

Community Grants Program

FINAL IMPLEMENTATION GUIDANCE

OCTOBER 2022



Contents

Purpose	2
Background	2
Eligibility	2
Technical Corrections	2
Cost Share Requirements	3
Waivers to Cost Share Requirements	5
Grant Administration: Community Grants Lifecycle.....	8
Regulations and Requirements	11
Appendix A: Statutory Language	17
Appendix B: List of EPA Congressionally Directed Spending Community Projects and Funding Levels.....	18
Appendix C: Technical Corrections-Procedural Information	46
Appendix D: Application Forms and Attachments	48
Appendix E: Community Grants Workplan Contents/Outline	53
Appendix F: Grant Policies and Resources.....	55

Purpose

This document provides information and guidelines on how the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will award and administer water infrastructure projects identified as Congressionally Directed Spending (CDS) and Community Project Funding (CPF) items in Appropriations Acts. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2022, the Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 117-103) includes \$841,405,095 in the State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG) account for 483 drinking water, wastewater, stormwater infrastructure, and water quality protection projects.¹

Background

President Biden signed the FY 2022 Consolidated Appropriations Act (P.L. 117-103) into law on March 15, 2022. In this law, Congress renewed the practice of funding specifically named community infrastructure projects, referred to by the Senate as CDS items and in the House of Representatives as CPF items. [Appendix A](#) of this document provides the pertinent section of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022, also referred to as the EPA's FY 2022 Appropriations Act. Water infrastructure CDS/CPF projects are further referred to as Community Grants projects in this document.

Eligibility

Community Grants projects are designated for the planning, design, and construction of drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure and for water quality protection. Eligible Community Grant projects are included in Appropriations Acts. For FY 2022, eligible projects are referenced in the explanatory statement found in [Appendix A](#). [Appendix B](#) lists each project that is eligible for funding under the FY 2022 Appropriations Act and identifies the state, recipient name, purpose, and appropriated funding amount of each project. EPA will use the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) framework to guide implementation of these Community Grants; the [CWSRF](#) and [DWSRF](#) eligibilities should be referred to for development of workplans, project scopes, costs, and sub-awards. Funds appropriated for Community Grants projects may not be awarded solely to repay loans received from SRF programs or to repay other debts unless there are explicit instructions to do so in Appropriations Acts or accompanying explanatory statements and/or committee reports. These funds may not be used for operation and maintenance.

Technical Corrections

Should a Community Grant recipient identified in an Appropriations Act need to modify the type, purpose, or named recipient of the Community Grant, a technical correction will be needed. The Agency's FY 2006 Appropriations Act (P.L. 109-54) included a permanent authority that allows EPA to make technical corrections to Community Grants only after consultation with Congress, without the need for additional legislation. For example, if a recipient (*e.g.*, City of Salem) is named in the authorizing language but a different legal entity (*e.g.*, Salem Wastewater Utility) owns the infrastructure, the recipient can request a technical correction. As another

¹ In the FY 2022 Consolidated Appropriations Act, EPA received a total of 491 CDS/CPF projects for \$860.3 million. Of this total, 483 projects are for water community projects; this document pertains to these projects.

example, if the Appropriations Act provides for a specific type of project (*e.g.*, drinking water) when a different type of project (*e.g.*, wastewater) is needed, the recipient can request a technical correction to change the project type.

Appropriate Types of Technical Corrections

A technical correction can be made for all, or part of a project identified in an Appropriations Act to change the recipient, the purpose, or both. The statutory language that provides EPA with the authority to make technical corrections does not limit the extent to which a technical correction can alter the original project, if the new project provides for water quality protection or involves construction² of drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater infrastructure. Technical corrections cannot, however, be used to change the project purpose to debt repayment, because debt repayment does not meet the statutory terms of the authority. After consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, EPA will generally approve changes in purpose that meet the above criteria or changes in recipient where both the original entity and the new entity to be named concur with the change. Any technical correction request involving a change to both the purpose and the recipient entity must be accompanied by additional detail explaining:

- The need or reason for the change;
- The relationship between the two entities;
- Who initiated the request; and
- The involvement of any third parties, if known.

Additional information on technical corrections is provided in [Appendix C](#).

Cost Share Requirements

Appropriations Acts require each Community Grant recipient to provide a cost share from non-federal sources unless the recipient is approved for a cost share waiver by EPA. For FY 2022, the cost share amount is 20% of the total grant project cost. All contributions toward cost share should be included in the grant budget and must be categorized in the appropriate grant budget category (see [Appendix D](#) for more information on budget development). The source of the cost share must be included in the workplan and payment requests. EPA may pay 80% of costs shown on approved payment requests up to the approved federal funding amount.

- All grant funds, including a cost share, can be used only for allowable costs in executing the project. All cost sharing funds must have supporting source documents (a record that supports a transaction).
- Services donated to recipients may be furnished by professional and technical personnel and consultants in accordance with [2 CFR 200.434](#). Dollar values must be placed on all

² “The term ‘construction’ means any one or more of the following: preliminary planning to determine the feasibility of treatment works, engineering, architectural, legal, fiscal, or economic investigations or studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, field testing of innovative or alternative waste water treatment processes and techniques meeting guidelines promulgated under section 1314(d)(3) of this title, or other necessary actions, erection, building, acquisition, alteration, remodeling, improvement, or extension of treatment works, or the inspection or supervision of any of the foregoing items.” (33 U.S.C. § 1292(1)).

donated services in accordance with [2 CFR 200.306](#). All cost sharing funds must be included in the workplan and budget and be part of the grant's total project costs.

- All cost sharing funds must conform to the same laws, regulations, grant conditions, etc., as the federal funds within the grant; recipients may prefer to limit cost sharing to the amount required.

See [Appendix D](#) and [Appendix F](#) for information on general principles of cost allowability.

Sources of Cost Share

Eligible sources of “non-federal” funds to meet the cost share requirement are described below; recipients can use any or a combination of the following eligible sources if the requirements in [2 CFR 200.306](#) are met:

1) Public sources³. The following public funding sources can be used to meet the cost share requirement:

- State appropriations;
- Local government match to the grant project;
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant funds;
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development funds;
- Appalachian Regional Commission funds; and,
- The CWSRF and DWSRF programs if those funds are:
 - non-federal funds such as loan repayments, interest earnings, bond proceeds, and fees, or
 - a state contribution to the SRF above the statutorily required 20% match.

Note: EPA has issued a [class deviation document](#) pertaining to CWSRF and a [policy memo](#) pertaining to DWSRF that allow Community Grant recipients to use certain sources of funds from the two SRF programs as the non-federal cost share. The class deviation and policy documents allow SRF programs to use the non-federal and non-state match share of SRF funds to provide loans that Community Grant recipients can use as the cost share for community projects.

Funding made available to jurisdictions through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (ARPA), including ARPA Revenue loss funds, cannot be used to meet the non-federal cost share requirement.

2) Private sources. These include funding from a business or nonprofit contributing to the project.

3) In-kind services. These may include the applicant's administrative expenses for managing and overseeing the grant and projects, provided that the expenses are not being reimbursed by the federal share of the grant award. In-kind services contributed by other

³ Community Grant recipients can use federal funds from other programs as all, or part, of the cost share only if the statute authorizing those programs specifically allows the funds to be used as match for other federal grants. Additionally, other federal program funding must be allowed to support the planning, design and/or construction of drinking water, wastewater, or stormwater infrastructure projects.

entities may also be allowable as cost share. Force accounts may be used as in-kind services: personnel costs include salaries, wages, and allowable incentive compensation for recipient employees (i.e., who receive W-2 forms) who spend time working on the project. In-kind (cost share) contributions must be verifiable and documented. For example, if the recipient does not intend to charge the EPA assistance agreement for all time employees spend working on the project, the applicant may include salaries or wages in the personnel category for cost share purposes.

Determining Cost Share Amount

For the purposes of calculating the cost share amount, the amount specified in the FY 2022 Appropriations Act for EPA's contribution represents 80% of the total grant project cost. Grant applications are not required to reflect costs that exceed total grant project costs as calculated below; this is the minimum total grant project cost required to receive the full FY 2022 appropriation amount.

The following example demonstrates how to calculate the cost share amount using \$100,000 as the EPA contribution:

A. Identify the Total Grant Project Cost

Divide the EPA contribution by .80 to calculate the total grant project cost:

$$\$100,000 \div 0.80 = \$125,000.$$

\$125,000 is the total grant project cost

B. Multiply the Total Grant Project Cost by .20 to determine the cost share amount

Total grant project cost x .20 = required cost share amount

$$\$125,000 \times .20 = \$25,000$$

\$25,000 is the required 20% cost share amount

C. Confirm

Total grant project cost = EPA Contribution + Cost Share Amount.

$$\begin{array}{rccccr} \$125,000 & & = & \$100,000 & + & \$25,000 \end{array}$$

Waivers to Cost Share Requirements

EPA supports waiving required non-federal cost share for projects located in, or that primarily serve, disadvantaged communities. EPA is using the discretion provided by the FY 2022 Appropriations Act (see [Appendix A](#)) to consider waiving or reducing statutorily required non-federal cost share on Community Grant funds when requested and appropriate.

EPA will consider the Cost Share Waiver Criteria A – I⁴ below, in defining disadvantaged communities for the purposes of Community Grants. Projects in communities that meet at least one of these criteria may request a waiver of the non-federal cost share requirement under the Community Grants Program. Systems that serve large service areas with a specific project that will primarily serve a subset of its service area that meets one of these criteria may also request a waiver.

Waivers to the cost share requirement must be approved by EPA’s Assistant Administrator for Water, in accordance with EPA’s Delegation of Authority 1-102⁵. Recipients requesting cost share waivers should submit a written request to the Regional EPA Project Officer for consideration. Waiver requests should include applicable Cost Share Waiver Criteria(s) and any related supporting documentation including source data retrieved from the websites noted below.

Many of the criteria can be found online on the [Census Bureau’s](#) website. Recipients can start by entering their community’s name in the search bar and viewing the community’s profile. Tables and graphics from the Census Bureau’s website can be downloaded or embedded in a recipient’s cost share waiver request. Recipients should use the most recent data available. Specific tables with more detailed information and other publicly available datasets beyond the community profile page for each metric are provided below.

Cost Share Waiver Criteria

A. Community median household income (MHI) is less than 80% of State MHI

- MHI can be found on a [community’s profile page of the US Census Bureau – use the search function to find your community](#). Communities should use the most recent data available.
- MHI is also available for most communities from the latest annual Census American Community Survey (ACS) data collection. In the few cases where a local jurisdiction's MHI is not available, the surrounding county's MHI may be sufficient. The Census Bureau provides annual [5-Year Average Median Household Income data in Table B19013](#). Click on the B19013 Table, select GEOS and search under “most common geographies” select “State” and then select the relevant and enter community name in the search bar.

⁴EPA developed Cost Share Waiver Criteria A – I for the purposes of assessing the appropriateness of waiving the cost share requirement for the 483 drinking water, wastewater, stormwater infrastructure, and water quality protection projects identified in the FY2022 Consolidation Appropriations Act, based on EPA’s Memorandum: [Implementation of the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Provisions of the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law](#), March 8, 2022 (see Attachment 1, Appendix E, of the memorandum).

⁵ EPA’s *Delegation of Authority 1-102, Grants and Cooperative Agreements for Water Infrastructure Projects or Other Water Resource Projects from Funds Appropriated for the State and Tribal Assistance Grant Account or the Environmental Programs and Management Account* authorizes EPA’s Assistant Administrator for Water and Regional Administrators “To approve and administer grants and cooperative agreements for water infrastructure projects or other water resource projects from funds appropriated for the State and Tribal Assistance Grant Account or the Environmental Programs and Management Account or any successor accounts, including a project authorized by Section 510 of the Water Quality Act of 1987, P.L. 100-4, 101 Stat. 7,80, EPA's FY 1991 Appropriations Act (P.L. 101-507), and any subsequent public law; and to perform other activities necessary for the effective administration of those grants and cooperative agreements.”

- B. Communities with \$25,766 or less upper limit of Lowest Quintile Income**
- Communities can view their Lowest Quintile Income on the [Census Bureau](#) website and search by community name and “B19080 HOUSEHOLD INCOME QUINTILE UPPER LIMITS.” Communities should use the most recent data.
- C. Communities with $\geq 30.9\%$ Population Living Under 200% of Poverty Level**
- The US Department of Health and Human Services provides [US Federal Poverty Guidelines](#), including a chart with percentage of poverty levels (i.e., 200%).
 - More detailed information on the population living under the poverty level can be found in [Table S1701: Poverty Status in the Past 12 months for communities](#).
- D. Community with census tracts that have a poverty rate greater than or equal to 20%**
- Percent of the poverty rate can be found on [a community’s profile page provided by](#) the Census Bureau.
 - More detailed information can be found in [Table S1701: Poverty Status in the Past 12 months](#).
- E. Communities with $\geq 3.4\%$ Unemployed Population age 16 and older in the Civilian Labor Force**
- The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) maintains current unemployment rate figures for municipalities and counties with a population over 25,000. National and state unemployment data are also available for comparison purposes. This information can be obtained from the [BLS Data Tools webpage](#). The most recent year of unemployment data can be used.
 - If the community is less than 25,000, information about employment status can be found in the community’s profile page on the [Census Bureau](#) website or more detailed community employment information can be found in [Table DP03 Selected Economic Characteristics](#).
- F. Communities with $\geq 12.1\%$ Vacant Households**
- Data on a community’s vacant household level can be found on [the community’s profile page](#).
 - More detailed information on vacant households is available in the Census Table H1 Occupancy Status.
 - Percentage of vacant households may also be available in a community’s annual Financial Report or community tax records.
- G. Community in a county with a Social Vulnerability Index score higher than 0.80**
- The Center for Disease Control (CDC)/Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) Social Vulnerability Index (SVI) uses 15 U.S. census variables to help local officials identify communities that may need support before, during, or after disasters.
 - Communities can find their SVI score via the online [SVI: Interactive Map](#) provided by the CDC. They should zoom into their county, select it, and the SVI score will be displayed in the pop-out table.
- H. Combined sewer and drinking water costs are greater than 2% of the 20th percentile household income**
- Communities can view their Lowest Quintile Income on the [Census Bureau](#) website and search by community name and “B19080 HOUSEHOLD INCOME QUINTILE UPPER LIMITS”. Communities should use the most recent data.

- Percent MHI = Total of Bills for One Year for a Residential Customer / Median Household Income of All Customers. The total bills for residential customers can be found from the community’s local utilities.
- I. Communities with ≥ 11.7% Population Receiving Food Stamps/SNAP Benefits**
- Communities can find the percentage of their population receiving SNAP benefits on the [Census Bureau](#) website. Select “view state and local data” to search by state and then City/town or county.

Grant Administration: Community Grants Lifecycle

EPA’s Community Grant appropriations are STAG infrastructure grants to improve water infrastructure and water quality through funding for drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater projects. [Appendix B](#) lists the 483 water CDS/CPF projects identified in the FY 2022 Appropriations Act. These 483 projects are collectively funded “off the top” at a level of \$443,639,051 from the FY 2022 general CWSRF appropriations and \$397,766,044 from the FY 2022 general DWSRF appropriations.

EPA’s Regional Offices will administer Community Grants as authorized under EPA’s Delegation of Authority 1-102⁵ Per EPA’s Delegation of Authority 1-14A⁶, EPA Regional Administrators are authorized to award grants and cooperative agreements, including Community Grants, that were appropriated in FY 2022.

The following describes the lifecycle stages of each award. Additional information on grant policies and resources including on receiving and managing EPA grants are listed in [Appendix F](#).

Pre-Award Phase

While Congress directs Community Grant funds to specified recipients for defined projects, recipients are required to fulfill statutory and regulatory requirements before EPA can award grant funding. These requirements include but are not limited to providing necessary information for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) environmental review, review of any pre-award costs, and submitting a complete grant application package. [Appendix D](#) and [Appendix E](#) provide information on grant application package content and submission.

1. NEPA Environmental Review

As required by EPA’s NEPA implementing regulations ([40 CFR 6.100-6.406](#)), EPA must complete the NEPA review process before awarding a grant for design and/or construction.

The requirement for an environmental review under NEPA generally does not apply to grants solely for planning activities, such as infrastructure assessments, watershed plans, and wastewater capital improvement plans. Applicants should check with their [EPA Regional](#)

⁶ EPA’s *Delegation of Authority 1-14A Assistance Agreements* authorizes Regional Administrators, the Assistant Administrator for Mission Support, and the Chief Financial Officer “To take all necessary actions to award, obligate and de-obligate funds for, and administer fellowship, grant, cooperative and loan agreements (hereinafter financial assistance), and to make any final determinations required by law or regulations, with eligible recipients”

[Contact](#) to determine if NEPA applies to a particular Community Grant. See the [Regulations and Requirements](#) section and [Appendix F](#) for additional information about NEPA Environmental Review.

2. Pre-award Costs and Procurement Review

Costs incurred prior to grant awards may be eligible for reimbursement if the costs are in conformance with applicable federal and EPA regulations. Incurred costs are financial obligations: costs owed by an entity as a result of a transaction. The costs may have been paid or remain unpaid. The regulations at [2 CFR 200.458](#) require that pre-award costs be incurred “...directly pursuant to the negotiation and in anticipation of the Federal award where such costs are necessary for efficient and timely performance of the scope of work. Such costs are allowable only to the extent that they would have been allowable if incurred after the date of the Federal award and only with the written approval of the Federal awarding agency. If charged to the award, these costs must be charged to the initial budget period of the award, unless otherwise specified by the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity.”

For Community Grants projects identified in the FY 2022 Appropriations Act, pre-award costs must be incurred on or after October 1, 2021, to be considered for eligibility. Notwithstanding, all costs incurred before EPA makes the award are at the recipient’s risk. EPA shall review the eligibility of such costs on a case-by-case basis prior to approving the project budget and awarding the grant.

A review of pre-award costs includes a review of contracts executed prior to award for compliance with applicable procurement regulations as described in [Regulations and Requirements](#).

3. Application Forms, Workplan, and Submitting an Application

Upon completion of an environmental review under NEPA, development of a project workplan⁷, and review of any pre-award costs (including any costs related procurement), applicants should submit a complete grant application package to EPA. The workplan and application must include any pre-award costs. Recipients must ensure that their organizations

⁷ The SRF appropriations are the vehicles being used to appropriate the CDS/CPF funds. However, the SRF authorities do not govern or authorize the CDS/CPF grants. The Consolidated Appropriation Act is structured so that the CDS/CPF funding is taken from the total amount in the SRF appropriations prior to the SRF allocation to the states. Accordingly, Program Results Codes (PRCs) have been assigned to each CDS/CPF project’s funding based on the SRF account from which each project’s funding was appropriated. However, the authority governing the CDS/CPF projects is the language in the explanatory statement (Appendix A), which states that “\$443,639,051 of the funds made available for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds and \$397,766,044 of the funds made available for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds shall be for the construction of drinking water, wastewater, and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection.” **Therefore, CDS/CPF grant/workplan activities may entail construction of drinking water, wastewater, and storm water infrastructure, and water quality protection related tasks**, irrespective of EPA’s assignment of PRC. Additionally, there is language in the explanatory statement that indicates the SRF is not intended to be the authority for the CDS/CPF funds. For example, the explanatory statement indicates “Applicable Federal requirements that would apply to a Clean Water State Revolving Fund or Drinking Water State Revolving Fund project grant recipient shall apply to a recipient receiving a CDS/CPF grant under this section.” That direction would be unnecessary if Congress was appropriating the CDS/CPF funds under the SRF authorities.

have registered with the federal government's [System for Award Management \(SAM\)](#). Recipients must have an active registration/record with [SAM.gov](#) and complete the [Grants.gov](#) registration process to apply for any federal funding.

The complete grant application includes several forms, as described in [Appendix D](#). These forms **must** be downloaded from the Community Grant opportunity package on Grants.gov - generic versions of the standard forms not downloaded from the Grants.gov website will not be accepted. See [Appendix D](#) for instructions on how to navigate to the Funding Opportunity Package and download the standard forms. [Appendix F](#) includes information on budget development and allowability of costs. In addition to the required forms, grant applicants must submit a project workplan that describes the proposed project, the milestone schedule, the need for the project, and the anticipated environmental and public health benefits (outputs and outcomes). See Community Grants Workplan Contents/Outline in [Appendix E](#) for more information.

Applicants must submit a complete application package (with all required forms, a workplan, and additional required documentation) for EPA review and approval, through the grants.gov portal. See additional information in [Appendix D](#).

Post-Award Phase

After receiving an award, the recipient is ready to start working on the activities outlined in the approved workplan. Adhering to various grant regulations and the terms and conditions outlined in the grant agreement are critical to ensuring a successful grant project.

- Recipients submit payment requests to EPA for incurred costs. In some cases, pre-award costs may be included. Once the payment request is approved, the recipient can draw down the requested amount. As required by [2 CFR 200.305\(b\)](#), EPA requires that recipients of EPA financial assistance participate in the [Automated Standard Application for Payments \(ASAP\)](#) system. Recipients must request payment for the minimum amounts needed for actual and immediate cash. Recipients will submit a payment request including supporting documentation such as copies of bills (vouchers, invoices, etc.), along with a description of services rendered, time spent, and charges for EPA review and approval. After review and approval, EPA will pay the recipient for the federal share of the allowable costs shown on the payment request. Information on [ASAP](#) is available online.
- EPA grants contain General, Administrative, and Programmatic terms and conditions, which include reporting requirements such as filing an interim (annual) Federal Financial Report (FFR), annual MBE/WBE Reporting, and progress report submission. [EPA's General Terms and Conditions](#) are applicable to all EPA awards, and additional terms and conditions for Community Grants awards will be specified in individual award agreements. Recipients should regularly review grant award terms and conditions throughout the life of the project to ensure that the organization remains in compliance with all requirements and must inform EPA if problems arise that jeopardize the completion of the project. EPA Regional Offices perform construction monitoring and oversight.

- Recipients' personnel payroll and records system must be capable of providing reports on the activities of each employee who works directly on a grant. Charges to federal awards for salaries and wages must be based on records that accurately reflect the work performed. Activity reports are typically signed by the individual employee and/or by a responsible supervisory official having first-hand knowledge of the activities performed by an employee. The supervisor should be able to certify that the distribution of activity represents a reasonable estimate of the actual work performed by the employee during the periods covered by the reports. [2 CFR 200.430](#) provides additional information on Standards for Documentation of Personnel Expenses.
- Recipients should contact the EPA Project Officer should any changes to the grant agreement (e.g., workplan, milestone schedule, budget) become necessary for the project to succeed, as soon as possible to discuss the changes. In accordance with [2 CFR 200.308](#), most changes must be approved by EPA and may require a formal amendment to the assistance agreement.
- EPA conducts administrative monitoring, including reviewing recipient invoices/payment requests and programmatic reports, and can request access to all records and conduct grant audits. EPA can disallow costs and take enforcement actions if the recipient fails to remain in compliance.

Closeout Phase

Closeout refers to the process EPA uses to determine that a recipient has completed all the required workplan activities under a grant and confirm that all applicable financial and administrative requirements as described in [2 CFR 200.344](#) have been met.

- Recipients must submit the final progress report according to the terms and condition listed in the grant agreement and should demonstrate satisfactory completion of all workplan tasks and activities.
- Recipients prepare and submit several reports as part of the grant closeout process. [EPA's Frequently Asked Questions about Closeouts](#) provides information about closeout requirements, procedures, records retention, and associated regulations. EPA provides more information for recipients via the [online course on closing out grants](#).

Regulations and Requirements

Recipients are responsible for compliance with many regulations and requirements including but not limited to [EPA's general regulations](#). In addition, each grant agreement will specify terms and conditions that establish a legally binding agreement between EPA and the recipient including but not limited to [EPA's General Terms and Conditions](#). Details and information related to several requirements that are of particular importance for recipient compliance prior to receiving grant awards are discussed below. Additional information and resources on these requirements including recipient responsibilities for compliance can be found in [Appendix F](#). EPA will review documentation from recipients to assess eligibility of costs incurred in

accordance with EPA's General Principles for Cost Allowability, as described in [EPA's Interim General Budget Development Guidance](#).

Environmental Review

NEPA and other relevant applicable statutes and Executive Orders, such as the Endangered Species Act (ESA), apply to Community Grants projects authorized by the Annual Appropriations Acts. The applicable NEPA regulations are the Council of Environmental Quality's (CEQ) implementing regulations at [40 CFR Parts 1500-1508](#) and EPA's NEPA regulations at [40 CFR Part 6](#). In accordance with EPA's NEPA regulations, EPA must complete the NEPA process before issuing a grant award for construction activities.

NEPA and other cross-cutting Federal requirements that apply to the project (i.e., the approval and/or funding of work beyond the conceptual design point) cannot be delegated. Although EPA may fund the recipient's development of an Environmental Information Document (EID) or other analysis for cross cutting authorities or executive orders in order to provide supporting information, EPA has the legal obligation to make the NEPA related decision, to issue the NEPA documents, to sign NEPA determinations, and to fulfill other cross-cutting Federal requirements before approving or paying for design and/or construction. Therefore, EPA grant funds cannot be used to prepare a federal document, such as an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

When both EPA and another Federal agency are funding the same project, the agencies may negotiate an agreement for one to be the lead agency for performing grant oversight and management activities, including those related to NEPA and other cross-cutting Federal requirements. The lead agency can be the one that is providing the most funds for the project, or the agency that provided the initial funds for the project. The CEQ NEPA regulations at [40 CFR 1501.7\(c\)](#) provide the factors listed in order of descending importance to determine the lead agency designation. If an EIS is required on a joint or related Federal action, EPA may serve as a co-lead or request to be a cooperating agency. In addition, EPA may adopt another Federal agency's EIS or EA. Note EPA may adopt another Federal agency's EA and use it as a basis for its Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), provided EPA has independently reviewed the EA and agrees with the analysis and circulates the FONSI and attached EA for the requisite 30-day comment period.

Recipients with CWSRF or DWSRF co-funded projects for which a State Environmental Review Process (SERP) has been completed can submit the completed state analysis for EPA review. EPA will review the SERP document and will incorporate by reference any pertinent part of that document into EPA's environmental document. EPA will request additional information from the recipient if necessary for EPA to conduct its own environmental analysis.

Each federal agency has its own regulations pertaining to the NEPA environmental review process. Recipients with projects that have undergone an environmental review by another federal agency may submit documents pertaining to another federal agency's analysis for EPA review. EPA will independently review these documents to determine if the proposed actions is substantially the same and if it meets the standards of an adequate EIS, EA, or Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) determination. If so, EPA may adopt the federal EIS, EA, or CATEX

determination, pursuant to [40 CFR 1506.3](#). If EPA is unable to adopt the federal EIS, EA, or CATEX determination, EPA will conduct its own environmental review and incorporate by reference any pertinent part of the agency's environmental document. EPA will request additional information from the recipient if necessary for EPA to conduct its own environmental review. See [Appendix F](#) for additional information on CATEX and EID development.

For design and construction projects for which another federal agency has not completed a NEPA review and projects that CWSRF or DWSRF do not co-fund and/or have not undergone a SERP, recipients will determine whether to request a CATEX from EPA or to prepare and submit an EID in order to proceed with a NEPA review.

Procurement

In general, all procurement transactions for professional engineering services and construction contractors must be conducted in a manner that includes and promotes fair and open competition from an adequate number of qualified sources. [2 CFR 200.320](#) details the specific methods of procurement to be followed and the circumstances under which each method can be used. Recipients and subrecipients must have and use documented procurement procedures, consistent with State, local or tribal laws and regulation as well as Federal laws and regulations in accordance with [2 CFR 200.317 – 2 CFR 200.327](#).

In accordance with [2 CFR 200.325](#), recipients must provide EPA with technical specifications on proposed procurements when requested by EPA, including when pre-award costs are being considered for eligibility. In addition, upon request by EPA's Grants Management Office (GMO) under [2 CFR 200.325](#) or [2 CFR 200.337](#), grantees must provide procurement documents to EPA for pre-procurement review when EPA is concerned that the grantee's procurement procedures or practices do not comply with federal procurement requirements, including but not limited to procurements that do not comply with competition requirements. As provided in [2 CFR 200.332\(d\)](#) and the terms of conditions of their EPA award, pass-through entities are responsible for monitoring subrecipient compliance with procurement requirements in 2 CFR Parts [200](#) and [1500](#). EPA's GMO may also request that pass-through entities provide EPA with information regarding subrecipient compliance with these requirements.

Selection of Architects and Engineers (projects inclusive of CWSRF-eligible activities)

Projects consisting of CWSRF-eligible activities, irrespective of whether such projects are co-funded with CWSRF funding, must comply with the procurement processes for architectural and engineering (A/E) services as identified in [40 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.](#), or an equivalent State requirement. Where equivalent State requirements are complied with, the source of the requirement (e.g., existing State legislation or regulation, etc.) must be stated, and the Governor of the State must provide a certification to accompany the grant application that the State's A/E procurement requirements are equivalent to [40 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.](#) In lieu of a certification from the Governor, the Attorney General's certification submitted with each grant application may include the A/E certification.

EPA's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program

EPA's [DBE Program](#) applies to all EPA Assistance Agreements and requires recipients who procure goods and/or services to: employ the good faith efforts, document their efforts, and maintain DBE forms and other documentation from the prime contractor. EPA grant recipients and subrecipients are required to seek and encouraged to utilize disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs) for their procurement needs under grant agreements. Recipients and subrecipients must ensure that their contracts contain the following term and condition:

“The contractor shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the performance of this contract. The contractor shall carry out applicable requirements of [40 CFR Part 33](#) in the award and administration of contracts awarded under EPA financial assistance agreements. Failure by the contractor to carry out these requirements is a material breach of this contract which may result in termination of this contract or other legally available remedies.”

Other DBE requirements are identified in [40 CFR Part 33](#).

Davis Bacon Act (DBA)

The [DBA](#) requires that all contractors and subcontractors performing construction, alteration, and repair (including painting and decorating) work under federal contracts in excess of \$2,000, pay their laborers and mechanics not less than the prevailing wage and fringe benefits for the geographic location. DBA requirements may be extended to federal financial assistance programs by the terms of other statutes (referred to as Davis Bacon and Related Acts (DBRA)) establishing or funding the programs. The [FY 2022 Appropriations Act](#) provides those federal requirements that would apply to a CWSRF or DWSRF project grant recipient shall apply to a grantee receiving a Community Grant. Consequently, the FY 2022 Appropriations Act extends DBRA provisions applicable to state revolving fund projects to the Community Grants. [Clean Water Act \(CWA\) Sec. 513](#) applies DBA requirements to projects for treatment works. DBA requirements apply to all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors with job duties that are physical and manual in nature including: laborers and mechanics, watchmen or guards (under certain conditions), and working foremen (under certain conditions). The term laborer or mechanic does not include workers whose duties are primarily administrative, executive, or clerical, rather than manual. Requirements only apply to construction at the “site of the work,” which has generally been defined as the physical place where the construction occurs. Work conducted off-site is generally not covered. EPA's [Interim Davis-Bacon Act Guidance](#) provides additional information on requirements and compliance.

Build America, Buy America (BABA)

BABA states that: “[N]one of the funds made available for a Federal financial assistance program for infrastructure...may be obligated for a project unless all of the iron, steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used in the project are produced in the United States.” Project means any activity related to the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of infrastructure in the United States. This law applies to all Federal financial assistance as defined in section [2 CFR 200.1](#), whether funded through the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs

Act (IIJA) or not. New awards made on or after May 14, 2022, must comply with BABA requirements. EPA provides [information and guidance](#) on BABA compliance, implementation, and any applicable waivers. Recipients are required to ensure that procurement plans comply with BABA requirements prior to grants being awarded.

American Iron and Steel (AIS)

The AIS provision requires recipients to use iron and steel products that are produced in the United States for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a public water system or treatment works. AIS requirements correspond to a subset of BABA requirements, therefore recipients in compliance with BABA are in compliance with AIS. EPA provides [information and guidance](#) on AIS compliance and implementation, any applicable waivers, as well as a step-by-step process for requesting waivers and the circumstances under which waivers may be granted.

Federal Cross-cutting Requirements/Other Applicable Federal Laws

Recipients must comply with Federal cross-cutting requirements as well as other applicable Federal laws. These requirements may include but are not limited to –

- **Environmental Authorities:** Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, Pub. L. 93-291, as amended; Clean Air Act, Pub. L. 95-95, as amended; Clean Water Act, Titles III, IV and V, Pub. L. 92-500, as amended; Coastal Barrier Resources Act, Pub. L. 97-348; Coastal Zone Management Act, Pub. L. 92-583, as amended; Endangered Species Act, Pub. L. 93-205, as amended; Environmental Justice, Executive Order 12898; Flood Plain Management, Executive Order 11988, as amended by Executive Order 12148; Protection of Wetlands, Executive Order 11990, as amended by Executive Order 12608; Farmland Protection Policy Act, Pub. L. 97-98; Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Pub. L. 85-624, as amended; Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, Pub. L. 94-265; National Environmental Policy Act, Pub. L. 91-190; National Historic Preservation Act, Pub. L. 89-655, as amended; Safe Drinking Water Act, Pub. L. 93-523, as amended; Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Pub. L. 90-54, as amended;
- **Economic and Miscellaneous Authorities:** OSHA Worker Health and Safety Standards; Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act, Pub. L. 91-54; Debarment and Suspension, Executive Order 12549; Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act, Pub. L. 89-754, as amended, and Executive Order 12372; Drug-Free Workplace Act, Pub. L. 100-690; Copeland “Anti-kickback” Act, Pub. L. 73-324; Government Neutrality Toward Contractor's Labor Relations, Executive Order 13202, as amended by Executive Order 13208; New Restrictions on Lobbying, Section 319 of Pub. L. 101-121; Prohibitions relating to violations of the Clean Water Act or Clean Air Act with respect to Federal contracts, grants, or loans under Section 306 of the Clean Air Act and Section 508 of the Clean Water Act, and Executive Order 11738; Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, Pub. L. 91-646, as amended;

- **Civil Rights, Nondiscrimination, Equal Employment Opportunity Authorities:** Age Discrimination Act, Pub. L. 94-135; Equal Employment Opportunity, Executive Order 11246; Section 13 of the Clean Water Act, Pub. L. 92-500; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, Pub. L. 93-112, supplemented by Executive Orders 11914 and 11250; Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, Pub. L. 88-352;
 - Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, EPA has a responsibility to ensure that federal funds are not being used to subsidize discrimination based on race, color, or national origin. This prohibition against discrimination under Title VI has been a statutory mandate since 1964, and EPA has had Title VI regulations since 1973. EPA's nondiscrimination regulations prohibit recipients of EPA financial assistance from taking actions in their programs or activities that are intentionally discriminatory and/or have a discriminatory effect based on race, color, national origin (including limited English proficiency), age, disability, or sex.
- **Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Authorities:** EPA's FY 1993 Appropriations Act, Pub. L. 102-389; Section 129 of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendment Act, Pub. L. 100-590; Small, Minority and Women Owned Business Enterprises, Executive Orders 11625, 12138 and 12432.

Regional Contacts

For general questions about the Community Grants Program, or for project specific questions that require the assistance of an EPA Regional Office, contact the [EPA Regional Contact](#).

Appendix A: Statutory Language

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022,⁸ contains the following provision:

Provided, That \$443,639,051 of the funds made available for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds and \$397,766,044 of the funds made available for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds shall be for the construction of drinking water, wastewater, and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the explanatory statement [discussed below] . . . for projects specified for “STAG—Drinking Water SRF”, “STAG—Clean Water SRF”, and “STAG—Drinking Water SRF; Clean Water SRF” in the table titled “Interior and Environment Incorporation of Community Project Funding Items/Congressionally Directed Spending Items” included for this division in the explanatory statement . . . , and, for purposes of these grants, each grantee shall contribute not less than 20 percent of the cost of the project unless the grantee is approved for a waiver by the Agency[.]

The aforementioned “explanatory statement⁹” accompanying the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022, states:

Community Project Funding Items/Congressionally Directed Spending Items.—From within funds provided for capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, the Committees recommend \$443,639,051 from the Clean Water SRF and \$397,766,044 from the Drinking Water SRF be for Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending grants for the construction of drinking water, waste-water, and storm-water infrastructure and for water quality protection. Each project shall provide not less than 20 percent matching funds from non-Federal sources, unless approved for a waiver. Applicable Federal requirements that would apply to a Clean Water State Revolving Fund or Drinking Water State Revolving Fund project grant recipient shall apply to a grantee receiving a CPF grant under this section. The Committees note that the following funding sources are to be treated as non-Federal funds and can be used to meet the non-Federal matching fund requirement: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Development Block Grant program; U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Program; and Appalachian Regional Commission grants. Funding made available to jurisdictions through the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 (P.L. 117–2) are considered Federal funds and may not be applied towards the non-Federal cost share requirement. A detailed list of projects is in the table titled “Interior and Environment Incorporation of Community Project Funding Items/Congressionally Directed Spending Items.”

⁸ P.L. 117-103

⁹ Explanatory Statement for Division G of P.L. 117-103

**Appendix B: List of EPA Congressionally Directed Spending Community Projects
and Funding Levels
(FY 2022 Consolidated Appropriations Act)**

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
<p><i>The list below is organized by: (1) Community projects funded by the Clean Water SRF, (2) Community projects funded by the Drinking Water SRF, and (3) Community projects funded by both Clean Water SRF and Drinking Water SRF. Projects are arranged alphabetically by state within each category. Note that EPA made grammatical changes to remove extra spaces, hyphens, and periods. The original CDS list should be referred to for technical corrections.</i></p>			
Community Projects Funded by Clean Water SRF Appropriations (alphabetical by state)			
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AK	The City of Ketchikan for the Tongass Sewer force main rehabilitation project	1,250,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AK	City of Ketchikan for Schoebner Culvert Rehabilitation	1,250,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AK	City of Kodiak for Wastewater Lift Station and Force Main Replacement	3,250,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AK	Kenai Peninsula Borough for Central Peninsula Landfill Leachate Volume Reduction Project	3,360,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AK	Municipality of Skagway for Waste Water Treatment Plant Upgrade	10,200,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AK	The City and Borough of Juneau for Mendenhall Wastewater Treatment Plant improvements	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AL	Lowndes County for Septic Tank Installations	700,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AZ	Mohave County for Bank Street Channel Stormwater Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	AZ	Town of Hayden for Sewer Line Replacement	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of East Palo Alto for O’Connor Stormwater Station improvement	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of Madera for Sewer Trunk Main Rehabilitation Project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of Maywood for Sewer Improvement Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of Millbrae for Water Recycling Project	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of Sacramento for 24th Street In-Line Combined Sewer System (CSS) Storage Pipe project	1,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of Sacramento for Combined Sewer System Improvement Project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of San Juan Bautista for Regional Waste Water Solution Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of San Leandro for Trash Capture Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of Torrance for Torrance Airport Storm Water Basin Project	938,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	County of Lake/Special Districts for Pipeline Design Project	320,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	Earlimart Public Utility District for a sewer relief project	1,284,696
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	Eastern Municipal Water District for the Quail Valley septic to sewer conversion project	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	Monterey One Water for Coral Street Pump Station Electrical Relocation Project	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians for Waste Water Treatment Plant improvements	112,340
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	The Big Bear Area Regional Wastewater Agency for the Replenish Big Bear Lake recycled water project	960,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	The City of Adelanto for a wastewater treatment plant tertiary treatment capability project	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	The City of Twentynine Palms for a wastewater treatment facility phase II project	663,224
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	The San Bernardino County Department of Public Works for the Desert Knolls Wash Phase III construction channel project	1,932,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	City of Banning for Wastewater Treatment and Groundwater Protection Project	1,250,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	The City of Yucaipa for the Wilson III basin project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CA	Western Municipal Water District for Western Water Recycling Facility PFAS Treatment and Prevention Project	3,000,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CO	City of Craig for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for Water and Wastewater Emergency Generators	1,080,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CO	Town of Rico for Central Sewer System Project	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CT	Save the Sound for Dam Removal Project	475,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CT	Town of Newtown for Non-impervious Parking in Newtown	480,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CT	City of West Haven for Organic Waste and Sludge Disposal	160,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CT	Metropolitan District Commission for City of Hartford Waste Treatment Facility Upgrades	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CT	Save the Sound for Distributed Green Infrastructure across the Watersheds of New Haven Harbor	375,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CT	Town of Manchester for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for Water and Sewer Transmission Pipe	1,800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	CT	Town of Stonington WPCA for River Road Pumping Station Upgrades	720,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	DE	City of Seaford for Sewer Line Relocation	1,200,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	DE	City of Wilmington for South Wilmington Sewer Infrastructure Expansion	4,800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Bay Park Conservancy for an environmental restoration project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Charlotte County for the Ackerman septic to sewer conversion project	3,200,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Cities of Wilton Manors, Oakland Park, and Fort Lauderdale for Oakland Park/Wilton Manors/Fort Lauderdale Middle River Water Quality Improvement Project	900,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	City of Coral Springs for Stormwater Drainage Infrastructure	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	City of North Miami Beach for Drainage Improvement Project	1,141,038

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	City of Oviedo for Percolation Pond Decom missioning project	900,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	City of Sunrise for Storm Water Pump Station Replacement	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	City of West Park for a Drainage Improvement Project	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	DeSoto County for a wastewater treatment expansion project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Hillsborough County for Septic-to-Sewer project	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Lee County for the Bob Janes Preserve restoration project	720,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Leon County for Lake Henrietta Stormwater Facility	1,600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Miami-Dade County for a septic to sewer project	750,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Miami-Dade Water and Sewer Department for the Biscayne Bay Water Pump project	1,600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Okeechobee Utility Authority for the Treasure Island wastewater expansion project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Pinellas County Government for Sanitary Sewer Interceptor at Pinellas Park	700,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Seminole County Government for Little Wekiva River Restoration Project	688,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	The City of Dade City for a wastewater treatment plant relocation and upgrade project	1,750,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	The City of Sarasota for a wetlands restoration project	2,578,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	The City of Zephyrhills for the Northside Lift Station and Force Main project	1,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	The Pinellas County Board of County Com missioners for a tidal check valves project	240,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	The Village of Key Biscayne for the Key Biscayne K-8 Center Elementary School stormwater improvements project	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	The Village of Pinecrest for a stormwater management project	606,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Town of Davie for Shenandoah Drainage Improvements	1,772,800
STAG—Clean Water SRF	FL	Town of Eatonville for Vereen Lift Station/ Quadrant Rehabilitation	665,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	GA	Augusta-Richmond County for Rock Creek Basin National Hills Neighborhood Stormwater Project	3,242,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	GA	Augusta-Richmond County for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for Sewer and Waterline Replacement	3,888,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	GA	City of McIntyre and Wilkinson County for Sewer System	6,300,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IA	City of Johnston for Sewer Extension Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IA	The City of Burlington for a sewer separation project	1,700,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IA	The City of Ottumwa for the Blake’s Branch sewer project	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	City of Elmhurst for Stormwater Improvement Project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	City of Hickory Hills for Sanitary Sewer Improvements	640,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	Downers Grove Sanitary District for Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation	1,080,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	The Galesburg Sanitary District for Anaerobic Digester Upgrades	1,200,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	Village of Burr Ridge for Stormwater Management Improvements	785,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	City of Harvey for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for Central Area Water and Sewer Improvement Project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	City of Peoria for Combined Sewer Overflow Project	450,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	City of Sesser for Sanitary Sewer Collection System Rehabilitation	750,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	HeartLands Conservancy for Centreville Cahokia Heights Sewer System Project	1,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	Kishwaukee Water Reclamation District for Malta/Kishwaukee Community College Sanitary Sewer Extension Project	250,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	Lake County Public Works for Des Plaines River Water Reclamation Facility Up grades Project	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago for Stormwater Project	1,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	IL	Will County for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for Southeast Joliet Sanitary District Water and Wastewater Upgrading	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	KS	City of Pittsburg for Wastewater Treatment Facility	3,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	KY	Eastern Kentucky PRIDE, Inc. for a septic system project	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	KY	Franklin County Fiscal Court for the Farmdale Sanitation District sewer system project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	KY	Louisville and Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District for Park DuValle Community Odor Control Improvements	480,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	KY	The City of Danville for the Spears Creek Pump Station upgrade	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	KY	The City of Lawrenceburg for a sanitary sewer overflow elimination and sewer extension project	750,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	LA	The City of Monroe for rehabilitation of a sewer main project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	LA	City of Monroe for Storm Water Drainage Study	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	LA	New Orleans Ernest N. Morial Convention Center for New Gravity Sanitary Sewer and Storm Sewer Project	8,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	Charles River Watershed Association, Inc. for Charles River Flood Model	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	City of Somerville for Poplar Street Pump Station Project	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	City of Waltham for Waltham Embassy Parking Lot Project	280,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	City of Westfield for Water Treatment Plant Building Upgrades	1,000,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	Merrimack River Watershed Council for Merrimack River Hot Spot Detection and Green Infrastructure Solutions	352,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	Town of Agawam Main Street Sewage Main and Slope Stabilization Project	740,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	Town of Hull for Pump Station 9 Replacement	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	Tyngsborough Sewer Department for Sewer Phase 3 Project	869,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MA	Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head Aquinnah for Administration Building Connection to Wastewater Treatment Plant	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MD	Montgomery County for Watershed Enhancement Project	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MD	Montgomery County for Watershed Stormwater Management Enhancements	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MD	Anacostia Watershed Society for Treating and Teaching program	200,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MD	Anne Arundel County for Stormwater Management Infrastructure Improvements	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MD	Cecil County for New Wastewater Infrastructure	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MD	City of Hyattsville for Ward 1 Stormwater Project	870,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MD	The City of Cambridge for Historic West End Sewer Line Replacements	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	City of Belfast for Sewer Line Replacements	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	City of Brewer for Oak Grove Sewer Subsystem Remediation Project	1,103,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	City of Eastport Wastewater Treatment Department for Middle Street Pump Station Generator Upgrade	120,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	City of Presque Isle for Echo Lake Septic Tank Effluent Pump System	550,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	City of Saco for Water Resource Recovery Facility Upgrade	3,930,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	Maine Department of Environmental Protection for Anson Madison Sanitary District Regional PFAS Treatment Facility	1,600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	Town of Bridgton for Sewer Main Extensions Project	1,400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	Town of Frenchville for Force Main and Pump Station Upgrade	247,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	Town of Livermore Falls for Wastewater Treatment Facility improvements	1,700,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	Town of Old Orchard Beach for Wastewater Treatment Facility Upgrades	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	Town of Vinalhaven for Downtown Sewer and Water Project	1,410,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	ME	Town of Winslow for Chaffee Brook Pump Station	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	City of Mason for Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvement and Expansion	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	Harrison Township for a sanitary sewer project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	Leoni Township for a wastewater treatment plant improvement project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	St. Clair County for the Clay-Ira interceptor project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	The City of Midland for a storm and sanitary sewer improvement project	750,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	The Macomb Interceptor Drain Drainage District for a segment sewer rehabilitation project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	The Village of Clinton for a septic waste treatment project	185,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	Tuscarora Township for a septic to sewer expansion and modernization project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	8 1/2 Mile Relief Drain Drainage District for Chapaton Retention Basin In-Storage Expansion	4,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	Great Lakes Water Authority for Detroit River Interceptor Evaluation and Rehabilitation	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MI	Martin Sanitary Diversion Drainage District for Martin Drain In-System Storage Device	1,000,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MN	City of Shakopee for River Stabilization Project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MN	City of Two Harbors for a wastewater treatment facility improvements project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MN	City of Bemidji for Wastewater Treatment Facility Rehabilitation	4,400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	MN	City of Rochester for Water Reclamation Plant Upgrade	935,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NC	The City of Clinton for a sewer line repair project	68,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NC	The City of Dunn for the Black River Waste Water Plant improvement project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NC	The Town of Benson for a sewer treatment capacity project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NC	Town of Cary for Swift Creek Stormwater Management and Modeling Program	900,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NC	Town of Hookerton for Waste Water Treatment Plant Lagoon and Sewer Collection System Improvements	1,897,001
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NE	The Sarpy County Wastewater Agency for the Springfield Creek sewer project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NH	Town of Exeter for Exeter Squamscott River Sewer Siphons	600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NH	City of Rochester for Septic Receiving Facility Upgrades	900,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NH	Conway Village Fire District for Sewer Main Rehabilitation	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NH	Keene, NH for Sewer Force Main Inspection and Rehabilitation	325,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NH	Town of Exeter for Webster Avenue Pump Station Rehabilitation Project	1,050,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NH	Town of Greenville for Wastewater Treatment Plant Chemical Feed Building	750,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NH	Town of Newport for Renovation of Wastewater Treatment Plant	1,936,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Saddle River for Sewer Main Construction Project	1,105,166

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	City of New Brunswick for Sewer Replacement Project	760,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Township of Saddle Brook for Sewage Rehabilitation and Improvements	1,393,682
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Paramus for Prospect Avenue Sewer Pump Station Project	250,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Prospect Park for Main Sewer Line Repair Project	223,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Sussex for Sewer Force Main Repair	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Wharton for Sanitary Sewer System Rehabilitation	398,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	City of Hackensack for Clay Street Combined Sewer Separation Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	City of Hammonton for Sanitary Sewer System Study and Rehabilitation	395,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Sparta Township for Wastewater Treatment Project	250,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Township of Berkeley Heights for West Side Drainage Project	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NJ	Willingboro Municipal Utilities Authority for Water Treatment Plant Microgrid	600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NV	The City of Carson City for a sewer extension project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NV	Boulder City for Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NV	City of Ely for Central Ely Sewer Upgrade	3,300,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NV	The City of Reno for the McCloud Area sewer conversion project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NV	The City of Sparks for Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility upgrades	3,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NV	Truckee Meadows Water Authority for Reno-Stead OneWater Nevada Purification Facility	3,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	City of Newburgh for North Interceptor Sewer Project	3,120,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	County of Putnam for Riparian and Watershed Ecological Restoration Project	3,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	Save the Sound for Little Neck Bay Stormwater Management	600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	The City of Corning for a wastewater treatment plant improvement project	480,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	The Incorporated Village of Patchogue for a wastewater treatment facility expansion project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	The Town of Cherry Creek wastewater collection project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	The Town of Prattsburgh for a wastewater service project	398,700
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	The Town of Seneca Falls for a pump station and force main wastewater collection project	1,966,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	The Village of Portville for a sanitary sewer improvements project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	Town of Clarkstown for Storm Water Management Improvements	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	Town of Rotterdam for Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements Project	960,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	Town of Yorktown for Hallocks Mill Sewer Extension Project	1,200,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	Village of Kiryas Joel Wastewater Treatment Plant for Wastewater Treatment Plant Components Modernization Project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	Village of Sea Cliff and Hempstead Harbor Protection Committee for North Shore Shellfish Seeding	300,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	City of Mount Vernon for City of Mount Vernon DPW Sewer Planning Project	1,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	NY	Incorporated Village of Hempstead for Sewer System Improvements	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The City of Chillicothe for a wastewater treatment plant project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The City of Fairview Park for sewer remediation and environmental improvements	3,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The City of Parma for Valley Villas, York, and State Roads sewer improvements	1,968,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The City of Rocky River for the Buckingham Road, Argyle Oval, and Arundel Road sewer replacement project	2,520,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The City of Strongsville for the Prospect Road storm sewer project	1,600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The City of Willoughby for the Willoughby-Eastlake Water Pollution Control Center Lakeshore East Equalization Basin project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The Geauga County Board of Commissioners for McFarland Wastewater Treatment Plant renovation and up grades	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The Village of Chagrin Falls for a wastewater treatment plant infrastructure re habilitation project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	The Village of Grover Hill for a wastewater collections system project	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	Village of Lowellville for Wastewater Improvements	549,600
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District for Brookside Culvert Repair Project	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District for Upper Ridgewood Stormwater Detention Basin Improvement Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OH	Village of Tuscarawas for Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OK	Davis Municipal Authority for Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OK	Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust for Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades	5,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OK	Stillwater Utilities Authority for City of Stillwater Wastewater Project	5,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	Port of Brookings Harbor for Wastewater Treatment Plant	3,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	City of Albany for Composting System Expansion at the Albany-Millsburg Water Reclamation	1,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	City of Dufur for Wastewater Treatment Expansion Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	City of Hood River for Phase IV Waterfront Stormwater Line Relocation	575,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	City of Newberg for Emergency Wastewater Treatment Plant	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	City of North Bend for Storm and Sanitary Infrastructure Replacement and Up grades	1,340,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	City of Prineville for a Drinking Water and/ or Clean Water Project for Water and Wastewater Services Extension	1,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	City of Sandy for Sewer Pipe Improvements	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	Klamath County for Upper Klamath Lake Water Reuse Equipment	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	North Unit Irrigation District for Jefferson County Main Canal Lining Project	555,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	Port of Toledo for Sewer Connection Expansion Project	1,958,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	OR	Rogue River Valley and Medford Irrigation District for Joint System Piping, Phase 1	5,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	PA	Cranberry Township for a sanitary sewer system project	960,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	PA	The City of Corry for a wastewater treatment plant project	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	PA	Wyoming Valley Sanitary Authority for Stream Restorations and Stormwater Basin Retrofit	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	PA	Cecil Township Municipal Authority for Village of Lawrence Sewage Facilities Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	PA	Mid-Cameron Authority for Cameron County Interceptor Line Replacement	376,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	RI	City of Warwick Sewer Authority for Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System	1,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	RI	Town of North Providence for Stormwater Improvements	375,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	SC	City of Aiken for Northside Gravity Sewer Expansion	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	City of Austin for a Wastewater and Stormwater Infrastructure Project	1,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	City of Buda for South Loop 4 Wastewater Extension Project	1,636,364
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	City of Wilmer for Force Main Replacement Project	2,226,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	Harris County Flood Control District for the Kingwood Diversion Channel improvement project	1,600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	Harris County Flood Control District for the Taylor Gully stormwater channel improvement project	1,600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	Harris County for the Forest Manor drain age improvement project	1,673,600
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	Memorial City Redevelopment Authority for a detention basin improvement project	3,394,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	TX	The City of Waco for the Flat Creek water reuse project	1,700,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	UT	The Town of Manila for a sewage system project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VA	City of Falls Church for Lincoln Avenue Stormwater Project	400,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VA	City of Petersburg for Sewer Service Area Infrastructure Upgrades	2,432,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VA	City of Norfolk for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for River Oaks Pump Station Replacement	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VA	City of Norfolk for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for West Ocean View Pump Station	2,300,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VA	City of Williamsburg for Walnut Hills Stormwater Abatement and Streambank Stabilization project	422,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VI	Virgin Islands Waste Management Authority for Residential Collection Sewers Re placement	960,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VI	Virgin Islands Waste Management Authority for Wastewater Treatment Facilities Upgrade	1,120,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VI	Virgin Islands Waste Management Authority for Water Security Infrastructure Up grades	1,200,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VT	Addison County Community Trust for Wastewater Infrastructure Improvements	500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VT	City of Vergennes for Wastewater Upgrade	3,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VT	Milton Mobile Home Community, Inc. for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for Mobile Home Community Water and Sewer Project	841,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VT	City of Barre for City of Barre North End Wastewater Pump Station	143,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VT	Town of Bethel for a Drinking Water and/or Clean Water Project for Water and Stormwater Infrastructure Upgrade	600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	VT	Town of Montgomery for Wastewater Infra structure Construction Project	2,800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	City of Ellensburg for Renewable Natural Gas Conversion and Methane Gas Recovery at the Wastewater Treatment Facility	840,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	City of North Bend for Snoqualmie Valley Trail Channel Widening and Wetland Creation/Enhancement	225,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	The City of College Place for a wastewater treatment project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	The Stevens Public Utility District #1 for a septage reuse project	1,680,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	City of Stevenson for Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	City of Sultan for Wastewater Plant Up grade	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	Clark Regional Wastewater District for Curtain Creek Septic Elimination Pro gram	800,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	Port Hadlock for Wastewater Facility	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WA	Town of Malden for a sewer system project	3,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WI	City of River Falls for West Central Wisconsin Biosolids Facility Improvements	1,600,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WI	City of Fitchburg for Stormwater Management Project	848,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	The City of Moundsville for a main sewer line evaluation project	100,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	City of Follansbee for Wastewater System Improvements Project	10,269,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	City of Grafton for Wastewater Systems Improvement Project	3,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	City of Nitro for Stormwater and Sewer Upgrade Project	2,888,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	City of Parsons for Sanitary Sewer System Compliance	1,600,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	City of Ravenswood for Pump Station Improvements	2,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	City of Ripley for Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements	3,000,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	DigDeep Right to Water Project for a sanitary septic and sewerage service project	495,840
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	Parkersburg Utility Board for Marrtown Road Sewer Improvements	2,500,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	Salt Rock Sewer Public Service District for Phase II Pump Station Upgrade Project	1,416,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	Southern Jackson County Public Service District for Wastewater Treatment System Upgrade	2,158,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	Town of Burnsville for Wastewater Collection System Rehabilitation Project	669,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	Town of Marmet for Sanitary/Storm Separation Project: Maryland Ave. Overflow Abatement	860,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	Town of Oceana for Wastewater Collection System Upgrades	1,444,000
STAG—Clean Water SRF	WV	Town of Rowlesburg for Sanitary Sewer System Upgrade	7,578,000
Community Projects Funded with Drinking Water SRF Appropriations (alphabetical by state)			
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	AK	City and Borough of Wrangell for Supply Connector to Treatment Plant	2,080,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	AK	City of King Cove for Delta Creek Water Well Field Expansion	5,200,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	AL	City of Marion for Source Water Rehabilitation Project	480,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	AZ	City of Chandler for Advanced Metering Infrastructure	990,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	AZ	City of Glendale for Water Supply Inter-Connection Upgrades	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Adventist Health St. Helena Hospital for Napa County Deer Park/St. Helena Water System improvements	1,840,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Cambria Community Services District for Water Tanks project	375,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Citrus Heights Water District for Ground water Production Well	585,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Dos Palos for Water Plant Clarifier Replacement and Repair	279,664
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Downey for Well Remediation Project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Gustine for Water Loop Line Completion Project	950,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Lomita for Lomita Water System Improvements Project	940,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Oxnard for a Water Transmission Line	500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Poway for Clearwell Bypass System Project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of San Buenaventura (Ventura Water) for a State Water Interconnection Project	2,840,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Santa Cruz for Water Meter Upgrade Program	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Thousand Oaks for a Water Reuse Project	1,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Coachella Valley Water District for Water Transmission Project	2,700,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Earlimart Public Utility District for a well treatment improvement project	1,756,416
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	East Bay Municipal Utility District for Upper San Leandro Drinking Water Treatment Plant upgrades	3,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Eastern Municipal Water District for Mead Valley Water Booster Station Replacement Project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District for the Canyon Lake Water Treatment Plant improvement project	780,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Ironhouse Sanitary District for Recycled Water Project	3,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	Pico Rivera Water Authority for PFAS Groundwater Treatment Project	2,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	West Valley Water District for Bloomington Alleyway Pipeline Project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Gustine for Tank and Booster Pump Station Improvements	3,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	City of Sacramento for Fairbairn Ground water Well	1,700,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CA	South Coast Water District for Doheny De salination Slant Well Project	2,400,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CO	Town of Dove Creek for Big Canyon Water Line	1,760,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CO	Town of Hotchkiss for Water Treatment Plant Upgrade	91,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CO	Town of La Veta for Water Treatment Plant	600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CO	Town of Minturn for Water Tank Replacement Project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CO	Town of Walden for Water System Old Valve Replacement	90,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CT	Town of Durham for Public Water Supply Expansion	3,412,455
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CT	South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority for Lake Saltonstall Water Treatment Plant Electrical Upgrades Projects	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CT	Town of Bethel Public Utilities Department for Bergstrom Well Treatment Facility	1,600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	CT	Town of Bethel Public Utilities Department for Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System	640,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	FL	City of Apopka for Northwest Water Production Plant New Water Storage Tank	1,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	FL	City of Dania Beach for Water Utility Upgrade and Improvement Project	1,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	FL	Miami-Dade County for a drinking water mains extension project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	FL	Miami-Dade County for a drinking water project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	FL	Sarasota County for extension of a port able transmission main project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	FL	The City of West Miami for a potable water main improvements project	3,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	GA	City of East Point for Water Treatment Plant Renovations	1,600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IA	Creston City Water Works for water intake Project	600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	The City of Assumption for water system and treatment plant improvements	1,965,040
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	The City of Carrollton for a water treatment plant project	1,975,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	The City of Farmer City for a water plant sand filter rehabilitation project	197,619
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	The City of Nokomis for a drinking water treatment plant system improvement project	480,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	The City of Rushville for drinking water system improvements	1,700,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	The Village of Blue Mound for water system improvements and a water tower rehabilitation project	320,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	Village of Pingree Grove for Water Treatment Expansion	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	Village of Richmond for Water Tower Rehabilitation	560,800
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	City of Joliet for Water Main Replacements and Alternative Water Source Program project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	City of Metropolis for Metropolis Water Treatment Plant Filter Rehabilitation Project	400,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	City of Monmouth for West Harlem Avenue Water Main Replacement Project	500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	IL	City of North Chicago for Lead Service Line and Water Main Replacement	500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	KY	The City of Lancaster for a drinking water treatment plant project	400,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	KY	The Hyden-Leslie County Water District for a water system improvement project	1,392,960
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MA	City of Malden for Lead Line Replacement Program	3,360,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MA	Norton Water & Sewer Department for Source Water Well Replacement Project	1,475,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MA	Town of Hopedale for Water Supply And Storage Enhancement Project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MA	Town of Medway for Central Water Treatment Facility Improvements	2,750,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MA	Town of Plainville for Water System Capacity Expansion Project	1,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MA	Town of Ipswich for Town Hill Water Storage Tank Replacement	3,280,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MA	Town of Sturbridge for Water Main Improvements	1,085,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MD	City of Bowie for Replacement of Tuberculated Pipes	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MD	The Board of Garrett County Commissioners for Gorman Waterline Rehabilitation Project	700,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MD	Town of Boonsboro for Drinking Water Reservoir Replacement	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	ME	Town of Berwick for Water Utilities Up grade	2,800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	Charter Township of Shelby for a water reservoir project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	City of Pleasant Ridge for Kensington Water Main and Lead Service Line Re placement Project	650,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	Oakland County for Royal Oak Township Water System Improvements	800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	The City of Croswell for a drinking water quality improvement project	1,000,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	The City of Jackson for the Pearl Loop North Branch water transmission main project	1,760,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	The City of Kalamazoo for a lead water service line replacement project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	Village of Fowlerville for Water Treatment Plant Improvements	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	Village of Milford for Water System Improvements Project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	City of St. Clair for Water Treatment Plant Improvements	970,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MI	Oakland County for Pontiac Water System Improvements	800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MN	City of Aurora for East Mesabi Water Treatment Project	2,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MN	City of Ely for Water Supply Improvements for School Campus	245,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MN	City of Zumbrota for Water Main Loop	560,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MO	City of Slater for Well Field Protection Project	147,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MO	City Utilities of Springfield for a raw water main construction project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MS	The City of Gautier for a water treatment project	2,770,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MS	City of Jackson for Water and Distribution System Improvements	4,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	MS	The Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians for the Bogue Homa water system project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NC	City of Henderson for Kerr Lake Regional Water System Upgrade and Expansion Project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NC	Martin County for Water Regionalization Project	3,437,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NC	Town of Pittsboro for Water Treatment Plant Infrastructure Upgrades	2,208,800
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NH	City of Portsmouth for Little Bay Waterline Replacement	600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NH	Town of Peterborough for Water Main Relocation	277,804

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NH	Town and Village of Canaan for Leaded Water Line Replacement and River Crossing Protection	1,470,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Hopatcong Borough for PFAS-related Water System Upgrades	800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Milford Borough for Water Main Improvements	360,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	The Village of Ridgewood for Drinking Water Treatment Facilities Construction	2,800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Town of Clinton for the West Main Street Water Main Replacement	898,257
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Borough of East Newark for Drinking Water System Improvements	338,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Red Bank for Lead Pipe Removal and Replacement Project	250,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Rocky Hill for PFOS Treatment and Other Water Improvements	1,667,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Stanhope for Water Main Re placements	677,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Borough of Sussex for Water Utility Improvement Project	100,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	City of Newark for Water Loss Monitoring Program	492,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NJ	Township of Bloomfield for Lead Service Line Replacement Program	255,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NM	Town of Silver City for Grant County Regional Water Project Update	200,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NV	Churchill County for a water treatment plant project	300,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NV	City of Fallon for Churchill County Rattle snake Hill Water Tank Upgrade	1,995,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NV	The City of Carson City for the Quill Water Treatment Plant filtration upgrade project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	City of Glen Cove for Rehabilitation of the Nancy Court Pump Station	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	City of Long Beach for Sand Filter Rehabilitation Project	1,000,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	City of Mechanicville for Water Reliability Project	800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	City of Middletown for Water System Improvements Project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	Herkimer County for the Eastern Mohawk Valley Regional transmission main project	500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	Suffolk County Water Authority for a drinking water project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Town of Babylon for the Oak Beach Water System project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Town of Riverhead for a drinking water project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Town of Vernon for the Vernon Central water project	3,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Village of Aurora for replacement of aging water infrastructure	160,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Village of Dundee for the water tank replacement and control system enhancements project	640,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Village of Frankfort for a water system improvements project	3,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Village of Marathon for a water river crossing project	600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	Town of Lewisboro for Oakridge Water District PFAS Mitigation	1,800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	City of Cohoes for Drinking Water Treatment Plant Rehabilitation Project	2,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	The Village of Mayville for a water well replacement project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	Town of Volney for Portable Water System Installation	280,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	NY	Village of Hempstead for Water Improvements Project	3,200,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OH	The City of Munroe Falls for a waterline crossing project	1,040,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OH	The City of Painesville for the Shamrock/ Brookstone waterline extension and capacity project	570,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OH	The City of Portsmouth for water treatment plant repairs and updates	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OH	The City of Rittman for a water transmission line project	2,628,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OH	The Village of Georgetown for a water tower rehabilitation project	450,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OH	Village of Midvale for Water Treatment Plant Filtration Improvement Project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OH	Village of Scio for Waterline and Household Lead Line Replacement	300,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OK	Cherokee County Rural Water District #1 for Drinking Water Project	5,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OK	Edmond Public Works Authority for City of Edmond Drinking Water Improvements	5,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OK	McAlester Public Works Authority for City of McAlester Drinking Water System Improvements	5,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OK	Okarche Public Works Authority for Drinking Water Treatment Plant Project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OK	Stillwater Utilities Authority for City of Stillwater Drinking Water Project	5,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OK	Welch Public Works Authority for Town of Welch Drinking Water Improvements	300,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OK	Wewoka Public Works Authority for Drinking Water Improvements	5,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OR	City of Hillsboro for Water Supply System Construction	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OR	City of Echo for Potable Water System Service Replacement	450,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OR	City of Haines for Water Supply and Distribution Project	1,015,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OR	City of Warrenton for Hammond Waterline Project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OR	City of Willamina for Water Intake Repair	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OR	City of Yamhill for Treatment Plant Project	192,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	OR	Mapleton Water District for Distribution and Meter Project	800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	PA	Center Township Water Authority for Center Grange Road Waterline Replacement	999,999
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	PA	Creswell Heights Joint Authority for Filter Media Material Upgrades	400,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	PA	Municipal Authority Borough of Midland for Water Treatment Plant Improvements	80,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	PA	The Avella Area School District for a water line extension project	500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	PA	Southwestern Pennsylvania Water Authority for Brave Water and Sewer Authority System Extension	2,200,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	RI	City of Newport for Narragansett Avenue Water Main Rehabilitation	1,520,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	RI	City of Warwick for Lincoln Avenue Transmission Line Rehabilitation	3,200,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	RI	City of Woonsocket for Lead Line Removal	775,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	RI	Greenville Water District for Water Line Extension	325,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	RI	Providence Water Supply Board for Water Lead Service Replacements	3,300,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	RI	Prudence Island Water District for System Improvement	1,350,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	RI	Town of North Smithfield Water Department for St. Paul Street Water Line Project	1,175,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	SC	City of Rock Hill for Water Plant Alum Sludge Dewatering Facility	8,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TN	Glen Hills Utility District for an updated drinking water infrastructure project in Greeneville	996,160
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TN	The City of Oak Ridge for a water treatment plant project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	City of Alamo for Water Treatment Plant Rehabilitation and Expansion	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	City of Bellaire for Bellaire Waterlines	782,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	City of Glenn Heights for Elevated Water Storage Tank Project	2,800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	City of Jacinto City for Northeast Water Mains & Fire Hydrant Improvements	1,950,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	City of Jersey Village for Seattle Street Waterlines Replacement	624,835
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	City of Schertz for Corbett Water Ground Storage Tank Project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	San Antonio Water System for Generators for Critical Infrastructure Protection	500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	TX	The Brownsville Public Utilities Board for Water Treatment Plant Pump Station Improvements	500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	UT	The City of Centerville for the Green Steel Tank replacement project	1,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	UT	The City of Ephraim for a drinking water resiliency project	3,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VA	City of Manassas for Transmission Main Replacement	2,400,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VA	City of Portsmouth for Water Service Line Inventory	500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VA	Frederick County Sanitation Authority for Diehl Water Treatment Plant Improvement Project	3,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VA	Prince George County for Central Water System Extension Project	3,200,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VA	Spotsylvania County for Motts Run Water Treatment Plant Expansion Project	1,840,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VA	Surry County for Water System Upgrades	3,200,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VA	Frederick County Sanitation Authority for Lake Frederick Well Development	3,600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	VT	Village of Jeffersonville for Water System Upgrades	560,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	MacKaye Harbor Water District for Agate Beach Lane Source Water and Transmission Improvements	694,480
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	Port of Coupeville for Wharf Rehabilitation Project	136,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	Quileute Nation for Quileute Move to Higher Ground Water System Improvement	1,479,355
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	Sammamish Plateau Water and Sewer District for Sammamish Plateau Water PFAS Treatment Plant upgrades	1,585,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	The City of Airway Heights for a water replacement project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	The Town of Cusick for a water treatment facility project	3,500,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	Lakewood Water District for PFAS Remediation	1,950,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WA	Town of Harrah for Drinking Water Well Project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WI	Waukesha Water Utility for an elevated storage tank project	530,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WI	City of La Crosse for Wellhead PFA Water Contamination Treatment	3,730,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WI	City of Monroe for Lead Service Line Replacement	1,022,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WI	City of Rhinelander for Drinking Water Quality Infrastructure Improvements	1,600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WI	Sheboygan Water Utility for Drinking Water Project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	The Bel-O-Mar Regional Council for a water system improvements project	1,120,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	The Marshall County Commission for a water meter project	230,400
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	The Ohio County Commission for the Town of Triadelphia water storage tank project	600,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Canaan Valley Public Service District for Water Plant	8,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	City of Weirton for Water Treatment Capacity Project	22,470,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Clarksburg Water Board for Distribution System Improvements	6,880,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Greenbrier County Public Service District No. 2 for Phase II Waterline Extension	1,500,000

STAG Account	State	Project (Recipient Name and Purpose)	Amount (\$)
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Hodgesville Public Service District for Water System Improvements	4,037,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Kanawha County Commission for Leatherwood Water Project	5,230,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Midland Public Service District for Faulkner Road Water Line Extension to Bow den	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Monumental Public Service District for Waterline Expansion	283,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Nettie Leivasy Public Service District for Water System Improvements Project	4,020,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Preston County PSD 1 for Water Treatment Plant and Water Line Upgrades	646,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Town of Alderson for Water System Rehabilitation and Extension Project	2,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Town of Burnsville for Burnsville Lake Water Supply Line Improvements	4,800,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Town of Kermit for Rehabilitation of Water Treatment Facility	2,747,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Town of Meadow Bridge for Distribution System Upgrade and Extension	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF	WV	Town of Worthington for Water Service Upgrade Project	1,000,000
Community Projects Funded with Both Clean Water SRF and Drinking Water SRF Appropriations (alphabetical by state)			
STAG—Drinking Water SRF; Clean Water SRF	MI	St. Clair County for a drinking water (\$200,000) and wastewater (\$800,000) improvement project	1,000,000
STAG—Drinking Water SRF; Clean Water SRF	TX	County of El Paso for First-Time Water (\$314,000) and Wastewater (\$791,000) Connection Projects	1,105,000

Appendix C: Technical Corrections-Procedural Information

Examples of Acceptable Technical Corrections

Below are three common types of corrections that are generally acceptable. All examples assume concurrence from the original recipient and the new recipient to be named, if applicable.

Original Language	Purpose (P) or Recipient (R)?	New Language
Anytown for wastewater infrastructure improvements	P	Anytown for water infrastructure improvements
Anytown for wastewater infrastructure improvements	R	Greater Anytown-Area Regional Sewer Authority for wastewater infrastructure improvements
Anytown for wastewater infrastructure improvements	P, R	Greater Anytown-Area Regional Water Authority for drinking water infrastructure improvements

Technical corrections cannot: 1) change the purpose to a non-construction project unless it otherwise provides for water quality protection; 2) change the purpose to construction of infrastructure that is not drinking, waste, or stormwater-related unless it otherwise provides for water quality protection; 3) change the purpose to debt repayment; 4) transfer funds to another Federal Agency.

Who Can Request a Technical Correction?

Technical correction requests must be in writing and, for a change in purpose, must be originated by the original recipient. A request involving a change in recipient can be initiated by either the original recipient or the new entity to be named, but such a request requires the written concurrence of the other party. Requests involving a change in both recipient and purpose can also be initiated by either entity with concurrence from the other; however, the original earmark recipient must specifically acknowledge both the change in purpose and the change in recipient in their concurrence. Any request for technical corrections from parties other than the original recipient or the new entity will generally not be considered.

Procedure for Making a Technical Correction

Recipients requesting a technical correction should first consult their [EPA Regional Contact](#) to discuss the need for, and evaluate the appropriateness of, a technical correction. When appropriate and necessary, the EPA Regional Office will submit technical corrections to EPA Headquarters for consultation with and resolution by Congress.

EPA Regional Offices provide all written requests that are consistent with this Guidance to EPA Headquarters for review and submission to the Agency’s Liaison to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations (“Appropriations Liaison”). The Appropriations Liaison initiates consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. EPA approves proposed corrections after the Appropriations Liaison transmits confirmation of consultation with the Committees.¹⁰ EPA may then proceed with administering projects within the scope of approved corrected language.

When a Technical Correction is Unnecessary

All changes in the project purpose require a technical correction. All changes in the recipient require a technical correction unless the intended recipient is an agency of the original recipient or is wholly owned or controlled by the recipient (e.g., the recipient is listed as Anytown, USA, but the intended recipient is the Anytown Department of Water Quality). In such cases, a grant may be made to the intended recipient without a technical correction.

Withdrawing or Reversing a Technical Correction

Technical corrections requests that have been approved by EPA can be reversed (i.e., reverted to the original appropriation language). Reversing a technical correction requires a new technical correction following the procedures outlined above. Technical corrections requests that have not been approved by EPA Headquarters can be withdrawn. Withdrawal procedures depend on how far along the request went in the Congressional consultation process.

- If the request has not yet been provided to Congress for consultation, the request will simply be removed from the submission list. Upon confirmation from EPA Headquarters that the request was removed, the Region can proceed under the scope of the original language.
- If the request has been sent to Congress for consultation, but not yet returned, EPA Headquarters will request its removal from consideration and will notify Region when they can proceed under the scope of the original language.
- If the consultation process was already completed, EPA will send the language reversal back to Congress in a subsequent request.

Administering a Technically Corrected Project

Technical corrections made under the technical corrections authority should be administered in accordance with the guidance document from the fiscal year of appropriation.

¹⁰ If the circumstances surrounding a technical correction for a particular project change after consultation with the Committees and EPA decides not to approve the request, EPA will notify the Committees in a subsequent request.

Appendix D: Application Forms and Attachments

The following registration steps must be completed prior to submitting an application package:

Registration in [SAM.gov](#). Unique Entity Identifiers (UEIs) are assigned during the SAM.gov registration process. Recipients with active SAM.gov registrations prior to April 2022 automatically have a UEI but may need to complete entity validation within SAM.gov. Recipients must be registered in SAM.gov. Recipients may refer to the [Entity Registration Checklist](#) and obtain SAM.gov assistance via the Federal Service Desk at 1-866-606-8220 or [fsd.gov](#) (M-F 8am-8pm ET).

Registration in [Grants.gov](#). Once registered in SAM.gov, recipients who have a SAM.gov registration can then [register with Grants.gov](#) and assign Grants.gov Roles. Please note that only an Authorized Organization Representative (AOR) can submit an application on behalf of the recipient. [Grants.gov instructions](#), and [Training Resources & Videos](#) are available online. Grants.gov assistance is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at 1-800-518-4726 or support@grants.gov (closed on federal holidays).

Complete application packages must be submitted through [Grants.gov](#) and must include the following:

1. **Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424)** with authorized signatures submitted.
2. **Additional information for SF424, Block #19 (if applicable):** [Is application subject to review by State under Executive Order 12372 Process?](#)

Select the appropriate box. If box “a” is selected, enter the date the application was submitted to the State SPOC (generally, applicants must submit the SF424 or summary thereof to the State SPOC to meet the requirements under Executive Order 12372).

- California. All EPA programs and activities subject to Intergovernmental Review have been selected for [State Single Point of Contact](#) (SPOC) review. Community Grant Applications for projects in California should be submitted to the California SPOC at state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov.
- Utah. Only applications for EPA financial assistance subject to Intergovernmental Review submitted by Utah state agencies have been selected for SPOC review. Applications by local governments, nonprofit organizations and other entities are not reviewed by the Utah SPOC. Utah state agencies are to submit their Community Grant applications to stategrants@utah.gov.

No other SPOCs have selected EPA programs and activities subject to Intergovernmental Review for SPOC review, however there may be requirements for submission of Federal grant applications to SPOCs or other state agencies based on state law that are independent of [40 CFR Part 29](#). EPA encourages applicants to comply with state requirements but does not enforce those requirements.

- [Intergovernmental Review SPOC List](#) provides contact information for each SPOC.
- [Fact sheet for Applicants Intergovernmental Review Process](#) provides additional information on Intergovernmental Review.

3. **Budget Information for Non-Construction Programs (SF 424A).**

Budget Detail-Breakdown by Object Class Categories.

[RAIN-2019-G02](#) at <https://www.epa.gov/grants/rain-2019-g02>

- Costs for hiring construction contractors would be reflected in **SF 424A Category g “Construction”**
- Costs for building or repairing facilities and related demolition and site preparation work or for remediating contamination are to be classified as **SF424A Category g “Construction”**
- Costs for hiring Architectural and Engineering firms for design/project management services would be categorized in **SF 424A Category f “Contractual”**
- Construction activities carried out by the applicant’s own employees (“force account”) are to be classified as **SF 424A Category a “Personnel.”**
- Information on cost allowability is provided in [2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E](#). Recipients may review EPA’s [training course](#) on budget development. EPA reviews costs included in project budgets as part of the application/pre award process to ensure they conform with general principles of cost allowability:
 - A cost is eligible if it is permitted by statute, program guidance, or regulations.
 - A cost is reasonable if it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision was made to incur the cost.
 - Costs must be allocable: costs must be incurred either directly or indirectly to carry out the project and must be charged proportionately across all benefitting cost centers.
 - Costs must be necessary for the project being funded.

Allowable costs are:

- Adequately documented.
- Conform to limitations of laws, regulations, etc. and grant terms and conditions.
- Consistent with recipient’s policies/procedures – same factors apply to both federal and non-federal activities.
- Accorded to consistent treatment – a cost may not be assigned as direct if a similar cost incurred for the same purpose has been allocated as an indirect cost.

- Not included as a cost or used to meet a matching requirement for any other federal grant.
 - Consistent with generally accepted accounting principles
4. **Use the Project Narrative Attachment Form to submit the Workplan.** The workplan should include tasks, milestones, and expected environmental results or outcomes (See [Appendix E](#)).
 5. **Use the Other Attachments Form to submit the Current Indirect Cost Rate Negotiation Agreement.** If applicable, include Rate and Signature pages (i.e., Sections 1 and 3) of the approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement with application. **EPA Policy on Indirect Rate Costs (IDC) effective 10/1/2018, [RAIN-2018-G02](#).** Prior to drawing down EPA funds for IDCs, and/or using unrecovered IDCs as cost-share, recipients must have an approved rate and an EPA- approved budget that includes IDCs.
 - IDCs are those that are not readily identifiable with a particular activity but are necessary to the general operation of the recipient organization and the conduct of the proposed project (such as general administration expenses).
 6. **EPA Key Contacts Form (EPA Form 5700-4).**
 7. **Pre-Award Compliance Review Report (EPA Form 4700-4),** current form with authorized signature. See [Tips for Completing EPA Form 4700-4](#).
 8. **Use the Other Attachments Form to submit the Certification Regarding Lobbying (EPA Form 6600-06)** with authorized signature. All applicants, including Tribes, are required to submit this certification if the total federal dollar awarded to the applicant/recipient is greater than \$100,000 for the life of the grant.
 9. **Use the Other Attachments Form to submit the Disclosure of Lobbying Activities (Form SF-LLL),** with authorized signature attached with the grant application package. For all other applicants, form is required for reporting entity, whether subawardee or prime federal recipient, at the initiation or receipt of a covered federal action, or a material change to a previous filing, pursuant to Title 31 U.S.C Section 1352. Used by applicants to disclose lobbying activities that have been secured to influence the outcome of a federal grant action.

Accessing the Application Package

NOTE: Do not use the “SEARCH” bar located at the top right of the Grants.gov webpage to find Application Packages.

To locate Application Package:

1. Go to directly to the [funding opportunity](#) on Grants.gov.
2. In the “Package” tab, scroll down the page to locate Assistance Listing Number 66.202 (listed under the column heading “CFDA”) for the application package.

VIEW OPPORTUNITY



EPA-CEP-01
EPA Mandatory Grant Programs
Environmental Protection Agency

[← Back | Link](#)

Apply

Subscribe

SYNOPSIS

VERSION HISTORY

RELATED DOCUMENTS

PACKAGE

[Print Package List](#) ?

Select Grant Opportunity Package

PLEASE READ BEFORE APPLYING!

If you view and complete your application package using Grants.gov downloadable PDF forms, you MUST have Adobe Reader installed. You may receive a validation error using incompatible versions of Adobe Reader. To prevent a validation error, it is now recommended you uninstall any earlier versions of Adobe Reader and install the latest compatible version of Adobe Reader. If more than one person is working on the PDF forms, ALL applicants must be using the same Adobe Reader version. [Click for more information on Adobe Reader Compatibility.](#)

Opportunity Package(s) Currently Available for this Funding Opportunity:						
CFDA	Competition ID	Competition Title	Opportunity Package ID	Opening Date	Closing Date	Actions
66.001			PKG00213703		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.032			PKG00214049		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.034			PKG00214050		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.038			PKG00214051		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.040			PKG00214052		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.042			PKG00214046		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.121			PKG00214048		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.124			PKG00214043		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.125			PKG00214045		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.202			PKG00214047		10/04/2030	Preview Apply
66.418			PKG00214053		10/04/2030	Preview Apply

REMINDERS:

- Do NOT use the “SEARCH” bar located at the top right of the [Grants.gov](#) screen to find Application Packages. Follow the instructions above.
- Recipients must ensure appropriate role(s) and access in [Grants.gov Workspace](#) are assigned within recipient entity as applicable; each entity’s [EBiz point of contact \(POC\)](#) is the person that authorizes or assigns Grants.gov roles. Additional [information on Grants.gov role assignment](#) is available online.
- There are a series of automated emails generated by Grants.gov during the application submission process. See sample email below.
- Obtain a Tracking Number from Grants.gov Support technicians when contacting the [Grants.gov Support Center](#) for assistance. This Tracking Number is used to help ensure your issue(s) is fully addressed.

Please contact the [Grants.gov Support Center](#) by phone (1-800-518-4726) or email (support@grants.gov) for technical support or questions. Help is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, excluding federal holidays.

ALERT: It is important to read the automated emails generated by Grants.gov as the messages provide application status updates during the submission process. Below is a sample automated email indicating that an application has been sent to the funding agency with an assigned tracking number.

Sample Grants.gov Email – Application Sent To Funding Agency

From: DoNotReply@grants.gov
<DoNotReply@grants.gov> Sent: Tuesday, December 25, 2019 4:32 AM
To: Jane.Doe@happycamp.org
Subject: GRANT12345678 Grants.gov Agency Tracking Number Assignment for Application

Grantor agency has assigned the following Agency Tracking Number to your application:
e9466bf2-797a-4cfc-b013-7bb696001c1bGRANT12345678.

You will need the Agency Tracking Number when corresponding with the Grantor agency about your application.

Use the Grants.gov Tracking Number at Grants.gov to check your application's status and to review your Agency Tracking Number:

Type: GRANT
Grants.gov Tracking Number: GRANT12345678
DUNS Number: 9876543210000
AOR name: Jane Doe
Application Name: Clean Environment Grant Program
Opportunity Number: EPA-CEP-01
Opportunity Name: EPA Mandatory Grant Programs

Thank you.
Grants.gov

If you have questions, please contact the Grants.gov Contact Center: support@grants.gov 1-800-518-4726
24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Closed on federal holidays.

PLEASE NOTE: This email is for notification purposes only. Please do not reply to this email for any purpose.

Appendix E: Community Grants Workplan Contents/Outline

Name of Applicant and Project Title

Project Objective(s) and Need

Narrative, how project will resolve need/purpose.

Project Description

Narrative, maps, photographs, relevant design parameters etc. Clearly defined scope of work, outlining all activities to be performed under the grant; detailed description of the proposed project, summary of deliverables. Framework for managing the project, explanation of the approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner, evaluating performance and reporting progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes. How tasks/activities will be undertaken. The scope of work must be in conformance with the project description. Budget narrative that links the budget to workplan tasks activities and includes source(s) of non-federal cost share.

Milestone Schedule

Narrative or tabular depiction of each grant activity's estimated start and end dates, interim milestones, deliverables, and project completion. The length of the grant award project period should be consistent with the milestone schedule.

Environmental Results/Benefits

Narrative or tabular linkage of each grant activity with the applicable [EPA Strategic Plan goal and objective](#) (i.e. EPA's FY2022 – FY2026 Strategic Plan Goal 5: Ensure Clean and Safe Water for All Communities, Objective 5.1: Ensure Safe Drinking Water and Reliable Water Infrastructure), anticipated environmental results, anticipated environmental outputs, and anticipated environmental outcomes.

- **Outputs:** environmental activities, efforts, and/or associated work products related to environmental goals or objectives, that will be produced or provided over a period of time or by a specified date. Outputs should be well-defined and may be quantitative or qualitative but must be measurable during an assistance agreement funding period.
- **Outcomes:** the results, effects or consequences that will occur from carrying out an environmental program or activity that is related to an environmental or programmatic goal or objective. Outcomes should be well-defined to the maximum extent practicable, and may be environmental, behavioral, health-related, or programmatic in nature, must be quantitative, and may not necessarily be achievable within an assistance agreement funding period.

Workplan Requirements for Identifying Contractors

Contractual selection must comply with the competitive Procurement Standards set forth in [2 CFR 200.317 – 2 CFR 200.327](#). EPA's Contracts and Subawards solicitation clause provides more information about partnerships, and the Best Practice Guide for Procuring

Services, Supplies, and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements can assist community project recipients in complying with procurement requirements. In general, all procurement transactions for professional engineering services and construction contractors must include and be conducted in a manner that promotes fair and open competition from an adequate number of qualified sources. 2 CFR 200.320 indicates the specific methods of procurement to be followed and the circumstances under which each method can be used.

Workplan Requirements for Identifying Subrecipients

Any proposed subawards must comply with regulatory standards as implemented in [EPA's Subaward Policy](#). In almost all cases, for-profit firms and individual consultants are not proper subrecipients. Profit firms and individual consultants would more likely be considered contractors.

Appendix F: Grant Policies and Resources

Grants Management Training for Applicants and Recipients

- [EPA's online training courses](#) are free and are designed to introduce potential EPA grant recipients to key aspects of the entire grant lifecycle, from preparation of an application through grant closeout.
- Information on EPA Form 4700-4 is available online, see [Tips for Completing EPA Form 4700-4](#)

EPA Grant Policies

- [EPA grant policies](#) may affect how recipients manage and administer EPA assistance agreements.

Budget Development

- Community Grant recipients may refer to [Interim General Budget Development Guidance for Applicants and Recipients of EPA Financial Assistance](#) to learn more about cost eligibility and preparation of the budget component of the application package.

Selected Items of Cost

EPA POs and grant specialists review costs included in project budgets as part of the application. Allowability of costs is based on several factors specified in [2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E](#).

EPA's [Guidance on Selected Items of Cost for Recipients](#) provides information on the allowability of specific costs.

Environmental Review

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires evaluation of how federal grant actions may affect the quality of the environment. Under NEPA, environmental impacts must be considered before EPA can award the grant.

- The [Categorical Exclusion \(CATEX\) Checklist](#) provides information on assessing whether a project may be considered for a CATEX. EPA's list of actions that can be categorically excluded is contained within [40 CFR Part 6 Subpart B](#). EPA makes CATEX determinations based on its own regulations and can use information collected as part of another federal agency's NEPA process. Recipients having a CATEX determination resulting from another agency's NEPA review of their project may provide that information to EPA as part of any request for a CATEX.

The following tools may be used to support development of Environmental Information Documents (EIDs).

- The sample [EID Outline](#) provides optional format and content on what to include in an EID.
- The [Infrastructure Task Force Preliminary Engineering Report](#) provides a recommended format for preliminary engineering reports (PER) for use when planning drinking water and wastewater infrastructure.

Procurement

- [EPA's Best Practice Guide for Procuring Services, Supplies and Equipment Under EPA Assistance Agreements](#) describes the financial transactions covered by the competitive procurement requirements and other rules you must follow when awarding and administering EPA funded contracts.
- Community grant recipients must follow their own procurement procedures, which must be documented and comply with State, local or tribal laws and regulation as well as Federal laws and Uniform Grant Guidance (UGG) [procurement regulations](#). [Projects inclusive of](#) CWSRF-eligible activities, irrespective of whether such projects are co-funded with CWSRF funding, must comply with the procurement processes for architectural and engineering (A/E) services as identified in [40 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.](#), or an equivalent State requirement.

Davis Bacon

- The [Davis-Bacon Act](#) requires that all contractors and subcontractors performing construction, alteration, and repair (including painting and decorating) work under federal contracts in excess of \$2,000, pay their laborers and mechanics not less than the prevailing wage and fringe benefits for the geographic location. Personnel costs include salaries, wages, and allowable incentive compensation for recipient employees (i.e., who receive W-2 forms) who spend time working on the project and are not subject to Davis Bacon.

EPA's Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program

- EPA's [DBE Program](#) applies to all EPA Assistance Agreements and requires recipients who procure goods and/or services to: employ the good faith efforts, document their efforts and maintain DBE forms and other documentation from the prime contractor, and [report their procurement and DBE activities](#) even if there isn't anything to report.

Build America, Buy America (BABA)

- Recipients are required to ensure that procurement plans comply with [BABA](#) requirements prior to grants being awarded. Requirements call for all the iron, steel, manufactured products, and construction materials used in the project to be produced in the United States.

American Iron and Steel (AIS)

- The [AIS provision](#) requires recipients to use iron and steel products that are produced in the United States for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a public water system or treatment works. AIS requirements correspond to a subset of BABA requirements, therefore recipients in compliance with BABA are in compliance with AIS.

EPA Community Grants program

- The [EPA Community Grants](#) web page will be updated as new information becomes available.

Reporting waste, fraud, abuse, or other suspected violations of law

- The EPA Office of Inspector General is an independent oversight office charged with preventing and detecting [waste, fraud, and abuse](#) by EPA and U.S. Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigations Board employees, grantees, contractors, and others. It does this through [audits](#) and [investigations](#) of Agency programs and operations, often in response to complaints submitted to the [OIG Hotline](#) regarding alleged violations of law, needless spending, or intentional deception.
- Suspected waste, fraud, abuse, or other violations of law can be reported anonymously or confidentially to the [OIG Hotline](#) via phone at (888) 546-8740, [email](#), or online [form](#). Listen to this podcast to learn more about the [hotline](#).

Whistleblower Protection

- A [whistleblower](#) is a federal employee, an employee of a federal contractor, subcontractor, grantee, or subgrantee or personal services contractor who discloses what the individual believes to be evidence of a gross waste of federal funds, a substantial danger to public health or safety, or any of the following related to a federal contract or grant: gross mismanagement, abuse of authority, or other violation of law, rule, or regulation.
- Because of the important public service these individuals perform when they come forward, [whistleblower protection](#) laws prohibit reprisal against them, such as firing, demotion, or other discrimination, and protect the identities of those who make anonymous or confidential disclosures, such as via the [OIG Hotline](#). Learn more about Whistleblower Protection [here](#).