

On December 22, 1977, this Commission held a public hearing to receive comments on the proposed FY-78 Construction Grants Priority List, which list was comprised of a "Continuing Project Portion" and a "New Project Portion."

Following said hearing and in accordance with established priority criteria, the staff submitted proposed revisions to the New Project Portion of the abovementioned list. During the Commission meeting on this date, the staff reported on situations existing in DeQueen and Mountain View, specifically, and the construction grants program, generally.

Having considered comments presented at the aforementioned hearing and having considered comments of the staff, the Commission, subject to the qualifications listed below, hereby approves the revised ranking of communities and SID's for the New Project Portion of the FY-78 Construction Grants Priority List as described in the attached document entitled "Rank Changes in New Project List" and approves the Continuing Project Portion of the FY-78 Construction Grants Priority List as presented at the aforementioned hearing.

Qualifications:

(1) The funding of DeQueen's project is subject to the director's determination that the discharge from Mountaire's processing facility will be adequately treated outside of the municipal system.

This qualification extends to any other project funded through the construction grants program where similar conditions are found to exist, i.e., where dischargers have elected not to use the municipal or SID system and which dischargers have not submitted sufficient documentation to the Department to demonstrate that compliance with applicable water quality standards and regulations can be feasibly achieved through means other than the use of the municipal or SID system.

(2) The director is authorized to withdraw funding approval for those municipalities and SID's which he finds to be unjustifiably delaying work on an approved project.

(3) Recognizing that the need for wastewater treatment facilities far exceeds the funding level of the current construction grants program, the Department is urged to thoroughly explore every available opportunity to enhance the effectiveness of currently available funds in order that financial support could be made available for other worthy projects not included in the priority list herein approved.


JB
BR
HAK
JS
JSS
HAK
A. J. Dumas

Ralph A. Dumas Submitted by: H. G. Hannah Date Passed: 1/27/78

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF POLLUTION CONTROL AND ECOLOGY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Hugh Hannah

FROM: Chuck Bennett 

DATE: January 24, 1978

SUBJECT: QUESTIONS CONCERNING CHANGES IN RANK ON THE
FY 78 NEW PRIORITY LIST

The question that has arisen is why did some towns on the FY 77 New Project List change in rank when the FY 78 New Project List was written. The explanation is as follows:

Normally, the projects included on the FY 77 New Project List would not have remained on the next year's list, but rather, would have been moved up to the continuing project list which contains the Step II and III projects. However, the two lists came so close together that the grants had not been offered to the towns on the FY 77 New Project List by the time the FY 78 New Project List was written. This meant that the FY 77 towns had to stay on the FY 78 list because EPA will not offer a grant to a town that is not on the most current priority list in its proper step.

With this established, we now proceed to the ranking of each project. Each new project is ranked according to the Priority System Worksheet. The FY 77 list had eleven (11) projects on it that were ranked according to the worksheet. The FY 78 list had those eleven projects plus twenty-five (25) more.

The entire list, all thirty-six (36) projects, were re-ranked when the FY 78 list was prepared. This necessitated a change in the ranks of the projects that were on the FY 77 list because some of the new projects being included were from higher categories. All of these changes were in accordance with our EPA approved priority system.

The above explanation is not all inclusive however. After getting the comments at the public hearing, a check of the rankings was made and some mistakes were found. These mistakes were at the very end of the New Project List for reasons unknown. The mistakes have been corrected and the projects re-ranked. A list of the projects as they will be ranked is attached.

In the end, the changes didn't mean anything anyway. All of the towns listed on the New Project List will be funded no matter where they are ranked.

/ewm

RANK CHANGES IN NEW PROJECT LIST

Public Hearing List

Revised List

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Burchwood Bay SID | 1. Burchwood Bay SID |
| 2. Molly Creek SID | 2. Molly Creek SID |
| 3. Hwy 270 West SID | 3. Hwy 270 West SID |
| 4. Warren | 4. Warren |
| 5. Corning | 5. Corning |
| 6. Hoxie | 6. Hoxie |
| 7. Alma | 7. Alma |
| 8. Marshall | 8. Marshall |
| 9. Danville | 9. Danville |
| 10. Blytheville | 10. Blytheville |
| 11. Jonesboro | 11. Jonesboro |
| 12. Magnolia | 12. Magnolia |
| 13. Van Buren | 13. Van Buren |
| 14. Mountain Home | 14. Mountain Home |
| 15. Atkins | 15. Atkins |
| 16. Waldron | 16. Waldron |
| 17. N.L.R.-Clayton Chapel | 17. N.L.R.-Clayton Chapel |
| 18. Wabbaseka | 18. Wabbaseka |
| 19. Coal Hill | 19. Coal Hill |
| 20. Delight-Antoine | 20. Delight-Antoine |
| 21. Palestine | 21. Palestine |
| 22. Plainview | 22. Oil Trough |
| 23. Hartford | 23. Hartford |
| 24. London | 24. Biggers |
| 25. Hermitage | 25. London |
| 26. Pottsville | 26. Hermitage |
| 27. Leola | 27. Altus |

Public Hearing List

28. Almyra
29. Oil Trough
30. Opello
31. Altus
32. Portia
33. Knobel
34. Biggers
35. Quitman
36. Norman

Revised List

28. Norman
29. Portia
30. Knobel
31. Pottsville
32. Leola
33. Almyra
34. Quitman
35. Opello
36. Plainview

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS REPORT

AS OF JANUARY 25, 1978

- A. Since the date of the last report the following grants have been offered and accepted:

	<u>TOWN</u>	<u>STEP</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1.	Hardy	II	\$ 30,000
2.	Hwy 270 West (Hot Springs)	I	16,500
3.	Molly Creek (Hot Springs)	I	24,000
			<u>70,500</u>
		SUB-TOTAL	\$ 70,500

- B. The following grant applications have been approved and forwarded to E.P.A. in Dallas:

1.	Wabaseka	I	\$ 12,000
2.	Hermitage	I	8,300
3.	Palestine	I	11,300
4.	Mountain Home	I	38,063
5.	Pottsville	I	15,100
6.	Alma	I	22,000
7.	Leola	I	10,518
8.	Almyra	I	13,300
9.	Delight-Antoine	I	16,800
			<u>147,381</u>
		SUB-TOTAL	\$ 147,381

- C. Pending Applications:

1.	Perry*	III	\$ 576,074
2.	Gardner SID (Hot Springs)*	II	98,000
3.	Pangburn*	II	26,500
4.	Redfield*	II	33,000
5.	Austin*	II	28,200
6.	Montrose*	II	42,459
7.	Lamar*	III	1,282,250
8.	Brookland*	II	61,100
9.	Van Buren	I	66,452
			<u>2,214,035</u>
		SUB-TOTAL	\$ 2,214,035

TOTAL \$2,431,916

* Held Pending FY-78 Priority List Approval