



MISSISSIPPI STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

October 5, 2011

Honorable Haley Barbour
Governor of Mississippi
501 North West Street
15th Floor Woolfolk Building
Jackson, Mississippi 39201

Re: Triennial Report to the Governor
Capacity Development Program
Mississippi State Department of Health
Bureau of Public Water Supply

Dear Governor Barbour:

Enclosed for your information and review are three (3) copies of the referenced Triennial Report to the Governor concerning Mississippi's Capacity Development Program for public water systems. As outlined in the report, the Program was developed pursuant to the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996, and this 3-year report is required as a condition of receiving the annual capitalization grants from EPA for the State's Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) Loan Program.

This report confirms that the Capacity Development Program continues to contribute to public health protection statewide by helping to improve the viability of public water systems throughout Mississippi.

If there are any questions or comments regarding the contents of the report, or the Capacity Development Program, please feel free to contact our Bureau of Public Water Supply Director, Leslie Royals, at 601-576-7518.

Sincerely,

Mary Carrier, MD, MPH
State Health Officer

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Dale Froneberger, EPA (w/enclosure)

**STATE OF MISSISSIPPI
PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS CAPACITY
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM**

TRIENNIAL REPORT TO THE GOVERNOR

Submitted To

Governor Haley Barbour

By

**Mississippi State Department of Health
Office of Health Protection
Bureau of Public Water Supply**

October 2011

(This page intentionally left blank)

State of Mississippi
Public Water Systems Capacity Development Program
Triennial Report to the Governor

Mississippi State Department of Health
Office of Health Protection
Bureau of Public Water Supply

INTRODUCTION

The Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (SDWA) established the national Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) Program. The program allows the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to make capitalization grants to states, to in turn provide low cost loans to public water systems to help achieve or maintain compliance with SDWA requirements. Accordingly, the State Legislature (through Section 41-3-16, MS Code of 1972 Annotated) created what is now called the Drinking Water Systems Improvements Revolving Loan Fund (DWSIRLF) Program, to receive the federal DWSRF capitalization grants from EPA and to provide the low cost loans to the state's public water systems to finance needed infrastructure improvements.

As a condition of receiving the DWSRF capitalization grants, the SDWA requires that each state implement a "capacity development program" to improve the technical, managerial, and financial capacity of the state's existing public water systems and to prevent the creation of new public water systems that do not have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with current and future provisions of the SDWA. This report describes Mississippi's Capacity Development Program and outlines the implementation results since the last Report to the Governor in 2008. Submission of this report represents a reporting milestone required by EPA to avoid withholdings from the FY-2012 DWSRF capitalization grant.

NEW PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

To comply with the new systems capacity development requirements of the SDWA, the State Legislature enacted the Mississippi Safe Drinking Water Act (Section 41-26-8, MS Code of 1972 Annotated) to require that all new community and non-transient non-community public water systems be approved by the Mississippi State Department of Health (MSDH) prior to beginning construction. During the review/approval process, MSDH is required to ensure that each proposed new public water system has the technical and operational capacity to comply with all SDWA requirements. This process is effectively the Program's first "control point," or point at which the State can exercise authority to ensure the demonstration of a new system's capacity to serve its customers from the *technical* side. Another control point created by the state law revision is the requirement that MSDH, prior to approving a new public water system, have written certification from the Executive Director of Mississippi's Public Utilities Staff that the new water system has the *managerial* and *financial* capacity to comply with all SDWA

requirements. There have been no changes in the State's legal authority or control points since the inception of the Capacity Development Program.

EXISTING PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

Implementation of a capacity development program for existing public water systems was a much more difficult task than it is for new public water systems. Mississippi has approximately 1,200 public water systems that are subject to the requirements of the SDWA, and the vast majority of these systems are very small with limited financial resources. Due to this limited financial capacity, it was impossible to develop a mandatory program in the state that would force these small systems to immediately make the necessary capital improvements to achieve the technical, managerial, and financial capacity needed to comply with the SDWA. However, recent additions to the SDWA, such as the Ground Water Rule, could force small systems to make necessary improvements or consolidate their system with other surrounding systems. The method implemented by MSDH consists primarily of two components: 1) stringent enforcement of existing laws and regulations, and 2) implementation of capacity assessment rating and technical assistance procedures.

ENFORCEMENT - MSDH stringently enforces the laws and regulations such as those related to: 1) federal and state SDWA water quality standards, 2) waterworks operator licensure, 3) overloaded water systems, 4) corrosion control treatment facilities, 5) cross-connection control, and 6) water system board member training. By strictly enforcing these laws and regulations, MSDH ensures that a safe supply of drinking water is provided. Strict enforcement also encourages water systems without adequate capacity to seek alternate methods of compliance, including the pursuit of mergers with neighboring viable water systems. In most cases, these mergers (or "consolidations"), result in the creation of much more viable public water systems in the capacity assessment areas.

CAPACITY ASSESSMENT - MSDH developed a Capacity Assessment Rating Program to promote existing systems' capacity development. The technical, managerial, and financial capacity of each public water system is rated annually during the sanitary surveys conducted by MSDH regional engineers. The assessment is an "open book test," since the water systems are aware of the questions and the necessary requirements to receive credit during the assessment. The maximum rating possible is "5.0" and a rating of "0.0" is the minimum. The rating is determined using Capacity Assessment Forms (CAFs), which consist of three major sections: 1) Technical, 2) Managerial, and 3) Financial. Each section includes key questions designed to identify those tasks that a public water system must routinely accomplish in order to demonstrate the capacity to comply with all current and proposed requirements of the SDWA and Mississippi's Safe Drinking Water Act.

The CAFs were developed by MSDH in conjunction with an Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of various "stakeholder" organizations such as the Mississippi Rural Water Association, the Mississippi Municipal League, the Mississippi Water & Pollution Control Operators' Association, the RCAP-Community Resources Group, Mississippi Development Authority and Public Service Commission, as well as selected water system managers and operators from throughout the state. Each year, prior to the annual Advisory Committee meeting

(typically held in the last quarter of the state fiscal year), the MSDH staff reviews and evaluates the Program and discusses the strengths, weaknesses, and any related problems which may have arisen during the fiscal year. The staff then determines any needed program changes to be reported to and discussed with the Advisory Committee. After input is obtained from the Advisory Committee at the annual meeting, MSDH makes changes as needed to the Program strategy in the following year's CAFs.

In April 2011, the Advisory Committee met to discuss the overall performance of the current capacity development/implementation strategy. Based on input from this year's Advisory Committee meeting, it was decided that the capacity assessment in its current form should not change. Reasons cited included: previous years capacity assessments had many changes that water supplies have had difficulty in achieving; recent inclusion of the compliance requirements associated with the Ground Water Rule have presented complications to many water supplies; and the desire to maintain a level of status quo. Moreover, the committee felt that the existing strategy was comprehensive enough and simply did not need to be modified at this time.

Appendix A contains copies of the three CAFs used during FY2011. Included are the: 1) Standard Form – used for community public water systems, 2) Private Form – used for public water systems that are owned by private investors, and 3) Non-Transient Non-Community Form – used for public water systems that provide water to 25 or more of the same individuals, in a non-residential manner, on a daily basis (such as schools or industries).

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE – One of the major advantages to the MSDH Capacity Assessment Rating is to aid the department in identifying public water systems that are at risk of being unable to provide safe and adequate drinking water to their customers. Once systems are shown to have low capacity, many efforts are then made to provide assistance to improve them within the limits of funding. With the aid of the Small System Technical Assistance Set-Aside provided through the DWSIRLF and Bureau of Public Water Supply staff, MSDH can provide assistance at no cost to the water systems. The previously mentioned set-aside gives MSDH the ability to contract with technical assistance providers such as Community Resources Group (CRG), Mississippi Rural Water Association (MsRWA), and the Mississippi State University Extension Service (MSU-ES) to provide specialized assistance beyond what MSDH provides. The assistance programs include: 1) Comprehensive and intermediate technical assistance provided by CRG; 2) PEER review inspection provided by MSU-ES; and 3) Hands-on operator training provided by MsRWA.

MSDH provides the technical assistance contractors for the PEER Review and Comprehensive and Intermediate Assistance programs an annual list of public water systems determined to be in the most need of assistance. The contractors then contact the water systems to determine specifics and to provide the assistance needed if the water systems so desire. Periodic reports are provided by the contractors to MSDH to confirm that the assistance being provided is benefitting the public water supplies of Mississippi.

The Comprehensive and Intermediate technical assistance provided through CRG allows the water system official and staff to receive one-on-one assistance to improve their overall capacity ratings. Whether obtaining new management policies, financial budgeting, or operational

improvements, the assistance is specific and specialized, based on the water system's needs. The PEER Review program is geared toward providing improved technical operations to water supply staff through peer-to-peer interaction. This voluntary program pairs select water system operators with other system water operators to prepare for annual MSDH inspections. Finally, the Hands-On Operator Training provided by MsRWA gives small system operators specialized "hands-on" training and skills they need in order to better operate their water systems. It could also provide a potential cost savings to the water system, since operators learn how to make repairs themselves rather than having to hire specialized help.

MSDH has found significant improvements after the implementation of the assistance programs. The comprehensive or intermediate assistance has shown an average capacity assessment improvement of 0.50 points after comprehensive assistance is received and an average capacity assessment improvement of 0.24 for comprehensive and intermediate together. More specifically, the Town of Como improved from a score of 1.33 to 3.33 in one year, and the City of Wiggins improved its score from 2.67 to 4.33 in one year. Even non-transient non-community systems such as the University of Mississippi saw an improvement of 1.5 points due to the assistance. Sometimes, improvements become evident over a period of years such as in the case of Town of Quitman. Over a two-year period, this town improved their score by 4.00 – 4.67 points. Additionally in FY2011, those systems receiving PEER Review assistance thus far have realized an average increase in their Capacity Assessment scores of 0.39 points. The full impact of PEER Reviews performed during FY2010 have an average increase in score of 0.70 points.

MSDH has found that the vast majority of public water systems are making efforts to improve, even though as previously indicated, the capacity development program for existing systems is not mandatory. There are no specific penalties for a water system refusing assistance (which does occasionally occur) or failing to improve/maintain their Capacity Assessment Rating. However, such actions do have inherent consequences. The annual capacity assessment results for all systems are publicized in a paper of local circulation and on the MSDH website. The Capacity Assessment Program is similar to the way the Consumer Confidence Report (CCR) is perceived. Whereas the Consumer Confidence Report is a public record of a public water supply's compliance performance, the Capacity Assessment Program reflects the overall performance of public water supply. Both reports are also similar in that their primary goal of the programs is for the public, not just the public water systems, to take an active role in assuring the quality of the State's water supply. The general public desires that their utilities be in compliance with laws and regulations, be viable for the future, and provide the best quality water at a reasonable cost. Customers of public water systems which have received a high capacity assessment rating are encouraged to contact their water system officials and congratulate them for an excellent job of operating and managing their water system. Likewise, customers of public water systems which have received a low rating are strongly encouraged to contact their water system officials and request a copy of the system's most recent Capacity Assessment Form. That form will quickly identify the areas where the water system needs improvement. A lower rating could indicate that the system is more likely to be non-viable, and thus unable to protect public health. Customers of such systems are also strongly encouraged to get involved with their water system to ensure that any needed improvements are completed.

the form of better utilization of assistance resources and funding. Although no changes have been made this year, the annual evaluation process, along with the Advisory Committee review and public involvement, will help to assure that any needed future changes are identified and implemented in a timely manner.

FURTHER INFORMATION

If there are questions regarding the information presented in this report or recommendations for improving the Public Water System Capacity Development Program, please contact:

Leslie Royals, PE, BCEE, Director
Bureau of Public Water Supply
P. O. Box 1700
Jackson, MS 39215-1700

Note that copies of this report can be obtained by calling 601-576-7518, or a copy can also be found on the Mississippi State Department of Health website at www.healthymms.com, by clicking on "Publications," then "Water Supply," then "Reports 2011."

Additional indirect consequences of failing to take action to improve Capacity Assessment Ratings include: 1) “losing” to neighboring water systems, and 2) receiving lower priority when seeking certain government funding. Since the Program’s inception, it has created a type of “peer pressure,” in that many water systems consider the annual Capacity Assessment a competition, much like a sports tournament, where the competing systems strive to achieve a score higher than other systems in the area. This competition results in more viable water systems, which ultimately translates into a benefit to the customers and the general public. Regarding funding priority, the state’s DWSRF Loan Program contains priority ranking incentives related to Capacity Assessment Ratings, and other government agencies such as the Mississippi Developmental Authority (CDBG Program) include a portion of the Capacity Assessment Rating to evaluate applicants for funding.

PROGRAM EFFICACY/PROGRESS

The efficacy of Mississippi’s CD Program is best demonstrated by the actual results. No new public water systems approved within the last three years have appeared on EPA's "Significant Non-compliers (SNC)" lists or the recently utilized Enforcement Targeting Tools (ETT) list. During that same three-year period, Capacity Assessment Ratings on average have progressively increased. Appendix B contains a complete listing of the Technical, Managerial, Financial, and Overall/Average Capacity Assessment Ratings (scores) of Mississippi's public water systems for FY2009, FY2010, and FY2011.

When reviewing the data, the following should be considered: Within the presented data it is important to note that several systems have been consolidated or merged. They will be indicated with the “CON” designation as they were consolidated with existing water supplies. Any newly created water supplies are identified by “NS”. There have also been systems that dissolved and are no longer serving customers. They are designated as “DIS”. Additionally, there are few system that still feel the effects of Hurricane Katrina. They are designated as “NAT” or natural disaster. This designation also was applied to systems that encountered destruction by some other type of natural disaster such as flood or tornado.

Appendix C contains individual Nine-Year Distribution Charts (FY2003 to FY2011) of the scores for each category. This information clearly reflects a trend in all categories away from lower scores (0 through 3) and toward higher scores (4 and 5), and thus toward improved capacity for water systems throughout the state. Mississippi’s Capacity Development Program continues to prove very effective in producing the desired result of protecting public health by improving the technical, managerial, and financial capacities of the public water systems throughout the state.

SUMMARY

Through the passage of proper legislation, the strict enforcement of existing laws and regulations, and the implementation of sound capacity assessment and technical assistance procedures, Mississippi continues a Capacity Development Program that effectively provides for higher levels of technical, managerial, and financial capacity in new and existing public water systems throughout the state. The program also provides an additional benefit to the public in

APPENDIX A

Fiscal Year 2011 Capacity Assessment Forms

(This page intentionally left blank)



Mississippi Department of Health
Bureau of Public Water Supply

STANDARD FORM

FY 2011 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

NOTE: This form must be completed whenever a routine sanitary survey of a public water system is conducted by a regional engineer of the Bureau of Public Water Supply

PWS ID#: _____ Class: _____ Survey Date: _____ County: _____
 Public Water System: _____ Conn: _____
 Certified Waterworks Operator: _____ Pop: _____

CAPACITY RATING DETERMINATION

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [] Managerial (M) Capacity Rating [] Financial (F) Capacity Rating []

$$\text{Capacity Rating} = \frac{T + M + F}{3} = \frac{\quad}{3} =$$

Overall Capacity Rating = _____

Completed by on _____

Comments: _____

Technical Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[T1] Does the water system have any significant deficiencies? [Y N]	N - 1pt. Y - 0pt.	
[T2] 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [Y N] (i.e. Is pH, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at the time of survey? [Y N] (NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.) 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been inspected and cleaned or painted (if needed) within the past 5 years? [Y N NA] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[T3] 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [Y N] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that MDH Minimum JOB Guidelines for W. W. Operators were being met? [Y N] 3) Was the water system properly maintained at the time of survey? [Y N] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [Y N] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[T4] 1) Does water system routinely track water loss and were acceptable water loss records available for review by the regional engineer? [Y N] 2) Is water system overloaded? (i.e. serving customers in excess of MSDH approved design capacity)? [Y N] 3) Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [Y N] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) 4) Are well pumping tests performed routinely? [Y N NA] (NOTE: YES FOR #1 & YES OR N/A FOR #4 AND NOs FOR #2 & #3 required to receive point)	1)Y - pt. 2)N - pt. 3)N - pt. 4)Y - pt.	
[T5] 1) Does the water system have the ability to provide water during power outages? (i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc.) [Y N] 2) Does the water system have a usable backup source of water? [Y N] (NOTE: Must be documented on survey report)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [] (Total Points)		

Managerial Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[M1] Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M2] 1) Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies available for review during the survey? [Y N] 2) Have all board members (in office more than 12 months) completed Board Member Training? [Y N NA] 3) Does the Board of Directors meet monthly and were minutes of Board meetings available for review during the survey? (NOTE: Quarterly meetings allowed if system has an officially designated full time manager) [Y N NA] (NOTE: ALL YESs or NAs required to receive point. NA - Not Applicable)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[M3] Has the water system had any SDWA violations since the last Capacity Assessment? [Y N]	N - 1pt. Y - 0pt.	
[M4] Has the water system developed a long range improvements plan and was this plan available for review during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M5] 1) Does the water system have an effective cross connection control program in compliance with MDH regulations? [Y N] 2) Was a copy of the MSDH approved bacti site plan and lead/copper site plan available for review during the survey and do the bacti results clearly show that this approved plan is being followed? [Y N] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
MANAGERIAL CAPACITY RATING = [_____] (Total Points)		

Financial Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[F1] Has the water system raised water rates in the past 5 years? [Y N] (NOTE: Point may be awarded if the water system provides acceptable financial documentation clearly showing that a rate increase is not needed, i.e. revenue has consistently exceeded expenditures by at least 10%, etc.)	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F2] Does the water system have an officially adopted policy requiring that water rates be routinely reviewed and adjusted as appropriate and was this policy available for review during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F3] Does the water system have an officially adopted cut-off policy for customers who do not pay their water bills, was a copy of this policy available for review by the regional engineer, and do system records (cut-off lists, etc.) clearly show that the water system effectively implements this cut-off policy? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F4] Was a copy of the water system's officially adopted annual budget available for review by the regional engineer and does the water system's financial accounting system clearly and accurately track the expenditure and receipt of funds? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F5 - Municipal Systems] 1) Is the municipality current in submitting audit reports to the State Auditor's Office? [Y N] 2) Was a copy of the latest audit report available for review at the time of the survey? [Y N] 3) Does this audit report clearly show that water and sewer fund account(s) are maintained separately from all other municipal accounts? [Y N] (NOTE: Yes answer to all questions required to receive point.)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[F5 - Rural Systems] 1) Has the rural water system filed the required financial reports with the State Auditor's Office and were these reports available for review? [Y N] 2) Does the latest financial report show that receipts exceeded expenditures? [Y N] (NOTE: Yes answer to both questions required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
FINANCIAL CAPACITY RATING = [_____] (Total Points)		

Mississippi State Department of Health
Bureau of Public Water Supply
Capacity Development Rating Form Assessment Criteria
01 July 2010 - 30 June 2011

(Underlined items indicate changes from previous year.)

Technical Capacity

- T1** Does the water system have any significant deficiencies?
- T2 (1)** Was the water treatment process functioning properly? Corrosion control plants: within +/- 0.5 of target pH (approximately 8.4, Langelier Index, or 7.2-7.8 if adding phosphate for corrosion AND minimum phosphate residual of 0.5 mg/L as P or 1.5 mg/L as PO₄ (most test kits)), Iron removal plants: finished water Fe < 0.3 mg/l, Chlorine: Adequate at plant to provide free residual throughout system, spot checked on system, Systems adjusting Fluoride: 0.7 - 1.3 mg/l
- T2 (2)** Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at the time of survey? Adequate security: locked fence around wells/treatment plant/tank (6' or 5' + barbed wire at top), locked hatches on water storage tanks (operator verifies), Security Vulnerability Self-Assessment and Emergency Response Plan, both updated annually. Required equipment in place (i.e., phosphate and/or fluoride feeders on all wells if required), major components sized correctly if affects water quality or quantity, major components working at time of inspection unless provisions for repairs made. Must be noted on inspection report.
- T2 (3)** Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been inspected and cleaned or painted (if needed) within the past 5 years? Maintenance and painting contracts, tank inspection reports, operator can inspect own tank if he/she writes a report and/or takes pictures, painted if needed.
- T3 (1)** Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for survey? Operator or representative must be present unless emergency; operator of record shouldn't miss two in a row.
- T3 (2)** Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that MSDH Minimum JOB Guidelines for W. W. Operators were being met? Log book: Cl₂ recorded as required, pH, Fe, Fluoride, and phosphate where applicable, major events recorded (fix major leaks, replace chlorine cylinder, equipment repairs, etc.) Part time operator must make required entries in log book to show MSDH MINIMUM JOB GUIDELINES are met. Major events can be recorded separately (work orders).
- T3 (3)** Was the water system properly maintained at the time of survey? Grass cut, packing not leaking excessively, plant presentable, etc.
- T3 (4)** Did the operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? Must have appropriate test kits, fresh reagents, and able to perform tests (where applicable: chlorine, pH, iron, fluoride, phosphate). Regional engineer may perform tests to verify operator's results. Chlorine test must be performed by operator at all inspections.
- T4 (1)** Does water system routinely track water loss and were acceptable water loss records available for review by the regional engineer? Requires metered connections and master meter or annual pump test with run time. Must show calculating water loss at least quarterly.
- T4 (2)** Is the water system overloaded? Cannot exceed MSDH design capacity, consecutive systems overloaded if supplier overloaded or based on hydraulic calculations or pressure recording.

- T4 (3) Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing low pressure in any part(s) of the distribution system? Documented by hydraulics or pressure recording, or verified by operator. Must be documented on inspection report**
- T4 (4) Are well pumping tests performed routinely? Must have pump tests at least every two years on all wells that are greater than three (3) years old. OR pump tests every year on wells at systems with design capacity exceeding 80%.**
- T5 (1) Does the water system have the ability to provide water during power outages? Credit given for generators, can give credit for emergency tie-ins w/ system w/ generator if hydraulics work, credit given for right angle drive if motor attached during survey, may be required to operate during inspection. Credit given for generator on trailer if quick-connect, systems with elevated storage may share generator on trailer, must have prior agreement.**
- T5 (2) Does the water system have a usable backup source of water?**

Managerial Capacity

- M1 Were all SDWA required records maintained in logical and orderly manner and available for review? In one location, sample results, MSDH correspondence, copy of CCR report, etc.**
- M2 (1) Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and available for review? Must have water users agreement (connection fees, late charges, deposits, wastewater requirements) and subdivision/line extension policy (written procedure requiring developer/system obtain MSDH approval before construction begins) and either By-laws or Job Description for Employees (employee handbook), plus at least two of the following: Emergency or contingency plan (chain of command, phone numbers, etc.), Flushing program (flushing schedule w/ records), Fire hydrant policy (maintenance schedule, flow tests, agreement w/ fire dept.), or Updated distribution map (can be updated by operator).**
- M2 (2) Have all Board Members (in office more than 12 months) completed Board Member Training? Must have certificate (or copy) available for review. This does not apply to Municipalities with population over 10,000.**
- M2 (3) Does Board meet monthly and were minutes of Board meetings available for review? Allow quarterly meetings with full time manager. Manager must be appointed by the board and documentation of appointment provided.**
- M3 Has the water system had any SDWA violations since the last Capacity Assessment? System and Regional Engineer's records**
- M4 Has the water system developed a long range improvement plan and was this plan available for review? Hydraulic analysis, engineering report, completed State Needs Survey Form or list of goals prepared by operator and adopted by board, can give credit for major improvement project within past 5 years. Plan in use should indicate progress towards improvements.**
- M5(1) Does the water system have an effective cross connection program in compliance with MSDH regulations? Shall include the following: Cross connection policy, records of backflow preventers installed on the system, current test results for each backflow preventer on system.**
- M5(2) Was a copy of the MSDH approved bacti sample site plan and lead and copper sample site plan available for review and bacti results show site plan is followed? Copy of sampling site plans available and bacti results show plan is being followed.**

Financial Capacity

- F1** Has the water system raised water rates in the past 5 years? Credit also allowed if revenue exceeds expenditures (excluding out of pocket for major improvements and depreciation) by 10% for past five years.
- F2** Does the water system have an official policy requiring rates routinely reviewed and adjusted if necessary? Must be in minutes showing adopted
- F3** Is the water system following an official cut off policy? Must be published (in minutes or on bills), must follow policy (cut off customers who by policy should be cut off)
- F4** Was a copy of system's adopted annual budget available for review and does financial accounting system clearly and accurately track receipts and expenditures? Must provide copy of budget and balance sheet (income statement) for review.
- F5** Is the municipality current in submitting audit reports to State Auditor? Was audit report (Municipal) available for review? Were water and sewer fund accounts separate from other accounts? List of violators, copy in records, can accept CPA audit report
- F5 1)** Has the water system filed financial report with State Auditor and copy available (Rural) for review? List of violators, copy in records, can accept CPA audit report 2) Does the latest report show that receipts exceed expenditures? Excluding out of pocket for major improvements

(This page intentionally left blank)



**Mississippi Department of Health
Bureau of Public Water Supply**

PRIVATE FORM

FY 2011 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

NOTE: This form must be completed whenever a routine sanitary survey of a public water system is conducted by a regional engineer of the Bureau of Public Water Supply.

PWS ID#: _____ Class: ____ Survey Date: _____ County: _____
 Public Water System: _____ Conn: _____
 Certified Waterworks Operator: _____ Pop: _____

CAPACITY RATING DETERMINATION

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [____] Managerial (M) Capacity Rating [____] Financial (F) Capacity Rating [____]

$$\text{Capacity Rating} = \frac{T + M + F}{3} = \frac{\quad}{3} =$$

Overall Capacity Rating = _____

Completed by on _____

Comments: _____

Technical Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[T1] Does the water system have any significant deficiencies? [Y N]	N - 1pt. Y - 0pt.	
[T2] 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [Y N] (i.e. Is ph, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at the time of survey? [Y N] (NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.) 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been inspected and cleaned or painted (if needed) within the past 5 years? [Y N NA] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[T3] 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [Y N] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that MDH minimum job guidelines for W.W. Operators were being met? [Y N] 3) Was the water system properly maintained at time of survey? [Y N] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [Y N] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[T4] 1) Does water system routinely track water loss and were acceptable water loss records available for review by the regional engineer? [Y N] 2) Is the water system overloaded? [Y N] 3) Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [Y N] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) 4) Are well pumping tests performed routinely? [Y N NA] (NOTE: YES FOR #1 & YES OR N/A FOR #4 AND NOs FOR #2 & #3 required to receive point)	1)Y - pt. 2)N - pt. 3)N - pt. 4)Y - pt.	
[T5] 1) Does the water system have the ability to provide water during power outages?(i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc.) [Y N] 2) Does the water system have a usable backup source of water? [Y N] (NOTE: Must be documented on survey report)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [____] (Total Points)		

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[M1] Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M2] Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies available for review during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M3] Has the water system had any SDWA violations since the last Capacity Assessment? [Y N]	N - 1pt. Y - 0pt.	
[M4] Has the water system developed a long range improvements plan and was this plan available for review during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M5] 1) Does the water system have an effective cross connection program in compliance with MDH regulations? [Y N] 2) Was a copy of the MSDH approved bacti sample site plan and lead and copper sample site plan available for review and bacti results show site plan is followed? [Y N] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [_____] (Total Points)		

Financial Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[F1] Does the water system have a PSC issued certificated service area? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F2] Has the water system petitioned PSC for a rate increase within the past five years? (NOTE: Point may be awarded if the water system provides acceptable documentation clearly showing that a rate increase is not needed, i.e., revenue has consistently exceeded expenditures by at least 10%, etc.) [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F3] Does the water system have an officially adopted cut-off policy for customers who do not pay their water bills, was a copy of this policy available for review by the regional engineer, and do system records (cut-off lists, etc.) clearly show that the water system effectively implements this cut-off policy? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F4] Was a copy of the water system's officially adopted annual budget available for review by the regional engineer and does the water system's financial accounting system clearly and accurately track the expenditure and receipt of funds? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[F5] 1) Are annual financial reports routinely filed with the Public Utility Staff and were copies of these reports available for review by the regional engineer at the time of the survey? [Y N] 2) Does the latest financial report show that system receipts exceed expenditures? [Y N] (NOTE: Yes answer to both questions required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
FINANCIAL CAPACITY RATING = [_____] (Total Points)		

Mississippi State Department of Health
Bureau of Public Water Supply
Capacity Development Rating Form Assessment Criteria
01 July 2010 - 30 June 2011

(Underlined items indicate changes from previous year.)

Technical Capacity

- T1 Does the water system have any significant deficiencies?
- T2 (1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? Corrosion control plants: within +/- 0.5 of target pH (approximately 8.4, Langelier Index, or 7.2-7.8 if adding phosphate for corrosion AND minimum phosphate residual of 0.5 mg/L as P or 1.5 mg/L as PO₄ (most test kits)), Iron removal plants: finished water Fe < 0.3 mg/l, Chlorine: Adequate at plant to provide free residual throughout system, spot checked on system, Systems adjusting Fluoride: 0.7 - 1.3 mg/l
- T2 (2) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at the time of survey? Adequate security: locked fence around wells/treatment plant/tank (6' or 5' + barbed wire at top), locked hatches on water storage tanks (operator verifies), Security Vulnerability Self-Assessment and Emergency Response Plan, both updated annually. Required equipment in place (i.e., phosphate and/or fluoride feeders on all wells if required), major components sized correctly if affects water quality or quantity, major components working at time of inspection unless provisions for repairs made. Must be noted on inspection report.
- T2 (3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been inspected and cleaned or painted (if needed) within the past 5 years? Maintenance and painting contracts, tank inspection reports, operator can inspect own tank if he/she writes a report and/or takes pictures, painted if needed.
- T3 (1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for survey? Operator or representative must be present unless emergency; operator of record shouldn't miss two in a row.
- T3 (2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that MSDH Minimum JOB Guidelines for W. W. Operators were being met? Log book: Cl₂ recorded as required, pH, Fe, Fluoride, and phosphate where applicable, major events recorded (fix major leaks, replace chlorine cylinder, equipment repairs, etc.) Part time operator must make required entries in log book to show MSDH MINIMUM JOB GUIDELINES are met. Major events can be recorded separately (work orders).
- T3 (3) Was the water system properly maintained at the time of survey? Grass cut, packing not leaking excessively, plant presentable, etc.
- T3 (4) Did the operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? Must have appropriate test kits, fresh reagents, and able to perform tests (where applicable: chlorine, pH, iron, fluoride, phosphate). Regional engineer may perform tests to verify operator's results. Chlorine test must be performed by operator at all inspections.
- T4 (1) Does water system routinely track water loss and were acceptable water loss records available for review by the regional engineer? Requires metered connections and master meter or annual pump test with run time. Must show calculating water loss at least quarterly.
- T4 (2) Is the water system overloaded? Cannot exceed MSDH design capacity, consecutive systems overloaded if supplier overloaded or based on hydraulic calculations or pressure recording.

- T4 (3)** Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing low pressure in any part(s) of the distribution system? Documented by hydraulics or pressure recording, or verified by operator. Must be documented on inspection report
- T4 (4)** Are well pumping tests performed routinely? Must have pump tests at least every two years on all wells that are greater than three (3) years old. OR pump tests every year on wells at systems with design capacity exceeding 80%.
- T5 (1)** Does the water system have the ability to provide water during power outages? Credit given for generators, can give credit for emergency tie-ins w/ system w/ generator if hydraulics work, credit given for right angle drive if motor attached during survey, may be required to operate during inspection. Credit given for generator on trailer if quick-connect, systems with elevated storage may share generator on trailer, must have prior agreement.
- T5 (2)** Does the water system have a usable backup source of water?

Managerial Capacity

- M1** Were all SDWA required records maintained in logical and orderly manner and available for review? In one location, sample results, MSDH correspondence, copy of CCR report, etc.
- M2 (1)** Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and available for review? Must have water users agreement (connection fees, late charges, deposits, wastewater requirements) and subdivision/line extension policy (written procedure requiring developer/system obtain MSDH approval before construction begins) and either By-laws or Job Description for Employees (employee handbook), plus at least two of the following: Emergency or contingency plan (chain of command, phone numbers, etc.), Flushing program (flushing schedule w/ records), Fire hydrant policy (maintenance schedule, flow tests, agreement w/ fire dept.), or Updated distribution map (can be updated by operator).
- M2 (2)** Have all Board Members (in office more than 12 months) completed Board Member Training? Must have certificate (or copy) available for review. This does not apply to Municipalities with population over 10,000.
- M2 (3)** Does Board meet monthly and were minutes of Board meetings available for review? Allow quarterly meetings with full time manager. Manager must be appointed by the board and documentation of appointment provided.
- M3** Has the water system had any SDWA violations since the last Capacity Assessment? System and Regional Engineer's records
- M4** Has the water system developed a long range improvement plan and was this plan available for review? Hydraulic analysis, engineering report, completed State Needs Survey Form or list of goals prepared by operator and adopted by board, can give credit for major improvement project within past 5 years. Plan in use should indicate progress towards improvements.
- M5(1)** Does the water system have an effective cross connection program in compliance with MSDH regulations? Shall include the following: Cross connection policy, records of backflow preventers installed on the system, current test results for each backflow preventer on system.
- M5(2)** Was a copy of the MSDH approved bacti sample site plan and lead and copper sample site plan available for review and bacti results show site plan is followed? Copy of sampling site plans available and bacti results show plan is being followed.

- F1** Does the water system have a Certificate of Need and Necessity (certificated service area) issued by PSC? Copy of tariff or PSC filings
- F2** Has the water system petitioned PSC for a rate increase in the past 5 years? Credit given if the water system provides acceptable documentation clearly showing that receipts consistently exceed expenditures by 10%.
- F3** Is the water system following an official cut off policy? Must be published in tariff or lease agreement, must follow policy (cut off customers who by policy should be cut off).
- F4** Was a copy of system's adopted annual budget available for review and does financial accounting system clearly and accurately track receipts and expenditures? Must provide copy of budget and balance sheet(income statement) for review.
- F5** 1) Does the water system file annual financial reports with PSC and copy available for review? Must provide copy.
2) Does the latest financial report show that receipts exceed expenditures? Excluding out of pocket for major improvements.

(This page intentionally left blank)



**Mississippi Department of Health
Bureau of Public Water Supply**

NON-TRANSIENT, NON-COMMUNITY FORM

FY 2011 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

NOTE: This form must be completed whenever a routine sanitary survey of a public water system is conducted by a regional engineer of the Bureau of Public Water Supply.

PWS ID#: _____ Class: _____ Survey Date: _____ County: _____
 Public Water System: _____ Conn: _____
 Certified Waterworks Operator: _____ Pop: _____

CAPACITY RATING DETERMINATION

Technical (T) Capacity Rating: [____] Managerial (M) Capacity Rating [____]

$$\text{Capacity Rating} = \frac{T + M}{2} = \frac{\quad}{2} =$$

Overall Capacity Rating = _____

Completed by on _____

Comments: _____

Technical Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[T1] Does the water system have any significant deficiencies? [Y N]	N - 1pt. Y - 0pt.	
[T2] 1) Was the water treatment process functioning properly? [Y N] (i.e. Is ph, iron, free chlorine, etc. within acceptable range?) 2) Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at the time of survey? [Y N] (NOTE: Equipment deficiencies must be identified in survey report.) 3) Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been inspected and cleaned or painted (if needed) within the past 5 years? [Y N NA]	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[T3] 1) Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for the survey? [Y N] 2) Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that MDH Minimum Job Guidelines for W.W. Operators were being met? [Y N] 3) Was water system properly maintained at time of survey? [Y N] 4) Did operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? [Y N] (NOTE: All YESs required to receive point)	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
[T4] 1) Does water system routinely track water production and were acceptable water production records available for review by the regional engineer? [Y N] 2) Is water system overloaded? (i.e. serving customers in excess of MDH approved design capacity)? [Y N] 3) Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing pressure problems in any part(s) of the distribution system? [Y N] (based on operator information, customer complaints, MSDH records, other information) 4) Are well pumping tests performed routinely? [Y N NA] (NOTE: YES for #1 & YES OR N/A/ FOR #4 and NOs for #2 & #3 required to receive point)	1)Y - pt. 2)N - pt. 3)N - pt. 4)Y - pt.	
[T5] 1) Does the water system have the ability to provide water during power outages? (i.e. generator, emergency tie-ins, etc.) [Y N] NOTE: Systems may provide bottled water if included as part of a published emergency plan. 2) Does the water system have a usable backup source of water? [Y N]	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
TECHNICAL CAPACITY RATING = [____] (Total Points)		

Public Water System: _____
 FY 2011 Public Water System Capacity Assessment Form

PWS ID #: _____
 Survey Date: _____

Management Capacity Assessment	Point Scale	Point Award
[M1] Were all SDWA required records maintained in a logical and orderly manner and available for review by the regional engineer during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M2] Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and were these policies and procedures available for review during the survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M3] Has the water system had any SDWA violations since the last Capacity Assessment? [Y N]	N - 1pt. Y - 0pt.	
[M4] Has the water system developed a preventive maintenance schedule and was a copy of this schedule available for review during survey? [Y N]	Y - 1pt. N - 0pt.	
[M5] 1) Does the water system have an effective cross connection control program in compliance with MSDH regulations? [Y N] 2) Was a copy of the MSDH approved bacti sample site plan and lead and copper sample site plan available for review and do bacti results clearly show this approved plan is being used for all bacti monitoring? [Y N]	All Y - 1 pt. Else - 0 pt.	
MANAGEMENT CAPACITY RATING = [_____] (Total Points)		

Mississippi State Department of Health
Bureau of Public Water Supply
Capacity Development Rating Form Assessment Criteria
01 July 2010 - 30 June 2011

(Underlined items indicate changes from previous year.)

Technical Capacity

- T1** Does the water system have any significant deficiencies?
- T2 (1)** Was the water treatment process functioning properly? Corrosion control plants: within +/- 0.5 of target pH (approximately 8.4, Langelier Index, or 7.2-7.8 if adding phosphate for corrosion AND minimum phosphate residual of 0.5 mg/L as P or 1.5 mg/L as PO₄ (most test kits)), Iron removal plants: finished water Fe < 0.3 mg/l, Chlorine: Adequate at plant to provide free residual throughout system, spot checked on system, Systems adjusting Fluoride: 0.7 - 1.3 mg/l
- T2 (2)** Was needed water system equipment in place and functioning properly at the time of survey? Adequate security: locked fence around wells/treatment plant/tank (6' or 5' + barbed wire at top), locked hatches on water storage tanks (operator verifies), Security Vulnerability Self-Assessment and Emergency Response Plan, both updated annually. Required equipment in place (i.e., phosphate and/or fluoride feeders on all wells if required), major components sized correctly if affects water quality or quantity, major components working at time of inspection unless provisions for repairs made. Must be noted on inspection report.
- T2 (3)** Were records available to the regional engineer clearly showing that all water storage tanks have been inspected and cleaned or painted (if needed) within the past 5 years? Maintenance and painting contracts, tank inspection reports, operator can inspect own tank if he/she writes a report and/or takes pictures, painted if needed.
- T3 (1)** Was the certified waterworks operator or his/her authorized representative present for survey? Operator or representative must be present unless emergency; operator of record shouldn't miss two in a row.
- T3 (2)** Was log book up to date and properly maintained and did it show that MSDH Minimum JOB Guidelines for W. W. Operators were being met? Log book: Cl₂ recorded as required, pH, Fe, Fluoride, and phosphate where applicable, major events recorded (fix major leaks, replace chlorine cylinder, equipment repairs, etc.) Part time operator must make required entries in log book to show MSDH MINIMUM JOB GUIDELINES are met. Major events can be recorded separately (work orders).
- T3 (3)** Was the water system properly maintained at the time of survey? Grass cut, packing not leaking excessively, plant presentable, etc.
- T3 (4)** Did the operator satisfactorily demonstrate to the regional engineer that he/she could fully perform all water quality tests required to properly operate this water system? Must have appropriate test kits, fresh reagents, and able to perform tests (where applicable: chlorine, pH, iron, fluoride, phosphate). Regional engineer may perform tests to verify operator's results. Chlorine test must be performed by operator at all inspections.
- T4 (1)** Does water system routinely track water production and were acceptable records available for review by the regional engineer? Requires master meter or annual pump test with run time. Must show calculating water production at least quarterly.
- T4 (2)** Is the water system overloaded? Cannot exceed MSDH design capacity, consecutive systems overloaded if supplier overloaded or based on hydraulic calculations or pressure recording.

- T4 (3) Was there any indication that the water system is/has been experiencing low pressure in any part(s) of the distribution system?** Documented by hydraulics or pressure recording, or verified by operator. Must be documented on inspection report.
- T4 (4) Are well pumping tests performed routinely? Must have pump tests at least every two years on all wells that are greater than three (3) years old, OR pump tests every year on wells at systems with design capacity exceeding 80%.**
- T5 (1) Does the water system have the ability to provide water during power outages?** Credit given for generators, can give credit for emergency tie-ins w/ system w/ generator if hydraulics work, credit given for right angle drive if motor attached during survey, may be required to operate during inspection. Credit given for generator on trailer if quick-connect, systems with elevated storage may share generator on trailer, must have prior agreement. Credit not given for renting generator w/o contract. SYSTEM MAY PROVIDE BOTTLED WATER IF INCLUDED AS PART OF A PUBLISHED EMERGENCY PLAN.
- T5 (2) Does the water system have a usable backup source of water?**

Managerial Capacity

- M1 Were all SDWA required records maintained in logical and orderly manner and available for review?** In one location, sample results, MSDH correspondence, copy of CCR report, etc.
- M2 Have acceptable written policies and procedures for operating this water system been formally adopted and available for review?** Must have Job Description for Employees associated with potable water system (employee handbook) and Emergency or Contingency plan (chain of command, phone numbers, etc.), plus at least one of the following: Construction policy (written procedure requiring MSDH approval before construction begins), Flushing program (flushing schedule w/records), Fire hydrant policy (maintenance schedule, flow tests, agreement w/fire dept.), or Updated distribution map (can be updated by operator).
- M3 Has the water system had any SDWA violations since the last Capacity Assessment?** System and Regional Engineer's records
- M4 Has the water system developed a preventative maintenance schedule and was this plan available for review?** Maintenance schedule for: wells (including annual pump tests), service pumps, tank inspections, with recommendations and corrective action taken. Documentation must be available for review.
- M5(1) Does the water system have an effective cross connection program in compliance with MSDH regulations?** Shall include the following: Cross connection policy, records of backflow preventers installed on the system, current test results for each backflow preventer on system.
- M5(2) Was a copy of the MSDH approved bacti sample site plan and lead and copper sample site plan available for review and bacti results show site plan is followed?** Copy of sampling site plans available and bacti results show plan is being followed.

APPENDIX B

Capacity Assessment Ratings

(This page intentionally left blank)

Mississippi State Department of Health - Bureau of Public Water Supply

Capacity Assessment Ratings for Public Water Systems in Mississippi

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09			Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10			Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11					
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
Adams County													
010002	CITY OF NATCHEZ	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
010005	BROADMOOR UTILITIES, INC	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
010007	OAKLAND WATER WORKS	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
010009	ADAMS CO W/A #2-SOUTH	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
010010	TESI: BRYANDALE W/A	0.00	2.00	5.00	2.33	1.00	2.00	1.00	1.33	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.67
010013	ADAMS CO W/A #3-PROVIDENCE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
010015	ADAMS CO W/A #4-KAISER LAKE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Alcorn County													
020001	ALCORN W/A #2-BIGGERSVILLE	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
020002	CITY OF CORINTH	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
020003	FARMINGTON WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
020004	KOSSUTH W/A #1	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
020005	TOWN OF RIENZI	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
020006	ALCORN W/A #1-INDIAN SPRINGS	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
020007	KOSSUTH W/A #3-PINE MOUNTAIN	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
020008	KOSSUTH W/A #2-BETHLEHEM	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
020014	PRENTISS-ALCORN WATER ASSN	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
Amite County													
030001	COLES WATER ASSOCIATION #1	0.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	2.67
030002	TOWN OF CROSBY	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	0.00	5.00	3.00	2.67	0.00	3.00	1.00	1.33
030003	TOWN OF GLOSTER	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
030004	TOWN OF LIBERTY	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
030005	MARY SPRINGS WATER ASSOCIATION	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
030006	PINE STREET WATER ASSOCIATION	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.33	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
030007	WILK-AMITE W/A #1-SOUTH	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
030020	COLES COMMUNITY WATER ASSN #2	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	CON
030021	WILK-AMITE W/A #2-NORTHWEST	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
030024	NORTHEAST AMITE WATER ASSN	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
030026	N CENTRAL AMITE WATER ASSN	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Attala County													
040001	CONEHOMA WATER ASSN #1	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
040002	TOWN OF ETHEL	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
040003	ETHEL RURAL WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
040004	CITY OF KOSCIUSKO	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Managerial, F-Financial

Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009				Fiscal Year 2010				Fiscal Year 2011			
		7/1/08 - 6/30/09		7/1/09 - 6/30/10		7/1/10 - 6/30/11		7/1/10 - 6/30/11		7/1/10 - 6/30/11		7/1/10 - 6/30/11	
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
040005	MCADAMS WATER ASSOCIATION	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	5.00	2.00	2.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
040006	TOWN OF MCCOOL	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
040008	POSSUMNECK-CARMACK W/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
040009	SUGAR CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33
040010	TOWN OF SALLIS	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
040011	ZAMA WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
040012	MISSISSIPPI WATER COMPANY	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00
040027	SPRINGDALE YOUTH CNT HWY 19-N	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
040028	SPRINGDALE YOUTH CNT HWY 12-W	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
040029	CONEHOMA WATER ASSN #2	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Benton County													
050001	TOWN OF ASHLAND	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
050002	TOWN OF HICKORY FLAT	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33
050003	TOWN OF SNOW LAKE SHORES	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33
050016	BLACKJACK DEVELOPMENT ASSN	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
050017	NORTH BENTON W/A	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	2.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
Bolivar County													
060001	TOWN OF ALLIGATOR	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.33	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.67
060002	TOWN OF BENOIT	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67
060003	TOWN OF BEULAH	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00
060004	TOWN OF BOYLE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
060006	CITY OF CLEVELAND	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
060007	DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY	5.00	4.00	N/A	4.50	5.00	4.00	N/A	4.50	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
060008	TOWN OF DUNCAN	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.33	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33
060009	TOWN OF GUNNISON	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.67	1.00	2.00	4.00	2.33
060011	LAMONT WATER CORPORATION	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
060012	TOWN OF MERIGOLD	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33
060013	CITY OF MOUND BAYOU	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.67	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
060014	TOWN OF PACE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
060015	TOWN OF RENOVA	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
060016	CITY OF ROSEDALE	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
060017	SCOTT COMBINED WATER & SEWER D	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
060018	TOWN OF SHAW	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67
060019	CITY OF SHELBY	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
060020	TOWN OF WINSTONVILLE	0.00	3.00	5.00	2.67	0.00	3.00	5.00	2.67	0.00	4.00	4.00	2.67
060035	BAXTER HEALTHCARE CORP	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
060042	SYMONDS WATER ASSOCIATION	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.33	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
060044	BOYLE-SKENE-BENOIT	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
060045	DELTA-CHOCTAW W/A #2	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Manual, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09				Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10				Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11			
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
060047	BOYLE-SKENE WATER ASSN	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
060048	PORT OF ROSEDALE	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00
060049	DEESON-ROUNDLAKE WATER CORP	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
060050	BOYLE-SKENE W/A #2	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
060051	BOYLE-SKENE W/A#3	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
060053	DEESON ROUNDLAKE #2	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
060054	NORTH BOLIVAR W/A	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Calhoun County													
070002	BIG CREEK WATER ASSOCIATION	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
070003	CITY OF BRUCE	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
070004	CITY OF CALHOUN CITY	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
070005	CROSS-ROADS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
070006	TOWN OF DERMA	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
070007	DUNCAN HILL WATER SUPPLY	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00
070008	MACEDONIA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
070010	MT COMFORT W/A	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
070011	MT COMFORT W/A-MT MORIAH	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
070012	NEW LIBERTY WATER ASSOCIATION	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
070014	MT COMFORT W/A-PARIS	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33
070015	TOWN OF PITTSBORO	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
070016	POPLAR SPRINGS W/A #1	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	0.00	3.00	5.00	2.67	0.00	4.00	5.00	3.00
070017	MT COMFORT W/A-SAREPTA	0.00	3.00	5.00	2.67	0.00	4.00	4.00	2.67	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
070018	SLATE SPRINGS WATER ASSN	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
070019	TOWN OF VARDAMAN	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	0.00	4.00	4.00	2.67
070020	MT COMFORT W/A-BANNER	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
070023	MT COMFORT W/A #6-HWY 331	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	0.00	3.00	5.00	2.67
070024	POPLAR SPRINGS W/A #2	0.00	3.00	5.00	2.67	0.00	4.00	4.00	2.67	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
Carroll County													
080001	BLACK HAWK WATER ASSN #1	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	1.00	2.00	5.00	2.67
080002	TOWN OF CARROLLTON	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
080003	PELUCIA RURAL W/A #2-GRAY HILL	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
080004	PELUCIA RURAL W/A #3-COILA	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
080005	MCCARLEY WATER ASSOCIATION	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
080006	TOWN OF NORTH CARROLLTON	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00
080009	TOWN OF VAIDEN	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
080015	PELUCIA RURAL W/A #4-NEW ZION	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
080017	PELUCIA RURAL W/A #5	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Managerial, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09			Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10			Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11					
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
Chickasaw County													
090001	ATLANTA WATER SYSTEM, INC.	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00
090002	EAST CHICKASAW W/A #1	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
090003	TOWN OF NEW HOULKA	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
090004	HOULKA-HOUSTON W/A	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
090005	CITY OF HOUSTON	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
090007	CITY OF OKOLONA	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00
090008	SOUTHEAST CHICKASAW W/A #1	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	5.00	NAT	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
090010	SPARTA WATER ASSOCIATION #1	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
090011	WOODLAND WATER WORKS #1	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
090012	EAST CHICKASAW W/A #2	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
090023	CCM WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	2.67	2.00	2.00	4.00	2.67
090024	THORN WATER ASSOCIATION	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00
Choctaw County													
100001	TOWN OF ACKERMAN	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33
100002	CHOCTAW WATER ASSN	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
100003	FENTRESS COMMUNITY W/S	5.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.67	5.00	3.00	3.00	3.67
100004	FRENCH CAMP W/A #1	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
100006	PAN HANDLE WATER ASSOCIATION	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
100007	REFORM WATER ASSOCIATION	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
100008	SIMPSON WATER ASSOCIATION #1	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
100009	TOWN OF WEIR	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00
100010	FRENCH CAMP ACADEMY	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
100016	PAN HANDLE W/A #2	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67
100017	UNION W/A	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.67
Claiborne County													
110002	C S & I WATER ASSN #1	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
110003	HERMANVILLE WATER ASSOCIATION	1.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00
110004	PATTISON W/A-WEST	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
110005	TOWN OF PORT GIBSON	1.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	4.00	4.00	2.67	0.00	5.00	4.00	3.00
110006	ROMOLA WATER ASSOCIATION	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
110011	ENERGY OPERATIONS, INC	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00
110013	ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY	3.00	4.00	N/A	3.50	4.00	2.00	N/A	3.00	2.00	4.00	N/A	3.00
110028	REEDTOWN WATER ASSN	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.67
Clarke County													
120004	TOWN OF ENTERPRISE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
120005	HARMONY WATER ASSOCIATION #1	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
120006	VILLAGE OF PACHUTA	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
120007	CITY OF QUITMAN	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Manual, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09				Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10				Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11			
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
120008	TOWN OF SHUBUTA	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
120009	TOWN OF STONEWALL	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
120011	EAST QUITMAN W/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
120016	HARMONY WATER ASSOCIATION #4	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
120018	HARMONY WATER ASSOCIATION #2	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
120027	WAUTUBBEE WATER ASSN	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
120028	HARMONY W/A #7-N ENTERPRISE	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
Clay County													
130003	SUN CREEK WATER INC-PHEBA	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
130004	SILIAM W/A #1	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
130008	CITY OF WEST POINT	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
130015	SILIAM W/A #2-GRIFFITH WELL	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
130016	SILIAM W/A #3-BEASLEY WELL	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
130017	SILIAM W/A #4-PINE BLUFF	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
130018	GOLDEN TRIANGLE W/A #1	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
130019	GOLDEN TRIANGLE W/A #2	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
130020	WHITE STATION WATER ASSN	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
130021	SILIAM W/A #5	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
130023	SILIAM W/A #6-UNA SYSTEM	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
130024	SILIAM W/A #7-MULDON	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
130025	SILIAM W/A #8-BEASLEY	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
Coahoma County													
140001	BOBO UTILITIES	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.67	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
140002	CLARKSDALE PUBLIC UTILITIES	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
140003	TOWN OF COAHOMA	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
140004	TOWN OF FRIARS POINT	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00
140005	TOWN OF LULA	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.67	2.00	3.00	3.00	2.67
140006	FARRELL UTILITIES	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	2.33	4.00	4.00	1.00	3.00
140007	GREEN ACRES W/A-NORTH	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
140008	TOWN OF JONESTOWN	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
140009	LU-RAND UTILITY DISTRICT	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
140010	TOWN OF LYON	5.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
140011	RENA LARA WATER ASSOCIATION	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.67	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.33
140012	MOORE BAYOU WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
140013	GREEN ACRES W/A-SOUTH	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
140024	MASCOT PLANTING CO	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	DIS
140033	COAHOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00
140045	PINE GROVE WATER ASSOCIATION	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67
140046	DAVENPORT WATER ASSOCIATION	3.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.33	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.33
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Manageial, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09			Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10			Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11					
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
140047	WATER ASSOCIATION OF MOON	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33
140049	SHERARD WATER ASSN	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.33	3.00	1.00	3.00	2.33	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.33
140050	IOC-LULA, INC/ISLE OF CAPRI	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50
140051	MOORE BAYOU W/A #2	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
140052	MOORE BAYOU W/A #3	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
140053	COAHOMA UTILITY DIST #2				NS				NS				3.67
Copiah County													
150001	COPIAH W/A - BAYOU PIERRE #1	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
150002	COPIAH W/A - HAZLEHURST	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
150003	CRYSTAL SPRINGS WATER SERVICE	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
150004	COPIAH W/A - GALLMAN	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
150005	TOWN OF GEORGETOWN	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
150006	HARMONY RIDGE WATER ASSN	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
150007	TOWN OF HAZLEHURST	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
150009	COPIAH-NEW ZION WATER ASSN, INC	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
150010	NORTHEAST COPIAH WATER ASSN	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
150011	TOWN OF WESSON	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
150018	COPIAH COUNTY INDUSTRIAL PARK	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
150020	COPIAH W/A - BAYOU PIERRE #2	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
150022	SANDERSON FARMS, INC	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
Covington County													
160001	COLD SPRINGS WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
160002	CITY OF COLLINS	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
160003	TOWN OF MOUNT OLIVE	2.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00
160004	NORTH COVINGTON W/A-NORTH	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
160005	SALEM WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
160006	TOWN OF SEMINARY	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
160009	SOUTHWEST COVINGTON W/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
160010	WILLOW GROVE WATER ASSN	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00
160011	NORTH COVINGTON W/A-SOUTH	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
160012	SANDERSON BROS POULTRY	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
Desoto County													
170001	BELMONT WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00
170002	BRIGHTS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
170005	DAYS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
170006	EUDORA WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
170009	CITY OF HERNANDO	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
170010	HORN LAKE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
170011	LEWISBURG WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
170014	NESBITT WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Manual, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09			Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10			Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11					
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
170015	CITY OF OLIVE BRANCH	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
170016	CITY OF OLIVE BRANCH - PLEASANT	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
170018	CITY OF SOUTHAVEN	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
170019	WALLS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
170020	BUENA VISTA LAKES	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	2.67
170022	CITY OF HORN LAKE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.33
170024	CITY OF HORN LAKE - HOLLY HILLS	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.33
170025	CITY OF HORN LAKE - TWIN LAKES	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.33
170027	COUNTRY HAVEN MOBILE HOME	4.00	5.00	2.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.67
170028	NORTH MS UTILITIES-CHICK BLUFF	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
170029	NORTH MS UTILITIES-LAKE O HILL	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
170031	MAGNOLIA HILLS MHP	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.33	1.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.67
170032	CITY OF OLIVE BRANCH-BRIDGETOWN	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
170033	KOKO REEF WATER CO	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.67
170043	WALLS WATER ASSN- LAKE FOREST	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
170049	LEWISBURG -INGRAMS MILL NORTH	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
Forrest County													
180001	BARRONTOWN W/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180002	CAMP SHELBY TRAINING SITE	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
180003	CARNES WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.33
180005	DIXIE COMMUNITY UTILITY ASSN.	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180006	EASTABUCHIE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
180007	GLENDALE UTILITY DISTRICT	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180008	CITY OF HATTIESBURG	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180009	S MS PUBLIC WATER AUTH-	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180011	CITY OF PETAL	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180012	RAWLS SPRINGS UTILITY DISTRICT	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180013	SUNRISE UTILITY ASSN INC	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
180014	BROOKLYN WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.67
180020	HANCOCK MOBILE HOME PARK	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.33	1.00	1.00	0.00	4.00	0.67	DIS	DIS	DIS
180021	BLACK CREEK RETREAT	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.67	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.33	3.67	3.67	3.67
180022	S MS PUBLIC WATER AUTH-ROCK	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	4.67
Franklin County													
190001	TOWN OF BUDE	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.33	4.00	5.00	4.00
190003	TOWN OF MEADVILLE	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	5.00	5.00	4.33
190004	PROVIDENCE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	1.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	3.67
190005	TOWN OF ROXIE	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	3.00	5.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00
190006	SIXTOWN WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
190008	FCWA - OLDENBURG	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.33	5.00	5.00	4.33
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Manageial, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09				Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10				Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11			
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
190009	FCWA-SOUTH MEADVILLE	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
190010	FCWA - BERRYTOWN	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
190014	FCWA - PLEASANT VALLEY	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
190015	FCWA-HAMBURG	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
George County													
200001	COMBINED UTILITIES	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
200003	BEXLEY WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
200004	CITY OF LUCEDALE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
200005	MULTI-MART WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
200006	ROCKY CREEK UTILITY	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
200017	BENDDALE SCHOOL	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00
Greene County													
210001	BEAT III W/A #1-SAND HILL	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	3.00	3.33
210002	TOWN OF LEAKESVILLE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
210003	TOWN OF MCLAIN	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
210004	NEELY UTILITIES	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	3.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	3.00	4.00
210005	TOWN OF STATE LINE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
210006	LEAF WATER ASSOCIATION-SOUTH	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
210011	BEAT III W/A #3-JONATHAN	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.67
210012	S E GREENE WATER AUTHORITY	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Grenada County													
220002	G T & Y WATER DISTRICT INC	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
220003	CITY OF GRENADA	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67
220004	GRENADA-BOGUE BASIN/HOLCOMB	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00
220005	GRENADA CO W/S-GIRL SCOUT	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.33
220007	GRENADA CO W/S-MONDY RD/ELLIOT	4.00	3.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	2.00	5.00	3.00
220008	POOR HOUSE W/A #1	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
220013	POOR HOUSE W/A #2	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
220036	GRENADA IND PK & AIRPORT WATER	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.33
220062	GRENADA-BOGUE BASIN/GORE SPRGS	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	3.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	2.00	5.00	3.33
220064	YOUNGS W/S DIST #1-DIVIDING R	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
220065	YOUNGS W/S DIST #2-YOUNGS SYS	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
Hancock County													
230001	CITY OF BAY ST LOUIS	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	2.00	0.00	5.00	2.33
230002	CITY OF WAVELAND	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
230003	TESI: CLERMONT HARBOR	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	0.00	3.00	4.00	2.33	0.00	4.00	3.00	2.33
230004	TESI: OAK HARBOR	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	0.00	3.00	4.00	2.33	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.67
230005	DIAMONDHEAD UTILITIES-NORTH	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
230007	TESI: JOURDAN RIVER SHORES	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	1.00	3.00	4.00	2.67	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.67
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Managerial, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09				Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10				Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11			
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
230012	SCAFIDIS WHEEL INN & TLR PARK	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
230015	STENNIS SPACE CENTER	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
230016	STENNIS INT AIRPORT & IND PARK	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50
230017	PORT BIENVILLE IND PARK	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50
230022	SOUTH HANCOCK ELEMENTARY	3.00	3.00	N/A	3.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	2.00	4.00	N/A	3.00
230050	KILN UTILITY AND FIRE DISTRICT OF	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
230051	TESI: WHITE CYPRESS LAKES	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	2.33	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.67
230052	APPLIED GEO TECHNOLOGIES INC	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	4.00	N/A	4.50	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
230057	SUNRISE MOBILE HOME PARK	2.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	2.33	2.00	4.00	0.00	2.00
230063	STANDARD DEDEAUX WATER	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
230065	HANCOCK COUNTY WATER & SEWER	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
Harrison County													
240001	CITY OF BILOXI	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
240002	DIBERVILLE W/S	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
240003	CITY OF GULFPORT	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
240005	CITY OF LONG BEACH	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
240008	CITY OF GULFPORT-ORANGE GROVE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
240009	CITY OF PASS CHRISTIAN	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
240011	SAUCIER UTILITIES	4.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.33
240026	CEDAR LAKE BILOXI, LLC	2.00	4.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.00
240027	CHARLOTTE DEV CO-KNOLLWOOD S/D	2.00	3.00	0.00	1.67	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.67	1.00	3.00	2.00	2.00
240033	CITY OF GULFPORT-DEDEAUX UTILITY	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00
240036	CITY OF BILOXI-FRENCH	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.00
240038	CEDAR LAKE APARTMENTS	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.33	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.00
240046	BAYOU BERNARD INDUSTRIAL PARK	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
240049	KEESLER AIR FORCE BASE	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	4.00	N/A	4.67	2.00	2.00	N/A	2.00
240052	TESI: LAKEWOOD ENVIRONMENTAL	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	0.00	3.00	4.00	2.33	1.00	4.00	3.00	2.67
240060	NAVAL CONSTRUCTION BATTAL CTR	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
240064	CITY OF GULFPORT-OAKLEIGH	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	0.00	4.00	3.00	3.33
240066	TESI: PASS CHRISTIAN ISLES	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33
240084	CITY OF BILOXI-NORTH	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.33
240089	TUXACHANIE ESTATES #2	1.00	4.00	0.00	1.67	0.00	4.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	N/A	3.00
240135	LIZANA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	3.00	5.00		4.00	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.00	4.00	4.00	N/A	DIS
240144	DELISLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	2.00	5.00	N/A	3.50	2.00	5.00	N/A	3.50	3.00	4.00	N/A	3.50
240154	HARRISON CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.00	1.00	4.00	N/A	2.50
240164	COAST EPISCOPAL HIGH SCHOOL	2.00	5.00	N/A	3.50	2.00	4.00	N/A	3.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.67
240172	C & R PROPERTIES	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.67
240188	MISS POWER CO-JACK WATSON ELEC	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
240192	DELISLE HEAD START				NAT				NAT				5.00
240194	RIVERBEND UTILITIES INC	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Managerial, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09			Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10			Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11					
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
240195	PINE HAVEN MOBILE HOME VILLAGE	2.00	5.00	0.00	2.33	2.00	4.00	0.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.33
240203	APPLE VALLEY TRAILER PARK	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.67	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.67
240212	ROBINWOOD FOREST UTILITY INC	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00
240213	COUNTRY LIVING MOBILE HOME PK	0.00	5.00	0.00	1.67	2.00	3.00	0.00	1.67	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.33
240214	DOLANS MOBILE HOME PARK	4.00	4.00	0.00	2.67	4.00	4.00	0.00	2.67	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67
240223	DESTINATION MOBILE HOME PARK				NS				NAT	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00
240224	LYMAN UTILITIES	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	CON	2.00	5.00	N/A	CON
240226	TINY TOTS DAYCARE CENTER	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.00	4.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	4.00	5.00	N/A	3.50
240232	DUPONT INC-DELISLE PLANT	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.50	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50
240234	PINEVILLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.00	1.00	4.00	N/A	2.50
240236	DEERWOOD UTILITIES	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.33
240237	WOOLMARKET VILLAGE ESTATES	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.67
240239	HIGHWAY 49 MOBILE HOME PARK	3.00	4.00	0.00	2.33	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.33
240247	PALMER CREEK UTILITY ASSC, INC	2.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.33
240249	BRADFORD PLACE SUBDIVISION	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	1.00	3.00	4.00	2.67
240250	DOGWOOD HILLS SUBDIVISION	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.33
240251	RIDGECREST ESTATES	3.00	4.00	0.00	2.33	4.00	3.00	0.00	2.33	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.00
240252	HOMESTEAD MOBILE HOME PARK	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
240253	LOVES TRAVEL CENTER	2.00	5.00	N/A	3.50	1.00	4.00	N/A	2.50	0.00	4.00	N/A	2.00
240254	PINEVILLE PROJECT III SOUTH	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	1.00	3.00	5.00	3.00
240255	CITY OF DIBERVILLE-MAGNOLIA BD	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
240256	THE OAKS UTILITIES	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.33	1.00	3.00	0.00	1.33	1.00	2.00	0.00	1.00
240258	THE WOODS	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.33
240259	ST PATRICK HIGH SCHOOL	4.00	3.00	N/A	3.50	4.00	3.00	N/A	3.50	3.00	3.00	N/A	3.00
240261	DELISLE ELEMENTARY #2	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00	1.00	2.00	N/A	1.50
240262	DIBERVILLE HIGH SCHOOL				NS				NS	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
240263	WEST HARRISON HIGH SCHOOL				NS				NS	2.00	4.00	N/A	3.00
Hinds County													
250001	TOWN OF BOLTON	2.00	3.00	5.00	3.33	1.00	3.00	4.00	2.67	0.00	3.00	5.00	2.67
250003	CITY OF CLINTON	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
250004	EASTSIDE WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
250005	TOWN OF EDWARDS	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
250007	HUBBARD WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33
250008	CITY OF JACKSON	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
250009	NORTH HINDS W/A #4-K&P	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
250011	NORTH HINDS W/A #5-LIMEKILN	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
250012	CITY OF JACKSON-MADDOX RD.	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
250014	MT OLIVE WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.67
250015	NORTH HINDS W/A #1-BROWNSVILLE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
250019	POCAHONTAS WATER ASSOCIATION	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	2.00	2.00	0.00	1.33
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Manual, F-Financial

Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster

PWS ID	Public Water Supply	Fiscal Year 2009 7/1/08 - 6/30/09				Fiscal Year 2010 7/1/09 - 6/30/10				Fiscal Year 2011 7/1/10 - 6/30/11			
		T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall	T	M	F	Overall
250020	CITY OF RAYMOND	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
250021	REEDTOWN WATER ASSN	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	3.00	3.67
250022	SOUTH CENTRAL WATER ASSN	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
250023	SOUTH TERRY WATER ASSN	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
250024	ST THOMAS WATER ASSOCIATION	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67
250025	TOWN OF TERRY	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
250026	TOWN OF UTICA	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33	0.00	4.00	5.00	3.00	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67
250028	JACKSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT	5.00	4.00	N/A	4.50	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
250029	NORTH HINDS W/A #2-CHAPEL HILL	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
250034	UNIVERSITY OF MS MEDICAL CNTR	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.00	5.00	4.00	N/A	4.50	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.00
250087	FRIENDS OF ALCOHOLICS	3.00	5.00	N/A	4.00	4.00	5.00	N/A	4.50	1.00	5.00	N/A	3.00
250094	NORTH HINDS W/A #6-SHEPHERD	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
250097	HINDS CO DETENTION CTR	1.00	2.00	N/A	1.50	2.00	1.00	N/A	1.50	3.00	2.00	N/A	2.50
250098	VA HOSPITAL	5.00	3.00	N/A	4.00	4.00	4.00	N/A	4.00	5.00	5.00	N/A	5.00
Holmes County													
260001	ACONA WATER ASSOCIATION #1	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
260003	CASTALIAN W/A	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	3.00	3.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
260004	CENTERVILLE COMMUNITY W/A	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
260005	TOWN OF CRUGER	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67
260006	CITY OF DURANT	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.67	1.00	4.00	5.00	3.33
260007	EBENEZER RURAL WATER ASSN	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.33	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
260008	TOWN OF GOODMAN	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
260009	HARLAND CREEK COMM W/A-A	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
260010	HOLMES JR COLLEGE	4.00	3.00	N/A	3.50	3.00	1.00	N/A	2.00	4.00	3.00	N/A	3.50
260011	LEBANON W/A-WEST	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.67	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
260012	CITY OF LEXINGTON	3.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
260013	TOWN OF PICKENS	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.33	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33
260014	SOUTH HOLMES W/A #1	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
260015	SWEET HOME WATER & SEWER DIST	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
260016	TOWN OF TCHULA	1.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
260017	TOWN OF WEST	3.00	3.00	5.00	3.67	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	2.33
260018	WEST HILL WATER ASSOCIATION	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.67	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.33
260021	SOUTH HOLMES W/A-B SYSTEM	2.00	4.00	4.00	3.33	2.00	4.00	2.00	3.67	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
260022	HARLAND CREEK COMM W/A-B	1.00	5.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
260027	WEST HOLMES WATER ASSN	5.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	3.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	2.00	5.00	5.00	4.00
260039	HARLAND CREEK COMM W/A-C	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67	3.00	5.00	3.00	4.00	2.00	4.00	5.00	3.67
260040	HOLMES INTERSTATE UTILITY DIST	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	0.00	4.00	0.00	2.33	0.00	3.00	3.00	2.00
260043	HARLAND CREEK W/A-HORSESHOE	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.33
Yearly State Averages		3.54	4.06	4.22	3.93	3.63	3.97	4.30	3.96	3.65	4.23	4.39	4.09

Maximum Rating = 5.0; T-Technical, M-Manual, F-Financial
Key: N/A - Not Applicable; NS - New System; CON - Consolidation; DIS - System Dissolved; NAT - Natural Disaster