following the SFY 2004 Priority List Hearing. For planning purposes, we are projecting future capitalization grants at the \$6.0 M level as shown in the attached 5-year pollution control projects planning document, also referred to as the P-list. The P-list shows anticipated planning and construction projects for the immediate five-year period inclusive of state fiscal year 2004.

E. Criteria and Methods for Distribution of Funds

The Vermont CWSRF initiated operations in FY89 and all initial financial assistance activities of the CWSRF have been in the form of loans. Loans will continue to be made in accordance with a project's priority list ranking (noted on the Priority List) established annually through the Municipal Pollution Control Priority System.

The Vermont General Assembly enacted Act 75 creating 24 V.S.A. Chapter 120 in the 1987 session, which act established Vermont's Clean Water Revolving Fund and set out certain priority criteria for the purpose of ranking prospective projects. The Municipal Pollution Control Priority System incorporates those criteria in addition to criteria required in federal construction grant regulations 40 CFR Section 35.915.

F. Re-allocated or Additional Federal Economic Stimulus Funds

In the event funds are re-allocated from the DWSRF to the CWSRF or additional federal funds are made available beyond the anticipated amount, Vermont will advance these funds to the appropriate projects in accordance with this Intended Use Plan, the Municipal Pollution Control Priority System, and any specific requirements of the re-allocated funds.

G. Public Participation

Vermont implements public participation procedures described in 40 CFR Part 25 during development of the annual Pollution Control Priority List (PPL) and CWIUP. The CWIUP is developed and adopted annually along with the PPL using the same public participation procedure employed for adoption of the PPL. That procedure is outlined in the *Municipal Pollution Control Priority System*.

Vermont implements public participation relating to project-specific environmental review for CWSRF funded projects in accordance with the department's *Environmental Review Procedures For Projects Funded Through the Vermont/EPA Revolving Loan Program*. This procedure was approved by the EPA Regional Administrator in accordance with the August 2, 1989 CWSRF Operating Agreement between the State of Vermont and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region I.

H. Annual Report

In accordance with the requirements of Section 606(d) of the Act, Vermont will provide EPA with an Annual Report, which will be submitted to EPA within 90 days of the end of the state fiscal year. The Annual Report will contain information on how the state has met the goals and objectives of the previous fiscal year as stated in the IUP and grant agreement. The Annual Report will describe how well the existing SRF financial operating policies, alone or in combination with other state financial assistance programs, will provide for the long term fiscal health of the fund, assist communities to increase local responsibility for compliance, and carry out other provisions specified in the State Clean Water Strategy. The Annual Report will also provide information on loan recipients, loan awards/disbursements, and environmental assessment determinations.

The Annual Report will also establish that the State has:

- (1) Reviewed all CWSRF funded section 212 projects in accordance with the approved environmental review procedures (section 602(a));
- (2) Deposited its match on or before the date on which each quarterly grant payment was made (section 602(b)(2));
- (3) Made binding commitments to provide assistance equal to 120 percent of the amount of each grant payment within one year after receiving the grant payment (section 602(b)(3)); and
- (4) Expended all funds in an expeditious and timely manner (section 206(b)(4)).

I. **Project Funding**

**Projects/Activities Anticipated to Receive Federal FY2003 CWSRF Funds
(Award of FFY2003 Funds are anticipated to be made during SFY04)**

Loan Recipient	Project Description	Total Project Cost	SRF Loan	Federal Share FFY 2003 Funds
-				
City of Newport	WWTF Refurbishment	2,700,000	2,536,950	2,114,125
Town of Randolph	Sewer Rehabilitation	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,083,333
Town of Rochester	New Disposal System	1,990,519	207,000	172,500
Rutland City	CSO Abatement Phase IIA	6,400,000	2,840,000	2,366,667
Town of Springfield	CSO Abatement Phase 2, C6	2,687,795	400,000	333,333
Town of Springfield	WWTF Refurbishment	9,678,000	166,956	139,130
Subtotal		24,756,314	7,450,906	6,209,088
Vermont SMRF	Administrative Expense	500,000	-	258,712
Total				6,467,800

Notes:

1. Final dollar amounts may change as project costs are modified and as the state grant / CWSRF balance is adjusted.
2. See pages 6 and 7 for the extended portion of this list.

Extended Portion Of Intended Use Plan Project Funding List*

ADDISON TOWN
ALBANY TOWN
Albany Village
ALBURG TOWN
Alburg Fire District #1
Alburg Village
Algiers Fire District #1
ANDOVER TOWN
ARLINGTON TOWN
ATHENS TOWN
BAKERSFIELD TOWN
Bakersfield Fire District #1
BALTIMORE TOWN
BARNARD TOWN
BARNET TOWN
BARRE CITY
BARRE TOWN
BARTON TOWN
Barton Village
Bellows Falls Village
BELVIDERE TOWN
BENNINGTON TOWN
BENSON TOWN
BERKSHIRE TOWN
BERLIN TOWN
BETHEL TOWN
BLOOMFIELD TOWN
BOLTON TOWN
BRADFORD TOWN
BRAINTREE TOWN
BRANDON TOWN
Brandon Fire District #1
Brandon Fire District #2
BRATTLEBORO TOWN
BRIDGEWATER TOWN
BRIDPORT TOWN
BRIGHTON TOWN
BRISTOL TOWN
Bristol Village
BROOKFIELD TOWN
BROOKLINE TOWN
BROWNINGTON TOWN
BRUNSWICK TOWN
BURKE TOWN
BURLINGTON CITY
CABOT TOWN
Cabot Village
CALAIS TOWN
CAMBRIDGE TOWN
Cambridge Village

CANAAN TOWN
CASTLETON TOWN
Castleton Fire District #1
Castleton Fire District #3
CAVENDISH TOWN
Cavendish Fire District #1
Cavendish Fire District #2
CHARLESTON TOWN
CHARLOTTE TOWN
CHELSEA TOWN
CHESTER TOWN
CHITTENDEN TOWN
CLARENDON TOWN
COLCHESTER TOWN
Colchester Fire District #1
Colchester Fire District #2
Colchester Fire District #3
Cold Brook Fire District #1
CONCORD TOWN
CORINTH TOWN
CORNWALL TOWN
COVENTRY TOWN
CRAFTSBURY TOWN
DANBY TOWN
Danby-Mt. Tabor Fire District#1
DANVILLE TOWN
Danville Fire District #1
DERBY TOWN
Derby Center Village
Derby Line Village
DORSET TOWN
DOVER TOWN
DUMMERSTON TOWN
DUXBURY TOWN
EAST HAVEN TOWN
EAST MONTEPELIER TOWN
EDEN TOWN
ELMORE TOWN
Enosburg Falls Village
ENOSBURG TOWN
ESSEX TOWN
Essex Junction Village
FAIR HAVEN TOWN
FAIRFAX TOWN
FAIRFIELD TOWN
Fairfield Fire District #1
FAIRLEE TOWN
FAYSTON TOWN
FERRISBURGH TOWN
Ferrisburgh Fire District #1
FLETCHER TOWN
FRANKLIN TOWN
GEORGIA TOWN
GLOVER TOWN
GOSHEN TOWN
GRAFTON TOWN
GRANBY TOWN
GRAND ISLE TOWN
Grand Isle Fire District #4
Graniteville Fire District #4
GRANVILLE TOWN
GREENSBORO TOWN

GROTON TOWN
Groton Village
GUILDHALL TOWN
GUILFORD TOWN
H2O F.F.D. #2 (Fairfield 2)
HALIFAX TOWN
HANCOCK TOWN
HARDWICK TOWN
HARTFORD TOWN
HARTLAND TOWN
HIGHGATE TOWN
HINESBURG TOWN
HOLLAND TOWN
HUBBARDTON TOWN
HUNTINGTON TOWN
Huntington Woods Fire District
HYDE PARK TOWN
Hyde Park Village
IRA TOWN
IRASBURG TOWN
ISLE LA MOTTE TOWN
Jacksonville Village
JAMAICA TOWN
JAY TOWN
Jeffersonville Village
JERICO TOWN
Jericho Fire District #1
Jericho Village
JOHNSON TOWN
Johnson Village
KILLINGTON TOWN
KIRBY TOWN
LANDGROVE TOWN
LEICESTER TOWN
LEMINGTON TOWN
LINCOLN TOWN
LONDONDERRY TOWN
LOWELL TOWN
LUDLOW TOWN
Ludlow Village
LUNENBURG TOWN
Lunenburg Fire District #1
Lunenburg Fire District #2
LYNDON TOWN
Lyndonville Village
MAIDSTONE TOWN
MANCHESTER TOWN
Manchester Village
MARLBORO TOWN
MARSHFIELD TOWN
Marshfield Village
MENDON TOWN
MIDDLEBURY TOWN
MIDDLESEX TOWN
MIDDLETOWN SPRS TOWN
MILTON TOWN
MONKTON TOWN
MONTGOMERY TOWN
MONTEPELIER CITY
Montpelier Fire District #1
MORETOWN TOWN
MORGAN TOWN

MORRISTOWN TOWN
 Morrisville Village
 MOUNT HOLLY TOWN
 MOUNT TABOR TOWN
 NEW HAVEN TOWN
 NEWARK TOWN
 NEWBURY TOWN
 Newbury Village
 NEWFANE TOWN
 Newfane Village
 NEWPORT CITY
 NEWPORT TOWN
 North Bennington Village
 North Branch Fire District #1
 NORTH HERO TOWN
 North Troy Village
 North Westminster Village
 NORTHFIELD TOWN
 Northfield Village
 NORTON TOWN
 NORWICH TOWN
 Norwich Fire District #1
 Old Bennington Village
 ORANGE TOWN
 Orleans Village
 ORWELL TOWN
 PANTON TOWN
 PAWLET TOWN
 PEACHAM TOWN
 Peacham Fire District #1
 Perkinsville Village
 PERU TOWN
 PITTSFIELD TOWN
 PITTSFORD TOWN
 Pittsford Fire District #1
 PLAINFIELD TOWN
 PLYMOUTH TOWN
 POMFRET TOWN
 POULTNEY TOWN
 Poultney Village
 POWNAL TOWN
 Pownal Fire District #2
 PROCTOR TOWN
 PUTNEY TOWN
 RANDOLPH TOWN
 Randolph Fire District #1
 Randolph Village
 READING TOWN
 READSBORO TOWN
 RICHFORD TOWN
 Richford Village
 RICHMOND TOWN
 RIPTON TOWN
 ROCHESTER TOWN
 ROCKINGHAM TOWN
 ROXBURY TOWN
 ROYALTON TOWN
 Royalton Fire District #1
 RUPERT TOWN
 RUTLAND CITY
 RUTLAND TOWN
 Rutland Town Fire District #1

Rutland Town Fire District #4
 Rutland Town Fire District #5
 Rutland Town Fire District #8
 Rutland Town-Mendon FD#2
 RYEGATE TOWN
 Ryegate Fire District #2
 SALISBURY TOWN
 SANDGATE TOWN
 Saxtons River Village
 SEARSBURG TOWN
 SHAFTSBURY TOWN
 SHARON TOWN
 SHEFFIELD TOWN
 SHELBURNE TOWN
 SHELDON TOWN
 Sherburne Fire District #1
 SHOREHAM TOWN
 SHREWSBURY TOWN
 SOUTH BURLINGTON CITY
 South Burlington Fire District #1
 South Georgia Fire District #1
 SOUTH HERO TOWN
 South Hero Fire District #4
 South Ryegate Village
 SPRINGFIELD TOWN
 SAINT ALBANS CITY
 SAINT ALBANS TOWN
 SAINT GEORGE TOWN
 SAINT JOHNSBURY TOWN
 STAMFORD TOWN
 STANNARD TOWN
 STARKSBORO TOWN
 STOCKBRIDGE TOWN
 STOWE TOWN
 STRAFFORD TOWN
 STRATTON TOWN
 SUDBURY TOWN
 SUNDERLAND TOWN
 SUTTON TOWN
 SWANTON TOWN
 Swanton Village
 THETFORD TOWN
 TINMOUTH TOWN
 TOPSHAM TOWN
 TOWNSHEND TOWN
 Townshend Village
 TROY TOWN
 TUNBRIDGE TOWN
 UNDERHILL TOWN
 VERGENNES CITY
 VERNON TOWN
 VERSHIRE TOWN
 VICTORY TOWN
 WAITSFIELD TOWN
 WALDEN TOWN
 WALLINGFORD TOWN
 Wallingford Fire District #1
 Wallingford Fire District #2
 WALTHAM TOWN
 WARDSBORO TOWN
 WARREN TOWN
 WASHINGTON TOWN

Washington Fire District #1
 WATERBURY TOWN
 Waterbury Village
 WATERFORD TOWN
 WATERVILLE TOWN
 WEATHERSFIELD TOWN
 Websterville Fire District #3
 WELLS TOWN
 Wells River Village
 West Burke Village
 WEST FAIRLEE TOWN
 WEST HAVEN TOWN
 WEST RUTLAND TOWN
 WEST WINDSOR TOWN
 WESTFIELD TOWN
 WESTFORD TOWN
 WESTMINSTER TOWN
 Westminster Village
 WESTMORE TOWN
 WESTON TOWN
 WEYBRIDGE TOWN
 WHEELOCK TOWN
 WHITING TOWN
 WHITINGHAM TOWN
 WILLIAMSTOWN TOWN
 WILLISTON TOWN
 WILMINGTON TOWN
 WINDHAM TOWN
 WINDSOR TOWN
 WINHALL TOWN
 Winhall-Stratton Fire District
 WINOOSKI CITY
 WOLCOTT TOWN
 WOODBURY TOWN
 WOODFORD TOWN
 WOODSTOCK TOWN
 Woodstock Village
 WORCESTER TOWN
 Worcester Fire District #1

***Note: The Towns listed in this table include all political subdivisions therein, whether such subdivisions are specifically included on the listing in their own names or not.**

**VERMONT AGENCY OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION**

State FY 2004 Municipal Pollution Control Project Priority List
and Federal FY 2003 Clean Water Intended Use Plan

Hearing and Public Responsiveness Summary

Hearing

A public hearing to receive comment on the state *FY 2004 Municipal Pollution Control Projects Priority List and the federal FY 2003 Clean Water Intended Use Plan* prior to adoption was convened at approximately 1:00 pm on Wednesday December 10, 2003. The hearing was held in the Skylight Conference Room at the state office complex in Waterbury, Vermont. Notice of the meeting was sent to those municipalities, organizations, and individuals appearing on the mailing list maintained for this purpose, and was published in the Burlington Free Press, the Rutland Herald, and the Barre Times Argus. Larry Fitch, Director of the Facilities Engineering Division, moderated the meeting. Twenty two people, including four agency staff, attended the hearing.

It was noted that the hearing was being taped to assist in the preparation of the responsiveness summary, and that any verbal or written comments received through December 17th would be considered in the preparation of the final documents. Copies of the draft Priority List and Intended Use Plan, and the Department's Pollution Control Priority System were made available.

General Questions/Responses

- 1) If a municipality receives an engineering planning advance to do a feasibility study, is it likely that the Department would decide to issue a planning loan if the municipality desires funding for a comprehensive preliminary engineering/facilities planning report?

- Yes, this is correct..

- An engineering planning advance is an advance of funds that does not have to be repaid unless a project is undertaken that solves the problem or need that was evaluated with the advance. When a project goes to construction, the planning work that had been funded by the advance is typically eligible for any grant and/or loan funding that is applied to the implementation project.

- At the time of a feasibility study, a municipality typically does not have the means to collect fees to repay a planning loan as there is no base of users - since at this time there is no wastewater 'system'. And, the feasibility study may reveal to the municipality that it is not reasonable to construct a system - due to resulting high user costs or other factors. However, if based on the feasibility study the municipality decides that construction of a system is feasible, and therefore proceeds into preliminary engineering - it is reasonably assured that the project will proceed through final design engineering and construction. Then, with a system in-place, there is a user base to pay back the planning loans.

- In actual practice, the planning loans are not 'paid back' but rather carried forward and included as eligible costs for the construction funding.

- 2) Is it accurate to say that municipalities are sometimes surprised to find they are expected to pay back an engineering planning advance that was issued many years earlier?

Yes. The applicable statute states: "Advances under this subchapter shall be repaid when construction of the facilities or any portion thereof is undertaken." There may be instances where the feasibility of a municipal system is studied - but not taken to construction for several years until the available funding is sufficient to result in reasonable user costs, or the need is deemed significant enough to make the user costs acceptable to the users.

- 3) Background: The legislative Act by which the state FY 2004 funds were allocated included the following provision: "It is the intent of the general assembly that all projects listed on the Agency of Natural Resources' one-page document, entitled "Wastewater Project Phase-In List from the Capital Bill Conference Committee" and dated May 20, 2003, that proceed to construction between the effective date of this act and June 30, 2005, will receive all or a portion of the grant funds for which they are eligible in accordance with chapter 55 of Title 10. Where a project proceeds with a grant in an amount less than the amount for which it would ordinarily be eligible, the project will receive elevated priority for funding in subsequent years in order to provide full funding pursuant to statute."

Question: Does this mean that it could take 3 or 4 years to complete funding?

- Yes, but if recent funding levels continue, it is reasonable to anticipate that all of the projects listed in the above-noted phase-in list would receive all of the grant funds they were eligible for out of the SFY 2005 and 2006 legislative appropriations to the Department for pollution control.

- 4) Some communities that are on the phase-in list may not have adequate bonding capability to take an increased SRF (or other) loan for the delayed grant portions. How should the community proceed?

- Options include going to the voters for additional bonding authority, or obtaining a bond anticipation note or grant anticipation note through their local financial institution. Either of the latter can be authorized by the municipal governing body at a duly warned meeting. A bond anticipation note requires that one-twentieth of the principal, and the interest charge be repaid each year. A grant anticipation note requires only payment of the interest, and can be renewed yearly for an indefinite period. Specific abilities and requirements of bond- and grant anticipation notes, and other options for interim funding, should be discussed with the municipality's legal and bond counsels.

- 5) Will the interest paid to a financial institution be covered in the final grant amount?

- Yes, per statute: "Interest costs incurred in local short-term borrowing of the grant amount shall be reimbursed as part of the grant."

- 6) If a CWSRF loan is used for interim funding, is there potential that the grants could be fully awarded before a payment was due?

- With the first payment not being due until one year after the performance period, it is indeed possible that some grants will be fully issued before a loan repayment is due.

- 7) What interest rate/administration fee will the CWSRF loans on delayed grant amounts be issued at?

- There will be no interest charge or administration fee on these loans.

- 8) Some communities may have borrowing authorization above what the long-term loan will be. What

amount should the application be submitted for: the long-term amount only, or should it include the interim loan amount also?

- If the long-term loan carries an administrative fee, then the loans must be separate. The amount can be combined in one loan application if the long-term loan is not subject to an administrative fee.

9) What assurance is there that the municipalities will get the remaining portions of the grants next year and what relative priority will these projects have for future years' funding?

- Based on the funding levels proposed both by the Governor and the VT House of Representatives for SFY 2005, and in consideration of historical funding levels, it is anticipated it will take the appropriations from 2005 and 2006 to completely fund these grants. Further, this will mean no 'new' grants for construction projects will be issued in 2005 - and maybe in 2006 also.

- The language from the 2003 Capital Bill (in #3 above) states: "the project will receive elevated priority for funding in subsequent years in order to provide full funding pursuant to statute." Thus, all projects that have received partial funding will have equal 'elevated' priority for funds from future years, and will receive their appropriate pro-ratio of the funds available.

10) Are the entries on the 5-year planning list or 'p-list' for additional grant amounts in any way guaranteed?

- No. This is a planning document that is used to project funding needs, and the progression of projects based on possible funding amounts. We do not know what level of appropriations we will receive from the legislature in future years, but include what we feel are reasonable estimates based on recent funding levels. Funding of a project is not 'set' until it appears in an adopted 'Pollution Control Projects Priority List' - and even then the dollar amounts may change as project costs or schedules change.

11) State authorization to award a contract is always contingent on the municipality having all funds necessary to complete the project. How will that work with phased grant amounts?

- The municipality will still need to have sufficient funding for the project, but it will not be the 'final' funding scenario. For phased-grant projects, the grant will be smaller and the loan will be larger at contract award than they will be in the final scenario. As the grant is increased, the loan will be decreased until the municipality has the total grant it is eligible for - and that will be the final project funding scenario.

12) Would there be a benefit in delaying a project to a year when sufficient funds were available for the total grant the community is eligible for?

- There are multiple considerations here:

- The available funding from each year will be pro-rated between projects that are proceeding - not saved to accumulate for 'waiting' projects.

- The wording in the 2003 Capital Bill effectively placed all the projects on the phase-in list at equal elevated priority for funding out of the funds available when they go to construction - as long this is by June 30, 2005. Projects going to bid after that would again be competing for funds with other projects that are ready to proceed - based on priority points.

- Given the response of projects willing to proceed with partial funding, it appears that project waiting for total grants could be looking at 2007 or later.

13) Would it be feasible for a community to proceed with a project with their own funding and come in for the grants they would have been eligible for in a later year?

- Our funding statutes include wording that direct the money for project implementation, and not for the refinancing of past projects. One exception to this is in the CWSRF statute which allows refinancing of past debt, but this would be at near-market rates and would have very low priority. It has not been done to-date.

- It does not appear that there would be any benefit to this scenario compared to normal funding procedures for either the 'typical' or the phased-grant projects.

14) In order for the state to provide a grant for a construction project, could the municipality bond for the eligible grant amount and lend it to the state; the state could then give it back to the municipality as a grant (so the grant is not issued after construction); and the state pay the municipality back on the loan at a later date with then-available grant funds?

- We do not have the statutory authority to enter into such an arrangement.

15) Where a community that is receiving the phased grant wants a CWSRF loan to make up the difference until the state can complete the grant, do they need to be on the priority list for that loan?

- Yes. All affected communities are being included on the priority list for such a loan, unless we have been told by them that it is not needed.

16) Is this phased-funding expected to be a one-time occurrence?

- We believe this to be the case.

17) Can municipalities that proceed with a partial grant be assured of eventually receiving all of the grant funds they are eligible for?

- Although we are not able to commit to providing any funds until they are appropriated to the Department by the legislature for this purpose, we believe the funding appropriations will continue at some level. Further, we believe the wording from the 2003 Capital Bill indicates an intent to provide the funding necessary to complete these grants.

18) If the pro-ration of available funds this year would provide less than a community felt it could proceed with, would they simply be dropped from consideration, or would there be a discussion process to see if an acceptable funding scenario could be reached?

- We do have the ability to make the allocations by other than a straight pro-ration and would do so if it allowed more projects to proceed with an acceptable funding scenario.

19) On the 'p-list': what does it mean when numbers appear in brackets or parenthesis?

- Where it appears in the 'Planning' column, it indicates that Engineering Planning Advances are coming back into the grant/planning advance fund. This occurs as a project which addresses the issue that was planned by the advance goes to construction, and the cost of that planning work gets included in the funding scenario for the total (planning, design, and construction) project.

- Where it appears in the 'SRF Loan' column, it indicates that either an SRF planning loan is being 'returned' in the same way, or where on a phased-grant project - a grant installment is being made and part or all of the interim SRF loan is being reduced.

20) At some time, will there be a big infusion of funds needed for the Lake Champlain Phosphorus Total

Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) plan?

- The Department has developed a proposed schedule that spreads this need (~\$7.5M) over six years so there is not a single-year spike. The schedule considers the renewal dates of the facilities' discharge permits, the relative benefit (between facility treatment type) of implementing the levels required in the TMDL, and the likely ability of the facility to actually achieve the phosphorus discharge levels in the TMDL even before a project is implemented - due to their current hydraulic loading being significantly less than the facility has been designed to handle. The proposed schedule can be adjusted at any time if deemed necessary.

21) Will additional portions of the \$139,000,000 cost identified in the Lake Champlain TMDL appear in future Agency of Natural Resources (ANR) capital funding requests?

- Currently and/or historically, the agency request has included funds for the pollution control, water supply, and solid waste grant and loan programs; for the major maintenance and reconstruction of dams owned by ANR; and for capital projects of the Departments of Fish and Wildlife and Forests, Parks and Recreation. There is a potential for future requests to include certain elements of the TMDL, but no specific information relative to this is available at this time.

Project-Specific Questions and Comments/Responses

22) Town of Brandon: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: 1) On the 2004 planning list: Combine the two projects into one entitled: 'Final Design - WWTF REF'; change the estimated construction cost of this project from \$328,000 to \$925,000; and recalculate the project's priority points. 2) On the 2005 planning list: add the Brandon WWTF REF construction phase and use a loan amount of \$875,000.

-1) All recommended changes have been made except for recalculation of priority points. Priority points do not have an impact on the funding of planning work (2004 entry), and a full recalculation will be done with new (2000) income and census figures before the next list (FY 2005) list is advertised for public comment.

-2) It was subsequently verified that Rural Development will fund this project when it goes to construction, so the 2005 entry only shows return of the preliminary and final design planning loans.

23) Town of Brattleboro: Letter dated 12/02/03 letter from Mr. Stephen Barrett, Director of Public Works requesting that a \$35,000 CWSRF loan be included in 2004 for preliminary engineering of the refurbishment of the town's wastewater treatment facility.

- This has been added.

24) City of Burlington: Letter dated 12/16/03 from Laurie Adams, Assistant Director of Burlington Public Works: In the information sheet for the bond vote on this digester upgrade project, it was noted they would receive half of the project cost of \$2.5 million in grant funds. They did not plan on phasing of the grant, and are fortunate that they voted the bond for the entire project cost. They thought they would receive at least \$520,000 in 2004 for this project, and hoped to receive the rest in 2005. 2) Hearing: There is currently no update on estimated cost of this project. The city plans go out to bid next month, and construct in the spring.

- It was noted in the mailing of the draft list that the amount of funding that would be available to the projects on the phase-in list in 2004 was highly uncertain. Increases in the costs of ongoing (open grant) projects have increased, which has significantly lowering the amount of funds available in 2004. Also,

there have been some increases in the grant needs for other phased projects - requiring an adjustment of the pro-rating calculations. The attached list shows the current estimated grant amounts for 2004. The draft list for 2005 will be issued shortly after the funds are made available in the Capital Construction Act for 2005.

25) Town of Castleton: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: On the 2004 p-list: move the 30,000 for preliminary engineering of the sewer extension to 2005 and show the special State grant of \$75,000, move the final design from 2005 to 2006, and move the construction from 2006 to 2007 and combine the Creek Road project with this one.

- All changes made as requested, except the \$75,000 special state grant appears in the top section of the first page for 2004. This 'reserves' it for use in the appropriate year.

26) Town of Georgia: Letter dated 12/10/03 Mr. Douglas Williams, Town Administrator asking for \$30,000 for a preliminary feasibility study of Georgia Shore.

- This has now been included in 2004 as requested.

27) Town of Lyndon: Letter dated 01/06/04 from Gary Leach, P.E. of Leach Engineering Consultants, Inc.. On behalf of the town, they request \$35,000 for evaluation of the sewer system to alleviate adverse affects on the WWTF when the river adjacent to plant rises following rainfall events. Further, they request \$20,000 for pilot testing of sludge dewatering alternatives to assist in defining the equipment that will be included in the upcoming facility refurbishment project.

- These have been added to 2004 as requested.

28) Town of Milton: Letter dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Andrew Legg, P.E. Town engineer. The WWTF upgrade contracts are to be undertaken in the fall of 2004 (SFY 2005). The loan needs to be increased to \$7,915,020. The sewer extension to the Catamount Industrial Park is in final design and they would plan to bid this in early 2005. A bond vote will be held this summer to provide the additional bonding capability needed for both projects. The sewer extension project cost should be increased to \$2,015,500.

- These project costs, funding amount projections, and timing changes have been updated on the p-list as requested.

29) Town of Newport: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: This project should be moved from FY 2004 to FY 2005.

- This change has been made.

30) Town of Pownal: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: On the 2004 p-list: The payback of the CWSRF planning loan will not occur until later. On the 2005 p-list: The state grant for contracts #3 and #4 should be increased to \$700,000; the cost of contract #1 (WWTF) should be increased to \$5,871,000 and state grant increased to \$2.2M; and the state grant on contracts #2 and #5 should be increased to \$1,500,000. On the 2006 p-list, the state grant on the services contracts (#6, #7, and #8) should be \$500,000.

- All changes and updates have been made.

31) Town of Putney: Letter dated 12/05/03 from Mr. Larry Hyde, Town Manager. The town's current

project appears in 2006. We have verified with Mr. Sundarabhaya that it was on the adopted list for FY 2003 and would plan to put it out to bid in the near future.

- This is correct. We apologize for the erroneous entry.

32) Town of Richford: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: This new project should be added to the list for implementation of the Lake Champlain Phosphorus TMDL: Estimated project cost \$450,000; planning in 2004 at a cost of \$12,000; final design in 2005 at a cost of \$30,000; and construction in 2006 with a state phosphorus grant of \$450,000 and return of the planning monies.

- This project has been added-in as requested except that the construction has been put in 2005 at a cost of \$500,000. If necessary, this can later be moved to 2006. The cost was adjusted to match the amount that was in the Governor's proposal, and that appears in the current (as proposed by the House and Senate) editions of the capital bill.

33) Town of Rochester: Letter dated 12/08/03 from Mr. John Kiernan, P.E. of Phelps Engineering, Inc.. The total grant should be \$604,500. They would proceed with the \$225,000 noted for 2004, and would like a temporary \$380,000 loan from the CWSRF.

- The total grant need has been adjusted to this figure. The 2004 available grant amount has been reduced due to cost increases to ongoing projects, and the loan amount included with an off-setting adjustment.

34) Town of St Johnsbury: 1) Letter from Mr. Michael Welch, Town Manager dated 12/15/03. The draft list indicates a partial grant of \$185,000 against a total need of \$251,702. The latter is an old number. Also, the phase-in list has a \$105,000 figure. The town's June '03 grant and SRF applications both carried a grant request of \$443,899 and thus we ask that the 2004 and later grant amounts be based on that number. The town would proceed with \$185,000 figure escalated to be based on the \$443,899 grant amount and would like a temporary loan to cover the delayed grant portion.. 2) At the Priority List hearing, Mr. Peter Silbermann, P.E. of Earth Tech Inc. noted that the grant amount for Phase E of the town's CSO project appeared in-error.

-1) One reason for the differences in the numbers appearing on the phase-in list and the funding- and p-lists is that they are from two different times - and reflect the mix of projects, costs, grant eligibilities, and funds availability then known to us. The phase-in list reflects numbers from May of 2003 - and was used to show the conference committee on the 2003 capital bill an approximation of what pro-rated partial funding would mean. The funding and p-lists were from November of 2003. Pro-rating available 2004 funds against the \$443,889 total grant amount gives the project approximately \$154,000 for the first part of the grant.

-2) We believe the estimated grant listed for Phase E (2005 p-list) is correct based on a now-corrected project cost. The ~\$12.5M cost of the rest of the St. Johnsbury CSO project (after phases A through E are implemented) is now listed in the p-list for 2006 with a state grant of ~\$3.0M. Remember that the p-list is only a 'planning' list and thus the numbers are estimates based on current information and they may change significantly as the planning and engineering for the contract progress.

35) City of South Burlington: Letter dated 12/17/03 from Mr. Eugene J. Forbes, P.E. of Hoyle, Tanner & Associates, Inc.. An update of the numbers for this project is: \$13.25M total project cost; \$10.16M construction cost, and \$690,000 for final design engineering.

- All numbers have been updated on the Planning Projects list and the p-list.

36) Springfield Town CSO project: Letter dated 12/16/03 from Mr. Gregory C. Kepler, P.E. of Dufresne-Henry Inc.. The design cost for Phase 2 should be \$254,900. Contract 4 will bid in FY 2004 and the current estimated total project cost \$2.8M with a resulting state grant of \$700,000. The town would like a CWSRF loan for delayed grant. Contract 5 will bid in FY 2005. It has a currently estimated project cost of \$2.9M, an estimated state grant of \$725,000, and at this time you should assume a 50% CWSRF as RD funding has not yet been confirmed. They would like a minimum grant on C4 of \$200,000.

- *The costs, and schedule have been updated on the funding and planning lists as-appropriate.*

37) Springfield Town WWTF upgrade project: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.. The phosphorus grant on this project is currently projected at \$2,035,000.

- *This number has been updated.*

38) Town of Warren: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: On the FY 2004 p-list: Contract 2: Increase the loan from \$65,000 to \$100,000. For Contract 1: Decrease the state grant to \$876,000 and increase the loan to \$730,000. Delete the final design line. Delete the Contract 2 entry from the 2005 p-list.

- *All changes made, however more-recent project eligibility information has resulted in the state grant on Contract 1 being increased to \$978,000.*

39) City of Winooski: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: The stormwater planning project should be moved from 2004 to 2005.

- *This change has been made.*

40) Wolcott Town: Memorandum dated 12/15/03 from Mr. Donald E. Phillips, P.E. of Forcier Aldrich & Associates, Inc.: Add a preliminary engineering project for \$30,000 on the FY 2005 p-list, and final design for \$60,000 on the 2006 list.

- *This project has been added as requested.*

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2004

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:47:56

Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
==== Funding Sources =====								
a 2003 to 2004 CARRYOVER			(14,602,300)	(5,167,323)		(8,147,662)	(1,111,817)	
b Bennington FY 01 Earmark				24,787				
c Castleton FY 02 Earmark				75,000				
d 2004 STATE APPROPRIATION				(5,404,042)				
e State Funds Bond Cost				20,000				
f CHAPTER 120 ADMIN COSTS				250,000				
g EPA 2003 SRF CAP GRANT						(6,467,800)		
h STATE MATCH - 2003 SRF CAP GT						(1,293,560)		
i EPA ADMIN 4% SETASIDE-FY03						258,712		
j Contingency						200,000		
k SRF REPAYMENTS & INTEREST						(3,270,391)		
l Admin \$ 3%-EPA 02 STAG to St J			30,000					
m REPAYMENTS - VT-ONLY RLF							(34,808)	
n Interest - VT-only SRF								
o Rest of 02 Cap Grant						(2,950,368)		
p To Match Rest of 02 Cap Grant				590,074		(590,074)		

==== Construction Projects =====								
Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
**** SRF PLANNING INCLUDED W/CONSTR ****	OTH	*****						
ADJUSTMENTS TO ACTIVE PLANNING	OTH	CHELSEA 5K			(5,000)			
ADJUSTMENTS TO ACTIVE PLANNING	OTH	NORTHFIELD Sludge Dewatering	1		(6,500)			
BOLTON-TOWN OF	OTH	Puchase of System				212,000		12.71
BRADFORD-TOWN OF	EXT	Lower plains sewer ext	2			75,000		3.40
BRADFORD-VILLAGE OF	REF	Sludge Storage - UDSA FUNDING	1,056,000		(9,000)	(53,300)		10.84
BRANDON-TOWN OF	REF	Final Design				50,000		12.75
BRATTLEBORO-TOWN OF	REF	REF Prelim				35,000		4.09
BURLINGTON-CITY OF	OTH	##### Digester Rehab N&E Fac	2,500,000	433,246	(9,144)	2,066,754		12.08
BURLINGTON-CITY OF	STW	Englesby Ravine Stormwater	500,000			500,000		4.59
CHESTER-TOWN OF	REF	Final Design	2			103,800		12.28
COLCHESTER-TOWN OF	OTH	Loan Prog for Onsite Systems				150,000		4.17
COLD BROOK-FD #1	OTH	Lagoon Line; Pmt Reqd; Des/Bld	420,000			420,000		14.06
ENOSBURG FALLS-VILLAGE OF	REF	REF Prelim	2			6,000		13.98
GRAFTON-TOWN OF	DWF	Preliminary	4,136,000			40,000		29.84
HINESBURG-TOWN OF	ENL	PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING	1			25,000		4.58
LUDLOW-VILLAGE OF	PO4	##### PO4 Rem - Partial Grant	1,010,600	241,380				24.24
LYNDON-TOWN OF	OTH	Prel: Inflow and Sludge Dewat				55,000		3.73
LYNDON-TOWN OF	REF	FINAL DESIGN - PLANT REF	2			145,000		3.73
LYNDON-TOWN OF	REF	USDA Funding - Solids Handling	1,156,000			(65,000)		12.60
MILTON-TOWN OF	ENL	Sewer to Catamnt IP Final Des	2			90,000		25.49
MONTGOMERY-TOWN OF	OTH	Facilities Plan Update/Closeout	1					14.95
MONTPELIER-CITY OF	CSO	Closeout net for C5 & C6	2	100,000		(80,000)		11.56
F MONTPELIER-CITY OF	CSO	Contract 03-10	9	400,000		64,900		11.56
F MONTPELIER-CITY OF	CSO	Contract 03-9	2	952,000		280,800		11.56
MONTPELIER-CITY OF	CSO	FINAL DESIGN - Contract 9	2	2		54,740		11.56
MORRISTOWN-TOWN OF	OTH	Final Design - Sewer Ext	2			40,000		5.11

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2004

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:47:56

Municipality/Funding Information		Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
NEWPORT-CITY OF	REF	Final Design - Plant Rehab	2				135,000		13.89
NORTH TROY-VILLAGE OF	REF	Preliminary / Final Design	275,000				25,000		2.86
NORTHFIELD-VILLAGE OF	PO4	Completion of Facilities Plan	1			(44,000)			35.60
NORTHFIELD-VILLAGE OF	PO4	Recovery of SRF Planning	2				(404,000)		35.60
F NORTHFIELD-VILLAGE OF	PO4	USDA \$s for Non-PO4 Cost	6,863,000		2,105,000	(64,520)			35.60
PAWLET-TOWN OF	REF	Prelim Engr	1				20,000		3.12
POWNAI-TOWN OF	DWF	##### Sew (C 3 &4) Part Gt	2	12,054,903	5,009,700				42.82
PUTNEY-TOWN OF	REF	Plant Rehab/ENL	638,000				584,000		12.23
RANDOLPH-TOWN OF	REF	Prelim Engr - 1272 Order	2				40,000		12.07
RANDOLPH-TOWN OF	REF	Sewer Rehab	1,300,000				1,300,000		5.24
RICHFORD-TOWN OF	PO4	Phos - Prelim	1				12,000		3.34
RICHMOND-TOWN OF	OTH	PRELIM ENGR - SEWER REHAB	1				30,000		5.33
RICHMOND-TOWN OF	PO4	##### Part of P Grant Inc	575,000		199,293		(199,293)		21.71
F RICHMOND-TOWN OF	PO4	NS&EB 4-29-03 Update	3,000,000		1,800,000	(29,000)	1,521,600		21.71
ROCHESTER-TOWN OF	DWF	##### New Disp Sys - Part Gt	1	1,990,519	209,518		394,982		16.39
RUTLAND-CITY OF	CSO	SEGMENT 2A	2	6,400,000	1,600,000	(118,635)	2,840,000		19.51
SHELBURNE-TOWN OF	OTH	Rte 7 AOT, Sewer Line Reloc	750,000				750,000		3.77
SHELDON-TOWN OF	REF	Ref Req'd - NPDES - USDA \$s	213,000				(28,700)		13.52
SO BURLINGTON-CITY OF	REF	AP Enlargement - FD					690,000		11.91
SO BURLINGTON-CITY OF	STW	Final Design	2				48,000		5.11
SO BURLINGTON-CITY OF	STW	Prelim Engineering	1				60,000		4.11
SPRINGFIELD-TOWN OF	CSO	##### Phase 2 - Contract #4	2	2,800,000	242,618	(40,000)	457,382		11.10
SPRINGFIELD-TOWN OF	CSO	1st Loan Repayment	200,000		50,000				11.10
SPRINGFIELD-TOWN OF	CSO	Final Design - Phase II	2				254,900		11.10
SPRINGFIELD-TOWN OF	REF	##### Phos Grant first part	2,035,000		705,325		1,329,675		24.23
ST JOHNSBURY-TOWN OF	CSO	##### Phase A & B - Part Gt	1	2,546,508	153,854	(115,496)	1,290,035		20.40
ST JOHNSBURY-TOWN OF	CSO	Final Design - Phase C	2	2,093,231			138,138		20.40
ST JOHNSBURY-TOWN OF	CSO	Final Design - Phase D	2				48,400		20.40
ST JOHNSBURY-TOWN OF	CSO	Final Design - Phase E	2	40,000			8,660		20.40
ST JOHNSBURY-TOWN OF	DWF	Reclaimed Planning				(38,000)			13.10
TROY AND JAY-TOWNS OF	PO4	Phos Prelim	1				12,000		3.30
WAITSFIELD, TOWN OF	OTH	Final Design Treat/Collect	2				207,000		12.70
WARREN-TOWN OF	DWF	##### C2 - Cluster Part Gt	2	1,633,000			100,000		25.28
F WARREN-TOWN OF	DWF	Contract 1- Community System	1	2,773,000	1,149,000	978,000	(72,398)	730,000	25.28
WARREN-TOWN OF	OTH	1st Year On-site Pilot Program	1	30,000			30,000		3.07
WEST RUTLAND-TOWN OF	PO4	Overrun and FM Work	25,000		15,000		10,000		24.08
WEST WINDSOR-TOWN OF	EXT	Brownsville Ext - Final Design					6,000		
WESTON-TOWN OF	DWF	Preliminary Engineering	1		45,000				

==== Planning And Final Design =====

CLARENDON-TOWN OF	DWF	Prelim for Village System	(P)			20,000			
GEORGIA-TOWN OF	DWF		(P)			30,000			
ST JOHNSBURY-TOWN OF	DWF	1272-NON-MUNICIPAL--OPTION D	(F)			38,000			13.10
WASHINGTON-TOWN OF	DWF	FEASIBILITY STUDY	(P)			20,000			2.97
WEST WINDSOR-TOWN OF	EXT	Brownsville Ext - Preliminary	(P)			3,000			
WOLCOTT-TOWN OF	OTH	Feasibility Study	(P)			30,000			

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

Page 2

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2004

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:47:56

Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
====Fiscal Year Totals =====								
Totals For Fiscal Year: 2004		Estimated Project Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	
		60,465,796	(8,413,600)	1,290,907	(410,693)	(5,419,110)	(1,146,625)	
				State Funds Total:	(266,411)			

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2005

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:49:41

Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
==== Funding Sources =====								
c '05 Capital Approp PC Gts & Match				(4,945,160)				
d '05 TMDL Approp Troy/Jay, Richford				(1,000,000)				
e State Funds Bond Cost				20,000				
f Chapter 120 Admin Costs				250,000				
g EPA 2004 Cap Grant						(6,510,800)		
h State Match- 2004 SRF Cap Grant				1,302,160		(1,302,160)		
i EPA Admin 4% Setaside FY04						260,432		
j Contingency								
k SRF Repayments & Interest						(4,150,262)		
l Admin - 3% on STAGs								
m Repayments VT-Only RLF							(34,808)	
n Interest VT-Only RLF								

==== Construction Projects =====								
**** SRF PLANNING INCLUDED W/CONSTR ****	OTH	*****						
ADJUSTMENTS TO ACTIVE PLANNING	OTH	PROCTOR 4.9K				(4,900)		
UNKNOWN	PO4	1st year of PO4 Funding	1	1,361,000				16.00
BARRE~CITY OF	ENL	PROJECT CLOSEOUT			(225,000)			24.21
BARTON~VILLAGE OF	REF	Prelim Engr - 20-Yr Study		1			18,000	9.95
BENSON~TOWN OF	REF	98?N!0!		204,000			204,000	13.80
BRANDON~TOWN OF	REF	RD funding construction	1	925,000			(65,800)	12.75
BRATTLEBORO / BELLOWS FALLS	OTH	Final Design		2			140,000	12.08
BURLINGTON~CITY OF	OTH	##### Rest of Grant - Dig		3		816,754	(816,754)	12.08
CASTLETON~TOWN OF	EXT	Preliminary Engineering		1			30,000	9.13
CHELSEA~TOWN OF	REF	POSSIBLE USDA FUNDING		120,000		(8,200)		13.05
CHESTER~TOWN OF	REF						(108,300)	12.28
ENOSBURG FALLS~VILLAGE OF	REF	REF Final Design					30,000	13.98
ESSEX JUNCTION~VILLAGE OF	ENL	PRELIM ENGR		1			35,000	5.22
GRAFTON~TOWN OF	DWF	Final Design		2			245,000	29.84
LUDLOW~VILLAGE OF	PO4	##### PO4 Rem - Rest of Gt		1,010,600		455,048		24.24
LYNDON~TOWN OF	REF	WWTF REF - USDA FUNDING 100%		2,200,000			(145,000)	3.73
MARSHFIELD~VILLAGE OF	REF	REF Air & Other		100,000			100,000	16.88
MIDDLEBURY~TOWN OF	OTH	Prel Engr - Sewer/Riv Crossing		1			20,000	4.90
MILTON~TOWN OF	ENL	##### WWTF Upg/ENL	3	8,600,000	599,708	954,569	(14,728)	25.49
MILTON~TOWN OF	ENL	Sewer to Catamount IP	4	2,015,500			1,925,500	25.49
MONTPELIER~CITY OF	REF	UV Disinfection		2			50,000	11.95
MORRISTOWN~TOWN OF	OTH	Sewer Extension - Rte. 100N		520,000			452,800	5.11
NEWPORT~CITY OF	REF	WWTF Rehab		2,700,000			2,536,950	13.89
NEWPORT~TOWN OF	REF	Evaluate Alts for System Rehab		1			10,000	13.45
POWNA~TOWN OF	DWF	##### Sew (C 3&4) Rest Gt				784,083		42.82
POWNA~TOWN OF	DWF	C1 - WW Treatment Plant (5)	1	5,871,000	2,400,000	2,200,000	(29,000)	42.82
POWNA~TOWN OF	DWF	C2 Sewers, C5 Pump Sta. (5)				1,500,000		42.82
POWNA~TOWN OF	DWF	delayed SRF planning payback					(6,958,300)	42.82
RANDOLPH~TOWN OF	REF	Final Design - 1272 Order	2	2			50,000	12.07
RICHFORD~TOWN OF	PO4	Phos - Final Design		2			30,000	3.34

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2005

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:49:41

Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
RICHFORD~TOWN OF	PO4	Phosphorus Project		500,000		(42,000)		3.34
RICHMOND~TOWN OF	OTH	FINAL DESIGN - SEWER REHAB		2		60,000		5.33
RICHMOND~TOWN OF	PO4	##### Rest of P Grant Inc				(375,707)		21.71
ROCHESTER~TOWN OF	DWF	##### New Disp Sys - Rest Gt				(394,982)		16.39
SO BURLINGTON~CITY OF	STW	TPC Estimate Not Yet Available						5.11
SPRINGFIELD~TOWN OF	CSO	##### P2 C4 Rest of Gt		2,800,000		(457,382)		11.10
SPRINGFIELD~TOWN OF	CSO	2nd \$50K Loan Repayment				50,000		11.10
SPRINGFIELD~TOWN OF	CSO	Phase 2 - Contract #5 (5)	2	2,949,385		725,000	(23,277)	11.10
SPRINGFIELD~TOWN OF	REF	##### Phos Grant - Rest				1,329,675	(1,329,675)	24.23
ST JOHNSBURY~TOWN OF	CSO	##### Phase A & B Rest of Gt				290,035	(290,035)	20.40
ST JOHNSBURY~TOWN OF	CSO	Phase C (5)	2	2,205,200		111,969	(11,548)	20.40
ST JOHNSBURY~TOWN OF	CSO	Phase D (5)	2	749,780		42,814	(46,619)	20.40
ST JOHNSBURY~TOWN OF	CSO	Phase E (5)	2	40,000		9,000	(137,247)	20.40
TROY AND JAY~TOWNS OF	PO4	Phos Final Design		2		30,000		3.30
TROY AND JAY~TOWNS OF	PO4	Phos Implementation		500,000		(42,000)		3.30
WAITSFIELD, TOWN OF	OTH	New WWTF Plant and Sewers		4,000,000		3,465,500		12.70
WARREN~TOWN OF	OTH	2nd Year On-site Pilot Program	2	40,000		40,000		3.07
WINOOSKI~CITY OF	STW	Prelim Engr		1		10,000		4.82
WOLCOTT~TOWN OF	OTH	New System - Prelim				30,000		

====Fiscal Year Totals=====								
Totals For Fiscal Year: 2005		Estimated Project Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	
		39,411,488	2,999,708	6,899,018	(275,519)	(2,488,455)	(34,808)	
				State Funds Total:	6,588,691			

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2006

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:50:24

Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points	
==== Funding Sources =====									
2006 State Appropriation				(6,000,000)					
CHAPTER 120 ADMIN COSTS				250,000					
EPA 2005 SRF CAP GRANT						(6,000,000)			
EPA ADMIN 4% SET-ASIDE FY06						240,000			
LC TMDL Year 2				1,000,000					
SRF Interest & Repayments						(4,555,551)			
STATE MATCH - 2006 SRF CAP GRANT				1,200,000		(1,200,000)			
==== Construction Projects =====									
UNKNOWN	PO4	2nd year of PO4 Funding	2	1,361,000				16.00	
BRATTLEBORO / BELLOWS FALLS	OTH	3/00/1M S&S PROJ (SINGLE PH)	1	2,500,000		1,250,000	(18,800)	1,110,000	12.08
CASTLETON-TOWN OF	EXT	Final Design		2				100,000	9.13
COLCHESTER-TOWN OF	OTH	Possible Future Phases 4 & 5	2						7.54
ENOSBURG FALLS-VILLAGE OF	REF	Facility REF		300,000		(4,900)		277,777	13.98
ESSEX JUNCTION-VILLAGE OF	ENL	FINAL DESIGN		2				70,000	5.22
ESSEX JUNCTION-VILLAGE OF	ENL	SLUDGE IMPRVMENTS FOR 3.3 MGD		1,000,000		500,000		430,000	5.22
GRAFTON-TOWN OF	DWF	New WWTF		4,136,000		(15,600)		3,891,000	29.84
MILTON-TOWN OF	ENL	##### Plant Enl - Rest of Gt				2,007,631		(2,007,631)	25.49
MONTPELIER-CITY OF	REF	New UV Disinfection System		1,475,000				1,425,000	11.95
POWNAI-TOWN OF	DWF	Connections - Contracts 6/7/8				500,000			42.82
RANDOLPH-TOWN OF	REF	WWTF Improvements	2	1,000,000				910,000	12.07
RICHMOND-TOWN OF	OTH	PR/1M SEWER SYSTEM IMPS		1,200,000				1,110,000	5.33
SO BURLINGTON-CITY OF	REF	Airport Pkwy ENL		13,250,000				12,484,000	11.91
SPRINGFIELD-TOWN OF	CSO	3rd \$50K Loan Repayment				50,000			11.10
ST JOHNSBURY-TOWN OF	CSO	Pass R. Separation Phase F	3	12,500,000		3,000,000		6,000,000	20.40
WARREN-TOWN OF	OTH	3rd Year On-site Pilot Program	3	60,000				60,000	3.07
WEST WINDSOR-TOWN OF	EXT	Brownsville Ext - Const						111,111	
WOLCOTT-TOWN OF	OTH	Feasibility Study		1		(30,000)			
WOLCOTT-TOWN OF	OTH	New System - Final Desigh						60,000	
==== Fiscal Year Totals =====									
Totals For Fiscal Year: 2006				Estimated Project Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan
				38,782,005	0	3,757,631	(69,300)	14,515,706	0
						State Funds Total:	3,688,331		

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

Page 1

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2007

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:51:04

Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
==== Funding Sources =====								
2007 State Appropriation				(6,000,000)				
Chapter 120 Admin Costs				250,000				
EPA 2006 SRF Cap Grant & State Match				1,200,000		(6,000,000)		
EPA ADMIN 4% SET-ASIDE FY07						240,000		
LC TMDL Year 3				1,100,000				
SRF Interest & Repayments						(4,798,643)		
==== Construction Projects =====								
UNKNOWN								
PO4	3rd year of PO4 Funding	3	1,361,000	1,361,000				16.00
BURLINGTON-CITY OF	DWF	PRI: N: IL NO AVENUE SEWER EXT	3	540,000		(9,144)	540,000	11.57
CASTLETON-TOWN OF	EXT	Service Area Expansion	3	3,157,779			2,952,779	9.13
DERBY CENTER-VILLAGE OF	WS	SPLIT FUNDING 05/06/07	3	2,000,000			2,000,000	2.85
SPRINGFIELD-TOWN OF	CSO	4th \$50K Loan Repayment					50,000	11.10
==== Fiscal Year Totals =====								
Totals For Fiscal Year: 2007			Estimated Project Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan
			7,058,779	0	(2,039,000)	(9,144)	(5,065,864)	0
				State Funds Total:		(2,048,144)		

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.

Agency of Natural Resources
 Department of Environmental Conservation
 Pollution Control Projects By Fiscal Year
 FY 2008

Date Report Run: 5/20/04
 Time Report Run: 14:51:24

Municipality/Funding Information	Phase	Projected Cost	Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan	Points
==== Funding Sources =====								
2008 State Appropriation				(6,000,000)				
Chapter 120 Admin Costs				250,000				
EPA 2007 SRF Cap Grant & State Match			(6,000,000)	1,200,000				
EPA Admin 4% Set-Aside FY08						240,000		
LC TMDL Year 4				1,475,000				
==== Construction Projects =====								
UNKNOWN	PO4	4th year of PO4 Funding	4	1,361,000				16.00
SPRINGFIELD-TOWN OF	CSO	5th \$50K Loan Repayment						11.10
==== Fiscal Year Totals =====								
Totals For Fiscal Year: 2008		Estimated Project Cost		Fed Grant	State Grant	Planning	SRF Loan	State Loan
		1,361,000		(6,000,000)	(1,664,000)	0	240,000	0
					State Funds Total:	(1,664,000)		

NOTE 1: Negative amounts represent Program Income or Surplus; Positive amounts represent Outlay or Deficit

NOTE 2: This list is constantly evolving as funding and project content, cost and timing change. Although projections of future years' funding are included, the Department can not commit such funds prior to appropriation. Therefore, this list is intended to serve as a planning tool only. Please keep the Department informed as your project progresses to assist us in determining its position on this planning list.