A Clear Commitment to America's Waters

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) . . . State Data and Lessons Learned from Clean Water Funding

July 14, 2010

Executive Summary

In February 2009, Congress enacted the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)*, providing \$787 billion to stimulate the economy. This amount included \$4 billion for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). The overarching trends regarding how \$4 billion was distributed through the states to the various project applicants is the subject of this report.

The National Association of Clean Water Agencies (NACWA) and its member agencies played a vital role in securing the CWSRF funding in the *ARRA*, as well as ensuring that key provisions, such as additional subsidization requirements and a "green reserve", were included in the *Act. ARRA* mandated that at least 50% of the SRF funds be distributed in the form of principal forgiveness, negative interest loans, or grants. Also, up to 20% of the SRF funding was made available for projects to address green infrastructure, water and/or energy efficiency, and other innovative environmental improvements (referred to as the "green reserve").

To illustrate how CWSRF dollars were distributed via *ARRA*, this report is comprised of two sections – the first is a narrative "key findings" section that provides the important trends on how the *ARRA* CWSRF funds were distributed. This information includes how states generally divvied up the funds between large, medium, and small communities. It includes information on the types of projects that received funding, distilling the data from analyses performed by the states. It also seeks to characterize the impact of *ARRA* funding on NACWA's ongoing advocacy efforts in the funding arena while also seeking to put the stimulus package within a context of the Association's advocacy efforts.

The report also provides key details such as each State's total CWSRF *ARRA* allocation amount, the number of project agreements awarded funding, the types of projects funded, the size of communities receiving funds, green project reserve statistics, and a breakdown on how States distributed additional subsidization dollars. In compiling the information contained in this report, NACWA relied on State data reported to the EPA and maintained in the *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List*, and individual State's *Intended Use Plans* for the *ARRA*-funded portion of CWSRF. NACWA received additional information from EPA's Office of Water and each State's primary CWSRF *ARRA* contact.

Key Figures and Trends for ARRA-Funded Projects

The \$4 billion allocated to all States and Puerto Rico through the *ARRA* CWSRF funded a total of 1,840 agreements. Each State distributed its CWSRF *ARRA* funds using different methods. As mentioned earlier, States were required to distribute at least 50% of the *ARRA* funds in the form of additional subsidization, including in the form of grants, negative interest loans, or principal forgiveness. Though the requirement was designed to encourage States to provide as much money as possible in the form of grants or grant equivalents, many States met the additional subsidization requirement through the use of lower than typical interest rates on loans. Several States distributed 100% of their money as principal forgiveness, including New York, Ohio, and Virginia. Some states chose to only distribute the minimum of 50% as principal forgiveness such as Illinois, Connecticut, and North Carolina. A total of 40 States distributed more than the minimum of 50% as principal forgiveness. States were also allowed to use up to 4% for state administrative costs to pay for staff time and other costs associated with administering the *ARRA* money. Several States did not keep any funding for administrative costs with a total of 16 States distributing 100% of their funds to communities.

States allocated a total of \$1,093,694,904 billion towards the green project reserve, making up approximately of 29% of all agreements. A total of 634 agreements were categorized as part of the "green reserve". The types of projects that were funded under this category ranged from green infrastructure projects to support work to control combined sewer overflows (CSOs) to wetland, river or habitat restoration projects as well energy efficiency projects.

Communities that received funding under the *ARRA* ranged in size from very large to very small. Specifically, approximately 31% of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000, for a total number of around 817 project agreements. Large communities with populations of over 100,000 received approximately 29% of the funds, for a total of approximately 276 project agreements. States that leaned toward smaller, rural funded projects included Pennsylvania, Iowa, and Louisiana, while some states did a more equitable job of targeting urban areas such as Ohio, Texas, and New Jersey.

ARRA funds were invested in agreements which addressed a multitude of clean water needs. Overall, 30% of the projects (representing 48% of the funds) went toward improving or maintaining treatment levels at POTWs; 44% of the projects (representing 33% of the funds) went toward improving, rehabilitating or expanding wastewater treatment collection systems; 6% of the projects (representing 9% of the funds) supported projects to correct CSOs; 11% of the projects (representing 4% of the funds) went toward nonpoint source projects; 7% of the projects (representing 4% of the funds) went toward municipal stormwater projects; and 2% of the projects (representing 2% of the funds) went toward water reuse projects.

ARRA Funding . . . Lessons Learned and Impact on Advocacy Priorities

Of the total \$4 billion in funds, NACWA members received approximately \$610 million. This represents approximately 108 NACWA members who received funding for approximately 164 executed agreements. There is no doubt that NACWA is pleased to have played a critical role in obtaining \$610 million in additional funding for its members. That being said, this was a fairly small percentage of the overall funding amount albeit commensurate with the typical annual spending patterns for the CWSRF. Additionally, this funding helped members in significant need during the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression but did little, ultimately, to overcome a water infrastructure funding gap estimated to be in the hundreds of billions of dollars. The effort did, however, underscore some of the shortcomings in terms of the equities involved in the distribution of CWSRF dollars. In line with these concerns, NACWA recently sent a letter to EPA's Deputy Administrator Bob Perciasepe regarding the future of the CWSRF and outlining some of the lessons learned from the *ARRA* effort. The letter specifically notes that "while more money is a vital part of the solution [addressing the funding gap], so too is ensuring the equitable distribution of any federal funding that becomes available. This means any new funding that becomes available should, on an equitable basis:

- Help urban and rural systems alike;
- Promote green and gray projects based on site-specific priorities;
- Account for a new, more flexible approach to affordability and to determining financial capability constraints;
- Incentivize new technologies and market-based approaches such as trading while also accounting for the impacts of climate change;
- Advance effective utility management principles and continuous asset management improvement;

• Take a watershed approach and focus on advancing water quality goals for the Nation's waterways with a focus on our great water bodies."

While the *ARRA* provided an injection of funds at a critical juncture, its limited help in meeting evergrowing funding needs underscored the importance for EPA and Congress to move toward a federalstate-local partnership for funding that is sustainable. NACWA believes the best way to accomplish this is through the creation of a clean water trust fund. Our nation has dedicated revenue sources for nearly every other infrastructure category including highways, rails and airports, why not create one for water, a resource that each of us uses and relies upon every day.

The *ARRA*, however, also made it clear that federal funding will not in and of itself solve the funding gap. The emergence of new and more costly regulations under the Clean Water Act makes this obvious. As such, NACWA believes that EPA must embark on a serious process to rethink its approach on Clean Water Act affordability assessment to ensure that the limited federal dollars that are made available are targeted to projects that maximize water quality benefits.

Despite the *ARRA* investment, over \$56 billion in identified, ready-to-go drinking water and wastewater infrastructure projects still await funding through the SRF programs. These projects are critical to meeting the objectives of the Clean Water Act and to ensuring that existing progress is not reversed. For this reason, while NACWA applauds Congress for this investment, we must continue our efforts to ensure federal funding for clean water priorities is sustainable over time. NACWA looks forward to working with this Administration and Congress in developing a long-term federal commitment to clean water that will provide a sustainable source of funding to help our communities meet their water quality objectives.

If you find any errors while reading this report or have any questions, please contact Thea Graybill, NACWA's Government Affairs Assistant, at 202-533-1839 or *tgraybill@nacwa.org*.

- ALABAMA $-^{1}$

Allocation: \$42,068,736 Agreements: 9

Municipalities: 9

Alabama received \$42,068,736 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of nine agreements with nine municipalities. Alabama's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 50% of the money allocated as principal forgiveness and 96% of the money allocated as Project Assistance Loans with a low interest rate; 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Alabama allocated \$16,773,368 towards the green project reserve, making up 40% of all agreements. The average amount of funding given to municipalities was \$4.7 million with the median being \$4.4 million. Of the nine municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, six have populations under 10,000 and three have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Fifty-eight percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 0% went to communities with populations of 100,000 or more.

Alabama invested ARRA funds to address the following issues: five agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; four agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; three agreements provided funding for infiltration or inflow; two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; and two agreements provided funding for new interceptors. Five of the agreements included project components categorized as part of the "green reserve". Five of the agreements addressed sewer system non-compliance.

¹ Relevant information was found from the EPA *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Alabama's DEM. *Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) Loan Program.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.adem.state.al.us/WaterDivision/SRF/Forms-Reports/CWSRF09IUP5-15-09.pdf</u>.

- ALASKA $-^2$

Allocation: \$22,516,800

Agreements: 20

Municipalities: 14

Alaska received \$22,516,800 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of twenty agreements with fourteen municipalities. Alaska's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were obligated in the form of additional subsidization with 6.7% of the money distributed as .05-1.5% interest loans; 89.3% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Alaska allocated \$6,687,019 towards the green project reserve, making up 30% of all agreements. The average amount for a single agreement was \$1.1 million and the median amount was \$1.1 million. Of the fourteen municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, eleven have populations under 10,000 and three have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Eighty percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 0% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Alaska invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: eight agreements received funding for sewer system rehabilitations; four agreements provided funding for storm sewers; three agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for sanitary landfills; one agreement provided funding for secondary treatment; one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; and one agreement provided funding for ground water. Four agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

² Relevant information was found from the EPA. (*Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Alaska's DOW. *State Fiscal Year 2010-Intended Use Plans & Project Lists with Economic Stimulus Funds*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.dec.state.ak.us/water/muniloan/StimulusCapitalization.htm</u>.

- ARIZONA $-^{3}$

Allocation: \$25,410,816

Agreements: 17

Municipalities: 14

Arizona received \$25,410,816 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of seventeen agreements with fourteen municipalities. Arizona's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 48% of the money distributed as either 2% or 2.5% interest loans; 52% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. The Water Infrastructure and Finance Authority of Arizona (WIFA) provided subsidies in the form of principal forgiveness to twelve of the seventeen *ARRA* Clean Water Projects and provided reduced combined interest and fee rate to the remaining five ARRA Clean Water Projects. Arizona allocated \$12,367,207 towards the green project reserve, making up 49% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.5 million with the median sized agreement being \$960,000. Of the fourteen municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, five have populations under 10,000, five have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and four have populations over 100,000. Forty-five percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 39% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Arizona invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: five agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; four agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; three agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; three agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for new interceptors; two agreements provided funding for recycled water distribution; one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; and one agreement provided funding for storm sewers. Eight agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Arizona's WIFA. *2010 Intended Use Plan*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.azwifa.gov/publications/IUPPPLs/2010CWIUP.pdf</u>.

- ARKANSAS $-^4$

Allocation: \$24,611,040 Agreements: 7 Municipalities: 5 Universities: 1

Arkansas received \$24,611,040 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of seven agreements with five municipalities and one university. Fifty-two and a half percent of Arkansas's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of* 2009 (ARRA) funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 47.5% of the money distributed as 3.25% interest loans; 50% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; 2.5% of the funds were distributed as grants; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Arkansas allocated \$10,268,353 towards the green project reserve, making up 42% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$3.5 million with the median sized agreement being \$3 million. Of the five municipalities and one university that received *ARRA* funds, three have populations under 10,000, two have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and one has a population over 100,000. Sixty-nine percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 1% of the funds went to communities with populations

Arkansas invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: two agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow issues; two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; one agreement provided funding for secondary treatment; one agreement provided funding for hydromodification; and one agreement provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation. One agreement was categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Arkansas's Natural Resources Commission. CWSRF & DWSRF ARRA Intended Use Plan. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.anrc.arkansas.gov/cwsrf_arra_intended_use_plan.htm</u>.

- CALIFORNIA $-^{5}$

Allocation: \$269,074,368 Agreements: 109 Municipalities: 53 NGOs: 17 Governmental Divisions: 10 Universities: 1 Indian Communities: 1

California received \$269,074,368 (not including administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 109 agreements with 58 municipalities, seventeen non-governmental organizations, ten governmental divisions, and one university. California's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 100% of the money distributed as low interest loans; 65% of the funds were distributed as subsidy; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. California allocated \$76,467,705 towards the green project reserve, making up 28% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.5 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.3 million. Of the 82 municipal entities that received *ARRA* funds, fifteen have populations under 10,000, 23 have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and 45 have populations over 100,000. Fourteen percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 61% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

California invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: sixteen agreements provided funding for hydromodification; fourteen agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; fourteen agreements provided funding for storm sewers; six agreements provided funding for recycled water distribution; five agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; five agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; four agreements provided funding decentralized systems; two agreements provided funding for individual or decentralized systems; one agreement provided funding for new collector sewers; one agreement provided funding for new interceptors; and one agreement provided funding for agricultural animals. Thirty-one agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁵ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from California's EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reference Material*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water issues/programs/grants loans/srf/arra ref material.shtml.

— COLORADO —⁶

Allocation: \$30,093,792

Agreements: 12

Municipalities: 12

Colorado received \$30,093,792 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of twelve agreements with twelve municipalities. Colorado's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 48% of the money distributed as 0-2.5% interest loans; 52% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Colorado allocated \$7,874,956 towards the green project reserve, making up 26% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.5 million with the median sized agreement being \$2 million. Of the twelve municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, six have populations under 10,000, four have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Forty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 11% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Colorado invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: six agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; four agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; and two agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation. Five agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁶ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Colorado's Department of Public Health and Environment. *Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.cdphe.state.co.us/wq/FinancialSolutions/WPCRF.html</u>.

- CONNECTICUT $-^7$

Allocation: \$46,089,888 Agreements: 2 Municipalities: 1

Connecticut received \$46,089,888 (excluding administration costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of two agreements with one municipality. Connecticut's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 46% of the money distributed as 2% interest loans; 50% of the funds were distributed as grants; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Connecticut allocated \$9,602,060 towards the green project reserve, making up 21% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$23 million with the median sized agreement being \$23 million. The one municipality which received *ARRA* funds has a population over 100,000. None of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 100% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Connecticut invested all of its *ARRA* funds in agreements addressing CSO corrections. One agreement was categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁷ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Connecticut's Department of Environmental Protection. Clean Water State Revolving Funds. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from

— DELAWARE —⁸

Allocation: \$18,469,536

Agreements: 10 Conservation Districts: 1 **Municipalities: 5**

Delaware received \$18,469,536 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of ten agreements with five municipalities and one conservation district. Delaware's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 96% of the money distributed as 2% interest loans; 50% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Delaware allocated \$3,847,820 towards the green project reserve, making up 21% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.9 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.4 million. Of the five municipalities and one conservation district that received *ARRA* funds, one has a population under 10,000 and five have populations over 100,000. One percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 99% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Delaware invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: three agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; two agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems; one agreement provided funding for new interceptors; one agreement provided funding for storm sewers; and one agreement provided funding for recycled water distribution. Five agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁸ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/arra.pdf and from Delaware's Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.dnrec.delaware.gov/Admin/Pages/ARRA.aspx.

- FLORIDA -9

Allocation: \$132,286,300 Agreements: 28 Municipalities: 27

Florida received \$132,286,300 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 28 agreements with 27 municipalities. Florida's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 52% of the money provided as additional subsidization and all of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness. The average interest rate for *ARRA* loans was 2.28%. All *ARRA* funds were utilized for projects. Florida allocated \$39,645,014 towards the green project reserve, making up 30% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$4.7 million with the median sized agreement being \$3.7 million. Of the 27 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, eighteen have populations under 10,000, seven have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Sixty-eight percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 13% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Florida invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: eight agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; seven agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; five agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; five agreements provided funding for new interceptors; four agreements provided funding for storm sewers; three agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; two agreements provided funding for recycled water distribution; and one agreement provided funding for secondary treatment. Four agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Florida's Department of Environmental Protection. *Fiscal Year 2010 Intended Use Plan*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/wff/cwsrf/docs/iup10.pdf.

- GEORGIA -10

Allocation: \$81,686,310

Agreements: 38

Municipalities: 35

Georgia received \$81,686,310 (excluding administration costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 38 agreements with 35 municipalities. Ninety-seven percent of Georgia's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form 3% interest loans with principal forgiveness. In aggregate, Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority (GEFA) provided 66% principal forgiveness on these 38 loans. GEFA retained 3% of the *ARRA* funding for state administrative costs. Georgia allocated \$17,338,258 towards the green project reserve, making up 21% of all agreements. The average size *ARRA* loan was \$ 2.1 million with the median sized agreement being \$1 million. According to NACWA's research, of the 35 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, 22 have populations under 10,000, nine have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and four have populations over 100,000. Thirty-six percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 34% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Georgia invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: fifteen agreements provided funding for sever system rehabilitation; nine agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; six agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; two agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow issues; two agreements provided funding for new interceptors; two agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized, systems; two agreements provided funding for recycled water distribution; one agreement provided funding for storm sewers; and one agreement provided funding for storm sewers; and one agreement provided funding for hydromodification. Ten agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹⁰ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Georgia's Environmental Facilities Authority. *Georgia's Intended Use Plan.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.gefa.org/Index.aspx?page=156.

- HAWAII -11

Allocation: \$29,752,300 Agreements: 7 Municipalities: 4

Hawaii received \$29,752,300 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of seven agreements in four municipalities. Hawaii's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds (100%) were distributed as 0% interest, principal forgiveness. Hawaii allocated \$13,687,891 towards the green project reserve, making up 46% of all agreements. The average amount of funds allocated per agreement was \$4.3 million with a median allocation per agreement of \$5 million. Of the four municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, one has a population between 10,000 and 100,000 and three have populations over 100,000. None of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 75% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Hawaii invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: two agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; three agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; and one agreement provided funding for advanced treatment; and one agreement provided funding to strengthen a facility's structure. Three agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹¹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Hawaii's DOH. *State of Hawaii: Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund; Intended Use Plan.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://hwww.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Hawaii's DOH. *State of Hawaii: Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund; Intended Use Plan.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://http

- IDAHO $-^{12}$

Allocation: \$19,239,100

Agreements: 8

Municipalities: 8

Idaho received \$19,239,100 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of eight agreements with eight municipalities. Seven agreements using Idaho's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds included some amount of additional subsidization. The total amount of the subsidization was \$12,334,212. Forty-six percent of the money was distributed as 0% interest loans; 38% of the funds were distributed as 0.5% interest loans; 16% of the money distributed as 1% interest loans; and 0% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Idaho allocated \$6,687,019 towards the green project reserve, making up 35% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.4 million with the median sized agreement being \$2.5 million. Of the eight municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, seven have populations under 10,000 and one has a population between 10,000 and 0% of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 0% of the funds went to communities with populations.

Idaho invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: five agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, three agreements provided funding for new collector sewers, one agreement provided funding for advanced treatment, and one agreement provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation. Four agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹² Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Idaho's Department of Environmental Quality. *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Funding: CW and DW State Revolving Funds*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.deq.idaho.gov/water/arra/arra water projects.cfm.

- ILLINOIS -13

Allocation: \$177,243,100 Agreements: 69 Municipalities: 62

Illinois received \$177,243,100 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 69 agreements in 62 municipalities. Illinois's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of 0% interest loans; with additional subsidization in the form of 25% principal forgiveness (50% of *ARRA* funds provided). Illinois operated what was in essence a hybrid program: 50% of total loan funds were provided directly from *ARRA* funding and the other 50% was allocated from Illinois' Water Pollution Control Loan Program, the Clean Water SRF. Illinois allocated \$40,769,501 towards the green project reserve, making up 23% of all agreements. The average amount of funding given per agreement was \$2.6 million with the median being \$1.4 million. Of the 62 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, 38 have populations below 10,000; eighteen have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and six have populations over 100,000. Forty-four percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 24% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Illinois invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: seven agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; three agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; two agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; and one agreement provided funding for advanced treatment. Twenty-five of the agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹³ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List*, 1. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Illinois's EPA. *Water Pollution Control Loan Program: Supplemental Intended Use Plan Pursuant to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.state.il.us/water/financial-assistance/economic-stimulus/wpclp-arra-final-iup.pdf</u>.

- INDIANA $-^{14}$

Allocation: \$94,447,500 Agreements: 43 M

Municipalities: 41

Indiana received \$94,447,500 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 43 agreements with 41 municipalities. Indiana's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 18% of the money as *ARRA* loans with a 'below-market interest rate' and 82% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness. Indiana allocated \$22,050,100 towards the green project reserve, making up 23% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.2 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.4 million. Of the 41 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, sixteen have populations under 10,000, twenty have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and five have populations over 100,000. Twenty-nine percent of the funds went to communities with populations of below 10,000 and 12% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Indiana invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 24 agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; eight agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; eight agreements provided funding for CSO correction; seven agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; four agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; one agreement provided funding for new interceptors; one agreement provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized, systems; and one agreement provided funding for brownfields. Twenty agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹⁴ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Indiana's IFA. *SRF Water Infrastructure Programs under ARRA 2009*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.in.gov/ifa/arra.htm.

- IOWA $-^{15}$

Allocation: \$53,040,000 Agreements: 47

Municipalities: 44

Iowa received \$53,040,000 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 47 agreements with 44 municipalities. Fifty-one percent of Iowa's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization through principal forgiveness; 49% of the money was distributed as 3% interest loans; 0% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Iowa allocated \$11,655,000 towards the green project reserve, making up 22% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.1 million with the median sized agreement being \$572,000. Of the 44 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, 36 have populations under 10,000, eight have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations between 50,000 and 100,000. Sixty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 0% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Iowa invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 21 agreements provided funding for advanced treatment, seven agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, seven agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation, four agreements provided funding for hydromodification, three agreements provided funding for infiltration or inflow, three agreements provided funding for new interceptors, two agreements provided funding for CSO correction, and one agreement provided funding for storm sewers. Thirteen agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹⁵ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Iowa's Finance Authority. *Water Quality*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from

http://www.iowafinanceauthority.gov/en/american recovery and reinvestment act/water quality/.

- KANSAS $-^{16}$

Allocation: \$35,374,200

Agreements: 22

Municipalities: 22

Kansas received \$35,374,200 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 22 agreements with 22 municipalities. Kansas's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 100% of the money distributed as low interest loans with rates between 2.55% and 2.86%; 64% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 0% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Kansas allocated \$29,926,828 towards the green project reserve, making up 85% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.6 million with the median sized agreement being \$502,285. Of the 22 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, eight have populations under 10,000, seven have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and seven have populations over 100,000. Eighteen percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 50% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Kansas invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: seven agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; six agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized, systems; two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; two agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitations; two agreements provided funding for hydromodification; one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; one agreement provided funding for CSO correction; and one agreement provided funding for recycled water distribution. Nineteen agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹⁶ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Kansas's Department of Health and Environment. *Kansas Public Water Supply Loan Fund*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.kdheks.gov/pws/loan/loanfund.htm</u>.

- KENTUCKY -17

Allocation: \$47,882,976 Agreements: 44 Municipalities: 35 Government Agencies: 2 (State); 8 (Local/Regional)

Kentucky received \$47,882,976 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 44 agreements with 35 municipalities, eight local and regional governmental organizations, and two state government agencies. Kentucky's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 96% of the funds distributed as low interest loans; 52.1% as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Kentucky allocated \$10,412,792 towards the green project reserve, making up 21% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.1 million with the median sized agreement being \$800,602. Of the 35 borrowers that received *ARRA* funds, fifteen have populations under 10,000, fifteen have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and five have populations over 100,000. Forty-three percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 32% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Kentucky invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 23 agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; thirteen agreements provided funding for new interceptors; five agreements provided funding for storm sewers; four agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; three agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; three agreements provided funding for CSO correction; two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; and one agreement provided funding for recycled water distribution. Twelve agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹⁷ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Kentucky's Infrastructure Authority. *Draft IUP and Economic Stimulus Recovery Funding Update*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://kia.ky.gov/.

- LOUISIANA -18

Allocation: \$43,081,400

Agreements: 53 Municipalities: 53

Louisiana received \$43,081,400 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 53 agreements with 53 municipalities. Louisiana's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed as principal forgiveness with 100% of the money distributed as 0% interest loans. Louisiana allocated \$8,660,252 towards the green project reserve, making up 20% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$812,857 with the median sized agreement being \$760,000. Of the 53 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, 41 have populations under 10,000 and twelve have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Sixty-six percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 0% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Louisiana invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 30 agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; twelve agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; twelve agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; eleven agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; four agreements provided funding for new interceptors; two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; and one agreement provided funding for ground water. Seven agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹⁸ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Louisiana's DEQ. *Louisiana's Intended Use Plan.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/tabid/2976/Default.aspx.

- MAINE $-^{19}$

Allocation: \$29,123,328 Agreements: 19 Municipalities: 17

Maine received \$29,123,328 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of nineteen agreements in seventeen municipalities. Maine's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 52% of the money distributed as principal forgiveness and 44% as 0% interest loans; 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Maine allocated \$8,719,000 towards the green project reserve, making up 32% of all agreements. The average amount of funding given per agreement was \$1.5 million with the median being \$1.1 million. Of the 17 communities that received *ARRA* funds, eleven have populations below 10,000, five have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and one has a population over 100,000. Fifty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 7% of the funds went to a community with a population above 100,000.

Maine invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: eight agreements provided funding for CSO correction; four agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; three agreements provided funding for urban stormwater mitigation, excluding decentralized systems; two agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; two agreements provided funding for new interceptors; and one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems. Seven of the agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

¹⁹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List*, 1. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Maine's DEP. *Clean Water SRF/ARRA: Intended Use Plan*, 5-10. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.maine.gov/dep/recovery/cwa/.

- MARYLAND $-^{20}$

Allocation: \$92,784,600 Agreements: 64 Municipalities: 38 NGOs: 7

Maryland received \$92,784,600 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 64 agreements with 38 municipalities and 7 nongovernmental organizations. Maryland's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (*ARRA*) funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 38% of the money distributed as either 0% interest loans for disadvantaged communities or 1% interest loans for nondisadvantaged communities, for up to 20 years; 60% of the funds were distributed as grants or principal forgiveness and 37% of the funds were distributed as disadvantaged community (DAC)²¹ and environmental benefit districts (EBD)²² grants; 2% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Maryland allocated \$21,888,425 towards the green project reserve, making up 24% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.4 million with the median sized agreement being \$567,300. Of the 38 municipalities and seven NGOs that received *ARRA* funds, eighteen have a population under 10,000, fourteen have a population between 10,000 and 100,000, and thirteen have a population over 100,000. Nineteen percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 51% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Maryland invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: twenty agreements provided funding for hydromodification; twelve agreements provided funding for storm sewers; eleven agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; six agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; six agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; four agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; four agreements provided funding for new interceptors; two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; and one agreement provided funding for recycled water distribution. Thirty-one agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²⁰ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Maryland's DEP. *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009: Proposed Funding List.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.mde.state.md.us/assets/document/FedStimulus/Proposed Projects Status.pdf.

²¹ A DAC is "any community with Median Household Income (MHI) less than \$47,810 (70% of the State MHI) or any community with average sewer user rate per year per Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) that exceeds 1% of MHI."
²² An EBD is a "[place] where State government and other stakeholders can focus their financial, technical, regulatory, administrative, policy and other appropriate resources to benefit targeted communities."

- MASSACHUSETTS -²³

Allocation: \$127,735,008 Agreements: 61 Municipalities: 46 School Districts: 1

Massachusetts received \$127,735,008 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 61 agreements with 45 municipalities and one school district. Massachusetts used a combination of *ARRA* funds and SRF funds to provide a total of \$572 million in financing through these agreements. Massachusetts' CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 100% of the funds distributed as principal forgiveness. The remainder of the agreement cost was financed through a 2% interest loan from the SRF and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Massachusetts allocated \$54,287,508 towards the green project reserve, making up 43% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.1 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.1 million. Of the 46 municipalities and one school district that received *ARRA* funds, three have a population under 10,000, 36 have a population between 10,000 and 100,000, and eight have a population over 100,000. Three percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 37% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Massachusetts invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: nine agreements provided funding for new collector sewers, six agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, six agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation, five agreements provided funding for advanced treatment, four agreements provided funding for CSO correction, three agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems, three agreements provided funding for new interceptors, and one agreement provided funding for individual or decentralized systems. Eleven agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²³ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Massachusetts's Department of Environmental Protection. Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Massachusetts's Department of Environmental Protection. Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.mass.gov/dep/recovery/srf.htm.

- MICHIGAN -24

Allocation: \$168,509,000 Agreements: 67 Municipalities: 54

Michigan received \$168,509,000 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 67 agreements with 54 municipalities. Michigan's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed, with 6.5% of the money distributed as 2.5% interest loans, 93.5% distributed as principal forgiveness, and none of the funds held for state administrative costs. Michigan allocated \$34,214,330 towards the green project reserve, making up 20% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.5 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.2 million. Of the 54 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, 24 have populations under 10,000, twenty have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and ten have populations over 100,000. Twenty percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 47% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Michigan invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: fifteen agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; fifteen agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; thirteen agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; eleven agreements provided funding for CSO correction; eight agreements provided funding for new interceptors; six agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized, systems; six agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; and one agreement provided funding for hydromodification. Fourteen agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²⁴ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Michigan's DEQ. Important Information on the ARRA for Environmental Quality. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.michigan.gov/deq/0,1607,7-135-3307_3515_3517-207202--,00.html</u>.

- MINNESOTA $-^{25}$

Allocation: \$79,682,760 Agreements: 25 Municipalities: 21

Minnesota received \$79,682,760 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 25 agreements in 21 municipalities. Minnesota's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 54% of the money distributed as principal forgiveness with no interest; 46% as loans; and 3.5% held for state administrative costs. Minnesota allocated \$17,521,709 towards the green project reserve, making up 22% of all agreements. The *ARRA* funds were leveraged with \$101.9 million non-*ARRA* CWSRF funding for a total agreement investment of \$181.6 million. The average amount of *ARRA* funds per agreement was \$3.2 million with the median being \$2 million. Of the 21 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, sixteen have populations under 10,000, four have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and one has a population over 100,000. Sixty-nine percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 19% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Minnesota invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: fifteen agreements provided funding for treatment plant construction and rehabilitation; ten agreements provided funding for sewer rehabilitation and conveyance projects. Three agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²⁵ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Minnesota's Public Facilities Authority. Minnesota Public Facilities Authority: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funds- Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.positivelyminnesota.com/Government/Public Facilities Authority/ARRA Documents/PFA-ARRA-Clean Water SRF.pdf.

- MISSISSIPPI -26

Allocation: \$33,895,968

Agreements: 16

Municipalities: 16

Mississippi received \$33,895,968 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 16 agreements with 16 municipalities. Mississippi's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed additional subsidization with 96% of the funds distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Mississippi allocated \$8,560,959 towards the green project reserve, making up 25% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.1 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.6 million. Of the sixteen municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, six have populations under 10,000, eight have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 29% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Mississippi invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: five agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; five agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; three agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for new interceptors; and two agreements provided funding for secondary treatment. Three agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²⁶ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Mississispipi's DEQ. Water Pollution Control (Clean Water) Revolving Loan Fund Program: Intended Use Plan. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.deq.state.ms.us/MDEQ.nsf/pdf/SRF_FY-09IUPAmendment1/\$File/IUPFY-09AmendmentNo1FINAL.pdf?OpenElement.

- MISSOURI -27

Allocation: \$104,955,560 Agreements: 44 Municipalities: 44

Missouri received \$104,955,560 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 44 agreements with 44 municipalities. Missouri's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 47% in the form of low interest loans, with a median interest rate of 1.48%; 53% as additional subsidization; and 3.4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Also, Missouri leveraged the available ARRA funds by providing an additional \$116,036,167 in base CWSRF funding. Missouri allocated \$39,896,687 towards the green project reserve, making up 38% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.4 million with the median sized agreement being \$956,069. Of the 44 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, 31 have populations under 10,000, seven have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and six have populations over 100,000. Thirty-six percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 36% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Missouri invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: seventeen agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, , sixteen agreements provided funding for new interceptors, fifteen agreements provided funding for new collector sewers, fourteen agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation, thirteen agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems, eleven agreements provided funding for advanced treatment, two agreements provided funding for storm sewers, one agreement provided funding for CSO correction and one agreement provided funding for stream bank stabilization. Eight agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²⁷ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List*, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf and from Missouri's Department of Natural Resources. *Wastewater Financial Assistance*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf and from Missouri's Department of Natural Resources. *Wastewater Financial Assistance*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.dnr.mo.gov/env/wpp/srf/wastewater-assistance.htm.

- MONTANA -28

Allocation: \$18,469,536

Agreements: 31

Municipalities: 31

Montana received \$18,469,536 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 31 agreements with 31 municipalities. Montana's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 52% of the money were distributed as principal forgiveness; 31% of funds distributed as 1.75% interest loans; 17% of the funds distributed as .75% interest loans based on disadvantaged status; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Montana allocated \$5,378,965 towards the green project reserve, making up 29% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$595,791 with the median sized agreement being \$750,000. Of the 31 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, 23 have populations under 10,000, six have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Sixty-eight percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 8% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Montana invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: eight agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; eight agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; six agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; four agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for new interceptors; two agreements provided funding for storm sewers; and one agreement provided funding for recycled water distribution. Eleven agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²⁸ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf and from Montana's Department of Environmental Quality. Water Pollution Control State Revolving Fund. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.deq.state.mt.us/wqinfo/srf/WPCSRF/default.mcpx.

- NEBRASKA -29

Allocation: \$20,045,000

Agreements: 16

Municipalities: 16

Nebraska received \$20,045,000 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of sixteen agreements with sixteen municipalities. Nebraska's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 50% of the money distributed as low interest loans; 50% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 1% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Nebraska allocated \$4,864,463 towards the green project reserve, making up 24% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.3 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.1 million. Of the sixteen municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, twelve have populations under 10,000, two have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Fifty-nine percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 27% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Nebraska invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: seven agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, six agreements provided funding for advanced treatment, four agreements provided funding for new interceptors, one agreement provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation, and one agreement provided funding for CSO correction. Ten agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

²⁹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Nebraska's Recovery Website. Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.recovery.nebraska.gov/infrastructure/water/clean.html.

- NEVADA $-^{30}$

Allocation: \$19,222,555 Agreements: 13 Municipalities: 12 Municipalities (under NDEP Administrative Order): 1

Nevada received \$19,222,555 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of thirteen agreements with twelve municipalities and one municipality under a NDEP Administrative Order. Nevada's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 87% of the money distributed with 100% as principal and interest forgiveness; 13% were distributed as interest forgiveness and less than 1% of the funds (\$16,545) were held for state administrative costs. Nevada allocated \$7,158,673 towards the green project reserve, making up 37% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.5 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.1 million. Of the twelve municipalities and one municipality under a NDEP Administrative Order that received *ARRA* funds, seven have populations under 10,000, three have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Thirty-nine percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 39% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Nevada invested *ARRA* funds were to address the following issues: nine agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; one agreement provided funding for advanced treatment; one agreement provided funding for infiltration or inflow; and one agreement provided funding for new interceptors. Four agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³⁰ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Nevada's

Division of Environmental Protection. American Recovery & Reinvestment Act 2009: ARRA Project Updates. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://ndep.nv.gov/recovery/srlf.html.

- NEW HAMPSHIRE $-^{31}$

Allocation: \$37,597,344 Agreements: 43 Municipalities: 35 NGOs: 2

New Hampshire received \$37,597,344 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 43 agreements with 35 municipalities and two nongovernmental organizations. New Hampshire's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 96% of the funds as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. New Hampshire allocated \$10,612,180 towards the green project reserve, making up 28% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$874,357 with the median sized agreement being \$635,099. Of the 35 municipalities and two NGOs that received *ARRA* funds, 24 have populations under 10,000, twelve have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and one has a population over 100,000. Fifty-six percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 8% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

New Hampshire invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: twenty agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; fifteen agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; six agreements provided funding for storm sewers; two agreements provided funding for CSO correction; one agreement provided funding for advanced treatment; one agreement provided funding for sanitary landfills; and one agreement provided funding for individual or decentralized systems. Twenty-four agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³¹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from New Hampshire's Department of Environmental Services. *DES's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Resources*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://des.nh.gov/recovery/index.htm.

- NEW JERSEY -32

Allocation: \$160,146,900 Agreements: 44 Municipalities: 39

New Jersey received \$160,146,900 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 44 agreements with 39 municipalities. New Jersey's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 28.89% of the money as 0% interest loans; 71.11% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and none of the funds were held for state administrative costs. New Jersey awarded \$49,189,062 to projects or portions of projects that are classified as green, making up 31% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$3.6 million with the median sized agreement being \$3.2 million. Of the 39 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, four have populations under 10,000, 23 have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and twelve have populations over 100,000. Seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 37% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

New Jersey invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 31 agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; seven agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; seven agreements provided funding for CSO corrections; four agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; three agreements provided funding for infiltration or inflow; and one agreement provided funding for storm sewers. Fifteen agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³² Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from New Jersey's DEP. *Status of ARRA Project Reviews*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.state.nj.us/dep/arra/.

- NEW MEXICO $-^{33}$

Allocation: \$23,019,536 Agreements: 17 Municipalities: 17

New Mexico received \$23,019,536 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of seventeen agreements with seventeen municipalities. New Mexico's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 96.77% of the money distributed as grant funds; and 3.23% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. New Mexico allocated \$8,040,538 towards the green project reserve, making up 35% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.3 million with the median sized agreement being \$580,383. Of the seventeen municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, fifteen have populations under 10,000 and two have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Ninety-eight percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and none of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

New Mexico invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: six agreements provided funding for advanced treatment and seven agreements provided funding for secondary treatment. Five agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³³ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from New Mexico's Environment Department. New Mexico Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.nmenv.state.nm.us/cpb/cwsrf.html</u>.

- NEW YORK $-^{34}$

Allocation: \$420,668,684 Agreements: 80 Municipalities: 62 Libraries: 3 Government Divisions: 2 Colleges: 1

New York received \$420,668,684 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 80 agreements in 62 municipalities. New York's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 100% of the money allocated as principal forgiveness or grants; 2.75% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. New York allocated \$157,703,989 towards the green project reserve, making up 37% of all appropriation. The average amount of funding given to municipalities was \$5.3 million with the median being \$1.9 million. Of the 62 municipalities, the two government divisions, the college, and three libraries that received *ARRA* funds, 39 have populations under 10,000, seventeen have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and twelve have populations over 100,000. Twentytwo percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 68% went to communities with populations above 100,000.

New York invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 46 agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; twelve agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems; nine agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; eight agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; five agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; five agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; five agreements provided funding for CSO correction; three agreements provided funding for new interceptors; two agreements provided funding for hydromodification; one agreement provided funding for sanitary landfills; and one agreement provided funding for agricultural animals. Sixty-eight agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³⁴ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List*, 4 Retrieved March1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from New York's DEC. *State of New York: Final Intended Use Plan for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for Water Pollution Control.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from New York's DEC. *State of New York: Final Intended Use Plan for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for Water Pollution Control.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.nysefc.org/docs/cwsrf 2010 final iup - entire document including annual multi-year lists.pdf.
- NORTH CAROLINA $-^{35}$

Allocation: \$67,899,936

Agreements: 56 Government Agencies: 1 Municipalities: 49

North Carolina received \$67,899,936 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 56 agreements with 49 municipalities and one government agency. All of North Carolina's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (*ARRA*) funds were distributed with 50% of the money distributed as principal forgiveness; 50% were distributed as 0% interest loans; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. North Carolina allocated \$14,380,823 towards the green project reserve, making up 21% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.2 million with the median sized agreement being \$807,228. Of the 50 municipalities and one government agency that received *ARRA* funds, 31 have populations under 10,000, ten have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and nine have populations over 100,000. Sixty percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 27% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

North Carolina invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 29 agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; twelve agreements provided funding for hydromodification; six agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; two agreements provided funding for storm sewers; one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; one agreement provided funding for new interceptors; and one agreement provided funding for resource extraction. Fifteen agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³⁵ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from North Carolina's Construction: Grants and Loans. *Financial Assistance Programs: Clean Water State Revolving Fund*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.nccgl.net/fap/cwsrf/application.html.

- NORTH DAKOTA $-^{36}$

Allocation: \$15,869,536 Agreements: 18 Municipalities: 17 Recreation Service Districts: 1

North Dakota received \$15,869,536 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of eighteen agreements with seventeen municipalities and one recreation service district. North Dakota's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of* 2009 (ARRA) funds were distributed in the form of principal forgiveness with 50% of the money distributed as 1% interest loans; 50% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. North Dakota allocated \$4,341,836 towards the green project reserve, making up 27% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$881,641 with the median sized agreement being \$452,248. Of the seventeen municipalities and one recreation district that received *ARRA* funds, sixteen have populations under 10,000 and two have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Seventy percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and none of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Eight of the agreements invested *ARRA* funds addressing secondary treatment and the other ten agreements received funding for sewer system rehabilitation. One agreement was categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³⁶ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from North Dakota's Department of Health Municipal Facilities. *Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from North Dakota's Department of Health Municipal Facilities. *Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.ndhealth.gov/MF/cwsrf.html.

- OHIO $-^{37}$

Allocation: \$220,623,100 Agreements: 274 Municipalities: 182 NGOs: 2

Ohio received \$220,623,100 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 274 agreements with 182 municipalities and two nongovernmental organizations. Ohio's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (*ARRA*) funds were distributed with 100% of the funds as principal forgiveness; and none of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Ohio allocated \$49,090,063 towards the green project reserve, making up 22% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$805,194 with the median sized agreement being \$308,939. Of the 182 municipalities and two NGOs that received *ARRA* funds, 68 have populations under 10,000, 85 have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and 31 have populations over 100,000. Twenty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 29% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Ohio invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 45 agreements provided funding for individual or decentralized systems; ten agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; ten agreements provided funding to correction infiltration or inflow problems; seven agreements provided funding for CSO correction; five agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; five agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; three agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; three agreements provided funding for hydromodification; one agreement provided funding for recycled water distribution; one agreement provided funding for new interceptors; and one agreement provided funding for storm sewers. Seventy-nine agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³⁷ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Ohio's Division of Environmental & Financial Assistance. *Ohio EPA's Clean Water Stimulus Project*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from

http://chagrin.epa.ohio.gov/defa/stimulus.html.

- OKLAHOMA $-^{38}$

Allocation: \$30,395,616 Agreements: 33 Municipalities: 26 State Agencies: 1 Public Trusts: 3

Oklahoma received \$30,395,616 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 33 agreements in 27 municipalities, one state agency, and three public trusts. Oklahoma's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with approximately 96% of the money distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Oklahoma allocated \$7,904,593 towards the green project reserve, making up 26% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$921,079 with the median sized agreement being \$579,000. Of the 26 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, twelve have populations under 10,000, twelve have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Thirty-four percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 13% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000. Eighty-one percent of the projects addressed wastewater issues in disadvantaged communities.

Oklahoma invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: eight agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; four agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; one agreement provided funding for secondary treatment; one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; and three agreements provided funding for best management practices for water quality improvements. Eleven agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

³⁸ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Oklahoma's Water Resources Board. *Oklahoma's Intended Use Plan.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Oklahoma's Water Resources Board. *Oklahoma's Intended Use Plan.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.owrb.ok.gov/financing/pdf fin/CWSRF IUP2010Amend1List.pdf.

- OREGON -³⁹

Allocation: \$44,271,000

Agreements: 13 Irrigation Districts: 4 **Municipalities: 9**

Oregon received \$44,271,000 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of thirteen agreements with nine municipalities and four irrigation districts. Oregon's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 100% of the money as 0% interest loans and 59% of the funds were distributed with principal forgiveness subsidization. Oregon allocated \$11,565,340 towards the Green Project Reserve (GPR), making up 26% of all agreements. The two wetlands projects for the cities of Albany and Millersburg are also considered Green Projects but their awards were not part of Oregon's GPR. The average sized funded agreement was \$ 3.4 million with the median sized agreement being \$4 million. Of the nine municipalities and four irrigation districts which received *ARRA* funds, five have populations under 10,000, six have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Thirty percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 18% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Oregon invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: five agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; four agreements provided funding for agricultural cropland; four agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; two agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems; one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; one agreement provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; one agreement provided funding for CSO correction; and one agreement provided funding for storm sewers. Four agreements were categorized as part of the GPR.

³⁹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Oregon's DEQ. *Clean Water State Revolving Fund Loan Program: Intended Use Plan Update #1*. Retrieved March 15, 2010, from http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/loans/docs/IUP2010Update1.pdf.

- PENNSYLVANIA $-^{40}$

Allocation: \$176,912,530 Agreements: 87 Municipalities: 68 NGOs: 8 Conservation Districts: 7 Universities: 1

Pennsylvania received \$176,912,530 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 87 agreements with 68 municipalities, seven conservation districts, eight nongovernmental organizations, and one university. Pennsylvania's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 8% of the money distributed as loans with interest rates ranging from 1.0 to 3.15%; 92% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and none of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Pennsylvania allocated \$39,795,689 towards the green project reserve, making up 22% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2 million with the median sized agreement being \$494,417. Of the 68 municipalities, seven conservation districts, eight nongovernmental organizations and one university that received *ARRA* funds, 59 have populations under 10,000, nine have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and sixteen have populations over 100,000. Eighty percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 14% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Pennsylvania invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: 38 agreements provided funding for non-point source projects; 27 agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; fifteen agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; thirteen agreements provided funding for CSO correction; seven agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; seven agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; seven agreements provided funding for hydromodification; three agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; three agreements provided funding for new interceptors; and one agreement provided funding for sanitary landfills. Forty-three agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴⁰ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Protection. Municipal Finance Programs. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.portal.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/municipal finance/10564/municipal finance programs/55405 8.

- PUERTO RICO $-^{41}$

Allocation: \$49,069,632

Agreements: 5

Municipalities: 1

Puerto Rico received \$49,069,632 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of five agreements with one municipality. Puerto Rico's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed as additional subsidization with 46% of the money as 2% interest loans; 50% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency allocated \$25,396,654 towards the green project reserve, making up 52% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$9.8 million with the median sized agreement being \$11.7 million. The one municipality that received *ARRA* funds has a population over 100,000. Therefore, 100% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Puerto Rico invested *ARRA* funds in one agreement addressing each of the following issues: secondary treatment, advanced treatment, sewer system rehabilitation, new collector sewers, and new interceptors. Four agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴¹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf and from EPA. *New Release from Region 2*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from

http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/d10ed0d99d826b068525735900400c2a/e1e15d799e819198852575f3006d142d!OpenDocument.

- RHODE ISLAND -42

Allocation: \$26,314,600 Agreements: 10 Municipalities: 10

Rhode Island received \$26,314,600 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of ten agreements with ten municipalities. Rhode Island's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 50% of the money allocated as Project Assistance Subsidization and 46% of the money allocated as Program Loans with a 1% interest rate; 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Rhode Island allocated \$5,262,920 towards the green project reserve, making up 20% of all agreements. The average amount of funding given to municipalities was \$2.6 million with the median being \$407,559. Of the ten municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, nine have populations between 10,000 and 100,000 and one has a population over 100,000. None of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 74% of the funds went to communities above populations of 100,000.

Rhode Island invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment and two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers. Two agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴² Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 4 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Rhode Island's DEM. DRAFT FY2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Supplemental Intended Use Plan. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.ricwfa.com/pdf/DRAFT%20FY2009%20American%20Recovery%20and%20Reinvestment%20Act%20Supplement al%20Intended%20Use%20Plan.pdf.

- SOUTH CAROLINA $-^{43}$

Allocation: \$40,148,200 Agreements: 22 Municipalities: 20

South Carolina received \$40,148,200 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 22 agreements with twenty municipalities. South Carolina's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 49% of the money distributed as 0% interest loans; 51% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness. South Carolina allocated \$10,350,984 towards the green project reserve, making up 26% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.8 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.6 million. Of the twenty municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, eight have populations under 10,000, eight have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and four have populations over 100,000. Thirty-five percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 23% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

South Carolina invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: ten agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation, five agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, three agreements provided funding for new interceptors, two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment, one agreement provided funding for new collector sewers, one agreement provided funding for storm sewers, and one agreement provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems. Eight agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴³ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from South Carolina's Department of Health and Environmental Control. *State Revolving Fund*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from South Carolina's Department of Health and Environmental Control. *State Revolving Fund*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.scdhec.gov/environment/water/srf stimulus.htm.

– SOUTH DAKOTA –⁴⁴

Allocation: \$18,469,536 Agreements: 27 Municipalities: 21 School Districts: 1

South Dakota received \$18,469,536 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 27 agreements with 21 municipalities and one school district. Of South Dakota's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds, 83% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; 13% of the funds were distributed as loans and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Interest rates on the *ARRA* loans were 2.25% of 3.00% depending on the term. South Dakota allocated \$3,935,128 towards the green project reserve, making up 21% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$684,057 with the median sized agreement being \$300,000. Of the 21 municipalities and one school district that received *ARRA* funds, sixteen have populations under 10,000, five have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and one has a population over 100,000. Sixty-five percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 21% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

South Dakota invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: ten agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; ten agreements provided funding for major sewer system rehabilitation; three agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; three agreements provided funding for storm sewers; two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; three agreements provided funding for new interceptors; one agreement provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems; and one agreement provided funding for sanitary landfills. Six agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴⁴ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from South Dakota's Department of Environment and Natural Resources. *Clean Water State Revolving Fund*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://denr.sd.gov/dfta/wwf/cwsrfprogram.aspx.

- TENNESSEE -45

Allocation: \$54,653,183

Agreements: 24

Municipalities: 24

Tennessee received \$54,653,183 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 24 agreements with 24 municipalities. All of Tennessee's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 20% of the money distributed as an average 3% interest loans; 80% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Tennessee allocated \$12,642,500 towards the green project reserve, making up 23% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.3 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.8 million. Of the 24 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, ten have populations under 10,000, twelve have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Thirty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 12% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Tennessee invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: twelve agreements provided funding for new collector sewers, six agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, six agreements provided funding for storm sewers, three agreements provided funding for infiltration or inflow, three agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation, two agreements provided funding for advanced treatment, one agreement provided funding for new interceptors, and one agreement provided funding for recycled water distribution. Nine agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴⁵ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Tennessee's Department of Environment and Conservation. State Revolving Fund Loan Program. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Tennessee's Department of Environment and Conservation. State Revolving Fund Loan Program. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.tn.gov/environment/srf/cwsrf/.

- TEXAS $-^{46}$

Allocation: \$171,957,024 Agreements: 21 Municipalities: 20

Texas received \$171,957,024 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 21 agreements with twenty municipalities. Texas CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 35% of the money distributed as 0% interest loans; 61% of the funds were distributed as grants; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Texas allocated \$46,935,739 towards the green project reserve, making up 27% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$8.2 million with the median sized agreement being \$3.6 million. Of the twenty municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, eight have populations under 10,000, six have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and six have populations over 100,000. Fifteen percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 64% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Texas invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: nine agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; five agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; five agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; three agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; one agreement provided funding for new interceptors; and one agreement provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems. Seven agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴⁶ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Texas Water Development Board. *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.twdb.state.tx.us/stimulus/index.htm.

— UTAH —47

Allocation: \$19,823,904

Agreements: 12 Municipalities: 9 Universities: 1 Governmental Divisions: 1

Utah received \$19,823,904 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of twelve agreements with nine municipalities, one governmental division, and one university. Utah's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed with 46% of the money as Project Assistance Loans with 0% interest; 50% of the funds were distributed as Project Assistance Subsidization; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Utah allocated \$7,052,769 towards the green project reserve, making up 35% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.7 million with the median sized agreement being \$863,750. Of the nine municipalities, one governmental district, and one university that received *ARRA* funds, five have populations under 10,000, four have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and two have populations over 100,000. Forty-five percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 16% of the funds went to communities with populations.

Utah invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: five agreements provided funding for hydromodification; three agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; three agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; one agreement provided funding for advanced treatment; one agreement provided funding for new collector sewers; and one agreement provided funding for agricultural cropland. Eight agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴⁷ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Utah's DEQ. State of Utah CWSRF Supplemental Intended Use Plan. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.waterquality.utah.gov/stimulus/Supplemental_IUP_2009.pdf.

- VERMONT -48

Allocation: \$18,469,762 Agreements: 32 Municipalities: 24

Vermont received \$18,469,762 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 32 agreements with 24 municipalities. Vermont's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 27% of the money distributed as 0% interest loans; 73% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Vermont allocated \$6,871,754 towards the green project reserve, making up 37% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$577,180 with the median sized agreement being \$436,250. Of the 24 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, nineteen have populations under 10,000 and five have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Sixty-five percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and none of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Vermont invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: ten agreements provided funding for sewer replacements, eight agreements provided funding for system refurbishment, seven agreements provided funding for stormwater control, five agreements provided funding for combined sewer overflows, and two agreements provided funding for green projects. Thirteen agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴⁸ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Vermont's Facilities Engineering Division. Financial Management Section. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.anr.state.vt.us/dec/fed/fms.htm</u>.

- VIRGINIA -49

Allocation: \$77,720,311

Agreements: 35

Municipalities: 31

Virginia received \$77,720,311 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 35 agreements in 31 municipalities. Virginia's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 100% of the money distributed as principal forgiveness loans; 3.1% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Virginia allocated \$16,182,463 towards the green project reserve, making up 21% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$2.2 million and the median sized agreement was \$890,000. Of the 31 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, sixteen have a population under 10,000, twelve have a population between 10,000 and 100,000, and three have a population over 100,000. Twenty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 17% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Virginia invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: six agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; six agreements provided funding for recycled wastewater distribution; five agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; five agreements provided funding for new inceptors; five agreements provided funding for CSO corrections; four agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; three agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; and two agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems. Thirteen agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁴⁹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Virginia's DEQ. *FY 2009 Supplemental Stimulus Funding Loan Authorizations (FINAL)*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.deq.state.va.us/export/sites/default/info/pdf/stimulus.pdf.

- WASHINGTON $-^{50}$

Allocation: \$65,425,824

Agreements: 17

Municipalities: 16

Washington received \$65,425,824 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of seventeen agreements with sixteen municipalities. Washington's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 42% of the money distributed as low interest loans (rates ranging from 0.6% to 2.9%); 58% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness loan; and 4% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Washington allocated \$17,106,580 towards the green project reserve, making up 25% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$3.8 million with the median sized agreement being \$2.1 million. Of the sixteen municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, five have populations under 10,000, six have a population between 10,000 and 100,000, and five have populations over 100,000. Forty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 7% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Washington invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: four agreements provided funding for advanced treatment; three agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; three agreements provided funding for new collector sewers; three agreements provided funding for new interceptors; two agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems; one agreement provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; one agreement provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; one agreement provided funding for CSO correction; and one agreement provided funding for hydromodification. Seven agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁵⁰ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Washington's Department of Ecology. *Water Quality: Grants and Loans*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.ecv.wa.gov/programs/wq/funding.funding.html.

- WEST VIRGINIA -51

Allocation: \$61,092,100 Agreements: 39 Municipalities: 37 NGOs: 1

West Virginia received \$61,092,100 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 39 agreements with 37 municipalities and one nongovernmental organization. All of West Virginia's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed as principal forgiveness loans. The *ARRA* funds leveraged another \$78,791,214 from other loan and grant funding sources, making the total project cost equal to \$139,883,314 on these 39 agreements. West Virginia allocated \$14,678,041 towards the green project reserve, making up 24% of all ARRA funds. The average sized funded agreement was \$1.6 million with the median sized agreement being \$1.1 million. Of the 37 municipalities and one NGO that received *ARRA* funds, 30 have populations under 10,000 and eight have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Eighty-one percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and none of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

West Virginia invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: nineteen agreements provided funding for secondary treatment; fourteen agreements providing funding involving new collector sewers; thirteen agreements provided funding for new interceptors; six agreements provided funding to correct infiltration or inflow problems; six agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation; three agreements provided funding for CSO correction; three agreements provided funding for urban, excluding decentralized systems; two agreements provided funding for storm sewers; one agreement provided funding for advanced treatment; and one agreement provided funding for individual or decentralized systems. Twelve agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁵¹ Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Louisiana's DEQ. *West Virginia's Intended Use Plan.* Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.deq.louisiana.gov/portal/tabid/2976/Default.aspx.

- WISCONSIN -52

Allocation: \$103,748,300 Agreements: 36 Municipalities: 34

Wisconsin received \$103,748,300 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 36 agreements with 34 municipalities. Wisconsin's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 98% of the money distributed as principal forgiveness and 2% of the funds were held for state administrative costs. Wisconsin allocated \$52,583,575 towards the green project reserve, making up 51% of all projects. The average sized funded project was \$2.9 million with the median sized project being \$584,549. Of the 34 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, twelve have populations under 10,000, nineteen have populations between 10,000 and 100,000, and three have populations over 100,000. Twenty-three percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and 38% of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Wisconsin invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: nineteen projects provided funding for storm sewers; thirteen projects provided funding for secondary treatment; four projects provided funding for advanced treatment; two projects provided funding for sewer system rehabilitations; one project provided funding for new interceptors; and one project provided funding for hydromodification. Fourteen projects were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁵² Relevant information was found from the EPA. *Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project* List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf arra.pdf and from Wisconsin's DNR and DA. *State of Wisconsin Clean Water Fund Program State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan*. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from http://dnr.wi.gov/org/caer/cfa/EL/Section/cwfpuplist.pdf.

- WYOMING -53

Allocation: \$19,239,100 Agreements: 26 Municipalities: 24

Wyoming received \$19,239,100 (excluding administrative costs) through the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and funded a total of 26 agreements with 24 municipalities. Wyoming's CWSRF *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA)* funds were distributed in the form of additional subsidization with 13% of the money distributed as 0% interest loans; and 87% of the funds were distributed as principal forgiveness. Wyoming allocated \$5,310,432 towards the green project reserve, making up 28% of all agreements. The average sized funded agreement was \$739,965 with the median sized agreement being \$472,500. Of the 24 municipalities that received *ARRA* funds, nineteen have populations under 10,000 and five have populations between 10,000 and 100,000. Forty-seven percent of the funds went to communities with populations below 10,000 and none of the funds went to communities with populations above 100,000.

Wyoming invested *ARRA* funds to address the following issues: sixteen agreements provided funding for sewer system rehabilitation, seven agreements provided funding for secondary treatment, two agreements provided funding for new collector sewers, one agreement provided funding for sanitary landfills, and one agreement provided funding for hydromodification. Five agreements were categorized as part of the "green" reserve.

⁵³ Relevant information was found from the EPA. Clean Water SRF ARRA Reporting: Summary Project List, 1 Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://www.epa.gov/owm/cwfinance/cwsrf/cwsrf_arra.pdf</u> and from Wyoming's Office of State Lands & Investments. Clean Water State Revolving Funds. Retrieved March 1, 2010, from <u>http://slf-web.state.wy.us/grants/srf.aspx</u>.