



# OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

**Brian P. Kemp**  
Governor

**Kelly Farr**  
Director

## Cost Effectiveness Analysis (CEA)

### State Fiscal Recovery Funds

Under Treasury Final Rule, recipients are required to assess cost-effectiveness of projects for the creation of:

- New drinking water systems
- Dam and reservoir rehabilitation projects
- Projects for the extension of drinking water service to meet population growth needs

#### **Treasury Considerations for Cost-Effectiveness Analysis**

In evaluating whether a project is a cost-effective means of providing the water or sewer service, the recipient should consider the need for the project, the costs and benefits of the project compared to alternatives, and the effectiveness of the project in meeting the identified need. Recipients are not required to conduct a full cost-benefit analysis; however, they should consider and analyze relevant factors. For example, a recipient may not use funds to pursue a costly dam rehabilitation to provide drinking water to a community if it could provide the same service with a significantly smaller investment by drawing water from another available reservoir, assuming that doing so would meet the other requirements of the final rule. As detailed further below, recipients are only required to assess cost-effectiveness of projects for the creation of new drinking water systems, dam and reservoir rehabilitation projects, or projects for the extension of drinking water service to meet population growth needs.

Certain DWSRF eligibilities are already subject to a cost-effectiveness test. Specifically, projects that create new drinking water systems must be a cost-effective solution to addressing the identified problem. The EPA also imposes a cost-effectiveness condition on dam and reservoir rehabilitation projects undertaken pursuant to its class deviation from the DWSRF rule. These projects are particularly expensive and, unlike in the case of other types of eligible projects, there are often available alternatives to conducting these projects. Projects for the extension of drinking water service to meet population growth needs are also often particularly expensive, and there are often different ways to meet the needs of expanding populations. Treasury will accordingly require that recipients engage in a cost-effectiveness analysis when engaging in projects for the creation of new drinking water systems, dam and reservoir rehabilitation projects, or projects for the extension of drinking water service to meet population



# OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

**Brian P. Kemp**  
Governor

**Kelly Farr**  
Director

## **Where to Submit**

### **Awarded Projects**

Awarded projects outlined above that are required to access cost-effectiveness of projects should submit the cost effectiveness plan to [GeorgiaARPA@rsmus.com](mailto:GeorgiaARPA@rsmus.com) prior to requesting any reimbursement requests in the portal. This plan will undergo a review and approval process before reimbursement requests for allowable expenses can occur.

### **Applications**

Applicants with projects outlined above that are required to access cost-effectiveness of projects should submit the cost effectiveness plan within their application to determine eligibility. Please do not send CEAs for applications to RSM.

### **What to Include in the Cost Effectiveness Analysis**

To assist with the cost-effectiveness analysis, applicants and awardees may utilize the referenced section of CFR as a guide along with Treasury considerations outlined on page 1 of this document as a guide.

<https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-40/chapter-I/subchapter-B/part-35/subpart-I/section-35.2030>

A cost-effectiveness analysis of the feasible conventional, innovative, and alternative wastewater treatment works, processes and techniques capable of meeting the applicable effluent, water quality and public health requirements over the design life of the facility while recognizing environmental and other non-monetary considerations. The planning period for the cost-effectiveness analysis shall be 20 years. The monetary costs to be considered must include the present worth or equivalent annual value of all capital costs and operation and maintenance costs. The discount rate established by EPA for the construction grants program shall be used in the cost-effectiveness analysis. The population forecasting in the analysis shall be consistent with the current Needs Survey.

A cost-effectiveness analysis must include:

- (i) An evaluation of alternative flow reduction methods. (If the grant applicant demonstrates that the existing average daily base flow (ADBf) from the area is less than 70 gallons per capita per day (gpcd), or if the Regional Administrator determines the area has an effective existing flow reduction program, additional flow reduction evaluation is not required.)
- (ii) A description of the relationship between the capacity of alternatives and the needs to be served, including capacity for future growth expected after the treatment works become



## OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

**Brian P. Kemp**

**Governor**

**Kelly Farr**

**Director**

operational. This includes letters of intent from significant industrial users and all industries intending to increase their flows or relocate in the area documenting capacity needs and characteristics for existing or projected flows;

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

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

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

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

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