



CENTENNIAL CLEAN WATER FUND PROGRAM

WASHINGTON STATE WATER POLLUTION
CONTROL REVOLVING FUND PROGRAM

CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 319
NONPOINT SOURCE FUND PROGRAM

FINAL OFFER LIST
FY 2000

August 18, 1999
Publication No. 9920



Printed on Recycled Paper

The Department of Ecology is an equal opportunity agency and does not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, color, disability, age, religion, national origin, sex, marital status, disabled veteran's status, Vietnam Era veteran's status, or sexual orientation.

If you have special accommodation needs or require this document in an alternative format, please call Donna Lynch at (360) 407-7529. The TDD number is (306) 407-6006. E-mail can be sent to dlyn461@ecy.wa.gov.

August 18, 1999

**Re: Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund
FY 2000 Funding Cycle
Final Offer List**

To Interested Persons:

I am pleased to provide you with the enclosed Final Offer List for the Centennial Clean Water Fund (Centennial), Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund (SRF), and Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund (Section 319) programs for state fiscal year 2000 (FY 2000). The Final Offer List reflects where funding offers have been made.

Ecology received 133 applications during the FY 2000 application cycle. Of these, 122 were determined to be eligible for funding consideration and they were evaluated and prioritized. Public meetings were held at four locations throughout the state during the last two weeks in July, to provide information and answer questions regarding the process used for project selection. A thirty-day public review and comment period was also provided. Written comments were received on the FY 2000 Draft Offer and Applicant List, along with the SRF Draft Intended Use Plan. A responsiveness summary has been prepared and is included with the Final Offer List to identify how the written comments were addressed. The Final Offer List reflects all revisions or adjustments that have been made.

A total of 93 projects will receive funding offers totaling approximately \$64.5 million. Projects will address water quality issues associated with salmon habitat and riparian corridor improvements, wastewater treatment and collection needs, agricultural best management practices, watershed action plan implementation, stormwater treatment, wastewater reuse and reclamation, public education/involvement, and environmental water quality monitoring. Many projects will address multiple problem areas.

As you review the Final Offer List, please keep in mind that it reflects 11 projects that will be offered funds from multiple sources. Due to the eligibility of various project components and the availability of funding, a greater percentage of projects are receiving funding through a combination of funding sources. Where once infrequent, combination grant and loan agreements are more common and serve as an excellent way to address complex water quality problems and local funding needs.

The application period for the next Centennial/SRF/Section 319 funding cycle (FY 2001) is tentatively scheduled to begin on January 4, 2000, and end on February 29, 2000. I would encourage all potential applicants to begin identifying potential water quality problem areas and

Interested Persons
Page 2
August 18, 1999

related technical considerations. Potential applicants are encouraged to begin networking with other local government groups and state agencies as they consider options for developing project proposals and budgets. Ecology Water Quality Program staff in our four regional offices are available to assist when requested.

If you have questions about the Centennial program, please contact Kim McKee at (360) 407-6566. Questions about the SRF program can be directed to Brian Howard at (360) 407-6510 and questions for Section 319 can be directed to Dan Filip at (360) 407-6509.

Sincerely,

Megan White, P.E., Manager
Water Quality Program

MW:KM:tkr

RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY

FY 2000

Responsiveness Summary

Introduction

Ecology conducted a 30-day public comment period following the publication of the *Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Offer and Applicant List* on June 15, 1999. During the comment period agency staff held four informational public meetings (in Tumwater, Mount Vernon, Spokane, and Yakima). During and after the comment period, staff reviewed the *Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Offer and Applicant List* carefully and discovered a few minor errors and omissions. Also, 17 comment letters were received during the comment period. Staff carefully addressed all comments from applicants and from other interested parties. All issues identified by staff, applicants, or interested parties are addressed in this section, with the comment summarized first and the response following. Any resulting changes to the list are identified in the response.

Local Prioritization Process

The local prioritization process used during the FY 2000 application cycle was a pilot process, recommended to Ecology by an advisory committee. This committee convened to address changes in the grant and loan selection process used by Ecology. The committee was composed of representatives of local governments, tribes, special districts, and state and federal agencies. One of the committee's recommendations was that there should be some opportunity for local input into the grant and loan selection process. Based on their recommendations, Ecology staff developed a process for allowing local input.

Applicants in a given area who chose to be involved with the local prioritization process would work with other applicants and other local groups. They were expected to reach a consensus on the priority of all applications for funding in a given geographic area. The geographic area, or "local prioritization area," could be either a Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) or a county, with the applicant deciding which type of local prioritization area to choose. Representatives from five required groups had to be involved in the process. The five groups were counties, cities, Native American tribes, sewer and water districts, and conservation districts.

Applicants submitted the signatures and priority lists in the form of documents called "Statements of Agreed Priority." The Statements of Agreed Priority needed to have signatures from all organizations in each of the five required groups in the local prioritization area. The signatures indicated each group's concurrence (or at least lack of opposition) to all the priorities in the WRIA or county boundary area. The applicant would not be penalized for the absence of a signature from a required organization if substantive efforts to secure this signature were documented. Also, if there were no members of a particular class of organizations in the local prioritization area, Ecology did not expect a signature.

Applicants could receive up to 100 points (of the 1000 available) for projects that were part of a successful local prioritization process. Ecology staff provided guidance on the local prioritization process at four application workshops held in January, and written guidance was included in all application packets.

Following the April 16, 1999, submittal deadline for Statements of Agreed Priority, staff conducted an initial screening of all the Statements for completeness. It became readily apparent that few submittals strictly adhered to the original guidance.

Ecology staff consulted with the Financial Assistance Advisory Council on the issue. This group was convened to continue the work of the earlier committee. Members of the Council, in agreement with Ecology staff, recommended exercising some leniency in assigning points. The Council recommended that a single signature from each of the five required groups would be sufficient to receive full points. This meant that the top priority project in the area would receive 100 points, the second would receive 90, and so on. They also recommended that in situations where there was substantial compliance with the intent of the process, but one of the five required groups had no signatures, partial points should be given. However, projects in local prioritization areas receiving partial points would never receive more points than the lowest priority projects in local prioritization areas receiving full points. Because there was a local prioritization area with eight projects prioritized (with the lowest receiving 30 local priority points), this meant that the maximum number of points assigned was 20 for projects in local prioritization areas getting partial points. Ecology again reviewed the submittals and assigned full or partial points.

Ecology staff treated all applicants equally and all applications were processed consistently. Ecology staff explained the approach to the local prioritization process at the four public meetings held during the public comment period on the *Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Offer and Applicant List*.

Changes and Corrections to Draft List Initiated by Ecology

<p>Arlington, City of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00066 	<p>Comment: In assigning local prioritization points, Ecology inadvertently reversed the priority order of the Stormwater Funding Implementation Project with that of the Blackman Lake Education Project (FP00031).</p> <p>Response: Ecology decreased the local prioritization points shown on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> to 50 points and the average rating was revised to 490 points. This change does not affect the funding amount identified for this project.</p>
<p>Friends of Blackman Lake</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00031 	<p>Comment: In assigning local prioritization points, Ecology inadvertently reversed the priority order of the Blackman Lake Education Project with that of the city of Arlington's Stormwater Funding Implementation Project (FP00066).</p> <p>Response: Ecology increased the local prioritization points shown on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> to 60 points and the average rating was revised to 443 points. This change does not affect the funding amount identified for this project.</p>

Responses to Comments

<p>Adams Conservation District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00004 • FP00005 • FP00006 	<p>Comment: The District wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the local prioritization points assigned for the “Develop Water Quality Information System Project,” “Channel Stabilization/Temperature Reduction Project,” and the “Non-point Source Pollution Reduction Project.” The comment letter states that the district staff believe Ecology used the wrong local prioritization area for evaluating the local prioritization process. Further, they do not agree that they need a signature from a tribal group as there are no “fishing issues” in the county.</p> <p>Response: Ecology did use the wrong local prioritization area for the initial local prioritization point screening. The correct (Adams County) local prioritization area was noted and the Statement of Agreed Priority was again reviewed for required signatures. However, Ecology is aware that the Yakama Nation has ceded lands within the southern portion of Adams County and therefore a tribal signature was needed in order to receive full local prioritization points. Because a tribal signature was not provided, no change has been made to the local prioritization points awarded for these projects.</p> <p>Note: See comment from city of Ritzville and Ecology’s response.</p>
<p>Centralia, City of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00122 • FP00127 • FP00128 	<p>Comment: The city of Centralia wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the denial of funding for its three related proposed projects (Wastewater Treatment Property Acquisition, Belt Filter Press, and Wastewater Treatment Plant Design). The projects had been determined to be ineligible for funding due to the fact that they weren’t ready to proceed. The City’s position was that completion of environmental review is not a prerequisite to being approved for funding. Moreover, the City stated that the third project, Belt Filter Press, was not restricted to the proposed new facility and would, in fact, be used in the old facility then moved to the new one when it is complete. The City believes that this project should not be subject to the same prerequisites as the other two projects. Finally, the City also requested that the application be analyzed for financial hardship.</p> <p>Response: Ecology staff have reviewed the applications, met with city officials, and discussed the issue with management. While it is true that environmental review is not a specific prerequisite to being approved for funding, readiness to proceed is a prerequisite.</p> <p>Ecology staff agreed that the Belt Filter Press project was not restricted to the proposed new facility. Ecology has reviewed its initial eligibility determination and agrees that the Belt Filter Press project does not require a completed Environmental Impact Statement to proceed. The project is eligible for funding and for financial hardship considerations and has been added to the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> for a \$500,000 Centennial grant.</p> <p>However, for the Wastewater Treatment Property Acquisition and Wastewater Treatment Plant Design projects, environmental review is an issue related to readiness to proceed. Until the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project is complete and a notice of action is issued on the EIS, the project cannot go forward.</p>

	<p>Ecology allows 90 days after the close of the application period for submission of materials showing that prerequisites are met. The final EIS was not complete at that time. Therefore, Ecology maintains that the two funding proposals that were related to the new facility were not ready to proceed. The City is encouraged to complete the necessary prerequisites and re-apply in FY 2001 for the revised project scope of work.</p>
<p>Elma, City of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00114 	<p>Comment: The City wrote to inform Ecology that they have received funding from a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) for the Sewer Basin 3 Improvement Project and would like to change the project scope to address infiltration/inflow reduction work in a different basin.</p> <p>Response: The City is proposing a significant change to the project that was evaluated and ranked. Because the proposed project is now fully funded by CDBG, Ecology's proposed funding offer is withdrawn, and the applicant is advised to re-apply in FY 2001 for the revised project scope of work.</p>
<p>Island County Public Works Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00111 • FP00112 	<p>Comment: The Island County Public Works Department wrote to say that they were pleased that the project proposals for the Iverson Farm Acquisition and West Beach Lake Acquisition were proposed for SRF loan funding, and to address technical issues of clarification requested by staff.</p> <p>Response: The applicant has adequately addressed technical issues raised by the staff of Ecology's Northwest Regional Office. The information in the letter will be used by Ecology staff during the negotiation of a funding agreement. The project is offered funding, as requested, on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i>.</p>
<p>Jefferson County</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00042 	<p>Comment: The County Commissioners wrote to express concern that Ecology did not propose to fund the Surface Water Management Plan Phase 1 project. The letter expressed the belief of the Commissioners that Ecology prioritizes remediation over prevention. The County asked that the project proposal be reconsidered for funding.</p> <p>Response: Ecology agrees that prevention projects are important. Several of the questions on the Fiscal Year 2000 application were designed to give proposed prevention projects more weight in relation to remedial projects than they had in past years. In fact, Ecology has proposed funding a number of prevention-oriented projects. However, there is intense competition for limited grant funding. As a consequence, many valuable proposed projects do not end up being funded simply due to the limited funding, not due to the overall merit of the proposed projects.</p> <p>This project was evaluated under the same criteria as all other projects which were submitted this funding cycle and received too few points to be grant funded.</p>
<p>Kitsap Conservation District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00115 	<p>Comment: The District wrote to clarify technical issues related to the Burley Agricultural Pollution Correction project as requested by Ecology staff.</p> <p>Response: The applicant has adequately addressed technical issues raised by the staff of Ecology's Northwest Regional Office. The information in the letter will be used by Ecology staff during the negotiation of a funding agreement. The project is offered funding, as requested, on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i>.</p>

<p>Olympus Terrace Sewer District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FP00073 	<p>Comment: The District wrote that it is willing to proceed with the combination of \$311,644 in Centennial grant funds and \$688,256 of SRF loan funds as proposed on the draft offer list for its Open Channel UV Disinfection System project.</p> <p>Response: The District’s original request was for a \$500,000 grant and a \$500,000 loan. During the 30-day public review and comment period additional grant funds became available. Ecology is able to offer the District the amounts that were originally requested. A \$500,000 grant and a \$500,000 loan for the project are included on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i>.</p>
<p>Palouse Conservation District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FP00063 	<p>Comment: The District wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the local prioritization points assigned for the Palouse Stream Team Watershed Planning project. The comment letter references information provided by a Whitman County staff planner that there were no special districts in this local prioritization area.</p> <p>Response: The applicant chose to prioritize using Whitman County as its local prioritization area. Ecology did not make an interpretation error in reviewing signatures provided on the Statement of Agreed Priority submitted for this project as no water and sewer district signature was provided. The Steptoe Sewer District is located in Whitman County and their signature should have been included in order to receive full local prioritization points. Ecology regrets that there was confusion in local communications but the correct number of local prioritization points were assigned based upon the signatures which were provided.</p>
<p>Ritzville, City of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FP00034 	<p>Comment: The City wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the local prioritization points assigned for their Wastewater Treatment Facility project. The City believes, based upon discussions with Ecology, that the wrong local prioritization area may have been used for the local prioritization process.</p> <p>The City also wanted to inform Ecology that the total eligible project cost for the proposed Wastewater Treatment project has been revised and the grant amount is too high. The applicant asked that a reduction in the grant amount be made and this difference be provided through a loan.</p> <p>Response: Ecology did use the wrong local prioritization area for the initial local prioritization point screening. The correct (Adams County) local prioritization area was noted and the Statement of Agreed Priority was again reviewed for required signatures. Ecology is aware that the Yakama Nation has ceded lands within the southern portion of Adams County and therefore a tribal signature was needed in order to receive full local prioritization points. Because a tribal signature was not provided, no change has been made to the local prioritization points assigned to this project.</p> <p>Regarding the second part of the City’s request, Ecology has reduced the grant amount to \$1,674,250 and included a \$525,750 loan from the SRF on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> as requested by the City. The \$525,750 in grant funds will be available for other high priority water quality improvement projects on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i>.</p>

	Note: See comment from Adams Conservation District and Ecology’s response.
<p>Skagit County Public Works Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00075 • FP00084 	<p>Comment: The Department wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the local prioritization points assigned for the Samish Basin Water Quality Monitoring project and the Skagit County Loan Fund project.</p> <p>Response: Ecology did make an interpretation error in reviewing the signatures provided on the Statement of Agreed Priority which was submitted for these projects. A signature from the Skagit Systems Cooperative was submitted on behalf of three Native American tribes and therefore these projects meet all of the necessary signature requirements to receive full local prioritization points. Ecology increased the local prioritization points shown on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> to 90 points for the Samish Basin Water Quality Monitoring project and to 100 points for the Skagit County Local Loan Fund project. The average rating for these projects was revised to 595 and 551 points, respectively. As funding had been proposed for these projects on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Offer and Applicant List</i>, funding for both projects is identified on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i>.</p>
<p>Spokane County Conservation District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00081 • FP00080 • FP00082 • FP00083 	<p>Comment: The District wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the local prioritization points assigned for the Little Spokane Watershed Plan Development project, the Alternative Agricultural Systems project, the Spokane County Minimum Tillage Assistance project, and the Rattlers Run Sub-Watershed Implementation project.</p> <p>Response: In the case of FP00081, the Little Spokane Watershed Plan Development project, prioritized within WRIA 55, Ecology did make an interpretation error in reviewing the signatures provided on the Statement of Agreed Priority submitted for this project. A county signature had been provided and therefore this project meets all of the necessary signature requirements to receive full local prioritization points. Ecology increased the local prioritization points shown on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> to 100 points and the average rating was revised to 537 points. This change does not affect the funding amount identified for this project.</p> <p>Ecology did not make an interpretation error in reviewing the signatures provided on the Statement of Agreed Priority submitted for the other three projects, those in WRIA 56. For the prioritization in this WRIA, no water and sewer district signature was provided. The correct number of local prioritization points were assigned based upon the signatures which were provided. No change has been made in the number of local prioritization points assigned for these projects.</p>
<p>Spokane County Conservation District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00082 	<p>Comment: The District wrote to ask Ecology for additional \$500,000 in SRF loan funding for the Alternative Agricultural Systems Assistance Program. At the Ecology public meeting in Spokane, the applicant understood that more loan funds were available than had been requested by applicants. As there had been a stronger than anticipated local response to the proposed program, the applicant requested an additional \$500,000 in SRF loan funding.</p> <p>Response: Because of the limited demand for SRF loan funds, Ecology staff believe an increase of \$500,000 is acceptable. The project is shown on the <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Offer and Applicant List</i>, and the applicant's request to the increase the loan</p>

	<p>amount to \$1,500,000 is consistent with the project scope of work. The <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> reflects this change, which does not impact funding for any other project.</p>
<p>Thurston Conservation District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00117 • FP00118 • FP00119 	<p>Comment: The District wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the local prioritization points assigned for the Henderson Inlet Watershed Implementation Program, Horse Farm Implementation and Education project, and the Building Community Salmon Enhancement Effort project.</p> <p>The District also expressed concern over the perception that any entity could negate a consensus simply by not being involved.</p> <p>Response: Ecology did not make an interpretation error in reviewing the signatures provided on the Statement of Agreed Priority submitted for these projects. No tribal signature was included. The correct number of local prioritization points were assigned based upon the signatures provided. No change has been made in the number of local prioritization points assigned for these projects.</p> <p>The problem of entities refusing to be involved in the process was covered in the explanatory materials related to local prioritization. Documentation of a substantive effort to get an agency, tribe, or district involved in the process would be an acceptable substitute for the signature.</p>
<p>Washington State University</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00057 	<p>Comment: The University wrote to ask Ecology to revise the amount offered from \$14,014 to \$104,014, which was what the University had requested.</p> <p>Response: The <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Draft Offer and Applicant List</i> showed the incorrect amount. The <i>Fiscal Year 2000 Final Offer List</i> shows the correct amount. Ecology apologizes for the oversight.</p>
<p>Whitman County Department of Public Works</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FP00063 	<p>Comment: The Department wrote to ask Ecology to reconsider the local prioritization points assigned for the Palouse Stream Team Watershed Planning project. The comment letter references the County's claim that there are no independent sewer districts within the boundaries of the South Fork Palouse River watershed and that the Steptoe Sewer District is outside of this watershed.</p> <p>Response: The applicant chose to prioritize using Whitman County as its local prioritization area. Ecology did not make an interpretation error in reviewing signatures provided on the Statement of Agreed Priority submitted for this project, as no water and sewer district signature was provided. Signatures from the five required groups were required from within the local prioritization area and not just from within a sub-boundary. The Steptoe Sewer District is located in Whitman County and their signature should have been included in order to receive full local prioritization points. Ecology guidance documents and public presentations contained no references to using a sub-WRIA boundary to meet this requirement. Ecology regrets that there was confusion in the local communications but the correct number of local prioritization points were assigned based upon the signatures which were provided.</p>

FINAL OFFER LIST

FY 2000

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00EPG01	King County West Point WWTP Secondary Upgrade					\$12,500,000 (G) Centennial			1
FP00EPG02	Spokane County/City Spokane Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer					\$5,000,000 (G) Centennial			1
FP00SP01	Mason County North Bay - Case Inlet Wastewater Facilities					\$6,559,688 (L) SRF	20	0%	21
FP00038	Connell City of Wastewater Treatment Plant Replacement				\$1,312,500	\$3,600,000 (G) Centennial			2
FP00069	Whatcom County Public Works Riparian Restoration and Water Quality	1	754	90	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) 319			3, 4, 5
FP00115	Kitsap Conservation District Burley Agricultural Pollution Correction Project	2	716	100	\$249,739	\$249,739 (G) 319			3, 6, 27
FP00076	Lummi Indian Business Council Historic Scale Logjams Phase 2	3	695	60	\$249,812	\$249,812 (G) 319			3, 5
FP00078	Lummi Indian Business Council North Fork Nooksack Sediment Reduction	4	693	80	\$249,749	\$249,749 (G) 319			3, 6
FP00051	Public Utility District No. 1 of Stevens County Echo Estates Community Sewer System Rehabilitation	5	688	80	\$153,752	\$153,752 (G) Centennial			7

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00050	Public Utility District No. 1 of Stevens County Addy Public Sewer System	6	683	100	\$216,193	\$100,000 (G) SRF \$116,193 (G) Centennial			9, 10
FP00129	Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe Dungeness Sediment Reduction for Fish/Shellfish	7	675	100	\$187,500	\$187,500 (G) Centennial			5
FP00088	Whatcom Conservation District South Fork 2000	8	664	70	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) 319			3, 4, 5, 6
FP00093	Wahkiakum Conservation District Design and Implementation Assistance Project	9	625	100	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) 319			3, 5
FP00108	Ferry Conservation District Kettle Tri-Watershed Project (KTWP)	10	624	100	\$236,869	\$236,869 (G) Centennial			4, 5, 6
FP00060	Stevens County Conservation District Restoring Colville River Watershed Health	11	620	90	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) 319			4, 5, 6
FP00072	Okanogan Conservation District Okanogan Irrigation Water Management	12	617	60	\$249,670	\$249,670 (G) Centennial			5
FP00012	Goldendale City of Goldendale Wastewater Facility Improvements	13	617	100	\$500,000	\$500,000 (L) SRF	20	4%	19

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00099	Bremerton City of Callow CSO Design - Final Priorities	14	613	70	\$575,000	\$575,000 (L) SRF	20	4%	15, 19
FP00018	Washington State University Cooperative Extension Sustainable Small Farms Incubator/Demonstration	15	608	90	\$128,368	\$128,368 (G) Centennial			6
FP00047	Okanogan County Methow Watershed Hydrologic Model	16	603	70	\$55,500	\$55,500 (G) Centennial			
FP00037	North Mason School District Lower Hood Canal Community Watershed Stewardship Program	17	602	80	\$150,000	\$18,750 (G) 319			11
FP00065	South Yakima Conservation District Irrigation Drain Water Quality Improvement	18	597	0	\$186,000	\$186,000 (G) 319			5
FP00075	Skagit County Public Works Department Samish Basin Water Quality Monitoring Project	19	595	90	\$187,500	\$187,500 (G) Centennial			5, 27
FP00121	Shelton City of Basin 2 Sewer Rehabilitation Design	20	587	90	\$155,000	\$155,000 (L) SRF	7	0%	12, 19
FP00028	Snohomish County Surface Water Management Quilceda/Allen Watershed Citizen Action Program	21	586	90	\$63,575	\$63,575 (G) 319			4, 5

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00077	Lummi Indian Business Council Road Sediment Reduction Effectiveness Monitoring	22	585	50	\$160,600	\$160,600 (G) Centennial			5, 6
FP00098	Bremerton City of Bremerton CSO Reduction Plan Update	23	573	90	\$500,000	\$245,000 (L) SRF \$191,250 (G) Centennial	20	4%	13, 15
FP00100	Bremerton City of Cooperative Approach to CSO Reduction	24	572	50	\$150,000	\$150,000 (G) Centennial			
FP00071	Okanogan Conservation District Okanogan Water Quality Monitoring	25	570	80	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) Centennial			5
FP00044	Mason County Health Services Lower Hood Canal Pollution Source Identification Project	26	569	70	\$56,100	\$56,100 (G) Centennial			5
FP00130	Clallam County State of the Waters: Clallam County	27	567	100	\$106,595	\$106,595 (G) Centennial			5
FP00126	Issaquah City of Issaquah Basin Watershed Community Link	28	566	5	\$44,588	\$44,588 (G) Centennial			5
FP00097	Kitsap County Department of Public Works Kitsap Stormwater Consortium Education Project	29	562	60	\$29,000	\$29,000 (G) Centennial			

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00068	Kittitas Reclamation District Cooperative Water Quality Monitoring Program	30	553	5	\$139,170	\$139,170 (G) Centennial			5
FP00043	Chelan County Department of Public Works Lake Chelan Basin Stormwater Management Plan	31	551	100	\$51,450	\$51,450 (G) Centennial			
FP00084	Skagit County Skagit County Local Loan Fund	32	551	100	\$700,000	\$700,000 (L) SRF	20	4%	19, 27
FP00019	Roza-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control Inventory On-Farm Irrigation Practices	33	543	0	\$11,138	\$11,138 (G) Centennial			
FP00106	Wollochet Harbor Sewer District Sanitary Sewer System Improvements	34	541	5	\$1,820,000	\$350,000 (L) SRF \$1,470,000 (G) Centennial	20	0%	8, 10, 13
FP00081	Spokane County Conservation District Little Spokane Watershed Plan Development	35	537	100	\$145,743	\$145,743 (G) Centennial			5, 18, 27
FP00125	Issaquah City of Issaquah Creek Bank/Habitat Enhancement	36	536	5	\$65,250	\$65,250 (G) Centennial			4, 5
FP00049	Kittitas City of Kittitas Wastewater Treatment Facility Upgrade	37	535	20	\$230,000	\$230,000 (G) Centennial			7, 10

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00017	Twisp Town of Construction of Wastewater Treatment Improvements	38	530	100	\$2,500,000	\$375,000 (L) SRF \$2,125,000 (G) Centennial	20	0%	8, 10, 13, 14
FP00010	Benton Conservation District Yakima River Water Quality Improvement Program	39	528	5	\$182,316	\$182,316 (G) Centennial			5, 6
FP00009	Benton Conservation District Endangered Species Habitat Improvement Project	40	519	5	\$245,948	\$245,948 (G) Centennial			6
FP00087	Buckley City of Wastewater Improvement Project (Phase 5)	41	518	0	\$331,140	\$331,140 (G) Centennial			7, 16
FP00070	Tieton Town of Water Reclamation Facility	42	513	0	\$1,071,000	\$1,071,000 (G) Centennial			10
FP00131	Mason Conservation District Chehalis Watershed Restoration Project	43	510	100	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) Centennial			4, 6
FP00021	Roza-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control Hydromet Station and Ramp Flume	44	506	0	\$25,000	\$25,000 (G) Centennial			5
FP00030	South Yakima Conservation District Sulphur Creek BMP Evaluation	45	506	0	\$51,750	\$51,750 (G) 319			5
FP00079	Eastern Klickitat Conservation District Healthier Water Through Conservation Farming	46	503	0	\$10,170	\$10,170 (G) Centennial			5, 6

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00127	Centralia City of Belt Filter Press	47	502	90	\$500,000	\$500,000 (G) Centennial			8, 27
FP00020	Roza-Sunnyside Board of Joint Control Drain Inventory for Buffer Zones	48	501	0	\$120,750	\$120,750 (G) Centennial			4, 5, 16
FP00095	Confederated Tribes of the Colville Indian Reservation Owhi Watershed Restoration Project	49	499	50	\$54,271	\$54,271 (G) Centennial			4, 6
FP00116	Chehalis Basin District Alliance Chehalis Basin Dairy Implementation	50	499	70	\$135,750	\$135,750 (G) Centennial			6, 16
FP00120	Lewis County Water District No. 2 Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements	51	499	100	\$1,000,000	\$550,150 (L) SRF \$449,850 (G) Centennial	20	0%	7, 13, 14
FP00048	Snohomish Conservation District Small Farm Water Quality Improvements in WRIA 7 (Snohomish)	52	493	80	\$141,923	\$141,923 (G) Centennial			5, 6
FP00066	Arlington City of Stormwater Funding Implementation	53	490	50	\$37,500	\$37,500 (G) Centennial			
FP00090	North Bend City of North Bend Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 2	54	490	0	\$3,268,309	\$2,486,884 (L) SRF \$493,478 (G) Centennial	20	4%	13

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00104	Island County Public Works Island County Watershed Implementation Actions	55	488	20	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) Centennial			5
FP00035	Okanogan City of Wastewater Treatment Improvements Design and Construction	56	486	90	\$918,000	\$499,000 (L) SRF \$419,000 (G) Centennial	20	4%	7, 13
FP00102	Darrington Town of Wastewater Collection, Treatment, and Disposal Design	57	478	100	\$759,923	\$759,923 (L) SRF	20	4%	19
FP00041	Clallam Conservation District Sequim Bay/Jimmy-Come-Lately Creek & Estuary Restoration	58	477	20	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) Centennial			4, 6
FP00033	Leavenworth City of Leavenworth Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade	59	471	5	\$3,141,000	\$2,301,000 (L) SRF \$840,000 (G) Centennial	20	0%	8, 13, 14
FP00094	Lakewood City of Steilacoom Lake Restoration Expanded Study	60	462	20	\$175,000	\$175,000 (G) Centennial			5
FP00008	Lincoln County Conservation District Upper Crab Creek Watershed, Part 2	61	462	100	\$169,688	\$169,688 (G) Centennial			5
FP00105	Pacific County Grayland Cranberry Best Management Practices	62	450	10	\$225,000	\$225,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00046	Lewis County On-Site Repair Financial Assistance Program	63	449	30	\$110,000	\$110,000 (L) SRF	14	3.2%	19
FP00123	Washington Trout Snoqualmie Sediment and Scour Analysis	64	445	0	\$38,766	\$38,766 (G) 319			5
FP00034	Ritzville City of Wastewater Treatment Facility	65	444	20	\$2,200,000	\$525,750 (L) SRF \$1,674,250 (G) Centennial	20	4%	13, 27
FP00107	Long Beach City of Long Beach WWTP Upgrade Phase 1	66	443	0	\$1,000,000	\$500,000 (L) SRF \$500,000 (G) Centennial	20	4%	7, 13
FP00031	Friends of Blackman Lake The Blackman Lake Education Project	67	443	60	\$4,500	\$4,500 (G) 319			
FP00128	Centralia City of Wastewater Treatment Final Design	68	442	60	\$3,500,000	\$0			17, 27
FP00057	Washington State University Whitman County Restoration and Education	69	441	5	\$104,014	\$104,014 (G) Centennial			4, 27
FP00117	Thurston Conservation District Henderson Inlet Watershed Implementation Program	70	437	10	\$221,125	\$221,125 (G) Centennial			4, 5, 6, 27
FP00055	Chehalis City of Chehalis Water Effects Ratio Study	71	436	80	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) Centennial			5

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00114	Elma City of Sewer Basin 3 Improvement Project	72	430	20	\$602,500	\$0			27
FP00085	Lacey City of 7th Avenue Stormwater Facility Planning	73	424	20	\$150,000	\$150,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19
FP00058	San Juan County Conservation District Wetland and Riparian Protection Project	74	418	5	\$37,500	\$37,500 (G) Centennial			
FP00133	Adopt-A-Stream Foundation Culvert Identification and Assessment	75	417	70	\$131,943	\$131,943 (G) 319			
FP00122	Centralia City of Wastewater Treatment Property Acquisition	76	411	50	\$2,500,000	\$0			17, 27
FP00053	Lewis County Conservation District Lewis County Poultry Nutrient Management	77	411	40	\$250,000	\$250,000 (G) Centennial			5, 6
FP00111	Island County Public Works Iverson Farm Acquisition	78	410	5	\$521,000	\$521,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19, 27
FP00045	Chehalis River Council Shade The Chehalis	79	410	5	\$72,658	\$0			20
FP00029	Island County Health Department On-Site Repair Financial Assistance Program	80	407	5	\$300,000	\$300,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00013	Franklin Conservation District Columbia Basin Crop and Water Quality Monitoring	81	402	10	\$197,072	\$197,072 (G) Centennial			5
FP00112	Island County Public Works West Beach Lake Acquisition (AKA Swantown Lake)	82	394	5	\$408,200	\$408,200 (L) SRF	5	0%	19, 27
FP00092	Cowlitz Conservation District "Local" Involvement in Resource Issues	83	393	0	\$247,125	\$247,125 (G) Centennial			5
FP00110	Island County Public Works Glendale Creek Restoration	84	390	5	\$645,000	\$645,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	4, 5, 19
FP00073	Olympus Terrace Sewer District Open Channel UV Disinfection System	85	385	60	\$1,000,000	\$500,000 (L) SRF \$500,000 (G) Centennial	15	4%	7, 13, 27
FP00006	Adams Conservation District Nonpoint Source Pollution Reduction Project	86	383	10	\$200,625	\$0			27, 28
FP00056	Kittitas Water District #6 KCWD #6 Comprehensive Sewer Plan	87	381	0	\$65,000	\$0			28
FP00074	Kennewick City of Ultra Violet Disinfection Facility	88	381	0	\$416,500	\$0			23
FP00005	Adams Conservation District Channel Stabilization/Temperature Reduction Project	89	376	5	\$168,750	\$0			27, 28

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00080	Spokane County Conservation District Rattlers Run Sub-Watershed Implementation Project	90	370	20	\$182,693	\$0			23, 27
FP00025	Whitman Conservation District Water Quality Awareness	91	366	5	\$30,961	\$0			23
FP00067	Snohomish Parks and Recreation Department Northwest Stream Center Exhibits/Displays	92	364	5	\$234,375	\$0			23
FP00059	Spokane City of CSO Basin Planning #6, #34, #12, #15, #33 A-D	93	360	5	\$1,353,345	\$1,353,345 (L) SRF	15	3.2%	19
FP00036	Clinton Water District Clinton Comprehensive Sewer Plan	94	357	10	\$45,000	\$0			23
FP00039	Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District On-Site Sewage Operation & Maintenance	95	354	80	\$57,000	\$0			23
FP00011	Benton Conservation District Glade Creek Watershed Project	96	352	5	\$51,600	\$0			23
FP00002	Chelan-Douglas Health District On-Site Septic System Replacement Assistance	97	351	100	\$100,000	\$100,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19
FP00054	King County Long-Term Effectiveness of Sand-Filters	98	351	20	\$225,000	\$0			23

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00063	Palouse Conservation District Palouse Stream Team Watershed Planning	99	350	10	\$44,813	\$0			23, 27
FP00119	Thurston Conservation District Building Community Salmon Enhancement Effort	100	347	5	\$110,700	\$0			23, 27
FP00007	Cowiche Sewer District Wastewater Treatment Plant Construction	101	346	0	\$1,500,000	\$0			29
FP00113	Cle Elum City of Regional Wastewater Facilities Plan	102	340	10	\$333,000	\$333,000 (L) SRF	20	4%	19
FP00040	Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District Local Loan Program (On-Site Repairs)	103	338	40	\$300,000	\$300,000 (L) SRF	5	2.1%	19
FP00118	Thurston Conservation District Horse Farm Implementation and Education	104	337	5	\$153,200	\$0			23, 27
FP00101	Ocean Shores City of Comprehensive Stormwater Plan Update	105	335	5	\$120,000	\$0			29
FP00083	Spokane County Conservation District Spokane County Minimum Tillage Assistance	106	327	10	\$500,000	\$500,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	6, 19, 27

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00023	Washington State University - WSU Puyallup WATERshed Institute	107	326	0	\$182,053	\$0			23
FP00096	Thurston County On-Site Hardship Loans	108	309	5	\$100,000	\$100,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19
FP00082	Spokane County Conservation District Alternative Agricultural Systems Assistance Program	109	308	5	\$1,000,000	\$1,500,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19, 27
FP00089	Edmonds City of Perrinville Creek Streambank Stabilization	110	307	10	\$240,000	\$0			28
FP00064	Soap Lake City of Sewer Treatment System Improvements	111	307	0	\$295,000	\$295,000 (L) SRF	5	0%	19
FP00032	Seattle/King County Department of Public Health On-Site Sewage System Monitoring Program	112	284	0	\$125,250	\$0			23
FP00042	Jefferson County Public Works Surface Water Management Plan, Phase 1	113	282	0	\$26,250	\$0			23, 27
FP00014	South Columbia Basin Irrigation District Water Quality Monitoring Program Development	114	280	5	\$59,868	\$0			29
FP00052	Rainier Town of Rainier Comprehensive Sewer Plan	115	277	0	\$75,000	\$0			23

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00124	Orting City of Orting Comprehensive Stormwater Plan	116	276	0	\$30,000	\$0			23
FP00062	Palouse Conservation District Union Flat Water Quality and BMP Assessment	117	263	5	\$101,814	\$0			23
FP00024	Whitman Conservation District Chemfallow Cost Share	118	261	20	\$165,000	\$0			23
FP00091	Pend Oreille Conservation District Natural Resources Data Service Center	119	247	0	\$29,250	\$0			23
FP00026	Whitman Conservation District Watershed Inventory	120	207	5	\$61,080	\$0			23
FP00004	Adams Conservation District Develop Water Quality Information System	121	182	5	\$150,000	\$0			23, 27
FP00003	Lynden City of Double Ditch Creek Realignment	122	139	40	\$26,250	\$0			23
FP00001	Bayview Beach Water District Safe Drinking Water Construction Project			0	\$340,000	\$0			26
FP00061	Blaine City of Wastewater Overflow Mitigation Program			0	\$837,000	\$0			26

FY 2000 Centennial Clean Water Fund/Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund/Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund

Final Offer List

8/18/99

Application Number	Applicant Name/Project Title	Overall Project Rank	Average Rating	Local Prioritization Points*	Funds Requested	Funds Offered/Funding Program	Loan Terms In Years	Loan Interest Rate	Footnotes
FP00109	Coupeville Town of Wastewater Treatment Plant			0	\$190,000	\$0			26
FP00086	Des Moines City of Barnes Creek Biofiltration Wetland/Detention Facility			0	\$1,000,500	\$0			26
FP00015	Kitsap County Public Works Central Kitsap WWTP Centrifuge Installation			0	\$3,367,000	\$0			26
FP00103	Klickitat County Dallesport Wastewater Facilities Project			0	\$7,049,000	\$0			26
FP00022	Quincy City of Water Reclamation Facility Design			0	\$630,000	\$0			26
FP00016	San Juan County Public Works - Solid Waste Solar Aquatic Septage Treatment Facility			0	\$350,000	\$0			26
FP00132	Sumner City of Sumner WWTP Upgrade/Expansion Design			0	\$800,000	\$0			26
FP00027	Whitman Conservation District No-Till Project			0	\$126,021	\$0			26

* Included in Average Rating.

Note: Centennial = Centennial Clean Water Fund; SRF = Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund; 319 = Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Fund; G = Grant; L = Loan.

FOOTNOTES:

1. The applicant is identified for extended grant payments in accordance with RCW 70.146.075 Extended Grant Payments and Section 306 of the 1999 Washington State Legislature Capital Budget.
2. The applicant is identified for funding in Section 306 of the 1999 Washington State Legislature Capital Budget.
3. The amount identified reflects consideration as a Section 319 Unified Watershed Assessment project.
4. The project includes implementation of bioengineered solutions and/or riparian revegetation components. Both of these efforts require a public easement in order to be grant eligible. Ecology design approval is also required for bioengineered solutions prior to implementation.
5. The project includes a component for water quality monitoring. Preparation of a Quality Assurance Project Plan, utilization of an Ecology accredited environmental laboratory, and electronic submittal of data will be required.
6. The project includes implementation of best management practices. Implementation of practices on private property without a public easement are loan eligible only.
7. The applicant requested funds for Step 4 (Design/Construction) consideration. Project design is loan eligible only and must be completed and approved by Ecology within one year of the date the Final Offer List is made public and prior to the initiation of construction activities.
8. The applicant requested that Ecology conduct a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was conducted and Ecology has determined that financial hardship can be shown. Funds identified include supplemental hardship grant funds.
9. The applicant requested that Ecology conduct a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was conducted and Ecology has determined that financial hardship can be shown. The amount identified includes a SRF grant from the federal Hardship Grants Program for Rural Communities. This amount is identified on the FY 2000 Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Final Intended Use Plan.
10. The applicant is identified for funding in accordance with Section 306 of the 1999 Washington State Legislature Capital Budget which directs Ecology to give priority consideration to water quality facility grants for communities: a) with populations less than 5,000; b) subject to a regulatory order from the Department of Ecology for noncompliance with water quality regulations; c) where design work has been completed; and d) where a local match results from reasonable water quality rates and charges.

FOOTNOTES CONTINUED:

11. The amount identified has been adjusted to reflect only the educational components of the project due to concerns raised about the jurisdictional authority of the applicant to successfully address the other project components.
12. The applicant requested that Ecology conduct a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was conducted and Ecology has determined that financial hardship has been demonstrated. The applicant is identified for SRF financial assistance at zero percent interest with a term of 7 years.
13. The amount identified includes both Centennial and SRF funding. The loan offer is identified on the FY 2000 Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Final Intended Use Plan.
14. The applicant requested that Ecology conduct a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was conducted and Ecology has determined that financial hardship can be shown. The applicant is identified for SRF financial assistance at zero percent interest with a term of 20 years.
15. The applicant requested that Ecology conduct a financial hardship analysis on the effect of the project on residential sewer user fees. A financial hardship analysis was conducted and Ecology has determined that financial hardship has not been demonstrated.
16. The project may contain elements that are loan eligible only, subject to a final determination of eligibility.
17. Funding for this project has not been identified, as project eligibility prerequisites were not met within the required time period.
18. To avoid funding a duplication of effort, the project must be coordinated with Spokane County's current HB2514 planning effort.
19. The amount identified reflects a loan request. The loan offer is identified on the FY 2000 Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Final Intended Use Plan.
20. This applicant is only eligible for funding from the Section 319 program. No Section 319 grant funds remain available after higher priority projects have been identified for funding.
21. The funds identified for the project supplement a prior loan award made in State Fiscal Year 1994 and was committed to by Ecology in a loan agreement. The amount identified will assist the applicant in meeting total eligible project costs.

FOOTNOTES CONTINUED:

22. The amount identified reflects a combination grant and loan request by the applicant. No grant funds remain after higher priority projects have been identified for funding. The applicant indicated on its application that it would not accept a loan for the grant eligible portion of the project if grant funds were not available. Only the loan portion of the project is identified on the FY 2000 Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Final Intended Use Plan.
23. No grant funds remain available after higher priority projects have been identified for funding.
24. The amount identified reflects a grant request by the applicant. No grant funds remain available after higher priority projects have been identified for funding. The applicant indicated on its application that it would accept a loan for a portion of the project if grant funds were not available. The loan amount is identified on the FY 2000 Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Final Intended Use Plan.
25. The amount identified reflects a grant request by the applicant. No grant funds remain available after higher priority projects have been identified for funding. The applicant indicated on its application that it would accept a loan if grant funds were not available for its project. The loan amount is for the full project and is identified on the FY 2000 Washington State Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund Final Intended Use Plan.
26. The project was determined to be ineligible for funding consideration and was not evaluated or ranked.
27. A written comment was received for this project during the Public Review and Comment Period. Refer to the Responsiveness Summary for more information on how this comment was addressed.
28. Either through written correspondence or telephone contact, the applicant declined the funding proposed on the Draft Offer and Applicant List.
29. Either through written correspondence or telephone contact, the applicant did not respond to the funding proposed on the Draft Offer and Applicant List.