FY 2018 Michigan PWSS Indicators and Measures October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018

Michigan contact: Eric Oswald, <u>oswalde1@michigan.gov</u>, 517-284-6565

Region 5 contacts: Jennifer Crooks, crooks.jennifer@epa.gov, 312-886-0244; and Andrea Porter, porter.andrea@epa.gov, (312) 886-4427

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
Offi	ice of Water National Program I	Measures						
1	% of pop. served by CWS that receive DW that meet health based standards	NPM/GPRA	PWSS overall	SDW-2.1.1 (Updated quarterly by HQ— NPM Measures Tables filtered for active, non-RTC'd MCL violations)	National Program Manager (NPM) measures	FY14: 94% FY15: 92% FY16: 92% FY17: 92%	FY ¹ (e.g., for FY15, the measure is calculated as of October 2015 for the period 7/1/14 to 6/30/15)	FY14: EOY: 99.2% (met) FY15: EOY: 97.7% (met) FY16: EOY: 98.9% (met) FY17: EOY: 99% (met)
2	% of CWS that meet health based standards	NPM/GPRA	PWSS overall	SDW-SP1.N11 (Updated quarterly by HQ— NPM Measures Tables)	NPM measures	FY14: 93% FY15: 90% FY16: 90% FY17: 90%	same as item #1 above	FY14: EOY: 95.9% (met) FY15: EOY: 94.7% (met) FY 16: EOY: 96% (met) FY 17: EOY: 97% (met)
3	% of "person months" in which CWS are meeting health-based standards	NPM/GPRA	PWSS overall	SDW-SP2 (Updated quarterly by HQ— NPM Measures Tables)	NPM measures	FY14: 96% FY15: 95% FY16: 95% FY17: 95%	same as item #1 above	FY14: EOY: 99.8% (met) FY15: EOY: 99.2% (met) FY16: EOY: 99.6% (met) FY17: EOY: 100% (met)
4	% of CWS with minimized risk b/c of SWP	NPM/GPRA	PWSS GW SWP	SDW-SP4a (Updated annually in October by States)	NPM measures	FY14: 31% FY 15: 30% FY 16: 32% FY17: 35%	same as item #1 above	FY14: 32.2% (met)* FY15: 34.9% (met)* FY16: 35.8% (met)* FY17: 27% (not met)* *SWP voluntary in MI

¹ However, due to the lag between when data are submitted and when the FY ends, the actual date range of the data used for these measures is one quarter off from the FY.

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period	Results and Comments
			FOI	opuate schedule			(CY/FY)	and comments
6	% of population served by CWSs with minimized risk b/c of SWP % of CWS with san. survey w/in the past 3 yrs +NOTE: This national measure was modified in FY14 to include both surface water and ground water systems. In prior years, this measure only reported "% of CWS with san survey within the past 3 years for Subpart H systems".	NPM/GPRA	PWSS GW SWP PWSS SS	SDW-SP4b (Updated annually in October by States) SDW-01a (Updated annually in July by HQ – Status queries updated by Region 5 in April and October)	NPM measures NPM measures +NOTE: This national measure was modified in FY14 to include both surface water and ground water systems.	FY14: 79% FY15: 80% FY 16: 80% FY 17: 81% FY14: 75% FY15: 79% FY16: 79% FY16: 79%		FY14: 80.2% (met)* FY15: 80.7% (met)* FY16: 80% (met)* FY16: 80% (met)* *SWP voluntary in MI FY14: 92.2% (1261/1367) of sanitary surveys at CWSs (GW and SW) completed between CY 2012 and CY 2014. FY15: 93.3% of sanitary surveys at CWSs (GW and SW) completed between CY 2013 and CY 2015. FY16: 91.4% of sanitary surveys at CWSs (GW and SW) completed between CY 2014 and CY 2016. Specifically: CWS-SW 276/300=89.0% CWS-GW 982/1066=92.1% NCWS (GW and SW) sanitary surveys completed between CY 2012 and CY 2016: TNC-SW 11/11= 100% NTNC-GW 1212/1227=98.8% TNC-GW 7477/7587=98.6% FY17: 91% of sanitary surveys at CWSs (GW and SW) completed between CY 2015 and CY 2017. Specifically: CWS-SW 261/300=87% CWS-GW 988/1066=92.7% NCWS (GW and SW) sanitary surveys completed between CY
								2013 and CY 2017: TNC-SW 10/10= 100% NTNC-GW 1224/1234=99.2%
								TNC-GW 7436/7525=98.8%

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
7	Fund Utilization Rate for DW SRF (cumulative dollar amount of loan agreements divided by cumulative funds available for projects) for the DWSRF.	NPM/GPRA	DWSRF	SDW-04 (Updated annually as of June 30 by HQ and tracked through DWNIMS database)	NPM measures	This is an indicator.	The FY14 EOY data are cumulative as of 6/30/14.	FY14: N/A (State-specific numbers removed. Not including State-specific targets. FY15: N/A (this measure not included in HQ reported measures) FY16: N/A (this measure not included in HQ reported measures) FY17: N/A (this measure not included in HQ reported measures) NOTE: EPA Region 5's State and Tribal Programs Branch (STPB) uses tools and resources other than national measures, SDW- 04, SDW-05, and SDW-11, to provide an accurate evaluation of the state's progress in implementing the DWSRF program. Region 5 believes that the most recent DWSRF Performance Evaluation Report (PER), prepared by STPB with input from GWDWB, should be consulted for a more accurate status of the state's DWSRF program.
8	# of DWSRF projects that have initiated operations (cumulative)*	NPM/GPRA	DWSRF	SDW-05 (Updated annually as of June 30 by HQ	NPM measures	This is an indicator.	The EOY data are cumuli- tive as of June 30 of	FY14: N/A (State-specific numbers removed. Not including State-specific targets. FY15: N/A (this measure no

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
				and tracked through DWNIMS database)			the same year as EOY.	longer has state-specific targets, only a regional target. FY16: N/A (this measure no longer has state-specific targets, only a regional target. FY17: N/A (this measure no longer has state-specific targets, only a regional target.
9	% of DWSRF projects awarded to PWS serving <500, 501-3,300, & 3,301- 10,000	NPM/GPRA	DWSRF	SDW-11 (Updated annually as of June 30 by HQ)	NPM measures	This is an indicator. There are no state targets.	The EOY data are cumuli- tive as of June 30 of the same year as EOY.	 FY14: HQ is not reporting to the Region state-specific or Regional EOY numbers. FY15: HQ is not reporting to the Region state-specific or Regional EOY numbers. FY16: HQ is not reporting to the Region state-specific or Regional EOY numbers. This is now an indicator reported on a regional basis. FY17: This is now an indicator reported on a regional basis.
10	# & % of small CWS and NTNCWS (<500, 501-3,300, & 3,301-10,000) w/repeat health-based NO ₃ & NO ₂ , Stage 1 D/DBP, SWTR, & TCR violations	NPM/GPRA	PWSS	SDW-15 (Updated annually in October by HQ)	NPM measures	This is an indicator. There are no state targets.	Same as item #1 above	FY14: In FY14, there were 13 small CWSs and NTNCWs (LT 10K pop) with repeat health-based NO ₃ and NO ₂ , Stage 1 D/DBP, SWTR, and TCR violations. FY15: In FY15, there were 13/2,625 (0.5%) small CWS and NTNCWSs (LT 10K pop) with repeat health-based Nitrate/Nitrite, Stage 1 D/DBP, SWTR and TCR violations. FY16: In FY16, there were 9/2,627 (0.3%) small CWS and

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
								NTNCWSs (LT 10K pop) with repeat health-based Nitrate/Nitrite, Stage 1 D/DBP, SWTR and TCR violations. FY17: In FY17, there were 0/2,619 (0%) small CWS and NTNCWSs (LT 10K pop) with repeat health-based Nitrate/Nitrite, Stage 1 D/DBP, SWTR and TCR violations.
11	# & % of schools and childcare centers that meet all health-based DW standards	NPM/GPRA	PWSS	SDW-17 (Updated annually in October by HQ, but can be generated from quarterly NPM measure)	NPM measures	This is an indicator.	Same as item #1 above	FY14: In FY 14, 598 out of 625 (95.5%) schools/ childcare centers met all health-based drinking water standards. FY15: In FY 15, 597 out of 624 (95.7%) schools/ childcare centers met all health-based drinking water standards. FY16: In FY 16, 611 out of 626 (97.6%) schools/childcare centers met all health-based drinking water standards. FY17: In FY 17, 613 out of 621 (98.7%) schools/childcare centers met all health-based drinking water standards.
12	# of dw and ww utilities and local, state, and fed officials receiving training and tech assistance to enhance emergency prep and resiliency to reduce risk from all hazards, including those attributed to climate change	NPM/GPRA	PWSS	SDW-21 (Updated annually in October by HQ)	TBD	This is an indicator; there are no state targets.	TBD	FY15/FY16: This measure is reported by HQ.

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period	Results and Comments
Offi	ce of Enforcement and Complia		National Dro				(CY/FY)	
13	During FY2018, the primacy agency must address with a formal enforcement action or RTC the # of priority systems equal to the # of its PWSs that have a score of 11 or higher on the July 2017 ETT report.	NPM/ OECA	PWSS ECA	SDWA02 (Updated quarterly by HQ at https://echo.epa. gov/targeting/saf e-drinking-water- act-enforcement- targeting-tool- reports)	ETT website: (OECA's ECHO drinking water data website)	FY14: 13 FY15: 31 FY16: 31 FY17: 27 FY18: 41	The ETT is generated on a quarterly basis with the measure based on FY ²	FY14: Michigan committed to address with formal enforcement or RTC 13 systems in FY 2014. During FY 2014, Michigan RTC'd 31 PWSs. FY15: In FY15, Michigan committed to address 31 priority systems with formal enforcement or RTC, and Michigan exceeded this commitment by addressing 51 systems, or 165%. FY16: In FY16, Michigan committed to address 31 priority systems with formal enforcement or RTC, and Michigan exceeded this commitment by addressing 34 systems, or 110%. FY17: In FY17, Michigan committed to address 27 priority systems with formal enforcement or RTC, and Michigan exceeded this commitment by addressing 57 systems; % FY 2017 commitment met = 211%.
	ional Shared Goals	T		1.	I		T	
14	1. % of NTNCWSs receive water that meets health- based drinking water	Shared Goals		(Updated annually in April by Region 5)	Regional Shared Goals		СҮ	CY 2014 : NOTE: Asterisk (*) indicates target not met .

² Each quarterly ETT calculation includes the most current data in the associated SDWIS/FED data freeze. For example, the October 2014 ETT includes data through 6/30/2014. The ETT retrieves addressed violations going back 5 years from the most current data (i.e., for October 2014, the ETT retrieves addressed violations from 7/1/2009 to 6/30/2014). Note that addressed violations do not contribute to ETT scores. In addition, the ETT score includes all un-addressed violations, even if they are more than 5 years old.

#	Description	Туре	Used	Name and	File	Target	Applicable	Results
			For	Update Schedule			period	and Comments
							(CY/FY)	
	standards							1. 95.5% (met)
	2.% of <u>TNCWSs</u> meeting all							2. 97.7% (met)
	health based standards							3. 4.6% (met)
	3. % of population served					By CY 2017:		4. 6.6% (met)
	by CWSs with					1 = ≥95%		5. 5.2% *
	significant/major					2 = ≥95%		6. 5.4% (met)
	monitoring violations					3 = <5%		7. 8.0% (met)
	4. % of CWSs with					4= <10%		CY2014 EOY: 6 out of 7 Shared
	significant/major					5 = <5%		Goals met. Much improvement
	monitoring violations					6 = <10%		noted from CY 2013. Only 1 goal
	5. % of NTNCWSs with					7 = <10%		not met, but very close; for
	significant/major							NTNCWSs with significant/major
	monitoring violations for							monitoring violations for acute
	<u>acute</u> health risks							contaminants (nitrate/TCR).
	6. % of NTNCWSs with							
	significant/major							CY 2015:
	monitoring violations for							NOTE: Asterisk (*) indicates
	<u>chronic</u> health risks							target not met .
	7. % of <u>TNCWSs</u> with							1. 97.0% (met)
	significant/major							2. 97.1% (met)
	monitoring violations.							3. 7.4%* inc of 2.8%
								4. 13.7%* inc of 7.1%
	NOTE: In FY 2017, the							5. 5.5%* slight inc
	queries for Shared Goals							6. 14.1%* inc of 8.7%
	#2-7 for CY 2014, CY 2015,							7. 9.5% (met) inc of 1.5%
	CY 2016 were re-written							CY2015 EOY: 3 out of 7 Shared
	and calculated, so that							Goals met. The inc in Goal 3
	comparisons of data							indicates some CWSs could be
	between years from CY							having issues with
	2014 forward could be							significant/major monitoring
	conducted more accurately.							violations, but the dramatic
								increase in Goal 4 indicates that
								many smaller CWSs are having
								problems sampling and are
								accruing monitoring violations.
								Goal number 5 not met in FY

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period	Results and Comments
				•			(CY/FY)	
								2014 or FY 2015 for NTNCWSs
								with significant/major monitoring
								violations for acute contaminants
								(nitrate/TCR). Inc in Goal 6 by
								8.7% may be due to NTNCWSs
								triennial VOC/SOC monitoring
								due. The inc in Goal 7 indicates
								TNCWSs are receiving more M/R
								violations for not sampling for
								coliform and nitrates.
								CY 2016:
								NOTE: Asterisk (*) indicates
								target not met .
								1. 98.6% (met)
								2. 99.7% (met)
								3. 8.3%* inc of 0.9%
								4. 14.2%*inc of 0.5%
								5. 3.23% (met) dec of 2.3%
								6. 14.7%* inc of 0.6%
								7. 7.7% (met) dec of 1.8%
								CY2016 EOY: 4 out of 7 Shared
								Goals met. The inc in Goal 3 by
								1.5% indicates some CWSs could
								be continuing to have issues with
								significant/major monitoring
								violations, but the increase in
								Goal 4 by 2.7% indicates that
								many smaller CWSs are having
								problems sampling and are
								accruing monitoring violations.
								Continued inc in Goal 6 indicates
								NTNCWSs are not sampling for
								chronic contaminants as
								required. The inc in Goal 7 by
								1.8% indicates TNCWSs are

Image: state of the state	and Comments
Image: Second	i in a second MA/D via lations for
Image:	iving more M/R violations for
CY 20 NOTE targe 1. 98 2. 99 3. 9. 4. 12 5. 10 6. 8. 7. 20 CY20 0 Goals 1.1% COTT signifi	sampling for coliform and
NOTE targe 1.98 2.99 3.9. 4.12 5.10 6.8. 7.20 CY20 Goals 1.1% conti signifi	ites.
NOTE targe 1.98 2.99 3.9. 4.12 5.10 6.8. 7.20 CY20 Goals 1.1% conti signifi	017
Image: 1.98 1.98 2.99 3.9. 3.9. 3.9. 4.12 5.10 6.8. 7.20 CY20 Goals 1.1% continuing 1	E: Asterisk (*) indicates
1.98 2.99 3.9. 4.12 5.10 6.8. 7.20 CY20 Goals 1.1% conti signifi violati	et not met .
2. 99 3. 9. 4. 12 5. 10 6. 8. 7. 20 CY20 Goals 1.1% conti signifi violati	8.1% (met)
3.9. 4.12 5.10 6.8. 7.20 CY20 Goals 1.1% 1.1% conti significities 1.1% violati violati	9.7% (met)
4.12 5.10 6.8. 7.20 CY20 Goals 1.1% conti significitation violation	.4%* inc of 1.1%
Image: Second	2.9%*dec of 1.3%
6. 8. 7. 20 CY20 Goals 1.1% conti signifi violati	0.8%* inc of 7.6%
Image: Constraint of the second se	.1% dec of 6.6%
CY20 Goals 1.1% conti signif violation	0.6%* inc of 12.9%
Goals 1.1% conti signif violati	017 EOY: 3 out of 7 Shared
1.1% conti signif violat	Is met. The inc in Goal 3 by
conti signif violati	6 indicates some CWSs are
signif violation	inuing to have issues with
violat	ificant/major monitoring
	ations, and the decrease in
Godi	4 by 1.3% indicates that
	y smaller CWSs are still
	ng problems sampling and
	accruing monitoring
	ations. Dramatic increase
	%) in Goal 5 is most likely due
	tate began reporting RTCR
	ations in FY 2017; also some
	culty in achieving RTCR
	pliance. Decrease in Goal 6
	cates NTNCWSs have
	roved sampling for chronic
	aminants as required. The
	ease in Goal 7 by 12.9% is
	bably due in part to State
	an reporting RTCR violations

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
								in FY 2017; and also indicates TNCWSs are having a difficult transition since April 2016 to achieving RTCR compliance.
15	New Rule Violation Completeness Reporting (GWR, LCRSTR, Stage 2, LT2).	R5 High Priority	PWSS DM	(Updated quarterly by Region 5)	Region 5 high priority query –new rule completeness reporting	None	N/A—this query pulls all violations for the new rules ever reported for any system type.	NOTE: The query used here includes all violations ever reported to SDWIS/Fed for these rules. FY14: July 2015*: LT2: no violations reported. <u>GWR</u> : 50 GWR M/R violations, 7 TT violations. <u>Stage 1</u> : 6 TT violations. <u>Stage 2</u> : 13 MCL violations. <u>Stage 2</u> : 169 M/R violations. <u>LCRSTR</u> : 11 consumer notification M/R violations. FY15: July 2016*: LT2: no violations reported. <u>GWR</u> : 59 GWR M/R violations, 12 GWR TT violations. <u>Stage 1</u> : 7 TT violations. <u>Stage 2</u> : 31 MCL violations. <u>Stage 2</u> : 251 M/R violations. <u>Stage 1</u> : 7 TT violations, 13 GWR TT violations. <u>Stage 1</u> : 7 TT violations. <u>Stage 2</u> : 393 M/R violations. <u>LCRSTR</u> : 79 consumer notification M/R violations.

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
16	SW and GW Sanitary Survey Completeness (not a national measure yet)	R5 High Priority	PWSS Sanitary Surveys GWR	(Updated in April and October by Region 5)	R5 high priority query— surface and ground water	None.	CY (e.g., July 2014 data will include sanitary surveys completed between 1/1/11 and 12/31/13 and NCWS sanitary surveys completed between 1/1/10 to 12/31/14) ³	 FY17: April 2018*: LT2: 33 TT violations reported, 2 M/R violations reported. <u>GWR</u>: 85 GWR M/R (source monitoring) violations, 20 GWR TT (failure to address deficiency) violations. Stage 1: 8 TT (lack of certified operator) violations Stage 2: 38 MCL violations. Stage 2: 399 M/R violations. Stage 2: 399 M/R violations. Stage 2: 19 (failure to submit DBPR Report) violations LCRSTR: 118 consumer notification M/R violations. FY14: As of April 2015, 92.54% (273 out of 295) of CWS SW sanitary surveys were completed, and 92.16% (988/1072) of CWS GW sanitary surveys were completed between CY 2012 and CY 2014. During CY 2012 – CY 2014: 100% (11/11) of TNCWS SW sanitary surveys were completed. 98.72% (1232/1248) of NTNCWS GW sanitary surveys were completed for time period CY 2010-CY 2014, and 98.4% (7613/7737) of TNCWS GW sanitary surveys were completed during time period CY 2010- CY 2014.

³ This will be measured in July 2013 for CWSs surveys completed between 1/1/10 to 12/31/12, in 2014 for NCWSs surveys completed between 1/1/10 to 12/31/14, and then every year after that (with rolling three-year periods).

#	Description	Туре	Used	Name and	File	Target	Applicable	Results
			For	Update Schedule			period (CY/FY)	and Comments
								FY15: As of April 2016, 97.8%
								(9736/9960) of all GW systems
								had a sanitary survey within the
								proper timeframe (CWS: CY
								2013-CY 2015; and
								NTNCWS/TNCWS: CY 2011-CY
								2015.)
								92.9% (276 out of 297) of CWS
								SW sanitary surveys were
								completed, and 93.4%
								(999/1070) of CWS GW sanitary
								surveys were completed between
								CY 2013 and CY 2015.
								During CY 2013 – CY 2015:
								100% (11/11)) of TNCWS SW
								sanitary surveys were completed.
								98.1% (1206/1229) of NTNCWS
								GW sanitary surveys were
								completed for time period CY
								2011-CY 2015, and 98.3%
								(7531/7661) of TNCWS GW
								sanitary surveys were completed
								during time period CY 2011-CY
								2015.
								FY16: As of April 2017, 91.4%
								(1249/1366) of sanitary surveys
								at CWSs (GW and SW) completed between CY 2014 and CY 2016.
								Specifically:
								CWS-SW 267/300=89% CWS-GW 982/1066=92.1%
								NCWS (GW and SW) sanitary
								surveys completed between CY
								2012 and CY 2016:
								TNC-SW 11/11= 100%
								NTNC-GW 1212/1227=98.8%
								NTINC-GVV 1212/1227=98.8%

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
								TNC-GW 7477/7587=98.6% FY17 : 91% of sanitary surveys at CWSs (GW and SW) completed between CY 2015 and CY 2017. Specifically: CWS-SW 261/300=87% CWS-GW 988/1066=92.7% NCWS (GW and SW) sanitary surveys completed between CY 2013 and CY 2017: TNC-SW 10/10= 100% NTNC-GW 1224/1234=99.2% TNC-GW 7436/7525=98.8%
17	Late RTCR Rule Reporting (In April 2016, the State began implementing RTCR. The State cannot currently report NCWS RTCR violations due to data management limitations, thus this query cannot be run for NCWSs)	R5 High Priority	PWSS DM TCR	(After April 2018, updated annually in October by Region 5)	TBD	None	CY	 FY15 data is currently being reanalyzed, due to the change from TCR to RTCR in April 2016. Late RTCR violations will be evaluated in April 2018. FY16: The nitrate late reporting query will be available in April 2018. FY 17: At this time, RTCR reporting data is incomplete for MI.
18	Late Nitrate Rule Reporting	R5 High Priority	PWSS DM NO2/NO3	(Updated annually in October by Region 5)	R5 high priority query—late nitrate rule reporting	None	СҮ	FY15: The data is currently being re-analyzed. FY16: The nitrate late reporting query will be available in April 2018. This query is currently being re-written due to changes in the database. There was concern that the data were being analyzed too soon, such that

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
19	Arsenic MCL Non- compliance (%	R5 High Priority	PWSS As	Updated annually in January by R5	R5 high priority	None	This query is based on	there wasn't a chance for States to be late. FY17: The nitrate late reporting query will be available in mid- 2018. FY14: Data as of January 2015 indicates 99.78% CWSs were
	CWS/NTNCWS systems in violation)				query— arsenic MCL noncomplian ce		data in the 4 th quarter national program measure tables (e.g., the January 2014 query covers the period from 10/1/2012 to 9/30/2013).	in compliance where 4 CWSs (total pop 265) had arsenic MCLs that were not RTC'd. The State has successfully reduced its number of NTNCWSs under bottled water agreements from 36 to 27; a 25% decrease. FY15: Data as of January 2016 indicates 99.86% CWSs were in compliance where 2 CWSs with 5 health-based violations (total pop 75) had arsenic MCLs that were not RTC'd. 99.39% NTNCWSs were in compliance where 8 NTNCWSs with 9 health-based violations (total pop 1,400) had arsenic MCLs that were not RTC'd. The State continues to reduce its number of NTNCWSs under bottled water agreements. FY16: Data as of January 2017 indicates 99.86% CWSs were in compliance where 2 CWSs with 7 health-based violations

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
								(total pop 238) had arsenic
								MCLs that were not RTC'd.
								99.15% NTNCWSs were in
								compliance where 11
								NTNCWSs with 14 health-
								based violations (total pop
								1,919) had arsenic MCLs that
								were not RTC'd. The State
								continues to reduce its
								number of NTNCWSs under
								bottled water agreements.
								(Refer to FY 2015/FY 2016 EOY
								report under Compliance and
								Enforcement Management for
								further discussion of the
								bottled water agreements.)
								FY17: Data as of January 2018
								indicates 99.78% CWSs were
								in compliance where 3 CWSs
								with 9 health-based violations
								(total pop 376) had arsenic
								MCLs that were not RTC'd.
								99.15% NTNCWSs were in
								compliance where 8 NTNCWSs
								with 11 health-based
								violations (total pop 734) had
								arsenic MCLs that were not
								RTC'd. The State continues to
								reduce its number of
								NTNCWSs under bottled water
								agreements. (Refer to FY
								2015/FY 2016 EOY report

#	Description	Туре	Used For	Name and Update Schedule	File	Target	Applicable period (CY/FY)	Results and Comments
								under Compliance and Enforcement Management for further discussion of the bottled water agreements.)