



State of Utah

SPENCER J. COX
Governor

DEIDRE HENDERSON
Lieutenant Governor

Department of
Environmental Quality

Tim Davis
Executive Director

DIVISION OF WATER QUALITY
John K. Mackey, P.E.
Director

November 24, 2025

UTAH DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
DIVISION OF WATER QUALITY
INTENDED USE PLAN FY2025

THE 2025 INTENDED USE PLAN & PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

The Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Water Quality (Division) opened its public comment period on the proposed 2025 Intended Use Plan (IUP) and Project Priority List (PPL) on October 17, 2025. The public comment [notice](#) was posted on the [Utah Public Notice website](#) and the [Division's Public Notice website](#). The [IUP and PPL](#) were made available for review and feedback, and comments were invited via mail to: Utah Division of Water Quality, P.O. Box 144870, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4870 and via email to: wqcomments@utah.gov.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The public comment notice was posted on October 17, 2025, and was open through close of business November 17, 2025. The comment period was open for at least 30 days and there were no public comments received by the Division. The 2025 IUP and PPL were finalized on November 24, 2025 and are available on the [Division's website](#).

FURTHER INFORMATION

The IUP and PPL may also be obtained in person at the Division of Water Quality, 195 North 1950 West, Multi Agency State Office Building in Salt Lake City, Utah. For further information you may contact Adriana Hernandez, Contract/Grant Analyst, at: eqwqfinance@utah.gov.

STATE OF UTAH STATE REVOLVING FUND

INTENDED USE PLAN FY25

PREPARED BY

The Division of Water Quality
September 2025



UTAH DEPARTMENT *of*
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
**WATER
QUALITY**

CHAPTER 1. Introduction

The Intended Use Plan is used by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to apply for the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Capitalization Grant. The primary purpose of the Intended Use Plan is to identify current and projected projects that may be awarded funding from federal grant awards. The federal award for the FY25 base program is \$8,360,000. The federal award for the FY25 general supplemental program is \$12,980,000. The federal award for the FY25 emerging contaminants general supplemental is \$1,121,000. See Table 4 for a list of State Revolving Fund projects. In addition, this document includes an overview of the Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants (OSG) Program, the Utah Wastewater Loan Fund (UWLF), and the Hardship Grant Fund (HGF). See Tables 5, 6 and 7 for a list of these respective projects.

As required under Sections 606(c) and 610(b) of the Clean Water Act, the State of Utah has prepared an Intended Use Plan (IUP) for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) program. The purpose of the IUP is to facilitate the negotiation process for the Fiscal Year 2025 CWSRF Capitalization Grant agreements. This IUP outlines the short-term and long-term goals of the program and proposes a schedule of payment between the Department of Environmental Quality - Division of Water Quality (Division) and the Environmental Protection Agency - Region 8. The data provided in the 2025 IUP are projections of funding for the listed projects. Ultimately, the Utah Water Quality Board (Board) will determine loan amounts and financing terms as projects are presented for authorization, pursuant to Utah Administrative Code (UAC) R317-101-4. See Appendix A for the Board's Financial Burden Evaluation Policy and Appendix B, Interest Rate Factors.

The CWSRF is a financial assistance program that provides low-cost financing for treatment works, sewerage systems, storm water projects, decentralized systems, and nonpoint source projects. The operation of Utah's CWSRF program is coordinated between the Utah Water Quality Board and the Department of Environmental Quality - Division of Water Quality. Projects financed through the State Revolving Fund may receive funding from the following sources: (a) SRF Capitalization Grants; (b) SRF loan repayments; and (c) State matching funds. Occasionally, an SRF-eligible project will be financed through the Utah Wastewater Loan Fund or Hardship Grant Fund.

The Division of Water Quality maintains the SRF Project Priority List (PPL) comprised of projects for which funding applications have been submitted. The Project Priority List is a numeric calculation used to prioritize projects which will remedy the most severe water quality problems and provide funds for the most beneficial protection of public health and water quality improvement. Projects are added to the list prior to being presented to the Water Quality Board for authorization. These updated Project Priority Lists are considered to be updates to the current IUP. Projects will be considered for funding according to their priority and readiness to proceed. If an SRF-eligible project

does not proceed or is funded by SRF, UWLF, HGF, or another source, it will be removed from the PPL. The Intended Use Plan includes projects listed on the most recent FY25 Project Priority List.

The Division of Water Quality conducts multiple surveys; one of which is the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) survey to project the potential Utah Statewide funding needs for wastewater treatment and wastewater collections systems. Participation in the MWPP is required for all political subdivisions which have received funding from the SRF, UWLF, or HGF. In addition, all wastewater agencies Statewide are encouraged to voluntarily participate. In the most recent survey from 2021, 168 responses were received, which represents 70% of the distributed surveys. Results from the MWPP survey for projected wastewater capital improvement projects are listed below, showing a projected Statewide need of more than \$4.4 billion through 2041. It should be noted that agency estimation accuracy diminishes with greater timelines; therefore, the 2025 estimation is believed to be accurate, while the need for 2040 is probably greater than estimated.

Table 1: 2021 MWPP Survey Results-Statewide Wastewater Capital Improvement Projects

2021-2026	2027-2031	2032-2036	2037-2041
\$2,540,200,246	\$737,598,506	\$610,615,718	\$579,739,913

The Clean Water Needs Survey (CWNS) has also been completed. The Division surveyed four facility types - wastewater, stormwater, nonpoint source, and decentralized - that showed a total need of \$9.7 billion for the survey period of 2022-2041. A State Specific Approach (SSA) was used to estimate data for each of these facility types where planning documents were not available.

A total of 190 wastewater collection and treatment facilities were entered into the survey using planning documents, small community forms, and the SSA; of these, 95% responded and 5% were estimated using the SSA. There were 91 stormwater facilities entered using a survey to estimate needs with the SSA, showing a need of \$1.9 billion. Decentralized systems were estimated with the SSA according to the 13 health departments in the state and showed a need of \$1.26 billion. The nonpoint source survey received 37 project responses, which showed a need of \$690 million.

1.1 Unified Water Infrastructure Plan

The Unified Water Infrastructure Plan (UWIP) is being created as a comprehensive prioritized list of water infrastructure projects that will potentially need financial assistance through state funds within the next 20 years. This plan will be created and administered by the Water Development Coordinating Council (WDCC). The relevant agencies included in the council (as defined in Utah

Code 73-10g-601) provide financial assistance for a large portion of water infrastructure projects in the state. These agencies that will be most involved in the UWIP include:

- Division of Water Resources (WRe) through the Board of Water Resources
- Division of Drinking Water (DDW) through the Drinking Water Board
- Division of Water Quality (DWQ) through the Water Quality Board

The plan will improve coordination between these agencies and simplify the process for entities that are seeking funding for water infrastructure projects. The plan will allow the state to assemble water infrastructure needs and priorities in a single, comprehensive location. The list of projects identified will help the council determine where funds should be allocated and when additional funds need to be requested from the state. The wastewater UWIP project list is being included in the IUP by reference as Appendix D.

1.2 Public Comment Process

The public comment process for Utah's IUP is a crucial step in ensuring transparency and community involvement. Once the draft Intended Use Plan is presented and approved by the Board, a public notice will be posted and the IUP and PPL will be made available to the public for review and feedback. The public comment period is open for 30 days and the notice is posted on the Division's and Public Notice website. Feedback can be submitted in writing or via email to the Division. All comments received during this period are carefully considered by the Division and responses will be added for submission to EPA.

CHAPTER 2. Program Operations

Since its inception in 1989, Utah's CWSRF program has received appropriations from the federal government through capitalization grants. For FY25 the base capitalization grant award is \$8,360,000, and the general supplemental capitalization grant award is \$12,980,000.

In addition to federal dollars, The Department of Environmental Quality-Division of Water Quality is required to provide a twenty percent (20%) state match for the base and the general supplemental funding. Utah has met the state match requirement for the base program by using money from the Utah Wastewater Loan Fund. Revenues into the UWLF are derived from principal repayments from state loans, from a state sales tax allocation, and additional legislature appropriation. Utah has received its full measure of sales tax dollars in the amount of \$3,587,500. The Division of Water Quality will ensure that it meets 602(b)(2) requirements by depositing the entire 20% match upon receipt of the federal grant awards.

The Department of Environmental Quality-Division of Water Quality will use SRF administrative funds of 4% of the overall grant awards. Administration will not exceed the statutory limit. In addition, loan origination fees equal to 1% of the principal loan amount are charged to loan recipients. That revenue may also be used for program administration expenses. The Division of Water Quality estimates that \$132,592 will be collected from loan origination fees by the end of the Fiscal Year.

The Department of Environmental Quality-Division of Water Quality will reserve the right to use 2% of the Clean Water SRF Capitalization Grants for Technical Assistance. The planned activities for these funds will be determined at a later date.

2.1 Transfer of Clean Water State Revolving Funds

The Water Quality Board and Division of Water Quality reserve authority to transfer funds from the Clean Water SRF program to the Drinking Water SRF (DWSRF) program. The amount reserved for future transfers is up to 33% of the DWSRF capitalization grant award. Tables 2 and 3 reflect the reserved transfer amount for the most recent three years. Prior amounts can be found on previous IUP's.

For FY25, the projected amount of funds to be transferred is \$0, with no short- or long-term impacts on the fund. Justification for any transfers to the Drinking Water SRF program, including amount, type of funds, and fund impact, will be documented in a future Intended Use Plan.

The Intended Use Plan will reserve the authority to transfer funding to the DWSRF program. A Memorandum of Understanding between the divisions to process the actual transfers will require the Water Quality Board approval.

Table 2: Transfer Amounts-Base Program

Award Year	DWSRF Capitalization Grant Award	Reserved Transfer Amount
2023	\$4,938,000	\$1,629,540
2024	\$4,661,000	\$1,538,130
2025	\$10,906,000	\$3,598,980

Table 3: Transfer Amounts-General Supplemental (GS) and Emerging Contaminants (EC)

Award Year	DWSRF GS Grant Award	Reserved Transfer Amount	DWSRF EC Grant Award	Reserved Transfer Amount
2023	\$21,055,000	\$6,948,150	\$7,640,000	\$2,521,200
2024	\$22,985,000	\$7,585,050	\$7,640,000	\$2,521,200
2025	\$24,898,000	\$8,216,340	\$7,640,000	\$2,521,200

2.2 Extended Financing Terms

In FY25, the Utah Water Quality Board authorized extended financing to Corinne City and Grantsville City. The Division of Water Quality estimates that the long-term impact of extended financing on the SRF program is less than a 1% revolving level reduction over 60 years. This estimate does not include an adjustment for inflation.

In cases of extreme hardship, the maximum affordable loan amount may not provide sufficient capital to cover project costs. In these cases, the Board would be requested to provide additional subsidization or hardship grant funds to make these projects feasible. Extended-term financing can increase the loan amount that a community qualifies for under the 1.4% median adjusted gross household income (MAGI) affordability guideline. The extended terms also benefit the SRF program by replacing an award of grant dollars with additional loan repayments, albeit in years 21- 30.

2.3 Additional Subsidization

The FY25 capitalization grant may allow states to provide additional subsidization in the form of principal forgiveness and negative interest loans. A minimum of \$1,672,000 and a maximum amount of \$2,508,000 additional subsidization amounts will be outlined in the programmatic terms and conditions of the base award. The Water Quality Board may utilize the difference between the minimum and maximum additional subsidization amounts to refinance existing debt on projects which met CWSRF requirements at the time of construction. General supplemental awards require 49% additional subsidization. The additional subsidization amount for the FY25 general supplemental award is \$6,360,200. The Water Quality Board uses principal forgiveness agreements as its mechanism for awarding additional subsidization.

The Board will prioritize projects for additional subsidization that benefit a municipality meeting the state's affordability criteria and is currently allocating 100% of available subsidy to disadvantaged communities. The community must have a demonstrated hardship based on its cost of sewer service relative to 1.4% of the MAGI, unemployment, poverty level, or economic trends. To qualify as a disadvantaged community the estimated annual cost of sewer service for the average residential user must exceed 1.4% of the modified median adjusted gross income (Modified MAGI). This "hardship" definition is also in UAC R317-101-4 (b) (1) and is the CWSRF State Affordability Criteria. Table 4: List of SRF Projects, identifies those projects that may meet this subsidization requirement. In addition, the Water Quality Board would consider an application seeking additional subsidy benefiting residential users qualifying under the hardship definition. Further, the Water Quality Board may authorize additional subsidization to additional projects presented for authorization during the year, such as those communities addressing water-efficiency or energy-efficiency goals, communities mitigating stormwater runoff, or to encourage sustainability. The Water Quality Board is currently working on a process for targeting disadvantaged communities.

2.4 Green Project Reserve

The FY25 capitalization grant allocation requires that, to the extent that there are sufficient eligible projects applications, not less than 10% of the SRF funds shall be used for projects that address green infrastructure, water or energy efficiency improvements, or other environmentally innovative activities. The State of Utah will meet this objective by identifying projects that meet green infrastructure requirements and providing funding, in whole or in part, as they proceed to construction. Future plans to ensure this requirement is met include creating a website dedicated to Green Project Reserve (GPR). This will create more visibility and transparency regarding the requirement.

Please refer to table 4 to view the projects that may meet the Green Project Reserve requirement.

2.5 Program Assurances

The State of Utah must comply with its Operation Agreement with EPA and Utah Administrative Code, R-317-102, Utah Wastewater State Revolving Fund (SRF). Assurances include:

- Section 602(a) - Environmental Reviews
- Section 602(b) (3) - Certify binding commitments within one year
- Section 602(b) (5) - First use for enforceable requirements

As required by the EPA, The Division of Water Quality will complete reporting requirements through the Office of Water State Revolving Fund (OWSRF) for all binding commitments in the quarter that they are made.

2.6 First Use Requirements

Utah's CWSRF has met "first use" requirements of Section 602(b) (5). CWSRF funds will be distributed using the method, criteria, and eligible activities that are outlined in Section R-317-101 and 102 of the Utah Administrative Code. The methods and criteria provide affordable assistance as well as maximum benefit to the long-term viability of the fund. If the dollar amount of projects in the FY25 Intended Use Plan exceeds the actual amount of funds available during the planning period, one of the following may occur:

- Projects listed may not be funded
- Projects may be funded using available credit enhancement techniques
- Projects may need to be delayed until funds are available

CHAPTER 3. CWSRF Project Funding

Eligible SRF projects to be funded by the SRF include loans closed with remaining draws, authorized loans, and anticipated loans. Loans closed with remaining draws are projects that are currently under construction. Authorized loans are projects that have been authorized by the Utah Water Quality Board and are in the design phase. Anticipated loans are projects that are in the beginning stages of planning.

Funding through the SRF can include federal dollars from the capitalization grant awards, principal repayments, interest payments, and investment fund interest earnings. Table 4 shows the projects that are expected to be funded from the CWSRF. Equivalency projects must meet specific programmatic requirements including federal cross cutters and "super cross-cutters" such as, Davis-Bacon wages, American Iron and Steel (AIS), NEPA-like environmental review, Single Audit Act, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE), and Architectural and Engineering Services procurement.

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law includes the Build America, Buy America Act (BABA) requirements which places additional requirements on the CWSRF Program. The United States must make significant investments to install, upgrade, or replace the public works infrastructure of the United States; with respect to investments in the infrastructure of the United States, taxpayers expect

that their public works infrastructure will be produced in the United States by American workers. These new BABA requirements have been placed on federal equivalency infrastructure projects.

As determined by the Water Quality Board, SRF loan recipients may be charged a hardship grant assessment in lieu of interest. Upon collection, the hardship grant assessment will be placed into the Federal Hardship Grant Fund. If a hardship grant assessment is derived from a loan funded directly by EPA Capitalization Grant monies, the assessment shall be used for purposes identified in 40 CFR Part 31.25. If a hardship grant assessment is derived from a loan funded by SRF loan repayments, the assessment may be used to provide grants to communities for projects that are economically unfeasible without grant assistance.

3.1 Long Term Goals

1. Provide a permanent funding source for water quality construction projects that supplements a community's own resources and/or other funding sources.
2. Distribute SRF funds to projects with the highest water quality and infrastructure needs by evaluating and prioritizing proposed projects throughout the state.
3. Support EPA's Sustainability Policy by balancing a community's economic and water quality needs with the perpetuity of the SRF program.
4. Assist communities with all phases of a project, including sufficient planning, project design, environmental work, and construction.

3.2 Short Term Goals

1. Present eligible projects to the Water Quality Board for authorization and assist communities through the application and award process.
2. Collaborate with other agencies (e.g., Utah Permanent Community Impact Board, U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to sufficiently fund projects.
3. Solicit and fund eligible nonpoint source, storm water, and emerging contaminants projects.
4. Provide funding, equal to at least ten percent (10%) of the capitalization award, for energy efficiency and recycled water and water reuse projects to the extent such projects exist.
5. Increasing the profile of the SRF program as a potential funding source for low income and rural Utah communities.

Table 4: List of SRF Projects

Funding Type: 1st=Base Cap Grant, 2nd=Revolved Funds, GS=General Supplemental, EC=Emerging Contaminants

Applicant	Permit Number (UT-)	Needs Category	Project Description	Assistance Amount	Total Project Costs	Funding Type	Int. Rate	Term (yrs)	Equiva- lency	Meets Hardship Definition	Addit'l Subsidy	Green Project Reserve	Agreement Date
Ash Creek SSD	OP00201	IV-A New Collectors	Virgin Town collection trunkline	\$6,876,000	\$6,876,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	0%	30	Yes	No	No	No	tbd
Ash Creek SSD	OP00201	IV-A New Collectors	Virgin Town collection trunkline	AdSub	\$6,876,000	EC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2,645,320	N/A	tbd
Ash Creek SSD	OP00201	IV-A New Collectors	Virgin Town collection trunkline	AdSub	\$6,876,000	EC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$2,354,680	N/A	tbd
Brian Head Town	0026158	IV-A New Collectors	Construction of sewer collection lines	\$1,900,000	\$8,398,155	1st Round	4%	30	Yes	No	No	No	24-Aug
Central Valley WRF	0024392	II-Advanced Treatment	CVWRF WRF upgrades	\$65,100,000	\$177,000,000	1st & 2nd Round	1.5%	20	Yes	No	No	No	18-Dec
Corinne City	0020931	III-B Sewer Replacement	Collection & treatment system upgrades	\$4,500,000	\$7,342,900	1st & 2nd Round	.5%	30	Yes	Yes	\$4,000,000	No	tbd
Daggett County	OP00302	III-B Sewer Replacement	Dutch John sewer upgrades	\$475,000	\$525,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
Enoch City	G580000	III-B Sewer Replacement	Sewer upgrades	\$5,485,800	\$5,685,800	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
Grantsville City	0021130	II-Advanced Treatment	Construction of MBR treatment plant	\$16,000,000	\$35,000,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	.75%	30	Yes	No	No	\$1,098,300	tbd
Hanksville Town	OP00119	I-Secondary Treatment	Lagoon reconstruction	AdSub	\$7,351,325	GS	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes	\$1,838,000	No	24-Apr
Henefer Town	0020192	III-B Sewer Replacement	Sewer upgrades	\$125,000	\$125,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
Hinckley Town	OP00121	I-Secondary Treatment	Lagoon reconstruction	\$2,065,500	\$2,124,500	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
Lewiston City	0020214	I-Secondary Treatment	Lagoon upgrades	\$2,660,000	\$6,145,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd

Funding Type: 1st=Base Cap Grant, 2nd=Revolved Funds, GS=General Supplemental, EC=Emerging Contaminants

Applicant	Permit Number (UT-)	Needs Category	Project Description	Assistance Amount	Total Project Costs	Funding Type	Int. Rate	Term (YRS)	Equivalency	Meets Hardship Definition	Addit'l Subsidy	Green Project Reserve	Agreement Date
Millville City	0023205	IV-A New Collectors	Construction of sewer collection system	\$5,200,000	\$35,760,000	2nd Round	0%	30	No	Yes	\$4,500,000	No	22-May
Mountain Green SID	0024732	II-Advanced Treatment	Wastewater plant upgrade	\$7,000,000	\$13,929,000	2nd Round	1.3%	30	No	No	No	No	22-Apr
Mt. Pleasant	OP00128	I-Secondary Treatment	Wastewater plant upgrade	\$2,535,000	\$2,670,000	1st & 2nd Round	2.5%	20	Yes	No	No	No	tbd
North Logan	002199920	III-B Sewer Replacement	Sewer trunkline upgrade	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	2nd Round	2%	30	No	No	No	No	tbd
Payson City	0020427	II-Advanced Treatment	Wastewater plant upgrade	\$13,500,000	\$57,085,000	1st Round	.5%	20	Yes	Yes	\$1,000,000	\$609,600	22-May
Provo City	0021717	II-Advanced Treatment	Construction of new treatment plant	\$85,800,000	\$174,600,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	.5%	20	Yes	Yes	\$7,000,000	\$19,633,000	18-Dec, 22-May
Provo City (2024)	0021717	II-Advanced Treatment	Construction of third bioreactor	\$4,500,000	\$50,000,00	1st & 2nd Round, GS	.75%	20	tbd	Yes	\$2,500,000	Yes	tbd
Richmond City	0020907	II-Advanced Treatment	Wastewater plant upgrade	\$8,144,722	\$9,595,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
Salem City	0026085	II-Advanced Treatment	Treatment expansion	\$72,029,000	\$72,479,000	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd	tbd
South Salt Lake City	See CVWRF	II-Advanced Treatment	CVWRF WRF upgrades	\$2,413,000	\$11,248,000	2nd Round	0%	20	No	Yes	\$3,760,000	No	20-Jun
Wolf Creek	OP00307	X-Water Reuse	Construction of reuse storage ponds	\$5,000,000	\$10,441,937	GS	2.5%	20	Yes	No	No	\$1,098,300	25-Jun
Wolf Creek	OP00307	III-B Sewer Replacement	Sewer replacement	\$1,404,000	\$10,441,937	1st & 2nd Round, GS	tbd	tbd	tbd	No	No	Yes	tbd
Totals				\$ 316,213,022	\$ 672,075,554						\$ 29,598,000	\$ 22,439,200	

CHAPTER 4. Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants Program

The Utah Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants (OSG) Program is a federal program designed to provide funds for infrastructure needs to address combined sewer overflows, sanitary sewer overflows (SSO), and stormwater management. The OSG program has been authorized as grants for the design and construction of green infrastructure stormwater projects.

The OSG program prioritizes green project reserve eligible projects in rural and distressed communities. Non-federal cost share requirements no longer apply to portions of the grant that support rural or distressed communities. Therefore, a 20% cost share will only be applied to the portion of the total project which does not directly support these communities. For urban and non-distressed communities, the program requires the community to provide a minimum 20% cost share. In addition, 15% of the funds are required to go to rural communities and 10% of the funds must go to distressed communities. For the OSG program, rural is defined as communities under 10,000 in population and distressed is defined as a community with sewer rates exceeding 1.4% of the modified median adjusted gross household income (MAGI).

Table 5: List of OSG Projects

Applicant	Distressed/ Rural	Assistance Amount	Local Cost-Share	Agreement Date
Herriman City - Autumn Detention Pond	N/N	\$ 54,960	\$36,640	25-Jun
Herriman City - Butterfield Detention Pond	N/N	\$ 11,640	\$7,760	25-Jun
Herriman City - City Hall Parking Lot Stormwater Retrofit	N/N	\$ 47,770	\$19,508	25-Jun
Ogden City - East Central Ogden	N/N	\$ 158,000	\$39,500	25-May
South Salt Lake City -	Y/N	\$ 241,360	\$0	25-May
Totals		\$ 513,730	\$ 103,408	

CHAPTER 4. Utah Wastewater Loan Fund Program

The Utah Wastewater Loan Fund (UWLF) program is a state-funded loan program similar to the SRF. Revenue for the UWLF is derived from sales tax dollars and principal repayments. Monies may be authorized in the form of loans or interest-rate buydowns.

Projects eligible for funding through the Utah Wastewater Loan program include closed loans with remaining draws, authorized loans, and anticipated loans. Closed loans with remaining draws are projects that have held loan closing and are currently under construction. Authorized loans are those projects which have received authorization from the Utah Water Quality Board but have not yet held loan closing and are still in the planning or design phase. Anticipated loans are those projects that may be presented to the Utah Quality Board for authorization in the next fiscal year.

Table 6: List of UWLF Projects

Applicant	Assistance Amount	Interest Rate	Term (yrs)	Agreement Date
Grantsville City	\$1,000,000	0%	20	24-Feb
Long Valley SID	\$1,470,000	1.5%	20	tbd
Monticello City	\$1,214,000	2.5%	20	tbd
North Fork SSD	\$3,551,000	4%	20	25-Sep
South Salt Lake City	\$7,867,000	0%	20	20-Feb, 22-Sep
Total	\$15,102,000			

CHAPTER 5. Hardship Grant Fund

The State of Utah provides assistance from the Hardship Grant Fund for several types of projects. First, hardship grant funds may be authorized as planning advances or grants and design advances or grants. Advances are repaid once construction funding has been secured through a loan closing. Second, funds may be awarded as hardship construction grants to entities that may not otherwise be able to afford to complete an eligible project. The Water Quality Board may consider authorizing a hardship grant when the estimated annual cost of sewer service exceeds 1.4% of the local MAGI. Third, hardship grants may be awarded for water quality improvement projects such as nonpoint source (NPS), water quality studies, and educational outreach efforts. Projects eligible for hardship grant funds may be added to the list once authorization has been received from the Board.

Table 7a: List of HGF Projects

Applicant	Assistance Amount	Type
Ash Creek SSD	\$230,400	Design Grant
Corinne City	\$102,900	Planning Advance
Daggett County	\$60,000	Short Term Loan
Eagle Mountain City	\$510,000	Construction Grant
Elwood	\$18,200	Planning Grant
Fairfield Town	\$33,290	Planning Grant
Grantsville	\$300,000	Design Advance
Hinckley Town	\$ 15,000	Design Advance
Hyrum	\$74,900	Short Term Loan
Kanab City	\$29,800	Planning Advance
Kane County	\$ 281,000	Hardship Grant
Long Valley SID	\$84,300	Design Advance
Millville City	\$1,000,000	Construction Grant
Mt. Pleasant	\$135,000	Hardship Grant
Richmond	\$99,800	Short Term Loan
Rockville Town	\$ 27,172	Hardship Grant
Virgin Town	\$60,000	Short Term Loan
Total	\$3,061,762	

Table 7b: List of NPS Hardship Grants

Applicant	Remaining Obligation	Type
FY17 DEQ - Utah Lake WQ Study	\$348,301	Water Quality Study Grant
FY19-FY25 Remaining Payments	\$1,779,695	Various NPS Grants
FY26 New Projects	\$1,000,000	Various NPS Grant
Total	\$1,348,301	

CHAPTER 6. SRF Sources and Use

Title VI section 602(b) (4) of the Clean Water Act requires the State to expend all CWSRF funds in an “expeditious and timely” manner. This requirement applies to the entire State Revolving Fund, not just the federal grants. The SRF Sources and Use table below demonstrates the proposed sources and uses of all funds in the SRF.

Table 8: SRF Sources and Use Table

State Revolving Fund	SFY 2026	SFY 2027	SFY 2028
Balance	\$ 23,113,661	\$ (8,448,974)	\$ (2,754,046)
Undrawn Federal Funds FY23-24 Base Cap Grants	\$ 8,254,000		
Undrawn Federal Funds FY23-24 General Supplemental Cap Grants	\$ 21,274,800		
New Federal Award Payments - 2025 Base Cap Grant		\$ 8,360,000	
New Federal Award Payments - 2025 General Supplemental		\$ 12,980,000	
State Match - Base Program	\$ 1,650,800	\$ 1,672,000	
State Match - General Supplemental	\$ 2,396,600	\$ 2,596,000	
Repayments from SRF Loans	\$ 13,338,484	\$ 17,284,536	\$ 20,903,816
Interest Earnings	\$ 1,032,996		
Total Fund Revenue (Sources)	\$ 71,061,340	\$ 34,443,563	\$ 18,149,770
Projected Disbursements for Loan Obligations	\$ (27,293,640)		
Projected Disbursements for Loan Authorizations	\$ (41,815,000)		
Projected Disbursements for Planned Projects	\$ (9,086,002)	\$ (36,344,009)	\$ (45,430,011)
Administration	\$ (1,315,672)	\$ (853,600)	\$ (400,000)
Total Estimated Expenses (Uses)	\$ (79,510,314)	\$ (37,197,609)	\$ (45,830,011)
Total Funds Available for Projects	\$ (8,448,974)	\$ (2,754,046)	\$ (27,680,241)

6.1 Cash Flow Projections

The following table reflects the detail of revenue and expenses for the State Revolving Fund as of June 30, 2025.

Table 9: SRF Cash Flow Projections

State Revolving Fund	SFY 2026	SFY 2027	SFY 2028
Capitalization Grant Awards (FY23-FY24)	\$ 8,254,000		
Future Capitalization Grant			
State Cap Grant Match	\$ 1,650,800		
Future State Cap Grant Match			
General Supplemental Grant (FY23-FY24)	\$ 21,274,800		
Future General Supplemental Grant			
State General Supplemental Grant Match	\$ 2,396,600		
Future State Gen. Sup Grants Match			
Account Balance	\$ 23,113,661		
Interest Earnings at 4.4692%	\$ 1,032,996		
Loan Repayments (5255)	\$ 13,338,484	\$ 17,284,536	\$ 20,903,816
Beginning Balance	\$ 71,061,340		
CWSRF Program Obligations			
Admin Expenses for all CAP Grant Awards	\$ (1,315,672)		
Cap Grant Principal Forgiveness (PF) (FY20-24)	\$ (4,601,140))		
Project Obligations			
Brian Head	\$ (1,825,000)		
Moab City	\$ (80,000)		
Payson City	\$ (14,425,000)		
South Salt Lake	\$ (1,512,500)		
Wolf Creek	\$ (4,850,000)		
Project Authorizations			
North Logan	\$ (3,500,000)		
Mt. Pleasant	\$ (2,535,000)		
Ash Creek SSD	\$ (6,876,000)		
Corinne City	\$ (4,500,000)		
Provo City	\$ (7,000,000)		
Grantsville City	\$ (16,000,000)		
Wolf Creek	\$ (1,404,000)		
Planned Projects			
New Applications	\$ (90,860,022)		

CHAPTER 7. Project Priority List

Pursuant to 40 CFR Part 31.3115, all wastewater treatment works projects must appear on the Project Priority List to be eligible for funding assistance. After applications are accepted, they are scored, added to the list, and presented to the Board. The scoring system assesses projects based on various factors including environmental benefits, public health impact, project readiness, and special consideration as identified in R317-100-3. See Appendix C, Project Priority Sheet.

Table 10: Project Priority List As of August 27, 2025

Rank	Project Name	Total Project Costs	Funding Authorized	Total Points	Point Categories			
					Project Need	Potential Improvement	Population Affected	Special Consideration
1	Grantsville	\$35,000,000	X	140	50	23	7	60
2	Corinne City	\$7,342,900	X	107	50	16	1	40
3	Salem	\$72,479,000		94	40	7	7	40
4	North Logan	\$3,500,000	X	86	25	14	7	40
5	Mt Pleasant	\$2,670,000	X	79	10	5	4	60
6	Richmond	\$9,595,000		77	10	24	3	40
7	Lewiston City	\$6,145,000		67	10	14	3	40
8	Ash Creek- Virgin Town	\$6,876,000	X	64	25	18	1	20
9	Monticello	\$1,506,125	X	61	0	19	2	40
10	Enoch	\$5,685,800		56	10	0	6	40
11	Hinckley	\$2,124,500		41	40	0	1	0
12	North Fork SSD	\$11,641,000	X	36	10	5	1	20
13	Henefer	\$125,000		22	10	11	1	0
14	Long Valley SID	\$220,000	X	11	10	0	1	0
15	Daggett County-Dutch John	\$525,000		7	5	1	1	0

Appendix A. Financial Burden Policy



FINANCIAL BURDEN EVALUATION POLICY FOR THE UTAH WASTEWATER PROJECT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

BACKGROUND

The Utah Water Quality Board (the Board) directed Division of Water Quality staff to create a policy to better evaluate the financial burden placed on communities by the various funding alternatives. In addition, the Board directed staff to incorporate the economic factors into this policy contained in Utah Administrative Code (UAC) R317-101-4.B. This policy will be used by staff in preparation of the Introduction and Authorization Reports for wastewater project assistance presented to the Board. The Board will utilize the policy in determining the appropriate funding package for a project.

POLICY

To clarify and standardize the evaluation of a community's Financial Burden in relation to funding requests, the following procedures will be implemented by staff. In general, a static cost model will be used in evaluating interest rates on loans and resulting monthly rates in relation to a community's modified median adjusted gross income (modified MAGI). In addition, staff will calculate a Financial Need Indicator (FNI) and a resulting Financial Burden.

Staff will utilize data from the census website (<https://data.census.gov/cedsci/>) to collect a community's indicator values and State of Utah average indicator values. Table 1 will then apply the range scoring criteria to determine a score for each indicator in relation to the State average value. Definitions and descriptions of the indicators including how to source the values are included at the end of this policy.

TABLE 1: Financial Need Indicator Ranges

INDICATORS	RANGE SCORING CRITERIA	Census Data Code - 5 Year ACS Table
Unemployment Rate	2% less than State = 1, between 2% less to 2% more than State average = calculated between 1 and 3; Above 2% = 3	S2301
Poverty Status	Less than State = 1, between 0-10% more = calculated between 1 and 3; more than 10% = 3	S1701
Threshold Lowest Quintile Income (LQI)	More than State average = 1, Local value is 100% to 50% of State LQI = calculated from 1 to 3, Less than 50% of State = 3	B19080
10 Year Population Percent Increase	More increase than state average = 1, Local increase is 100% to 0% of State average = calculated from 1 to 3, Any percent decrease = 3	B01003

Table 2 will be used by DWQ Staff to calculate a Financial Need Indicator (FNI) for a community and will be included in the Estimated Annual Cost for Sewer Service section of Feasibility Reports. The local and State indicator values from the census website will be entered in Table 2 and then scored in relation to Table 1. Further, the scores will be multiplied by weighting factors, previously set by the Board, to calculate a weighted score. Finally, the weighted scores will be summed and divided by the sum of the weighting factors for a resulting Financial Need Indicator from 1 to 3.

Appendix A. Financial Burden Policy

TABLE 2: Financial Need Indicator Calculation

INDICATORS	Local Value	State Value	Score	Weighting Factor	Weighted Score
Unemployment Rate				4	
Poverty Status				2.5	
Threshold LQI				2.5	
10 Year Population Percent Increase				1	
Financial Need Indicator (Sum of weighted Scores/10)					

The Modified MAGI for a community will be used along with the FNI in the matrix found in Table 3 to determine the financial burden of the community on a scale from Low to High.

TABLE 3: Financial Burden Matrix

FNI	Modified MAGI				
	Below 1.4%	1.4% to 1.75%	1.75% to 2.1%	2.1% to 2.45	Above 2.45
Below 1.5	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
1.5 to 2.5	Low	Medium	Medium	High	High
Above 2.5	Medium	Medium	High	High	High

The following statement will be included in the Estimated Annual Cost for Sewer Service Section of Feasibility Reports:

“Based on the Financial Burden Evaluation Policy for the Utah Wastewater Project Assistance Program, the community has a Financial Burden of: (Low/Medium/High).”

IMPLEMENTATION

The Utah Wastewater Project Assistance Program application will be updated to include the following table:

Additional Financial Need Metrics

	Local Value
Local Unemployment Rate	
Local Poverty Rate	
Local Threshold LQI	
Local 10 Year Population Percent Increase	

POLICY IMPACTS

The Financial Burden Evaluation Policy for the Utah Wastewater Project Assistance Program does not alter the Board’s hardship grant consideration threshold contained within UAC R317-101-4. This policy will be used to inform the Board and staff as a tool to evaluate staff funding package recommendations. It does not create requirements for funding package offered by the Board, as the Board makes the final decision on any financing package, and may take other factors into consideration in making that decision.

Appendix A. Financial Burden Policy

DEFINITIONS AND DESCRIPTIONS

To calculate the FNI, staff will utilize data from the census website (data.census.gov/cedsci/). The census data is available by entering a community and the reference table number into the search bar. Typically, up to 10 years of data tables are available and for this policy staff will utilize the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimate tables. The indicator parameters evaluated in this policy are the following:

- **Modified MAGI** – Is the modified median adjusted gross income as reported on the Division of Drinking Water's (DDW) website currently at <https://deq.utah.gov/drinking-water/magi-by-city>. Modified MAGI is calculated by the Utah State Tax Commission by City or for entities that are that are not listed or are not located in a city it is reported by zip code and currently at <https://deq.utah.gov/drinking-water/magi-zip-code>. The modified MAGI equivalent to approximately 1.4 time the Median Household Income.
- **10-Year Population Percent Increase** evaluates the 10-year change in a community's population compared to the average State of Utah 10-year population change. Indicator values are found in Table B01003 (Total Population). [Row: Total. Column: Estimate.] The indicator value is calculated based on the most recent year ACS 5-Year population less the 10 year ago ACS 5-Year population divided by the 10 years ago ACS 5-Year population.
- **Poverty Status** evaluates a community's poverty rate compared with the average State of Utah poverty rate. Indicator values are found in Table S1701 (Poverty Status in the past 12 months). [Row: Population for whom poverty status is determined. Column: Percent below poverty level.]
- **Threshold of Lowest Quintile Income (LQI)** evaluates the upper income of the lowest 20% of a community's population compared with the average State of Utah LQI. Indicator values are found in Table B19080 (Household Income Quintile Upper Limits). [Row: Lowest Quintile. Column: Estimate.]
- **Unemployment Rate** evaluates the local unemployment rate compared with the average State of Utah Table S2301 (Employment Status). [Row: Population 16 years and over. Column: Unemployment Rate -Estimate]

DWQ-2021-008243

Appendix B. Interest Rate Factors

Table 11 provides how interest rate recommendations are determined for each project. Recommended discounts are given in similar tables for individual projects. Consideration begins with the 20-year market rate.

Table 11: Interest Rate Factors

Market Rate (20-year basis)		
Discount Factors	Maximum Discount Related to Market Rate	Recommended Discount
SRF Non-Equivalency Requirements	12.5%	calculated
SRF Equivalency Requirements	25%	calculated
Rural Community*	25%	calculated
Fiscal Sustainability Credit	6.25%	calculated
Existing Asset Management Plan	6.25%	calculated
Green Project Reserve	12.5%	calculated
Regionalization	6.25%	calculated
Economic Hardship**	100%	calculated
Recommended Interest Rate	calculated	

*Staff has historically interpreted this to only apply to projects that serve existing primary residences and not for development.

** Staff has historically interpreted this rate reduction for economic hardship based on the Financial Burden Indicator. Staff has estimated a rate reduction of 0%-50% for Low burden, 0%-75% for Medium burden, and 0%-100% for High burden.

Appendix C. Project Priority Sheet

PROJECT PRIORITY LIST DATA SHEET			
PROJECT NAME:		Staff Reviewer:	
PROJECT STATUS:		II. POTENTIAL FOR IMPROVEMENT POINTS	
1. New interceptor and treatment.		1. Discharge Stream	(name of water body)
2. Improve system to meet secondary standards.		Water Use Classification	1A, 2A, 3B, 4, etc.
3. Improve treatment to meet water quality standards.		Classified Water Use Point Total:	
4. Future needs for interceptor and/or treatment		2. Discharge Standard Factor:	
5. Future needs for improvement and/or expansion		3. Water Quality Use Restoration:	
6. Project in planning phase		4. Estimated improvement:	
7. Project in design phase		III. POPULATION POINTS:	
8. Project under construction		Population Served:	
9. Other (describe)		Data Source:	(lots, ERUs, GOF)
I. PROJECT NEED POINTS:		IV. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION POINTS:	
1. Documented substantial health hazard		1. Interceptor sewer necessary to regionalization plan	
2. Raw sewage discharge		2. Project needed to preserve high quality waters	
3. Impaired surface WQ standards (R317-2)		Project will change facility's sludge disposal practice from non-beneficial to beneficial use method	
4. Impaired ground WQ standards (R317-6)		3. Users of proposed project are subject to documented water conservation plan	
Need to provide secondary treatment or meet UPDES or ground water permit or Sludge regs.		4. The sponsor of the proposed project has completed and submitted the most recent Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) questionnaire	
5. Documented WQ degradation due to septic		5. The sponsor of the proposed project, or its member entities, is certified as meeting the requirements for a Quality Growth Community	
6. Documented WQ degradation due to septic		6.	
7. Chronic failure of on-site systems		TOTAL POINTS	
8. 95% capacity		I. PROJECT NEED:	0
9. Facilities do not meet design criteria in R317-3 or 6		II. POTENTIAL FOR IMPROVEMENT	0
10. Existing GW, pollution, or public health concerns		III. POPULATION	0
11. Regionalization		IV. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	0
12. Future needs for existing system			
13. Future needs for new system			
Reviewer Initials:		Date:	

Appendix C. Project Priority Sheet

GUIDANCE FOR SCORING PROJECT NEED: R317-100-3.B.	
All projects receive the highest applicable point level only	Points Project
1. Documented substantial health hazard: A documented existing substantial health hazard will be eliminated by the project. This may include: (1) discharge of inadequately treated wastewater to an area of immediate public contact where inadequate operation and maintenance is not the primary cause of the condition; (2) an area where a substantial number of failing subsurface disposal systems are causing surfacing sewage in areas of human habitation. The elimination of existing substantial health hazards is of highest priority. The determination of the existence of substantial health hazards shall be based upon the investigation, report, and certification of the local health department and the State Division of Water Quality. Such reports and certifications will be forwarded to EPA with the Priority List. The health hazard designation will normally apply to unsewered communities experiencing widespread septic tank failures and surfacing sewage: 70 points.	
2. Raw sewage discharge: A raw sewage discharge will be eliminated or prevented: 60 points	
3. Impaired surface WQ standards (R317-2): The surface water quality standards identified in R317-2 are impaired by an existing discharge. For points to be allotted under this criterion the affected stream segment must be "water quality limited" according to a wasteload analysis and water quality standards. Water quality standards have been established for the waters of Utah according to designated beneficial use classifications. A stream segment is considered to be "water quality limited" if a higher level of treatment than that which is provided by state effluent limitations is required to meet water quality standards. A stream segment is "effluent limited" if water quality standards are met by state imposed effluent limitations: 50 points.	
4. Impaired ground WQ standards (R317-6): The ground water quality standards identified in R317-6 are impaired by an existing discharge. For points to be allotted under this criterion the affected ground water must be impaired according to the numerical criteria outlined in the ground water protection levels established for Class I and II aquifers: 50 points.	
5. Need to provide secondary treatment or meet UPDES or ground water permit or Sludge regs: Construction is needed to provide secondary treatment, or to meet the requirements of a Utah Pollution Discharge Elimination System (UPDES) Permit or Ground Water Discharge Permit, or the Federal Sludge Disposal Requirements: 50 points.	
6. Documented WQ degradation due to septic: Documented water quality degradation is occurring, attributable to failing individual subsurface disposal systems where inadequate operation and maintenance is not the primary cause of the condition: 45 points.	
7. Chronic failure of on-site systems: Areas not qualifying as an existing substantial health hazard, but where it is evident that inadequate on-site conditions have resulted in the chronic failure of a significant number of individual subsurface disposal systems, causing an ongoing threat to public health or the environment. Points may be awarded in this category only when the Division of Water Quality determines that existing on-site limitations cannot be overcome through the use of approved subsurface disposal practices, or that the cost of upgrading or replacing failed systems to meet the minimum requirements of the local health department are determined to be excessive: 45 points.	
8. 95% capacity: Treatment plant loading has reached or exceeded 95 percent of design requirements needed to meet conditions of an UPDES Permit or needed to restore designated water use, or design requirements are projected to be exceeded within 5 years by the Division of Water Quality. Points will not be allocated under this criterion where excessive infiltration or inflow is the primary cause for the loading to the system to be at 95 percent or greater of design requirements: 40 points.	
9. Facilities do not meet design criteria in R317-3 or 6: Existing facilities that do not meet the design requirements in R317-3. Points may be allocated under this category only if the design requirements that are not being met are determined to be fundamental to the ability of the facility to meet water quality standards: 40 points.	
10. Existing GW, pollution, or public health concerns: Interceptor sewers, collection systems, pump stations and treatment, where applicable, are needed to solve existing pollution, ground water, or public health concerns: 35 points. a. Points may be awarded under this category only if they will primarily serve established residential areas and only if they are needed to solve existing pollution or public health problems. b. Points shall not be awarded under this category where an interceptor is proposed for newly developing recreational communities, resorts, or unincorporated subdivisions. c. Points may be awarded under this category when the majority of existing septic systems are located in defined well head protection zones or principal ground water recharge areas to Class I and II aquifers.	
11. Regionalization: Interceptor sewers, collection systems, pump stations and treatment, where applicable, are needed to accomplish regionalization or eliminate existing treatment facilities. Points shall not be awarded under this category where an interceptor is proposed for newly developing recreational communities, resorts, or unincorporated subdivisions: 25 points.	
12. Future needs for existing system: Communities having future needs for wastewater facilities construction at existing wastewater systems, not included above, which are consistent with the goals of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act: 10 points.	
13. Future needs for new system: Communities having future needs for new treatment plants and interceptors, not included above, which are consistent with the goals of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act: 5 points.	
Reported Point Total	

Appendix C. Project Priority Sheet

GUIDANCE FOR SCORING POTENTIAL FOR IMPROVEMENT FACTOR: R317-100-3.C.	
The PIF priority point sub-total is obtained by adding the points obtained in each of the four subcategories. Total PIF points = Classified Water Use + Discharge Standard Factor + Restoration from Water Quality Standard Violation + Estimated Improvement.	Points Project Receives
1. Classified Water Use. Priority points under this subcategory are allotted in accordance with segment designations listed in R317-2-13, Classifications of Waters of the State. Points are cumulative for segments classified for more than one beneficial use.	
a. Protected as a raw water source of culinary water supply; R317-2-13 Use Classes: 1A, 1B, or 1C: 4 points.	
b. Protected for primary contact recreation (swimming); R317-2-13: 2A: 4 points.	
c. Protected for secondary contact recreation (water skiing, boating and similar uses); R317-2-13: 2B: 3 points.	
d. Protected for cold water species of game fish and other cold water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain; R317-2-13: 3A: 3 points.	
e. Protected for warm water species of game fish and other warm water aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in the food chain; R317-2-13: 3B: 3 points.	
f. Protected for non-game fish and other aquatic life, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain; R317-2-13: 3C: 2 points.	
g. Protected for waterfowl, shore birds and other water-oriented wildlife not included above, including the necessary aquatic organisms in their food chain; R317-2-13: 3D: 2 points.	
h. Protected for agricultural, industrial, and "special" uses; R317-2-13: 4, 5, and 6: 1 point.	
2. Discharge Standard Factor. Priority points are allotted as follows:	
a. Project discharge standards are water quality based: 5 points.	
b. Project must meet secondary effluent treatment standards: 2 points.	
c. Project does not discharge to surface waters: 0 points.	
3. Restoration from Water Quality Standard Violation.	
a. Project WLL RESTORE Designated Water Use: 5 points.	
b. Project WLL NOT RESTORE Designated Water Use: 0 points.	
c. Points under this subcategory are assigned on the basis of whether appropriate water quality standard(s) can be restored if the respective project is constructed and any other water quality management controls are maintained at present levels. For a project to receive points under this subcategory, data from a State-approved waste load analysis must generally show that the designated water use is substantially impaired by the wastewater discharge and that the proposed project will likely restore the numerical water quality standards and designated use(s) identified in R317-2-12 and R317-2-14 for the waterbody.	
d. Points may not be assigned under this subcategory if nonpoint source pollution levels negate water quality improvement from the proposed construction, if numerical standards or actual levels of pollutants being discharged are questionable, if serious consideration is being given to the redesignation of the stream segment to a lower classification, or if numerical standards for specific pollutants are inappropriately low for the classified water use.	
4. Estimated Improvement. Estimated Improvement in Stream Quality or Estimated Improvement in Environmental Quality including Presently Unsewered Communities and Sewered Communities with Raw Sewage Discharges. Points in this category shall be allocated based upon the judgment of the Division of Water Quality Staff and on the nature of the receiving water and surrounding watershed. Consideration shall be given to projects which discharge into Utah priority stream segments as identified in the biennial water quality report (305(b)). The criteria used to develop the Stream Segment Priority List may be used to evaluate projects on other streams not on the Stream Segment Priority List. These criteria include the existing use impairment, the overall index from a use impairment analysis, the potential for use impairment, the downstream use affected, the population affected, the amount of local interest and involvement toward improving the stream quality, the presence of endangered species, and the beneficial use classification. Activities within the watershed that are aimed at reducing point and nonpoint sources of pollution may also be considered in the allocation of points. In addition, the effect of a discharge or proposed change in a discharge on the chemical and biological quality of the receiving stream may be considered in the determination of points. Only those projects which will significantly improve water quality or environmental quality and will restore or protect the designated uses or eliminate public health hazards shall be given the maximum points allowable. Fewer points can be given in instances where some significant improvement will be achieved if a project is constructed.	
a. The project is essential immediately, and must be constructed to protect public health or attain a high, measurable improvement in water quality: 20 points.	
b. The project will likely result in a substantial level of improvement in water quality or public health protection: 10 points.	
c. Some level of water quality improvement or public health protection would likely be provided by the construction of the project, but the effect has not yet been well established. Also, present facilities lack unit processes needed to meet required discharge standards: 5 points.	
d. No significant improvement of water quality or public health protection would likely be achieved, at present, by a project: 0 points.	

Appendix C. Project Priority Sheet

<u>GUIDANCE FOR SCORING POPULATION AFFECTED: R317-100-3.D.</u>	
For sewerred communities, priority points are based on the population served by a treatment facility.	Points Project Receives
For unsewerred areas, points are based on the population of the affected community.	
1. Greater than 80,000: 10 points.	
2. 40,000 - 80,000: 9 points.	
3. 20,000 - 40,000: 8 points.	
4. 10,000 - 20,000: 7 points.	
5. 5,000 - 10,000: 6 points.	
6. 4,000 - 5,000: 5 points.	
7. 3,000 - 4,000: 4 points.	
8. 2,000 - 3,000: 3 points.	
9. 1,000 - 2,000: 2 points.	
10. Less than 1,000: 1 point.	

<u>GUIDANCE FOR SCORING SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: R317-100-3.E.</u>		Points Project Receives
1. <u>Interceptor sewer necessary to regionalization plan:</u> The proposed project is an interceptor sewer which is part of a larger regional plan and is necessary to maintain the financial, environmental or engineering integrity of that regionalization plan: 20 points, or		
2. <u>Project needed to preserve high quality waters:</u> The project is needed to preserve high quality waters such as prime cold water fishery and anti- degradation segments: 20 points.		
3. <u>Project will change facility's sludge disposal practice from non-beneficial to beneficial use method:</u> The proposed project will change the facility's sludge disposal practice from a non-beneficial use to a beneficial use method: 20 points.		
4. <u>Users of proposed project are subject to documented water conservation plan:</u> The users of the proposed project are subject to a documented water conservation plan: 20 points.		
5. <u>The sponsor of the proposed project has completed and submitted the most recent Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) questionnaire:</u> The sponsor of the proposed project has completed and submitted the most recent Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) questionnaire: 20 points.		
6. <u>The sponsor of the proposed project, or its member entities, is certified as meeting the requirements for a Quality Growth Community:</u> 20 points.		

Appendix D. UWIP Project List

UWIP - Division of Water Quality Agency Plan

Table 7: Project Recommendations for WDCC, Ready for Construction (1-2 years)

Project ID	Lead entity	Infrastructure type	Project name	Nearest location	Pct of State MAGI	Estimated cost	State funding cost	SCORE: Hardship	SCORE: Criticality	SCORE: Water Efficiency	SCORE: Sound Design	SCORE: Entity Priority	SCORE: Pop and Funding	SCORE: Total
17	Ogden City Corporation	Wastewater	Van Buren M Maintenance	Ogden	84%	\$1,104,804	\$552,402	15	22	18	14	16	10	95
1998	Weber Basin Water Conservancy District	Stormwater/Flood Control	Willard Canal Lining	Willard	120%	\$60,000,000	\$24,000,000	6	22	18	14	16	12	88
2073	Weber Basin Water Conservancy District	Reuse	Reuse Project at Central Weber WCF	Marriott-Slaterville	129%	\$215,700,000	\$53,925,000	6	22	18	14	16	12	88
967	Spanish Fork City	Wastewater	SW AMI Tower	Spanish Fork	111%	\$31,877	\$15,939	6	22	18	14	16	5	81
583	Richfield City	Wastewater	RECONSTRUCT SEWER LAGOONS (2 CELLS)	Richfield	88%	\$6,000,000	\$4,500,000	15	16	14	9	16	10	80
671	Vineyard City Public Works Department	Stormwater/Flood Control	Shotcrete Storm Water Outfalls	Vineyard	98%	\$200,000	\$50,000	10	22	18	9	16	5	80
2190	Bicknell Town	Stormwater/Flood Control	Town-wide Storm Drain Infrastructure Phase 1	Bicknell	86%	\$3,200,000	\$960,000	15	22	0	14	16	12	79
1527	Ogden City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	22nd and Adams dipstone	Ogden	84%	\$66,000	\$33,000	15	22	14	14	0	12	77
1772	La Verkin City	Stormwater/Flood Control	100 East Trunk Line	La Verkin	80%	\$4,571,000	\$4,113,900	15	22	0	14	16	10	77
3183	Lewiston Utah	Wastewater	Sewer Lagoon Upgrades	Lewiston	100%	\$6,145,000	\$1,843,500	10	22	0	14	16	12	74
784	Tooele City Corporation	Wastewater	Channel #2 UV installation	Tooele	98%	\$3,000,000	\$2,400,000	10	22	18	3	16	5	74
1555	Cedar City Corporation	Reuse	Type 1 Effluent Reuse Pump Station Installation	Enoch	98%	\$5,000,000	\$2,000,000	10	22	18	3	16	5	74
973	Spanish Fork City	Wastewater	New MBR Plant	Spanish Fork	111%	\$124,186,978	\$62,093,489	6	22	18	14	7	5	72
974	Spanish Fork City	Wastewater	New Solids Handling	Spanish Fork	111%	\$4,925,903	\$2,462,952	6	22	18	14	7	5	72
943	City Of Orem	Wastewater	Biosolids Handling Facility	Orem	80%	\$17,000,000	\$8,500,000	15	22	0	14	16	2	69
975	Spanish Fork City	Wastewater	New Plant Inf/Eff Lines	Spanish Fork	111%	\$4,616,210	\$2,308,105	6	22	18	14	4	5	69
588	Vineyard City	Wastewater	Lift Station #2 Upgrades Project	Vineyard	98%	\$192,000	\$48,000	10	22	0	14	16	5	67
1552	Washington County Water Conservancy District	Reuse	Phase I Reuse	La Verkin	80%	\$55,624,915	\$47,208,865	15	0	18	3	16	12	64
2263	Hanksville Town	Stormwater/Flood Control	Stormwater Master Plan	Hanksville		\$40,000	\$40,000		22	0	14	16	12	64
959	Washington Terrace City	Stormwater/Flood Control	5000 S. 300 W Re-design storm water detention basin	Washington Terrace	95%	\$563,896	\$563,896	10	0	18	9	16	10	63



Appendix D. UWIP Project List

UWIP - Division of Water Quality Agency Plan

Project ID	Lead entity	Infrastructure type	Project name	Nearest location	Pct of State MAGI	Estimated cost	State funding cost	SCORE: Hardship	SCORE: Criticality	SCORE: Water Efficiency	SCORE: Sound Design	SCORE: Entity Priority	SCORE: Pop and Funding	SCORE: Total
16	Ogden City Corporation	Wastewater	16th to 13th Washington (east side)	Ogden	84%	\$1,500,000	\$750,000	15	0	18	3	16	10	62
18	Ogden City Corporation	Wastewater	3rd & Jefferson Capacity	Ogden	84%	\$431,800	\$215,900	15	0	18	3	16	10	62
19	Ogden City Corporation	Wastewater	5151 S Harrison Blvd Maintenance	Ogden	84%	\$690,688	\$345,344	15	0	18	3	16	10	62
548	Powder Mountain Water And Sewer Improvement District	Wastewater	Cross Country Sewer Line Replacement	Eden	157%	\$1,250,000	\$625,000	0	22	0	14	16	10	62
578	Richfield City	Stormwater/Flood Control	Install Drainage Channel Piping	Richfield	88%	\$1,700,000	\$1,275,000	15	16	0	3	16	12	62
624	Saratoga Springs	Stormwater/Flood Control	Clay Pits Debris Basins	Saratoga Springs	152%	\$23,000,000	\$9,200,000	0	22	0	14	16	10	62
2133	Fillmore City Corp.	Stormwater/Flood Control	Storm Water	Fillmore	86%	\$100,000	\$100,000	15	16	0	3	16	12	62
3635	Clinton City Corporation	Wastewater	Sewer Lining	Clinton	125%	\$5,161,200	\$2,580,600	6	16	0	14	16	10	62
2059	Payson City	Wastewater	Upsize and replace sewer line on east side of I-15 from 400 N to Utah Avenue	Payson	98%	\$2,600,000	\$2,470,000	10	22	0	3	16	10	61
2105	Fillmore City Corp.	Wastewater	Sewer Lagoon Primary Cell	Fillmore	86%	\$4,250,000	\$2,975,000	15	16	0	3	16	10	60
1726	Cedar City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	Greens Lake Dam 2, 3, and 4 Rehabilitation	Cedar City	79%	\$16,650,000	\$3,330,000	15	16	0	3	16	10	60
167	Murray City Public Works Stormwater Division	Stormwater/Flood Control	900 E Drain Line from 5700 S to Wood Oak Lane	Murray	98%	\$3,600,000	\$1,800,000	10	0	14	14	16	5	59
579	Richfield City	Stormwater/Flood Control	Install New Storm Drain Piping	Richfield	88%	\$1,275,000	\$956,250	15	16	0	3	13	12	59
15	Ogden City Corporation	Wastewater	12th St Trunk Line Capacity	Ogden	84%	\$6,806,685	\$3,403,343	15	0	18	3	16	5	57
2052	Payson City	Stormwater/Flood Control	Construct a regional retention basin and storm drain trunkline for a flooding issue on 800 West.	Payson	98%	\$14,000,000	\$12,600,000	10	0	18	3	16	10	57
779	Tooele City Corporation	Wastewater	Secondary Clarifier #2 improvements	Tooele	98%	\$1,250,000	\$1,000,000	10	22	0	3	16	5	56
783	Tooele City Corporation	Wastewater	Channel #1 electrical improvements	Tooele	98%	\$680,000	\$544,000	10	22	0	3	16	5	56
788	Tooele City Corporation	Wastewater	Retrofit solar dryer - bay 1	Tooele	98%	\$6,500,000	\$5,200,000	10	22	0	3	16	5	56



Appendix D. UWIP Project List

UWIP - Division of Water Quality Agency Plan

Project ID	Lead entity	Infrastructure type	Project name	Nearest location	Pct of State MAGI	Estimated cost	State funding cost	SCORE: Hardship	SCORE: Criticality	SCORE: Water Efficiency	SCORE: Sound Design	SCORE: Entity Priority	SCORE: Pop and Funding	SCORE: Total
789	Tooele City Corporation	Wastewater	Retrofit solar dryer - bay 2	Tooele	98%	\$6,500,000	\$5,200,000	10	22	0	3	16	5	56
1446	Ogden City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	1150 N Detention to North Ogden Canal	Ogden	84%	\$3,450,000	\$1,725,000	15	22	0	9	0	10	56
944	City Of Orem	Wastewater	Oxidation Ditch Improvements	Orem	80%	\$8,661,000	\$4,330,500	15	22	0	3	13	2	55
1453	Ogden City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	Lower Weber River Wilson Diversion, Dog Park, Kayak Park	Ogden	84%	\$700,000	\$350,000	15	22	0	3	0	12	52
2255	Gunnison City	Wastewater	Lagoon Improvements Phase 1	Gunnison	88%	\$1,256,000	\$314,000	15	0	0	9	16	10	50
2320	Salina Town	Stormwater/Flood Control	Industrial Park Flood Mitigation P-1	Salina	84%	\$850,000	\$425,000	15	0	0	9	16	10	50
1593	Heber City Corporation	Wastewater	S-050 100 West Sewer Replacements	Heber City	114%	\$1,186,000	\$1,008,100	6	0	0	14	16	12	48
1723	Cedar City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	Increase the Capacity of the Cross Hollow Detention Basin Inlet	Cedar City	79%	\$1,300,000	\$650,000	15	0	0	3	16	10	44
1724	Cedar City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	Create Conveyance on the East Side of I-15 at the Crossing of University Blvd	Cedar City	79%	\$1,760,000	\$880,000	15	0	0	3	16	10	44
1725	Cedar City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	Install a 36" HDPE Trunkline Along Cody Drive with Sidewalk and Curb and Gutter	Cedar City	79%	\$1,915,000	\$957,500	15	0	0	3	16	10	44
2103	Grand Water & Sewer Service Agency	Wastewater	Hwy 191 Sewer Mainline Replacement	Moab	84%	\$1,500,000	\$450,000	15	0	0	3	16	10	44
1718	Heber City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	100 West Storm Water Improvements	Heber City	114%	\$900,000	\$765,000	6	0	0	9	16	12	43
3151	Town Of Hideout	Wastewater	New Vantage Lane Lift Station Improvements	Hideout	255%	\$290,000	\$72,500	0	0	0	14	16	12	42
1429	North Village Special Service District	Wastewater	UVU Regional Lift Station	Heber City	114%	\$4,290,065	\$1,716,026	6	0	0	14	16	5	41
2953	American Fork City	Wastewater	400 West Reroute	American Fork	107%	\$671,098	\$167,775	10	0	0	3	16	12	41
2959	American Fork City	Wastewater	200 South TOD Improvements	American Fork	107%	\$1,897,016	\$948,508	10	0	0	3	16	12	41
674	Vineyard City Public Works Department	Stormwater/Flood Control	GIS Mapping for Stormwater Maintenance Tracking	Vineyard	98%	\$50,000	\$25,000	10	0	0	9	16	5	40
1359	Highland City	Wastewater	Dry Creek Improvements	Highland	163%	\$500,000	\$250,000	0	0	0	14	16	10	40
1394	Jordanelle Special Service District	Wastewater	Manhole Restoration	Hideout	255%	\$600,000	\$180,000	0	22	0	9	4	5	40



Appendix D. UWIP Project List

UWIP - Division of Water Quality Agency Plan

Project ID	Lead entity	Infrastructure type	Project name	Nearest location	Pct of State MAGI	Estimated cost	State funding cost	SCORE: Hardship	SCORE: Criticality	SCORE: Water Efficiency	SCORE: Sound Design	SCORE: Entity Priority	SCORE: Pop and Funding	SCORE: Total
2956	American Fork City	Wastewater	Lakeshore, 100 W to 300 W	American Fork	107%	\$4,900,452	\$1,225,113	10	0	0	3	16	10	39
3150	Town Of Hideout	Wastewater	Soaring Hawk to JSSD Sewer Connection	Hideout	255%	\$274,000	\$68,500	0	0	0	14	13	12	39
549	Powder Mountain Water And Sewer Improvement District	Wastewater	Lefty's Canyon Gravity Sewer Line	Eden	157%	\$17,500,000	\$8,750,000	0	0	0	14	13	10	37
550	Powder Mountain Water And Sewer Improvement District	Wastewater	Grinder Station Upgrade	Eden	157%	\$750,000	\$375,000	0	0	0	14	13	10	37
394	Lindon City	Wastewater	Orem Water Reclamation Phase 1	Lindon	118%	\$6,890,692	\$3,445,346	6	0	0	9	16	5	36
3081	Ballard City	Stormwater/Flood Control	Channel Cleaning 2000N to 1000N	Ballard	123%	\$50,700	\$25,350	6	0	0	3	16	10	35
3082	Ballard City	Stormwater/Flood Control	Channel Cleaning Hwy 40 North to 1000 N	Ballard	123%	\$61,300	\$30,650	6	0	0	3	16	10	35
3204	North Logan City	Wastewater	2500 N - 300-400 E	North Logan	111%	\$900,000	\$540,000	6	0	0	3	16	10	35
3207	North Logan City	Wastewater	2500 N Pipe Burst	North Logan	111%	\$2,000,000	\$1,200,000	6	0	0	3	16	10	35
3645	Clinton City Corporation	Stormwater/Flood Control	1500 West Replacement	Clinton	125%	\$676,000	\$338,000	6	0	0	3	16	10	35
3637	Clinton City Corporation	Wastewater	1800 North: 2000 W to 2400 W Lateral Reconfiguration	Clinton	125%	\$198,000	\$99,000	6	0	0	3	13	12	34
2270	Hanksville Town	Wastewater	Sewer Master Plan	Hanksville		\$40,000	\$40,000		0	0	14	7	12	33
3206	North Logan City	Wastewater	2500 N - 1250-1600 E	North Logan	111%	\$2,000,000	\$1,200,000	6	0	0	3	13	10	32
3205	North Logan City	Wastewater	2500 N - 1250 E	North Logan	111%	\$400,000	\$240,000	6	0	0	3	13	10	32
3083	Ballard City	Stormwater/Flood Control	Channel Cleaning Hwy 40 South Past City Building	Ballard	123%	\$27,200	\$13,600	6	0	0	3	13	10	32
3152	City Of Holladay	Stormwater/Flood Control	Storm Drain Cleaning	Holladay	145%	\$500,000	\$400,000	2	0	0	9	16	5	32
945	City Of Orem	Wastewater	Grit removal upgrade	Orem	80%	\$2,200,000	\$1,100,000	15	0	0	3	10	2	30
552	Powder Mountain Water And Sewer Improvement District	Wastewater	I&I Reduction	Eden	157%	\$3,000,000	\$1,500,000	0	0	0	3	16	10	29
1063	Draper City	Stormwater/Flood Control	Lasso Ct to Hole 12	Draper	136%	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000	2	0	0	3	13	10	28



Appendix D. UWIP Project List

UWIP - Division of Water Quality Agency Plan

Project ID	Lead entity	Infrastructure type	Project name	Nearest location	Pct of State MAGI	Estimated cost	State funding cost	SCORE: Hardship	SCORE: Criticality	SCORE: Water Efficiency	SCORE: Sound Design	SCORE: Entity Priority	SCORE: Pop and Funding	SCORE: Total
2116	Syracuse City	Stormwater/Flood Control	3000 South 2400 West	Syracuse	148%	\$155,000	\$124,000	2	0	0	3	16	5	26
2119	Syracuse City	Stormwater/Flood Control	2700 South 3000 West	Syracuse	148%	\$3,026,000	\$2,420,800	2	0	0	3	16	5	26
2120	Syracuse City	Stormwater/Flood Control	2500 West 435 South	Syracuse	148%	\$2,094,000	\$1,675,200	2	0	0	3	16	5	26
2123	Syracuse City	Stormwater/Flood Control	2700 South 3230 West	Syracuse	148%	\$4,948,000	\$3,958,400	2	0	0	3	16	5	26
2121	Syracuse City	Stormwater/Flood Control	1900 West 3300 South	Syracuse	148%	\$2,733,000	\$2,186,400	2	0	0	3	13	5	23
3002	American Form City	Stormwater/Flood Control	202 200 S Conveyance & trunk line	American Fork	107%	\$2,539,000	\$634,750	10	0	0	3	0	10	23

