House
Legislative
Analysis
Section

Olds Plaza Building, 10th Floor
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Phone: 517/373-6466

SAFE DRINKING WATER ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

House Bill 4465 with committee amendments
House Bill 4466 as introduced
First Analysis (5-6-97)

Sponsor: Rep. Jon Jellema
Committee: Conservation, Environment and Recreation

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

The 1996 amendments to the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) placed a strong emphasis on preventing contamination, rather than regulating water problems after-the-fact, by establishing a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program. The program is similar to another state revolving fund (SRF) program -- the state water pollution control revolving fund -- established under the federal Clean Water Act. The amendments to the federal act provide that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) may now award a capitalization grant to a state, which, in turn, may provide low cost loans and other assistance to eligible public water suppliers. The state must agree to provide an amount in state matching funds equal to at least 20 percent of the amount of each grant into an SRF, and must deposit the grant and the state matching funds into the SRF.

Under the DWSRF program, each state has considerable flexibility in determining the design of its program and in directing funds toward its most pressing needs in the areas of public health protection and compliance with SDWA. For example, the federal act allows a state to reserve, or "set aside", a certain percentage of its capitalization grant for purposes that are outside the scope of the loan program. It may use this money to provide technical assistance to public water systems serving 10,000 persons or less. A state may also administer its revolving fund program in combination with other state loan funds, including a state water pollution control revolving fund program such as the one Michigan operates under the provisions of the Clean Water Assistance Act (MCL 324.5301 et al.) to finance municipal water pollution control projects.

A state must formally apply to the EPA for an annual capitalization grant. A central component of the application is an Intended Use Plan (IUP), which describes how the state intends to use available DWSRF program funds for the year to meet the objectives of the SDWA. Specifically, an IUP must describe how all available funds, including capitalization grants, state matching funds, and other proceeds, will be spent. The IUP must also include a prioritized list of projects eligible for funding. The state must prepare an IUP and provide it to the public for review and comment prior to submitting it to the EPA.

According to the EPA's *Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program Guidelines*, EPA 816-R-97-005, issued February, 1997, $9.6 billion has been authorized in DWSRF funds from fiscal year 1994 through fiscal year 2003. Of that amount $1.275 billion has been appropriated for fiscal year 1997, and $725 million has been requested for fiscal year 1998. In its March 7, 1997, issue, the Bureau of National Affairs (BNA's) *Environment Reporter* (Vol. 27, No. 43) noted that Michigan is one of five states eligible for the highest level of funding, and is qualified to receive a federal capitalization grant of $59.2 million. Legislation has now been introduced that would enable the state to comply with the provisions of the federal SDWA.

THE CONTENT OF THE BILLS:

House Bill 4465 would add a new part, Part 54, to the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (MCL 324.5401 et al.) to establish a safe drinking water assistance program. The bill would define "assistance" to mean one or more of the following activities, to the extent authorized by the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA): loans for the planning, design, and construction or alteration of waterworks systems; project refinancing assistance; the guarantee or purchase of insurance for local obligations, if either would improve credit market access or reduce interest rates; the use of proceeds from the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund (created in House Bill 4466) as a source of revenue or security to pay for revenue or general obligation bonds if the proceeds of the sale of the bonds were to be deposited into the revolving fund; provision

of loan guarantees for sub-state funds established by water suppliers that were municipalities; the use of deposited funds to earn interest on fund accounts; provision for reasonable administration costs and for technical assistance under the provisions of the bill; and provision of loan forgiveness for certain planning costs incurred by disadvantaged communities.

House Bill 4465 and House Bill 4466 are tie-barred to each other. House Bill 4466 would amend the Shared Credit Rating Act (MCL 141.1051 et al.) to specify that a State Drinking Water Revolving Fund be established under the provisions of a U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) grant, as provided under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (Title XIV of the Public Health Service Act, Chapter 373, 88 Stat. 1660).

Qualified Water Suppliers: Project Plans. A water supplier, defined to mean a municipality or its designated representative accepted by the director of the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), a legal business entity, or any other person, with the exception of the water hauler, who owned a public water supply, who was interested in applying for assistance would have to prepare and submit a project plan to the department. The department would use submitted project plans to develop a priority list for assistance. During the development of a project plan, a water supplier that was a municipality would have to consider and use, where practicable, cooperative regional or intermunicipal projects, and a water supplier that was not a municipality would have to consider and use, where practicable, connection to, or ownership by, a water supplier that was a municipality. A project plan would have to include documentation demonstrating that the project was needed to assure maintenance of, or progress toward, compliance with the federal Safe Drinking Water Act. A complete project plan would have to include all of the following as background: identification of planning area boundaries and characteristics; a description of the existing waterworks systems; a description of the existing waterworks problems and needs, including the severity and extent of water supply problems or public health problems; an examination of projected needs for the next 20 years; and population projections, and the source and basis for them.

A project plan would also have to include an analysis of alternatives, consisting of systematic identification, screening, study, evaluation, and cost-effectiveness comparison of feasible technologies, processes, and techniques. The alternatives would have to be capable of meeting the applicable state drinking water standards over the design life of the facility, while recognizing environmental and other nonmonetary considerations. The analysis would include, but not be limited to, all of the following:

• A planning period for the cost-effectiveness analysis of 20 years, or other planning as justified by the characteristics of the project.

• Monetary costs that considered the present worth or equivalent annual value of all capital costs and operation and maintenance costs.

• Provisions for the ultimate disposal of residuals and sludge resulting from drinking water treatment processes.

• A synopsis of the environmental setting of the project and an analysis of the potential environmental and public health impacts of the various alternatives, and identification of any environmental or public health benefits precluded by rejection of an alternative.

• Consideration of opportunities to make more efficient use of energy and resources.

• A description of the relationship between the service capacity of each waterworks system's alternative and the estimated future needs using the population projections provided for the project plan.

In addition, a project plan would have to include a description of the selected alternative, including the following: relevant design parameters; estimated capital construction costs, operation and maintenance costs, and a description of how project costs would be financed; a demonstration of the water supplier's ability to repay the incurred debt; a demonstration that the selected alternative was possible to implement; assurance that there was sufficient waterworks system service capacity for the service area; documentation of the project's consistency with the approved general plan prepared according to the provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act, known as "Act 399" (MCL 325.1001 et al.); an analysis of the environmental and public health impacts of the selected alternative; and consideration of structural and nonstructural measures that could be taken to mitigate or eliminate adverse effects on the environment.

A project plan would have to describe the public participation activities conducted during planning and would include all of the following: significant issued raised by the public, including changes made as a result of the public participation process; a demonstration that there were adequate opportunities for public consultation and input in the decision-making process during alternative selection; a demonstration that, before the adoption of the project plan, the water supplier held a public hearing on the proposed project at least 30 days after advertising in local media of general circulation, and at a time and place conducive to maximizing public input; a demonstration that, concurrent with

advertisement of the hearing, a notice of public hearing was sent to all affected local, state, and federal agencies and to any public or private parties that had expressed an interest in the proposed project; and a transcript or recording of the hearing, a list of all attendees, any written testimony received, and the water supplier's responses to the issues raised.

A project plan would include either of the following, as appropriate: for a water supplier that was a municipality, a resolution adopted by the governing board of the municipality approving the plan; or, for a water supplier that was not a municipality, a statement of intent to implement the project plan.

Annual Priority List. Under the bill, the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would be required to develop each year a priority list of projects eligible for assistance under the provisions of the bill, and submit it to the chairpersons of the Senate and House standing committees that primarily consider public health and environmental legislation. The following are some of the restrictions that would apply to projects placed on the list:

• Projects not funded during a current year would be automatically prioritized on the next annual list. The same criteria would be used unless new information were submitted.

• The priority list would be based on projects plans submitted by water suppliers, using the criteria specified under the bill and based also on the number of points assigned to a project. Point values would be earned based on how well a project addressed drinking water quality and infrastructure improvements. Point values would also be earned based on the size of the population served by the water system, for a community that was disadvantaged, and for projects that included consolidation.

• If a project was primarily designed to replace individual wells at private homes, 50 percent or more of the homes in the affected area would have to meet specific equivalent water quality or infrastructure deficiency criteria in order to receive the maximum available points; if less than 50 percent of the homes could demonstrate deficiencies, one-half of the total points available would be awarded.

• The department would be required to apply specific criteria when judging projects that had scored the same number of points.

• The department could segment a project to ensure that a disproportionate share of funds were not committed to a single water supply project.

• When preparing the intended use plan, the department would be required to make every effort to assure that funding for assistance was equitably distributed among public water supplies of varying sizes.

• The priority list would take effect on the first day of each fiscal year, for the purpose of providing assistance.

The department would be required to annually identify those projects in the fundable range of the priority list, review the project plans, and, following completion of the environmental review process, either approve or disapprove the plans.

Environmental Review. In order to determine whether any significant impacts were anticipated and whether any changes could be made in a project to eliminate adverse impacts, the DEQ would have to conduct an environmental review of the project plan of each project in the fundable range of the priority list. As part of the review, the DEQ could require additional information or additional public participation and coordination to justify the environmental determination. Based on the environmental review, the department could issue a categorical exclusion for certain categories of actions that did not have an adverse effect on the quality of the human environment or on public health.

Following receipt of a project plan, the director of the department would have to determine if a proposed public water supply project qualified for a categorical exclusion and to document that decision. The director could revoke a categorical exclusion and require a complete environmental review if, subsequent to the determination, any of the following were found: the project no longer qualified for a categorical exclusion due to changes in the proposed plan; new evidence existed documenting a serious health or environmental issue; or federal, state, local, or tribal laws would be violated by the proposed project.

A proposed project would not qualify for a categorical exclusion if the director of the department determined that any of the following criteria applied to proposed facilities or public water supply project:

• An increase in residuals and sludge generated by drinking water processes would negatively impact the performance or the disposal methods of the waterworks system, or an aquifer recharge zone would be threatened.

• Service would be provided to a population greater than 30 percent of the existing population, unless population projections predicted in the project plan supported the projected needs.

• Cultural areas, fauna or flora habitats, endangered or threatened species, or environmentally important natural resource areas would be affected.

• The extension of transmission system to new service areas would be affected.

• The project had been shown not to be the cost-effective alternative.

• The project would cause significant public controversy.

Environmental Assessment. If, based on the environmental review, the department determined that an environmental assessment was necessary, the department could describe the following: the purpose and need for the project; the project, including its costs; the alternatives considered and the reasons they were accepted or rejected; the existing environment; any potential adverse impacts and mitigative measures; and how mitigative measures would be incorporated in the project, as well as any proposed conditions of financial assistance and the means for monitoring compliance with the conditions. The department could also issue a finding of "No Significant Impact" based upon an environmental assessment documenting that potential environmental impacts would not be significant or could be easily mitigated.

An environmental impact statement could be required when the department determined that any of the following applied:

• The pattern and type of land use, or the growth and distribution of the population would be significantly impacted.

• There would be a conflict with local or state laws or policies.

• Significant adverse impacts would be made on any of the following: wetlands; flood plains; threatened or endangered species or habitats; or cultural resources, including park lands, preserves, other public lands, or areas of recognized scenic, recreational, agricultural, archeological, or historical value.

• A significant displacement of population would result.

• There would be a significant adverse effect upon local ambient air quality or noise levels, surface water and groundwater quantity or quality, shellfish, fish, wildlife, or wildlife natural habitats.

• Significant public controversy would be generated.

A record of decision summarizing the finding of the environmental impact statement would be issued identifying those conditions under which the project could proceed and maintain compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (Public Law 91-190, 42 USA 4321, 4331 to 4335, and 4341 to 4347). In addition, the department would be required to reevaluate the project for compliance if five or more years had elapsed since a determination of compliance with the national act, or significant changes in the project, had taken place. The department could either reaffirm the original finding; amend or revoke a finding of "No Significant Impact" and issue a public notice that an environmental impact statement was required; or issue a supplement to, or revoke, a "Record of Decision" and issue a public notice that financial assistance would not be provided. Action regarding approval of a project plan or provision of financial assistance could not be taken during a 30-day public comment period after a finding of "No Significant Impact" or "Record of Decision" was issued.

Application for Assistance. If a project plan was approved or was under review, a water supplier could apply for assistance from the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Fund. The department would accept applications in the fundable range of the priority list. However, the state would not be liable to a water supplier, or anyone working for the water supplier, for costs incurred in developing or submitting an application for assistance. A water supplier would have to demonstrate that a dedicated source of revenue would be available to operate and maintain a waterworks system and to repay the incurred debt.

An application would have to include all of the following information, if applicable:

• If assistance was in the form of a loan, financial documentation that a dedicated source of revenue had been established.

• Evidence of an approved project plan.

• A certified resolution from a water supplier that was a municipality, or a letter from a water supplier that was not a municipality, designating an authorized representative for the project.

• Certification by the authorized representative confirming that the water supplier had the legal, institutional, technical, financial, and managerial capability to build, operate, and maintain the project.

• Credit enhancement supporting the water supplier's credit position.

• A set of plans and specifications, developed in accordance with the provisions of Act 399, that was suitable for bidding.

• Certification that it had or would have all applicable state and federal construction permits before construction commenced.

• Certification that there was no undisclosed fact or pending litigation that could materially or adversely affect the project, the prospects for its completion, or the water supplier's ability to make timely loan repayments.

• All applicable executed service contracts or agreements.

• An agreement that the waterworks system would be operated in compliance with applicable state and federal laws.

• An agreement that the waterworks system would not be sold, leased, abandoned, or otherwise disposed of without an effective assignment of obligations and the prior written approval of the department and the authority (defined under the bill to mean the Michigan Municipal Bond Authority).

• An agreement that all accounts would be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting practices and standards; and an agreement that contractors would be required under contract to maintain project accounts in accordance with these provisions, and that any subcontractor could be subject to a financial audit as part of an overall project audit.

• An agreement that the department would be provided written authorization to examine the physical plant or the project's operational or financial records, and that all contractors, consultants, or agents would grant similar authorization.

• An agreement that all pertinent records would be available for a minimum of three years after the project began operation, or, if litigation, a claim, an appeal, or an audit was begun, until the action had been resolved.

• If a project was segmented, a schedule for completion and assurance that it would be complete with or without assistance from the fund, or that it would be operational without completion of the entire project.

• An agreement that the project would proceed in a timely fashion if the application for assistance was approved.

• An application fee, if required.

Water Supplier: Responsibilities. Under the bill, a water supplier who received assistance would be responsible for obtaining federal, state, or local permits or clearances and for performing any required surveys or studies for them. A water supplier would also have to incorporate all appropriate provisions, conditions, and mitigative measures included in the applicable studies, surveys, permits, clearances, and licenses into the construction documents. These documents would be subject to review by the DEQ. In addition, all applicable and appropriate conditions and mitigative measures would have to be enforced by the water supplier or its designated representative, and would apply to all construction and post-construction activities, including disposal of all liquid or solid spoils, waste material, and residuals from construction.

Approved Applications. If the DEQ approved an application of assistance, it would have to issue an "Order of Approval" to establish the specific terms of the assistance. This would include, but would not be limited to, all of the following: the term of the assistance; the maximum principal amount; the maximum rate of interest or method of calculation of the interest rate that would be used, or the premium charged. After issuing the "Order of Approval", the department would have to incorporate all requirements, provisions, or information submitted during the application process and certify to the authority that the water supplier was eligible for assistance.

Bypassed Projects. The DEQ could bypass projects that failed to meet the negotiation schedule or that did not have approved project plans, specifications, and application 90 days prior to the last day of the state fiscal year, whichever came first. In turn, a water supplier could submit a written request to have a project schedule extended for up to 60 days and could file one additional 30-day extension request to its schedule. A project that was bypassed would not be considered for an "Order of Approval" until all other projects had been funded or rejected; however, this would not prohibit inclusion of the project in the next annual funding cycle's priority list or the resubmission of an application for assistance.

The department would have to provide affected water suppliers and projects with written notice of intent to bypass at least 30 days before the bypass action. However, a bypass action would not modify any compliance dates established under a permit, order, or other document issued by the department or entered as part of an action brought by the state or a federal agency. After a project was bypassed, the department could award assistance to projects outside the fundable range. These would be made in priority order, contingent upon the supplier's satisfaction of all applicable requirements for assistance within an

established time period. Water suppliers with projects outside the fundable range of bypass action would be notified of the amount of bypassed funds available for obligation and of the deadline for submittal of a complete, approvable application.

Termination of Assistance. The department could issue an order recommending that the authority take appropriate action to terminate assistance. Cause for making this determination could include, but would not be limited to, one or more of the following: substantial failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the assistance agreement; a legal finding or determination that the assistance was fraudulently obtained; illegal or unfair practices in the administration of the project that could impair the project's successful completion or organization; misappropriation of assistance for uses other than those set forth in the assistance agreement; and failure to accept an offer of assistance from the fund within a period of 30 days after receipt of a proposed loan agreement from the Michigan Municipal Bond Authority.

The department would have to give a water supplier notice by certified letter of its intent to issue an order of termination at least 30 days before it forwarded the order recommending that the authority take action to terminate assistance. Termination of assistance, however, would not relieve a water supplier of the obligation to repay an outstanding loan balance to the fund, which would have to be repaid according to a schedule established by the authority, nor of any requirements that might exist under state or federal law to construct the project. Further, any settlement costs incurred in the termination of project assistance would be the responsibility of the water supplier.

Interest Rates. Interest rates assessed for projects receiving assistance would be established annually by the department and would be in effect for loans made during the following state fiscal year. In establishing the rates, all of the following criteria would be considered: future demands; present demands; market conditions; and the cost of compliance with program elements.

Funding Sources. Administration costs could be paid to the department, its designated agents, and the authority from funds annually appropriated by the legislature from one or more of the following sources: the federal capitalization grant (a federal grant to the state from the EPA, as provided under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act); a local match from the water supplier receiving the assistance, not to exceed the DEQ's administrative costs associated with providing the assistance; interest or earnings realized on loan repayments to the fund, unless pledged to secure or repay authority indebtedness; the proceeds of bonds or notes issued under the fund and sold by the authority; and any other money appropriated by the legislature.

Department Responsibilities. The DEQ could undertake one or more of the following to implement the provisions of the bill: execute contracts, conveyances, and other instruments; solicit and accept gifts, grants, loans, allocations, appropriations, and other aid, including capitalization grant awards; expend federal and state money allocated under the federal SDWA for fund activities, including administering the fund and providing set-asides annually identified as part of an intended use plan, fund implementation of a program to provide technical assistance to public water systems serving not more than 10,000 persons, and fund activities authorized under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act; and enter into agreements with the federal government to establish and operate the fund.

The department could also employ personnel and contract for other professional services; charge and collect fees and establish penalties for delinquent payment of fees or charges; review and approve all necessary documents in an assistance application and issue an order to the authority authorizing assistance; promulgate rules to carry out the purposes and the powers granted under the bill; administer, and do other things that are necessary to achieve the objectives of the fund, the authority, the provisions of the act, or other state and federal laws relating to the purposes and responsibilities of the fund; apply for a capitalization grant; establish priority lists and fundable ranges for projects; prepare and submit an annual report and an annual intended use plan, as required under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, and invite stakeholders to one or more public meetings to provide recommendations for the development of the intended use plan, as it relates to the set asides allowed under the federal act; and perform other functions necessary to implement the provisions of the bill. Determinations made by the department could be appealed in writing to the director. Determinations made by the director would be considered final. However, judicial review could be sought under provisions of the Revised Judicature Act pertaining to appeals from state agency decisions.

House Bill 4466 would amend the Shared Credit Rating Act (MCL 141.1051 et al.) to establish a State Drinking Water Revolving Fund and to specify that a U.S. EPA grant should be used to establish this fund, as provided under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, and to revise other provisions of the Shared Credit Rating Act to conform to the provisions for this fund.

State Drinking Water Revolving Fund. Under the bill, the Michigan Municipal Bond Authority would be required to establish the fund, in compliance with the requirements and objects of the federal Safe Drinking

Water Act. Accounts and subaccounts established within the fund could include, but would not be limited to, those established for any of the purposes authorized under the provisions of House Bill 4465. At the close of a fiscal year, money would remain in an account or subaccount established under the bill, as permitted under the federal act, and would not lapse to the general fund. The authority could fund the revolving fund through federal grants, authority revenues, or through any other means permitted under the federal act. The authority could also provide assistance, as that term is defined under House Bill 4465, to a governmental unit for a community or noncommunity water supply, with proceeds of the revolving fund. If the assistance were in the form of a loan, it would have to be made through a loan agreement in which a governmental unit agreed to make repayments to the authority or through the purchase or refinancing of municipal obligations in fully marketable form. Loan agreements with governmental units would have to contain appropriate provisions relating to maturity or length of loan, repayment terms, state or local funding requirements, and other provisions necessary to comply with the provisions of the federal act, and any agreements entered into with the federal government to implement that act. Community and noncommunity water supplies eligible for assistance from the revolving fund would be determined under the provisions of Part 54 of the NREPA, concerning safe drinking water assistance. In addition, the bill would specify that the maximum amount of any municipal obligation purchased with proceeds of the revolving fund and the maximum interest rate on a loan or municipal obligation would have to be determined according to the provisions of Part 54 of the NREPA.

Municipal Obligations. Currently, the act specifies that it is in the public interest and it is the policy of the state to foster and promote borrowing of money by governmental units within the state for financing public improvement, among other purposes, and to encourage governmental units within the state to continue their independent undertaking of public improvements. The bill would add to the activities allowed under these provisions that of financing community and noncommunity water supplies. In addition, under the bill, a "fully marketable form," or municipal obligation, could used for purposes of a community or noncommunity water supply, in which case an order of approval issued by the DEQ under the provisions of House Bill 4465 would have to be included. The order would have to state that the proposed community or noncommunity water supply had been approved for assistance by the DEQ. The act also specifies that a municipal obligation does not include "qualified bonds", as defined in the state constitution. The bill would specify that bonds issued by a governmental unit for a community or noncommunity water supply financed through the proposed state Drinking Water Revolving Fund would be considered to be "qualified bonds". In addition, the bill would exempt bonds or notes issued pursuant to the state Drinking Water Revolving Fund from the current prohibition against authorizing new bonds or notes after December 31, 2000.

Municipal Bond Authority Board of Trustees. The bill would add new responsibilities for the authority's board of trustees. Under the bill, the board would be required to provide assistance to any governmental unit for a revolving fund community or noncommunity water supply, including, but not limited to, using funding allocated under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act. The board could also enter into agreements with the federal government to establish and operate the fund, according to the provisions of the federal act.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

The House Fiscal Agency (HFA) reports that the Department of Environmental Quality would need $12.275 million to implement the provisions of the federal Safe Drinking Water Act. Of that amount $7.5 million would come from the general fund and $4.775 would be provided through a federal grant. Funding for the new programs proposed in the bill has been included in the executive budget recommendations for fiscal year 1997-98. (4-30-97)

ARGUMENTS:

For:

The 1996 amendments to the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) established a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program, and replaced the previous, after-the-fact, regulatory program with one that places a strong emphasis on preventing contamination and enhancing water systems management. Central to this emphasis is the development of state prevention programs, including source water protection, capacity development, and operator certification. According to the EPA's *Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Program Guidelines*, EPA 816-R-97-005, issued February, 1997, the main goal of the fund is to finance aging drinking water infrastructure improvements. Each state may use a portion of federal capitalization grants to fund eligible activities under a drinking water state revolving fund (SRF) program.

The program that would be established under the provisions of the bills would enable cities and villages that own and operate drinking water delivery systems to compete for low interest loans to finance improvements to comply with SDWA requirements. Projects that would qualify as improving such infrastructure would include the rehabilitation or development of water sources to replace contaminated sources; the installation

or upgrading of treatment facilities if the project would improve the quality of tap water; the installation or upgrading of storage facilities, including finished water reservoirs, to prevent microbiological contaminants from entering the water system; and the installation or replacement of transmission and distribution pipes to prevent contamination caused by leaks or breaks in the pipe. In addition, land acquisition would be eligible only if it was integral to a project that was needed to meet or maintain compliance and further public health protection. Projects involving dams or reservoirs, except for finished water reservoirs and those that are part of the treatment process, would not be eligible for funding.

POSITIONS:

The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) supports the bills. (4-30-97)

The Michigan Municipal Bond Authority supports the bills. (5-5-97)

The Michigan Municipal League (MML) supports the bills. (5-5-97)

The Michigan Environmental Council (MEC) supports the bills. (4-30-97)

Associated Underground Contractors, Inc. Supports the bills. (5-5-97)

The City of Wixom supports the bills. (5-5-97)

The Ottawa County Public Utilities System supports the bills. (5-5-97)

The Water Utilities Committee, Michigan Section, of the American Water Works Association (AWWA) supports the bills. (5-5-97)

The Michigan United Conservation Clubs supports the bills. (4-30-97)

The Michigan Township Association (MTA) has no position on the bills. (5-5-97)

Analyst: R. Young

■This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by House members in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.