

§ 35.910-12

40 CFR Ch. I (7-1-10 Edition)

(b) The allotments were computed by applying the percentages in §35.910-8 (a) and (d) to the funds appropriated for FY 1980 and rounding to the nearest hundred dollars.

(c) The \$3.4 billion are allotted as follows:

State	Allotments from funds appropriated under Pub. L. 95-372
Alabama	\$43,057,800
Alaska	16,764,500
Arizona	26,008,400
Arkansas	25,190,300
California	266,595,100
Colorado	30,803,000
Connecticut	37,123,200
Delaware	16,764,500
District of Columbia	16,764,500
Florida	128,637,000
Georgia	65,106,400
Hawaii	26,581,700
Idaho	16,764,500
Illinois	174,159,300
Indiana	92,801,300
Iowa	43,430,000
Kansas	29,515,500
Kentucky	49,012,600
Louisiana	42,330,300
Maine	25,129,900
Maryland	93,133,300
Massachusetts	99,051,100
Michigan	138,494,500
Minnesota	62,668,900
Mississippi	32,388,900
Missouri	83,678,100
Montana	16,764,500
Nebraska	18,457,700
Nevada	16,764,500
New Hampshire	29,539,000
New Jersey	119,748,500
New Mexico	16,764,500
New York	356,107,300
North Carolina	66,414,100
North Dakota	16,764,500
Ohio	216,781,200
Oklahoma	31,111,500
Oregon	43,500,400
Pennsylvania	146,239,700
Rhode Island	17,609,400
South Carolina	39,450,100
South Dakota	16,764,500
Tennessee	51,922,900
Texas	146,300,100
Utah	16,764,500
Vermont	16,764,500
Virginia	65,723,400
Washington	59,305,900
West Virginia	60,026,800
Wisconsin	65,391,400
Wyoming	16,764,500
American Samoa	2,065,400
Guam	2,494,500
Puerto Rico	39,342,800
Trust Terr	4,667,200
Virgin Islands	1,267,400
Northern Marianas	462,700
Total	3,400,000,000

§ 35.910-12 Reallotment of deobligated funds of Fiscal Year 1978.

(a) Of the 4.5 billion appropriated by Public Law 95-240 for Fiscal Year 1978, \$23,902,130 remained unobligated as of September 30, 1979 and thereby became subject to reallotment.

(b) The reallotment was computed by applying the percentages in §35.910-8(a), adjusted to account for the absence of Ohio and readjusted to comply with the requirements of §35.910(d) establishing a minimum allotment of .5 percent.

(c) These funds are added to the Fiscal Year 1980 allotments and will remain available through September 30, 1981 (see §§ 35.910-2(b) and 35.910-8).

(d) The \$23,902,130 is allotted as follows:

State	Amount
Alabama	\$324,543
Alaska	118,190
Arizona	196,050
Arkansas	189,880
California	2,009,389
Colorado	232,191
Connecticut	279,813
Delaware	118,190
District of Columbia	118,190
Florida	969,582
Georgia	490,736
Hawaii	200,367
Idaho	125,148
Illinois	1,312,681
Indiana	699,465
Iowa	327,345
Kansas	222,494
Kentucky	369,430
Louisiana	319,073
Maine	189,428
Maryland	701,974
Massachusetts	746,591
Michigan	1,043,875
Minnesota	472,360
Mississippi	244,147
Missouri	630,710
Montana	118,190
Nebraska	139,138
Nevada	118,190
New Hampshire	222,653
New Jersey	902,590
New Mexico	118,190
New York	2,684,060
North Carolina	500,590
North Dakota	118,190
Oklahoma	234,496
Oregon	327,888
Pennsylvania	1,102,234
Rhode Island	132,719
South Carolina	297,352
South Dakota	118,190
Tennessee	391,354
Texas	1,102,708
Utah	118,190
Vermont	118,190
Virginia	495,392
Washington	447,046

[45 FR 16486, Mar. 14, 1980]

Environmental Protection Agency

§ 35.915

State	Amount
West Virginia	452,493
Wisconsin	492,883
Wyoming	118,190
Guam	18,805
Puerto Rico	296,561
Virgin Islands	9,561
American Samoa	15,573
Tr. Terr. of Pac. Islids	35,192
N. Mariana Islids	3,480
Total	23,902,130

§ 35.915 State priority system and project priority list.

Construction grants will be awarded from allotments according to the State priority list, based on the approved State priority system. The State priority system and list must be designed to achieve optimum water quality management consistent with the goals and requirements of the Act.

[45 FR 83497, Dec. 19, 1980. Correctly designated at 46 FR 9947, Jan. 30, 1981]

§ 35.912 Delegation to State agencies.

EPA's policy is to maximize the use of staff capabilities of State agencies. Therefore, in the implementation of the construction grant program, optimum use will be made of available State and Federal resources. This will eliminate unnecessary duplicative reviews of documents required in the processing of construction grant awards. Accordingly, the Regional Administrator may enter into a written agreement, where appropriate, with a State agency to authorize the State agency's certification of the technical or administrative adequacy of specifically required documents. The agreement may provide for the review and certification of elements of:

- (a) Facilities plans (step 1),
- (b) plans and specifications (step 2),
- (c) operation and maintenance manuals, and
- (d) such other elements as the Regional Administrator determines may be appropriately delegated as the program permits and State competence allows. The agreement will define requirements which the State will be expected to fulfill as part of its general responsibilities for the conduct of an effective preaward applicant assistance program; compensation for this program is the responsibility of the State. The agreement will also define specific duties regarding the review of identified documents prerequisite to the receipt of grant awards. A certification agreement must provide that an applicant or grantee may request review by the Regional Administrator of an adverse recommendation by a State agency. Delegation activities are compensable by EPA only under section 106 of the Act or subpart F of this part.

(a) *State priority system.* The State priority system describes the methodology used to rate and rank projects that are considered eligible for assistance. It also sets forth the administrative, management, and public participation procedures required to develop and revise the State project priority list. In developing its annual priority list, the State must consider the construction grant needs and priorities set forth in certified and approved State and areawide water quality management (WQM) plans. The State shall hold a public hearing before submission of the priority system (or revision thereto). Before the hearing, a fact sheet describing the proposed system (including rating and ranking criteria) shall be distributed to the public. A summary of State responses to public comment and to any public hearing testimony shall be prepared and included in the priority system submission. The Regional Administrator shall review and approve the State priority system for procedural completeness, insuring that it is designed to obtain compliance with the enforceable requirements of the Act as defined in §35.905. The Regional Administrator may exempt grants for training facilities under section 109(b)(1) of the Act and §35.930-1(b) from these requirements.

(1) *Project rating criteria.* (i) The State priority system shall be based on the following criteria:

- (A) The severity of the pollution problem;
 - (B) The existing population affected;
 - (C) The need for preservation of high quality waters; and
 - (D) At the State's option, the specific category of need that is addressed.
- (ii) The State will have sole authority to determine the priority for each category of need. These categories