



## WATER QUALITY-HEALTH

How well does this utility eliminate harmful contaminants from drinking water, and keep drinking water safe?



## INFRASTRUCTURE & OPERATIONS

Are the utility's transmission and distribution pipes sound, with few leaks or water main breaks? Is the utility investing adequately in replacement of aging pipes? Is the utility energy efficient?



## FINANCE

Is the utility financially sound and sustainable?  
Are service prices fair and affordable?



## COMMUNICATIONS

Is the utility transparent and interactive with its customers?

### GRADING SCALE

A: 90-100 B: 80-89 C: 70-79 D: 60-69 F: <60



## WHAT DO THESE GRADES MEAN?

### QUALITY - HEALTH

Delivering safe, healthy drinking water is the primary objective of any water utility, and grades are based on regulated contaminant levels for both acute and chronic contaminants. Our grades view complying with federal and state rules as a minimum. Utilities that violate Treatment Technique (TT) or whose water exceeds Mandatory Contaminant Levels (MCLs) under the Safe Drinking Water Act automatically fail, but the higher the grade the healthier the drinking water. Grades in the A range indicate very safe drinking water.

### INFRASTRUCTURE & OPERATIONS

Physical integrity and operational effectiveness are both essential to water system excellence and sustainability. Infrastructure focuses on transmission and distribution of water, measuring things like main breaks. Operations includes several measures of operating efficiency.

### FINANCE

Financial strength is crucial for a utility's sustainability, affordability is critical to the public health mission, and progressive pricing is important for equity. Utilities receive strong marks for showing ample financial capacity and liquidity, and for distributing costs fairly based on the amount of water that customers use.

### COMMUNICATIONS

This grade is based on transparency and interactivity. Transparency reflects opportunities for the public to interact with utility leaders and personnel, while Interactivity gauges opportunities for the public to interact with them. High grades are given to utilities with websites, use of social media, as well as communicating by telephone, email, and/or public meetings.



**QUALITY-HEALTH VALUES & SCORES FOR ACUTE CONTAMINANTS**

Contaminant	Value	Score
Cadmium	0.0	100.0
Coliform, total	0.0000	100.0
Dalapon	0	100.0
O-dichlorobenzene	0	100.0
P-dichlorobenzene	0	100.0
Di(2-ethylhexyl) adipate	0	100.0
Nitrate (no3-n)	2.490	95.2
Nitrite (no2-n)	0.000	100.0
Oxamyl (vydate)	0	100.0
Violations?	No	



QUALITY-HEALTH VALUES & SCORES FOR CHRONIC CONTAMINANTS

Contaminate	Value	Score	Contaminate	Value	Score
Arsenic	0.00	98.0	Fluoride	0.630	96.7
Alachlor (Lasso)	0.00	100.0	Glyphosate	0	100.0
Antimony, Total	0.00	100.0	Heptachlor	0	100.0
Atrazine	0.00	100.0	Heptachlor Epoxide	0	100.0
Barium	0.12	99.0	Hexachlorobenzene (HCB)	0	100.0
Benzene	0.00	100.0	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	0.000	100.0
Benzo(a)pyrene	0.00	100.0	Lead	24.10	0.0
Beryllium, Total	0.00	97.4	Mercury	0.000	100.0
Bromate	0.00	100.0	Methoxychlor	0	100.0
Carbofuran	0.00	100.0	PCB, Total	0	100.0
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.00	100.0	Pentachlorophenol	0	100.0
Chloramine	0.00	100.0	Picloram	0.0	100.0
Chlordane	0.00	100.0	Radium (226 + 228)	7.92	0.0
Chromium	0.00	100.0	Selenium	0.003	99.0
Copper	217	96.8	2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	0	100.0
Cyanide	0.00	100.0	Simazine	0	100.0
2,4-D	0.00	100.0	Styrene	0.000	100.0
1,2-Dibromo-3-Chloropro (DBCP)	0.00	100.0	Tetrachloroethylene	0.000	100.0
1,2-Dichloroethane	0.000	100.0	Thallium total	0.000	97.0
cis-1,2-dichloroethylene	0.000	100.0	Toluene	0.00	100.0
trans-1,2-dichloroethylene	0.00	100.0	Toxaphene	0	100.0
Dichloromethane	0.00	100.0	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	0	100.0
1,2-Dichloropropane	0.00	100.0	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	0	100.0
Di(2-ethylhexyl) adipate	0	100	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	0	100.0
Di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate	0.00	100.0	Trichloroethylene	0	100.0
Dinoseb	0.00	100.0	TTHM	10.30	97.6
Diquat	0.00	100.0	Combined Uranium	0.60	99.6
Endothall	0	100.0	Vinyl Chloride	0.00	100.0
Endrin	0	100.0	Xylenes, Total	0.00	100.0
Ethylbenzene	0	100.0	Violations?	No	No
Ethylene Dibromide (EDB)	0	100	Chronic Average	96.2	96.2



# 2024 WATER UTILITY REPORT CARD

## WATERFORD VILLAGE OF WTR & SWR UTILITY

### FINANCE VALUES & SCORES

Indicator	Value	Score	Weight (%)
Debt to assets ratio	0.19	92.0	20
Monthly bill in Hours of Minimum Wage	4.1	87.5	25
Days of Operating Reserve	701	100.0	20
Poehler Index	0.7	66.0	5
Return on Equity	0.1	100.0	20
PILOT/Property Tax Equivalent	1.0	75.0	10
<b>Weighted Average</b>		<b>91.1</b>	

### INFRASTRUCTURE & OPERATIONS VALUES AND SCORES

INFRASTRUCTURE			
Indicator	Value	Score	Weight (%)
Main & Service Breaks per 100 miles	11.6	79.4	25
Water Loss per 100 miles (gallons)	57397.4	75.8	12.5
Weighted Average Age of Main (years)	45.5	70.0	6.25
Weighted Replacement Rate (years)	89.2	87.2	6.25
<b>Infrastructure Weighted Average (50% overall)</b>		<b>78.3</b>	
OPERATIONS			
Indicator	Value	Score	Weight (%)
kWh per Million Gallons per Year	2296	85.3	10
Operating Expenses per Thousand Gallons (\$)	4	86.3	7.5
Operating Expenses per Mile of Pipe (\$)	14325	86.7	7.5
Operating Expenses per Customer (\$)	104	99.9	7.5
Operating Expenses per Capita (\$)	92	91.1	7.5
SDWA Management compliance (violations)	3	65.0	10
<b>Operations Weighted Average (50% overall)</b>		<b>84.7</b>	
<b>Total Infrastructure &amp; Operations grade</b>		<b>81.5</b>	

The Wisconsin Waterworks Excellence Project (WWEP) at UW-Madison seeks to make the performance and conditions of these critical but often invisible systems more visible to the people of Wisconsin.



**COMMUNICATIONS VALUES & SCORES**

Indicator	Points Earned*	Weight (%)
Website Present	100	5
Mobile-friendly	100	5
Accessibility	100	5
Non-English	0	10
Consumer Confidence Report	100	20
Rates	100	20
Source Water Information	0	4
Facilities Information	No	3
Operations Information	0	3
Phone Number	100	5
Webform/Email	0	5
Online Bill Pay	100	5
Past Meetings	100	2.5
Future Meetings	100	2.5
Utility Social Media	0	2.5
Municipal Social Media	25	2.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>70.6</b>	<b>100</b>

\*See full WWEP report for scoring methodology for individual communication indicators.