



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUN 6 2005

OFFICE OF  
WATER

**MEMORANDUM**

**SUBJECT:** Award of Grants and Cooperative Agreements for the Special Projects and Programs Authorized by the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act

**FROM:** James A. Hanlon, Director  
Office of Wastewater Management (4201M) *James A. Hanlon*

**TO:** Water Management Division Directors  
Regions I - X

**PURPOSE**

This memorandum provides information and guidelines on how the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will award and administer grants and cooperative agreements for the special projects and programs identified in the State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) account of the Agency's fiscal year (FY) 2005 Appropriations Act.

**BACKGROUND**

The EPA section of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, (P. L. 108-447), also referred to as the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act, includes \$309,925,000 in the STAG account for 666 water, wastewater and groundwater infrastructure projects and for the Long Island Sound Restoration Program. Also included as separate line items in the STAG account were \$50,000,000 for the United States-Mexico Border Program and \$45,000,000 for the Alaska Rural and Native Villages Program. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 also contains an across the board rescission of 0.80 percent except for defense, military construction or supplemental appropriations. The 0.80 percent rescission applies to all of the funds included in the STAG account.

The specific requirements governing the award of the special projects and programs are contained in the following documents: the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, the Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 108-792), the House Report (H. Rept. No. 108-674), and the Senate Report (S. Rept. No. 108-353). The specific requirements contained in these documents have been incorporated into this memorandum.

### **THREE PERCENT SET-ASIDE**

The Agency's FY 2001 Appropriations Act (P. L. 106-377) included a provision stating that the Administrator may use up to three percent of the amount appropriated for each earmark to fund State, Corps of Engineer or contractor support for the management and oversight of the special projects. This means that the set-aside monies cannot be used to pay for EPA staff or travel expenses. EPA issued a formal policy memorandum on September 27, 2001, that provides information and guidelines on how the Agency will implement the three percent set-aside provision.<sup>1</sup>

The three percent set-aside provision is permanent statutory authority which means it applies to all post-FY 2001 special Appropriations Act projects including those listed in the STAG account of this year's Appropriations Act. However, the three percent set-aside provision does not apply to funds appropriated for specific programs, such as the Long Island Sound Restoration Program, the United States-Mexico Border Program and the Alaska Rural and Native Villages Program.

### **PROJECTS**

The Conference Report that accompanied the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act identified two projects funded from monies appropriated for the United States-Mexico Border Program. These two projects will be awarded and administered within the guidelines and provisions contained in this memorandum.

Attachment 1 identifies the 667 earmarks listed in the STAG account and the two projects funded from monies appropriated for the United States-Mexico Border Program. Attachment 1 also shows the original amount appropriated for each project, as well as the actual amount available for grant award after the reduction due to the 0.80 percent rescission and three percent set-aside provision.<sup>2</sup>

With the exception of Earmark Number 133 for Columbus Water Works, Columbus, Georgia, which will be awarded and administered by the Office of Water in Headquarters, the special projects identified in Attachment 1 will be awarded and administered by the Regional Offices. The delegation of authority (1200 TN 516), issued on September 28, 2000 (Attachment 2), is listed in Chapter 1, Delegation Number 1-102, of EPA's Delegation Manual. This delegation of authority transferred the authority to award grants and cooperative agreements for funds included in the STAG account to the Assistant Administrator for Water and the Regional

---

<sup>1</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0318.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0318.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> States that choose to perform the necessary construction oversight activities for the planning, design and building phases of a project at their own expense may request to have the three percent set-aside funds assigned to the respective grant recipients within their States. Headquarters will transfer the necessary funds to the Regions for this purpose after the formal review and approval of the State's request.

Administrators. Accordingly, the Regions and Headquarters have the necessary authority, effective the date of this memorandum, to award grants and cooperative agreements for the special projects and programs identified in the STAG account of the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act.

### **COST-SHARE REQUIREMENT**

The FY 2005 Conference Report language that precedes the listing of the 667 STAG earmarks (H. Rept. No. 108-792, at p. 1568) states that:

The conferees have provided \$309,925,000 for a targeted program making grants to communities for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection. As in past years, these grants shall be accompanied by a cost-share requirement whereby 45 percent of a project's cost is the responsibility of the community or entity receiving the grant. In those few cases where such cost-share requirement poses a particular financial burden on the recipient community or entity, the conferees support the Agency's use of its long-standing guidance for financial capability assessments to determine reductions or waivers from this match requirement.

With the exception of the limited instances in which an applicant meets the criteria for a waiver, the conferees have provided no more than 55% of an individual project's costs, regardless of the amount appropriated below. The phrase "terms and conditions" referenced in the bill language includes the maximum 55% federal share, as well as the intended recipients and the specific project descriptions, as listed below.

The report language only allows the Agency to approve waivers to the 45 percent matching requirement that are based on financial capability issues. Accordingly, our policy for the projects listed in Attachment 1 is that grant applicants will be expected to pay for 45 percent of the project costs, unless there is specific language in the Conference Report or Appropriations Act that specifies a different matching requirement or a waiver to the matching requirement is approved based on financial capability issues.

Furthermore, in those situations where the description in the Conference Report explicitly defines the scope of work of the project, the Federal share of the grant will be limited to 55 percent of the estimated cost for completing the scope of work described, regardless of the amount appropriated for the project, unless a waiver to the matching requirement is approved based on financial capability issues. This means, in some instances, that the grant amount will be less than the amount appropriated for the project and that some funds will not be obligated. The disposition of any such unobligated grant funds will be determined by Congress.

## WAIVERS TO THE MATCHING REQUIREMENT

In March 1997, EPA published *Combined Sewer Overflows -- Guidance for Financial Capability Assessment and Schedule Development*.<sup>3</sup> This financial guidance document includes a process for measuring the financial impact of current and proposed wastewater treatment facilities and drinking water facilities on the users of those facilities, and establishes a procedure for assessing financial capability. The process for assessing financial capability contained in that document was initially developed in the 1970's and has been extensively revised based on EPA's experience in the construction grants, State Revolving Fund (SRF), enforcement and water quality standards programs. The assessment process requires the calculation of a financial capability indicator. The Agency approves waivers in those cases where the financial capability indicator shows that the project would result in a high financial burden on the users of the facility.

Exceptions to the 45 percent match requirement must be approved by EPA Headquarters. All requests for an exception should be prepared by the EPA Regional Offices using information provided by the grant applicant. The request must include the information contained in Chapters III and IV of the Financial Capability Assessment guidance document.<sup>4</sup> The requests, including the necessary supporting documentation and appropriate background material, should be submitted to the Director, Office of Wastewater Management, (Mail Code 4201M), USEPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20460.

## FEDERAL FUNDS AS A SOURCE OF MATCHING FUNDS

Federal funds from other programs may be used as all or part of the match for the special projects only if the statute authorizing those programs specifically allows the funds to be used as a match for other Federal grants. Additionally, the other Federal programs must allow their appropriated funds to be used for the planning, design and/or construction of water, wastewater or groundwater infrastructure projects. Listed below are the major Federal programs whose grant or loan funds can be used to provide all or part of the match for the special projects:

- Department of Agriculture, Rural Development program,
- Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant program, and
- Appalachian Regional Commission grants.

---

<sup>3</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/owm/pdfs/csofc.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owm/pdfs/csofc.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> All of the financial data used to calculate the financial capability indicator must be indexed to the same year. The Bureau of Labor Statistics' web site ([www.bls.gov/cpi/](http://www.bls.gov/cpi/)) contains an "Inflation Calculator" that will automatically perform this function.

As previously stated, Federal funds may be used as all or part of the match for other Federal grant programs only if the authorizing legislation includes such authority. Since the FY 2005 Appropriations Act does not include such language, the special Appropriations Act grant funds cannot be used as a source of matching funds for other Federal programs.

## **LOANS FROM A STATE REVOLVING FUND AS A SOURCE OF MATCHING FUNDS**

The Agency provides funding for two separate State Revolving Fund (SRF) loan programs, the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) program and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program. The Agency has taken actions that allow particular sources of funds from the two SRF programs to be used as a source of the local match. Specifically, the Agency issued the following two documents:

- A class deviation from the regulatory provisions of 40 CFR §35.3125(b)(1). The class deviation,<sup>5</sup> issued August 16, 2001, pertains to the CWSRF program.
- A policy memorandum designated as DWSRF 02-01. The policy memorandum,<sup>6</sup> issued October 10, 2001, pertains to the DWSRF program.

The class deviation and policy document listed above allow State SRF programs to use the non-Federal and non-State match share of SRF funds to provide loans that can be used as the match for the special projects. The non-Federal funds include repayments, interest earnings and bond proceeds. The non-State match share (i.e., the overmatch) is any State contribution to the SRF above the statutorily required 20 percent match.

The use of a loan from an SRF to provide part or all of the match for a special project is a State SRF program agency decision. However, the action must be consistent with established State policy, guidelines and procedures governing the use of SRF loans. Projects that receive SRF assistance must also adhere to Federal CWSRF or DWSRF program requirements relating to eligibility and prioritization.

## **PRE-AWARD COSTS**

The Grants Administration Division (GAD) issued a policy memorandum (GPI 00-02) on March 30, 2000, that applies to all grants, including special Appropriations Act projects awarded on or after April 1, 2000. Additionally, a clarification to the policy memorandum (GPI 00-02(a)) was issued by GAD on May 3, 2000. The two memoranda revised the Agency's interpretation of a provision contained in the general grant regulations at 40 CFR §31.23(a) concerning the approval of pre-award costs.

---

<sup>5</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0324.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0324.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0325.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0325.pdf).

In essence, the GAD memoranda state that:

- “Recipients may incur pre-award costs [up to] 90 calendar days prior to award provided they include such costs in their application, the costs meet the definition of pre-award costs and are approved by the EPA Project Officer and EPA Award Official.”
- The award official can approve pre-award costs incurred more than 90 calendar days prior to grant award, in appropriate circumstances, if the pre-award costs are in conformance with the requirements set forth in OMB Circular A-87 and with applicable Agency regulations, policies and guidelines.

The GAD memoranda state that the award official can approve pre-award costs incurred prior to grant award in appropriate situations if the approval of the pre-award costs is consistent with the intent of the requirements for pre-award costs set forth in OMB Circular A-87 and are in conformance with Agency regulations, policies and guidelines. The following two situations meet these requirements:

- Any allowable costs incurred *after* the start of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated but before grant award (*for FY 2005 projects, this date is October 1, 2004*).
- Allowable facilities planning and design costs associated with the construction portions of the project included in the grant that were incurred *before* the start of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated (*for FY 2005 projects, this date is October 1, 2004*).

Accordingly, effective April 1, 2000, the Regions have the authority to approve pre-award costs for the two situations described above. Any approval, of course, is contingent on the Regional Office determination that the pre-award costs in question are in conformance with the applicable Federal laws, regulations and executive orders that govern EPA grant awards and are allowable, reasonable and allocable to the project.

The Regions should not approve any pre-award costs for special Appropriations Act projects, other than those that involve the two situations discussed above, without written approval from Headquarters. The request, with sufficient supporting documentation, should be submitted to the Director, Office of Wastewater Management, (Mail Code 4201M), USEPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20460. The Office of Wastewater Management will consult, in appropriate circumstances, with the Grants Administration Division and the Office of General Counsel. If appropriate, a deviation from 40 CFR §31.23(a) will be processed and issued.

## **LAWS, REGULATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

A listing of the Federal Laws and Executive Orders that apply to all EPA grants, including the projects authorized by the Agency’s FY 2005 Appropriations Act, is contained in

Attachment 3. Some of the authorities only apply to grants that include construction, e.g., EO 13202 as amended by EO 13208. A more detailed description of the Federal laws, Executive Orders, OMB Circulars and their implementing regulations is contained in Module No. 2 of the EPA Assistance Project Officers Training Course which is available through the Regional Grants Management Offices.

The regulations at 40 CFR Part 31 apply to grants and cooperative agreements awarded to State, local, and Indian tribal governments. The regulations at 40 CFR Part 30 apply to grants with nonprofit organizations and with non-governmental for profit entities. In appropriate circumstances, such as grants for demonstration projects, the research and demonstration grant regulations at 40 CFR Part 40 can be used to supplement either 40 CFR Part 30 or Part 31.

The Agency issued a memorandum<sup>7</sup> in January 1995, concerning the applicability of 40 CFR Part 29 (Intergovernmental Review) to the special projects authorized by the Agency's FY 1995 Appropriations Act. That memorandum also applies to the special projects authorized by the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act does not apply to grants awarded under the authority of the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act because the Act does not include language that makes it apply. However, if FY 2005 funds are used to supplement funding of a construction contract that includes Clean Water Act Title II requirements (e.g., contracts awarded under the construction grants or coastal cities programs), the entire contract is subject to Davis-Bacon Act requirements, including the portion funded with FY 2005 funds.

## **SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS**

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant applicable statutes and Executive Orders, such as the Endangered Species Act (ESA), apply to the special projects authorized by the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act. The applicable NEPA regulations are the Council of Environmental Quality's implementing regulations at 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508 and EPA's NEPA regulations at 40 CFR Part 6, Subparts A-D.<sup>8</sup>

The Agency issued a memorandum (Attachment 4) on January 20, 1995, concerning NEPA compliance for the special projects authorized by the Agency's FY 1995 Appropriations Act. That memorandum also applies to the special projects authorized by the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act.

---

<sup>7</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0326.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0326.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> EPA's regulations at 40 CFR Part 6, Subpart E, while they do not apply to these special Appropriations Act projects, may provide additional guidance.

The development of information needed to determine compliance with NEPA and other cross-cutting Federal requirements is an allowable cost that can, and should, be included in the scope of work of the grant if not performed prior to grant award. These activities can be funded on an incremental basis, by awarding a grant that only includes these activities, or as part of the entire project (i.e., planning, design and construction) with the stipulation, in the form of a grant condition, stating that EPA will not approve or fund any work beyond the conceptual design point<sup>9</sup> until the applicable requirements of such authorities have been met. The Agency issued a memorandum (Attachment 5) on July, 29, 2003 that contains a model grant condition that should be used in this situation.

It should be noted that NEPA and other cross-cutting Federal requirements that apply to the major Federal action (i.e., the approval and/or funding of work beyond the conceptual design point) cannot be delegated. Although EPA can fund the grantee or state/tribal development of an Environmental Information Document (EID) or other analysis to provide supporting information, EPA has the legal obligation to issue the NEPA documents, to sign NEPA determinations, and to fulfill other cross-cutting Federal requirements before approving or paying for design and/or construction.

When both EPA and another Federal agency are funding the same project, the agencies may negotiate an agreement for one to be the lead agency for performing grant oversight and management activities, including those related to NEPA and other cross-cutting Federal requirements. The lead agency can be the one which is providing the most funds for the project, or the agency that provided the initial funds for the project. If an environmental impact statement (EIS) is required, EPA should be a co-lead or cooperating agency so that it can adopt the EIS without recirculating it. If the project requires an environmental assessment (EA), EPA may use the other agency's EA as a basis for its finding of no significant impact (FONSI), provided EPA has independently reviewed the EA and agrees with the analysis and circulates the FONSI and attached EA for the requisite 30 day comment period. Note that EPA may not use a categorical exclusion of another Federal agency unless EPA's regulations at 40 CFR Part 6 also provide for the categorical exclusion.

## **OPERATING GUIDELINES**

The authority for awarding grants for the special projects listed in Attachment 1 and the United States-Mexico Border Program is Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, (P. L. 108-447). The authority for awarding grants for the Alaska Rural and Native Villages Program is section 303 of the Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1996 (P. L. 104-182). The authority for awarding grants for the Long Island Sound Restoration Program is section 119 of the Clean Water Act as amended by the Long Island Sound Restoration Act (LISRA), Title IV of the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000 (P. L. 106-457).

---

<sup>9</sup> Completion of conceptual design is essentially the same as completion of facility planning as defined in EPA's Construction Grants program.



The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for the special Appropriations Act projects is 66.606 “Surveys, Studies, Investigations, and Special Purpose Grants.” The Integrated Grants Management System (IGMS) code for the special projects is XP, titled “Water Infrastructure Grants as authorized by EPA Appropriations.” The Object Class Code (budget and accounting information) for the special projects is 41.83. Applicants should use Standard Form 424 (Version 7/03) to apply for the grants.

### Location of Project

To be able to report on environmental and public health benefits, the Agency has decided to collect, and store in an appropriate database, the geographic location for grant funded infrastructure projects. Accordingly, all special project grants authorized by the FY 2005 Appropriations Act should include a term and condition stating that locational information must be submitted. For most projects, the specific information needed is the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) number(s) or the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) number(s). EPA’s information technology (IT) systems will use the NPDES and the SDWIS numbers to determine the specific geographic parameters of the project. For those situations where NPDES and SDWIS identifiers are not appropriate, the longitude and latitude of the project should be provided.

### Grants to Nonprofit Organizations

Funds appropriated under the STAG account can, if the situation warrants, be used for grants to nonprofit organizations. However, grants cannot be awarded to a nonprofit organization classified by the Internal Revenue Service as a §501(c)(4) organization unless that organization certifies that it will not engage in lobbying activities, even with their own funds (see P. L. 104-65 -- Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995). The rationale for any award to a nonprofit organization should be clearly explained, suitably documented, and included in the project file. Additionally, EPA Order 5700.8<sup>10</sup>, “EPA Policy on Assessing Capabilities of Non-Profit Applicants for Managing Assistance Awards,” applies to funding packages/funding recommendations submitted to the Grants Management Offices on or after March 31, 2005.

### Grants to Private For-Profit Entities

Funds appropriated under the STAG account may be used for grants to private for-profit entities, such as a privately owned drinking water company, when the language contained in the Conference Report clearly indicates that intention. The specific requirements for awarding a grant to a private for-profit entity will be addressed when there is need to award such a grant.

---

<sup>10</sup> The Order is available on the **EPA intranet** at [http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/Order/5700\\_8.pdf](http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/Order/5700_8.pdf)

### Grant Recipient

The intended recipient of the grant funds listed in Attachment 1 can, in the appropriate circumstances, refer to any of the following: a governmental or non-profit entity, a non-governmental for-profit entity, the geographical area where the project will be located, the geographical area that will benefit from the project, or the name of the project. For example, if the earmark designation is a county, the funds could, in certain circumstances and with the consent of the county, be awarded to a governmental entity or entities within the county. In any such situation, the intended recipients, and the amount each is to receive, should be confirmed by the sponsoring congressperson or senator.

### Ownership Requirements

With the exception of small, on-site/decentralized wastewater treatment systems, which are discussed later in this section, only wastewater and drinking water infrastructure facilities that are or will be owned by the grant or subgrant recipient are eligible for grant funding. This means that house laterals (the sewer line from the collection system to the house) and drinking water service lines (the line from the drinking water distribution system to the house) must be owned by the grantee or subgrantee in order for these facilities to be eligible for grant funding. The ownership requirement applies to new construction, as well as the rehabilitation of existing facilities, and to infiltration/inflow correction associated with existing sewer lines, including house laterals. The grantee or subgrantee can have ownership by either fee simple title, by the issuance of an enforceable easement with right of access, or other suitable authority such as an ordinance assuring right of access for such purposes as inspection, monitoring, building, operation, rehabilitation and replacement. Since the grantee or subgrantee has ownership of these facilities, the grantee or subgrantee would be responsible for the operations and maintenance of those facilities for the life of those facilities. Additionally, the grantee or subgrantee could not transfer ownership of the facilities to any entity without written approval from EPA.

In those rare situations where a grant or subgrant is awarded to a governmental or nonprofit entity that does not have the legal authority to own or operate drinking water, wastewater, or groundwater protection infrastructure facilities, and the grant includes the construction or acquisition of infrastructure facilities, that entity can transfer ownership of the grant funded infrastructure facilities with the approval of EPA. In all cases, the receiving entity must have the managerial and legal capability to assume all of the relevant responsibilities associated with the ownership of an EPA grant funded infrastructure facility, including any special conditions contained in the original grant agreement. Generally, EPA's approval to transfer ownership should be incorporated into the grant award document in the form of a special term and condition.

### On-Site Systems

For small, privately-owned, on-site/decentralized wastewater treatment systems, such as a septic system, an eligible applicant may apply for a grant to build or renovate these privately-owned systems. In such cases the applicant must:

- demonstrate that the total cost and environmental impact of building the decentralized system will be less than the cost of a conventional system,
- certify that ownership by a public entity or a suitable non-profit organization (such as a home owners' association or cooperative) is not feasible and list the reasons,
- certify that the treatment facilities will be properly operated and maintained for the life of the facilities, and
- provide assurance of access to the systems at all reasonable times for such purposes as inspection, monitoring, building, operation, rehabilitation and replacement.

### Intermunicipal Projects and Service Agreements

Although a special Appropriations Act grant may be awarded to one entity, the successful operations of the grant funded project may depend on the support and cooperation of other entities, municipalities, or utility districts. This is especially evident when one entity is providing wastewater treatment services or supplying drinking water to another entity. Accordingly, for projects involving interactions between two or more entities, the applicant should provide assurances that the grant funded project will function as intended for its expected life. Adequate assurance may be met through the creation of special service districts, regionalization of systems, or intermunicipal service agreements.

Special service districts and regionalization of systems are considered to be obligations in perpetuity to serve the customers of the newly created authority and automatically meet the expected lifetime requirements. The intermunicipal service agreement or contract is a legal document for cooperative ventures between separate entities, both of which wish to continue functioning with a large degree of independent control in their respective service areas. Such agreements will need to extend for a minimum number of years for an EPA funded project to be considered viable. For the purposes of special Appropriations Act projects, EPA will accept the following contract lifetimes as meeting the minimum standard<sup>11</sup>:

---

<sup>11</sup> The anticipated useful life of the facility components is based on the low end of the assumed service life for items in EPA's Construction Grants Program and past experience with the award and administration of special Appropriations Act projects.

| <u>ITEM</u>  | <u>LIFE (years)</u> |
|--|---------------------|
| • <u>Land</u>  | Permanent           |
| • <u>Wastewater/Water Conveyance Structures:</u> collection systems, pipes, interceptors, force mains, tunnels, distribution lines, etc. | 40                  |
| • <u>Other Structures:</u> plant buildings, concrete tankage, basins, lift station and pump station structures, inlet structures, etc.   | 30                  |
| • <u>Wastewater and Drinking Water Process Equipment</u>   | 15                  |
| • <u>Auxiliary Equipment</u>   | 10                  |

A shorter time frame may be accepted if suitably justified and approved by EPA.

#### Non-Construction Costs

The scope of work of a grant may include planning, design and administrative activities, and the cost of land. Land need not be an “integral part of the treatment process” as in the Clean Water Act Title II construction grant program. However, all elements included within the scope of work of the grant must conform to the requirements of 40 CFR Parts 30 or 31. This means, if planning, design and administrative activities are included in the grant, the procurement of those services and the contracts must comply with the applicable sections of Parts 30 or 31. If land is included, there will be a Federal interest in the land regardless of when it was purchased and the purchase must be (must have been) in accordance with the applicable sections of Parts 30 or 31 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition regulations for Federal and Federally assisted programs at 49 CFR Part 24.

#### Refinancing

Funds appropriated for the special projects may not be awarded solely to repay loans received from a State Revolving Fund or other indebtedness unless there are explicit instructions to do so in the Appropriations Act or accompanying reports, or the facts of the case are such that this is the only way to award the funds that were appropriated for the project. Any request to use special Appropriations Act grant funds to repay a loan, in whole or in part, must be approved, in writing, by EPA Headquarters. The request, with sufficient supporting documentation, should be submitted to the Director, Office of Wastewater Management, (Mail Code 4201M), USEPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, D.C. 20460.

## Definitions

In the context of determining that the scope of work of the grant is in conformance with the project description contained in Attachment 1, the word “water” can be considered to mean: drinking water, wastewater, storm water or combined sewer overflow. Furthermore, the words “and” & “or” as used in the project description are interchangeable. Additionally, the phrases “sewer project,” “sewer improvements,” “sewer upgrade,” “sewer development,” “sewer expansion,” “sewer system,” “plant project,” “plant upgrade,” or “plant expansion” are considered broad enough to include all aspects of the upgrade, expansion and development of a complete wastewater treatment system as defined at 40 CFR §35.2005(12). Comparable phrases concerning the project descriptions for drinking water facilities should be similarly interpreted.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL RESULTS UNDER EPA ASSISTANCE AGREEMENTS**

### Introduction

EPA Order 5700.7<sup>12</sup>, “Environmental Results Under Assistance Agreements,” applies to all non-competitive funding packages/funding recommendations submitted to the Grants Management Offices after January 1, 2005. The Order requires EPA Program Offices to: 1) link proposed assistance agreements to the Agency’s Strategic Plan/Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) architecture; 2) ensure that outputs and, to the maximum extent practicable, outcomes are appropriately addressed in assistance agreement work plans<sup>13</sup> and funding recommendations; and 3) ensure that progress in achieving agreed-upon outputs and outcomes is adequately addressed in recipient progress reports and advanced monitoring activities.

### The Strategic Plan/GPRA Architecture

EPA’s *2003 Strategic Plan*<sup>14</sup> sets out five long-term goals through 2008. Each of these five goals is supported by a series of objectives and sub-objectives that identify, as precisely as possible, what environmental outcomes or results the EPA seeks to achieve within a defined time frame using resources expected to be available. The objectives and sub-objectives established in EPA’s Strategic Plan are part of the “GPRA architecture” that is used to measure the EPA’s progress in meeting its strategic goals.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Order is available on the **EPA intranet** at <http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/Order/5700.7.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> Throughout this section, the term “work plan” is used for convenience. For construction projects, outputs/outcomes are normally included in a Facility Plan, Preliminary Engineering Report, or an Environmental Information Document. In many cases these documents may not exist at the time of grant application. In those situations the development of the documents will be included in the scope of work of the assistance agreement.

<sup>14</sup> The Strategic Plan is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/2003sp.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/ocfo/plan/2003sp.pdf)

Program offices must include in the funding package for a proposed assistance agreement a description of how the project fits within the EPA's Strategic Plan/GPRA architecture. In developing the aforementioned descriptions, a project officer must list all applicable EPA strategic goals and objectives and, where available, sub-objectives. The project officer must ensure that the Program Results Code(s) (PRCs) listed on the commitment notice is consistent with the selected strategic goals, objectives and sub-objectives. The Strategic Plan/Program Results Code Crosswalk, which summarizes the strategic goals, objectives, sub-objectives, and the PRCs for every EPA assistance agreement program, is attached to Appendix A of EPA Order 5700.7.

### Outputs and Outcomes

The term "output" means an environmental activity, effort, and/or associated work products related to an environmental goal or objective, that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period. Outputs reflect the products and services provided by the recipient, but do not, by themselves, measure the programmatic or environmental results of an assistance agreement. Examples of outputs for special Appropriations Act projects are:

- Number of additional homes (or equivalents) provided adequate wastewater treatment (can be centralized or decentralized).
- Number of additional homes (or equivalents) provided safe drinking water.
- Percent improvement in infrastructure reliability and maintenance (e.g., collection and distribution system improvements, pump replacement, improvements at wastewater treatment or drinking water facilities plant, upgrade, expansion, integrity, reduction of infiltration/inflow, etc.).
- Capacity (MGD) of newly constructed wastewater treatment plant.
- For expansion of an existing wastewater treatment plant, increase in capacity (MGD) of plant.
- For upgrade of an existing wastewater treatment plant, new level of treatment provided.
- Storage (MG) provided by newly constructed drinking water tank.
- Storage (MG) provided by new reservoirs.
- Population served by new construction.
- Feet of sewer lines replaced.

- Feet of sewer lines extended.
- Feet of water lines replaced.
- Feet of water lines extended.
- Wet weather improvement:
  - Estimated number of combined sewer overflows (CSOs) reduced.
  - Estimated amount (e.g., million gallons per year) of untreated wastewater not discharged as a result of CSO improvements.
  - Number of sanitary sewer overflows reduced.
  - Storm water improvements.
- Environmental restoration improvements.
- Enhanced security improvements to wastewater or drinking water facilities.

The term “outcome” means the result, effect or consequence that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes may be environmental, behavioral, health-related or programmatic in nature, must be quantitative, and may not necessarily be achievable within an assistance agreement funding period. There are two major types of outcomes - end outcomes and intermediate outcomes. End outcomes are the desired end or ultimate results of a project or program. They represent results that lead to environmental/public health improvement. Intermediate outcomes are outcomes that are expected to lead to end outcomes but are not themselves “ends.” Given that the end outcomes of an assistance agreement may not occur until after the assistance agreement funding period, intermediate outcomes realized during the funding period are an important way to measure progress in achieving end outcomes.

Program offices must include in the funding package for a proposed assistance agreement an assurance that the program office has reviewed, or will review, the assistance agreement work plan<sup>15</sup> and that the work plan includes, or will include, well-defined outputs and, to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes.

The CWSRF program is in the process of finalizing a “Benefits Assessment” format for individual projects, see Attachment 6. This format can be used to measure “outcomes” for the special Appropriations Act projects. Accordingly, the Regions can include the information contained in Items 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Attachment 6 as a means for measuring and reporting

---

<sup>15</sup> See Footnote 13, supra.

outcomes.<sup>16</sup> The measurement of environmental outputs and outcomes is in the developmental stages. The Regions will be informed of changes as they occur.

### Examples of Acceptable Descriptions In Assistance Agreement Funding Packages

The following are examples of acceptable descriptions in assistance agreement funding packages:

#### Example 1:

*This project supports Goal 2 (Clean and Safe Water), Objective 2.2 (Protect Water Quality), Subobjective 2.2.1 (Improve Water Quality on a Watershed Basis). The overall goal of the project is to provide adequate wastewater treatment services for those areas of the community with failing on-site septic systems. The Project Results Code (PRC) assigned to the funding for this project is 202B51E which is consistent with the strategic goal/objective/subjective. The **(name of Division/Branch) in (Region\_\_)** has reviewed the work plan<sup>17</sup> for this project and determined that it contains well-defined outputs, and to the maximum extent practicable, well defined outcomes.*

#### Example 2:

*This project supports Goal 2 (Clean and Safe Water), Objective 2.1 (Protect Human Health), Subobjective 2.1.1 (Water Safe to Drink). The overall goal of the project is to lower the amount of arsenic in the drinking water to meet revised permit requirements. The Project Results Code (PRC) assigned to the funding for this project is 201B51E which is consistent with the strategic goal/objective/subjective. The **(name of Division/Branch) in (Region\_\_)** will review the work plan<sup>18</sup> for this project and will determine that it contains well-defined outputs, and to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes when these measures are developed. These measures will be developed during the planning portion of the grant. Additionally, EPA will not fund any design or construction work until these measures are accepted.*

### EPA Review of Recipient Performance Reports

EPA Order 5700.7 establishes requirements for program office review of construction and non-construction interim and final recipient performance reports for progress in achieving outputs

---

<sup>16</sup> GPRA reporting in the SAAP database system is also required for the NEPA compliance program and project officers/NEPA coordinators will need to report out on environmental outcomes for the NEPA program in addition to the reporting needed for grants.

<sup>17</sup> See Footnote 13, supra.

<sup>18</sup> See Footnote 13, supra.



and outcomes contained in assistance agreement work plans. Under 40 CFR Parts 30 and 31, EPA may require recipients to submit performance/progress reports as frequently as quarterly but no less frequently than annually. These regulations also require recipients to provide the EPA with an acceptable final performance report at the end of a project.

The review of recipient performance reports is largely the responsibility of the EPA project officer. The project officer must review interim<sup>19</sup> and final<sup>20</sup> performance reports to determine whether they adequately address the achievement of agreed-upon outputs/outcomes, including providing a satisfactory explanation for insufficient progress or a failure to meet planned accomplishments. This review must be documented in the official project file. If a report does not adequately address the achievement of outputs/outcomes, the project officer should seek further explanation from the recipient and require appropriate corrective action. Additionally, any mitigation measures that should be implemented on the project as determined through the NEPA analysis should be reviewed as part of the performance reports.

Award officials must use the following special conditions in all assistance agreements requiring performance reports to provide a comparison of actual accomplishments to agreed-upon outputs/outcomes:

*Required special conditions for assistance agreements to State and local governments:*

*In accordance with 40 CFR §31.40, the recipient agrees to submit performance reports that include brief information on each of the following areas: 1) a comparison of actual accomplishments to the outputs/outcomes established in the assistance agreement work plan for the period; 2) the reasons for slippage if established outputs/outcomes were not met; and 3) additional pertinent information, including, when appropriate, analysis and information of cost overruns or high unit costs.*

*In accordance with 40 CFR §31.40(d), the recipient agrees to inform EPA as soon as problems, delays or adverse conditions become known which will materially impair the ability to meet the outputs/outcomes specified in the assistance agreement work plan.*

*Required special conditions for assistance agreements to institutions of higher education and other non-profit organizations:*

---

<sup>19</sup> For construction projects, on-site technical inspections and certified percentage of construction data meet the interim reporting requirements, see 40 CFR §31.40(c).

<sup>20</sup> For construction projects, the final inspection report or other final performance report should include a comparison of the actual outcomes/outputs with those incorporated into the assistance agreement.

*In accordance with 40 CFR §30.51(d), the recipient agrees to include in performance reports submitted under this agreement brief information on each of the following areas: 1) a comparison of actual accomplishments to the outputs/outcomes specified in the assistance agreement work plan 2) reasons why anticipated outputs/outcomes were not met; and 3) other pertinent information, including, when appropriate, analysis and information of cost overruns or high unit costs.*

*In accordance with 40 CFR §30.51(f), the recipient agrees that it will notify EPA of problems, delays or adverse conditions which materially impair the ability to meet the outputs/outcomes specified in the assistance agreement work plan.*

### Advanced Monitoring

EPA Order 5700.7 directs program offices, when conducting on-site reviews or desk reviews under EPA Order 5700.6 A1, *Policy on Compliance, Review and Monitoring*, to include an assessment of the recipient's progress in achieving the outputs and outcomes set forth in the assistance agreement work plan.<sup>21</sup> If the assessment reveals significant problems in meeting agreed-upon outputs/outcomes, the project officer must require the recipient to develop and implement an appropriate corrective action plan. The results of the assessment must be documented in the Grantee Compliance Database in a format determined by the Director of the Grants Administration Division.

### **NEW INITIATIVE**

This section describes the Agency's plan for implementing one new initiative.

### Conformance with Combined Sewer Overflow Control Policy

EPA's Combined Sewer Overflow Control (CSO) Policy<sup>22</sup> is a national framework for control of CSOs through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The policy was signed by the Administrator on April 11, 1994, and was incorporated into law by the Wet Weather Water Quality Act of 2000, which was enacted as part of the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2001 (P. L. 106-554). The purpose of the CSO policy is to coordinate the planning, selection, design and implementation of CSO management practices and controls to implement the requirements of the Clean Water Act (CWA).

One of the elements of the CSO policy is the development of a long-term control plan. If a long-term control plan has been reviewed and approved by the NPDES permitting agency, then any CSO work or activities included in the scope of work of a special Appropriations Act project

---

<sup>21</sup> See Footnote 13, supra.

<sup>22</sup> The CSO policy is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/npdes/cso](http://www.epa.gov/npdes/cso).

should be in conformance with that plan. If a long-term control plan has not been approved by the permitting agency, then any special Appropriations Act project that includes funding for CSO work or activities should address the development, including timing, of a long term CSO control plan.

## **PROJECT SPECIFIC GUIDELINES**

The FY 2005 Appropriations Act and Conference Report contain a number of provisions related to individual projects. The following discussion describes the Agency's interpretation and planned implementation of these provisions.

### Guam and Virgin Islands Projects

Earmark Number 146 and Earmark Number 411 in the Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act provide, respectively, "\$250,000 to the Guam Waterworks Authority for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the Territory of Guam," and "\$250,000 to the Government of the Virgin Islands for wastewater infrastructure improvements in St. Croix, Virgin Islands."

The Omnibus Territories Act of 1977 (P. L. 95-134) authorizes Departments and Agencies to award grants to Insular Territories, such as Guam and the Virgin Islands, without a matching requirement. Historically, EPA has exercised this discretionary authority and awarded funds to the Insular Territories without any matching requirement. The Agency intends to continue this practice. Accordingly, the FY 2005 special Appropriations Act projects for Guam and the Virgin Islands can be awarded without a matching requirement. However, the FY 2005 Appropriations Act also states that the grant funds for Guam must be used "for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in the Territory of Guam," and the grant funds for the Virgin Islands must be used "for wastewater infrastructure improvements in St. Croix, Virgin Islands." Accordingly, separate grants must be awarded to Guam and the Virgin Islands specifically for these activities.

## **PROGRAM SPECIFIC GUIDELINES**

The Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act and accompanying reports contain a number of requirements for the United States-Mexico Border Program, the Alaska Rural and Native Villages Program, and the Long Island Sound Restoration Program. This section describes the Agency's interpretation and planned implementation of those requirements.

### United States-Mexico Border Program

The Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act provides \$49,600,000, after rescission, for:

. . . architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater

facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission.

The scope of work for grants awarded for the United States-Mexico Border Program must conform with the language contained in the Appropriations Act and the grant file should include documentation that describes the results of the discussions and consultations with the appropriate border commissions. In large part, EPA provides grant funding to the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission (BECC) for the project development assistance program (PDAP) and the North American Development Bank (NADBank) for the Border Environmental Infrastructure Fund (BEIF); in these cases, the subgrants from BECC and NADBank should contain similar documentation.

The Conference Report identifies two projects that are to be funded by monies provided for the United States-Mexico Border Program: “\$5,000,000 is for continuation of the El Paso, Texas desalination and water supply project, and \$2,000,000 is for the Brownsville, Texas water supply project.” The Brownsville and El Paso projects will be awarded by the EPA Region VI Office and administered within the provisions, including the 45 percent matching requirement, contained in this memorandum.

EPA cost participation on projects funded from the United States-Mexico Border appropriation item (with the exception of the two projects identified above) will be decided on a project-by-project basis. The EPA cost share will depend on a number of factors which have been separately defined within the context of the United States-Mexico Border Program.

On May 12, 1997, the Agency issued a memorandum<sup>23</sup> concerning “Program Requirements for Mexican Border Area Projects Funded under the Authority of this Agency’s FY 1995, 1996 and 1997 Appropriations Acts.” That memorandum also applies to the United States-Mexico Border Area projects funded under the authority of the Agency’s FY 2005 Appropriations Act.

#### Alaska Rural and Native Villages Program

The Agency’s FY 2005 Appropriations Act provides \$44,640,000, after rescission,

for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages: *Provided*, That, of these funds (1) the State of Alaska shall provide a match of 25 percent, (2) no more than 5 percent of the funds may be used for administrative and overhead expenses, and (3) not later than October 1, 2005 the State of Alaska shall make awards consistent with the state wide priority list established in 2004 for all water, sewer, waste disposal, and similar projects carried out by the State of Alaska that are funded under section 221 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1301) or the Consolidated

---

<sup>23</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0327.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0327.pdf).

Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et. seq.) which shall allocate not less than 25 percent of the funds provided for projects in regional hub communities.

Item (1) above means that the State of Alaska must provide \$14,880,000 as its share for the program. Items (2) and (3) above are self explanatory and do not require any further explanation.

Additionally, the Alaska Rural and Native Villages Program funds may be used to pay for activities specified in the Safe Drinking Water Act of 1996, (P. L. 104-182, Section 303), specifically: “training, technical assistance, and educational programs relating to the operation and management of sanitation services in rural and Native villages.” These include the Remote Maintenance Worker (RMW) and the Rural Utility Business Advisory (RUBA) programs.

Prior to awarding any grants under the Alaska Rural and Native Villages Program, Region 10 shall develop a “Plan of Action” (Plan) in consultation with the Office of Wastewater Management. The Plan shall include steps to remedy the fiscal and program management deficiencies outlined in the EPA Inspector General’s Audit of September 21, 2004 (Report No. 2004-P-00029)<sup>24</sup> and the OMB Program Assessment and Rating Tool (PART) review<sup>25</sup> of the program.

#### Long Island Sound Restoration Program

Earmark Number 293 in the STAG account of the Agency’s FY 2005 Appropriations Act provides “\$4,000,000 for water quality infrastructure improvements for Long Island Sound, New York.” The Agency intends to administer this earmark using the Long Island Sound Program Guidelines issued on May 6, 2002. These guidelines entitled “Award of Infrastructure Grants to Implement the Long Island Sound Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan” were developed to implement the Long Island Sound Restoration Act (LISRA), Title IV of the Estuaries and Clean Waters Act of 2000 (P. L. 106-457). The funds, after the reduction due to the 0.80 percent rescission and three percent set-aside provision, will be awarded as grants to the States of New York and Connecticut in accordance with allocation procedures established by the Long Island Sound Management Conference. The Long Island Sound Program has a separate Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number which is 66.437.

#### **GRANTS MANAGEMENT**

Grants awarded under the authority of an Appropriations Act are subject to assistance agreement regulations, OMB cost principles and Agency policies. The grants must be awarded and managed as any other assistance agreement.

---

<sup>24</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2004/20040921-2004-P-00029.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/oig/reports/2004/20040921-2004-P-00029.pdf)

<sup>25</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2006/pma/epa.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2006/pma/epa.pdf)

The Grants Administration Division (GAD) has developed Grants Policy Issuances (GPIs) to assist project officers and program offices in fulfilling and understanding their responsibilities. Two GPIs that are directly related to the award and management of Special Appropriations Act projects are GPI-03-01-Attachment VI “Policy and Procedures for Funding Assistance Agreements” and GPI-00-05 “Cost Review Guidance.”<sup>26</sup>

On November 14, 2003, GAD disseminated GPI-04-03 entitled “Performance Standards for Grants Management.” This memorandum requires that performance standards established for project officers and their supervisors adequately address grants management responsibilities.

EPA Order 5700.6 A1, issued January 8, 2004,<sup>27</sup> streamlines post-award management of assistance agreements and helps ensure effective oversight of recipient performance and management. The Order encompasses both the administrative and programmatic aspects of the Agency’s financial assistance programs. It requires each EPA program office providing assistance to develop and carry out a post-award monitoring plan, and conduct basic monitoring for every award. From the programmatic standpoint, this monitoring should ensure satisfaction of five core areas: (1) compliance with all programmatic terms and conditions; (2) correlation of the recipient’s work plan/application and actual progress under the award; (3) availability of funds to complete the project; (4) proper management of and accounting for equipment purchased under the award; and (5) compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements of the program. If during monitoring it is determined that there is reason to believe that the grantee has committed or commits fraud, waste and/or abuse, then the project officer must contact the Office of the Inspector General. Advanced monitoring activities must be documented in the official grant file and the grantee compliance database. The EPA Order applies to the projects identified in Attachment 1.

In addition to the general requirements contained in the EPA Order, the following types of activities, which are directly related to construction projects, should be considered in the development of a post-award monitoring plan:

- Review periodic payment requests.
- Conduct interim inspections.
- Review change orders and claims.
- Review and approve final payment requests.
- Analyze environmental review documents for NEPA-compliance, if that is appropriate at this time (as applicable to Regions where the project officer also undertakes the NEPA responsibilities).
- Determine that the project is capable of meeting the objectives for which it

---

<sup>26</sup> These GPIs are available on the **EPA intranet** at <http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/7.0-GPI-GPI-03-01-5.htm> and <http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/7.0-GPI-GPI-00-05.htm>

<sup>27</sup> The Order is available on the **EPA intranet** at [http://intranet.epa.gov/rmpolicy/ads/orders/5700\\_6A1.pdf](http://intranet.epa.gov/rmpolicy/ads/orders/5700_6A1.pdf)

was planned, designed and built.

Many of these activities can be performed by a State, the Corps of Engineers or a contractor, and as such, are eligible for funding under the three percent set-aside provision.

A work group consisting of staff from the Regions, the Office of Water, and the Office of Grants and Debarment has been established for the purpose of developing recommendations for alternative reporting procedures that would comply with the requirements of EPA Order 5700.6 A1. The scope of the work group will be expanded to include development of recommendations for alternative reporting procedures that will comply with the requirements contained in GPI-00-05 "Cost Review Guidance."

## **AGENCY GOALS FOR COMPLETING AND CLOSING OUT PROJECTS**

On June 10, 1997, the Agency issued a strategy for administratively completing and closing out the remaining construction grant projects.<sup>28</sup> Administrative completion takes place when a final audit is requested, or if a final audit is not required, when the following has been achieved: all the grant conditions have been satisfied, a final inspection has been performed, the final payment has been reviewed and processed, and project performance standards<sup>29</sup> have been achieved. Closeout takes place when a closeout letter is sent to the grant recipient. The June 10, 1997 strategy document established the goal of administratively completing post FY 1991 construction grant *and special Appropriations Act projects* within five years of grant award, and closing out construction grant *and special Appropriations Act projects* within seven years of grant award. Accordingly, all future grant awards, except in those circumstances where the complexities or size of the project dictate otherwise, should include schedules that are in conformance with the national goals.

## **PROJECT OFFICER RESPONSIBILITIES<sup>30</sup>**

The project officers must review the grant application to determine that:

- the scope of work of the grant is clearly defined;
- the scope of work is in conformance with the project description contained in Attachment 1;
- there is a clearly stated environmental or public health objective;

---

<sup>28</sup> In a memorandum dated May 6, 1999, the Agency issued supplemental guidance providing clarification to the completion/closeout strategy.

<sup>29</sup> Project performance standards are defined at 40 CFR §35.2005(33).

<sup>30</sup> "Assistance Administration Manual 5700 Chg 6, Part 1, Section 02, Roles and Responsibilities" is available on the **EPA intranet** at <http://intranet.epa.gov/rmpolicy/ads/transmanuals.htm>

- work plans<sup>31</sup> contain well-defined outputs and, to the maximum extent practicable, well-defined outcomes, and demonstrate linkage to the Agency's Strategic Plan goals, objectives, and subobjectives;
- there is a reasonable chance that the project will achieve its objective(s);
- the environmental review documents are NEPA-compliant, if that is appropriate at this time (as applicable to Regions where the project officer also undertakes the NEPA responsibilities); and
- the costs are reasonable, necessary and allocable to the project.

Grant applications should be processed in a timely manner, but the applications should be carefully reviewed and the grant awarded only when it is prudent to do so. Additionally, the Regions may impose reasonable requirements through grant conditions in those situations considered necessary.

## **PROJECT MANAGEMENT RESOURCES**

You should invite State agencies to participate as much as possible in the pre-application, application review, and grant administration process.

Legislative language in the Agency's FY 1997 Appropriations Act authorized the use of Title II deobligations for State administration of special Appropriations Act *wastewater* projects, coastal/needy cities projects and construction grant projects. The guidance document on the implementation of this provision was issued by the Director, Municipal Support Division, on December 3, 1996.<sup>32</sup>

The interagency agreement (IAG) with the Corps of Engineers was recently amended to allow the IAG funds to be used for the administration, oversight and management of all special Appropriations Act projects, including those involving drinking water and other water related projects.

States may also use funds awarded under Section 106 of the Clean Water Act (P. L. 92-500) for activities associated with these special projects provided Section 106 program officials agree.

The Agency's FY 2001 Appropriations Act states that "the Administrator may use up to 3 percent of the amount of each project appropriated to administer the management and oversight of construction of such projects through contracts, allocation to the Corps of Engineers, or grants to States." A discussion of the three percent set-aside provision is contained on page two of this memorandum.

---

<sup>31</sup> See Footnote 13, supra.

<sup>32</sup> This document is available on the internet at [www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0328.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/owm/mab/owm0328.pdf).



## REVISION OF LANGUAGE CONTAINED IN PREVIOUS APPROPRIATIONS ACTS

The Agency's FY 2005 Appropriations Act amended the following STAG earmarks:

- The project description for Earmark Number 471 (FY 2003) for the Town of Mercer, Wisconsin was changed to “water infrastructure improvements.”
- Earmark Number 22 (FY 2004) was changed from “\$400,000 to the West Lauderdale County Water and Fire Protection Authority, Alabama for construction of a water treatment plant” to “\$200,000 to Jackson County, Alabama for water system improvements and \$200,000 to the City of Muscle Shoals, Alabama for water and sewer infrastructure improvements.”
- The project description for Earmark Number 158 (FY 2004) to the City of Burlington, Illinois was changed to “water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.”
- The designated recipient for Earmark Number 9 (FY 2002) was changed from the “Southeast Alabama Regional Water Authority” to the “Southwest Alabama Regional Water Authority.”
- Earmark Number 103 (FY 2002) was changed from “\$500,000 for Rock Falls, Illinois, wastewater treatment improvements” to “\$500,000 for the City of Chicago, Illinois for water infrastructure improvements at the Thomas Jefferson and Lakeview Pumping Stations.”
- The designated recipient for Earmark Number 484 (FY 2004) was changed from “Norfolk” to “Portsmouth,” Virginia.
- The designated recipient for Earmark Number 283 (FY 2004) was changed from the “City of Kalispell, Montana” to the “Flathead County Water and Sewer District No. 1 – Evergreen.”
- The designated recipient for Earmark Number 139 (FY 2003) was changed from the “State of Hawaii Health Department” to the “County of Hawaii.”
- Earmark Number 148 (FY 2004) was changed from “\$1,000,000 for Oahu County and Kauai County, Hawaii for water infrastructure improvements” to “\$1,000,000 for the replacement of cesspools in Hawaii, \$250,000 to the City and County of Honolulu for Varona Village, \$500,000 to the County of Hawaii and the remainder to the Housing and Community Development Corporation of Hawaii.”
- Earmark Number 388 (FY 2004) was changed from “\$1,500,000 to the City of Lawton, Oklahoma for the Southwest Water Treatment Plant” to “\$1,500,000 for the Southwest

Water Treatment Plant in Lawton, Oklahoma for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.”

- The project description for Earmark Number 46 (FY 2001) to Lewes, Delaware was changed to “wastewater treatment improvements.”
- The designated recipient for Earmark Number 409 (FY 2004) was changed from “the City of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Water Department” to “the Philadelphia Water Department.”
- The designated recipient for Earmark Number 265 (FY 2004) was changed from “Franklin County,” Mississippi to the “Okhissa Lake Sewer District.”
- The project description for Earmark Number 322 (FY 2004) to the Village of Endicott, New York was changed to “wastewater and water infrastructure improvements.”
- The project description for Earmark Number 173 (FY 2004) to the Village of Armington, Illinois was changed to “planning, design and construction of a sanitary sewer project.”
- Earmark Number 184 (FY 2004) was changed from “\$250,000 to be divided equally between Vanderburgh County and the City of Evansville, Indiana for Pigeon Creek wastewater system improvements” to “\$250,000 to Vanderburgh County or the City of Evansville, Indiana for Pigeon Creek wastewater system improvements.”

## **ACTIONS**

If you have not already done so, you and your staff should initiate discussions with the appropriate grant applicants to develop a detailed scope of work and to explain the grant application and review process. Additionally, the grant applicant should be provided with a copy of this memorandum prior to grant award to ensure that the applicant is on notice of the applicable requirements before the grant is awarded.

If you have any questions concerning the contents of this memorandum, you may contact me, or have your staff contact Benjamin J. Hamm, Chief, Municipal Assistance Branch, Municipal Support Division, at (202) 564-0648.

## **Attachments**

cc: Municipal Construction Program Managers, Regions I-X  
 Regional NEPA Contacts, Regions I -X  
 Mark Tedesco, Long Island Sound Office, Region II  
 Marcia Combes, Alaska Operations Office, Region X

# ATTACHMENT 1

**SPECIAL WATER AND WASTEWATER INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (STAG ACCOUNT)  
INCLUDED IN EPA'S FY 2005 APPROPRIATIONS ACT**

| Line Item #          | Budget Code | Earmark Designation                                    | Earmark Amount   | Rescission    | Set Aside     | Grant Amount     | Description  |
|----------------------|-------------|--|------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|--|
| <b>Region 1</b>      |             |  |                  |               |               |                  |  |
| <b>Connecticut</b>   |             |  |                  |               |               |                  |  |
| 92                   | GLD         | Meriden, City of                                       | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500         | 144,300          | for the City Center Initiative Flood Control and Demolition  |
| 93                   | AXI         | New Britain, City of                                   | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900         | 288,700          | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 94                   | AXI         | Southington, City of                                   | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900        | 481,100          | for the Southington Water Supply Improvement Project   |
| 95                   | GE6         | Stamford, City of                                      | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for storm water infrastructure improvements  |
| 96                   | GUW         | Groton, City of  | 350,000          | 2,800         | 10,400        | 336,800          | for water and sewer line extension   |
| 478                  | GQG         | Bristol, City of                                       | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900         | 288,700          | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 479                  | GBW         | East Hampton, Town of                                  | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900         | 288,700          | for drinking water infrastructure improvements   |
| 480                  | GQD         | Stamford   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400         | 240,600          | for a waste-to-energy project  |
| <b>8 total</b>       |             |  | <b>2,350,000</b> | <b>18,800</b> | <b>69,900</b> | <b>2,261,300</b> |  |
| <b>Massachusetts</b> |             |  |                  |               |               |                  |  |
| 220                  | GEU         | Boston, City of  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | to continue efforts to address deteriorating groundwater levels in the Greater Boston area   |
| 221                  | GVV         | Towns of Braintree, Holbrook and Randolph              | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 222                  | AUH         | Cities of Fall River and New Bedford                   | 950,000          | 7,600         | 28,300        | 914,100          | for combined sewer overflow projects   |
| 223                  | QL5         | Lawrence, City of                                      | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for combined sewer overflow mitigation   |
| 224                  | GVU         | Leominster, City of                                    | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900        | 384,900          | for the Rockwell Village revitalization initiative for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 225                  | GJR         | Essex County   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400         | 240,600          | for wastewater projects for communities  |
| 226                  | QBA         | Pioneer Valley Planning Commission in West Springfield | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900        | 481,100          | for the Connecticut River combined sewer overflow  |
| 531                  | GQY         | Bristol County   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400         | 240,600          | for the Combined Sewer Overflow Abatement Project  |
| 532                  | QBA         | Pioneer Valley Planning Commission                     | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400         | 240,600          | for combined sewer overflow abatement in the Connecticut River   |
| <b>9 total</b>       |             |  | <b>3,200,000</b> | <b>25,600</b> | <b>95,300</b> | <b>3,079,100</b> |  |
| <b>Maine</b>         |             |  |                  |               |               |                  |  |
| 212                  | GMO         | Windham, Town of                                       | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 213                  | GVS         | Brewer, City of  | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900        | 481,100          | for the sewer improvements project   |
| 519                  | GQV         | Greater Limestone                                      | 450,000          | 3,600         | 13,400        | 433,000          | Wastewater Treatment Facilities to consolidate and replace antiquated waste water collection and treatment facilities at the Loring Development Authority [LDA] and Caribou Utilities District [CUD] |
| 520                  | GD4         | Indian Township Tribal Government                      | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400         | 240,600          | for the first phase for expansion of current lagoon system to provide adequate capacity  |
| 521                  | GGV         | Machias, Town of                                       | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900         | 288,700          | for replacement of sewers and completion of deficiencies at existing aging wastewater treatment plant  |
| <b>5 total</b>       |             |  | <b>1,700,000</b> | <b>13,600</b> | <b>50,600</b> | <b>1,635,800</b> |  |
| <b>New Hampshire</b> |             |  |                  |               |               |                  |  |
| 254                  | AXH         | Nashua, City of  | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500         | 144,300          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 255                  | GN2         | New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services     | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for sewer system expansion in Franklin   |
| 256                  | QQ3         | Somerset, City of                                      | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 566                  | ASK         | Berlin Waterworks in Berlin                            | 600,000          | 4,800         | 17,900        | 577,300          | for drinking water distribution system improvements  |
| 567                  | AXH         | Nashua Combined Sewer Overflow project in Nashua       | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900        | 384,900          | for CSO treatment and abatement  |
| 568                  | GY9         | New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services     | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900        | 384,900          | to develop a septage treatment facility based at the wastewater treatment facility in Franklin   |
| 569                  | GYA         | Troy   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for a wastewater and water improvement program   |
| 570                  | QBG         | Manchester New Hampshire                               | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900        | 384,900          | for Combined Sewer Overflow project in Manchester  |
| 571                  | GDT         | Rochester  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for Route 108 sewer line extension   |
| 572                  | QQ3         | Somerset   | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500         | 144,300          | for the sewerage improvement program to provide upgrades to the wastewater treatment plant   |
| 573                  | GRE         | Bristol  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000         | 192,400          | for wastewater system improvements   |
| 574                  | GYB         | Milton   | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500         | 144,300          | for a water storage tank replacement project   |
| 575                  | QRJ         | Exeter, Town of  | 600,000          | 4,800         | 17,900        | 577,300          | for water treatment plant replacement  |

|                 |     |  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|-----------------|-----|--|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| <b>13 total</b> |     |  | <b>3,850,000</b>  | <b>30,800</b>  | <b>115,000</b> | <b>3,704,200</b>  |   |
|                 |     | <b>Rhode Island</b>  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 367             | GTC | North Smithfield, Town of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                            |
| 368             | GPF | Newport, City of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                            |
| 369             | A81 | Narragansett Bay Commission in Providence                                  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for combined sewer overflow control and wastewater improvement project          |
| 621             | GYL | Shannock Water District,   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 622             | GDC | Lincoln Water Commission   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 623             | QLE | Pawtucket Water Supply Board   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 624             | GYO | North Kingstown, Town of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 625             | A81 | Narragansett Bay Commission  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,700         | 962,300           | for combined sewer overflow infrastructure improvements                         |
| 626             | GPF | Newport, City of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 627             | QBB | Warren, Town of  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>10 total</b> |     |  | <b>3,600,000</b>  | <b>28,800</b>  | <b>107,100</b> | <b>3,464,100</b>  |   |
|                 |     | <b>Vermont</b>   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 647             | GYS | Colchester, Town of  | 1,250,000         | 10,000         | 37,200         | 1,202,800         | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                      |
| 648             | GCJ | Waitsfield, Town of  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                      |
| <b>2 total</b>  |     |  | <b>2,250,000</b>  | <b>18,000</b>  | <b>67,000</b>  | <b>2,165,000</b>  |   |
| <b>47</b>       |     | <b>Region 1 Totals</b>   | <b>16,950,000</b> | <b>135,600</b> | <b>504,900</b> | <b>16,309,500</b> |   |
|                 |     | <b>Region 2</b>  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|                 |     | <b>New Jersey</b>  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 257             | GW1 | Parsippany, Township of  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 258             | GMZ | Wildwood, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for storm sewer outflow reconstruction  |
| 259             | GSZ | New Jersey Municipal Utilities Authority                                   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the Peninsula at Bayonne Harbor Water Infrastructure Improvement Project    |
| 260             | ATI | Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for the Combined Sewage Overflow Program  |
| 261             | GN4 | Bergen County Utilities Authority  | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                      |
| 262             | QVL | New Jersey Meadowlands Commission  | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Hackensack Meadowlands Ecosystem Restoration                            |
| 576             | GRG | Township of Parsippany-Troy  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 577             | GSY | Bayonne, City of   | 1,250,000         | 10,000         | 37,200         | 1,202,800         | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                            |
| <b>8 total</b>  |     |  | <b>4,050,000</b>  | <b>32,400</b>  | <b>120,500</b> | <b>3,897,100</b>  |   |
|                 |     | <b>New York</b>  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 271             | GW3 | Brookhaven, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for storm water infrastructure improvements                                     |
| 272             | GN5 | Chenango County Agricultural Society of Chenango County                    | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for upgrades to the water and septic systems                                    |
| 273             | GW6 | Schulyer, Town of  | 125,000           | 1,000          | 3,800          | 120,200           | for water system improvements   |
| 274             | GN7 | Bridgewater, Village of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 275             | GW4 | Springport and Fleming, Towns of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                            |
| 276             | AXW | Rockland County  | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Western Ramapo sewer extension and water reuse project                  |
| 277             | GNB | Deposit, Village of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                      |
| 278             | GW5 | Blooming Grove, Town of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                      |
| 279             | GNE | Sea Cliff, Village of  | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Sanitary Sewer System Infrastructure Development and Management project |
| 280             | GW8 | Mamarone, Village of   | 110,000           | 900            | 3,300          | 105,800           | for sewer system improvements   |
| 281             | GN9 | New Castle, Town of  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for the Phase II Storm Water Compliance Program                                 |
| 282             | QOY | Oswego, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for sewer overflow system improvements  |
| 283             | GN8 | Warnerville Water District in Warnerville                                  | 275,000           | 2,200          | 8,200          | 264,600           | for a water and sewer project   |
| 284             | GNA | Cheektowaga, Town of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the Plant No. 3 overflow retention facility                                 |
| 285             | GW7 | Erie Water Authority for the Town of Newstead and Village of Williamsville | 650,000           | 5,200          | 19,300         | 625,500           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 286             | GNC | Town/Village of East Rochester   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 287             | GND | Dutchess County Water and Wastewater Authority in Hyde Park                | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                      |
| 288             | AME | Onondaga Lake  | 12,000,000        | 96,000         | 357,100        | 11,546,900        | for continued clean water improvements  |
| 289             | GTD | Monroe County Water Authority  | 4,000,000         | 32,000         | 119,000        | 3,849,000         | for the Eastside Water Treatment Project  |
| 290             | GW9 | Wayne County   | 900,000           | 7,200          | 26,800         | 866,000           | for construction of a waterline along North Geneva Road                         |
| 291             | QWW | Wayne County Water and Sewer Authority                                     | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,900         | 577,300           | water infrastructure improvements in the Town of Huron                          |
| 292             | ANI | Drinking water infrastructure needs  | 4,000,000         | 32,000         | 119,000        | 3,849,000         | in the New York City Watershed  |
| 293             | QBO | Long Island Sound, New York  | 4,000,000         | 32,000         | 0              | 3,968,000         | for Water quality infrastructure  |

|                 |     |   |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
|-----------------|-----|---|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|--|
| 294             | GNK | Jamesville, New York sewer project                  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800           | 962,200           | for Water quality infrastructure improvements  |
| 295             | GT7 | Elbridge, Town of                                   | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400           | 336,800           | for the construction of a waterline  |
| 296             | A5E | Onondaga County of, Department of Community         | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 297             | GNG | Cayuga County in Victory                            | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 583             | GCX | Babylon, Town of                                    | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for the Oak Beach Park Stormwater Management Project   |
| 584             | GYC | Orange County Water Authority, Goshen               | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900            | 288,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 585             | GT9 | Plattsburg, Town of                                 | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900            | 288,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>30 total</b> |     |   | <b>33,660,000</b> | <b>269,300</b> | <b>882,800</b>   | <b>32,507,900</b> |  |
|                 |     | <b>Puerto Rico</b>                                  |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
| 366             | GPG | Puerto Rico   | 4,000,000         | 32,000         | 119,000          | 3,849,000         | for drinking water infrastructure improvements to the Metropolitan community water system in San Juan              |
| <b>1 total</b>  |     |   | <b>4,000,000</b>  | <b>32,000</b>  | <b>119,000</b>   | <b>3,849,000</b>  |  |
|                 |     | <b>Virgin Islands</b>                               |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
| 411             | A80 | Government of the Virgin Islands                    | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure system improvements in St. Croix   |
| <b>1 total</b>  |     |   | <b>250,000</b>    | <b>2,000</b>   | <b>7,400</b>     | <b>240,600</b>    |  |
| <b>40</b>       |     | <b>Region 2 Totals</b>                              | <b>41,960,000</b> | <b>335,700</b> | <b>1,129,700</b> | <b>40,494,600</b> |  |
|                 |     | <b>Region 3</b>                                     |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
|                 |     | <b>District of Columbia</b>                         |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
| 97              | GSV | District of Columbia Government                     | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for drinking water infrastructure improvements to address lead problems  |
| <b>1 total</b>  |     |   | <b>500,000</b>    | <b>4,000</b>   | <b>14,900</b>    | <b>481,100</b>    |  |
|                 |     | <b>Delaware</b>                                     |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
| 98              | QWO | Wilmington, City of                                 | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 481             | QWO | Wilmington  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 482             | GXO | Ocean View, Town of                                 | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>3 total</b>  |     |   | <b>900,000</b>    | <b>7,200</b>   | <b>26,700</b>    | <b>866,100</b>    |  |
|                 |     | <b>Maryland</b>                                     |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
| 214             | AW5 | Salisbury, City of                                  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 215             | QCP | Cambridge, City of                                  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 216             | QQM | Elkton, City of                                     | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 217             | GVT | Prince George's County                              | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for the Livable Community Initiative in Brentwood, North Brentwood, Edmonston and Cottage City                     |
| 218             | GMR | Prince George's County                              | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for the Anacostia Trash Reduction Program and Removal of Floatable Trash for the Cities of Brentwood and Edmonston |
| 219             | GMQ | YMCA Camp Letts in Edgewater                        | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 522             | GQT | Chesapeake Beach                                    | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 523             | QQB | Indian Head   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 524             | QQM | Elkton  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 525             | QU5 | Hurlock   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 526             | GR1 | Kent Island   | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300           | 721,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 527             | GXX | Easton  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 528             | GR4 | Cumberland  | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300           | 721,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 529             | GQX | Frostburg   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 530             | GXY | Brunswick   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>15 total</b> |     |   | <b>5,350,000</b>  | <b>42,800</b>  | <b>158,900</b>   | <b>5,148,300</b>  |  |
|                 |     | <b>Pennsylvania</b>                                 |                   |                |                  |                   |  |
| 352             | AN4 | Allegheny County                                    | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800           | 962,200           | for the 3 Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration Project   |
| 353             | GWL | Sharon, City of                                     | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for the Budd Street sewer line replacement   |
| 354             | GP8 | Philadelphia, City of                               | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | to continue the planning, design, and construction of innovative storm-water management solutions                  |
| 355             | GE8 | Cheltenham Township                                 | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | to continue the planning, design, and construction of innovative storm-water management solutions                  |
| 356             | QCS | Beaver Falls Municipal Authority                    | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements to the Big Beaver Treatment Facility in Big Beaver,                     |
| 357             | GPB | Harrisburg, City of                                 | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for the Harrisburg Advanced Wastewater Treatment Facility  |
| 358             | QC2 | Wyoming Valley Sanitary Authority in Wyoming Valley | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400           | 336,800           | for the Wyoming Valley Combined Sewer Overflow Project   |
| 359             | GPA | Ligonier Township                                   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for the Ligonier Township sewage project   |
| 360             | GWP | South Hills Area Council of Governments             | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for the South Hills Area Storm Sewer Project in Allegheny County   |

|                 |     |   |                  |               |                |                  |   |
|-----------------|-----|---|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| 361             | GWO | Clarion Area Authority  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for the Fifth Avenue sewer line replacement project in Clarion  |
| 362             | GP7 | Nelson Township Authority   | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for water infrastructure improvements in Nelson   |
| 363             | QKG | Lancaster, City of  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for the water treatment membrane project  |
| 364             | GZ2 | York City Sewer Authority   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Clean Water Demonstration Project in York   |
| 365             | GG2 | Kulpmont-Marion Heights Joint Municipal Authority in Kulpmont             | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 609             | GGF | Municipality of Penn Hills  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Madison Avenue Storm Sewer  |
| 610             | GYJ | Nesquehoning Borough Authority, Carbon County                             | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for a water main replacement  |
| 611             | GJD | Mercer County Regional Council of Governments                             | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Shenango Valley Sewer/Water Improvement Project   |
| 612             | GYK | Berwick Industrial Development Association, Berwick                       | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the sanitary storm water system   |
| 613             | GRR | Johnstown, City of  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for water and sewer improvements at the Point Stadium multi-use facility                              |
| 614             | AN4 | Three Rivers Wet Weather Demonstration program in Allegheny County        | 1,500,000        | 12,000        | 44,600         | 1,443,400        | to develop innovative, cost-effective solutions to assist municipalities to eliminate sewer overflows |
| 615             | QQC | Derry Township Municipal Authority in Hershey                             | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for wastewater treatment plant upgrades   |
| 616             | A5X | Hermitage, City of City of Sharon, and Borough of Sharpsville             | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for Mercer County Sanitary Sewer and Water Treatment project  |
| 617             | QKG | Lancaster, City of  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,500          | 240,500          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 618             | GBV | Newport Borough Sewer Authority in Newport                                | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for storm and sewer water separation  |
| 619             | QC1 | York City Sewer Authority in York   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for wastewater collection system improvements   |
| 620             | GRT | Pocono Township in Tannersville   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for the Route 611 Corridor sewer line construction  |
| <b>26 total</b> |     | <b>Virginia</b>   | <b>9,100,000</b> | <b>72,800</b> | <b>270,900</b> | <b>8,756,300</b> |   |
| 399             | QC3 | Smyth County  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 400             | GX1 | Hanover County  | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 401             | GPO | Fauquier County   | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500          | 144,300          | for a sewage treatment plant in the Catlett/Calverton area  |
| 402             | QMP | Dale Service Corporation in Dale City                                     | 750,000          | 6,000         | 22,300         | 721,700          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 403             | GPP | Isle of Wight County  | 100,000          | 800           | 3,000          | 96,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 404             | GX2 | Halifax, Town of  | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 405             | QCB | Franklin County   | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 406             | QCX | Fluvanna County   | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 407             | GX3 | Brookneea, Town of  | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 408             | QSR | Nelson County   | 218,000          | 1,700         | 6,500          | 209,800          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 409             | QOU | to Pittsylvania County  | 682,000          | 5,500         | 20,300         | 656,200          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 410             | QB9 | Eastern Shore of Virginia Public Service Authority in Northhampton County | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 412             | QT2 | Alexandria, City of Virginia and Arlington County                         | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water infrastructure improvements in the Four Mile Run watershed                                  |
| 649             | A1F | Fairfax County Water Authority  | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900         | 384,900          | for the drinking water infrastructure improvements associated with the Electric Reliability project   |
| 650             | QCG | Caroline County   | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for the Dawn Wastewater Treatment project   |
| 651             | GYV | Norfolk, City of  | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900         | 384,900          | for the Norfolk Sewer and Water Infrastructure Replacement  |
| <b>16 total</b> |     | <b>West Virginia</b>  | <b>7,750,000</b> | <b>62,000</b> | <b>230,800</b> | <b>7,457,200</b> |   |
| 427             | GTA | Kanawha County Commission, Kanawha County                                 | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Upper Fishers Branch/Guthrie Water Project  |
| 428             | GPV | Braxton County Development Authority                                      | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Curry Ridge Water Line Extension Development Authority  |
| 429             | GDD | Marshall County Public Service District #4                                | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 430             | GPX | Jane Lew Public Service District in Harrison County                       | 100,000          | 800           | 3,000          | 96,200           | for water and wastewater  |
| 431             | GPZ | Pleasants County Public Service District                                  | 1,500,000        | 12,000        | 44,600         | 1,443,400        | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 432             | GX8 | Grant County Commission   | 480,000          | 3,800         | 14,300         | 461,900          | to extend water service to the Deep Spring area   |
| 433             | GPW | Shinnston, City of  | 900,000          | 7,200         | 26,800         | 866,000          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |

|                 |     |  |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
|-----------------|-----|--|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| 434             | GX9 | Pine Grove, Town of  | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300           | 721,700           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 435             | GQ1 | Fairmont Sanitary Sewer Board                              | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800           | 962,200           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 436             | GEG | Petersburg, City of  | 2,374,000         | 19,000         | 70,600           | 2,284,400         | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 437             | GXB | River Road Public Service District                         | 101,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 97,200            | to extend water service on National Church Hollow Road  |
| 438             | GQ3 | Taylor County Public Service District                      | 935,000           | 7,500          | 27,900           | 899,600           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 439             | GQ4 | Taylor County Commission                                   | 833,000           | 6,700          | 24,800           | 801,500           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 440             | GXA | Cameron, City of   | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800           | 962,200           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 441             | GQ2 | Hammond Public Service District                            | 55,000            | 400            | 1,700            | 52,900            | for the Lazear's Lane water project   |
| 442             | GXC | Canaan Valley Institute                                    | 1,840,000         | 14,700         | 54,800           | 1,770,500         | to work in conjunction with the Highlands Action Program for an innovative wastewater demonstration program in Canaan Valley in Tucker County |
| <b>16 total</b> |     |  | <b>13,268,000</b> | <b>106,100</b> | <b>395,200</b>   | <b>12,766,700</b> |   |
| <b>77</b>       |     | <b>Region 3 Totals</b>                                     | <b>36,868,000</b> | <b>294,900</b> | <b>1,097,400</b> | <b>35,475,700</b> |   |
| <b>Region 4</b> |     |  |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
| <b>Alabama</b>  |     |  |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
| 1               | GKL | Falkville, City of   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for sewer infrastructure improvements;  |
| 2               | GUJ | Albertville, City of                                       | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300           | 721,700           | for sewer infrastructure improvements;  |
| 3               | GKN | Boldo, City of   | 180,000           | 1,400          | 5,400            | 173,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 4               | GUL | Addison, City of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 5               | GKP | Lamar County   | 220,000           | 1,800          | 6,500            | 211,700           | for infrastructure improvements to the Lamar County Reservoir   |
| 6               | GUK | Arley, City of   | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400           | 336,800           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 7               | QMR | Eva, City of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 8               | QEU | Guin, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 9               | QPB | Phil Campbell, City of                                     | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 10              | QDY | Blount County  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 11              | GKT | DeKalb-Jackson Water Supply District in Ider               | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for construction of a water treatment plant   |
| 12              | GT2 | Fort Payne   | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500            | 144,300           | for a pump station at Wills Valley Industrial Park  |
| 13              | GUM | Helena Utility Board in Helena                             | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 14              | QES | Jackson, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 15              | QN5 | Athens, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 16              | QRC | Lawrence County  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for the Bankhead Forest Water Project   |
| 17              | QEK | Huntsville, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 18              | GE9 | Hartselle Utilities  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Hartselle   |
| 19              | GKR | Harvest-Monrovia Water, Sewer, and Fire Protection         | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for a master plan to accomplish the establishment of a sewer system within the service area   |
| 20              | QER | Limestone County Water and Sewer Authority                 | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900            | 288,700           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 21              | QUB | Waterworks Boards of the Towns of Section and Dutton       | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 22              | GT3 | Scottsboro Water works, Sewer, and Gas Board in Scottsboro | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for construction and rehabilitation of a sanitary sewer collection system   |
| 23              | GKZ | Sheffield, City of   | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,900           | 577,300           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 24              | QEO | West Morgan-East Lawrence Water and Sewer Authority        | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for water and wastewater system infrastructure improvements   |
| 25              | AQ3 | Jackson County   | 50,000            | 400            | 1,500            | 48,100            | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 26              | QOG | Muscle Shoals, City of                                     | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 27              | GKW | Community of Overlook Hills in Dallas County               | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 28              | QP3 | Fulton, Town of  | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | to construct a wastewater treatment facility  |
| 29              | GKX | Red Level, Town of   | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500            | 144,300           | for Phase II water infrastructure improvements  |
| 30              | GKU | Valley, City of  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500            | 144,300           | to purchase Langdale Mill and Fairfax Utilization Plant   |
| 31              | GUO | Millerville Water Authority (Clay County Commission)       | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for water infrastructure improvements in Millerville  |
| 32              | GL1 | Smiths Station Water Authority                             | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |



|           |              |  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|-----------|--------------|--|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| 33        | GKY          | Piedmont, City of  | 30,000            | 200            | 900            | 28,900            | Water and Utilities Board to extend water lines to the Terrapin Cove/Borden Springs area in Cleburne County |
| 444       | QLB          | Coosa Valley Water Supply District                                     | 800,000           | 6,400          | 23,800         | 769,800           | for development of a surface water supply in St. Clair County   |
| 445       | GQ5          | Utilities Board of the City of Helena                                  | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300         | 721,700           | for water and sewer upgrades and construction   |
| 446       | GQ7          | Cleburne County Commission in Heflin                                   | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,900         | 577,300           | for county water expansion in Cleburne, County  |
| 447       | GXD          | Randolph County Commission in Wedowee                                  | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,900         | 577,300           | for county water expansion in Randolph County   |
| 448       | QDY          | Blount County Water Authority in Oneonta                               | 450,000           | 3,600          | 13,400         | 433,000           | for development of a county water supply line   |
| 449       | GXG          | Fort Payne, City of  | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300         | 721,700           | for water and sewer improvements in Fort Payne  |
| 450       | GXE          | West Morgan/East Lawrence Water and Sewer Authority in Decatur         | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water and sewer improvements  |
| 451       | GXF          | Lamar County Commission in Vernon                                      | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Lamar County Water Supply Project   |
| <b>41</b> | <b>total</b> |  | <b>13,630,000</b> | <b>109,000</b> | <b>406,000</b> | <b>13,115,000</b> |   |
|           |              | <b>Georgia</b>   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 130       | GV2          | Albany, City of  | 900,000           | 7,200          | 26,800         | 866,000           | storm water infrastructure improvements   |
| 131       | GLY          | Americus, City of  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for sewer service expansion   |
| 132       | GV3          | Atlanta, City of   | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for the McDaniel Basin Combined Sewer Overflow Separation project   |
| 134       | GLX          | Plains, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 135       | GLV          | Social Circle, City of   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 136       | GV6          | Thomasville, City of   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for extension of sewer lines  |
| 137       | GLU          | Moultrie, City of  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 138       | GV5          | Summerville, City of   | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 139       | GLZ          | Polk County  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the Polk County Wastewater Collection System  |
| 140       | AXX          | Roswell, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the Big Creek Watershed Project   |
| 141       | QKU          | Atlanta, City of   | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300         | 721,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 142       | GLU          | Moultrie, City of  | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300         | 721,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 143       | QKU          | Metropolitan North Georgia Planning District                           | 700,000           | 5,600          | 20,800         | 673,600           | for water infrastructure improvements in North Atlanta Metropolitan Area                                    |
| 144       | GV7          | Byron, City of   | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 145       | GLV          | Social Circle, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 486       | GDS          | Atlanta, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the west area combined sewer project  |
| 487       | GQK          | Eatonton, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 488       | GEC          | Forsyth, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>18</b> | <b>total</b> |  | <b>6,850,000</b>  | <b>54,800</b>  | <b>203,800</b> | <b>6,591,400</b>  |   |
|           |              | <b>Florida</b>   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 99        | QNC          | Tarpon Springs, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 100       | GLL          | Gainesville, City of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the depot regional storm water park   |
| 101       | QW9          | Citrus County  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the Chassahowitzka Area Wastewater Collection and Drinking Water Distribution System                    |
| 102       | QEM          | Hillsborough County  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the Hillsborough County Alternative Water Supplies--Phase III   |
| 103       | GLN          | Miami Beach, City of   | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300         | 721,700           | for storm water infrastructure improvements   |
| 104       | QWS          | Key West, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for storm water infrastructure improvements   |
| 105       | GLJ          | Pemroke Pines, City of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water treatment expansion   |
| 106       | GJN          | Homestead, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 107       | GLM          | South Seminole & North Orange County Wastewater Transmission Authority | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for the replacement of wastewater pipes and mechanical equipment  |
| 108       | GLK          | Southwest Florida Water Management District                            | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the Peace River & Myakka River Water Initiative in Polk County  |
| 109       | GUC          | Wellington, Village of   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the reconfiguration of storm water system project   |
| 110       | GLO          | Sarasota, County of  | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 111       | GUN          | Rivera Beach, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the storm water management plan   |
| 112       | GLS          | Windermere, Town of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for storm water management improvements   |
| 113       | GFY          | Miami Gardens, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water, wastewater, storm water, and sewer infrastructure improvements                                   |
| 114       | GLP          | Bunnell, City of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the Wastewater Collection, Treatment and Disposal System Rehabilitation Project                         |

|           |              |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|-----------|--------------|---|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| 115       | QDV          | St. Johns County  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the College Park Drainage Improvement Project in West Augustine                   |
| 116       | QLY          | Escambia County Utility Authority   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for Wastewater Treatment/water Reclamation Partnership in Escambia County             |
| 117       | GUX          | Davenport, City of  | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 118       | GUZ          | Lakeworth, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 119       | GLR          | Davie, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water main replacement  |
| 120       | GLT          | South Central Regional Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Board            | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the 100% Wastewater Reuse Project in the Cities of Delray Beach and Boynton Beach |
| 121       | GUY          | Starke, City of   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Water Quality Improvement Program   |
| 122       | GLQ          | Osceola County  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for drainage basin improvements   |
| 123       | GEW          | St. Johns River Water Management District                                 | 2,500,000         | 20,000         | 74,400         | 2,405,600         | for water infrastructure improvements in Central and East Florida                     |
| 124       | AY6          | Southwest Florida Water Management District                               | 4,000,000         | 32,000         | 119,000        | 3,849,000         | for continuation of the Tampa Bay Reservoir Project                                   |
| 125       | GZ9          | Southwest Florida Water Management District                               | 1,200,000         | 9,600          | 35,700         | 1,154,700         | for Tampa Bay Reclaimed Water and Downstream Augmentation Project                     |
| 126       | GHV          | Southwest Florida Water Management District                               | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Peace River and Myakka River Watershed Restoration Initiative                 |
| 127       | QDT          | Clearwater, City of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the Wastewater and Reclaimed Water Infrastructure Project                         |
| 128       | GV1          | Tampa, City of  | 1,300,000         | 10,400         | 38,700         | 1,250,900         | for sediment removal from estuaries of the headwaters at the canals                   |
| 129       | GLW          | Treasure Island, City of  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for wastewater and sewer system upgrades  |
| 483       | QWS          | Key West, City of   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 9,000          | 288,600           | for stormwater infrastructure improvements  |
| 484       | GXP          | South Florida Water Management District Lake Region Water Treatment Plant | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for water improvements  |
| 485       | AY6          | Southwest Florida Water Management District in Tampa                      | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,500          | 240,500           | for the Tampa Bay Regional Reclaimed Water project                                    |
| <b>34</b> | <b>total</b> |   | <b>17,950,000</b> | <b>143,600</b> | <b>534,400</b> | <b>17,272,000</b> |   |
|           |              | <b>Kentucky</b>   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 195       | GMG          | North Middletown, Town of   | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for water and sewer improvements  |
| 196       | GVQ          | Shepherdsville, City of   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for storm water compliance  |
| 197       | GMF          | Hillview, City of   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for the Hillview Storm water Compliance   |
| 198       | QVC          | Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District                   | 550,000           | 4,400          | 16,400         | 529,200           | to construct a gravity interceptor sewer in Shively                                   |
| 199       | GML          | Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District                   | 225,000           | 1,800          | 6,700          | 216,500           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Beechwood Village                       |
| 200       | GMH          | Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District                   | 225,000           | 1,800          | 6,700          | 216,500           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements at Canoe Lane                              |
| 201       | QXE          | Whitesburg, City of   | 700,000           | 5,600          | 20,800         | 673,600           | for construction of a wastewater treatment plant                                      |
| 202       | GMN          | Perry County Fiscal Court in Hazard                                       | 1,200,000         | 9,600          | 35,700         | 1,154,700         | for the construction of a wastewater treatment plant                                  |
| 203       | QKM          | Morehead, City of   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for the renovation and expansion of a wastewater treatment plant                      |
| 204       | GMM          | Jamestown, City of  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for the water treatment plant   |
| 505       | QXV          | Bowling Green, City of  | 2,000,000         | 16,000         | 59,500         | 1,924,500         | for the South Central Kentucky Water Infrastructure Project                           |
| 506       | GG4          | Hardin County Water District No. 2 in Hardin County                       | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300         | 721,700           | for a Water Quality Assurance Plan and System Improvements Projects                   |
| 507       | GQR          | City of Elkton, Kentucky  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the Sewer Plant Expansion and Sewer Line Extension Project                        |
| 508       | GQN          | Breckinridge County   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 509       | GXT          | Bullitt County  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 510       | GQP          | Calloway County   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the City of Hazel Wastewater System   |
| 511       | GXV          | Cadiz-Trigg County  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 512       | GQW          | Marshall County   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for drinking water infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>18</b> | <b>total</b> |   | <b>8,000,000</b>  | <b>64,000</b>  | <b>238,000</b> | <b>7,698,000</b>  |   |
|           |              | <b>Mississippi</b>  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 241       | GMS          | Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Neshoba County                       | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for an Academic Wetlands and Wetlands Mitigation Project                              |
| 242       | GVY          | Lamar County  | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 243       | GMX          | Belmont, City of  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 244       | GMW          | Pontotoc, City of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 541       | QW2          | Tchula  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 542       | GY2          | Brookhaven, City of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 543       | GR6          | Sherman, City of  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements                                       |

|           |              |   |                  |               |                |                  |   |
|-----------|--------------|---|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|---|
| 544       | GY3          | Oxford, City of   | 1,300,000        | 10,400        | 38,700         | 1,250,900        | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 545       | GHH          | Forest, City of   | 750,000          | 6,000         | 22,300         | 721,700          | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 546       | GR5          | French Camp, Town of  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>10</b> | <b>total</b> |   | <b>5,300,000</b> | <b>42,400</b> | <b>157,800</b> | <b>5,099,800</b> |   |
|           |              | <b>North Carolina</b>   |                  |               |                |                  |   |
| 298       | GWA          | Landis, Town of   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 299       | GNL          | Harnett County,   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | to install pump stations and a forcemain as part of a central wastewater treatment rehabilitation project |
| 300       | GNJ          | Towns of Biscoe, Star, and Troy   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Montgomery County Sewer Project   |
| 301       | GWB          | Towns of Hamlet-Rockingham  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 302       | GNF          | Farmville, Town of  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 303       | GWC          | Cities of East Arcadia, Bolton and Sandyfield                                     | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500          | 144,300          | for a regional water system   |
| 304       | GNH          | Wendell, Town of  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Buffalo Creek Interceptor project   |
| 305       | AZZ          | Charlotte, City of  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for the wastewater plant expansion  |
| 306       | GTB          | Apex, Town of   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 307       | GNR          | Wake County   | 1,500,000        | 12,000        | 44,600         | 1,443,400        | for water infrastructure improvements in cooperation with the Town of Cary and Durham County              |
| 308       | QL8          | Orange County   | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 309       | GNN          | Orange Water and Sewer Authority (OWASA)  | 650,000          | 5,200         | 19,300         | 625,500          | for a water reuse project   |
| 310       | GFT          | Hillsborough, Town of   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 311       | GNM          | Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians  | 880,000          | 7,000         | 26,200         | 846,800          | for water infrastructure improvements in Cherokee   |
| 312       | GNP          | McDowell County   | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 313       | GV4          | East Spencerr, Town of  | 100,000          | 800           | 3,000          | 96,200           | for water and sewer rehabilitation project  |
| 586       | GRM          | Washington County   | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | sewer improvements  |
| 587       | QDW          | Mooresville, City of  | 600,000          | 4,800         | 17,900         | 577,300          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>18</b> | <b>total</b> |   | <b>7,780,000</b> | <b>62,200</b> | <b>231,900</b> | <b>7,485,900</b> |   |
|           |              | <b>South Carolina</b>   |                  |               |                |                  |   |
| 370       | GWQ          | Lake, City of   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 371       | QRA          | Mount Pleasant Waterworks   | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500          | 144,300          | for the Mount Pleasant Waterworks Rural Roads Gravity Wastewater Extension Project                        |
| 372       | QXQ          | Myrtle Beach Downtown Redevelopment Corporation                                   | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for a new storm water drainage system   |
| 373       | GPC          | Towns of Olar and Govan   | 750,000          | 6,000         | 22,300         | 721,700          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 374       | GPE          | Wellford, City of   | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for sewer/wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 375       | GWR          | Chester County Sewer District   | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900         | 384,900          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Lando   |
| 376       | GPD          | Ridgeland, Town of  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for the Wagon Branch Water Project  |
| 628       | GYM          | Charleston CPW  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for a Wastewater Tunnel Replacement Project   |
| 629       | GRY          | Kershaw County  | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | Kershaw for the I-20 Corridor Infrastructure Project-WasteWater Treatment Plant Expansion                 |
| 630       | GYQ          | Chester Sewer District  | 800,000          | 6,400         | 23,800         | 769,800          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 631       | QWB          | Kershaw County  | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>11</b> | <b>total</b> |   | <b>4,850,000</b> | <b>38,800</b> | <b>144,300</b> | <b>4,666,900</b> |   |
|           |              | <b>Tennessee</b>  |                  |               |                |                  |   |
| 377       | QP9          | Franklin, City of   | 125,000          | 1,000         | 3,800          | 120,200          | for water system improvements to the Watson Branch Watershed  |
| 378       | GWS          | Pikeville, City of  | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500          | 144,300          | for the Pikeville/Bledsoe County Water Improvements Project   |
| 379       | GWW          | Hampton Utility District in Little Milligan/Fish Springs Community, Carter County | 125,000          | 1,000         | 3,700          | 120,300          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 380       | GGE          | Tusculum, City of   | 125,000          | 1,000         | 3,700          | 120,300          | for first construction phase of a wastewater treatment plant  |
| 381       | GWV          | Bean Station, City of   | 50,000           | 400           | 1,500          | 48,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 382       | GPI          | Roane County  | 100,000          | 800           | 3,000          | 96,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 383       | GPK          | Spring City   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for water and sewer line replacement  |
| 384       | GWU          | Anderson County   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 385       | GPH          | Dayton, City of   | 400,000          | 3,200         | 11,900         | 384,900          | for flocculation and settling basins  |

|                 |     |   |                        |                   |                |                   |  |
|-----------------|-----|---|------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|--|
| 637             | GRU | Pikeville, and Bledsoe County, City of Pikeville      | 750,000                | 6,000             | 22,300         | 721,700           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 638             | QEP | Watauga River Regional Water Authority, Carter County | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,900         | 481,100           | for planning and construction of regional water infrastructure facilities                    |
| 639             | GRW | Walden's Ridge Water System, Hamilton County          | 750,000                | 6,000             | 22,300         | 721,700           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>12 total</b> |     |   | <b>3,525,000</b>       | <b>28,200</b>     | <b>105,000</b> | <b>3,391,800</b>  |  |
| <b>162</b>      |     |   | <b>Region 4 Totals</b> | <b>67,885,000</b> | <b>543,000</b> | <b>2,021,200</b>  | <b>65,320,800</b>  |
|                 |     |   | <b>Region 5</b>        |                   |                |                   |  |
|                 |     |   | <b>Illinois</b>        |                   |                |                   |  |
| 152             | GM4 | Lockport, City of                                     | 150,000                | 1,200             | 4,600          | 144,200           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 153             | A2T | Johnsburg, Village of                                 | 450,000                | 3,600             | 13,400         | 433,000           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 154             | QV4 | Lake County Storm water Management Community          | 300,000                | 2,400             | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Lake County Watershed Plan in Lake County  |
| 155             | GVC | Silvis, City of                                       | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 156             | GVB | Newark, Village of                                    | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 157             | GM8 | Paw Paw   | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for construction of an elevated water storage tower  |
| 158             | GVD | Annawan, Village of                                   | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 159             | GT6 | Salt Creek Sanitary District in Villa Park            | 650,000                | 5,200             | 19,400         | 625,400           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 160             | GM5 | Village of East Hazel Crest                           | 300,000                | 2,400             | 8,900          | 288,700           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 161             | GVE | Lexington, City of                                    | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 162             | A9Q | Lake County   | 400,000                | 3,200             | 11,900         | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements on the Des Plaines River                          |
| 163             | QU6 | Peoria, City of                                       | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,900         | 481,100           | for stormwater management  |
| 164             | GM9 | Bartonville, Village of                               | 542,500                | 4,300             | 16,200         | 522,000           | for storm sewer improvements in Broadmoor Heights  |
| 165             | GM6 | Arenzville, Village of                                | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,800         | 481,200           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 166             | GVF | Argenta, Village of                                   | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,800         | 481,200           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 167             | GM7 | North Pekin, Village of                               | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,800         | 481,200           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 168             | GVH | Spring Valley, City of                                | 357,500                | 2,900             | 10,700         | 343,900           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 169             | QV5 | Virginia, City of                                     | 250,000                | 2,000             | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 170             | GVG | Pekin, City of  | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,900         | 481,100           | wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 171             | QXN | Lincoln, City of                                      | 250,000                | 2,000             | 7,400          | 240,600           | to repair and slip line Pulaski Street sewer line  |
| 172             | QRB | La Grange, Village of                                 | 350,000                | 2,800             | 10,400         | 336,800           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 173             | QSN | Fox River Grove, Village of                           | 550,000                | 4,400             | 16,400         | 529,200           | for Phase II sewer plant infrastructure improvements   |
| 174             | QXY | Shelbyville, City of                                  | 250,000                | 2,000             | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 175             | QMY | Breese, City of                                       | 250,000                | 2,000             | 7,400          | 240,600           | for construction of the Breese Water Plant   |
| 176             | GMB | Mazon, Village of                                     | 100,000                | 800               | 3,000          | 96,200            | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 177             | GMA | Will County   | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the feasibility study for sanitary district expansion                                    |
| 493             | QSS | Effingham, City of                                    | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,900         | 481,100           | for drinking water infrastructure improvements   |
| 494             | QFA | Monmouth, City of                                     | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,900         | 481,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 495             | GQL | Olympia Fields, Village of                            | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,900         | 481,100           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 496             | GDF | Franklin Park, Village of                             | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,800         | 481,200           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>30 total</b> |     |   | <b>10,850,000</b>      | <b>86,800</b>     | <b>323,100</b> | <b>10,440,100</b> |  |
|                 |     |   | <b>Indiana</b>         |                   |                |                   |  |
| 178             | GVJ | Marion, City of                                       | 300,000                | 2,400             | 8,900          | 288,700           | for water infrastructure improvements associated with the Water Loop Project in Grant County |
| 179             | GMD | Crawford, City of                                     | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the design and construction phases of the Crawfordsville Eastside Sanitary Sewer Project |
| 180             | GVL | Frankfort, City of                                    | 500,000                | 4,000             | 14,900         | 481,100           | for construction of the Eastside Drainage/Detention Facility                                 |
| 181             | GME | Indianapolis, City of                                 | 150,000                | 1,200             | 4,500          | 144,300           | for sewer rehabilitation in northeast Indianapolis   |
| 182             | AWB | Evansville, City of                                   | 300,000                | 2,400             | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Pigeon Creek Enhancement Project   |
| 183             | GVK | New Castle, City of                                   | 200,000                | 1,600             | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the sanitary sewer and sanitary forcemain project  |
| 184             | GMC | Lowell, City of                                       | 330,000                | 2,600             | 9,900          | 317,500           | for construction of additional water lines   |
| 185             | GVN | Hebron, City of                                       | 400,000                | 3,200             | 12,000         | 384,800           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 497             | GSR | Marion, City of                                       | 1,000,000              | 8,000             | 29,800         | 962,200           | for the Marion Water Loop and Deer Creek Project   |
| 498             | GQO | Southport, City of Southport/Marion County            | 100,000                | 800               | 3,000          | 96,200            | for downtown infrastructure and drainage improvements  |
| <b>10 total</b> |     |   | <b>3,480,000</b>       | <b>27,800</b>     | <b>103,900</b> | <b>3,348,300</b>  |  |

| Michigan        |     |   |                  |               |                |                  |  |
|-----------------|-----|---|------------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--|
| 227             | AK9 | Wayne County  | 900,000          | 7,200         | 26,800         | 866,000          | for the Rouge River National Wet Weather Demonstration Project                             |
| 228             | ASX | Grand Rapids, City of   | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for combined sewer overflows   |
| 229             | QFV | Genesee County Drain Commission                                       | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for the Northeast Relief Sewer/Kearsley Creek Interceptor project in Genesee               |
| 230             | GMU | Detroit, City of  | 350,000          | 2,800         | 10,400         | 336,800          | for the Woodmere Sewage Pump Station Rehabilitation  |
| 231             | QQZ | Oakland County Drain Commission                                       | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for Evergreen-Farmington Sanitary Sewer Overflow control project in Farmington Hills       |
| 232             | GSW | Oakland County Drain Commission                                       | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for Footing Drain/Sewer Lead Excess Flow Prevention demonstration project in Waterford     |
| 233             | GMV | Oakland County  | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | to identify and eliminate sewage contributions from older urban areas in the Clinton River |
| 234             | GVX | Westland, City of   | 200,000          | 1,600         | 6,000          | 192,400          | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 235             | GMV | Macomb County and St. Clair County                                    | 650,000          | 5,200         | 19,300         | 625,500          | to implement a comprehensive water quality monitoring program                              |
| 236             | GMT | Brighton Township   | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for a waterline construction   |
| 237             | GTE | Livingston County Drain Commission                                    | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for drain construction in Livingston County  |
| 238             | GVV | L'Anse Township   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements  |
| 533             | GFD | Benton Harbor, City of  | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 534             | GQZ | Seney Township  | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for sewer infrastructure improvements  |
| 535             | QQI | Saginaw, City of  | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for sewer infrastructure improvements  |
| 536             | GR3 | Macomb County Department of Public Works                              | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for sewer infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>16 total</b> |     |   | <b>8,400,000</b> | <b>67,200</b> | <b>250,100</b> | <b>8,082,700</b> |  |
| Minnesota       |     |   |                  |               |                |                  |  |
| 239             | GB8 | Roseau, City of   | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for storm water infrastructure improvements  |
| 240             | GH2 | Minneapolis, City of  | 600,000          | 4,800         | 17,900         | 577,300          | for the combined sewer overflow  |
| 537             | GXZ | Minnesota State University in Moorhead                                | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,600          | 144,200          | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 538             | GR2 | Duluth, City of   | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 539             | GH2 | Minneapolis, City of  | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for combined sewer overflow improvements   |
| 540             | GY1 | Duluth and Western Lake Superior Sanitary District in Duluth, City of | 250,000          | 2,000         | 7,400          | 240,600          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| <b>6 total</b>  |     |   | <b>1,850,000</b> | <b>14,800</b> | <b>55,100</b>  | <b>1,780,100</b> |  |
| Ohio            |     |   |                  |               |                |                  |  |
| 315             | GWE | Lorain, City of   | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500          | 144,300          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 316             | GNQ | Butler County   | 150,000          | 1,200         | 4,500          | 144,300          | for the Butler County Waterline  |
| 317             | GNO | North Baltimore, Village of   | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for the Water Street Combined Sewer Separation Project                                     |
| 318             | GWF | Hicksville, Village of  | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for the Hicksville Wastewater Treatment Plant Project                                      |
| 319             | GNS | Defiance, City of   | 300,000          | 2,400         | 8,900          | 288,700          | for the Sewer Separation Project   |
| 320             | GWD | Circleville, City of  | 750,000          | 6,000         | 22,300         | 721,700          | for sewer infrastructure improvements  |
| 321             | GNV | Burr Oak Regional Water District                                      | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water infrastructure improvements in Perry County                                      |
| 322             | QSG | Greene County   | 550,000          | 4,400         | 16,400         | 529,200          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 323             | GNV | Logan Elm School District   | 50,000           | 400           | 1,500          | 48,100           | for water infrastructure improvements in Circleville                                       |
| 324             | GNT | Lancaster Campus of Ohio University                                   | 220,000          | 1,800         | 6,600          | 211,600          | for water infrastructure improvements in Lancaster   |
| 325             | GWG | Fairfield County  | 155,000          | 1,200         | 4,700          | 149,100          | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 326             | AQD | Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District                                | 350,000          | 2,800         | 10,400         | 336,800          | for the Easterly/Doan Brook Watershed Pollution Abatement Project                          |
| 327             | AY7 | Toledo, City of   | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for wet weather flow and wastewater infrastructure improvements                            |
| 328             | GNX | Ottawa County   | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 329             | GT4 | Sandusky, City of   | 1,000,000        | 8,000         | 29,800         | 962,200          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 330             | GWH | Ashtabula County  | 350,000          | 2,800         | 10,400         | 336,800          | for the Rock Creek Village Waterline Extension   |
| 331             | AWQ | Jackson County  | 50,000           | 400           | 1,600          | 48,000           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 332             | GFB | Guernsey County   | 550,000          | 4,400         | 16,400         | 529,200          | for a water line extension   |
| 333             | GNW | St. Mary's Municipal Government                                       | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 334             | GNU | Urbana University in Urbana   | 625,000          | 5,000         | 18,600         | 601,400          | for storm drainage and water and sewer line construction                                   |
| 335             | QFD | Delphos Municipal Government  | 500,000          | 4,000         | 14,900         | 481,100          | for the Tri-County regional water system in Delphos  |

|                 |     |  |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
|-----------------|-----|--|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| 336             | GE1 | Metropolitan Sewer District of Greater Cincinnati                                | 550,000           | 4,400          | 16,400           | 529,200           | for the sanitary sewer overflow demonstration project   |
| 337             | GWJ | Wooster, City of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for storm water infrastructure improvements along Beall Ave   |
| 338             | GP5 | Hayesville, Village of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 339             | QR4 | Canton, City of  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 340             | GP2 | Trumbull County Sanitary Engineer  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500            | 144,300           | for installation of the Maplewood Park sewer system in Hubbard Township   |
| 341             | QNZ | Columbiana County  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements to the Buckeye Water District   |
| 593             | GRJ | Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District, Carroll County                         | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900            | 288,700           | for the Atwood Conference Center Water Treatment Plant Improvements   |
| 594             | GYD | Village of Racine, Meigs County  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water treatment plant improvements  |
| 595             | GRN | Celina, City of  | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300           | 721,700           | for the Water Treatment Plant Project   |
| 596             | QE3 | Akron, City of   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for Combined Sewer Overflow Improvements Project  |
| 597             | GYE | Parma, City of   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900            | 288,700           | for City Sewer Replacement Project  |
| 598             | GRK | Defiance County Commissioners, Defiance and Paulding Counties                    | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for Auglaize River Sewer Project  |
| 599             | GYF | Jefferson County Water and Sewer District, Jefferson County                      | 175,000           | 1,400          | 5,300            | 168,300           | for Crestview/Belvedere Sewer Project   |
| 600             | GT5 | Tri-County Rural Water and Sewer District, Washington, Morgan and Noble Counties | 175,000           | 1,400          | 5,300            | 168,300           | for Tri-County/Noble County Water Interconnect Project  |
| 601             | QFD | Delphos, Allen, City of Putnam and Van Wert Counties                             | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for Tri-County Regional Water System Project  |
| 602             | GRP | Corning, Village of  | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for Wastewater System Improvements Project  |
| <b>37 total</b> |     |  | <b>15,300,000</b> | <b>122,400</b> | <b>456,100</b>   | <b>14,721,500</b> |   |
|                 |     | <b>Wisconsin</b>   |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
| 420             | GX6 | Sun Prairie, City of   | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500            | 144,300           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 421             | GSU | Antigo, City of  | 1,850,000         | 14,800         | 55,100           | 1,780,100         | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 422             | GPR | Vesper, City of  | 862,000           | 6,900          | 25,700           | 829,400           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 423             | GPY | Boyd, City of  | 1,500,000         | 12,000         | 44,600           | 1,443,400         | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 424             | GX5 | Scott, Town of   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000            | 96,200            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 425             | QFI | Racine, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 5,900            | 192,500           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 426             | GX7 | Waukesha, City of  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for systems planning and water infrastructure improvements  |
| 665             | AQ7 | Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District   | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800           | 962,200           | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 666             | QF1 | Racine, City of  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800           | 962,200           | for water infrastructure improvements and   |
| 667             | GZ1 | Sun Prairie, City of   | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,800           | 577,400           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.   |
| <b>10 total</b> |     |  | <b>7,762,000</b>  | <b>62,100</b>  | <b>231,100</b>   | <b>7,468,800</b>  |   |
| <b>109</b>      |     | <b>Region 5 Totals</b>   | <b>47,642,000</b> | <b>381,100</b> | <b>1,419,400</b> | <b>45,841,500</b> |   |
|                 |     | <b>Region 6</b>  |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
|                 |     | <b>Arkansas</b>  |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
| 34              | GKV | Fayetteville, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 35              | GAY | Faulkner County Public Facilities Board  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for Lake Conway Sewer Improvements in Faulkner County   |
| 462             | QUC | Fort Chafee Redevelopment Authority in Barling/Fort Smith                        | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,800           | 577,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 463             | QOM | Fayetteville, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>4 total</b>  |     |  | <b>1,350,000</b>  | <b>10,800</b>  | <b>40,000</b>    | <b>1,299,200</b>  |   |
|                 |     | <b>Louisiana</b>   |                   |                |                  |                   |   |
| 205             | GGT | Monroe, City of  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500            | 144,300           | for the Monroe Wastewater Improvement Program in Monroe   |
| 206             | GVR | Slaughter, Village of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 207             | AQ8 | West Baton Rouge Parish  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 208             | QMJ | Shreveport, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for the Municipal Water Distribution System--Backflow Prevention  |
| 209             | GMP | Shreveport, City of  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000            | 192,400           | for watershed protection  |
| 210             | GCZ | South Central Planning & Development Commission                                  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900           | 481,100           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements in New Iberia, St. Charles, Morgan City, St. Bernard and St. James |
| 211             | QR3 | Slidell, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400            | 240,600           | for storm water infrastructure improvements   |
| 513             | GQU | Rapides Parish   | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,900           | 577,300           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 514             | QMZ | St. Charles Parish   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900           | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |

|                   |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|-------------------|-----|---|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| 515               | AQ8 | Jefferson Parish                                  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                                |
| 516               | GXU | Bastrop, City of                                  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 517               | QK7 | Hammond, City of                                  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 518               | GXW | Grand Isle, City of                               | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for drinking water infrastructure improvements                                      |
| <b>13 total</b>   |     |   | <b>4,350,000</b>  | <b>34,800</b>  | <b>129,600</b> | <b>4,185,600</b>  |   |
| <b>New Mexico</b> |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 263               | GN6 | Lordsburg, City of                                | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 264               | QGG | Bayard, City of                                   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for the Ft. Bayard Effluent Reuse System  |
| 265               | QGI | Ruidoso Downs, City of                            | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 266               | GHZ | Elephant Butte, City of                           | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 267               | A2Y | Los Lunas, City of                                | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | to build a sewer interceptor line   |
| 268               | AVK | Espanola, City of                                 | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,400          | 144,400           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 269               | GW2 | Tijeras, City of                                  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 270               | AVK | Bernalillo County                                 | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the South and North water and wastewater infrastructure improvements            |
| 578               | AVK | Albuquerque and County of Bernalillo, City of     | 1,600,000         | 12,800         | 47,600         | 1,539,600         | for the Valley Utilities Project  |
| 579               | AVK | Espanola, City of                                 | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for water and wastewater treatment infrastructure                                   |
| 580               | GRF | Kirtland, City of                                 | 900,000           | 7,200          | 26,800         | 866,000           | for Phase 1 of a sewer system project   |
| 581               | QS5 | Los Lunas, Village of                             | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the interceptor sewer line project  |
| 582               | GRH | Clovis, City of                                   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>13 total</b>   |     |   | <b>5,450,000</b>  | <b>43,600</b>  | <b>162,400</b> | <b>5,244,000</b>  |   |
| <b>Oklahoma</b>   |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 342               | GP6 | Marlow, City of                                   | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                                |
| 343               | GP4 | Sulphur, City of                                  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 344               | GG5 | Seminole, City of                                 | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 345               | GNZ | Meeker, City of                                   | 80,000            | 600            | 2,400          | 77,000            | 7   |
| 346               | GWK | Skiatook  | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for water and sewer infrastructure improvements                                     |
| <b>5 total</b>    |     |   | <b>1,480,000</b>  | <b>11,800</b>  | <b>44,200</b>  | <b>1,424,000</b>  |   |
| <b>Texas</b>      |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 386               | GWX | Houston, City of                                  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 387               | GPL | Liberty Hill, City of                             | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the Central City Sewer System Project   |
| 388               | AUP | Brazos River Authority                            | 75,000            | 600            | 2,300          | 72,100            | for the Brazos/Navasota Watershed Management Project in Fort Bend County            |
| 389               | QT7 | Brazos River Authority                            | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for the West Fort Bend County Regional Water Treatment Facility in Fort Bend County |
| 390               | QT7 | Fort Bend County                                  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 391               | QGH | Bosque County                                     | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 392               | GWY | Weatherford, City of                              | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 393               | GWZ | Pharr, City of                                    | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 394               | GPN | Alvin, City of                                    | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 395               | QVN | El Paso Water Utilities                           | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure expansion in El Paso                                       |
| 396               | GPM | San Antonio Water System                          | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for the Espada Road Sewer Project in San Antonio                                    |
| 397               | GEY | Austin, City of                                   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the non-structural sanitary sewer overflow prevention project                   |
| 640               | GRX | San Antonio Water System                          | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements at KellyUSA                                   |
| 641               | GYU | Lower Rio Grande Valley                           | 650,000           | 5,200          | 19,300         | 625,500           | for the Lower Rio Grande Morillo Drain Rehabilitation project                       |
| 642               | GRZ | Canyon Lakes Water Reuse Project in Lubbock       | 800,000           | 6,400          | 23,800         | 769,800           | for construction related costs to the water system infrastructure                   |
| 643               | GSL | Abilene Breckenridge Reservoir project in Abilene | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | for drinking water infrastructure   |
| 644               | GYT | Pharr Wastewater Collection System in Pharr       | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | to update the wastewater system infrastructure                                      |
| 645               | GSN | Breckenridge, City of                             | 300,000           | 2,400          | 9,000          | 288,600           | wastewater and sewer infrastructure project   |
| 646               | GSM | Hillsboro, City of                                | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | wastewater and sewer infrastructure project   |
| US-M              |     | El Paso   | 5,000,000         | 40,000         | 0              | 4,960,000         | for continuation of the desalination and water supply project                       |
| US-M              |     | Brownsville                                       | 2,000,000         | 16,000         | 0              | 1,984,000         | for the water supply project  |
| <b>21 total</b>   |     |   | <b>13,475,000</b> | <b>107,800</b> | <b>192,800</b> | <b>13,174,400</b> |   |
| <b>56</b>         |     | <b>Region 6 Totals</b>                            | <b>26,105,000</b> | <b>208,800</b> | <b>569,000</b> | <b>25,327,200</b> |   |
| <b>Region 7</b>   |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| <b>Iowa</b>       |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 186               | GVM | Des Moines, City of                               | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for storm water infrastructure improvements to the Closes Creek Watershed           |



|                 |     |  |                   |                |                |                   |  |
|-----------------|-----|--|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|--|
| 187             | GMK | Storm Lake, City of                        | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 188             | QXU | Postville, City of                         | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the completion of the Postville wastewater facility  |
| 189             | A7P | Mason City, City of                        | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for completion of the Mason City water treatment plant   |
| 190             | GVO | Ft. Madison, City of                       | 450,000           | 3,600          | 13,400         | 433,000           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 191             | QA2 | Ottumwa, City of                           | 450,000           | 3,600          | 13,400         | 433,000           | for the South Ottumwa Sewer Separation project   |
| 192             | GMJ | Davenport, City of                         | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the Westside Diversion Tunnel  |
| 499             | GQQ | Fort Madison, City of                      | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the Water Treatment Plant  |
| 500             | GXR | West Burlington, City of                   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant Improvements  |
| 501             | QA2 | Ottumwa, City of                           | 1,500,000         | 12,000         | 44,600         | 1,443,400         | for the separation of combined sewers  |
| 502             | GQS | Davenport, City of                         | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>11 total</b> |     |  | <b>5,550,000</b>  | <b>44,400</b>  | <b>165,200</b> | <b>5,340,400</b>  |  |
| <b>Kansas</b>   |     |  |                   |                |                |                   |  |
| 193             | GT8 | Mission, City of                           | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for construction and expansion of a storm water flow management system   |
| 194             | GVP | Harper, City of                            | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 503             | GXS | Abilene, City of                           | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for construction of a wastewater treatment plant   |
| 504             | GHD | Hutchinson, City of                        | 1,500,000         | 12,000         | 44,600         | 1,443,400         | for groundwater remediation and treatment projects   |
| <b>4 total</b>  |     |  | <b>3,100,000</b>  | <b>24,800</b>  | <b>92,200</b>  | <b>2,983,000</b>  |  |
| <b>Missouri</b> |     |  |                   |                |                |                   |  |
| 245             | QPZ | Joplin, City of                            | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | for the Crossroads Parallel Sewer Phase 4 upgrades   |
| 246             | GCE | St. Louis, City of                         | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | Department of Public Utilities for the Columbia Bottoms Wellfield Development water project in St. Louis   |
| 247             | GVZ | Clarence Cannon Wholesale Water Commission | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements in Monroe County   |
| 248             | GJF | Duckett Creek Sanitary District            | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 547             | GR7 | Kansas City                                | 1,500,000         | 12,000         | 44,600         | 1,443,400         | for water and wastewater infrastructure  |
| 548             | QPZ | Joplin, City of                            | 687,500           | 5,500          | 20,500         | 661,500           | for the final phase of the Crossroads Parallel Sewer project   |
| 549             | GY5 | Milan, City of                             | 1,312,500         | 10,500         | 39,100         | 1,262,900         | for the Milan Water Quality Treatment Project  |
| 550             | GR9 | Clarence Cannon Wholesale Water Commission | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | to expand the existing water treatment capacity from 5 million gallons to 7.5 million gallons per day and to include connecting the Macon County PWS #1 and the City of Wellsville to the CCWWC transmission system                    |
| 551             | GY7 | Environmental Resources Coalition          | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | to mitigate point source pollution issues in distressed communities that border Table Rock Lake  |
| 552             | GR8 | Springfield, City of                       | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for wastewater treatment plant improvements including the design and construction of infrastructure for removal of nitrogen from the treated wastewater effluent and improved anaerobic digester facilities that treat solids from the |
| <b>10 total</b> |     |  | <b>7,550,000</b>  | <b>60,400</b>  | <b>224,800</b> | <b>7,264,800</b>  |  |
| <b>Nebraska</b> |     |  |                   |                |                |                   |  |
| 250             | GN3 | Lincoln, City of                           | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements   |
| 251             | QGU | Omaha, City of                             | 550,000           | 4,400          | 16,400         | 529,200           | for the Combined Sewerage Overflow   |
| 557             | QGU | Omaha, City of                             | 900,000           | 7,200          | 26,800         | 866,000           | for the construction of combined sewer separation systems  |
| 558             | GY8 | Lincoln, City of                           | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | to upgrade the Theresa Street and Northeast Wastewater Treatment plants  |
| <b>4 total</b>  |     |  | <b>2,100,000</b>  | <b>16,800</b>  | <b>62,500</b>  | <b>2,020,700</b>  |  |
| <b>29</b>       |     | <b>Region 7 Totals</b>                     | <b>18,300,000</b> | <b>146,400</b> | <b>544,700</b> | <b>17,608,900</b> |  |
| <b>Region 8</b> |     |  |                   |                |                |                   |  |
| <b>Colorado</b> |     |  |                   |                |                |                   |  |
| 90              | GUU | Jefferson County                           | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | to implement a new storm water improvement program   |
| 91              | GUV | Ouray, City of                             | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements  |
| 471             | GXK | Trinidad, City of                          | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Trinidad Wastewater Improvement Project  |
| 472             | GQF | Bayfield, Town of                          | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the construction of a water storage tank   |



|                |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|----------------|-----|---|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| 473            | GQH | Mancos Water Conservancy District                   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water supply facility renovation  |
| 474            | GXL | Idaho Springs, Town of                              | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water distribution facility renovation  |
| 475            | GQJ | Eldorado Springs, Town of                           | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for improving wastewater treatment  |
| 476            | GUV | Ouray   | 950,000           | 7,600          | 28,400         | 914,000           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 477            | GXM | Jefferson County                                    | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for stormwater collection system improvements   |
| <b>9 total</b> |     |   | <b>3,000,000</b>  | <b>24,000</b>  | <b>89,100</b>  | <b>2,886,900</b>  |   |
|                |     | <b>Montana</b>                                      |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 249            | GN1 | Rosodyn Corporation in Butte                        | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for a waste recovery from municipal waste treatment plant   |
| 553            | GY6 | Bozeman, City of                                    | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 554            | QW3 | Missouri River Water Project, Helena                | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for a water treatment project   |
| 555            | GRD | Glasgow, City of                                    | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,800         | 481,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 556            | GT1 | Seeley Lake Sewer District                          | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,300         | 721,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>5 total</b> |     |   | <b>3,400,000</b>  | <b>27,200</b>  | <b>101,200</b> | <b>3,271,600</b>  |   |
|                |     | <b>North Dakota</b>                                 |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 314            | GFX | Devils Lake, City of                                | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for the Devils Lake water line  |
| 588            | QHF | Grafton, City of                                    | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for the Grafton Water Treatment Plant   |
| 589            | GFX | Devils Lake, City of                                | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,800         | 481,200           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 590            | QWE | Riverdale, City of                                  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the Regional Water Treatment Facility   |
| 591            | GGM | Dickey Rural Water Users Association in Southeast   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for the Southeast Regional Expansion Project  |
| 592            | GRL | Mandan, City of                                     | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for drinking water infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>6 total</b> |     |   | <b>2,400,000</b>  | <b>19,200</b>  | <b>71,300</b>  | <b>2,309,500</b>  |   |
|                |     | <b>South Dakota</b>                                 |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 632            | A2I | Huron, City of                                      | 1,500,000         | 12,000         | 44,600         | 1,443,400         | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 633            | GYP | Green Valley Sanitary District,                     | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,800         | 577,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 634            | GRV | Tyndal, City of                                     | 400,000           | 3,200          | 12,000         | 384,800           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 635            | GYR | Milbank   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 636            | QUP | Sisseton  | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for stormwater improvements   |
| <b>5 total</b> |     |   | <b>3,100,000</b>  | <b>24,800</b>  | <b>92,200</b>  | <b>2,983,000</b>  |   |
|                |     | <b>Wyoming</b>                                      |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 443            | GQ8 | Cheyenne, City of                                   | 350,000           | 2,800          | 10,400         | 336,800           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>1 total</b> |     |   | <b>350,000</b>    | <b>2,800</b>   | <b>10,400</b>  | <b>336,800</b>    |   |
|                |     | <b>Utah</b>   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 398            | GPQ | Logan City  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements for Phase I and II of the Northwest Park Project |
| 652            | GSK | Holladay, City of                                   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for water infrastructure improvements associated with the Wayman Storm Drain Project                  |
| 653            | GYW | Magna Water Comp any an Improvement District, Magna | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,800         | 481,200           | for water infrastructure improvements associated with the perchlorate & arsenic treatment plant       |
| 654            | GSJ | Logan, City of                                      | 400,000           | 3,200          | 12,000         | 384,800           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 655            | QP8 | Park City   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for water infrastructure improvements associated with the Judge and piro Tunnel treatment plant       |
| 656            | GA9 | Riverton, City of                                   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 12,000         | 384,800           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 657            | GC1 | Orem, City of                                       | 400,000           | 3,200          | 12,000         | 384,800           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 658            | QG6 | Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District            | 100,000           | 800            | 3,000          | 96,200            | for the Groundwater Extraction and Treatment Remedial project   |
| 659            | QHD | Sandy City  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for drinking water and storm water infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>9 total</b> |     |   | <b>3,650,000</b>  | <b>29,200</b>  | <b>108,900</b> | <b>3,511,900</b>  |   |
| <b>35</b>      |     | <b>Region 8 Totals</b>                              | <b>15,900,000</b> | <b>127,200</b> | <b>473,100</b> | <b>15,299,700</b> |   |
|                |     | <b>Region 9</b>                                     |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|                |     | <b>Arizona</b>                                      |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 36             | QRM | Goodyear, City of                                   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 37             | QJ6 | Avondale, City of                                   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 38             | GUR | Chandler, City of                                   | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for the Chandler Arsenic Mitigation Program   |
| 39             | GL3 | University of Arizona, College of Pharmacy          | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for the US-Mexico Border Environmental Protection Program   |
| 40             | QQ1 | Stafford, City of                                   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for construction of a wastewater treatment plant  |
| 41             | GUQ | St. Johns, City of                                  | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for new water transmission pipeline construction  |
| <b>6 total</b> |     |   | <b>2,350,000</b>  | <b>18,800</b>  | <b>70,000</b>  | <b>2,261,200</b>  |   |
|                |     | <b>California</b>                                   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 42             | GUP | Rialto, City of                                     | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for water infrastructure improvements   |

|    |     |   |           |       |        |         |   |
|----|-----|---|-----------|-------|--------|---------|---|
| 43 | GL2 | Box Springs Mutual Water Company of the City of Moreno Valley | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for installation of a sewer system  |
| 44 | GL5 | Oxnard, City of   | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for the Headworks Expansion Project and Redwood Trunk Project   |
| 45 | QH6 | Modesto Project, City of                                      | 150,000   | 1,200 | 4,500  | 144,300 | for the neighborhood storm water, sewer, and water infrastructure project (Ninth Street Corridor Storm Drain Project) |
| 46 | QJ8 | Orange County Sanitation District                             | 600,000   | 4,800 | 17,900 | 577,300 | for wastewater infrastructure improvements in Fountain Valle  |
| 47 | GUS | Laguna Beach, City of   | 500,000   | 4,000 | 14,900 | 481,100 | for emergency sewer repairs   |
| 48 | GL4 | Solana Beach, City of   | 1,000,000 | 8,000 | 29,800 | 962,200 | for wastewater treatment improvements in the municipal sewer system   |
| 49 | GE5 | Roseville, City of  | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 50 | GUT | Monrovia, City of   | 400,000   | 3,200 | 11,900 | 384,900 | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvement   |
| 51 | AVN | Cities of Arcadia and Sierra Madre,                           | 1,000,000 | 8,000 | 29,800 | 962,200 | for the Joint Water Infrastructure Restoration Program  |
| 52 | GEF | City of East Palo Alto  | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for the storm water infrastructure improvements   |
| 53 | QXA | Monterey County Water Resource Agency                         | 350,000   | 2,800 | 10,400 | 336,800 | for the Salinas Valley Water Project in Monterey County   |
| 54 | A9W | Sweetwater Authority  | 100,000   | 800   | 3,000  | 96,200  | for the water quality monitoring in Chula Vista   |
| 55 | GKS | El Segundo  | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for wastewater infrastructure improvements for Smoky Hollow   |
| 56 | QHO | Redding, City of  | 350,000   | 2,800 | 10,400 | 336,800 | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 57 | GDA | San Diego County Water Authority                              | 750,000   | 6,000 | 22,300 | 721,700 | for the County Water Authority Regional Seawater Desalination Initiative in San                                       |
| 58 | QSQ | Brisbane, City of   | 350,000   | 2,800 | 10,400 | 336,800 | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 59 | GL6 | Bighorn Desert Water Agency                                   | 100,000   | 800   | 3,000  | 96,200  | for water infrastructure improvements in Yucca Valley   |
| 60 | QAY | San Bernardino, City of                                       | 450,000   | 3,600 | 13,400 | 433,000 | for Lakes and Stream Project  |
| 61 | QHY | Hesperia, City of   | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 62 | GZN | Lake Arrowhead, City of                                       | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for the Community Services District   |
| 63 | A31 | Mission Springs Water District                                | 500,000   | 4,000 | 14,900 | 481,100 | for the Groundwater Protection, Supply Enhancement/Reuse Program in Desert Hot Springs                                |
| 64 | GL7 | Banning, City of  | 450,000   | 3,600 | 13,400 | 433,000 | for the Brinton Reservoir   |
| 65 | AN9 | Hi-Desert Water District in Yucca Valley                      | 300,000   | 2,400 | 8,900  | 288,700 | for the Warren Valley Recharge Facility   |
| 66 | GLA | Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority                         | 300,000   | 2,400 | 8,900  | 288,700 | for the Santa Ana Regional Interceptor (SARI) Enhancement   |
| 67 | GL9 | San Jose, City of   | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 68 | QQ5 | Sacramento, City of   | 500,000   | 4,000 | 14,900 | 481,100 | for combined sewer system improvement rehabilitation project  |
| 69 | GJE | Castaic Lake Water Agency                                     | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 70 | GZ6 | Barstow, City of  | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for a sewer master plan implementation project  |
| 71 | QH9 | Victorville, City of  | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 72 | GZE | California State University, Dominguez Hills                  | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for the Center for Urban Environmental Research in Carson   |
| 73 | QIA | Brea, City of   | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 74 | GLC | Mission Viejo, City of  | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for the Oso Creek Barrier Project   |
| 75 | AX8 | Vallejo, City of  | 300,000   | 2,400 | 8,900  | 288,700 | for the Mare Island Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Improvement Project  |
| 76 | GL8 | Norwalk, City of  | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for the Balancing Facility Project  |
| 77 | GLB | Strathmore Public Utility District                            | 150,000   | 1,200 | 4,500  | 144,300 | for a wastewater treatment plant  |
| 78 | QVJ | Folsom, City of   | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for the sewer rehabilitation project  |
| 79 | QLF | San Francisco, City of  | 1,000,000 | 8,000 | 29,800 | 962,200 | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 80 | GC4 | Santa Clara Valley Water District                             | 800,000   | 6,400 | 23,800 | 769,800 | in Santa Clara County for Perchlorate Cleanup   |
| 81 | GER | Westminster, City of  | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for the Westminster Water Quality Pilot Project   |
| 82 | GLF | Huntington Beach, City of                                     | 300,000   | 2,400 | 8,900  | 288,700 | for the Wintersberg Channel Urban Run-Off Treatment   |
| 83 | GLG | Downey, City of   | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for storm water infrastructure improvements   |
| 84 | GZ7 | Municipal Water District of Orange County                     | 150,000   | 1,200 | 4,500  | 144,300 | for an Orange County water reliability study  |
| 85 | GLH | Orange County Sanitation District                             | 200,000   | 1,600 | 6,000  | 192,400 | for a new secondary treatment facility in Fountain Valley   |
| 86 | QIZ | Eureka, City of   | 250,000   | 2,000 | 7,400  | 240,600 | for the Martin Slough Interceptor   |

|                 |     |   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|-----------------|-----|---|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| 87              | GHL | Gardena, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                                    |
| 88              | GAA | Santa Monica, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 89              | GLE | Sonoma County   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the Monte Rio sanitation project in Monte Rio                                       |
| 464             | GC4 | Santa Clara Valley Water District   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for perchlorate groundwater clean-up  |
| 465             | GJZ | Inland Empire Perchlorate Task Force  | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Wellhead Treatment of Perchlorate Contaminated Wells                            |
| 466             | GXH | Santa Ana, City of  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for East and West Reservoir Upgrades  |
| 467             | GQE | San Jose, City of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for North San Pedro water and sewer infrastructure improvements                         |
| 468             | QIZ | Eureka, City of   | 500,000           | 4,000          | 14,900         | 481,100           | for the Martin Slough Interceptor Project   |
| 469             | GXJ | Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for the City of Ontario Final Design for Wellhead Treatment for Perchlorate and Nitrate |
| 470             | QIB | Laguna Beach, City of   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>55 total</b> |     | <b>Guam</b>   | <b>18,850,000</b> | <b>150,800</b> | <b>561,200</b> | <b>18,138,000</b> |   |
| 146             | QHW | Guam Waterworks Authority   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                                    |
| <b>1 total</b>  |     | <b>Hawaii</b>   | <b>250,000</b>    | <b>2,000</b>   | <b>7,400</b>   | <b>240,600</b>    |   |
| 147             | QUK | Maui County Department of Water Supply  | 150,000           | 1,200          | 4,500          | 144,300           | for the lead reduction in Upcountry Maui in Upcountry Maui                              |
| 489             | GQM | State of Hawaii   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for upgrade and expansion of the Sand Island Wastewater Treatment Plant                 |
| 490             | QHS | \$500,000 to the County of Hawaii and \$500,000 to the Housing and Community Development Corporation of Hawaii, | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| <b>3 total</b>  |     | <b>Nevada</b>   | <b>1,400,000</b>  | <b>11,200</b>  | <b>41,700</b>  | <b>1,347,100</b>  |   |
| 252             | AT7 | Fallon, City of   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 253             | AWL | Henderson, City of  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 559             | GRA | Las Vegas Valley Water District/Searchlight   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 560             | GEM | Clark County Reclamation District/Searchlight   | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 561             | GRB | Reno, City of   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for sewer infrastructure improvements   |
| 562             | QOW | Spanish Springs   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for the Nitrate Removal Project   |
| 563             | GRC | North Valley Lemmon Artificial Recharge Project in North Lemmon Valley  | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 564             | QTN | Virgin Valley Water District,   | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,400          | 240,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 565             | QNS | Carson City   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for reservoir lining  |
| <b>9 total</b>  |     | <b>Region 9 Totals</b>  | <b>2,800,000</b>  | <b>22,400</b>  | <b>83,300</b>  | <b>2,694,300</b>  |   |
| <b>74</b>       |     | <b>Region 9 Totals</b>  | <b>25,650,000</b> | <b>205,200</b> | <b>763,600</b> | <b>24,681,200</b> |   |
|                 |     | <b>Region 10</b>  |                   |                |                |                   |   |
|                 |     | <b>Alaska</b>   |                   |                |                |                   |   |
| 452             | QIK | Girdwood, Inc.  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for water and sewer expansion in Girdwood   |
| 453             | GQ9 | Municipality of Anchorage,  | 1,300,000         | 10,400         | 38,700         | 1,250,900         | for Sand Lake Water Extension   |
| 454             | GQB | Matanuska-Susitna Borough   | 300,000           | 2,400          | 8,900          | 288,700           | for water wells for Gorsuch Lake  |
| 455             | QIQ | Wasilla, City of  | 1,100,000         | 8,800          | 32,700         | 1,058,500         | for sewer expansion   |
| 456             | AY8 | Valdez, City of   | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,400         | 721,600           | to replace septic systems with sewers and wells with city water                         |
| 457             | QIJ | Ketchikan, City of  | 400,000           | 3,200          | 11,900         | 384,900           | for Mountain Point Sewer System   |
| 458             | GQC | Skagway, City of  | 250,000           | 2,000          | 7,600          | 240,400           | for water system upgrades   |
| 459             | QOF | Wrangell, City of   | 425,000           | 3,400          | 12,600         | 409,000           | for water and sewer upgrades  |
| 460             | GQA | Nome, City of   | 800,000           | 6,400          | 23,800         | 769,800           | for water and sewer upgrades for Old Federal Building                                   |
| 461             | GWT | Seldovia, City of   | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,900         | 577,300           | for water and sewer upgrades  |
| <b>10 total</b> |     | <b>Idaho</b>  | <b>6,925,000</b>  | <b>55,400</b>  | <b>206,300</b> | <b>6,663,300</b>  |   |
| 148             | GVA | Castleford, City of   | 200,000           | 1,600          | 6,000          | 192,400           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 149             | GVA | Castleford, City of   | 450,000           | 3,600          | 13,400         | 433,000           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 150             | GV9 | Twin Falls, City of   | 600,000           | 4,800          | 17,900         | 577,300           | for wastewater infrastructure improvements  |
| 151             | GM3 | Pocatello, City of  | 750,000           | 6,000          | 22,400         | 721,600           | for water infrastructure improvements   |
| 491             | A2S | Burley, City of   | 2,000,000         | 16,000         | 59,500         | 1,924,500         | to continue work on a Wastewater Treatment System Project                               |
| 492             | GXQ | Pocatello, City of  | 1,000,000         | 8,000          | 29,800         | 962,200           | for Day Street Division Water System Improvements                                       |
| <b>6 total</b>  |     | <b>Oregon</b>   | <b>5,000,000</b>  | <b>40,000</b>  | <b>149,000</b> | <b>4,811,000</b>  |   |

|                                      |     |   |                    |                  |                  |                    |   |
|--------------------------------------|-----|---|--------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|---|
| 347                                  | GP3 | Portland, City of                                   | 150,000            | 1,200            | 4,600            | 144,200            | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                        |
| 348                                  | GWN | Sweet Home, City of                                 | 150,000            | 1,200            | 4,500            | 144,300            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                  |
| 349                                  | GP1 | Salem, City of                                      | 150,000            | 1,200            | 4,500            | 144,300            | for the Peak Excess Flow Treatment Facility for Sanitary Sewer Overflows    |
| 350                                  | GP9 | Klamath Falls, City of                              | 200,000            | 1,600            | 6,000            | 192,400            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                  |
| 351                                  | GWM | Rainier, City of                                    | 150,000            | 1,200            | 4,500            | 144,300            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                  |
| 603                                  | QUG | Warrenton, City of                                  | 250,000            | 2,000            | 7,400            | 240,600            | for continued work on the municipal water outfall                           |
| 604                                  | GRS | Rainier, City of                                    | 250,000            | 2,000            | 7,400            | 240,600            | for a wastewater treatment plant  |
| 605                                  | GYH | Coquille, City of                                   | 250,000            | 2,000            | 7,400            | 240,600            | for a wastewater treatment plant  |
| 606                                  | GP9 | Klamath Falls                                       | 250,000            | 2,000            | 7,400            | 240,600            | for preliminary work on wastewater treatment improvements                   |
| 607                                  | GRQ | Coburg, City of                                     | 300,000            | 2,400            | 8,900            | 288,700            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                  |
| 608                                  | GWM | Rainier, City of                                    | 300,000            | 2,400            | 8,900            | 288,700            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                  |
| <b>11 total</b>                      |     |   | <b>2,400,000</b>   | <b>19,200</b>    | <b>71,500</b>    | <b>2,309,300</b>   |   |
| <b>Washington</b>                    |     |   |                    |                  |                  |                    |   |
| 413                                  | GPU | Chehalis, City of                                   | 150,000            | 1,200            | 4,600            | 144,200            | for water infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 414                                  | QUS | Tacoma, City of                                     | 1,000,000          | 8,000            | 29,800           | 962,200            | for an integrated storm water system for Salishan housing development       |
| 415                                  | GPS | Carson, City of                                     | 200,000            | 1,600            | 6,000            | 192,400            | for water infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 416                                  | GPT | Oak Harbor, City of                                 | 200,000            | 1,600            | 6,000            | 192,400            | for water infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 417                                  | GX4 | Uniontown, Town of                                  | 150,000            | 1,200            | 4,500            | 144,300            | for wastewater infrastructure improvements                                  |
| 418                                  | GPT | Ione, Town of                                       | 250,000            | 2,000            | 7,600            | 240,400            | for water infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 419                                  | QX1 | Lakewood, City of                                   | 150,000            | 1,200            | 4,500            | 144,300            | for the American Lake Gardens Industrial Sewer Extension                    |
| 660                                  | GYX | Battle Ground, City of                              | 400,000            | 3,200            | 11,900           | 384,900            | for sewer infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 661                                  | GYG | Port of Walla Walla                                 | 750,000            | 6,000            | 22,400           | 721,600            | for the Burbank Water System improvements                                   |
| 662                                  | GSP | Kennewick, City of                                  | 500,000            | 4,000            | 14,800           | 481,200            | for drinking water infrastructure improvements                              |
| 663                                  | GSO | Skamania County Public Utilities District in Carson | 500,000            | 4,000            | 14,800           | 481,200            | for water infrastructure improvements                                       |
| 664                                  | GYZ | Squaxin Island Tribe in Shelton                     | 250,000            | 2,000            | 7,600            | 240,400            | for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements                        |
| <b>12 total</b>                      |     |   | <b>4,500,000</b>   | <b>36,000</b>    | <b>134,500</b>   | <b>4,329,500</b>   |   |
| <b>39</b>                            |     | <b>Region 10 Total</b>                              | <b>18,825,000</b>  | <b>150,600</b>   | <b>561,300</b>   | <b>18,113,100</b>  |   |
| <b>Headquarters FY 2005 earmarks</b> |     |   |                    |                  |                  |                    |   |
| 133                                  | QAG | Columbus Water Works                                | 1,000,000          | 8,000            | 29,800           | 962,200            | for its Biosolids Flow-Through Thermophilic Treatment Demonstration Project |
| <b>1</b>                             |     | <b>HQ Total</b>                                     | <b>1,000,000</b>   | <b>8,000</b>     | <b>29,800</b>    | <b>962,200</b>     |   |
| <b>669</b>                           |     | <b>National Totals</b>                              | <b>317,085,000</b> | <b>2,536,500</b> | <b>9,114,100</b> | <b>305,434,400</b> |   |

# ATTACHMENT 2

**GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND MISCELLANEOUS**

- 102. Grants and Cooperative Agreements for Water Infrastructure Projects or Other Water Resource Projects from Funds Appropriated for the State and Tribal Assistance Grant Account or the Environmental Programs and Management Account

**AUTHORITY.** To approve and administer grants and cooperative agreements for water infrastructure projects or other water resource projects from funds appropriated for the State and Tribal Assistance Grant Account or the Environmental Programs and Management Account or any successor accounts, including a project authorized by Section 510 of the Water Quality Act of 1987, P.L. 100-4, 101 Stat. 7,80, EPA's FY 1991 Appropriations Act (P.L. 101-507), and any subsequent public law; and to perform other activities necessary for the effective administration of those grants and cooperative agreements.

2. **TO WHOM DELEGATED.** The Assistant Administrator for Water and Regional Administrators.
3. **REDELEGATION AUTHORITY.**
  - a. The authority granted to the Regional Administrator may be redelegated to the Division Director level, or equivalent, and no further.
  - b. The authority granted to the Assistant Administrator for Water may be redelegated to the Office Director level, or equivalent, and no further.
4. **LIMITATIONS.**
  - a. Except as provided in c. below, this delegation applies only to those grants and cooperative agreements for which authority is provided exclusively in a statute other than the Clean Water Act or the Safe Drinking Water Act (e.g., a statute making appropriations to the State and Tribal Assistance Grant Account or the Environmental Programs and Management Account or any successor accounts).
  - b. Awards are subject to guidance issued by the Office of the Comptroller or by the Office of Water or its Component Offices.
  - c. This delegation also applies to grants and cooperative agreements for projects described in, and pursuant to the 1987 Water Quality Act Section 510, as amended by EPA's 1991 Appropriations Act (P.L. 101-507), as amended.

5. **ADDITIONAL REFERENCES**

- a. **Authority to execute (sign) these financial assistance agreements is delegated to the Regional Administrators under Delegation 1-14, Assistance Agreements;**
- b. **40 CFR Part 31;**
- c. **40 CFR Part 40 for Demonstration grants;**
- d. **40 CFR Part 35, Subpart K; and**
- e. **EPA Assistance Administration Manual.**

# ATTACHMENT 3



**LISTING OF CROSS-CUTTING  
FEDERAL AUTHORITIES  
FOR SPECIAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT PROJECTS**

**Environmental Authorities**

Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, Pub. L. 93-291, as amended

Clean Air Act, Pub. L. 95-95, as amended

Clean Water Act, Titles III, IV and V, Pub. L. 92-500, as amended

Coastal Barrier Resources Act, Pub. L. 97-348

Coastal Zone Management Act, Pub. L. 92-583, as amended

Endangered Species Act, Pub. L. 93-205, as amended

Environmental Justice, Executive Order 12898

Flood Plain Management, Executive Order 11988 as amended by Executive Order 12148

Protection of Wetlands, Executive Order 11990 as amended by Executive Order 12608

Farmland Protection Policy Act, Pub. L. 97-98

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Pub. L. 85-624, as amended

Magnunson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, Pub. L. 94-265

National Environmental Policy Act, Pub. L. 91-190

National Historic Preservation Act, Pub. L. 89-655, as amended

Safe Drinking Water Act, Pub L. 93-523, as amended

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Pub. L. 90-54, as amended

**Economic and Miscellaneous Authorities**

Debarment and Suspension, Executive Order 12549

Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, Pub. L. 89 -754,  
as amended, and Executive Order 12372

Drug-Free Workplace Act, Pub. L. 100-690

Government Neutrality Toward Contractor's Labor Relations, Executive Order 13202 as  
amended by Executive Order 13208

New Restrictions on Lobbying, Section 319 of Pub. L. 101-121

Prohibitions relating to violations of the Clean Water Act or Clean Air Act with respect to  
Federal contracts, grants, or loans under Section 306 of the Clean Air Act and Section  
508 of the Clean Water Act, and Executive Order 11738.

Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, Pub. L. 91-646, as  
amended

#### **Civil Rights, Nondiscrimination, Equal Employment Opportunity Authorities**

Age Discrimination Act, Pub. L. 94-135

Equal Employment Opportunity, Executive Order 11246

Section 13 of the Clean Water Act, Pub. L. 92-500

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Pub. L 93-112 supplemented by Executive Orders  
11914 and 11250

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Pub. L 88-352

#### **Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Authorities**

EPA's FY 1993 Appropriations Act, Pub. L. 102-389

Section 129 of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendment Act,  
Pub. L. 100-590

Small, Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprises, Executive Orders 11625,  
12138 and 12432

# ATTACHMENT 4



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JAN 20 1995

OFFICE OF  
ENFORCEMENT AND  
COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: NEPA Guidance for Special Wastewater Treatment Projects  
in the FY95 Appropriation Bill

FROM: Richard E. Sanderson *Richard E. Sanderson*  
Director  
Office of Federal Activities (2252)

TO: NEPA Coordinators

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide guidance on the requirements for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for special projects authorized for EPA grant funding by the FY95 Appropriations Act (Act). The Act appropriated "no-year" money to fund special wastewater treatment projects identified by Congress. Each region has projects on this list. The list is included in the attached copy of the guidance memorandum prepared by the Office of Water Management (OWM).

The OWM memorandum indicates that NEPA applies to all of these projects except the three to be funded as Clean Water Act (CWA) section 104(b)(3) demonstration projects. These three are exempted from NEPA under the CWA section 511(c). The Office of General Counsel (OGC) has prepared an "Analysis of NEPA applicability to special grants authorized by FY 1995 Appropriations Act." This analysis is also attached.

OFA Guidance to Regional NEPA Coordinators

An independent EPA NEPA analysis for the non-demonstration projects is required. In addition, other cross-cutting federal statutes, such as the Endangered Species Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, also apply to these projects. The Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) NEPA regulations do not allow EPA to adopt a state analysis. However, the NEPA regulations do require agencies to "cooperate with State and local agencies to the fullest extent possible to reduce



Recycled/Recyclable  
Printed with Soy/Canola Ink on paper that  
contains at least 75% recycled fiber

duplication between NEPA and State and local requirements ..." (40 CFR 1506.2). There are several ways the regions can use the existing information and assessments for these projects as summarized below and as discussed in greater detail in the attached OGC analysis. In all cases, EPA must independently evaluate the state documentation and review process and is responsible for the accuracy of the NEPA documentation and the adequacy of the process (40 CFR 1506.5).

- Where states have performed environmental reviews under NEPA-like statutes or pursuant to State Revolving Fund regulations, EPA can incorporate, but not simply adopt, the state analysis into the Agency's NEPA analysis.
- Where state reviews have found no significant impacts and EPA approves of that finding and the state process, EPA may issue an environmental assessment (EA) summarizing and referencing the state analysis and an accompanying Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).
- Where state reviews have found significant impacts or EPA independently determines that there are significant impacts, EPA must issue a notice of intent and proceed with an environmental impact statement (EIS) and record of decision (ROD) in accordance with the Agency's regulations at 40 CFR Part 6.
- Where construction of projects is complete or nearly completed, a NEPA analysis will not have to be done.
- Where construction has started and the project is not nearly completed, a NEPA analysis is required and a notification of intent to pursue an independent analysis must be sent to the grantee.
- Where projects to be funded have been ongoing for several years, additional assessment may not be required if prior federal NEPA documentation has addressed the portions of the project to be funded by the FY95 grant. The region will need to assure that since the previous assessment: 1) there are no substantial changes in the proposed action relevant to environmental concerns, or 2) there are no significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts.

If the NEPA analysis was carried out under an earlier construction grant action and is no longer adequate or the project has not previously been assessed by EPA, it will be necessary to issue either an EA/FONSI or an EIS/ROD. The regulations applicable to these special project grants are the CEQ regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) and EPA's NEPA regulations (40 CFR Part 6, Subparts A-D). EPA's regulations at 40 CFR Part 6, Subpart E, while they do not apply to these special project grants, may provide additional guidance.

We anticipate that additional issues or sub-issues may arise which are not fully treated in this general guidance memorandum. These should be brought to our attention as soon as possible. In addition, we have scheduled a teleconference on Tuesday, January 24, 1995 from 11:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon eastern standard time to discuss this guidance and additional issues or concerns with the process. The call in number is (202) 260-4257. We look forward to your participation. Please inform John Gerba (202/260-5910) if you or your staff will not be on the call.

**Attachments**

cc: Jim Havard, OGC  
Ed Gross, OWM

# ATTACHMENT 5



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

JUL 29 2003

**MEMORANDUM**

**SUBJECT:** Conditioning Grants for Water Infrastructure Projects Prior to NEPA Reviews

**FROM:** Anne Norton Miller, Director *Anne Norton Miller*  
Office of Federal Activities

James A. Hanlon, Director *James A. Hanlon*  
Office of Wastewater Management

**TO:** EPA NEPA Compliance Coordinators, Regions I - X  
Water Division Directors, Regions I - X

The purpose of this memorandum is to alert you to the outcome of a recent court case that will affect how you manage grants for the special projects awarded under the authority of the Agency's Appropriations Acts.

In the January 20, 1995 memorandum, "NEPA Guidance for Special Wastewater Projects in the FY 1995 Appropriation Bill," Richard E. Sanderson provided guidance on how EPA would comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the special water infrastructure projects authorized in the Agency's FY 1995 Appropriations Act. With Congress providing funding in the State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) account of the Agency's Appropriations Acts annually since FY 1995, this guidance continues to be the primary source of policy direction for NEPA compliance for all of the special projects, including drinking water, stormwater and groundwater protection infrastructure projects.

Following the issuance of the 1995 memorandum, the Office of Federal Activities (OFA) determined that Regions could award grants for special Appropriations Act projects before completing a NEPA review if the grant award contained a condition stating that EPA would not fund any work beyond the conceptual design point until completion of the applicable requirements of NEPA and other cross-cutting statutes such as the Endangered Species Act. This guidance has been memorialized in the "STAG Guidelines" issued annually by the Office of Wastewater Management (OWM). We have developed the attached model grant condition (with optional language depending on the situation of a specific grant) that can be used to set out the specific restrictions the grantee would agree to when EPA awards a grant that includes activity beyond conceptual design before the NEPA review is completed.



In a recent court case, CARE v. EPA, No. 03-0417 (D.D.C. April 15, 2003) involving a NEPA challenge to a local sewer project to be funded in part by an EPA grant, the court suggested that if EPA had awarded the special Appropriations Act grant prior to completing the NEPA review, the entire project, even the part being constructed with local funds, might have been considered a Federal project and subject to the NEPA requirements. This could have resulted in the court enjoining the entire project pending completion of the NEPA review. This court case raises the risk that projects could successfully be challenged under NEPA when EPA awards grants that include a grant condition stating that EPA will not fund any work beyond the conceptual design point until the NEPA process is completed. Accordingly, we recommend that you inform grantees of this potential issue if a conditioned grant is being considered.

Under the STAG Guidelines Regions may make separate planning grants to special Appropriations Act project recipients. The courts consistently have held that Federal actions that involve only planning activities are not subject to NEPA. Although awarding two separate grants (one for planning activities and one for all other activities) involves more paperwork, we recommend that the Regions consider using this approach.

The Office of General Counsel (OGC) has concurred in this memorandum. If you have any questions concerning the contents of this memorandum, you may contact us, or have your staff contact Joe Montgomery (202-564-7157) in OFA, Marilyn Kuray (202-564-3449) in OGC, or Larry McGee (202-564-0619) in OWM.

Attachment

cc: Richard Kuhlman

## **MODEL GRANT CONDITIONS**

### **To Be Included in STAG Grants Awarded Before Completion of Environmental Review under the National Environmental Policy Act**

#### **Instructions for Project Officers:**

For projects that have not progressed beyond conceptual design<sup>1</sup> prior to grant award, include the introductory paragraphs and, as appropriate, the two paragraphs labeled "Option 1."

For projects that have started detailed design or construction prior to the start of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated, include the introductory paragraphs and the paragraph labeled "Option 2."

For projects that started detailed design or construction after the start of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated but before completion of the environmental review process, the Region should either:

Award an incremental grant that only includes planning activities. A grant for the remainder of the project would be awarded after the NEPA requirements and other relevant authorities have been met, or;

Wait and award a grant for all of the project after the NEPA requirements and other relevant authorities have been met.

#### **NEPA Compliance:**

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*, EPA is required to conduct an environmental review on the project funded by this grant. Accordingly:

The recipient agrees to provide EPA, in a timely fashion, an environmental information document (EID) containing all the necessary information on the project including a written analysis of the alternatives and the environmental impacts of the project. The EID must be of sufficient scope and detail to enable EPA to perform an environmental review under NEPA and other Federal environmental statutes.

---

<sup>1</sup>Conceptual design is essentially the same as facility planning as defined in EPA's Construction Grants program.

**Option 1: (To be used for projects that have not progressed beyond conceptual design prior to grant award)**

The recipient agrees not to take any action on the project beyond conceptual design, including but not limited to, beginning the preparation of plans and specifications, purchasing land, advertising or awarding design and/or construction contracts, initiating construction or requesting reimbursement from EPA for costs associated with such actions until such time as EPA has completed its environmental review in accordance with NEPA and 40 C.F.R. Parts 6 and 1500 et seq. Completion of this review will be evidenced by the issuance of a Categorical Exclusion (CE), the conclusion of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) process, or the issuance of a Record of Decision (ROD).

The recipient agrees that, upon completion of the NEPA review, design and construction shall be undertaken in accordance with the results of that review, including but not limited to, the implementation of measures EPA identifies as reasonable to mitigate the environmental impacts of the project. EPA reserves the right to unilaterally terminate this grant in the event the recipient fails to comply with this condition, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Section 31.43.

**Option 2: (To be used for projects that have started detailed design or construction prior to the start of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated)**

The recipient agrees to cooperate with the EPA project officer to establish the appropriate procedures to be followed to ensure that the NEPA environmental review process is completed in accordance with NEPA and 40 C.F.R. Parts 6 and 1500 et seq. Completion of this review will be evidenced by the issuance of a Categorical Exclusion (CE), the conclusion of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) process, or the issuance of a Record of Decision (ROD). Furthermore, the recipient agrees to implement reasonable measures to mitigate the environmental impacts of the project.

EPA will not approve or fund any work beyond the conceptual design point until the NEPA requirements and other relevant authorities have been met. Additionally, EPA reserves the right to unilaterally terminate this grant in the event the recipient fails to comply with this condition, in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Section 31.43.

# ATTACHMENT 6

**CWSRF BENEFITS ASSESSMENT – CORE MEASURES FOR PROJECTS**

- This page lays out the measures. An electronic version of this worksheet will be used for reporting. It will include links to the DEFINITIONS and DATA SOURCES listings found on the following pages. These describe the data requested and EPA’s plans to aggregate the information for all projects.
- Complete measures 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 for **each individual project** at the time of loan execution; a single loan may finance multiple projects. \*1, 2, and 3b are optional for nonpoint source projects. Please include clarifying and other comments where applicable.

CWSRF Core Benefits Measures

**0. Basic project information (complete for all projects)**

- a. Project name \_\_\_\_\_  
Project tracking # \_\_\_\_\_ Additional tracking # \_\_\_\_\_  
(phased project?  phase # \_\_\_\_\_ | original project # \_\_\_\_\_ )
- b. Permit: Type \_\_\_\_\_ Number \_\_\_\_\_  
Waterbody ID#/12-digit HUC \_\_\_\_\_  
Other location information: \_\_\_\_\_
- c. CWSRF loan amount to the project \$ \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Total CWSRF loan amount \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Execution date \_\_\_\_\_  
Interest rate (final) \_\_\_\_\_% Repayment period \_\_\_\_\_yrs
- e. NIMS categories for the project.  
Circle all NIMS categories that apply to the project. For a nonpoint source project, enter the sub-category.  
**I II IIIA IIIB IVA IVB V VI X NPS=VII -** \_\_\_\_\_

**1.\* User population served by the:**

project \_\_\_\_\_ | treatment facility(ies) \_\_\_\_\_

**2.\* Volume of wastewater treated/processed**

project \_\_\_\_\_mgd | treatment facility(ies) \_\_\_\_\_mgd

**3. Improvement or maintenance of water quality.**

- a. Does this project contribute to (check one)  
water quality improvement?  neither   
water quality maintenance?
- \*b. Does this project allow the system to (check one)  
achieve compliance?  neither   
maintain compliance?
- c. Is the affected *surface water*  or *groundwater*  :  
meeting standards , impaired , threatened   
or not assessed ?

- d. Does this project’s specific loadings reductions allow the system to address:

- an existing TMDL allocation?
- a projected TMDL allocation?
- a watershed management plan?  N/A

**4. Contribution to protection or restoration of designated uses and outcomes in the affected waterbody.**

Mark all applicable boxes with a ✓. For the designated uses, specify **one** primary use that drives the water quality goals of the project, if applicable. **P**=primary **O**=other.

If the project does not provide any water quality or public health benefits, but **only** improves infrastructure simply check this box.

| Designated uses              | Protection  | Restoration   |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Drinking water supply        | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Shellfish harvesting         | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cold water fishery           | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Warm water fishery           | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Primary contact recreation   | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Secondary contact recreation | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agriculture                  | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other – please specify       | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other – please specify       | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> | P <input type="checkbox"/> O <input type="checkbox"/> |

| Other uses and outcomes | Protection               | Restoration              |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Other public health     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Water reuse/recycling   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Groundwater protection  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other – please specify  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other – please specify  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Reporting information: person filling out this form**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Phone # \_\_\_\_\_ Agency \_\_\_\_\_ Date completed \_\_\_\_\_

## DEFINITIONS and DATA SOURCES for the Core Benefits Measures

### **0.**

#### **a. Project name and tracking #s**

Enter the project name and the number used to track the project in your state CWSRF program. If additional tracking information is required, enter "a," "b," "c," etc. For example, if the project number refers to the loan and this only one of three projects under that loan, differentiate the projects as "a," "b," and "c." If the project received a previous CWSRF loan, note the tracking number of the original loan/project.

#### **b. Permit type & number, waterbody ID/12-digit HUC, other location information**

Permit type will usually be "NPDES," but may be groundwater or land discharge. Please also enter a waterbody ID #, a HUC (hydrologic unit code) number, or some other geographic information for the affected waterbody(ies). This is especially important if the facility that the project affects does not have a permit or if the project affects a waterbody or waterbodies other than the receiving waterbody for this facility. A permit number itself should allow states and EPA to access this information. This information will allow EPA to access additional information about the waterbody from other data sources. Waterbody ID #'s are part of the National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) and are available through map interfaces on the EPA and USGS websites, as are HUCs. State environmental or mapping agencies can also often provide this information.

#### **c. CWSRF loan amount to the project**

Enter the amount loaned to finance the specific project. This may differ from the total loan amount if the loan finances multiple projects.

#### **d. Total CWSRF loan amount and execution date**

Enter the total loan amount and the date of loan execution.

##### **Interest rate and repayment period**

EPA will use this information and market data to compute estimated borrower savings due to the CWSRF interest rate subsidy. Report the final interest rate that includes any fees to best capture the borrower's realized savings.

#### **e. NIMS project categories for the loan**

This is the simplest way to describe a project. Its use here allows reporting for the individual projects that often receive financing from a single CWSRF loan, thus accurately cataloguing benefits information. Select all categories that apply to the project (not all categories that apply to the loan). (The electronic version makes this much easier.)

**Note:** If the project includes multiple NIMS categories (next page), please consider reporting project cost allocated to each NIMS category. This optional step will help EPA use environmental benefits information to the greatest effect.

Category

- I** Secondary treatment and best practicable wastewater treatment technology.
- II** Advanced treatment.
- IIIA** Infiltration/inflow correction.
- IIIB** Replacement and/or major rehabilitation of existing sewer systems.
- IVA** New collector sewer systems and appurtenances.
- IVB** New interceptor sewer systems and appurtenances.
- V** Correction of combined sewer overflows.
- VI** Municipal storm water management programs pursuant to NPDES permits.
- VII** Nonpoint source projects related to
  - A agriculture activities
  - B animal agricultural activities
  - C forestry activities
  - D development: roads, buildings, etc
  - E ground water pollution
  - F boating and marinas
  - G mining and quarrying activities
  - H idle, and underused industrial sites
  - I petroleum or chemical tanks
  - J sanitary landfills
  - K stream bank/shoreline modification, dams, wetland/riparian improvements
  - L rehabilitation/replacement of individual or community sewage disposal systems
- X** Recycled water distribution

**1.**

**User population served**

Enter the number of people that the project serves directly and the number of people currently connected to the permitted facility or system that the CWSRF project improves. If this information has not been updated on the permit recently, the applicant should be able to provide it easily.

Example: A project that simply extends sewer lines to a neighborhood that was formerly on septic would only register the population of that neighborhood as served directly. I&I improvements throughout the system that allow the treatment plant to maintain capacity for the newly connected neighborhood, however, would register the entire population connected to that facility as served directly. In both example cases, we would enter the entire population connected to the facility in the facility blank. Thus for the latter case, we enter the entire population connected to the facility in both blanks.

**2.**

**Volume of wastewater treated/processed**

For the project, enter the flow that it directly affects. This figure could be equivalent to the entry for the facility(ies), the design flow obtained from the engineering plans or updated permit for the facility. When flow cannot be accurately calculated for each phase of a phased project, divide the final resulting affected flow and design flow by the number of anticipated loan commitments and report the quotient for each commitment year.

Example 1:

A CWSRF loan funds rehabilitation of two pump stations, each of which processes 8% of total flow to the treatment facility. Enter 16% of the total flow for the project and enter the total design flow for the facility.

Example 2:

A CWSRF loan funds I&I repair designed to only affect 5% of flow but is designed to reduce wet weather flow by 12%. Because this project is **not** predominantly a wet weather project, we would count the 5%. (If it was a wet weather project, we would count the 12%.) Enter the total design flow for the facility.

### **3.**

#### **a. Improvement or maintenance of water quality.**

To contribute to water quality improvement, a project must reduce pollutant loading to the receiving waterbody. A project that simply sustains the treatment capacity of a facility counts for water quality maintenance. Find this information in the engineering and/or environmental review documents for a project. It may be wise to confirm pre-project pollutant loadings with information from the most recent Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs). (See also **3d.**)

#### **b. Compliance**

Use the engineering and environmental review documents, the DMRs, and the permit (most likely a NPDES permit, but also possibly a reuse, recharge, or land discharge permit), along with any administrative, consent, or court orders. Any project that eliminates risk of noncompliance can be counted as having maintained compliance.

#### **c. Is the affected 'surface water' or 'groundwater' meeting standards, impaired, or threatened?**

Check the surface water or the groundwater box. Access the name of the receiving waterbody from the permit or another state data system (or a different affected waterbody for a nonpoint source project or other project). Then look it up on the 303(d) impaired waters list, or on a state groundwaters list, to learn if it is meeting standards, impaired or threatened, or not assessed.

#### **d. Does this project allow the system to address a TMDL allocation or watershed management plan?**

Because TMDL implementation is incomplete and NPDES permits are only renewed every five years, it will be necessary to contact the state environmental agency's TMDL office to learn if the receiving waterbody has an approved TMDL. If it does, refer back to the engineering and environmental documents to see if the CWSRF-funded project reduced the specified pollutants in the TMDL. In some cases, this TMDL information will already be attached to the permit. *Projects on impaired waters do NOT automatically address a TMDL.*

In the Chesapeake Bay watershed and others, states are implementing watershed management plans that will prevent the need for a TMDL. Check with the appropriate state offices to determine whether the project helps implement such a plan.

For projects on waterbodies without TMDLs or management plans or for projects that do not help meet the goals – often pollutant-specific – of such efforts, check the N/A box. A project may address both TMDLs and a watershed management plan – check both boxes.



Example:

On a nutrient impaired stream, a new wastewater treatment plant replaces a smaller early-1980s POTW and the aging septic tanks of a few subdivisions. In the next few years, its up-to-date treatment processes will improve pollutant removal efficiency. Because state or local planning has targeted the area for development, however, the plant is designed and permitted for a higher level of loadings to the stream than the existing POTW. Average effluent loadings over the lifetime of the plant will be significantly greater than those from the old POTW.

- a. Check the N/A box. The project will degrade, not maintain or improve, water quality.
- b. Check the box for achieves compliance, since the project will comply with stricter permit limits.
- c. The receiving waterbody is impaired.
- d. Although a TMDL has been submitted to EPA for the stream, the permit does not contain any allocations. The TMDL program office, however, quotes a projected allocation figure for nutrients that the new facility does meet. Check the projected TMDL allocation box.

#### **4.**

##### **Contribution to protection or restoration of designated uses<sup>∞</sup> in the receiving waterbody.**

If the project maintains or improves water quality or, as in the case of the example for measure 3, increases effluent loadings but meets its permit, it is contributing to protection of the uses you find when matching pollutants. If the project reduces loadings of a pollutant that is impairing a designated use (303(d) list), the project contributes to restoration of that use.

While some project benefits are better described as infrastructure improvement, we should make an effort—to the extent that the documentation allows—to link project benefits to the affected waterbody of the facility/system.

While it may be obvious in some cases, we can systematically link a project to uses of the affected waterbody. First, identify the pollutants that the project removes from the influent sewage (design and environmental review documents) and that show up in the water quality criteria for the receiving waterbody's uses (water quality standards database) and outcomes. The design objectives for the project will make it clear which pollutants are targeted and will often mention uses/outcomes that are driving the project. Only mark uses/outcomes that are *explicitly addressed or strongly inferred* by the planning and design documentation. If these documents do not specify uses/outcomes, mark those that the project significantly affects. For the designated uses, specify one and only one primary use that drives the water quality goals of the project, if applicable.<sup>¶</sup> Specify "other" for additional uses.

---

<sup>∞</sup> Note that EPA will report this measure using a summary use/outcome list. It may make sense for states to record the measure using their own established state designated uses; EPA would then work with states to equate state uses with EPA reported summary uses. For the pilot effort, the form will provide a summary use/outcome list with space for states to enter additional uses and outcomes.

<sup>¶</sup> If two separate uses more or less equally contribute to the project's goals, make a note. The electronic form will have a separate option for this.

For projects that address, for example, a sewage spill that does not flow into the receiving waterbody, we assume that the "other public health" outcome category is most appropriate.

Example:

A project renovates a POTW and installs post-secondary chemical phosphorus removal equipment to comply with new TMDL allocations. The receiving waterbody is temperature impaired for its designated use as a cold water fishery and is also bacteria-impaired for its use of primary contact recreation. The project reduces effluent loadings of BOD, TSS, ammonia, and phosphorus. Because these pollutants are listed in the criteria for the receiving waterbody's two designated uses, the project protects both uses. Because the TSS reduction will affect the listed bacteria impairment, the project contributes to restoration of the primary contact recreation use. But because the project did not change effluent temperature, it will not be credited with restoring the cold water fishery use. Nonetheless, the cold water fishery is the primary use for this waterbody because its more stringent water quality criteria drive efforts to reduce loadings. Do not mark additional uses that are not explicitly addressed or strongly inferred in the planning/design documentation, even if project improvements incidentally protect these uses (e.g. agriculture).

Additional important comments

It is important to take every reasonable step to accurately link loan dollars spent for a project to the uses/outcomes that the project benefits. We can rarely measure protection or restoration of fishing or recreational uses on the scale of a single CWSRF project and the associated affected waterbody. State assigned designated uses and accompanying water quality criteria allow us to link the loading reductions from a CWSRF project to fishing, swimming, and other uses of and outcomes for affected waterbodies.