

Environmental Protection Agency

§ 35.2032

(i) An evaluation of alternative flow reduction methods. (If the grant applicant demonstrates that the existing average daily base flow (ADBF) from the area is less than 70 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), or if the Regional Administrator determines the area has an effective existing flow reduction program, additional flow reduction evaluation is not required.)

(ii) A description of the relationship between the capacity of alternatives and the needs to be served, including capacity for future growth expected after the treatment works become operational. This includes letters of intent from significant industrial users and all industries intending to increase their flows or relocate in the area documenting capacity needs and characteristics for existing or projected flows;

(iii) An evaluation of improved effluent quality attainable by upgrading the operation and maintenance and efficiency of existing facilities as an alternative or supplement to construction of new facilities;

(iv) An evaluation of the alternative methods for the reuse or ultimate disposal of treated wastewater and sludge material resulting from the treatment process;

(v) A consideration of systems with revenue generating applications;

(vi) An evaluation of opportunities to reduce use of, or recover energy;

(vii) Cost information on total capital costs, and annual operation and maintenance costs, as well as estimated annual or monthly costs to residential and industrial users.

(4) A demonstration of the non-existence or possible existence of excessive infiltration/inflow in the sewer system. See § 35.2120.

(5) An analysis of the potential open space and recreation opportunities associated with the project.

(6) An adequate evaluation of the environmental impacts of alternatives under part 6 of this chapter.

(7) An evaluation of the water supply implications of the project.

(8) For the selected alternative, a concise description at an appropriate level of detail, of at least the following:

(i) Relevant design parameters;

(ii) Estimated capital construction and operation and maintenance costs,

(identifying the Federal, State and local shares), and a description of the manner in which local costs will be financed;

(iii) Estimated cost of future expansion and long-term needs for reconstruction of facilities following their design life;

(iv) Cost impacts on wastewater system users; and

(v) Institutional and management arrangements necessary for successful implementation.

(c) *Submission and review of facilities plan.* Each facilities plan must be submitted to the State for review. EPA recommends that potential grant applicants confer with State reviewers early in the facilities planning process. In addition, a potential grant applicant may request in writing from the State and EPA an early determination under part 6 of this chapter of the appropriateness of a categorical exclusion from NEPA requirements, the scope of the environmental information document or the early preparation of an environmental impact statement.

§ 35.2032 Innovative and alternative technologies.

(a) *Funding for innovative and alternative technologies.* Projects or portions of projects using unit processes or techniques which the Regional Administrator determines to be innovative or alternative technology shall receive increased grants under § 35.2152.

(1) Only funds from the reserve in § 35.2020(c) shall be used to increase these grants.

(2) If the project is an alternative to conventional treatment works for a small community, funds from the reserve in § 35.2020(b) may be used for the 75 percent portion, or any lower Federal share of the grant as determined under § 35.2152.

(b) *Cost-effectiveness preference.* The Regional Administrator may award grant assistance for a treatment works or portion of a treatment works using innovative or alternative technologies if the total present worth cost of the treatment works for which the grant is to be made does not exceed the total present worth cost of the most cost-effective alternative by more than 15 percent.

§ 35.2034

40 CFR Ch. I (7-1-07 Edition)

(1) Privately-owned individual systems (§35.2034) are not eligible for this preference.

(2) If the present worth costs of the innovative or alternative unit processes are 50 percent or less of the present worth cost of the treatment works, the cost-effectiveness preference applies only to the innovative or alternative components.

(c) *Modification or replacement of innovative and alternative projects.* The Regional Administrator may award grant assistance to fund 100 percent of the allowable costs of the modification or replacement of any project funded with increased grant funding in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section if he determines that:

(1) The innovative or alternative elements of the project have caused the project or significant elements of the complete waste treatment system of which the project is a part to fail to meet project performance standards;

(2) The failure has significantly increased operation and maintenance expenditures for the project or the complete waste treatment system of which the project is a part; or requires significant additional capital expenditures for corrective action;

(3) The failure has occurred prior to two years after initiation of operation of the project; and

(4) The failure is not attributable to negligence on the part of any person.

§ 35.2034 Privately owned individual systems.

(a) An eligible applicant may apply for a grant to build privately owned treatment works serving one or more principal residences or small commercial establishments.

(b) In addition to those applicable limitations set forth in §§ 35.2100 through 35.2127 the grant applicant shall:

(1) Demonstrate that the total cost and environmental impact of building the individual system will be less than the cost of a conventional system;

(2) Certify that the principal residence or small commercial establishment was constructed before December 27, 1977, and inhabited or in use on or before that date;

(3) Apply on behalf of a number of individual units to be served in the facilities planning area;

(4) Certify that public ownership of such works is not feasible and list the reasons; and

(5) Certify that such treatment works will be properly operated and maintained and will comply with all other requirements of section 204 of the Act.

§ 35.2035 Rotating biological contractor (RBC) replacement grants.

The Regional Administrator may award a grant for 100 percent of the cost, including planning and design costs, of modification or replacement of RBCs which have failed to meet design performance specifications, provided:

(a) The applicant for a modification/replacement grant demonstrates to the Regional Administrator's satisfaction, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the RBC failure is not due to the negligence of any person, including the treatment works owner, the applicant, its engineers, contractors, equipment manufacturers or suppliers;

(b) The RBC failure has significantly increased the project's capital or operation and maintenance costs;

(c) The modification/replacement project meets all requirements of EPA's construction grant and other applicable regulations, including 40 CFR parts 31, 32 and 35;

(d) The modification/replacement project is included within the fundable range of the State's annual project priority list; and

(e) The State certifies the project for funding from its regular (i.e. non-reserve) allotments and from funds appropriated or otherwise available after February 4, 1987.

[55 FR 27095, June 29, 1990]

§ 35.2036 Design/build project grants.

(a) *Terms and conditions.* The Regional Administrator may award a design/build (Step 7) project grant provided that:

(1) The proposed treatment works has an estimated total cost of \$8 million or less;

(2) The proposed treatment works is an aerated lagoon, trickling filter,