



OFFICIAL NOTICE AND AGENDA
of a meeting of a City Board, Commission, Department
Committee, Agency, Corporation, Quasi-Municipal
Corporation, or Sub-unit thereof.

A Meeting of Wausau Water Works Commission will be held in the
Council Chambers, 1st Floor City Hall, Wausau, WI 54403 at 11:00 a.m. on
Tuesday, October 7, 2025.

Members: Doug Diny (President), Jim Force, Sarah Watson, Deb Hadley, Peter Gelhar

AGENDA

1. Approve Minutes of September 2, 2025 Meeting.
2. Director's Report on Utility Operations
 - Update on LSL Replacements
 - Funding- 2025 WDNR Loan Closing
 - Wastewater Update on Washington St. Siphon Replacement
 - Wastewater Update on Headworks Screening Project
 - Wastewater Update on Cherry St. Lift Station
3. Discussion and Update on EPA Motion to Vacate Regulatory Determinations for PFAS Hazard Index.
4. Discussion and Update on AWWA Petition for Review of the USEPA Lead and Copper Rule Improvements.
5. Discussion and Update on Water Meter Replacements-to-Date and Estimated Replacements for Future.
6. Discussion and Possible Action Approving 2026- 2030 Capital Budgets for Drinking Water and Wastewater.
7. Discussion and Possible Action Approving Grant Submission to USEPA for the Solar Array Project at 1010 Bugbee Ave.
8. Discussion and Possible Action Approving a Part-time Wastewater Lab Technician on the Job Training Program with Outside Funding up to 500 Hours.
9. Discussion and Possible Action Approving Budget Modification to the 2025 Wastewater Budget.
10. Discussion and Possible Action Approving the Purchase of a UTV and Golf Carts with Funds Procured from Sale of 3 General Fixed Assets Sold at Integrity Auction.

Adjourn.

**Next meeting scheduled for November 4th 2025 @ 11:00 AM.*

Signed by: /s/ Doug Diny, Mayor
Presiding Officer or Designee

THIS NOTICE POSTED AT CITY HALL AND EMAILED TO CITY PAGES AND DAILY HERALD: October 3rd, 2025 at 2:55 p.m.

This meeting is being held in person. Members of the public who do not wish to appear in person may view the meeting live over the internet, cable TV, Channel 981, video is available in its entirety and can be accessed at <https://tinyurl.com/wausaucitycouncil>. Any person wishing to offer public comment not appearing in person may e-mail gina.vang@wausauwi.gov with "Water Commission Public Comment" in the subject line prior to the meeting start. All public comment, either by email or in person, will be limited to items on the agenda at this time. The messages related to agenda items received prior to the start of the meeting will be provided to the Chair.

In accordance with the requirements of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), the City of Wausau will not discriminate against qualified individuals with disabilities on the basis of disability in its services, programs or activities. If you need assistance or reasonable accommodations in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA, please call the ADA Coordinator at (715) 261-6622 or ADAServices@ci.wausau.wi.us to discuss your accessibility needs. We ask your request be provided a minimum of 72 hours before the scheduled event or meeting. If a request is made less than 72 hours before the event the City of Wausau will make a good faith effort to accommodate your request.



Minutes of September 2, 2025

A meeting of the Wausau Water Works Commission was called to order at 11:03 a.m. in City Hall on Tuesday, September 2, 2025. In compliance with Wisconsin Statutes, this meeting was posted and receipted by the Wausau Daily Herald on August 29, 2025.

Members Present: President Diny, Commissioners Hadley, Gelhar, Force arrival 11:22am

Member Excused: Watson

Others Present: Eric Lindman, Scott Boers, Ben Brooks, MaryAnne Groat, Lisa Nowak, Carrie Edmondson, Mary Kluz/past Chair of SEEC, John Robinson, Tonia Westphal/ClarkDietz

1) Approve Minutes of August 5, 2025 Meetings.

Gelhar motioned to approve minutes. Seconded by Hadley.

Motion carried 3-0.

2) Director's Report on Utility Operations.

Lindman highlighted an editorial came out in Wausau Pilot about the sewer Penta study we did back in 2019-2020 attached and updates on the Washington Street siphon replacement, Headworks Screening project and Cherry Street lift station.

Hadley thanked Wausau Waterworks for both facility tours because a lot was learned.

Director's Report Placed on File.

3) Discussion and Update on Solar Array Project.

Kluz, who was the past Chair for Sustainable Energy & Environment Coalition (SEEC), summarized the importance and support of the Solar Array Project proposed at Wausau Waterworks. The Committee support letter & signed petition are enclosed showing full support from residents. She encouraged the commission to look at the financials because electricity will be much higher than was very conservatively estimated for this project. City council passed a greenhouse gas reduction resolution moving us toward energy independence. Strains are coming to our infrastructure that will demand more energy. New York Times quoted a June analysis from Carnegie Mellon University, NC State found that energy prices are likely to rise 8% nationwide by 2030 as much as 25% in other places. We don't know where we'll fall between those percentages.

Edmondson stated the sustainability committee is overwhelmingly supportive of the project, looking at different options, grants and funding and formerly recommends approval.

Diny questioned if this went to CIP?

Lindman replied yes and it will be going to Finance Committee for consideration, the proposed funding will be out of general obligation with the city and not the utility.

Groat clarified just the engineering part is funded in 2026 through CIP's recommendation, only \$150,000, not the project itself.

Lindman highlighted in his memo that recently came to light were the tax credits that were going to fade away from what they were before. What goes to Finance Committee might have to change once we start discussion, if they want the project to go and still earn tax credits, they'll have to fund design and construction for next year.

Groat added it would go through the budget process and if it's funded by the city, then it's funded by taxpayers and would be borrowed money. Regardless of who funds it, borrowed money or water utility would have opportunity to consider PFAS settlement for that funding source.

No Action Taken.

4) Discussion on Utility Financials Update through July 2025.

Groat added financials in the packet for both the water and sewer utility (page 77) explanation at 12:25 [video](#).

No Action Taken.

5) Discussion and Possible Action Approving Wage Recommendations.

Diny requested review of the recommendation brought forth.

Motioned to approve as recommended by Gelhar, Seconded by Hadley.

Lindman summarized this was discussed a few years ago and these numbers are updated with today's costs within the pay structure developed with the city. This doesn't put us in the lead but will make us competitive with recruitment, retention and improve culture of being fully staffed, it will help with training people from ground up and knowledge along with shorter on-call rotation. We invited Brian from Ehlers but he's not on the call, so in the packet is also the cash flow projections from Ehlers, it's a small impact to our overall annual budget.

Groat speaks about the uniqueness of the technicians but was surprised that the clerical administrative positions were included because those are generic positions found in every department because they are not unique and raised concern about internal equity.

Force is supportive of this but questioned the basis of where the increases came from and if it's just the pay grade change?

Lindman replied correct, these are pay grades based on our pay structure within the city. The pay grades are being reclassified in comparison to other utilities and AWWA comp surveys that span 3 different years.

Nowak advised she's been running analysis on existing Admin positions of level 2 that will be re-slotted to level 3 and the 3 to an analyst as in Groat's point of general catch-all term, secretary is a term I've removed from some of the job descriptions because what was once a secretary answering phones has morphed into analyzing data and in some instances filing federal reports with the data enclosed, it's not a secretary's or administrative's duty. When you look at the level of the position and semantics you also understand there's a lot of old antiquated terms. So, in doing an actual job evaluation, which is what needs to be done across the city, we'll be adjusting a lot of these admin positions and clarifying what they do vs what they did 10 years ago.

Gelhar motioned to amend the motion to accept recommendations as proposed except for the admins that will be brought back separately. Seconded from Hadley.

Force questioned overall impact to our budget. Lindman replied about 1% of our budget.

Motion carried 4-0.

6) Discussion and Possible Action Approving the Sole Source Purchase of Magnesium Hydroxide Chemical by Midwest Chemical and Equipment.

Brooks included memo, quotes for the Sole Source Purchase of Magnesium Hydroxide and recommended to stay with Midwest Chemical. It's a chemical that increases alkalinity, making wastewater more stable/treatable for biological phosphorous removal. They're holding their pricing firm, after the 1st year, it'll raise a penny per pound more. It's water soluble and works well with piping set up at the plant because we've had some clogging issues with other products and had to make piping modifications, it has a unique formulation.

Force motioned to approve the sole source purchase of Magnesium Hydroxide by Midwest

Chemical. Seconded by Gelhar.

Motion carried 4-0.

7) Discussion and Possible Action Approving the Purchase of a UTV and Golf Cart with Funds Received from the Sale of Three General Fixed Assets Sold at Integrity Auction.

Brooks' memo explained this would enable staff to travel over the top of the tunnels due to weight restrictions, we can't drive a pickup truck with fear the roof would collapse in the tunnels. Right now, they are dragging pumps, fire hoses out there by hand, this allows them to have access to vehicles readily to go. Bill's offered cooperative purchase pricing, there are no can-am dealerships in Wausau for the UTV. Brad is working on golf cart pricing so I've placed a "not to exceed" in the memo.

Gelhar questioned if it's normal process to get more than 1 quote.

Lindman reiterated procurement policy allows pricing through cooperative purchase but if the commission would like something different, we are open to that.

Diny requested to revisit in October so that we'll have the golf cart information as well.

No Action Taken.

8) Discussion and Possible Action Approving/ Setting PFAS Target Levels and GAC Replacement.

Diny began this was brought last month and had lively discussion but we are shooting at a moving target listing 70ppt, 20ppt and 4ppt.

Boers summarized the recommendations from different entities that either make suggestions or set standards. EPA-4ppt, not enforceable until 2031, WI-DNR-70ppt combined (PFOA/PFOS), WI-DHS 20ppt combined. This Spring DHS revised their advisory level to 4ppt shadowing EPA's recommendation. I don't know when DNR will start requiring public notification for 4ppt but they're still requiring it for the 20ppt.

Hadley questioned why we had to make this decision when nobody's decided; since we have a standard we are meeting.

Diny replied we have the GAC filter in place and over time loading and contamination of it will require a change out, we have the capacity to get under 4ppt but we know 70ppt is not where we want to push it to.

Boers reiterated that under state standards we wouldn't have to treat the water at all; we have combined between 30ppt and 40ppt from each of our wells in the groundwater. We have the system and we'll be meeting standards in the future but this allows us time to gather data to know when we will be required to meet that 4ppt, so that we have it correct and can meet the timing and economically run our system, stage our changeouts and our reactivations to meet that timeline and stay under our regulatory or in compliance of 4ppt and run it most cost effective.

Force questioned if 4ppt with EPA was current or past administration and if they were going to change that? Before the GAC, we had considerable public concern about the quality of our drinking water, in fact, city council authorized purchase of bottled water and filters, weren't we in the 20ppt range when that was going on with our conventional system? The community likes where we are, we should stay at 4ppt or below.

Boers replied the 4ppt was proposed under the past administration, current administration plans to keep it; they moved compliance date out because they figure most facilities wouldn't meet it by 2026. They're looking at adjusting the health index number that had combined numbers of different PFAS that

created a health index. They plan on moving forward with the 4ppt for the PFOA/PFOS. At the old plant, we were between 30ppt- 40ppt, when we moved to our new facility, our anion exchange process lowered it below 20ppt, so that's where this commission voted to stay under that 20ppt. The anion exchange is not designed for PFAS removal, it loads up, then sluffs off, after 9 months, we exceeded that 20ppt to about 22ppt range, we worked on getting that resin replaced. The life on that resin for TOC removal is 15-20 years.

Diny recapped we needed a trigger point but also time to collect data, we don't want to be doing this in February when it's cold but we need a little latitude.

Robinson summarized the EPA isn't changing the standards, the 4ppt has been embedded for PFOA/PFOS, they've delayed the effective date for parties that are non-compliant. These are forever chemicals, there's 12 plus thousands of them out there. There were six other ones that the EPA walked back, DNR is working on their groundwater standard and the drinking water standard tends to be tied into the federal standard. We currently have a lead/lag system of vessels at the water treatment plant, which means one removes most of the PFOA/PFOS, then goes into the other and comes out non-detect. When the lead becomes too saturated, you go to the lag and then look at changing out that lead or regenerating that carbon. As a member of DNR's external advisory group on PFAS, we're looking at different ways of controlling costs, in recent discussions with management departments expressing their willingness to look at different approaches relating to regeneration. I'd encourage not to change the standard because it would affect wastewater treatment plant with their effluent and PFAS levels in their biosolids. It's good to be ahead of the curve but not step back from that standard.

Diny replied operating at this range would allow flexibility to collect information and get the most useful life out of the carbon allowing for cost-effective GAC changeouts in the future. We should be operating this system efficiently and part of that calculation is that it's about \$1 million per changeout, don't want to change it out 3x a year if we could get by with 1x a year. Would entertain a motion to accept Boers' recommendation.

Hadley motioned to approve staff recommendation to run it to 4ppt. Seconded by Gelhar.

Force questioned clarification is it just 4ppt or 5ppt or 6ppt?

Boers recapped, it's for that trigger for our changeouts to see what that timeline would be because the changeouts can't happen immediately, might be month or so, we're testing monthly but without increasing that testing frequency, there may be a lag time in there. We're looking for some leeway on the timing and want to run at least 4ppt to get the information to that number. That's why the EPA set those numbers at 4ppt, because that's where they can maintain the accuracy.

Motion carried 4-0.

9) Adjourn.

Diny stated for the record, next meeting is October 7th at 11:00am here in the Council Chambers.

Hadley motioned to adjourn. Seconded by Force.

Motion carried 4-0.

Link to view meeting in its entirety: <https://tinyurl.com/wausaucitycouncil>

Gina Vang, Recording Secretary

S:\WaterWorks\Common\WaterCommission\2025\October\WWWC_20250902_Minutes.doc.



MEMORANDUM

TO: President Diny
Commissioner Force
Commissioner Watson
Commissioner Hadley
Commissioner Gelhar

FROM: Eric Lindman, P.E.
Director of Public Works & Utilities

SUBJECT: Director's Report – October 2025

Update on LSL Replacement – 2025 construction continues to move forward. They have been behind schedule but are working to catch up with the good weather. We have had to have some very close construction oversight this year to ensure best construction practices are being done on the site. Things are doing better but we are continuing to inspect closely with lots of inspection time on the site. City staff have begun visiting the construction sites periodically to assist with questions and review work being completed.

Regarding funding, the 2025 WDNR loan is expected to close on Nov 26, which is late but much better than the 2024 funding which did not close until June 2025. The proposed 2026 funding allocations have not yet been published but we are optimistic we will again be receiving 100% PF for private side replacements. The funding allocations are supposed to be released in October and will bring these allocations to Commission once they are released. One of the most recent determinations by the WDNR is they are restricting the non-construction loan funding to 25% of the construction cost of the project. This is unfair, unequitable and not reasonable. Please find attached a letter that has/will be sent to the USEPA regarding this determination explaining why this is an unfair distribution of funds.

WASTEWATER DIVISION

1. **Washington St. Siphon Replacement Update:**
 - Final punch items remain and are still in progress.

2. **Headworks Screening Project Update:**

- Ahern & Subcontractors mobilized June 16, 2025 with substantial completion set for October 15, 2026 and a final completion date of November 15, 2026.
- Bypassing of the Wastewater Treatment Plant Headworks was discontinued on September 19, 2025 with new wet well gates installed now.
- **Treatment Facility Overflow (TFO)** reported to WDNR on September 19, 2025. TFO was a result of bypass system equipment failure. (See Memo)

3. **Cherry St. Lift Station Project Update:**

- Contractor (Integrity) Mobilized on site September 8, 2025 with substantial completion set for October 24, 2025 and a final completion date of mid-January, 2026.
- September 26, 2025: New manhole has been installed and back filling is complete.



**Jessica Kramer, U.S. EPA Assistant Administrator
U.S. EPA Office of Water**

Subject: WDNR LSL Funding Non-Construction Costs Determination

Wausau's Lead Service Line Replacement (LSLR) program should be recognized as the most successful LSLR program throughout the state of Wisconsin and arguably the United States, having replaced the most lines in Wisconsin per capita, by a long measure. By the end of 2025 Wausau will have replaced nearly 2,300 LSLs in 18 months with an all-in average cost of less than \$9,000/LSL. Having never replaced more than 55 in a single year prior.

As other communities throughout the state struggle to meet their replacement goals, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) is sitting on excess funding throughout the first two years of BIL funding due to other municipalities underspending their funding allotments. As a result, the DNR has asked if Wausau can expand their scope for 2025 given the program's demonstrated success and ability to accelerate the removal of LSLs.

However, the WDNR has made an unfair and inequitable determination of how to distribute federal LSL funding. In August of this year, 6 months into construction season, WDNR arbitrarily set a limit on Non-Construction funds to 25% of the construction cost for that project. This decision put Wausau in a deficit of nearly \$850,000. A simple example of why this is unreasonable, unfair and prejudicial towards small-to-mid-sized utilities is shown below with two municipalities replacing 1,000 LSL's in a year, but with different construction costs:

Description of Funding	City A (1,000 LSL Replaced)	City B (1,000 LSL Replaced)	Difference
Construction Costs	\$9,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$2,000,000
DNR 25% Construction Cap for Non-Construction work	\$2,250,000	\$2,750,000	\$500,000
Total Costs	\$11,250,000	\$13,750,000	\$2,500,000

City A received favorable construction pricing which directly translates to more lines being replaced across the state because your all-in unit price is lower, yet they are punished for efficiency and fiscal responsibility in being awarded less non-construction funding to administer and oversee the project. The scope of the work for both cities is exactly the same, but City B receives \$500,000 more funding for non-construction work. This is not fair, reasonable or equitable.

Non-Construction related costs are essential for this type of project to be properly administered given the critical nature of proper public outreach and engagement with residents and property owners. This arbitrary decision to restrict funding incentivizes increased construction costs and penalizes municipalities who proactively drive towards lower construction costs and run their program efficiently. Additionally, it favors those that have access to significantly more resources and can self-perform many of these requisite tasks.

As referenced above, another issue with this structure is that it penalizes a community-centric approach to outreach and engagement. Wausau uses a trusted, local nonprofit organization to lead community outreach efforts, which is categorized as non-construction by WDNR. However, Milwaukee uses a less community-centered approach by imposing that function on its construction contractor. WDNR considers this structure to be construction dollars, despite performing the same service, with significantly less results. In short, this arbitrary decision rewards and incentivizes municipalities and utilities to take an approach to outreach and engagement that has been proven to be least effective across the country.

Further, WDNR fails to look at total “all-in” costs per line. Wausau’s all-in cost per line between 2024 and 2025 is less than \$9,000. However, DNR is funding Milwaukee’s program which has a cost of approximately \$11,000 per LSL and South Milwaukee which has a cost of approximately \$11,500 per LSL per their own self-reported data. WDNR also fails to look at the volume and overall scope/results of each program. The WDNR presented data comparing Wausau to Milwaukee, which is 14x the size of Wausau with significantly more internal resources (350+ Water Works staff to Wausau’s 19) and to the City of Spooner which was replacing just 30 LSLs, a scale easily handled internally.

Finally, WDNR’s admission that they settled on the arbitrary number of 25% of construction costs because Milwaukee asked for 22% illustrates the folly of the entire premise. Milwaukee and Wausau are in no way comparable, nor should they be for reasons that are obvious to all. The inconsistency is even further on display when you consider WDNR’s data set showed other Wisconsin communities with more than double this arbitrary cap for 2024, including Spooner and New London at 51% and 58%, respectively. It is also important to note that the funding in question is loan funding that will be repaid with interest in its entirety by Wausau. This is not grant funding or principal forgiveness that is being taken away from other communities.

Wausau requests the 25% non-construction funding cap be revised to ensure equitable, fair and reasonable funding allocations are available to all municipalities in Wisconsin. The overall goals of this funding is to replace LSL’s efficiently and economically while ensuring adequate public outreach and engagement within a community. Wausau’s funding allocations should not be reduced for having an efficient and economic LSLR Program.

Eric Lindman, PE
Director of Public Works & Utilities

Cc: Tony Evers, Governor – WI
Jenni Dye, Policy Director – WI
Karen Hyun, PhD, Secretary - WDNR
Stephen Little, WDNR Deputy Secretary
Tom Tiffany, US Congressman – WI-07
Tammy Baldwin, US Senator
Ron Johnson, US Senator – WI
Cory Tomczyk, State Senator – WI-29
Pat Snyder, Representative – WI Assembly 85th



To: Wausau Waterworks Commission
From: Ben Brooks, Wausau Waterworks-Wastewater Superintendent
Date: October 7, 2025
Subject: September 19, 2025, Treatment Facility Overflow reported

Dear Commissioners,

The Wastewater Treatment Facility reported a Treatment Facility Overflow on September 19, 2025, to the WDNR Spills Hotline which is a requirement of Administrative Code NR. 210.21(5) for all Treatment Facility Overflow (TFO) or Sanitary Sewer Overflow (SSO).

The overflow was a result of an isolation plug prematurely deflating and surcharging the wet-well. The isolation plug was used by the contractor to isolate the headworks wet well to prevent wastewater from entering the wet well while work was being performed during the installation of the new isolation gates. The event occurred during the decommissioning process of bypass equipment while attempting to return the headworks pumps back to normal operations. All influent pumps turned on along with bypass pumps and overwhelmed the grit system influent channel causing an overflow onto the asphalt alley way between DPW and the WWTF.

Wastewater entered the storm water sewer piping located within the confinement of the DPW parking lot, flowed to a storm water drainage ditch also located inside the DPW parking lot and was confined inside of a storm water retention pond that is also located within the DPW parking lot. No Wastewater entered the Wisconsin River at any time. Staff from the Wastewater Treatment Plant and Collections crew collaborated with the cleanup which included the cleaning of the storm water sewer piping, the drainage ditch and retention pond.

WDNR acknowledged receipt of the TFO reported on 9/24/25 and will notify the City if any further action is required.

I would like to commend Brad Wendtland, Austin Uttech and Ryan Dwelly for a job well done. Their prompt action to dissolve the overflow situation efficiently and effectively is commendable.

Best regards,

Ben Brooks

Wausau Waterworks – Wastewater, Superintendent



Fw: WI SPILL #22691 ID 20250919WC37-1 - OTHER: WASTEWATER

From Bradley Wendtland <Bradley.Wendtland@wausauwi.gov>

Date Fri 9/19/2025 9:56 PM

To Ben Brooks <Ben.Brooks@wausauwi.gov>

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: dnrlehotline@wisconsin.gov <dnrlehotline@wisconsin.gov>

Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 9:22:40 PM

To: Bradley Wendtland <Bradley.Wendtland@wausauwi.gov>

Subject: WI SPILL #22691 ID 20250919WC37-1 - OTHER: WASTEWATER

[You don't often get email from dnrlehotline@wisconsin.gov. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

SERTS ID:
20250919WC37-1

Reported:
09/19/2025 20:47

Occurred:
09/19/2025 16:20

Substance:
OTHER: WASTEWATER
WASTEWATER
Released Amt: 3500 Gal
Recovered Amt: 3200 Gal
(AMOUNTS ARE OFTEN ESTIMATED)

Reported by:
BRADLEY WENDTLAND
PLANT OPERATIONS SUPERVISOR
WAUSAU WATER WORKS WASTEWATER
bradley.wendtland@wausauwi.gov
(715) 571-7750
(715) 573-3278
Also RP Contact

Location:

WC REGION
MARATHON COUNTY
WAUSAU, CITY OF
WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY
435 ADRIAN ST

<https://www.google.com/maps/place/435%20Adrian%20St%20%20WAUSAU,%20WI>

Responsible Party:
WAUSA WATER WORKS WASTEWATER
430 ADRIAN
WAUSAU, WI 54401
(715) 571-7750

Cause:
EQUIPMENT FAILURE

Cause Description:
3200-3500 GALLONS, SURFACE RELEASE INTO A DITCH LINE

Environmental Impact:
RELEASED ONTO BLACK TOP ASPHALT PARKING LOT, INTO STORM DRAIN THAT GOES TO A RETAINING DITCH LINE. NONE LEFT FACILITY OR ADJOINING PUBLIC WORKS FACILITY. NONE REACHED THE WISCONSIN RIVER.

Contractor Company:
NONE

Cleanup:
VACUUMED ANY PONDING AND WASHED OFF ASPHALT WHILE VACUUMING UP ALL WATER USED

Notified SPOKE TO MAIZIE REIF 2103 by Phone

Submitted by:
TRACY JALLAH
(800) 943-0003
dnrlehotline@wisconsin.gov

Sent to:
aleshia_kenney@fws.gov
anthony.knipfer@wisconsin.gov
bart.sponseller@wisconsin.gov
bbyrne@glifwc.org
bradley.wendtland@wausauwi.gov
bradleya.johnson@wisconsin.gov
brenda.kelly@wisconsin.gov
carl.stenbol@widma.gov
caroline.rice@wisconsin.gov
christine.sieger@wisconsin.gov



Outlook

Notification of SSO Notification Summary Report from Wausau Water Works - 0025739-09-2 has been Accepted

From DNRSSOForms@wisconsin.gov <DNRSSOForms@wisconsin.gov>

Date Tue 9/23/2025 2:33 PM

To Doug Diny <Doug.Diny@wausauwi.gov>; Ben Brooks <Ben.Brooks@wausauwi.gov>

Cc Nicholas.Lindstrom@wisconsin.gov <Nicholas.Lindstrom@wisconsin.gov>

This email was sent to Notify you that the DNR has accepted your SSO Notification Summary Report with an Overflow start date of: 09/19/2025 04:15:00 PM and located at Latitude: 44.946, Longitude: -89.62817.

No additional actions are required at this time.



September 22, 2025

Wastewater Treatment & Collection

Public Notice

This is a Public Notification of a treatment facility overflow as required by NR 210.21(5). Due to an equipment malfunction on Friday night September 19, 2025, the City of Wausau experienced a treatment facility overflow. The overflow lasted approximately 10 minutes and took place in the alley between the East side of the Department of Public Works building and the West side of the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Sanitary sewage spilled onto the asphalt drive between both buildings and flowed into the storm water retention pond where it was contained, no sewage entered the Wisconsin River. Wastewater staff were able to pump all sewage out of the retaining pond and dispose of the sewage properly at the wastewater treatment plant mitigating the potential for human exposure or contact. City personnel were present at the time of the overflow and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources has been notified.

Eric Lindman

From: AWWA Public Affairs <publicaffairs@awwa.org>
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 12:32 PM
To: Eric Lindman
Subject: Public Affairs Advisory - Update to AWWA's LCRI petition

[View in Browser](#)



AWWA
ADVISORY

A BENEFIT OF YOUR AWWA UTILITY MEMBERSHIP 

Public Affairs Advisory

Who: AWWA

What: Update to AWWA's LCRI petition

When: Sept. 12, 2025

On Sept. 12, the American Water Works Association (AWWA) filed its opening brief in its Petition for Review of the Lead and Copper Rule Improvements in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

In the petition process, the opening brief is the first written document filed by the involved petitioners. The purpose of these briefs is to explain to the court what legal errors were made.

AWWA made a [statement](#) regarding filing the opening brief that, in part, said, "AWWA is asking the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to return the rule to EPA to create a final regulation that protects public health and is legal, feasible and affordable to implement.

“We remain committed – regardless of what regulation is in place -- to strong protections today as we work toward a future in which lead service lines are replaced in their entirety across the United States.”

In its petition, AWWA highlighted the following concerns, regarding whether EPA violated the Safe Drinking Water Act by:

- Requiring water systems to replace lead service lines located on private property and owned by entities other than the systems if the systems can “access” such lines or to otherwise take actions on private property that are not part of the public water system.
- Imposing requirements that are not feasible, including a 10-year mandatory service line replacement deadline.
- Failing to adequately analyze public water systems’ costs of compliance with the Final Rule or properly assess the benefits.

The petition for judicial review and related materials are available at www.awwa.org/lead.

Questions from utilities or media can be directed to [Greg Kail](#), AWWA director of communications, 303-913-0063.



American Water Works Association
6666 W. Quincy Ave. | Denver, Colorado 80235
Telephone: 1-800-926-7337

[Email AWWA](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)

OR reply to this message with the word Remove in the subject line.

This email was sent to eric.lindman@ci.wausau.wi.us, 3100738

AWWA, AMWA statement on EPA motion to vacate Hazard Index portion of PFAS rule

September 12, 2025

[AWWA Articles](#) > [AWWA, AMWA statement on EPA motion to vacate Hazard Index portion of PFAS rule](#)

American Water Works Association (AWWA) CEO David LaFrance and Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) CEO Tom Dobbins released the following statement today regarding EPA's request to the U.S. Court of Appeals to vacate the regulations and regulatory determinations for six PFAS (individually and as a mixture through a novel Hazard Index):

"AWWA and AMWA share the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's goal of protecting people from potentially harmful levels of PFAS in drinking water. Our goal in filing a petition for review of the PFAS rule last year was to help the agency arrive at a regulation that protects water consumers from PFAS, is grounded in science, and is affordable to implement nationwide. We remain committed to this outcome.

"EPA's decision to ask the Court to vacate the regulatory determinations for the Hazard Index PFAS is a positive step forward for the PFAS rule and the future of drinking water regulation. The decision is consistent with EPA's May 14 announcement, in which the agency stated its intention to rescind the Hazard Index 'to ensure that the [regulatory] determinations and any resulting drinking water regulation follow the legal process laid out in the Safe Drinking Water Act.'"

"The SDWA sets forth a rigorous process for developing drinking water rules. It allows EPA to evaluate potential risks and arrive at scientifically sound regulations. And it requires EPA to consider public comment at various points in the process. The introduction of a complicated Hazard Index calculation, along with reduced opportunities for public comment, strayed from this rigorous and congressionally-mandated approach.

"If accepted by the Court, EPA's request will reopen the opportunity for meaningful public input and ultimately lead to a more scientifically defensible final rule. It will also ensure that future rulemakings better respect the SDWA process, helping EPA, water utilities, and other partners identify risks and prioritize investments."

###

About AWWA

Established in 1881, the American Water Works Association is the largest nonprofit, scientific and educational association dedicated to managing and treating water, the world's most vital resource. With approximately 50,000 members, AWWA provides solutions to improve public health, protect the environment, strengthen the economy and enhance our quality of life.

About AMWA

The Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies (AMWA) has been the unified and definitive voice for the nation's

largest publicly owned water systems for over 40 years. AMWA's membership serves more than 160 million people with safe drinking water.



The advertisement features a dark blue background. On the left, the 'dipra' logo is shown with a green arrow pointing up and a blue arrow pointing down. Next to it are images of a smartphone, a tablet, and a laptop displaying a 'KNOWLEDGE PIPELINE' interface. The main text in white and green reads: 'FREE EDUCATIONAL COURSES AVAILABLE FOR WATER ENGINEERS'. A green button on the right contains the text 'LEARN MORE'.

Advertisement

Eric Lindman

From: AWWA Public Affairs <publicaffairs@awwa.org>
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 12:32 PM
To: Eric Lindman
Subject: Public Affairs Advisory - Update to AWWA's LCRI petition

[View in Browser](#)



AWWA
ADVISORY

A BENEFIT OF YOUR AWWA UTILITY MEMBERSHIP 

Public Affairs Advisory

Who: AWWA

What: Update to AWWA's LCRI petition

When: Sept. 12, 2025

On Sept. 12, the American Water Works Association (AWWA) filed its opening brief in its Petition for Review of the Lead and Copper Rule Improvements in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

In the petition process, the opening brief is the first written document filed by the involved petitioners. The purpose of these briefs is to explain to the court what legal errors were made.

AWWA made a [statement](#) regarding filing the opening brief that, in part, said, "AWWA is asking the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to return the rule to EPA to create a final regulation that protects public health and is legal, feasible and affordable to implement.

“We remain committed – regardless of what regulation is in place -- to strong protections today as we work toward a future in which lead service lines are replaced in their entirety across the United States.”

In its petition, AWWA highlighted the following concerns, regarding whether EPA violated the Safe Drinking Water Act by:

- Requiring water systems to replace lead service lines located on private property and owned by entities other than the systems if the systems can “access” such lines or to otherwise take actions on private property that are not part of the public water system.
- Imposing requirements that are not feasible, including a 10-year mandatory service line replacement deadline.
- Failing to adequately analyze public water systems’ costs of compliance with the Final Rule or properly assess the benefits.

The petition for judicial review and related materials are available at www.awwa.org/lead.

Questions from utilities or media can be directed to [Greg Kail](#), AWWA director of communications, 303-913-0063.



American Water Works Association
6666 W. Quincy Ave. | Denver, Colorado 80235
Telephone: 1-800-926-7337

[Email AWWA](#) | [Unsubscribe](#)

OR reply to this message with the word Remove in the subject line.

This email was sent to eric.lindman@ci.wausau.wi.us, 3100738

AWWA statement on filing of opening brief for LCRI petition

September 15, 2025

[AWWA Articles](#) > [AWWA statement on filing of opening brief for LCRI petition](#)

Today, the American Water Works Association filed its opening brief in its Petition for Review of the Lead and Copper Rule Improvements. The Association issued the following statement.

AWWA shares EPA's desire to replace lead service lines on both public and private property, and to accomplish this monumental undertaking as quickly as feasible. However, the proposed Lead and Copper Rule Improvements (LCRI) does not support this shared goal.

Our opening brief in AWWA's petition for review of the LCRI emphasizes three areas of concern:

First, AWWA is concerned the rule asserts that if a water system can "access" a lead service line on private property, it has "control" of that service line. This assertion is incorrect and has the effect of expanding the scope of responsibility for a public water system beyond what it can enforce.

"Practically speaking, equating 'control' with 'access' would expand or contract the scope of a water system's responsibilities (and with it, EPA's jurisdiction) like an accordion any time a property owner, tenant, or third party granted or subsequently withheld any kind of 'access' to privately owned service lines," the brief explains. "The scope of the system subject to EPA regulation and system operator responsibility cannot be ever shifting based on the whims of third parties."

Second, the LCRI introduces a ten-year timeline for lead service lines to be removed, absent a special exemption. The logistical, labor, supply chain, and technical realities of complete lead service line removal and replacement nationwide, in small communities and large, make a ten-year window implausible.

Third, EPA dramatically underestimates the nationwide cost of lead service line replacement. Even with federal and state infrastructure loans, the cost of lead service line replacement will be borne by communities and their water customers.

"Most federal and state funding comes in the form of loans that water systems must repay, which are repaid with funds obtained from customer charges or water rates," the brief explains. "While these funding sources can be useful to reduce household burdens, their impacts are marginal and limited to the subset of systems that are capable of accessing these funds."

AWWA is asking the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to return the rule to EPA to create a final regulation that protects public health and is legal, feasible and affordable to implement.

We remain committed – regardless of what regulation is in place – to strong protections today as we work toward a future in which lead service lines are replaced in their entirety across the United States.

Established in 1881, the American Water Works Association is the largest nonprofit, scientific and educational association dedicated to managing and treating water, the world's most vital resource. With approximately 50,000 members, AWWA provides solutions to improve public health, protect the environment, strengthen the economy and enhance our quality of life.



Advertisement



To: Wausau Waterworks Commission

From: Scott Boers, Superintendent
Wausau Waterworks

Date: October 7, 2025

Subject: Meter Replacements-to-Date and Estimated Replacements for Future

As of 10/2/2025 staff has installed 2,090 meters. According to our billing system there are 6,035 residential meters sizes 5/3" through 1" to be replaced. Our inventory will be short of approximately 1,000 meters and 2,700 radios to complete the residential replacements. Costs for the meters and radios will be about \$480K at today's pricing. A lot of the meters we are changing fail to meet WI DNR accuracy requirements, 5/3" meters have a 39% fail rate, 3/4" is 12.5%, 1" is 16%.

DRINKING WATER DIVISION

Total Cost of Each Project by Year

Department - Project Name	Prior to 2026	Current Year: 2026	Year 1: 2027	Year 2: 2028	Year 3: 2029	Year 4: 2030	Unfunded	Total
Water Division								
2026 Lead Service Line Replacement	19,881,347	20,208,912	20,000,000	12,000,000	-	-	-	72,090,259
Asset Management Software	-	300,000	-	-	-	-	-	300,000
Asterra Leak Detection	-	45,000	-	-	-	-	-	45,000
Backhoe/ Excavator	-	180,000	-	350,000	-	-	-	530,000
Hydrovac Valve Turner	-	-	600,000	-	-	-	-	600,000
Meters and (Transmitters) Radios	-	200,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	-	600,000
Monroe Booster Reconstruction	-	60,000	-	500,000	-	-	-	560,000
New Well	-	-	-	-	700,000	-	-	700,000
Portable/On Site Generator	-	-	80,000	-	80,000	-	-	160,000
Reservoir Coatings and Maintenance	-	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	-	750,000
Reservoir Inspections	-	-	-	-	-	40,000	-	40,000
Vehicles	-	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	-	425,000
Water Main Looping	-	550,000	300,000	400,000	400,000	300,000	-	1,950,000
Water Main Replacement - 12th Street from Forest Street to Jackson Street	-	-	-	-	63,000	-	-	63,000
Water Main Replacement - 28th Avenue from Westhill Drive to West Wausau Avenue	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	100,000
Water Main Replacement - 2nd Street from Forest Street to Division Street	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	-	75,000
Water Main Replacement - 3rd Avenue from West Eldred Street to Randolph Street	-	-	-	160,000	-	-	-	160,000
Water Main Replacement - Brown Street from 5th Street to 13th Street	-	-	-	-	1,009,000	-	-	1,009,000
Water Main Replacement - Division Street from 2nd Street east to the dead end	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Water Main Replacement - Ethel Street from Grand Avenue to Zimmerman Street	-	-	791,000	-	-	-	-	791,000
Water Main Replacement - Forest Street from Bellis Street to 12th Street	-	-	-	-	335,000	-	-	335,000
Water Main Replacement - Garfield Avenue from Marathon Park to 3rd Avenue	-	-	-	-	353,000	-	-	353,000
Water Main Replacement - North 11th Avenue from Elm Street to Cedar Street	-	-	-	-	-	412,000	-	412,000
Water Main Replacement - North 11th Street from East Crocker Street to Sylvan Street	-	-	-	264,000	-	-	-	264,000
Water Main Replacement - North 4th Avenue from Merrill Avenue to Randolph Street	-	-	-	-	-	395,000	-	395,000
Water Main Replacement - North 8th Avenue from Spruce Street to Bridge Street	-	400,000	-	-	-	-	-	400,000
Water Main Replacement - North 9th Avenue from Elm Street to Bridge Street	-	-	-	695,000	-	-	-	695,000
Water Main Replacement - Park Avenue from 2nd Street to 10th Street	-	-	-	-	-	798,000	-	798,000
Water Main Replacement - Plumer Street from Grand Avenue to Battery Street	-	-	-	-	-	434,000	-	434,000
Water Main Replacement - South 11th Avenue from West Thomas Street to Flieth Street	-	-	404,000	-	-	-	-	404,000
Water Main Replacement - South 17th Avenue from Sherman Street to Stewart Avenue	-	-	-	-	-	230,000	-	230,000
Water Main Replacement - Stark Street from 5th Street to 12th Street	-	775,000	-	-	-	-	-	775,000
Water Main Replacement - West Eldred Street from North 3rd Avenue to North 1st Avenue	-	-	-	136,000	-	-	-	136,000
Water Main Replacement - West Wausau Avenue from North 10th Avenue to Stevens Drive	-	242,000	-	-	-	-	-	242,000
Water Division Total	19,881,347	23,370,912	22,510,000	14,840,000	3,275,000	2,944,000	-	86,821,259
w/o Lead Service Line =	\$3,520,879	3,162,000	2,510,000	2,840,000	3,275,000	2,944,000	-	\$18,251,879
with LSL only borrowed amount =	\$7,575,438	9,224,673	9,510,000	7,040,000	3,275,000	2,944,000	-	\$39,569,112
Total LSL borrowing =	\$4,054,559	\$6,062,673	\$7,000,000	\$4,200,000	\$-	\$-	-	\$21,317,232

WASTEWATER DIVISION

Total Cost of Each Project by Year

Department - Project Name	Prior to2026	Current Year:2026	Year 1:2027	Year 2:2028	Year 3:2029	Year 4:2030	Unfunded	Total
Wastewater Division								
Airport and 32nd Ave Lift Station Upgrades	-	-	1,320,000	-	-	-	-	1,320,000
Asset Management/Work Order Program	-	300,000	-	-	-	-	-	300,000
Automated Septage Receiving Station	-	-	-	-	-	1,200,000	-	1,200,000
Biogas Conditioning Skid or New Microturbines and Gas Skid	-	-	-	1,309,000	-	-	-	1,309,000
Crocker St Lift Station	-	1,693,000	-	-	-	-	-	1,693,000
Forcemain Pigging and Cleaning	-	120,000	-	120,000	-	120,000	-	360,000
Interceptor Line H2S Repairs and Manhole Rehab	500,000	500,000	-	500,000	-	500,000	-	1,500,000
Lift Station Engineering Report & Design- 6 Lift Stations	-	100,000	100,000	-	-	-	-	200,000
New Lift Station Service Truck	-	-	-	200,000	-	-	-	200,000
New Sludge Truck	-	-	-	-	-	250,000	-	250,000
New Vector Truck	-	-	-	800,000	-	-	-	800,000
Radio or Cellular Communications Upgrade at Lift Stations	-	83,500	90,000	-	-	-	-	173,500
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - 2nd Street from Forest Street to Division Street	-	75,000	-	-	-	-	-	75,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Garfield Avenue from Marathon Park to 3rd Avenue	-	-	-	-	487,000	-	-	487,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - 12th Street from Forest Street to Jackson Street	-	-	-	-	42,000	-	-	42,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - 28th Avenue from Westhill Drive to West Wausau Avenue	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	100,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - 3rd Avenue from West Eldred Street to Randolph Street	-	-	-	82,000	-	-	-	82,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Brown Street from 5th Street to 13th Street	-	-	-	-	705,000	-	-	705,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Division Street from 2nd Street east to the dead end	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Ethel Street from Grand Avenue to Zimmerman Street	-	-	530,000	-	-	-	-	530,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Forest Street from Bellis Street to 12th Street	-	-	-	-	209,000	-	-	209,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - North 11th Avenue from Elm Street to Cedar Street	-	-	-	-	-	288,000	-	288,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - North 11th Street from East Crocker Street to Sylvan Street	-	-	-	194,000	-	-	-	194,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - North 4th Avenue from Merrill Avenue to Randolph Street	-	-	-	-	-	327,000	-	327,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - North 8th Avenue from Spring Street to Bridge Street	-	300,000	-	-	-	-	-	300,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - North 9th Avenue from Elm Street to Bridge Street	-	-	-	328,000	-	-	-	328,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Park Avenue from 2nd Street to 10th Street	-	-	-	-	-	671,000	-	671,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Plumer Street from Grand Avenue to Battery Street	-	-	-	-	-	271,000	-	271,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - South 11th Avenue from West Thomas Street to Flieth Street	-	-	380,000	-	-	-	-	380,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - South 17th Avenue from Sherman Street to Stewart Avenue	-	-	-	-	-	498,000	-	498,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - Stark Street from 5th Street to 12th Street	-	625,000	-	-	-	-	-	625,000
Sanitary Sewer Replacement - West Wausau Avenue from North 10th Avenue to Stevens Drive	-	176,000	-	-	-	-	-	176,000
Sewer Capacity Study of Wausau's Collections System	-	159,000	-	-	-	-	-	159,000
Slipline Sewers (Cured in Place & I&I Repairs)	525,000	-	525,000	525,000	525,000	525,000	-	2,100,000
Sludge Loadout Bldg. Addition, Class B Sludge Automatic Diversion and Concrete between STR. 770 & STR. 540	-	-	-	-	781,000	-	-	781,000
Str. 110 (Parking Garage) Roofing	-	-	-	-	-	282,000	-	282,000
Str. 115 (Cold Storage Bldg.) Remodel	-	-	-	-	312,000	-	-	312,000
West Eldred Street from 3rd Avenue to 1st Avenue	-	-	-	48,000	-	-	-	48,000
Wastewater Division Total	1,025,000	4,231,500	2,945,000	4,106,000	3,061,000	4,932,000	-	19,275,500

Street Reonstruction - Sewer Replacement only = 1,276,000 910,000 652,000 1,443,000 2,055,000

Notice of Funding Opportunity

Applications Due: **Monday, October 6, 2025**



Office of Water, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water

Midsize and Large Drinking Water System Infrastructure Resilience and Sustainability Program

Funding Opportunity Number: **EPA-OW-OGWDW-25-01**



Contents

1.	Basic Information	1
	A. Executive Summary:	1
	B. Key Information:	1
	C. Key Dates:	1
	D. Funding Details:	1
	E. Agency Contact Information:	1
2.	Eligibility	3
	A. Eligible Applicants	3
	(1) Other Eligibility Requirements	3
	B. Cost Sharing	4
3.	Program Description	5
	A. Purpose, Priorities, and Activities	5
	B. Program Goals and Objectives	5
	C. Statutory Authority	10
	D. Funding Type	10
4.	Application Contents and Format	10
	A. Application Forms	10
	B. Applicants Using Contractors	14
	C. Release Copies of Applications	15
	D. Coalition Coverage	15
	E. Other Program Specific Application Information	15
5.	Submission Requirements and Deadlines	16
	A. Submission Dates and Times	16
	B. Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) and System for Award Management (SAM.gov)	17
	C. Submission Instructions	17
	D. Technical Issues with Submission	17
	E. Intergovernmental Review	18
6.	Application Review Information	18
	A. Responsiveness Review	18
	B. Review Criteria	18
	C. Review and Selection Process	21
	D. Risk Review	22
7.	Award Notices	22
8.	Post-Award Requirements and Administration	22
	A. Administrative and National Policy Requirements	22
	B. Reporting	22
	C. FFATA and FSRS Reporting	23
9.	Other Information	23

A. Additional Provisions for Applicants..... 23

1. Basic Information

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office of Water, Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water

Midsize and Large Drinking Water System Infrastructure Resilience and Sustainability Program

<https://www.epa.gov/dwcapacity/midsize-and-large-drinking-water-system-infrastructure-resilience-and-sustainability>

A. Executive Summary:

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) section 1459F authorizes the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to establish the Midsize and Large Drinking Water System Infrastructure Resilience and Sustainability Program. This grant program assists medium and large size public water systems with protecting drinking water sources from natural hazards, extreme weather events, and cybersecurity threats.

Eligible applicants for this grant program include public water systems that serve a population of 10,000 people or more. Projects or programs that may be funded through this opportunity are those which aim to increase the resilience of a water system to natural hazards, extreme weather events, or reduce cybersecurity threats.

C. Key Dates:

September 5, 2025

NOFO Questions Submission
Deadline

October 6, 2025 11:59 pm ET

Application Submission Deadline

October 6, 2025 11:59 pm ET

Application Submission Deadline (Local Time)

March 2026

Anticipated Notification of Selection

May 2026

Anticipated Award Notification

B. Key Information:

Opportunity Number:

EPA-OW-OGWDW-25-01

Federal Assistance Listing:

66.488

Announcement Type:

Initial

Funding Available:

\$9,500,000

Number of Awards:

6

D. Funding Details:

It is anticipated that up to 6 award(s) will be made under this announcement. Awards are expected to be between **\$1,187,500 and \$2,375,000**, depending on Agency funding levels, the quality of applications received, agency priorities, and other applicable considerations. Awards funded under this opportunity are expected to have a **one to four year** project period.

E. Agency Contact Information:

Further information, if needed, may be obtained from the EPA contact(s) indicated below.

Technical Contact: **Claudette Ojo**, Resiliencygrant@epa.gov

Note to Applicants: In accordance with EPA's Assistance Agreement Competition Policy (EPA Order 5700.5A1) and consistent with the provisions in the announcement, EPA will respond to questions from individual applicants regarding threshold eligibility criteria, administrative issues related to the submission of the application, and requests for clarification about any of the language or provisions in the announcement. In accordance with the Policy, EPA cannot meet with individual applicants to discuss draft applications, provide informal comments on draft applications, or provide advice to applicants on how to respond to ranking criteria. Applicants are responsible for the contents of their applications. Please note that applicants should raise any questions they may have about the solicitation language to the contact identified above as soon as possible so that any questions about the solicitation language may be clarified prior to submitting a proposal. In addition, if necessary, EPA may clarify threshold eligibility issues with applicants prior to making a final eligibility determination.

Questions about this Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) must be submitted in writing via e-mail and must be received by the Agency Contact identified above by 11:59 PM Eastern Time, September 5, 2025 and written responses will be posted on EPA's website at (<https://www.epa.gov/dwcapacity/midsize-and-large-drinking-water-system-infrastructure-resilience-and-sustainability>). Please note answers to frequently asked questions (FAQs) are available at (<https://www.epa.gov/dwcapacity/midsize-and-large-drinking-water-system-infrastructure-resilience-and-sustainability>). EPA strongly recommends interested applicants refer to the FAQs webpage prior to submitting a question.

F. Other Funding Considerations

Up to \$9,500,000 may be awarded under this NOFO over approximately one to four years, contingent on the quality of applications received, funding availability, future appropriations, satisfactory performance of work, and other applicable considerations. Funding each year is not guaranteed. The applications should include an annualized budget and budget detail narrative for the project, and a detailed workplan covering each year of the project.

The EPA anticipates awarding approximately four assistance agreements under National Priority Area 1, ranging from approximately \$1,000,000 to no more than \$1,187,500. It is anticipated that the total amount of all awards under National Priority Area 1 will be approximately \$4,750,000 in federal funds, with project periods of one to four years, depending on the amount requested and the overall size and scope of the project(s).

The EPA anticipates awarding approximately two assistance agreements under National Priority Area 2 ranging from approximately \$2,000,000 to no more than \$2,375,000. It is anticipated that the total amount of all awards under National Priority Area 2 will be approximately \$4,750,000 in federal funds, with project periods of one to four years, depending on the amount requested and the overall size and scope of the project(s).

SDWA 1459F(f)2 authorizes 50 percent of the total amount of federal funding available under this announcement to be awarded to eligible midsize community water systems, and 50 percent of the total amount of federal funding available under this announcement to be awarded to eligible large size community water systems. It is anticipated that a total of six assistance agreements, each with a project period of up to four years, will be awarded under this announcement.

EPA reserves the right to partially fund applications by funding discrete portions or phases of proposed projects. If EPA decides to partially fund an application, it will do so in a manner that does not prejudice

any applicants or affect the basis upon which the application was evaluated and selected for award to maintain the integrity of the competition and selection process.

Selection or award of funding under this NOFO is not a guarantee of future funding. EPA reserves the right to make additional awards under this announcement if additional funding becomes available after the original selections are made. Any additional selections for awards will be made no later than 6 months after the original selection decisions.

2. Eligibility

A. Eligible Applicants

Only these types of organizations may apply:

- A public water system that serves a community with a population of 10,000 or more.

The Safe Drinking Water Act 42 USC Section 300f(4)(A) defines a public water system as, “a system for the provision to the public of water for human consumption through pipes or other constructed conveyances, if such system has at least fifteen service connections or regularly serves at least twenty-five individuals. Such term includes (i) any collection, treatment, storage, and distribution facilities under control of the operator of such system and used primarily in connection with such system, and (ii) any collection or pretreatment storage facilities not under such control which are used primarily in connection with such system.”

(1) Other Eligibility Requirements

Applications must meet the following threshold criteria to be considered eligible:

- An applicant must meet the eligibility requirements in [Section 2](#) of this announcement at the time of application submission.
- Applicants must demonstrate in their application how they will meet the minimum cost share requirement of 10% of the total project cost (federal plus non-federal match) for the project.
- Applications must address one, and only one, of the two National Priority Areas listed in [Section 3](#). Applications that address more than one National Priority Areas in a single application will not be reviewed.
- Applications for awards under National Priority Area 1 cannot request more than \$1,187,500 in federal funds; and applications for awards under National Priority Area 2 cannot request more than \$2,375,000 in federal funds. Applications that request more than the maximum amount of federal funds for the National Priority Area it addresses will not be reviewed.
- Applications must address at least one program or project for increasing drinking water system resilience to natural hazards, extreme weather events, or reducing cybersecurity vulnerabilities, as described in [Section 3](#). Funding must be used for the planning, design, construction, implementation, operation, or maintenance of a program or project that

increases resilience of drinking water systems to natural hazards and extreme weather events or reduces cybersecurity vulnerabilities.

- Applications must include a description of the natural hazard risk(s), extreme weather event(s), or potential cybersecurity vulnerabilities to be addressed by the proposed program or project.
- Applications must include documentation prepared by a Federal, State, regional, or local government agency of the natural hazard risk, risk for extreme weather events, or potential cybersecurity vulnerability to the area where the proposed program or project is to be located.
- Applications must include a description and the date(s) of any recent natural hazards, extreme weather events, or cybersecurity events that have affected the water system. Applicants that have not experienced a recent natural hazard, extreme weather event, or cybersecurity event must indicate that in the application and may describe, if applicable, their assessment of potential future risks of natural hazards, extreme weather events, or cybersecurity events, that may affect the water system.
- Applications must include a description of how the proposed program or project would improve the performance of the public water system under the anticipated natural hazards, extreme weather events, and cybersecurity vulnerabilities.
- Applications must include an explanation of how the proposed program or project is expected to enhance the resilience of the public water system to the anticipated natural hazards or extreme weather events, or to reduce cybersecurity vulnerabilities.
- Applications must demonstrate that proposed projects will occur in communities with a population of 10,000 individuals or more.
- Applications must **substantially comply** with the application submission instructions and requirements set forth in [Section 5](#) of this announcement or else they will be rejected. However, where a page limit is expressed in [Section 4](#) with respect to the application, or parts thereof, pages in excess of the page limitation will not be reviewed. Section 4 establishes a 15-page, single-spaced Project Narrative page limit. Applicants are advised that readability is of paramount importance and should take precedence in application format, including selecting a legible font type and size for use in the application.
- If an application is submitted that includes any ineligible tasks or activities, that portion of the application will be ineligible for funding and may, depending on the extent to which it affects the application, render the entire application ineligible for funding.

Please see [Section 6](#) for additional threshold criteria.

B. Cost Sharing

Applicants must demonstrate in their proposal how it will meet the minimum cost share requirement of 10% of the total project cost (federal plus non-federal match) to be considered eligible. Selected

recipients must comply with [2 CFR 200.306](#) when meeting a cost share requirement. All grant funds are subject to federal audit. Any restrictions on the use of grant funds also apply to the use of cost-share/match. **Applicants that do not demonstrate how they will meet the minimum cost-share/match requirement in their application submission will not be considered for funding.**

3. Program Description

A. Purpose, Priorities, and Activities

Purpose: The purpose of this funding opportunity is to support infrastructure projects that increase the resilience of midsize and large drinking water systems to natural hazards, extreme weather events, and that reduce cybersecurity threats. This program aims to enhance the ability of a public water system to prepare for and withstand the effects of natural hazards, extreme weather events, and cyber security threats.

Program Office Priorities: The EPA's Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water's (OGWDW) mission is to protect public health and the environment by ensuring safe drinking water and protecting sources of drinking water, including groundwater. Awards made through this funding opportunity will increase the ability of Americans to access clean and safe drinking water, support states who share responsibility for ensuring safe drinking water through cooperative federalism, and will strengthen the cybersecurity of water systems through the incorporation of modern technologies which may include artificial intelligence. These activities will ensure that water facilities can be operated in a clean and efficient manner with American-made resources.

B. Program Goals and Objectives

The activities to be funded under this funding announcement support Pillar 1: Clean Air, Land, and Water for Every American, sub pillar 1 C. Water, Pillar 3: Permitting Reform, Cooperative Federalism, and Cross-Agency Partnership, and Pillar 4: Make the United States the Artificial Intelligence Capital of the World of Administrator Zeldin's Five Pillars. All applications must be for projects that support the pillars identified above.

This Notice of Funding Opportunity is being offered under Federal Assistance Listing 66.488.

The EPA is soliciting applications from eligible public water systems for projects in midsize and large communities that serve a population of 10,000 or more individuals to increase drinking water system resilience to natural hazards, extreme weather events, and reduce cybersecurity vulnerabilities.

For the purposes of this grant program, the term "resilience," as defined in Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) section 1433(h), means the ability of a community water system or an asset of a community water system, for example the equipment, buildings, land, people, and other components needed to deliver safe and clean water, to adapt to or withstand the effects of a natural hazard without interruption to the corresponding function, or if the function is interrupted, to rapidly return to a normal operating condition. The term "natural hazard" means a natural event, such as an earthquake, tornado, flood, hurricane, wildfire, drought, freezing or hydrologic change that threatens the functioning of a community water system, as defined in Section 1433(h) of the SDWA. A midsize community is identified in Section 1459F(f)(2) of the SDWA as one that has a population of equal to or greater than 10,000 individuals and fewer than 100,000 individuals, and a large community is identified as one that has a population equal to or greater than 100,000 individuals.

When considering natural disasters, extreme weather events, and cybersecurity threats, a public water system may consider and ensure that resilience-building activities address future conditions, such as: increasing or decreasing temperatures, changes in precipitation, and, where applicable, sea-level rise. Projects must also occur in communities with a population of 10,000 people or more.

There are two National Priority Areas in which applicants may apply for funding under this opportunity. The goal of the first National Priority Area is to increase drinking water system resilience in midsize communities by implementing resilience projects informed by drinking water system plans. The goal of the second National Priority Area is to improve drinking water system resilience in large communities by implementing resilience projects that may include infrastructure improvements and/or optimization of mitigation measures at a drinking water system.

National Priority Areas

Each application submitted under this announcement must address one, and only one, of the National Priority Areas described below. The cover page of each application package must clearly indicate the National Priority Area addressed in the application. If an applicant submits an application addressing more than one National Priority Area, it will be rejected.

Regardless of which National Priority Area is being applied to, applications submitted under this announcement must address at least one of the activities described below. The cover page of the application package must clearly indicate the activities being proposed for funding in the application.

As prescribed by SDWA 1459F, funding must be used for the planning, design, construction, implementation, operation, or maintenance of a program or project that increases resilience of public water systems to natural hazards and extreme weather events or reduces cybersecurity vulnerabilities. Examples of possible projects include, but are not limited to the following:

- Conservation of water or the enhancement of water use efficiency (e.g., conducting water audits, installing water metering, and water reuse).
- Modification or relocation of existing drinking water system infrastructure made, or that is at risk of being significantly impaired by natural hazards or extreme weather events, including risks to drinking water from flooding; (e.g., building flood protection infrastructure, elevation of electrical panels at a lift station to prevent flooding damage, physical hardening, elevation of treatment plants, and reinforcement of water towers to prevent tornado damage).
- Design or construction of new or modified desalination facilities to serve existing communities.
- Enhancement of water supply through watershed management and source water protection (e.g., developing and implementing watershed plans, conducting source water assessments, and public education).
- Enhancement of energy efficiency in the conveyance or treatment of drinking water (e.g., energy use monitoring, energy audits, and technology upgrades).
- Development and implementation of measures to increase the resilience of the drinking water system to natural hazards and extreme weather events; or to reduce cybersecurity vulnerabilities (e.g., conducting cyber risk assessment and implementing priority cybersecurity practices, infrastructure and technological improvements, larger capacity water storage tanks, relocation or deepening of wells, updating extreme weather or natural disaster risk and

resilience assessments, and improving emergency response plans based on the findings of a risk and resilience assessment).

- Formation of regional water partnerships to collaboratively address documented water shortages (e.g., informal or formal agreement between two or more public water systems to address shared drinking water system issues of drought, flooding, contamination, etc.).

To obtain necessary support for the anticipated resiliency projects in a community, public education and outreach about the effects of natural hazards, extreme weather events and cybersecurity vulnerabilities on the access to and availability of safe drinking water is critical. It is also important for the grantee to inform the community members about drinking water resiliency projects prior to the start of the project and provide updates as the project proceeds. All applications should describe the proposed approach to provide public education and conduct outreach.

National Priority Area 1: Midsize Community Infrastructure Investments for Drinking Water System Resilience

Under this National Priority Area, the EPA is soliciting applications from public water systems that serve communities with a population between 10,000 and 100,000 individuals for projects that enable midsize drinking water systems to implement measures to improve resiliency.

National Priority Area 2: Large Community Infrastructure Investments for Drinking Water System Resilience

Under this National Priority Area, the EPA is soliciting applications from public water systems that serve communities with a population of 100,000 individuals or more for projects that enable large drinking water systems to implement measures to improve resiliency.

Examples of Eligible Activities for both National Priority Areas

Examples of eligible activities under various types of natural hazards, extreme weather events, and cybersecurity vulnerabilities include, but are not limited to, the following:

Multiple Threats

- Training and exercising an emergency response plan;
- Measures to address power outages (e.g., defining power needs for key assets, purchasing a backup power generator, and securing generators to mitigate hazard activity);
- Measures to reinforce incoming power supply and plan or establish alternate or on-site power supply;
- Diversify options for water supply and expand current sources such as through design or construction of a water reuse or desalination facility; and
- Source water protection planning (e.g., public education and watershed conservation initiatives, application of best management practices, or land use restrictions measures).

Cybersecurity Vulnerabilities

- Implementing or updating drinking water system operation technology (e.g., bolstering of Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA), Human Machine Interface (HMI), programmable logic controllers (PLCs) or Remote Terminal Unit (RTU) systems);
- Implementing or updating physical security to protect facility and IT assets (e.g., installation of locks, doors, video cameras, etc.);
- Implementing or updating cybersecurity measures to protect drinking water system cyber assets and network(s) (e.g. installation of cyber locks, multifactor authentication, firewalls, virtual private networks and segmentation);
- Implementing, developing, and/or redeveloping drinking water system cyber security best practices (e.g., establishment of offsite back-ups of critical data, development of an incident response plan, and incident action checklist); and
- Staff cybersecurity awareness training.

Flooding

- Physical hardening (e.g., waterproofing electrical components, dry floodproofing/sealing of structures to prevent floodwater penetration, installing wind resistant features);
- Installation of flap valves on low-lying overflow pipes to protect finished water;
- Securing or elevating chemical/air tanks to prevent floating and content release;
- Elevating, relocating or floodproofing instrumentation, electrical controls, pumps; and
- Moving assets to higher ground and developing alternative ways to access facilities, or building flood barriers such as berms, levees, dikes, and seawalls to protect critical infrastructure.

Earthquake

- Performing an engineering risk analysis and cost estimates pursuant to established standards for evaluating existing structures;
- Retrofitting occupied utility buildings to prevent collapse;
- Seismically retrofitting water tanks (e.g., anchoring to foundations);
- Installing automatic shutoff valves on tanks; and
- Designing upper casing on wells to resist loads or locating outside of a seismic zone.

Drought

- Implementing a leak detection and repair program to reduce lost water;
- Interconnecting with other water systems and water reuse;
- Adding raw water storage and aquifer recharge;
- Developing a conservation program with public outreach; and
- Coordinating water usage with neighboring irrigation districts and communities.

Wildfire

- Instituting high fire danger procedures such as smoking bans and fire bans;
- Removing fuel sources (brush/trees) to create a buffer zone around utility infrastructure;
- Installing fire-resilient building materials;
- Installing backflow valves on service connections, fireproof concrete meter boxes, and brass meters to prevent contamination of distribution pipes; and
- Installing water lines at greater depths and upgrading to hardened materials.

Tornado

- Designing new facilities, control rooms and offices to withstand high winds;
- Reinforcing water tower legs and welds;
- Removing sources of potential flying debris and bolting down chemical tanks; and
- Securing and anchoring any trailers or temporary structures.

Extreme Weather Events

- Preparation of risk assessments and extreme weather event projection mapping;
- Implementation of inclement weather or water system disruption communications alert system; and
- Development of hazard mitigation plans for extreme weather events.

EPA's [Hazard Mitigation Guide for Natural Disasters for Water and Wastewater Utilities](#) is a useful resource for identifying a range of practical examples of mitigation projects to address the impacts of earthquakes, tornados, floods, drought, wildfires and power outages. EPA's [Cybersecurity for the Water Sector](#) guidance website can assist communities with identifying and implementing cyber security enhancement strategies at various scales of their water systems.

Results

Applicants are required to describe how the requested funding will help EPA achieve outputs and outcomes in their responses to the criteria in Section 6. Outputs and outcomes specific to each project will be identified as deliverables in the negotiated workplan if the application is selected for award. Recipients will be expected to report progress toward the attainment of expected project outputs and outcomes during the project performance period. Outputs and outcomes are defined as follows:

Outputs

The EPA requires that grant applicants adequately describe environmental outputs and outcomes to be achieved under assistance agreements (see EPA Order 5700.7A1, Environmental Results under Assistance Agreements, <https://www.epa.gov/grants/epa-order-57007a1-epas-policy-environmental-results-under-epa-assistance-agreements>). Environmental outputs (or deliverables) refer to an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work product related to an environmental goal or objective, that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period. Examples of anticipated environmental outputs from the grants expected to be awarded under this announcement may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- An increased number of public water systems in communities with a population of 10,000 individuals or more that are resilient and ready for extreme weather events, natural disasters, and cybersecurity attacks. This includes, but is not limited to, more systems with updated emergency response plans that outline their water systems' preparedness and responses to natural hazards, adverse weather events and cybersecurity attacks.
- An increased number of customers in communities with a population of 10,000 individuals or more with information about drinking water conservation measures, achieved through outreach and public education.

- An increased number of public water systems in communities with a population of 10,000 individuals or more with bolstered systems and assets, such as improved Operational Technology (OT) and Information Technology (IT) networks, that are resilient to cybersecurity threats and attacks.

Outcomes

Environmental outcomes are the result, effect or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic in nature. Outcomes should be quantitative and may not necessarily be achieved within an assistance agreement funding period. Outcomes may be short-term (changes in behavior, practice, or decisions), intermediate (changes in behavior, practice, or decisions), or long-term (changes in condition of the natural resource). Examples of anticipated outcomes from grants expected to be awarded under this announcement, may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Decrease in average water usage rates indicating enhanced sustainability and effective use of water resources due to implementation of water reuse measures.
- Percentage decrease in operation and maintenance costs of a public water system in a mid-sized or large community due to more energy-efficient water production.
- Number of customers with increased access to drinking water services; acreage of expanded flood control and water supply infrastructure; and quantity of improved water strategies that impact affected community(ies), especially during water- and extreme weather-related events.

C. Statutory Authority

The statutory authority for the awards expected to be made under this announcement is Section 1459F of the SDWA and Assistance Listing 6.488, which authorizes the EPA to provide grants to assist communities with a population of 10,000 individuals or more to increase their drinking water system resilience to natural hazards and extreme weather events, and reduce cybersecurity vulnerabilities. (42 USC 300j-19g)

D. Funding Type

It is anticipated that grants will be funded under this funding opportunity.

4. Application Contents and Format

A. Application Forms

The following forms and documents are required under this announcement:

Mandatory Documents:

1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF-424)
2. Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF-424A)
3. EPA Key Contacts Form 5700-54

4. EPA Form 4700-4 Preaward Compliance Review Report
5. Project Narrative Attachment Form: use this to submit your Project Narrative
6. Documentation prepared by a Federal, State, regional, or local government agency of the natural hazard risk, potential cybersecurity vulnerability, or risk for extreme weather events to the area where the proposed program or project is to be located (Project Narrative Attachment Form) - not included in the 15-page Project Narrative page limitation

Optional Documents:

7. Other Attachments Form – Biographical Sketches
8. Other Attachments Form – Negotiated Indirect Cost Rate Agreement, if applicable
9. Other Attachments Form – Supporting documentation demonstrating readiness to proceed, such as permits, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations necessary to carry out the project or activity.

Project Narrative

The Project Narrative must include sections a-c below. The Project Narrative (covering sections a-c below) is limited to no more than fifteen (15) typewritten, single spaced 8.5x11-inch pages (a page is one side of a piece of paper) including the cover page and executive summary. Pages should be consecutively numbered for ease of reading. It is recommended that applicants use no smaller than a 11-point Times New Roman font with 1-inch margins. Readability is of paramount importance. Do not use a “double column” (aka newspaper) format. Do not include more than one application in any file. Additional pages beyond the 15-page limit will not be considered.

The following documents do not count towards the 15-page Project Narrative limitation. These include, as mentioned in Section 4.A., numbers 6-9 (6. Supporting documentation of the known natural hazard, potential cybersecurity vulnerability, or risk for extreme weather events, 7. Biographical Sketches, 8. Negotiated Indirect Rate Cost Agreement, and 9. Supporting documentation demonstrating readiness to proceed)

The application’s Project Narrative must be typewritten and must include the information listed below. If a particular item is not applicable, clearly state this in the Project Narrative.

1. Cover Page (included in the page limit)

- a) Funding Opportunity Number. The NOFO number is EPA-OW-OGWDW-25-01.
- b) Project Title
- c) Applicant Information: Include applicant (organization) name, address, contact person, phone number, and e-mail address. *Do not include private information.*
- d) National Priority Area from Section 3 addressed in the application (applicants must address only one National Priority Area per application package).
- e) Short 2-3 sentence description of the proposed program or project with identification of the natural hazard, extreme weather event or cybersecurity vulnerability to be addressed.
- f) Proposed Funding Request: The total dollar amount requested from EPA - make sure it is within the limits specified or your application will be rejected.

2. Executive Summary: Provide a brief summary of the proposed project (should not exceed one page). This should include a brief description of the proposed project and the anticipated environmental outputs and outcomes.

3. Workplan: The workplan must address the following elements:

a) Project Description:

Describe your approach for increasing drinking water system resilience to natural hazards, extreme weather events or reducing cybersecurity vulnerabilities in a community with a population of 10,000 individuals or more, through one or more of the eligible programs or projects described in this announcement (see Sections I.B and I.C). Provide details indicating how the community served meets the criteria of a population of 10,000 individuals or more. Describe the program or project to be planned, designed, constructed, implemented, operated, or maintained and the natural hazard risk, extreme weather event, or cybersecurity vulnerability to be addressed, and if there have been any recent natural hazard events, extreme weather events or cybersecurity vulnerabilities that have affected the system. Explain how the project supports improving the performance of the drinking water system and increasing the resilience of the drinking water system to anticipated natural hazards, extreme weather events, or cybersecurity vulnerabilities. Describe the approach to provide public education and conduct outreach. Describe how the proposed project benefits the midsize or large community.

b) Expeditious Project Readiness to Proceed:

Demonstrate that the project will be ready to proceed expeditiously upon award of funding. Describe past and current practices being implemented to increase the resilience to natural hazards, extreme weather events or to reduce cybersecurity vulnerabilities of public water systems. Describe the completed project planning and design phases if relevant. As appropriate, demonstrate that any land, easements, rights-of-way, and relocations necessary to carry out the project or activity have been obtained.

Submission of supporting documentation demonstrating this readiness to proceed may be included as optional attachments and are not subject to the Project Narrative page limitation.

c) Environmental Results and Measuring Progress:

- i. Stated Objective – List the objective of the project.
- ii. Results of Activities (Outputs) - Describe the anticipated products/results which are expected to be achieved from accomplishment of the project and describe an approach for tracking and reporting your progress toward achieving the expected project output(s) (examples of outputs can be found in Section 3 of this announcement).
- iii. Projected Environmental Improvement (Outcomes) - List the anticipated environmental improvements that will be accomplished as a result of the project. These improvements are changes or benefits to the environment or public health which are a result of the accomplishment of the work plan commitments and outputs. Describe an approach for tracking and reporting progress toward achieving the expected project outcome(s) (examples of outcomes can be found in Section 3 of this announcement).

d) Milestone Schedule:

Provide a projected milestone schedule for the proposed project period (one to four years). The milestone schedule should provide a breakout of the project activities into phases with associated tasks and a timeframe for completion of tasks and an approach for ensuring that awarded funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. The project start date will follow award acceptance by the successful applicant.

e) Detailed Budget Narrative:

Provide a detailed budget and estimated funding amounts for each project component/task. This section provides an opportunity for a narrative description of the budget or aspects of the budget found in the SF-424A such as “other” and “contractual.” Please see [EPA’s Budget Development Guidance](#) which includes a sample budget.

- i. Applicants must itemize costs related to personnel, fringe benefits, contractual costs, travel, equipment, supplies, other direct costs, indirect costs and total cost. All subgrant funding should be located in the “other” cost category. Total costs must include both federal and any non-federal funds; indicate what portion of the cost will be paid by EPA and what portion of the cost will be paid with non-federal funds, if any. Describe itemized costs in sufficient detail for EPA to determine the allowability of costs for each project component/task, as well as the cost-effectiveness and reasonableness of all costs.

f) Programmatic Capability/Experience:

- i. Organizational Experience - Provide a brief description of your organization and experience related to the proposed project, and your organization’s infrastructure as it relates to its ability to successfully implement the proposed project.
- ii. Staff Expertise/Qualifications - Provide a list of key staff and briefly describe their experience/expertise/qualifications, knowledge, and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project, including demonstrated knowledge of state and local regulations and policies relevant to the program or project. Include an estimate of the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) workers (based on 2080 hours per year/FTE). A biographical sketch must be submitted for each major project manager, support staff member or other major project participant. Biographical sketches are not counted in the page limit. Full resumes may be included as an appendix to the application narrative and are not counted in the page limit.

g) Past Performance:

Briefly describe federally funded and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include grants and cooperative agreements but not contracts) that your organization performed within the last three years (no more than five agreements, and preferably EPA agreements) and:

- i. Describe whether, and how, you were able to successfully complete and manage those agreements.
- ii. Describe your history of meeting the reporting requirements under those agreements including submitting acceptable final technical reports.
- iii. Describe how you documented and/or reported on whether you were making progress towards achieving the expected results (i.e., outputs and outcomes) under

those agreements. If you were not making progress, please indicate whether, and how, you documented why not.

Note: In evaluating an applicant's past performance, the Agency will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and/or from current and prior federal agency grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information provided by the applicant). If you do not have any relevant or available past performance information, please indicate this in the application, and you will receive a neutral score for these factors under Section 6. Failure to provide any programmatic past performance or reporting information, or to include a statement that you do not have any relevant or available past performance or reporting information, may result in a zero score for these factors (see also Section 6).

h) Documentation of the known natural hazard, potential cybersecurity vulnerability, or risk for extreme weather events (not included in the 15-page Project Narrative page limitation):

Submit documentation prepared by a prepared by a Federal, State, regional, or local government agency of the natural hazard risk, potential cybersecurity vulnerability, or risk for extreme weather events to the area where the proposed program or project is to be located. Examples of documentation include, but are not limited to, evidence of a disaster declaration, local government hazard mitigation planning document, FEMA flood map, Federal Flood Risk Management Standard, or USGS earthquake hazard map. This documentation is to be submitted separately using a Project Narrative Attachment form. The documentation is not subject to the Project Narrative page limitations specified for the application.

i) Quality Assurance/Quality Control (not included in the Project Narrative work plan page limit):

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) (not included in the page limit) – If you plan to collect or use environmental data or information, explain how you will comply with the Quality Assurance/Quality Control requirements (see Section 4.E. Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) of this announcement for additional information.)

Note: The applicant should also provide in the Project Narrative any additional information, to the extent not already addressed above, that addresses the review criteria in Section 6.

B. Applicants Using Contractors

Applicants must compete contracts for services and products, including consultant contracts, and conduct cost and price analyses, to the extent required by the [procurement provisions](#) of the regulations at 2 CFR Part 200.

Do not name a procurement contractor (including a consultant) as a “partner” or otherwise in your application unless the contractor has been selected in compliance with competitive procurement requirements. If an applicant selected for award has named a specific subrecipient, contractor, or

consultant in the application, it does not relieve the applicant of its obligations to comply with subaward and/or competitive procurement requirements.

The EPA will not consider the qualifications, experience, and expertise of named subrecipients and/or named contractor(s) during the application evaluation process unless the applicant provides documentation that it has complied with these requirements.

For additional guidance, applicants should review [EPA's Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements](#), [EPA's Subaward Policy](#), and [EPA's Subaward Policy Frequent Questions](#). The EPA expects recipients of funding to comply with competitive procurement contracting requirements in 2 CFR Parts 200 and 1500 as well as the EPA's rule on Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in EPA Programs in 40 CFR Part 33.

Applicants should:

- clearly indicate which portion(s) of the application are confidential, privileged, or sensitive information, or
- state 'n/a' or 'not applicable' if the application does not have confidential, privileged, or sensitive information;
- not include trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is confidential or privileged, or sensitive information that would invade another individual's personal privacy (e.g., an individual's salary, personal email addresses, etc.);
- be aware that if such information is included, it will be treated in accordance with 40 CFR § 2.203.

C. Release Copies of Applications

EPA recommends that applicants do not include confidential business information (CBI) in applications. However, if CBI is included, it will be treated in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2, Subpart B. Applicants must clearly indicate which portion(s) of their application they are claiming as CBI. EPA will evaluate such claims in accordance with 40 CFR Part 2. If no claim of confidentiality is made, information may be made available to the public by EPA without further notice to the applicant. See 40 CFR 2.203(a), 41 Fed. Reg. 36,907.

D. Coalition Coverage

A coalition is formed when two or more eligible applicants coordinate to submit a single application. Coalitions must identify which single eligible organization will be the recipient of the grant and which eligible organization(s) will receive subawards from the recipient (the "pass-through entity"). The pass-through entity that administers the grant and subawards will be accountable to the EPA for proper expenditure of the funds and reporting and will be the point of contact for the coalition. Subawards must be consistent with the definition of that term in [2 CFR 200.1](#) and comply with the [EPA's Subaward Policy](#).

E. Other Program Specific Application Information

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC)

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) requirements may apply to these grants ([see 2 CFR 1500.12](#)). QA/QC requirements apply to the collection of environmental data. Environmental data are any measurements or information that describe environmental processes, location, or conditions; ecological

or health effects and consequences; or the performance of environmental technology. Environmental data include information collected directly from measurements, produced from models, and compiled from other sources such as databases or literature. Successful applicants should allow enough time and resources for this process. EPA can assist successful applicants in determining whether QA/QC is required for the proposed project. If QA/QC is required for the project, the successful applicant may work with EPA QA/QC staff to determine the appropriate QA/QC practices for the project. The Agency's [Enterprise Quality Management Division \(EQMD\)](#) webpage contains information, including documents to assist in the development and implementation of a suitable Quality System. For further information, see [Section J, Agency Contact for Agency Contact information for referral to an EPA QA/QC staff.](#)

Successful applicants must ensure all water quality data generated in accordance with an EPA approved Quality Assurance Project Plan, either directly or by subaward, are transmitted into the Agency's Water Quality Exchange (WQX) data system (formerly known as STORET) annually or by project completion. More information about WQX and WQXweb, including tutorials, can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/waterdata/water-quality-data-wqx>.

Data Sharing

All recipients of these assistance agreements may be required to share any data generated through this funding agreement as a defined deliverable in the final workplan.

Compliance with other applicable statutes, regulations, and policies

If proposals include the use of funds for an infrastructure project located in the United States, all iron, steel, manufactured goods, and construction materials must be domestically made. This is a requirement under the Build America, Buy America Act. Applicants should direct questions about this requirement to the EPA Contact listed funding opportunity. For more information on Build America provisions and requirement, please visit [EPA's Build America, Buy America website](#).

5. Submission Requirements and Deadlines

A. Submission Dates and Times

September 5, 2025	NOFO Questions Submission Deadline
October 6, 2025 11:59 pm ET	Application Submission Deadline
October 6, 2025 11:59 pm ET	Application Submission Deadline (Local Time)

Grants.gov creates a date and time record when it receives the application. If you submit the same application more than once, we will accept the last on-time submission.

B. Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) and System for Award Management (SAM.gov)

SAM.gov

You must have an active account with SAM.gov. SAM.gov will provide a UEI for your organization, which is required to apply for grants using Grants.gov. To register, go to [SAM.gov Entity Registration](#) and click Get Started. From the same page, you can also click on the [Entity Registration Checklist](#) for the information you will need to register. Make sure you are current with SAM.gov and UEI requirements before applying for the award.

SAM.gov registration can take several weeks. [Begin that process today.](#)

Grants.gov

You must also have an active account with [Grants.gov](#). You can see step-by-step instructions at the Grants.gov [Quick Start Guide for Applicants](#).

Please visit [How to Register to Apply for Grants](#) for additional information.

C. Submission Instructions

You must submit your application through Grants.gov. See Section 5.B. above for information on getting registered.

Important tips:

- To begin the application process under this grant announcement, go to Grants.gov and click the red “Apply” button at the top of the view grant opportunity page associated with this opportunity.
- See the Quick Start Guide for Applicants for instructions on how to submit.
- Make sure your application passes the Grants.gov validation checks.
- Do not encrypt, zip, or password protect any files.
- Your application must be submitted by an official representative of your organization who is registered with Grants.gov and is authorized to sign applications for Federal financial assistance.
- If you receive an error or the button is grayed out, it may be because you do not have the appropriate role to submit in your organization. Contact your organization’s EBiz point of contact or contact Grants.gov for assistance at 1-800-518-4726 or support@grants.gov.
- See Grants.gov Errors for information on other Grants.gov errors.
- The UEI listed on the application must be registered to the applicant organization's SAM.gov account. If not, the application may be deemed ineligible.

D. Technical Issues with Submission

If applicants experience technical issues during the submission of an application that they are unable to resolve, follow these procedures **before** the application deadline date:

- Contact Grants.gov Support Center before the application deadline date.
- Document the Grants.gov ticket/case number.
- Send an email with the funding opportunity number: EPA-OW-OGWDW-25-01 in the subject line to Resiliencygrant@epa.gov before the application deadline time and date and must include the following:

- Grants.gov ticket/case number(s)
- Description of the issue
- The entire application package in PDF format.

Without this information, the EPA may not be able to consider applications submitted outside of Grants.gov. Any application submitted after the application deadline time and date deadline will be deemed ineligible and **not** be considered.

Please note that successful submission through Grants.gov or email does not necessarily mean your application is eligible for award.

E. Intergovernmental Review

You will need to submit application information for [Intergovernmental Review](#) under Executive Order 12372. Under this order, states may design their own processes for obtaining, reviewing, and commenting on some applications. Some states have this process and others don't.

To find out your state's approach, see the [list of state single points of contact](#). If you find a contact on the list for your state, contact them as soon as you can to learn their process. If you do not find a contact for your state, contact the [Regional Grants Office](#) for further instruction.

This requirement never applies to American Indian and Alaska Native Tribes or tribal organizations.

6. Application Review Information

A. Responsiveness Review

Applications must meet the threshold criteria requirements described in [Section 2](#) to be evaluated. Applicants not meeting these requirements will be deemed ineligible and will be notified within 15 calendar days of the determination.

- Applications must adhere to the page limit requirements. Any pages over the limit(s) in [Section 4](#) will not be reviewed.
- Initial applications must be submitted *on or before* the application deadline through Grants.gov or through limited circumstances as expressed in [Section 5](#). The EPA will not evaluate applications that are not submitted on time.
- *Technical difficulties applying:* Applicants having technical difficulties applying must contact the Grants.gov hotline at 1-800-518-4726 *and* then must email a PDF of the full application to the EPA contact listed in [Section 1](#). The submission must be received prior to the application deadline for consideration.

B. Review Criteria

Only eligible entities whose applications meet the threshold criteria in Section 2 of this announcement will be evaluated. Applicants should explicitly address these criteria as part of their application package submittal in the project narrative. Each application will be rated using a point system. Applications will be evaluated based on a total of 100 possible points.

Criteria Name and Description	Points
Total Possible Points	100
<p><u>National Priority Area:</u> Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability and approach for increasing drinking water system resilience to natural hazards and extreme weather events, or reducing cybersecurity vulnerabilities through effectively addressing the National Priority Area in Section 3 of this announcement. In conducting this evaluation, the following factors will be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The extent and quality of the overall approach to addressing drinking water system resilience to natural hazards and extreme weather events or reducing cybersecurity vulnerabilities. (13 points) ii. Description of the public water system serving 10,000 individuals or more to benefit from the proposed program or project. (5 points) iii. Description of the natural hazard risk(s), extreme weather events or potential cybersecurity vulnerabilities to be addressed by the proposed program or project, including any recent natural hazards, cybersecurity events, or extreme weather events, if applicable, that have affected the water system. (5 points) iv. Description of how the proposed program or project would improve the performance of the drinking water system under the anticipated natural hazard(s), cybersecurity vulnerabilities, or extreme weather event(s). (4 points) v. The extent and quality to which the application demonstrates plans to provide public education and conduct outreach. (4 points) vi. The degree to which the proposed program or project will benefit the midsize or large community. (4 points) 	35
<p><u>Expeditious Project Readiness to Proceed:</u> Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their approach to proceeding expeditiously to implement the project upon award taking into account the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The extent and quality to which the application describes past and current practices being implemented to increase the resilience to natural hazards and extreme weather events, or to reduce cybersecurity vulnerabilities of public water systems. (5 points) ii. The extent and quality to which the applicant demonstrates completion of planning and design, and securement of necessary approvals to proceed expeditiously. (10 points) 	15

<p><u>Environmental Results and Measuring Progress:</u> Applications will be evaluated based on each of these sub-criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The extent and quality to which the application demonstrates the potential to achieve environmental results, and anticipated outputs and outcomes. (5 points) ii. The extent and quality to which the application demonstrates a sound plan for measuring and tracking progress toward achieving the anticipated outputs and outcomes (examples of outputs and outcomes can be found in Section 3 of this announcement). (5 points) 	10
<p><u>Milestone Schedule/Detailed Budget:</u> Applications will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which the application addresses each of the following sub-criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Applicants will be evaluated based on the adequacy and completeness of the milestone schedule, including timeframes and major milestones to complete significant project tasks, and applicants will be evaluated based on their approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. (8 points) ii. The reasonableness and transparency of the budget and estimated funding amounts for each project component/task. Applicants will be evaluated based on the adequacy of the information provided in a detailed budget breakdown and whether the proposed costs are reasonable and allowable. Total costs include both federal and cost-share/match (non-federal) components. The cost-effectiveness and reasonableness of all costs (both federal and non-federal components) will also be evaluated. (7 points) 	15
<p><u>Programmatic Capability/Experience:</u> Under this criterion, applications will be evaluated based on the applicant’s ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project considering their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Organizational experience related to the proposed project, and their organizational infrastructure as it relates to the ability to successfully implement the proposed project. (8 points) ii. Staff expertise/qualifications/knowledge and resources or the ability to obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the project. (7 points) 	15
<p><u>Past Performance:</u> Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed project considering their:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Past performance in successfully completing and managing federally funded and/or non-federally funded assistance agreements 	10

<p>(assistance agreements include grants and cooperative agreements but not contracts) performed within the last three years (no more than five agreements, and preferably EPA agreements). (4 points)</p> <p>ii. History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section 6 of the funding opportunity including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements and if such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. (2 points)</p> <p>iii. The extent and quality to which the applicant adequately documented and/or reported on their progress towards achieving the expected results (e.g., outputs and outcomes) under federally funded and/or non- federally funded assistance agreements (assistance agreements include grants and cooperative agreements but not contracts) performed within the last three years (no more than five agreements, and preferably EPA agreements), and if such progress was not being made, whether the applicant adequately documented and/or reported why not. (4 points)</p> <p>Note: In evaluating applicants under i., ii., and iii. above, the EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources including Agency files and/or prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). Applicants with no relevant or available past performance information or reporting history must indicate that in the application and they will receive a neutral score (half of the points) for the factor (i.e., 2 points for item i., 1 point for item ii., and 2 points for item iii.</p> <p>Failure to provide any past performance information, or to include a statement that you do not have any relevant or available past performance information, may result in a zero score for the factor (i.e., 0 points for item i., 0 points for item ii., and 0 points for item iii.</p>	
--	--

Applicants will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which they demonstrate that they have the capability to successfully perform the project as described in [Section 3](#) of this funding opportunity.

C. Review and Selection Process

All applications received via [Grants.gov](https://www.grants.gov) by the submission deadline will first be screened by EPA staff against the threshold criteria in [Section 2](#) of the announcement. Applications that do not pass the threshold review will not be evaluated further or considered for funding.

A panel(s) comprised of EPA staff will review the eligible applications based on the evaluation criteria listed in [Section 6](#) Two separate ranking lists, one per National Priority Area, will be developed based on

the panel evaluations. The ranking list for each National Priority Area will be provided to the Selection Official(s) who make(s) the final funding decisions. As noted above, while the EPA intends to make awards in each National Priority Area it reserves the right not to do so and to redistribute the number of awards per area.

Other Evaluation Factors

In making the final funding decisions, for each National Priority Area, the Selection Official(s) will consider the application score/ranking and may also take into account geographic distribution.

D. Risk Review

The EPA will consider any comments by the applicant, along with information available in the responsibility/qualification records in SAM.gov., when doing the risk review as required by [2 CFR 200.206](#).

7. Award Notices

The EPA anticipates notification to successful applicants will be made by electronic or postal mail. The notification will be sent to the original signer of the application or the project contact listed in the application. This notification is not an authorization to begin work. The official notification of an award will be made by the Grants Management and Business Operations Division . Selection does not guarantee an award will be made. Statutory authorization, funding, or other issues during the award process may affect the ability of the EPA to make an award. The award notice, signed by an EPA grants officer, is the authorizing document and will be provided through electronic or postal mail. The successful applicant may need to prepare and submit additional documents and forms, which must be approved by the EPA, before the grant can officially be awarded. The time between notification of selection and award of a grant can take up to 90 days or longer.

8. Post-Award Requirements and Administration

A. Administrative and National Policy Requirements

The recipient and any sub-recipient must comply with the applicable [General Terms and Conditions](#). These terms and conditions are in addition to the assurances and certifications made as part of the award, terms and conditions, and restrictions reflected on the official assistance award document.

Awards issued as a result of this funding opportunity are subject to the requirements of the Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards; Title [2 CFR Part 200](#) and [2 CFR Part 1500](#).

B. Reporting

[EPA's General Terms and Conditions](#) in the Notice of Award will have information on performance and financial reports, including:

- How often you will report.
- Any required form or formatting.
- How to submit them.

C. FFATA and FSRS Reporting

The [Federal Financial Accountability and Transparency Act](#) (FFATA) requires:

- Data entry at the FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS) for all subawards and subcontracts you issue for \$30,000 or more.
- Reporting executive compensation for both recipient and subaward organizations.

9. Other Information

A. Additional Provisions for Applicants

Additional provisions that apply this funding opportunity and/or awards made under this funding opportunity, can be found at [EPA NOFO Clauses](#). If you are unable to access these provisions electronically at the website above, please contact the EPA point of contact to obtain the provisions.

Department of Public Works & Utilities



Eric Lindman, P.E.
Director of Public Works and Utilities

TO: Wausau Waterworks Commission

FROM: Eric Lindman, P.E.
Director of Public Works & Utilities

DATE: October 7, 2025

SUBJECT: OJT Opportunity Part-Time WW Lab – Workforce Development

There is an opportunity for the utility to work with workforce development and hire a part-time intern at the wastewater utility to assist with daily samples and lab work. This is an On-the-Job Training program, and the program would pay for 50% of the wages up to 500 hours. Based on anticipated hourly wage this would cost the utility up to \$4,250. This would be a part-time position for a student taking college level courses in Soil Science Waste Management or similar areas of study.

The wastewater utility had used interns in the past for seasonal work in the summer and sometimes in the fall if the students schedule allowed it. In the past our wages were so low for seasonals that we stopped getting applications. Our wages were adjusted for seasonal help and this year we were able to attract seasonal help within the utility. This would be a great opportunity for the utility to hire some part-time help for half the cost and provide a student with practical experience in their field of study. HR and staff feel this would be a great partnership to step into and hopefully grow some local talent.



To: Wausau Waterworks Commission
From: Ben Brooks, Wausau Waterworks-Wastewater Superintendent
Date: October 7, 2025
Subject: 2025 Carryover Funds – Sliplining & Hydrogen Sulfide (H2S) Repairs
Balance.

Dear Commissioners,

On February 4, 2025 the Commission approved to carry over the unused 2024 Sewer Utility budgeted amounts from the Sliplining and Hydrogen Sulfide (H2S) funds into the 2025 budget. This carryover amount combined with the 2025 Sliplining budgeted amount, totaled \$1,525,000.00.

- 2024 Slip Lining Budget carryover into the 2025 budget= \$500,000.00
- 2024 Hydrogen Sulfide (H2S) Repairs carryover into the 2025 budget= \$500,000.00
- 2025 Slip Lining Budget= \$525,000.00
- Total 2025 Budget amount combined= \$1,525,000.00

The 2025 Sliplining project bid came in much lower than anticipated totaling \$463,000.00

Staff are requesting approval of a budget modification to carry over the unused 2025 Sliplining and Hydrogen Sulfide (H2S) balance of \$1,062,000.00 into the 2026 budget and use a necessary amount of funding a sewer project located on Hamilton Street in 2026. The Water Utility will be replacing the water main at this location in 2026, and it would be my recommendation to perform the sewer repair/replacement work at the same time.

Best regards,

Ben Brooks

Wausau Waterworks – Wastewater, Superintendent



To: Wausau Waterworks Commission

From: Ben Brooks, Wausau Waterworks-Wastewater Superintendent

Date: October 7, 2025

Subject: Purchase of UTV & Golf Carts with Funds Procured from the Sale of General Assets.

Dear Commissioners,

The Sewer Utility is requesting approval to proceed with the purchase of a 2026 UTV and two golf carts with funds procured from the sale of three general assets at the recent Integrity Auction. The mobility of the UTV and golf carts would enable staff to travel anywhere on-site at the wastewater treatment plant as well as making more site transportation readily available.

- Sales of General Assets = \$53,000.00
- 2026 Can-Am Defender Pro from Bills Service/Stratford, WI = \$31,138.00
- 2025 Polaris Ranger XD, Lang Equipment/Rothschild, WI = \$39,586.00
- Central Wisconsin Powersports/Weston, WI = Did not submit a quote.
- Two, 2024 Industrial type, Electric Icon EV's, from Death Grip Motorsports, Wausau, WI = \$18, 535.00
- No other Golf cart dealerships in Wausau.

It would be my recommendation to approve the purchase of the 2026 Can-Am Defender Pro from Bill's Service Center and the two 2024 Electric Icon golf carts from Death Grip Motorsports.

Best regards,

Ben Brooks

Wausau Waterworks – Wastewater, Superintendent



CITY OF WAUSAU
SOLE SOURCE PURCHASE JUSTIFICATION
REQUIRED FORM PURCHASE OF GOODS OR SERVICES EXCEEDING \$10,000

Purchase of goods or services for no more than \$25,000 may be made without competition when it is agreed *in advance* between the Department Head and the Finance Director. Sole source purchasing allows for the procurement of goods and services from a single source without soliciting quotes or bids from multiple sources. Sole source procurement cannot be used to avoid competition, rather it is used in certain situations when it can be documented that a vendor or contractor holds a unique set of skills or expertise, that the services are highly specialized or unique in character or when alternate products are unavailable or unsuitable from any other source. Sole source purchasing should be avoided unless it is clearly necessary and justifiable. The justification must withstand public and legislative scrutiny. The Department Head is responsible for providing written documentation justifying the valid reason to purchase from one source or that only one source is available. Sole source purchasing criteria include: urgency due to public safety, serious injury financial or other, other unusual and compelling reasons, goods or service is available from only one source and no other good or service will satisfy the City’s requirements, legal services provided by an attorney, lack of acceptable bids or quotes, an alternate product or manufacturer would not be compatible with current products resulting in additional operating or maintenance costs, standardization of a specific product or manufacturer will result in a more efficient or economical operation or aesthetics, or compatibility is an overriding consideration, the purchase is from another governmental body, continuity is achieved in a phased project, the supplier or service demonstrates a unique capability not found elsewhere, the purchase is more economical to the city on the basis of time and money of proposal development.

1. Sole source purchase under \$10,000 shall be evaluated and determined by the Department Head.
2. Sole source purchase of \$10,001 to \$25,000 a formal written justification shall be forwarded to the Finance Director who will concur with the sole source or assist in locating additional competitive sources.
3. Sole source purchase exceeding \$25,000 must be approved by the Finance Committee.

Ongoing Sole Source – 365 days

One Time Sole Source Request

1. Provide a detailed explanation of the goods or services to be purchased and vendor.

Purchase of a 2026 CanAm Defender Pro 9HTA (UTV) from Bills Service Center located in Stratford, Wisconsin

2. Provide a brief description of the intended application for the service or goods to be purchased.

The UTV will be used for staff and equipment transportation within the grounds of the wastewater treatment facility only. The UTV will have the ability to travel in areas of the plant where larger vehicles are not allowed. The UTV will enable staff to transport tools and other equipment to get to these areas other vehicles aren’t allowed.

3. State why other products or services that compete in the market will not or do not meet your needs or comply with your specifications.

Cooperative Pricing Offered

4. Describe your efforts to identify other vendors to furnish the product or services.

Cooperative Pricing offered

5. How did you determine that the sole source vendor’s price was reasonable?

Bills Service Center offers Cooperative Pricing and the cost is reasonable in its nature. It does not exceed that which would be incurred by another Utility in the conduct of competitive business.

6. Which of the following best describes this sole source procurement? Select all that apply.

- Product or vendors are uniquely qualified with capability not found elsewhere.
- Urgency due to public safety, serious financial injury or other. (explain)
- The procurement is of such a specialized nature that by virtue of experience, expertise, proximity or ownership of intellectual property
- Lack of acceptable quotes or bids.
- Product compatibility or the standardization of a product.
- Continuation of a phased project.
- Proposal development is uneconomical.

Department: Wausau Water Works – Wastewater Treatment Facility

Preparer: Ben Brooks

Vendor Name: Bills Service Center, Stratford, Wisconsin

Expected amount of purchase or contract: \$31,138.00

Department Head Signature:

Date:

Finance Director Signature:

Date:



SERVICE CENTER

P O Box 122 Stratford WI 54484 715-687-3128

WAUSAU WATERWORKS

Sales Contract

Date 10/01/2025

Order No.

Salesman Kyle Imhoff

430 ADRIAN STREET
WAUSAU, WI 54401

H

C 715-261-6941

E Ben.Brooks@wausauwi.gov

By making a NON-REFUNDABLE DEPOSIT I hereby agree to purchase the following unit(s) from you under the terms and conditions specified. Delivery is to be made as soon as possible. It is agreed, however, that neither you nor the manufacturer will be liable for failure to make delivery.

Unit Information

New/U	Year	Make	Model	Serial No.	Model Name	Price(Incl factory options)
New	2026	CAN-AM	9HTA		PRO LIMITED CAB H	\$33,499.00

Parts and Accessories	Price	Qty	Ext Price	Manufacturer Retail Price	
					\$33,499.00
				Rebates	(\$1,500.00)
				Dealer Rebate	(\$2,750.00)
				Dealer Price	\$29,249.00
				Freight	\$1,595.00
				Dealer Prep	\$294.00
				Factory Installed Options	\$0.00
				Parts & Accessories	\$0.00
				Installation Fee	\$0.00
				Service Contract 0 Months	\$0.00
				Unit Subtotal	\$31,138.00
				Trade Allowance	\$0.00
				Payoff	\$0.00
				Net Trade	\$0.00
				Net Sale (Unit Subtotal - Net Trade)	\$31,138.00
				Sales Tax	\$0.00
				Sub-Total with Tax	\$31,138.00
				DNR	\$0.00
				Finance Fee	\$0.00
				Cash Down Payment	\$0.00
				Amount to Pay/Finance	\$31,138.00

DUE TO ECONOMIC VARIABLES, PRICE SUBJECT TO CHANGE BASED ON MANUFACTURING SURCHARGE & PRICE INCREASE

Trade Information

***Monthly Payment of \$31,138.00 For 1 Months at 0.00% Interest**

NOTICE TO BUYER: (1) Do not sign this agreement before you read it or if it contains any blank spaces to be filled in. (2) You are entitled to a completely filled in copy of this agreement. (3) If you default in the performance of your obligations under this agreement, the vehicle may be repossessed and you may be subject to suit and liability for the unpaid indebtedness evidenced by this agreement. (4) ALL CREDIT CARDS WILL INCUR A 3.99% CONVENIENCE FEE.

TRADE-IN NOTICE: Customer represents that all trade in units described above are free of all liens and encumbrances except as noted.

*With Approved Credit. Interest rates and monthly payment are approximate and may vary from those determined by the lender.

Customer Signature _____ Dealer Signature _____

Thank You for Your Business!



1575 County Rd XX
Rothschild, WI 54474
(715) 298-6600

Sales Person: Abie Benson

Date: 09/09/2025

Buyer: Wausau Water Works
407 Grant St, Wausau, WI (Marathon)
54403 - Ben.brooks@wausauwi.gov
(P) (715) 261-7265

Stock#	Unit	VIN	Mi/Hrs	Price
POL18934 5	New 2025 Polaris Ranger XD 1500 Northstar Edition Premium (Titanium Metallic Gloss)	3NSXAL1RXSM189345	0	\$37,394.00
Total Unit(s) Price:				\$37,394.00

Invoice Summary	
Total Unit(s) Price:	\$37,394.00
Total Freight:	\$1,995.00
Total Set-Up:	\$0.00
Total Other:	\$0.00
Total F&I:	\$0.00
Total Parts:	\$0.00
Total Service:	\$0.00
Sales Tax:	\$0.00
Doc Fees:	\$197.00
Other Fees:	\$0.00
Total Sale Price:	\$39,586.00
Trade-In Allowance:	\$0.00
Trade-In Payoff:	\$0.00
Trade-In Value:	\$0.00
Cash Back:	\$0.00
Payments:	\$0.00
Balance Due:	\$39,586.00



1575 County Rd XX
Rothschild, WI 54474
(715) 298-6600

Sales Person: Abie Benson

Date: 09/09/2025

Buyer: Wausau Water Works
407 Grant St, Wausau, WI (Marathon)
54403 - Ben.brooks@wausauwi.gov
(P) (715) 261-7265

Thank you for choosing Lang Equipment LLC for your purchase. We appreciate it greatly.

General terms and conditions of this sale are as follows:

1. All deposits on machines are non refundable.
2. To obtain warranty repairs, the purchaser must deliver the equipment at the purchaser's expense, to an authorized dealer during the applicable warranty term.
3. Maintenance of the machine is the purchasers responsibility and is not covered under the manufacturer's warranty.
4. All applicable incentives such as rebates, discounts and coupons are withheld from the sale price on this contract and the incentives are assigned to Lang Equipment LLC. These incentives may or may not show up on the contract as Cash Back on the contract as payment to Lang Equipment LLC.
5. Special rate financing may be available in lieu of rebates and pricing may change based on selection of financing offers.
6. Due to circumstances beyond Lang Equipment LLC's control any and all surcharges and delivery dates are subject to change.

By signing below I fully understand the terms of sale set forth by Lang Equipment LLC

Buyer: _____ Date: _____

Co-Buyer: _____ Date: _____

Dealer: _____ Date: _____

ENJOY TODAY!

QUOTE

Death Grip Motorsports
 1100 West Street, Suite 500 - Wausau, WI 54401
 deathgripmotorsport@gmail.com
 (715) 298-2060



Date:	9/22/2025	Phone:	715-571-7750
Customer Name:	Brad Wendtland - Wausau Water Works		
Email:	bradley.wendtland@wausauwi.gov		
Billing Address:	407 Grant St		
Billing City/State/Zip:	Wausau	WI	54403
Purchase Order #			

ITEM DESCRIPTION		PRICE	QUANTITY	TOTAL
Year:	2024	\$6,850	1	\$ 6,850.00
Make:	ICON EV			\$ -
Model:	C20U			\$ -
Color:				\$ -
VIN/Serial:	TBD			\$ -
				\$ -
ICON Roof		\$ 1,080.50	1	\$ 1,080.50
Hard Enclosure		\$ 1,079.00	1	\$ 1,079.00
Enclosure Installation (Optional)		\$ 258.00	1	\$ 258.00
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
Year:	2024	\$6,850	1	\$ 6,850.00
Make:	ICON EV			\$ -
Model:	C20U			\$ -
Color:				\$ -
VIN/Serial:	TBD			\$ -
				\$ -
ICON Roof		\$ 1,080.50	1	\$ 1,080.50
Hard Enclosure		\$ 1,079.00	1	\$ 1,079.00
Enclosure Installation (Optional)		\$ 258.00	1	\$ 258.00
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -
				\$ -

Notes: Tax Exempt: 008-0000040982-12	TRADE-IN VALUE	\$	-
	SUBTOTAL	\$	18,535.00
	SALES TAX (5.5%)		
	PICKUP / DELIVERY FEE	\$	-
	FREIGHT	\$	-
	TOTAL	\$	18,535.00
	DEPOSIT	\$	-
	BALANCE DUE	\$	18,535.00

Technician Notes

Technician Time

Date:

Start Time:

Purchaser agrees to indemnify and hold the Seller harmless from any and all loss, liability or expense of any kind and nature incurred by or asserted against Seller arising in any manner from the purchased equipment.

Seller Hereby disclaims any representation or warranty, either expressed or implied, as to any matter whatsoever including, without limitation the design, performance, specifications, or condition of the equipment, its merchantability or its fitness for any particular purpose, the quality of the material or workmanship of the equipment.

CUSTOMER SIGNATURE

DATE