

APPENDIX D
COMPLETE PRIORITY SYSTEM

62-552.300 General Program Information.

...

(e) Priority System. Timely submitted projects shall be given priority according to the extent each project is intended to remove, mitigate, or prevent adverse effects on public health and drinking water quality. The final priority score for each project shall be determined as described in subparagraphs 1. through 3. below.

1. Base Priority Score. Each project shall receive a base priority score (BPS) dependent on the weighted average of its components. The BPS shall be determined using the following formula where CPS means the component priority score and CCC means component construction cost or:

$$BPS = [CPS_1 \times CCC_1 + \dots + CPS_n \times CCC_n] / \text{Total Construction Cost}$$

a. Project components shall be assigned a component priority score (CPS) according to the categories in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Project Component	CPS
Acute Public Health Risk 1a. E-Coli or Fecal Coliform Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) Exceedance (subsection 62-550.310(5), F.A.C) 1b. Nitrate, Nitrite, or Total Nitrogen MCL Exceedance (subsection 62-550.310(1), F.A.C., Table 1) 1c. Lead or Copper Action Level Exceedance (Rule 62-550.800, F.A.C) 1d. Surface Water Filtration and Disinfection Noncompliance (subsection 62-550.817(2), F.A.C.)	800 points
Potential Acute Public Health Risk 2a. Nitrate, Nitrite, or Total Nitrogen Exceed 50% of MCL (subsection 62-550.310(1), F.A.C., Table 1) 2b. Microbiological MCL Exceedance (subsection 62-550.310(5), F.A.C) 2c. Surface Water Enhanced Filtration and Disinfection Noncompliance (subsection 62-550.817(3), F.A.C.) 2d. State Health Officer Certification of Acute Health Risk for Unregulated Microbiological Contaminants	700 points

2e. Violation of Disinfection Requirements (subsection 62-555.320(12), F.A.C.)	
Chronic Public Health Risk	600 points
3a. Inorganic or Organic Contaminant MCL Exceedance (subsection 62-550.310(1) & (4), F.A.C., Tables 1,4,5)	
3b. Disinfection Byproducts MCL Exceedance (subsection 62-550.310(3), F.A.C., Table 3)	
3c. Radionuclide MCL Exceedance (subsection 62-550.310(6), F.A.C)	
Potential Chronic Public Health Risk	500 points
4a. Inorganic or Organic Contaminant Exceed 50% of MCL (subsection 62-550.310(1) & (4), F.A.C., Tables 1,4,5)	
4b. Disinfection Byproducts Exceed 80% of MCL (subsection 62-550.310(3), F.A.C., Table 3)	
4c. State Health Officer Certification of Chronic Health Risk for Unregulated Chemical Contaminants	
Compliance-1	400 points
5a. Infrastructure upgrades to facilities that are undersized, exceed useful life, or have continual equipment failures	
5b. Insufficient water supply source, treatment capacity, or storage	
5c. Water distribution system pressure less than 20 psi	
5d. Eliminate dead ends and provide adequate looping in a distribution system	
5e. Replace distribution mains to correct continual leaks, pipe breaks, and water outages	
5f. New public water system or extension of existing system to replace contaminated or low yield residential wells	
5g. Lack of significant safety measures (e.g. chemical containment)	
5h. Secondary Contaminant MCL Exceedance (Rule 62-550.320, F.A.C.)	
5i. Drinking water supply project as defined in paragraph 403.8532(9)(a), F.S.	
Compliance-2	300 points
6a. Treatment, Storage, Power, and Distribution Requirements (Rule 62-555.320, F.A.C)	
6b. Minimum Required Number of Wells (subsection 62-555.315(2), F.A.C)	
6c. Well Set-back and Construction Requirements (Rule 62-555.312 and 62-555.315, F.A.C)	

6d. Cross-Connection Control Requirements (Rule 62-555.360, F.A.C)	
6e. Physical Security Project Documented in a Vulnerability Analysis	
6f. Consolidation or regionalization of public water systems	
6g. Water/Energy Conservation Project	
Other Projects	100 points

b. Project component scores that are based on contaminant levels shall be justified by sample analytical data. The date samples were collected must be no older than 24-months from the date of submittal of a Request for Inclusion. The sample results shall show an ongoing and current problem with a drinking water quality standard. The project sponsor shall provide documentation demonstrating contaminant levels (e.g. disinfection byproducts) cannot be reduced by adjusting system operations, if applicable. Samples shall be analyzed by a state certified laboratory as defined in Rule 62-550.550, F.A.C.

c. A project component score of 400 points that is based on compliance-1 categories of Table 1 shall be supported by documentation demonstrating the need for the project; otherwise, a component score of 300 points will be assigned.

d. A project sponsor with a qualifying water conservation project is eligible to receive an additional 100 points added to their priority score if the sponsor provides a water conservation plan in accordance with EPA’s Water Conservation Plan Guidelines, document number EPA-832-D-98-001, August 6, 1998, hereby adopted and incorporated by reference. The sponsor must demonstrate that the proposed project meets the objective of the water conservation plan. This document is available from the Department’s Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program, 3900 Commonwealth Blvd, Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000, or electronic versions are available at <https://www3.epa.gov/watersense/pubs/guide.html> or <http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-08363>.

e. If 50% or more of residential wells of a given project meet the contamination levels indicated in Table 1 and connect to a new or existing public water system, then the project would be awarded component priority points according to the appropriate public health risk. Surface water flooding of wells of residents with septic drainfields and wells under the direct influence of surface water are considered an unregulated microbiological potential acute public health risk, and require substantiated documentation of occurrence in lieu of sampling data.

2. Affordability Score. The extent of affordability existing in a small community to be served by the project shall be reflected in the priority score. Points shall be awarded based upon two affordability criteria: namely, median

household income (MHI) and service area population. These points are to be added to the base priority score.
Affordability Score = (MHI Score + Population Score).

a. MHI Score. MHI score shall be derived based on the extent a community's MHI falls below the statewide average. MHI data used to determine points shall be determined using the ACS 5-year estimate calculated as provided in Subsection 62-552.200 (12), F.A.C. or from verifiable estimates and shall represent all areas to be served by the project sponsor's public water system.

(I) MHI score shall not exceed a maximum of 75 points, shall not be less than zero points, and shall be rounded to the nearest whole number.

(II) MHI score is calculated as follows:

MHI Score = $100 \times (1.00 - \text{MHI fraction})$, MHI fraction is equal to the MHI of the service area divided by the statewide MHI.

b. Population Score. Projects for small systems are generally less affordable than those for larger systems due to a limited rate base from which to recover costs. Special consideration is given to such projects based on service area population. Population data used to determine the score shall come from verifiable estimates and shall represent all areas to be served by the project sponsor's public water system.

(I) Population score shall not be less than zero points and shall be rounded to the nearest whole number.

(II) The population score is calculated as follows

Population score = $50 - (P/200)$. P is the population of the service area.

3. Tie-breaking procedure. The sponsor with the larger population will have the higher priority.