

Engineering Report Guidelines—Do's and Don'ts for Rural Center Funding

Keith A. Krzywicki, PE

John R. (Bobby) Blowe, PE

I. General Comments

II. PER Related Reasons
for Unsuccessful
Applications

General Comments

- PER is new requirement
- Use USDA / DENR format
- Be involved in: selecting engineer, evaluating problem, final selection process for problem solution.
- Ask questions ! It's your document. Your application. Your project.

- Understand the project. Is it affordable? Do you have enough staff?
- Utilize resources: DENR's Regional Offices, experienced staff members, other units of government with similar problems / projects.
- Do your part- are intermunicipal agreements required? What about user sign ups? Commercial commitments?

- Does application match PER?
- A good PER has many benefits.
- Remember---we don't have time to ask follow up questions. Our decisions are based upon the information presented in the original application! If it doesn't make sense to you, it probably won't make sense to us either !

PER Related Issues / Unsuccessful Applications

- Project in application differs from PER
- Extremely brief PER's---8 paragraphs!
- PER or PER Amendment referring to recommendations of a study, but no information on the study
- PER doesn't address critical need that project is supposed to remedy
- Application / PER quantities differ

- No basis for customer projections
- Raw data on flow tests, hydrant tests, pump run times with no explanation
- Addresses for wells / septics don't match addresses on map
- The # of homes to be served differs from # of houses on map.
- Applications for Phase II of a previously funded project with no correlation to maps in Phase I.

- Generic project descriptions
- Planning document. An engineer's seal doesn't make it a PER.
- No documentation of insufficient capacity when that is basis for project
- PER's lacking line lengths and sizes when asking to replace "undersized" lines.
- No I/I analysis for I/I correction projects

- Insufficient info for DENR review
- Illegible maps / reports
- Irrational financial analysis
- Suspiciously large elevated tanks
- Rehab projects spill locations upstream of rehab area, *or*
- Based on spills during floods / hurricane
- Project that can't be located on map
- Wells with no connecting lines
- Outdated PER's or data

- PER's that don't address previous shortcomings from previous applications
- CCPCUA projects that don't acknowledge previously funded RC projects
- Project is to replace component that PER identifies as working well.
- Lack of required documentation for critical next step.
- Interlocal agreement needed for implementation

- Project is for future growth (or resort area) rather than critical need, *or*
- Insufficient documentation of critical need, *or*
- Critical need based on regulation with no citation.
- PER's with no alternatives analysis, *or*
- Applications to fund other than most cost-effective solution identified in PER.

Contact Information

- Keith Krzywicki, P.E.
kkrzywicki@ncruralcenter.org
- John R. (Bobby) Blowe, P.E.
bblowe@ncruralcenter.org

(919) 250-4314