

State Water Infrastructure Authority

Meeting Date: July 15, 2026

Agenda Item H: Spring 2026 Application Round, Example Funding Scenarios, and Funding Decisions for Drinking Water and Wastewater Construction Projects (SRF/IIJA-EC)

Division of Water Infrastructure Staff Report

This report presents a preliminary funding scenario for the consideration of the State Water Infrastructure Authority (Authority). Subsequent updates and corrections to the application information and funding scenario (including application scores, ranking, potential funding amount, etc.) may occur and will be presented to the Authority during the meeting. Applications are selected for funding by the Authority during the meeting, and the Authority's selections are final.

Background

The Spring 2026 application round includes funds appropriated to the Water Infrastructure Fund established in G.S. 159G. This staff report presents information on the Spring 2026 application round for drinking water and wastewater applications to be funded from the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF), including the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) General Supplemental Funds and the IIJA State Revolving Fund (SRF) Emerging Contaminants funds (DWSRF-EC and CWSRF-EC) for construction. This information includes a summary of available funds and any limitation on awarding the funds, a summary of applications received, and the process staff used to apply funds in the funding scenario example presented to the Authority. Funding demand continues to exceed available funds.

During the Spring 2026 application round, it was anticipated that Viable Utility Reserve (VUR) grants would be available for funding a few construction and planning projects for local government units designated as Distressed. Asset Inventory and Assessment (AIA) and Merger/Regionalization Feasibility (MRF) applications were accepted only from local government units designated as Distressed since only VUR grants would have been awarded in this application round to planning projects. However, the state budget that was passed during the week of June 29, 2026, restricted the availability of those funds and no Viable Utility Reserve grant funding is available in this round. Consequently, the preliminary funding scenarios described in this agenda item exclude VUR grant funding.

Summary of Applications Received

Spring 2026 applications were due April 30, 2026. Excluding applications for the Community Development Block Grant-Infrastructure (CDBG-I) program, the Division received a total of 88 drinking water and wastewater construction applications, and 25 Asset Inventory and Assessment and Merger/Regionalization Feasibility VUR grant applications for which funding is no longer available. One wastewater application and five planning grant applications were incomplete and ineligible for consideration. An additional 27 unfunded Fall 2025 construction applications and three partially funded Fall 2025 planning applications were reconsidered as part of this round. A summary of the number of drinking water and wastewater applications considered in this staff report is shown

in Table 1. The funding requested for construction projects far exceeds the amount of available funds for this round, and no funding is available for planning grants.

Table 1. Number of Applications including Reconsiderations Considered for Funding^a						
Category	CDBG-I^b	Drinking Water	Wastewater	AIA^c	MRF^c	Total
Incomplete/Ineligible	4	0	1	3	2	10
Complete and Eligible Applications						
New applications	5	43	44	14	6	112
Fall 2025 Reconsiderations	0	14	13	2	1	30
Total Applications Considered	5	57	57	16	7	142
Funding Requested in Complete and Eligible Applications	\$13,000,000	\$894,850,751	\$725,564,224	\$3,449,656	\$1,756,800	\$1,638,621,431

^a Only projects considered as part of the Spring 2026 funding round are included in this table. Projects considered on a rolling basis are not part of this table or staff report.

^b CDBG-I applications are discussed in greater detail in Agenda Item G.

^c Though AIA and MRF applications are no longer considered for funding, their numbers are shown as part of the Spring 2026 application intake.

Table 2 shows a comparison of funding requested from complete and eligible applications (including Fall 2025 applications that were not funded or fully funded and are reconsidered in this round) and the amount of funding available from the sources above. Table 2 includes number of applications and funding availability from the CDBG-I program, which is covered in Agenda Item G. Table 2 also includes applications received for AIA/MRF programs and indicates funding available for those programs as \$0.

Table 2. Comparison of Funding Requested from Complete and Eligible Applications (including Fall 2025 Reconsiderations) and Amount of Funding Available

Application Type	No. of Apps.	Total Requests	Approximate Amount Available ¹				
Community Development Block Grant – Infrastructure (CDBG-I)	5	\$13,000,000	CDBG-I Grant: \$10.76M				
Drinking Water Projects	57	\$894,850,751	DWSRF Loan ¹ : \$92M	IIJA DWSRF-EC ² : \$5.129M	Viable Utility Reserve Grants: \$0M	State Reserve Loans: \$0M	State Reserve Grants: \$0M
Wastewater Projects	57	\$725,564,224	CWSRF Loan ¹ : \$125M	IIJA CWSRF-EC ² : \$2.587M			
Asset Inventory & Assessment Grants (AIA)	16	\$3,449,656					
Merger/Regionalization Feasibility Grants (MRF)	7	\$1,756,800					
Total	142	\$1,638,621,431	Approximately \$235.5M				

¹ Including Principal Forgiveness (PF).

² IIJA Emerging Contaminant funds in this staff report are for Construction projects only and are offered as 100 percent PF.

Spring 2026 Funds Available

This staff report does not include information about funding from CDBG-I grants¹ and rolling applications for the IIJA DWSRF-EC and IIJA CWSRF-EC for Evaluation/Assessment “Study” projects², the IIJA DWSRF-Lead Service Line Replacement funds³, and the CWSRF Decentralized Wastewater Treatment System Pilot Program funds⁴.

The following funds, described in this staff report, are available for the Spring 2026 Application Round:

- Clean Water State Revolving Funds (CWSRF) and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (DWSRF) are available to local government units (LGUs) and nonprofit water corporations (and investor-owned drinking water corporations for the DWSRF) in the form of low-interest loans and Principal Forgiveness (PF). The State Revolving Fund (SRF) amounts in this staff report include a portion of the IIJA General Supplemental funds for the CWSRF and DWSRF programs. Approximately \$11.6 million of the \$125 million of available CWSRF loans and \$14.3

¹ See Agenda Item G.

² See Agenda Item I.

³ See Agenda Item J.

⁴ See Agenda Item K.

million of the \$92 million available DWSRF loans can be provided as PF in this funding round to satisfy federal capitalization grant requirements.

DWSRF loans are capped at \$25 million per applicant per round, and CWSRF loans are capped at \$35 million per applicant per round. Applicants are limited to a maximum of \$200 million in debt in active projects under each funding source.

Federal requirements specify that at least ten percent of the annual CWSRF capitalization grant shall be used for eligible Green Projects, if applications are available. Federal requirements also specify that at least 15 percent of the DWSRF loans shall be used for providing funding assistance to small water systems, although North Carolina's Intended Use Plan (IUP) requires a minimum of 30 percent for this use. The Authority may consider the additional information provided in the wastewater project applications for determining funding commitments for the CWSRF. Funding decisions for the DWSRF must be based on the Priority Rating System (PRS).

- The IIJA funds for Emerging Contaminants (DWSRF-EC and CWSRF-EC), which are dedicated funds to address PFAS contamination, are described as separate funds. In this staff report, DWSRF-EC and CWSRF-EC funds available only for *construction* projects are included (see Agenda Item I for EC funds available for Evaluation/Assessment "Study" project). IIJA funds for DWSRF-EC and CWSRF-EC projects are available to LGUs and nonprofit water corporations (and investor-owned drinking water corporations for the DWSRF-EC) in the form of PF. The EC funds include a reserve of 50 percent of the available funds to support evaluation/assessment (i.e., "study" or planning) projects if there is enough demand for planning projects. IIJA DWSRF-EC funding is limited to \$5 million per applicant for construction projects across all federal grants from FY 2022 through FY 2026, starting on August 1, 2025. IIJA CWSRF-EC projects do not have funding limits but have a 50 percent reserve for evaluation/assessment projects.⁵

Projects that address PFAS contamination may be eligible this round for the IIJA Emerging Contaminants funds and other funding programs, such as the SRFs. The IIJA Emerging Contaminants funds have Priority Rating Systems that are separate from the Priority Rating Systems for other drinking water and wastewater construction projects approved by the Authority. Staff have provided funding spreadsheets prioritizing projects for regular SRF projects and EC-eligible projects.

Table 3 provides a summary of construction project applications meeting criteria previously identified by the Authority. The table does not provide information on all PRS line items.

⁵ The Division did not receive any IIJA CWSRF-EC construction projects during the Spring 2026 round.

Table 3. Summary of Project Applications by Characteristics and Receiving Specific Priority Rating System Points										
Project Type (excluding CDBG-I)	Parameter Type									
	Total	Local Government Unit Designated as Distressed	Consolidate a Non-Viable Utility ^a	Failing Infrastructure ^b	Rehab/Replace Old Infrastructure ^c	Provide Service to Disadvantaged Areas ^d	Address Enforcement Document ^e	Merger/ Regionalization ^f	Emerging Contaminants ^g	Resiliency ^h
Drinking Water	57	20	0	2	24	1	4	1	11	3
Wastewater	57	31	0	0	35	2	20	5	0	20
Total	114	51	0	2	59	3	24	6	11	23

^a Consolidate a Non-Viable Utility: successfully claimed Line Item 1.A of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW.

^b Failing Infrastructure: successfully claimed Line Item 1.B of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW.

^c Rehab/Replace Old Infrastructure: successfully claimed Line Items 1.C.1 or 1.D.1 of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW.

^d Provide Service to Disadvantaged Area: successfully claimed Line Item 1.E of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW. Does not include similar applications that successfully claimed Line Item 1.B (Failing Infrastructure) points instead.

^e Address Enforcement Document: successfully claimed Line Items 2.E.1 or 2.E.2 of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW.

^f Merger/Regionalization: successfully claimed Line Items 2.F.1 or 2.F.2 of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW.

^g Address Emerging Contaminants: successfully claimed Line Item 2.H.3 or 2.H.4 of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW. Only projects that are exclusively addressing Emerging Contaminants are eligible for IIJA Emerging Contaminants Funds.

^h Resiliency: successfully claimed one of Line Items 2.N.1 through 2.N.7 of the Construction PRSs for WW/DW.

Example Funding Scenario for SRF and IIJA EC Construction

The Authority may consider multiple funding scenarios. In the example funding scenario presented, applications are shown as receiving the best available funding for project applications, in priority order, that would satisfy the requirements and limitations stated above, until available funds are exhausted.

- The order of funding for construction is as follows:
 - Apply IIJA DWSRF-EC to eligible construction projects using the DWSRF-EC PRS, up to the limit of \$5 million per applicant from the FY 2022-FY 2026 IIJA DWSRF-EC cap grants, until all available EC funds in this round are exhausted.
 - Apply DWSRF and CWSRF Principal Forgiveness (up to an initial cap of \$500,000) and SRF loan funds to eligible projects until awarded funds meet SRF loan funds available in this round.

- Adjust recommendations to the DWSRF scenario to meet the minimum 30 percent loan assistance to small water systems. The proposed funding scenario meets the 30 percent small system reserve.
- Adjust recommendations to the CWSRF to meet the minimum ten-percent capitalization grant Green Project Reserve (GPR) loan assistance. The proposed funding scenario meets the 10 percent Green Project Reserve.
- Apply any additional available PF in \$500,000 increments to projects receiving SRF funds that qualify for PF, up to the Applicant's PF eligibility, starting with the highest-scoring application receiving SRF funds.
- Apply the rest of SRF loan and PF funds to the next eligible projects in priority order to fully utilize all available funds.

In the example funding scenario presented, two drinking water EC construction projects (\$5,841,120), 10 drinking water construction projects (\$91,843,148) and 17 wastewater construction projects (\$125,045,915) would receive loan and PF from the SRFs, totaling \$222,730,184 in funding assistance. Table 4 summarizes the example funding scenario.

Table 4. Example Funding Scenario for Spring 2026 Funding					
Project Types	Complete and Eligible Applications considered	Applications in example funding scenario	Potential SRF Principal Forgiveness (Including IJJA EC)	Potential SRF loans	Potential Total Funding
Drinking Water Construction (including EC)	57	12	\$20,467,811	\$77,216,457	\$97,684,268
Wastewater Construction (No EC application received)	57	17	\$11,080,540	\$113,965,375	\$125,045,915
Total	114	29	\$31,548,351	\$191,181,832	\$222,730,183

Project-Specific Notes for Applications in the Example Funding Scenario

Drinking Water Emerging Contaminants Construction Project Applications

- None of the applications received were incomplete and/or ineligible for consideration.
- There were seven complete and eligible applications for construction projects to address PFAS contamination in drinking water. Per the IUP, half of the DWSRF-EC funds are reserved for evaluation/assessment study projects until the Fall 2026 funding round.
- An EC application was submitted for the Town of Siler City for funding for Construction of PFAS Treatment. The Town of Siler City was merged with TriRiver Water in July 2025 and

TriRiver Water now owns and operates the system in Siler City. The Applicant is considered to be TriRiver Water in the funding scenario. TriRiver Water is eligible for up to \$5M in IIJA DWSRF-EC funding assistance.

- Three applications were bypassed for the City of Goldsboro, Fayetteville Public Works Commission, and Roanoke Rapid Sanitary District. All three were previously awarded \$5M of IIJA DWSRF-EC funds, which is the per-applicant cap for EC construction funding.
- The South Granville Water and Sewer Authority's (SGWASA) Post-filter PFAS treatment project (re-considered from Fall 2025 application round) was eligible for \$5 million but received only a partial award of \$4,158,880 in the Fall 2025 application round. This funding round, staff recommend an additional \$841,120 for SGWASA's project to award the \$5 million as eligible from the IIJA DWSRF-EC funds. This is \$711,950 above the available IIJA DWSRF-EC funding in this round, and would reduce funding availability in Fall 2026 by that amount, but would provide SGWASA the maximum IIJA DWSRF-EC funding, for which it is eligible.
- The City of Graham's Graham-Mebane WTP PFAS Improvement project previously received \$3,441,666 in IIJA DWSRF-EC funds and is eligible for a maximum of \$1,558,534 in additional funds. The application scores lower than the two applications in the funding range that would potentially be awarded all of the IIJA DWSRF-EC available funds in this round. The Authority may consider an alternate funding scenario of awarding the City of Graham \$1,558,534 to completely award the per applicant cap for EC-construction funding. If this scenario is considered, available EC funding for Fall 2026 will be reduced by \$1,558,534.

Drinking Water Project Applications

- No applications received were incomplete and/or ineligible for consideration.
- Ten (excluding EC) of the 57 eligible applications (18 percent) for drinking water construction project funding are recommended for funding from DWSRF.
- Nineteen out of 57 drinking water project applications (33 percent) were from LGUs designated as Distressed. Six of the applications from Distressed LGUs are shown in the funding range in this scenario.
- The last funded project, excluding IIJA DWSRF EC funding, is for the Town of Newport, which scored 48 points. Three other projects also scored 48 points and had the same Project Purpose points but lower Project Benefits points than the Town of Newport's application. According to the IUP, "applications will be ranked based on the following scores, in the following order: 1) total application score (points), 2) project purpose points, 3) project benefit points, and 4) affordability points". Hence, Newport's application ranked above other applications that scored 48 points.
- The City of Graham's Graham-Mebane WTP Reliability project is the only partially funded project shown in the funding scenario. The application requested \$28,028,000 and is shown as funded to the DWSRF per round funding limit of \$25,000,000 per applicant. This project previously received \$6,441,466 (\$3 million State Reserve Program [SRP] loan and \$3,441,466 in DWSRF IIJA EC funds).
- The Town of Seaboard's two applications were bypassed for funding in the example funding

scenario because they are not eligible for the minimum PF requested by the Applicant.

- The Town of Pilot Mountain applied for funding and indicated in the application that they would be willing to accept a loan. The application is in the funding range and the example funding scenario would offer nearly \$2 million in loans to the Town. However, the Division is uncertain of the Town's potential to accept a loan based on recent funding interactions.
- Nash County applied for funding to extend and connect homes in a disadvantaged area to its water system. It is unclear in the application if all of the homes are existing homes or proposed as new development. The DWSRF funds can only be used to connect existing homes to the water system. Due to awarding of specific PRS line item points that placed the application in the funding range, the Applicant will be required to ensure that 75% of the project funds will be used to provide service to existing homes in the disadvantaged area.
- After identifying all applications that qualify for SRF loan assistance and applying the initial \$500,000 PF cap (where eligible), additional PF funding was available. In accordance with the DWSRF IUP, the additional PF funding exceeding the \$500,000 cap would be awarded in \$500,000 increments up to the maximum PF eligibility of those projects, in priority order. For this funding round, six projects received additional PF exceeding the \$500,000 cap, up to \$3 million or the PF eligibility limit for the applicant.
- Six out of 10 applications proposed DWSRF funding assistance in this funding scenario are for small water systems, potentially awarding 43 percent of the DWSRF funding assistance (exceeding the minimum 30 percent small system reserve).

Wastewater Emerging Contaminants Construction Project Applications

- No applications were received for CWSRF-EC construction projects. Funding will be made available in the Fall 2026 funding round.

Wastewater Project Applications

- One application (Town of Lincolnton) received was incomplete/ineligible for consideration.
- Seventeen out of 57 eligible wastewater construction project applications (30 percent) are recommended for funding.
- Twenty-eight out of 57 wastewater project applications (49 percent) were from LGUs designated as Distressed. Nine of the applications from Distressed LGUs are shown in the funding range in this scenario.
- The Fayetteville Public Works Commission, Lift Station Electrical Upgrades is shown as funded with a \$14,350,000 SRF loan and meets the CWSRF Green Project Reserve requirement.
- The last project shown as funded in priority order (Fayetteville Public Work Commission's Rockfish Creek WRF Expansion) scores 49 points; all other applications score fewer than 49 points. The project receives \$16.5M of remaining funding available in this round. This project was previously funded with \$66M in SRF loan and \$3M in SRP loan. The Applicant is seeking an additional \$118M for phase 3 expansion. This funding award and previous funding awards

for this project are contingent upon the applicant receiving a permit to expand their wastewater facility from 21 MGD to 28 MGD and also meeting all nutrient load limits.

- Fayetteville Public Works Commission has two projects in the funding range and total funding proposed for both (\$30.85M) is under the \$35M CWSRF cap per applicant per round.
- The Town of Liberty, Sewer Rehabilitation project is shown as awarded a combination of SRF loan and principal forgiveness and is the highest scoring application (85 points).
- The Town of Bridgeton and the Town of Star's applications are bypassed as they are not eligible for the minimum PF requested. The Town of Warrenton and the Town of Love Valley's applications are also bypassed, as there is insufficient PF available in this funding round to satisfy their minimum PF requests.
- After identifying all applications that qualify for CWSRF loan assistance and applying the initial \$500,000 PF cap where eligible, additional PF funding was available. In accordance with the CWSRF IUP, the additional PF funding exceeding the \$500,000 cap would be awarded in \$500,000 increments up to the maximum PF eligibility of those projects, in priority order. For this funding round, additional PF exceeding the \$500,000 cap was available for 12 projects, up to \$1 million or the PF eligibility limit for the applicant.
- The Town of Elizabethtown, WWTP Rehab & Sewer Improvements is shown as awarded \$6,252,700 of SRF loan.
- Town of Milton's Grinding Toward Progress project is fully funded with SRF Principal Forgiveness.

Tables 5 through 7 detail the example funding scenario discussed above. These tables identify the projects that would potentially be funded under the example funding scenario. A full list of applications, including those that would not be funded under this scenario, are shown in the accompanying spreadsheets (Agenda Items H-1 through H-6). Application numbers in the tables below reference application numbers in the accompanying spreadsheets.

Other Funding Scenarios

Note that there are other funding scenarios which could be constructed, and staff can assist the Authority with other scenarios during the meeting.

All awards from the State Revolving Funds are contingent on the Division's receipt of the SRF funds from EPA.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend the Authority award funding as presented in the staff report and Agenda Items H-1 – H-6:

- For IJIA DWSRF EC: Application Nos. 1 and 5 (Agenda Item H-2)
- For Drinking Water: Application Nos. 1-5, 7, 8, 10-12 (Agenda Item H-4)
- For Wastewater: Application Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-18, 21 (Agenda Item H-6)

Table 5A. IJJA DWSRF-EC Construction Project Applications in the Example Funding Scenario A					
SWIA Sheet Appl. No.	Applicant Name	Project Name	County	Amount of Funding Requested	Potential IJJA DWSRF EC - Principal Forgiveness
1	TriRiver Water (applied as Siler City, Town of)	Siler City PFAS Treatment Construction	Wayne	\$23,722,800	\$5,000,000
5	South Granville Water & Sewer Authority	Post-Filter PFAS Treatment Improvements	Granville	\$21,868,000	\$841,120
Totals for IJJA DWSRF-EC Construction applications in the example funding scenario:				\$45,590,800	\$5,841,120

Table 5B. IJJA DWSRF-EC Construction Project Applications in the Example Funding Scenario B					
SWIA Sheet Appl. No.	Applicant Name	Project Name	County	Amount of Funding Requested	Potential IJJA DWSRF EC - Principal Forgiveness
1	TriRiver Water (applied as Siler City, Town of)	Siler City PFAS Treatment Construction	Wayne	\$23,722,800	\$5,000,000
5	South Granville Water & Sewer Authority	Post-Filter PFAS Treatment Improvements	Granville	\$21,868,000	\$841,120
6	Graham, City of	Graham, City of - Medium PFAS Treatment Improvements	Alamance	\$30,250,000	\$1,558,534
Totals for IJJA DWSRF-EC Construction applications in the example funding scenario:				\$75,840,800	\$7,399,654

Table 6. DWSRF Construction Project Applications in the Example Funding Scenario							
SWIA Sheet Appl. No.	Applicant Name	Project Name	County	Funding Requested	Potential DWSRF Principal Forgiveness	Potential DWSRF Loan	Total Potential Funding
1	Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	Brookwood Community Well #11 Rehab	Cumberland	\$998,500	\$0	\$998,500	\$998,500
2	Aqua North Carolina, Inc.	Brookwood Community Well #19 Rehab	Cumberland	\$998,500	\$0	\$998,500	\$998,500
3	Milton, Town of	Milton DeW- Water for Tomorrow	Caswell	\$4,703,600	\$3,000,000	\$1,703,600	\$4,703,600
4	Elm City, Town of	DW THM Removal System Project	Wilson	\$1,460,628	\$1,460,628	\$0	\$1,460,628
5	Spring Lake, Town of	Drinking Water System Improvements	Cumberland	\$1,554,750	\$1,166,063	\$388,687	\$1,554,750
7	Pilot Mountain, Town of	Pilot Mtn Water Line Replacement	Surry	\$4,999,800	\$3,000,000	\$1,999,800	\$4,999,800
8	TriRiver Water	Sanford-Pittsboro Water Transmission	Lee	\$25,000,000	\$0	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000
10	Nash County	Northern Nash Water System Phase 3	Nash	\$13,707,370	\$3,000,000	\$10,707,370	\$13,707,370
11	Graham, City of	Graham-Mebane WTP Reliability	Alamance	\$28,028,000	\$0	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000
12	Newport, Town of	WTP Improvements- Replacement Water Plant	Carteret	\$13,420,000	\$3,000,000	\$10,420,000	\$13,420,000
Totals for drinking water applications in the example funding scenario:					\$14,626,691	\$77,216,457	\$91,843,148

Table 7. CWSRF Construction Project Applications in the Example Funding Scenario

SWIA Sheet Appl. No.	Applicant Name	Project Name	County	Amount of Funding Requested	Potential CWSRF Principal Forgiveness	Potential CWSRF Loan	Total Potential Funding
1	Liberty, Town of	Liberty VUR SRF Sewer Rehabilitation	Randolph	\$3,500,000	\$875,000	\$2,625,000	\$3,500,000
2	River Bend, Town of	WW Collection System PSs and FM Impvts.	Craven	\$5,777,400	\$1,000,000	\$4,777,400	\$5,777,400
4	Hendersonville, City of	WWTF Flood Mitigation	Henderson	\$100,217,200	\$0	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000
5	Red Springs, Town of	Red Springs WWTP Rehabilitation	Robeson	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$5,000,000
7	Waynesville, Town of	WWTP Resiliency Upgrades	Haywood	\$5,443,600	\$0	\$5,443,600	\$5,443,600
8	Simpson, Village of	Wastewater Collection System Improvement	Pitt	\$10,136,125	\$1,000,000	\$9,136,125	\$10,136,125
9	Roseboro, Town of	2026 WWTP Improvements	Sampson	\$4,219,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,219,000	\$4,219,000
10	Spring Lake, Town of	Sewer System Improvements	Cumberland	\$3,442,550	\$1,000,000	\$2,442,550	\$3,442,550
11	Elizabethtown, Town of	WWTP Rehab & Sewer Improvements	Bladen	\$6,252,700	\$0	\$6,252,700	\$6,252,700
12	Parkton, Town of	Sewer System Rehabilitation Project	Robeson	\$3,679,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,679,000	\$3,679,000
13	Milton, Town of	Milton Grinding Toward Progress	Caswell	\$700,620	\$700,620	\$0	\$700,620
14	St. Pauls, Town of	Sewer System Rehabilitation	Robeson	\$2,889,880	\$1,000,000	\$1,889,880	\$2,889,880
15	East Bend, Town of	East Bend WWTP Renewal	Yadkin	\$2,797,500	\$1,000,000	\$1,797,500	\$2,797,500

Table 7. CWSRF Construction Project Applications in the Example Funding Scenario							
SWIA Sheet Appl. No.	Applicant Name	Project Name	County	Amount of Funding Requested	Potential CWSRF Principal Forgiveness	Potential CWSRF Loan	Total Potential Funding
16	Louisburg, Town of	Sanitary Sewer Pump Station Rehabilitation	Franklin	\$4,347,700	\$1,000,000	\$3,347,700	\$4,347,700
17	Yadkin Valley Sewer Authority	Pump Stations Resiliency Project	Wilkes	\$1,009,840	\$504,920	\$504,920	\$1,009,840
18	Fayetteville Public Works Commission	Lift Station Electrical Upgrades	Cumberland	\$14,350,000	\$0	\$14,350,000	\$14,350,000
21	Fayetteville Public Works Commission	Rockfish Creek WRF Expansion Phase 3	Cumberland	\$118,263,250	\$0	\$16,500,000	\$16,500,000
Totals for wastewater applications in the example funding scenario:					\$11,080,540	\$113,965,375	\$125,045,915