




**STATE OF ARKANSAS**  
**CLEAN WATER REVOLVING LOAN FUND PROGRAM**  
**STATE FISCAL YEAR 2018**  
**Federal Cap Grants 2016 & 2017**



**WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**  
**Of the**  
**ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION**  
**APRIL 2017**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction.....	4
CWRLF Goals.....	5
Objectives.....	5
Short-Term Goals.....	5
Long-Term Goals.....	5
Priority List System.....	6
Project Descriptions.....	6
Bypass Procedures .....	7
Types of Communities Served & Financial Assistance.....	7
Policy on Setting Lending Rates and Bond Purchase Terms.....	7
Agriculture Water Quality Loans.....	8
Green Project Reserve.....	8
Affordability Criteria/Additional Subsidization.....	8
Financial Management.....	9
State Matching Funds .....	9
Service Fee.....	9
Administrative Funding .....	10
Anticipated Cash Draw .....	10
Transfer of Funds .....	10
Sources and Uses .....	10
Financial Management Strategies.....	11

Assurances And Specific Proposals.....	11
Binding Commitments .....	11
Expeditious & Timely Expenditures.....	11
First Use of Funds.....	11
Environmental Review Requirements .....	11
Federal Requirements.....	11
Architectural and Engineering.....	12
Audits and Reporting.....	12
Cost & Effectiveness Analysis.....	12
Davis-Bacon Related Act Provision.....	12
Fiscal Sustainability Plan.....	13
Signage.....	13
Wage Rate Requirements Davis Bacon .....	13
Intended Use Plan Amendment Procedures.....	13
Appendix A: Public Review And Comment.....	15
CWRLF Cash Flow Chart.....	16
Appendix B: Priority List .....	19
Charts:.....	37
1. Binding Commitments.....	38
2. Sources and Uses of Funds.....	42

## Introduction

The State of Arkansas submits the Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund (CWRLF) Intended Use Plan (IUP) for State Fiscal Year 2018. The CWRLF is administered by the Water Resources Development Division (Division) of the Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). This IUP was prepared by the Division. The Arkansas Development Finance Authority (ADFA) assists ANRC by acting as Agent, Financial Advisor and the Purchaser and Seller of Bonds.

This IUP contains a list of projects the State anticipates funding and information on how the State plans to use the funds carried over from the 2016 Clean Water grant, and the funds from the 2017 Clean Water grant/allotment, the funds the State will provide as match, and the funds the State receives from the repayment of loans previously made from the CWRLF program after allowance is made for debt service on outstanding bonds issued to fund the Program. We estimate that over \$137 million will be available to provide assistance during SFY 2018. A sources and uses of funds schedule is detailed in Chart 2. Arkansas uses the all project method.

The CWRLF program anticipates disbursing over \$30 million to projects in SFY 2018 as shown in Chart 2. All the projects listed are designed to help those areas ensure public health protection and compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA).

In accordance with 2 CFR 200.328 and 40 CFR 35.3165 the Division agrees to provide in its Annual Report information regarding key project characteristics, milestones, and environmental/public health protection results in the following areas: 1) achievement of the outcomes established in the Intended Use Plan, 2) the reasons for delays if any, 3) environmental results, 4) compliance with Green Project Reserve, and 5) compliance with Additional Subsidization. Arkansas will summarize variations/changes from the IUP that occur during the SFY 18 in our Annual Report.

All projects for Arkansas comply with the federal requirements and equivalency will not be used.

Throughout this document Arkansas references loans however Arkansas actually purchases a bond from our borrower there forth any loan references means bond purchases.

## WRRDA Amendments

The Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014(WRRDA) was signed into law on June 10, 2014. Among its provisions are amendments to Titles I, II, V, and VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA). Throughout this IUP the WRRDA amendments will be incorporated.

In accordance with the amendments in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act to Titles I, II, V, and VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, ANRC can now offer financing terms up to 30 years as long as this does not exceed the useful life of the project.

## CWRLF Goals

Arkansas is committed to support the three major objectives found in Title VI, and has established its short and long term goals accordingly. Those objectives and our goals are set forth below.

### Objectives:

Hasten wastewater treatment facility construction in order to meet the enforceable requirements of the CWA;

1. Emphasize nonpoint source pollution control and the protection of estuaries,
2. Facilitate the establishment of permanent institutions in each State that would provide continuing sources of financing needed to maintain water quality.

### Short-Term Goals:

1. The Division agrees to comply with all requests for data related to the use of the funds for Clean Water as EPA specifies for the Clean Water Project Benefits Reporting database and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) Requirement.
2. The Division anticipates entering into binding commitments with five (5) Section 212 projects for a total of \$62.6 million. Out of these five binding commitments the Division anticipates closing three (3) bond purchase agreements.
3. The Division will promote the RLF program at various conferences and conventions during the SFY 2018.
4. The Division will submit the Intended Use Plan in order to apply for the federal cap grant within the first year that funds are appropriated.
5. The Division anticipates that Magnolia will be applied to the Additional Subsidization requirements.

### Long Term Goals:

1. Achieve statewide compliance with Federal and State water quality standards by providing both traditional, low interest rate loans and innovative assistance to make affordable wastewater treatment projects and other eligible environmental improvements available to Arkansas communities and other qualified recipients.
2. Progress toward achievement of our long-term water quality compliance goal by achieving initiation of operation on projects in a timely manner.
3. Maintain the purchasing power of the CWRLF into perpetuity through sound and effective administration and fiscal management.

## Priority List and System

The available funds will be allocated in accordance with the current priority system by priority ranking, ability of the community to enter into a binding commitment and ability to proceed. The priority list is found in Appendix B. Please note that Arkansas may use any projects found in the priority list that is included in Appendix B.

All projects scheduled for funding with Arkansas' CWRLF have been reviewed for consistency with appropriate plans developed and approved under Sections 205(j), 208, 303(e), 319 and 320 of the Clean Water Act, as amended. Evidence of this review and finding of consistency is documented in each CWRLF project file.

Cross-cutter equivalency standards are applied to each Section 212 project. Each project will be subject to a technical review sufficient to determine compliance with equivalency requirements. The status of the National Municipal Policy (NMP) projects in this Intended Use Plan will not be affected by the work contemplated. All of the Section 212 projects listed on the NMP List have been:

- (a) Previously funded, or
- (b) In compliance, or
- (c) On an enforcement schedule, or
- (d) Have an enforcement action filed

The Division works with the NPDES Enforcement Section of the Water Division of the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality to implement long-term goals (see Long-Term Goals No. 1 and 2).

The current Priority System and List quantifies relative water quality and/or public health importance of individual projects and adds an extra 5,000 points for those cities with executed Memoranda of Agreement (MOA). Communities that have met with the Division and have indicated they will enter the program but have not executed an MOA will have 2,500 points added to their score.

## Project Descriptions

Amity will make wastewater treatment plant improvements including adding 275' of 8" force main, one manhole, one lift station and associated appurtenances. This project is estimated to be \$285,000.

Little Rock will make improvements and rehab to the wastewater treatment plant. The project is anticipated to be \$61,500,000.

Lockesburg plans to add aerators to the lagoon, replacing the media in the rock reed filters and relocating the influent force main into the lagoon. The project is anticipated to be \$350,000.

Magnolia will install a force main, and pump station to provide treated wastewater. Magnolia meets Arkansas' affordability criteria to receive Principal Forgiveness of \$250,000.

McNeil will install two aerators at sewer ponds and replace filter media in rock reed filter beds.

### Bypass Procedures

If a project's readiness to precede status changes after it was placed on the Fundable List, the Division reserves the right to put the project on hold and take another project from the Priority List that is ready to proceed in its place. If a project is not ready to proceed, the Division will substitute the next project on the priority list that is ready to proceed. Arkansas defines ready to proceed as an entity being ready to loan close within the specified timeframe of this Intended Use Plan. Arkansas' intention is to fund every project on the Priority List as it becomes ready to proceed.

### Type of Communities Served and Financial Assistance Needed

In accordance with the FFY 2016, FFY 2017 capitalization grants and P.L. 111-88, Arkansas provides additional subsidization in the form of principal forgiveness.

Because of the sufficiency of loan repayments and ANRC's access to the municipal bond market, financing or refinancing is available for both large and small communities. Arkansas anticipates closing three loan to a community with populations of less than 5,000 during SFY 2018.

### Policy on Setting Lending Rates and Loan Terms

The Lending Rate is composed of two parts: the interest rate and the servicing fee. The initial objective for ANRC is to establish a Lending Rate for CWRLF loans at 80% of the current bond market's taxable or tax-exempt rate depending on whether the project qualifies for a taxable or tax-exempt rate.

The Lending Rate will be determined at the time the Borrower is developing the Bond Purchase Agreement and the Bond Ordinance. The Lending Rate is determined using a formula that starts with a published list of daily market interest rates for a series of maturity dates for General Obligation Bonds. Those rates are modified to take into account the fact that the CWRLF is a Revenue Bond program and then the series is converted to an average weighted value. That single rate is then multiplied by 80% to get the Lending Rate. The servicing fee is currently set at 1.0%, and interest rate is the difference between the Lending Rate and the servicing fee. The servicing fee is the same for all projects, so the interest rate changes as the lending rate changes. Arkansas varies the lending rate in this manner to encourage repayment of the loans as quickly as possible in order for the CWRLF program to fund other projects. The 1% service fee is placed into an account which is outside the CWRLF fund.

Effective January 1, 2015, the Lending Rate was 1.5% for a ten year repayment period, 2.50% for a 20 year repayment period, and 3.0% for a thirty year repayment period.

### Agriculture Water Quality Loans

Arkansas has placed \$25 million in linked deposits in commercial banks throughout the state. Rural landowners are able to obtain below market interest rate loans to be used to implement nonpoint source pollution control activities. ANRC has no plans to increase the \$25 million; however we do reserve the right to make modifications. The Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program revolves like the SRF program with new loans processed from repayments. The financing terms for the Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program are 3%.

### Green Project Reserve

ANRC agrees to include in its IUP such qualified projects, or components of projects, that total an amount as stated in each of our 2017 capitalization grants/allotment.

The applicant must be a POTW and the project must demonstrate that it will be a public entity and the project must demonstrate that it will facilitate compliance with Clean Water Act. Projects eligible for Green Project Reserve will be in following categories:

- Energy Efficiency
- Water Efficiency
- Green Infrastructure
- Environmentally Innovative

The green project for Arkansas for the 2017 grant is to be determined. Currently Arkansas has no projects that require a business case. If a business case was required then it would be posted at <http://www.anrc.arkansas.gov/>.

### Affordability Criteria/Additional Subsidization

The FWPCA section 603(i)(2) requires States to develop affordability criteria that will assist them in identifying applicants that would have difficulty financing projects without additional subsidization. Arkansas provides additional subsidization in the form of Principal Forgiveness.

ANRC has developed the following affordability criteria to determine if a project is eligible for additional subsidization funds for the CWRLF:

1. The current utility rates or proposed utility rates for 4,000 gallons of water on an annual basis are at least 1.5% of the Median Household Income (MHI) for the project area; or
2. If 51% of the customers who benefit from a project are either Low or Moderate Income as defined by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Developments' Community Block Grant (CDBG) Program then the ratio used drops to 1.25% of the Median Household Income (MHI) for the project area.



3. If the Population trend (2010 census compared to 1990 census) has declined at least 20% (the 2010 population is at least 20% lower than the 1990 population) then the ratio used drops to 1.25% of the MHI for the project area.

4. If the Unemployment figures (average of last three 5-year ACS numbers) are 250% higher than the State's unemployment figures then the ratio used drops to 1.25% of the MHI for the project area.

Once a project has been determined to be eligible for additional subsidization from the CWRLF, additional priority will be given to projects that meet the Green standards set by ANRC. The amount available to be used for additional subsidization from the 2011 cap grant has a minimum of \$894,875 and a maximum of \$2,982,915. The 2012 cap grant has a minimum of \$513,470 and a maximum of \$770,205, 2013 cap grant minimum is \$410,843 maximum of \$616,265, 2014 cap grant is \$498,738 and maximum of \$748,107, the 2015 cap grant has no minimum and a maximum of \$2,735,100, and the 2016 cap grant has a minimum of \$872,900 and a maximum of \$2,618,700. The 2017 cap grant/allotment is anticipated to have a minimum of \$872,900 and a maximum of \$2,618,700.

ANRC will be using the minimum as stated above from the 2011 and 2012 cap grant for projects who meet the criteria for additional subsidization. Arkansas anticipates using the minimum amounts from the 2013 and 2014 grants with the option to spend up to the maximum. Since the 2015 cap grant has no minimum, Arkansas has the option to spend up to the maximum of \$2,735,100. The 2016 cap grant has a minimum of \$872,900 and a maximum of \$2,618,700. The projected 2017 cap grant/allotment is anticipated to be the same as the 2016 cap grant. ANRC may allocate full subsidization or a combination of subsidization and loan to projects who meet the criteria. See Chart 1-3 for the projects to be used for additional subsidization.

## Financial Management

### State Matching Funds

Arkansas will expense all State Match for a Cap Grant before requesting federal funds. This is because Arkansas is prohibited from disbursing State Match in any of the forms used for Additional Subsidization. As long as federal funds are required to be spent on Additional Subsidization, Arkansas will need to disburse State Match first before requesting federal cap grant funds. The State of Arkansas will fund the required State Match by using State appropriations, grants from State funding programs, bond proceeds, or servicing fees.

Arkansas has deposited and disbursed all required state match for the 2016 cap grant. The state match for the FFY 2017 cap grant/allotment is estimated to be \$1,745,800.

### Service Fee

The service fee is the same for all projects which is one percent. The service fees are deposited into the Administrative account which is outside the CWRLF and not subject to the four percent

administration cap applicable to the CWRLF. Arkansas anticipates collecting over \$1 million in service fees for SFY 2018. The disbursements for service fees are projected to be over \$1 million in SFY18. Approximately \$7 million in service fees are expected to be available in SFY 2018. The service fee will be used for items such as travel, supplies, possible system software purchase, contracts, state match, salary, and fringe.

#### Administrative Funding

The Division intends to use an amount equal to four percent of estimated FFY 2018 cap grant allotment ( $\$8,729,000 \times 4\% = \$349,160$ ) funds for payment of administrative expenses, and any additional administrative costs will be paid from the Service Fees account. The administrative funds will be used for the budgeted categories of travel, supplies, salary, fringe, contracts, and indirect cost.

#### Anticipated Cash Draw Ratio

Because Arkansas is prohibited from disbursing State Match in any of the forms used for Additional Subsidization, Arkansas will disburse 100% of the State Match first before requesting any federal funds. As long as federal funds are required to be spent on Additional Subsidization, Arkansas will continue to disburse State Match in its entirety.

#### Transfer of Funds

Arkansas is reserving the authority to transfer up to 33 percent of the DWSRF 2017 federal capitalization grant to the 2017 CWRLF grant. These funds will be transferred from Drinking Water construction to Clean Water construction. Arkansas has no plans to transfer funds for state fiscal year 2018.

#### Sources and Uses

Arkansas' total funding sources for the CWRLF for SFY 2018 are identified in Chart 2. With the capitalization grants for FFY 2016 and FFY 2017, the required State Match for those capitalization grants, bond proceeds, interest earnings, fees collected, and loan repayments, Arkansas will have over \$137 million available during SFY 2018 for existing projects and future eligible program purposes.

Arkansas' EPA payment schedule is based on the State's projection of binding commitments for selected projects included in Chart 1 of this IUP. Chart 2 shows Arkansas' expected SFY 2018 disbursements.

Arkansas has requested that the 2017 cap grant be allocated in one lump sum payment in the first quarter of FFY 2018.

## Financial Management Strategies

Arkansas leverages periodically to increase the funds available for assistance. Arkansas has no plans to leverage the Clean Water program in State Fiscal Year 2018.

## Assurances And Specific Proposals

Arkansas provides the necessary assurances and certifications as part of the Operating Agreement between the State of Arkansas and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Arkansas' Operating Agreement includes the following requirements of section 35.3150 (b) (4).

### Binding Commitments (35.3135(c))

A binding commitment is defined as the execution of a contract called the Bond Purchase Agreement between the borrower and ANRC. The Bond Purchase Agreement sets out the terms of the bond that will be issued by the borrower and purchased by ADFA. The binding commitment date is the date when both parties have signed that contract. The bond closing will take place within six months of the execution of the Bond Purchase Agreement.

The State of Arkansas will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each payment within one year of receipt of that payment.

### Expeditious and Timely Expenditures (35.3135(d))

The State of Arkansas will expend all funds in the CWRLF in a timely and expeditious manner. Federal EPA payments and the associated State Match shall be expended within sixteen (16) quarters from scheduled payment dates. The bond proceeds shall be expended within three years from the bond issue dates.

### First Use of Funds (35.3135(e))

The State of Arkansas confirms that any publicly owned treatment works previously identified as part of the National Municipal Policy (NMP) universe are either in compliance, on an enforcement schedule, has an enforcement action filed, or has a funding commitment from a prior year.

### Environmental Review Requirements (35.3140)

The State of Arkansas will conduct environmental reviews as specified in the Project Review Procedures of the Operating Agreement. To date, none of the projects that have gone through the CWRLF program have required an Environmental Impact Statement. The projects were either issued a Finding of No Significant Impact or a Categorical Exclusion.

## Federal Requirements

Arkansas will be in compliance with the following federal requirements:

- American Iron and Steel
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprise compliance (DBE)
- Federal Environmental crosscutters
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency ACT (FFATA) reporting
- Single Audit Act (OMB A-133)
- Architectural and Engineering Contracts (A/E)

#### Architectural and Engineering (A/E) Contracts

Arkansas' Governor has certified that Subchapter 8 of Chapter 11 of Title 19 Arkansas Professional Services Procurement Law is equivalent to Chapter 11 of Title 40, United States Code for Selection of Architectural and Engineering Services under the Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund.

#### Audits and Reporting

Arkansas's Intended Use Plans and Annual Reports will be posted on our website: <http://www.anrc.arkansas.gov/>.

An independent audit and single audit (as required) will be conducted by an outside CPA firm annually.

Project milestones and information are reported through EPA's Clean Water Benefits Reporting database.

Arkansas will enter data into the CWSRF National Information Management System (NIMS) and the CWSRF Benefits Reporting (CBR) system. We will submit the completed worksheets for all loans closed in SFY16 with the Annual Report as reported in the CBR system.

#### Cost And Effectiveness Analysis

As part of the technical review and selection of alternatives, projects are reviewed for cost and effectiveness. The cost and effectiveness analysis includes a present worth analysis of the total project cost, associated operations and maintenance cost, and the cost of replacing the project or activity, for all the alternatives considered. The analysis also evaluates the cost and effectiveness of the processes, materials, techniques, and technologies. Non-cost factors are also considered in the analysis including, to the extent practicable, that the project maximizes the potential for efficient water use, reuse, recapture and conservation, energy conservation, green infrastructure, and sustainable design.

#### Davis-Bacon Related Act Provision

The FWPCA section 602(b) (6) permanently applies the prevailing wage (Davis-Bacon) provision of the FWPCA section 513 to any projects for treatment works that are funded by a CWSRF. Consistent with EPA's prior implementation of this provision, application of the Davis-Bacon Act requirements extend not only to assistance agreements funded with capitalization

grants, but to all CWSRF-funded projects involving the construction of treatment works regardless of the source of the funding (e.g., prior years' appropriations, state match, bond proceeds, interest earnings, principal repayments, etc.). Any project that is considered a "treatment work" as defined in the FWPCA section 212, now incorporated in FWPCA Section 502(26), must comply with the FWPCA 513, regardless of which eligibility it is funded under (*see section 603(c)*).

#### Fiscal Sustainability Plan (FSP)

The FWPCA section 603(d) (1) (E) requires a recipient of a loan for a project that involves the repair, replacement, or expansion of a publicly owned treatment works to develop and implement an FSP. Since Arkansas does bond purchase agreements, we do not plan for our borrowers to implement an FSP. Arkansas defines an application as having all information needed to conduct an analysis of the project. Once the analysis is completed then the project is presented to our Commission for approval. After approval is received from our Commission Arkansas considers this to be a complete application. Arkansas does not consider the first submittal of an application form to be the application.

#### Signage

Arkansas agrees to comply with the SRF Signage Guidance in order to enhance public awareness of EPA assistance agreements nationwide.

#### Wage Rate Requirements (Davis-Bacon)

ANRC agrees to include in all agreements to provide assistance for the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part with such assistance made available by Arkansas Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund as authorized by title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), or with such assistance made available under section 205(m) of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1285(m)), or both, a term and condition requiring compliance with the requirements of section 513 of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1372) in all procurement contracts and sub-grants, and require that loan recipients, procurement contractors and sub-grantees include such a term and condition in subcontracts and other lower tiered transactions. All contracts and subcontracts for the construction of treatment works carried out in whole or in part with assistance made available as stated herein shall insert in full in any contract in excess of \$2,000 the contract clauses "Wage Rate Requirements Under the Clean water Act, Section 513". This term and condition applies to all agreements to provide assistance under the authorities referenced herein, whether in the form of a loan, bond purchase, grant, or any other vehicle to provide financing for a project, where such agreements are executed on or after October 2009. ANRC will continue to update this term and condition as updated procedures are provided with subsequent cap grants.

#### Intended Use Plan Amendment Procedures

Revisions to this IUP that are determined significant will require Public Notice and EPA notification and approval.

Revisions to this IUP which are deemed to be insignificant shall be made by the Division with notification to EPA.

Any changes in the project funding list shall be in accordance with procedures provided in the CWRLF Priority System and List.

## APPENDIX A

### **NOTICE OF PROPOSED FY 2018 INTENDED USE PLAN (IUP)**

On March 19, 2017 and March 26, 2017, the State of Arkansas published the Notice of Proposed FY 2018 IUP advertisement for the Clean Water Intended Use Plan in the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, a statewide paper. Written comments on the proposed document and any requests for a public hearing should be sent to ANRC by close of business March 31, 2017. Instructions for written comments and requests for a public hearing will also be available on the ANRC website. Copies of the Intended Use Plan will also be available, upon request, for public inspection at the Water Resources Development Division of the Arkansas Natural Resources Commission.

Arkansas received no comments on the SFY 2018 IUP.

ARKANSAS CLEAN WATER  
CASH FLOW CHART



Clean Water  
Narrative for Flow-of-Funds Chart

Starting with the Federal cap grant funds, 96% plus State Match are used to make loan disbursements to borrowers. The other 4% is used for paying administration expenses.

Monthly installments of semi-annual loan repayments, principal and interest, are held in the Pledged Receipts account or to the Revolving Loan Fund account depending upon whether or not the loan is leveraged. The 1% financing fee goes into the Admin Account.

When wastewater revenue bonds are issued, a portion of total proceeds goes into Debt Service Fund account. The remaining portion after expenses is net bond proceeds and goes into the Net Bond Proceeds account and disbursed to loan recipients.


All receipts are transferred from the Pledged Receipts account to the Revenue Fund semi-annually.

Revenue funds are transferred to the Debt Service Fund and from there, payments are made to wastewater revenue bondholders. Revenue funds not needed for debt service requirements are then transferred to the Revolving Loan Fund.

Funds from the Revolving Loan Fund are used to make qualified loans and for other eligible purposes.

Funds from the Admin account are used to pay administrative expenses such as travel, supplies, salary and fringe benefits, and State Match.

# CLEAN WATER FUND Cash Flow Diagram



APPENDIX B  
PRIORITY LIST

## PROJECT PRIORITY FUNDABLE LIST

The following list is of projects submitted to ANRC for possible funding from the Clean Water RLF program. The projects are listed in order of the ranking in the Priority System of each entity that submitted the project and will fund the project. The list will be updated from time to time as provided for in Title XVI of the ANRC. Projects will be removed from the list when they receive funding commitment(s) for their project from any source(s) or when they request their project be removed. Funding commitment for the Clean Water RLF program will mean an executed Bond Purchase Agreement (Binding Commitment).

The chart below is a brief overview of the fundable list. For further information on the below projects, see project descriptions that begin on page 6 of the IUP.

CHART 1-3 :CLEAN WATER PRIORITY FUNDABLE LIST												
IUP Year	Project Name	Total Assistance	Interest Rate	Term	Green Project Reserve			Additional Subsidy		Cap Grant	Binding Commitment Date	Brief Project Description
					Bus. Case	Green Project Reserve Amt	Cap Grant	Additional Subsidy Amt	Principal Forgiveness			
	Section 212						GPR			Ad Sub		
2018	Amity	\$285,000	TBD	20		TBD					6/15/18 T	Rehab collection system
2018	Little Rock	\$61,500,000	TBD	20		TBD					6/15/18 T	Improvements at treatment plant
2017	Magnolia	\$250,000	TBD	20		TBD		250,000	\$250,000	15	6/15/18 T	Improvements at treatment plant
2017	McNeil	\$250,000	TBD	20		TBD					6/15/18 T	Improvements at treatment plant
	Section 212 Total	\$62,285,000				\$0		\$250,000	\$250,000			
	Section 319											
	Section 319 Total	\$0										
	Grand Total	\$62,285,000				\$0		\$250,000				

## PROJECT RANKING

The purpose of this system is to quantify the relative water quality and/or public health importance of individual entities located throughout the State. The Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) Priority System does not consider the type of project being considered or try to rank one type of project over another type. The RLF Priority System considers the following criteria to evaluate the relative merits of each entity:

- 1) Population
- 2) Segmented or Phased Projects
- 3) Receiving Stream Use Classification
- 4) Receiving Stream Flow
- 5) Enforcement Factor
- 6) NPDES Permit Compliance
- 7) Septic Tank Failure
- 8) Septic Tank Suitability
- 9) Executed Memorandum of Agreement

These factors are multiplied together (or added in the case of executed memorandum of agreement) to determine each entity's priority points.

### 1) Population

The population factor is determined by dividing an entity's 2000 census population by the population total for all entities in the priority system and multiplying by 1,000. If a 2000 census figure does not exist, the current population will be used.

### 2) Segmented or Phased Projects

All segmented or phased projects will be awarded a factor of 10.

### 3) Receiving Stream Use Classification

This factor is based upon the receiving stream classification in the Arkansas Water Quality Standards as contained in Regulation Number 2 (as amended) of October 28, 2002. The factors used are as follows:

Extraordinary Resource Waters	-	8.00
Natural and Scenic Waterways	-	8.00
Ecologically Sensitive Waterbodies	-	8.00
Trout Fishery	-	8.00
Primary Contact Recreation	-	4.00
Secondary Contact Recreation	-	2.00
No Discharge	-	1.00

The factor shall be awarded based upon the highest use classification of a given stream. Entities that discharge into another sewer system will use the classification of that sewer system's stream.

4) Receiving Stream Flow

This factor is used as a quantitative indicator of receiving stream flow at seven day-ten year (7Q10) low flow conditions. The factors used are as follows:

0 cubic feet/second	8
Greater than 0, but less than 10 cubic feet/second	4
Greater than 10, but less than 100 cubic feet/second	2
Greater than 100 cubic feet/second	1

If an entity discharges into receiving waters in two different categories, the factor will be prorated based upon the quantity of each discharge and its receiving stream classification.

For unsewered entities, the largest stream within a one mile radius will be used in determining the stream classification. Entities that discharge into another sewer system will use the classification of that sewer system's stream.

5) Enforcement Factor

Entities which have a sewer connection ban in effect pursuant to an order of the Commission on Pollution Control and Ecology and which require construction of facilities to meet the provisions of said order will be awarded a factor of 2000.

6) NPDES Permit Compliance

Entities with permits that are currently expired or are under an enforceable compliance schedule will have a factor of 10.

7) Septic Tank Failure

This factor is the percentage of septic tank failure as reported to the Department by the Arkansas Department of Health multiplied by 10. This factor applies only to unsewered entities.

8) Septic Tank Suitability

The soil suitability for septic tank use within an entity is determined from soil survey information obtained from the Soil Conservation Service and uses their classification system for septic tank use. Soils well suited for septic tanks are classified as SLIGHT

and given a point value of 1; MODERATE soils are those in which septic systems sometimes fail and are given a point value of 2; and SEVERE soils unsuitable for septic systems have a value of 3. The soils within a one mile radius of the unsewered entity are used in the rating. The classification with the highest percentage in this area will have its point value used in the priority system. This factor applies only to unsewered entities.

9) Executed Memorandum of Agreement

Entities with executed MOA's from the Division will have 5,000 points added to their score. Entities that have met with the Division and have indicated they will enter the program, but have not executed a MOA will have 2,500 points added to their score.

The ranking for all entities is presented by rank.

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
1	Magnolia	Columbia	4.061	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2,565
2	Amity	Clark	0.285	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2,505
3	Lockesburg	Sevier	0.266	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2,504
4	McNeil	Columbia	0.248	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2,504
5	Little Rock	Pulaski	68.502	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	0	2,501
6	Hot Springs	Garland	13.372	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	428
7	Fayetteville	Washington	21.713	3.0	6.0	0.0	0	1	391
8	Jacksonville	Pulaski	11.190	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	358
9	Jonesboro	Craighead	20.766	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	332
10	Prairie Creek CDP	Benton	0.692	4.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	332
11	Parkers-Iron Spring CDP	Pulaski	1.309	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	314
12	Baxter Co WWFB	Baxter	8.498	8.0	4.0	1.0	1	1	272
13	Benton	Saline	8.194	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	262
14	Bentonville	Benton	7.380	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	236
15	Rogers	Benton	14.524	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	232
16	Kibler	Crawford	0.362	4.0	8.0	6.0	3	1	209
17	Bella Vista CDP	Benton	6.203	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	198
18	Faulkner Co PFB	Faulkner	1.608	4.0	2.0	5.0	3	1	193
19	East End	Saline	2.103	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	168
20	Wooster	Faulkner	0.193	4.0	8.0	9.0	3	1	167
21	Russellville	Pope	8.858	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	142
22	Springdale	Washington	17.131	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	137
23	Paragould	Greene	8.236	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	132
24	Blytheville	Mississippi	6.835	3.1	6.2	0.0	0	1	131
25	Shirley	Van Buren	0.126	8.0	8.0	5.4	3	1	131
26	Belleville	Yell	0.139	4.0	8.0	9.4	3	1	125
27	Fort Smith	Sebastian	30.025	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	120
28	Cave Springs	Benton	0.413	8.0	4.0	3.0	3	1	119
29	McAlmont CDP	Pulaski	0.719	4.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	115
30	El Dorado	Union	8.053	2.0	6.5	0.0	0	1	105
31	Holland	Faulkner	0.216	8.0	4.0	5.0	3	1	104
32	Cedarville	Crawford	0.424	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	102
33	Humoke	Lonoke	0.105	4.0	8.0	9.9	3	1	100
34	Hartford	Sebastian	0.289	4.0	8.0	3.5	3	1	97
35	Oxford	Izard	0.240	8.0	8.0	3.0	2	1	92
36	Dyer	Crawford	0.219	2.0	8.0	8.5	3	1	89
37	Forrest City	St. Francis	5.526	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	88
38	Alexander	Pulaski	0.230	2.0	8.0	8.0	3	1	88
39	Salem CDP	Saline	1.043	4.0	4.0	5.0	1	1	83
40	Poyen	Grant	0.102	4.0	8.0	8.5	3	1	83
41	Pine Bluff	Jefferson	20.605	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	82
42	Texarkana	Miller	9.893	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	79
43	Wickes	Polk	0.252	2.0	8.0	9.5	2	1	77
44	Harrison	Boone	4.546	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	73
45	Gum Springs	Clark	0.073	4.0	8.0	9.8	3	1	68
46	Mountain Home	Baxter	4.119	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	66



ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
47	Grannis	Polk	0.215	2.0	8.0	9.5	2	1	65
48	Siloam Springs	Benton	4.056	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	65
49	Tupelo	Jackson	0.066	4.0	8.0	10.0	3	1	64
50	Hope	Hempstead	3.971	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	64
51	Walnut Ridge	Lawrence	1.842	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	59
52	Fairfield Bay	Van Buren	0.920	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	59
53	Bryant	Saline	3.652	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	58
54	Searcy	White	7.080	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	57
55	Cherokee Village	Sharp	1.739	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	56
56	Damascus	Faulkner	0.114	4.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	55
57	Horseshoe Bend	Izard	0.852	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	55
58	Hunter	Woodruff	0.057	4.0	8.0	9.9	3	1	54
59	Hartman	Johnson	0.223	4.0	8.0	2.5	3	1	54
60	Marion	Crittenden	3.329	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	53
61	Ratcliff	Logan	0.071	4.0	8.0	7.5	3	1	51
62	Oak Grove	Carroll	0.141	2.0	8.0	7.5	3	1	51
63	Hot Springs Village CDP	Garland	3.141	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	50
64	Caulksville	Logan	0.087	4.0	8.0	6.0	3	1	50
65	Caldwell	St. Francis	0.174	2.0	8.0	8.8	2	1	49
66	Van Buren	Crawford	7.102	3.8	1.8	0.0	0	1	49
67	Sweet Home CDP	Pulaski	0.400	4.0	2.0	5.0	3	1	48
68	Piney SID	Garland	1.492	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	48
69	Newport	Jackson	2.922	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	47
70	Piggott	Clay	1.457	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	47
71	Avoca	Benton	0.158	4.0	8.0	3.0	3	1	46
72	Lynn	Lawrence	0.118	2.0	8.0	8.0	3	1	45
73	Allport	Lonoke	0.048	4.0	8.0	9.9	3	1	45
74	Jennette	Crittenden	0.046	4.0	8.0	10.0	3	1	45
75	Bellefonte	Boone	0.150	4.0	4.0	6.0	3	1	43
76	Briarcliff	Baxter	0.090	4.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	43
77	Winslow	Washington	0.149	2.0	8.0	6.0	3	1	43
78	Greenwood	Sebastian	2.660	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	43
79	Burchwood Bay SID	Garland	1.309	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	42
80	Evening Shade	Sharp	0.174	8.0	4.0	2.5	3	1	42
81	Bonanza	Sebastian	0.192	2.0	8.0	4.5	3	1	42
82	West Memphis	Crittenden	10.349	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	41
83	Cove	Polk	0.143	2.0	8.0	9.0	2	1	41
84	Islands SID	Garland	1.285	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	41
85	Highway 270 West SID	Garland	1.283	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	41
86	Dell	Mississippi	0.094	4.0	4.0	9.0	3	1	41
87	Dermott	Chicot	1.231	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	39
88	Mulberry	Crawford	0.609	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	39
89	Warren	Bradley	2.410	8.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	39
90	Heber Springs	Cleburne	2.406	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	38

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION									
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings									
Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
91	Bald Knob	White	1.201	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	38
92	Elkins	Washington	0.468	4.0	8.0	2.5	1	1	37
93	Bergman	Boone	0.152	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	37
94	Crossett	Ashley	2.281	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	36
95	Greenbrier	Faulkner	1.138	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	36
96	Hector	Pope	0.189	2.0	8.0	4.0	3	1	36
97	England	Lonoke	1.112	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	36
98	Carpenter-Catherine SID	Garland	1.107	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	35
99	Coy	Lonoke	0.043	4.0	8.0	8.5	3	1	35
100	DeQueen	Sevier	2.156	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	35
101	Mena	Polk	2.109	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	34
102	Alpena	Boone	0.139	4.0	4.0	5.0	3	1	33
103	Traskwood	Saline	0.205	2.0	8.0	10.0	1	1	33
104	Arkadelphia	Clark	4.082	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	33
105	Tontitown	Washington	0.352	3.0	6.0	5.0	1	1	32
106	Oden	Little River	0.082	8.0	4.0	6.0	2	1	32
107	College City	Lawrence	0.101	2.0	8.0	6.5	3	1	31
108	Dumas	Desha	1.959	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	31
109	Branch	Franklin	0.134	2.0	4.0	9.7	3	1	31
110	Ward	Lonoke	0.965	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	31
111	Black Oak	Craighead	0.107	2.0	8.0	6.0	3	1	31
112	Garner	White	0.106	4.0	8.0	9.0	1	1	31
113	Lowell	Benton	1.875	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	30
114	Beebe	White	1.844	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	30
115	Highland	Sharp	0.369	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	30
116	Nashville	Howard	1.825	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	29
117	Stuttgart	Arkansas	3.645	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	29
118	Fordyce	Dallas	1.795	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	29
119	Pea Ridge	Benton	0.878	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	28
120	Gibson CDP	Pulaski	1.750	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	28
121	Mammoth Spring	Fulton	0.429	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	27
122	Monticello	Drew	3.421	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	27
123	Viola	Fulton	0.143	4.0	8.0	2.0	3	1	27
124	Gurdon	Clark	0.851	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	27
125	Sherrill	Jefferson	0.047	4.0	8.0	9.0	2	1	27
126	Enola	Faulkner	0.070	2.0	8.0	8.0	3	1	27
127	Okolona	Clark	0.060	2.0	8.0	9.3	3	1	27
128	Woodson CDP	Pulaski	0.166	4.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	27
129	Bauxite	Saline	0.162	2.0	8.0	10.0	1	1	26
130	Wynne	Cross	3.222	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	26
131	Centerton	Benton	0.803	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	26
132	Lonoke	Lonoke	1.604	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	26
133	Stamps	Lafayette	0.797	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	26
134	Anthonyville	Crittenden	0.094	2.0	8.0	5.5	3	1	25

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
135	Booneville	Logan	1.540	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	25
136	West Fork	Washington	0.764	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	24
137	Farmington	Washington	1.348	3.0	6.0	0.0	0	1	24
138	Halley	Desha	0.028	4.0	8.0	9.0	3	1	24
139	McNab	Hempstead	0.014	8.0	8.0	9.0	3	1	24
140	Brinkley	Monroe	1.474	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	24
141	Lake City	Craighead	0.732	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	23
142	Banks	Bradley	0.045	4.0	8.0	8.0	2	1	23
143	Magnet Cove	Hot Spring	0.142	2.0	8.0	5.0	2	1	23
144	Hughes	St. Francis	0.698	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	22
145	Paris	Logan	1.387	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	22
146	Prescott	Nevada	1.379	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	22
147	Greenland	Washington	0.339	4.0	8.0	2.0	1	1	22
148	Saratoga	Howard	0.028	4.0	8.0	8.0	3	1	22
149	North Crossett CDP	Ashley	1.339	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	21
150	DeWitt	Arkansas	1.329	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	21
151	Waldron	Scott	1.312	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	21
152	London	Pope	0.346	4.0	1.0	5.0	3	1	21
153	Mount Vernon	Faulkner	0.054	2.0	8.0	8.0	3	1	21
154	Strawberry	Lawrence	0.106	2.0	4.0	8.0	3	1	20
155	Fargo	Monroe	0.044	2.0	8.0	9.5	3	1	20
156	Greers Ferry	Cleburne	0.348	8.0	8.0	0.3	3	1	20
157	Corinth	Yell	0.024	4.0	8.0	8.5	3	1	20
158	Camden	Ouachita	4.920	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	20
159	Gravel Ridge SID	Pulaski	1.209	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	19
160	Lake Hamilton SID	Garland	0.602	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	19
161	Reader	Ouachita	0.031	8.0	4.0	6.5	3	1	19
162	Salem	Fulton	0.595	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	19
163	Elm Springs	Washington	0.391	2.0	4.0	2.0	3	1	19
164	Lakeview	Baxter	0.285	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	18
165	Hamburg	Ashley	1.137	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	18
166	Guy	Faulkner	0.076	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	18
167	Rockwell CDP	Garland	1.131	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	18
168	Osage Basin WWTD	Benton	0.561	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	18
169	Beedeville	Jackson	0.039	2.0	8.0	9.5	3	1	18
170	Omaha	Boone	0.062	2.0	8.0	6.0	3	1	18
171	Charleston	Franklin	1.109	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	18
172	Garfield	Benton	0.183	2.0	8.0	2.0	3	1	18
173	Mountain View	Stone	1.076	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	17
174	Lake Village	Chicot	1.056	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	17
175	Hoxie	Lawrence	1.054	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	17
176	Imboden	Lawrence	0.256	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	16
177	Wrights ville	Pulaski	0.512	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	16
178	Green Forest	Carroll	1.016	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	16
179	Sherwood	Pulaski	8.046	1.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	16

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
180	Dover	Pope	0.497	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	16
181	Midland	Sebastian	0.095	2.0	8.0	3.5	3	1	16
182	Haskell	Saline	0.989	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	16
183	Maumelle	Pulaski	3.949	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	16
184	Decatur	Benton	0.492	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	16
185	Yellville	Marion	0.491	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	16
186	Marianna	Lee	1.938	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	16
187	Winchester	Drew	0.071	2.0	4.0	9.0	3	1	15
188	Pottsville	Pope	0.475	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	15
189	Prairie Grove	Washington	0.950	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	15
190	Winthrop	Little River	0.070	8.0	1.0	9.0	3	1	15
191	Lake Catherine SID	Garland	0.449	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	14
192	Danville	Yell	0.895	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	14
193	Johnson	Washington	0.867	2.0	4.0	2.0	1	1	14
194	Carlisle	Lonoke	0.862	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	14
195	Stephens	Ouachita	0.431	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	14
196	McGehee	Desha	1.709	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	14
197	Eureka Springs	Carroll	0.852	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	14
198	Malvern	Hot Spring	3.374	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	13
199	Molly Creek SID	Garland	0.421	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	13
200	Lonsdale	Garland	0.044	8.0	4.0	9.5	1	1	13
201	Cleveland	Conway	0.028	2.0	8.0	10.0	3	1	13
202	Osceola	Mississippi	3.320	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	13
203	Berryville	Carroll	1.658	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	13
204	West Point	White	0.061	4.0	2.0	9.0	3	1	13
205	Harrisburg	Poinsett	0.820	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	13
206	Ozan	Hempstead	0.030	2.0	8.0	9.0	3	1	13
207	West Helena	Phillips	3.250	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	13
208	Lepanto	Poinsett	0.798	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	13
209	Vilonia	Faulkner	0.788	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	13
210	Menifee	Conway	0.116	4.0	1.0	9.0	3	1	13
211	Fountain Lake	Garland	0.153	8.0	2.0	5.0	1	1	12
212	Ravenden	Lawrence	0.191	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	12
213	Bethel Heights	Benton	0.267	3.0	6.0	2.5	1	1	12
214	Shannon Hills	Saline	0.750	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	12
215	Smackover	Union	0.750	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	12
216	Holiday Island SID	Carroll	0.748	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	12
217	Little Mazarn SID	Garland	0.374	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	12
218	Pleasant Hills SID	Garland	0.374	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	12
219	Gosnell	Mississippi	1.484	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	12
220	Leachville	Mississippi	0.741	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	12
221	Blue Mountain	Logan	0.049	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	12
222	Rockport	Hot Spring	0.296	4.0	1.0	5.0	2	1	12
223	Saint Paul	Madison	0.061	4.0	8.0	6.0	1	1	12
224	Sheridan	Grant	1.448	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	12

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
225	Saint Paul	Madison	0.061	4.0	8.0	6.0	1	1	12
226	Sheridan	Grant	1.448	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	12
227	Huntsville	Madison	0.722	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	12
228	Clarksville	Johnson	2.887	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	12
229	Goshen	Washington	0.281	4.0	4.0	2.5	1	1	11
230	Antoine	Pike	0.058	4.0	4.0	4.0	3	1	11
231	Smithville	Lawrence	0.027	4.0	4.0	8.5	3	1	11
232	Lavaca	Sebastian	0.683	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	11
233	Gravette	Benton	0.677	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	11
234	East Camden	Ouachita	0.337	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	11
235	Bay	Craighead	0.673	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	11
236	Tinsman	Calhoun	0.028	2.0	8.0	8.0	3	1	11
237	Kensett	White	0.670	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	11
238	Knoxville	Johnson	0.191	4.0	1.0	7.0	2	1	11
239	Murfreesboro	Pike	0.660	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	11
240	Tuckerman	Jackson	0.657	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	11
241	Lincoln	Washington	0.655	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	10
242	Glenwood	Pike	0.655	8.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	10
243	Datto	Clay	0.036	2.0	8.0	9.0	2	1	10
244	Trumann	Poinsett	2.577	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	10
245	Rose Bud	White	0.160	8.0	8.0	1.0	1	1	10
246	Beaver	Carroll	0.036	8.0	8.0	4.5	1	1	10
247	Gassville	Baxter	0.638	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	10
248	Chidester	Ouachita	0.125	2.0	4.0	10.0	1	1	10
249	West Crossett CDP	Ashley	0.622	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	10
250	Hazen	Prairie	0.612	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	10
251	Mayflower	Faulkner	0.610	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	10
252	Pocahontas	Randolph	2.438	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	10
253	Jacksonport	Jackson	0.088	4.0	1.0	9.2	3	1	10
254	Denning	Franklin	0.101	4.0	8.0	1.0	3	1	10
255	Smale	Monroe	0.020	2.0	8.0	10.0	3	1	10
256	Humphrey	Jefferson	0.301	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	10
257	Bradford	White	0.299	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	10
258	Helena	Phillips	2.365	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	9
259	Hampton	Calhoun	0.591	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	9
260	Mountain Pine	Garland	0.289	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	9
261	Manila	Mississippi	1.143	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	9
262	Earle	Crittenden	1.136	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	9
263	Scranton	Logan	0.083	4.0	1.0	9.0	3	1	9
264	Diamond City	Boone	0.273	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	9
265	Perryville	Perry	0.545	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	9
266	Success	Clay	0.067	4.0	2.0	8.0	2	1	9
267	Lamar	Johnson	0.529	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
268	Adona	Perry	0.070	2.0	8.0	2.5	3	1	8
269	Marked Tree	Poinsett	1.047	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	8
270	Conway	Faulkner	16.147	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
271	Marvell	Phillips	0.522	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	8
272	Central City	Sebastian	0.199	4.0	1.0	3.5	3	1	8
273	Gateway	Benton	0.043	4.0	8.0	2.0	3	1	8
274	Twin Groves	Faulkner	0.103	2.0	4.0	10.0	1	1	8
275	Huntington	Sebastian	0.257	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
276	Mountainburg	Crawford	0.255	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
277	Flippin	Marion	0.508	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
278	Caraway	Craighead	0.505	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
279	Brookland	Craighead	0.498	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
280	Horseshoe Lake	Crittenden	0.120	4.0	1.0	5.5	3	1	8
281	Marshall	Searcy	0.491	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
282	Gould	Lincoln	0.488	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
283	Little Flock	Benton	0.967	4.0	4.0	0.5	1	1	8
284	Rison	Cleveland	0.475	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
285	Mineral Springs	Howard	0.473	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	8
286	McCaskill	Hempstead	0.031	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	8
287	Kelso	Desha	0.009	4.0	8.0	9.0	3	1	7
288	Star City	Lincoln	0.924	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	7
289	Dierks	Howard	0.460	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	7
290	Newark	Independence	0.456	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
291	Zinc	Boone	0.028	4.0	8.0	8.0	1	1	7
292	Austin	Lonoke	0.226	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
293	Ola	Yell	0.450	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
294	Ashdown	Little River	1.788	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	7
295	Altheimer	Jefferson	0.446	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
296	White Hall	Jefferson	1.770	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	7
297	Monette	Craighead	0.441	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
298	Sparkman	Dallas	0.219	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
299	Atkins	Pope	1.077	3.8	1.7	0.0	0	1	7
300	Marmaduke	Greene	0.433	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	7
301	Lead Hill	Boone	0.107	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
302	Highfill	Benton	0.142	2.0	8.0	1.0	3	1	7
303	Bearden	Ouachita	0.421	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
304	Dalark	Dallas	0.028	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	7
305	Mansfield	Sebastian	0.410	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	7
306	Dardanelle	Yell	1.582	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	6
307	Ladelle	Drew	0.013	4.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	6
308	Casa	Perry	0.078	4.0	8.0	2.5	1	1	6
309	Barling	Sebastian	1.562	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	6
310	Alma	Crawford	1.556	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	6
311	Crawfordsville	Crittenden	0.192	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	6
312	Rector	Clay	0.754	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	6

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
313	Friendship	Hot Spring	0.077	4.0	1.0	6.5	3	1	6
314	Bull Shoals	Marion	0.748	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	6
315	Horatio	Sevier	0.373	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	6
316	Jasper	Newton	0.186	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	6
317	Judsonia	White	0.741	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	6
318	Mount Ida	Montgomery	0.367	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	6
319	Cave City	Sharp	0.728	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	6
320	Reyno	Randolph	0.181	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	6
321	Leslie	Searcy	0.180	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	6
322	Moorefield	Independence	0.060	4.0	8.0	1.0	3	1	6
323	Cotton Plant	Woodruff	0.359	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	6
324	Vandervoort	Polk	0.045	2.0	8.0	8.0	1	1	6
325	Cabot	Lonoke	5.708	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	6
326	Willisville	Nevada	0.070	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	6
327	McCrary	Woodruff	0.692	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	6
328	Cotter	Baxter	0.345	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	6
329	Corning	Clay	1.376	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	6
330	Magazine	Logan	0.342	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
331	Weldon	Jackson	0.037	2.0	8.0	9.0	1	1	5
332	Ozark	Franklin	1.319	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	5
333	Subiaco	Logan	0.164	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
334	Wilton	Little River	0.164	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
335	Swifton	Jackson	0.326	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
336	Everton	Boone	0.064	4.0	4.0	5.0	1	1	5
337	Norman	Montgomery	0.158	8.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	5
338	Melbourne	Izard	0.626	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	5
339	Gillett	Arkansas	0.306	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
340	Western Grove	Newton	0.152	2.0	8.0	1.0	2	1	5
341	Keiser	Mississippi	0.302	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	5
342	Wildwood PFB	Union	0.299	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
343	Rosston	Nevada	0.099	2.0	8.0	3.0	1	1	5
344	Buckner	Lafayette	0.148	2.0	8.0	2.0	1	1	5
345	Wilmot	Ashley	0.294	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
346	Collins	Drew	0.010	4.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	5
347	Lafe	Greene	0.144	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
348	Hermitage	Bradley	0.288	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	5
349	Bono	Craighead	0.566	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	5
350	Whelen Springs	Clark	0.031	8.0	2.0	9.0	1	1	5
351	Gillham Lake RWA	Sevier	0.561	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	4
352	Hensley CDP	Pulaski	0.056	4.0	4.0	5.0	1	1	4
353	Palestine	St. Francis	0.277	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
354	Cushman	Independence	0.172	4.0	4.0	0.8	2	1	4
355	Patmos	Hempstead	0.023	2.0	8.0	4.0	3	1	4
356	Huttig	Union	0.273	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
357	Oak Grove Heights	Greene	0.272	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	4

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
358	Holly Grove	Monroe	0.270	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	4
359	Junction City	Union	0.270	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	4
360	Quitman	Cleburne	0.267	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
361	Cherry Valley	Cross	0.263	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
362	Sunset	Crittenden	0.130	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
363	Hackett	Sebastian	0.260	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
364	Batesville	Independence	3.533	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	4
365	Umpire	Howard	0.028	2.0	8.0	3.0	3	1	4
366	Augusta	Woodruff	0.997	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	4
367	McRae	White	0.247	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
368	Pangburn	White	0.245	8.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	4
369	Strong	Union	0.244	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	4
370	Ben Lomond	Sevier	0.047	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	4
371	Bodcaw	Nevada	0.058	4.0	8.0	2.0	1	1	4
372	Letona	White	0.075	2.0	8.0	1.0	3	1	4
373	Pleasant Oaks SID	Saline	0.056	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
374	Powhatan	Lawrence	0.019	8.0	1.0	8.0	3	1	4
375	Chester	Crawford	0.037	4.0	8.0	1.0	3	1	4
376	Arkansas City	Desha	0.220	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	4
377	Brickeys	Lee	0.018	8.0	1.0	8.0	3	1	4
378	Wilmar	Drew	0.214	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
379	Taylor	Columbia	0.212	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
380	Bradley	Lafayette	0.211	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
381	Pleasant Plains	Independence	0.100	2.0	8.0	0.7	3	1	3
382	Morrison Bluff	Logan	0.028	4.0	1.0	10.0	3	1	3
383	Reed	Desha	0.103	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
384	Sidney	Sharp	0.103	2.0	8.0	2.0	1	1	3
385	Joiner	Mississippi	0.202	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	3
386	Lake View	Phillips	0.199	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
387	Montrose	Ashley	0.197	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
388	Grady	Lincoln	0.196	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
389	Big Flat	Baxter	0.039	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	3
390	Thornton	Calhoun	0.193	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
391	Springtown	Benton	0.043	2.0	4.0	3.0	3	1	3
392	Woodberry	Calhoun	0.013	2.0	8.0	5.0	3	1	3
393	Emmet	Nevada	0.189	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	3
394	Pyatt	Marion	0.095	4.0	4.0	2.0	1	1	3
395	Sulpher Springs	Benton	0.251	6.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	3
396	HACT SID	Lonoke	0.187	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	3
397	Harris Brake SID	Perry	0.037	4.0	4.0	5.0	1	1	3
398	Saline Co SID	Saline	0.187	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
399	White Oak W&SID #49	Garland	0.037	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	3
400	Calico Rock	Izard	0.371	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	3
401	Madison	St. Francis	0.369	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	3



ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION									
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings									
Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
402	Clarendon	Monroe	0.733	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	3
403	Ash Flat	Sharp	0.365	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	3
404	Des Arc	Prairie	0.723	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	3
405	Moro	Lee	0.090	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
406	Paraloma	Sevier	0.022	4.0	8.0	4.0	1	1	3
407	Turrell	Crittenden	0.358	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	3
408	Biscoe	Prairie	0.178	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
409	Daisy	Pike	0.044	4.0	8.0	2.0	1	1	3
410	Keo	Lonoke	0.088	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
411	Scott CDP	Pulaski	0.035	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	3
412	Patterson	Woodruff	0.175	8.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	3
413	Pine Bluff SID #38	Jefferson	0.696	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	3
414	Tyronza	Poinsett	0.343	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	3
415	Center Point	Howard	0.028	2.0	8.0	2.0	3	1	3
416	Kingsland	Cleveland	0.168	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
417	Carthage	Dallas	0.165	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
418	Skyline SID #4	Pope	0.165	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	3
419	Grubbs	Jackson	0.164	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	3
420	Elaine	Phillips	0.324	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	3
421	Rudy	Crawford	0.027	4.0	8.0	1.0	3	1	3
422	Saint Joe	Searcy	0.032	8.0	2.0	5.0	1	1	3
423	Valley Springs	Boone	0.062	2.0	4.0	5.0	1	1	2
424	Norphlet	Union	0.307	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
425	Morrilton	Conway	2.450	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
426	Fouke	Miller	0.304	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
427	Crittenden Co SID #3	Crittenden	0.152	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
428	Perla	Hot Spring	0.043	2.0	4.0	7.0	1	1	2
429	Hatfield	Polk	0.150	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
430	Parkin	Cross	0.599	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
431	145th St WSID #345	Pulaski	0.150	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
432	Houston	Perry	0.059	2.0	8.0	2.5	1	1	2
433	Havana	Yell	0.147	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
434	Hickory Ridge	Cross	0.144	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
435	College Station CDP	Pulaski	0.287	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	2
436	Maynard	Randolph	0.143	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
437	Weiner	Poinsett	0.284	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
438	Higginson	White	0.141	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
439	Gillham	Sevier	0.070	2.0	4.0	4.0	1	1	2
440	Hilltop SID #6	Pope	0.140	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
441	Wheatley	St. Francis	0.139	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
442	Etowah	Mississippi	0.137	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
443	Blevins	Hempstead	0.137	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
444	Emerson	Columbia	0.134	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
445	Black Rock	Lawrence	0.268	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION									
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings									
Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
446	Knobel	Clay	0.134	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
447	Tull	Grant	0.134	8.0	4.0	0.5	1	1	2
448	South Lead Hill	Boone	0.033	8.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
449	Runyan SID #211	Pulaski	0.524	2.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	2
450	Lexa	Phillips	0.124	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
451	Luxora	Mississippi	0.493	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
452	Wabbaseka	Jefferson	0.121	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
453	Lewisville	Lafayette	0.481	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
454	Diaz	Jackson	0.480	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
455	Almyra	Arkansas	0.119	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
456	Bluff City	Nevada	0.059	2.0	8.0	1.0	2	1	2
457	Sulpher Rock	Independence	0.157	6.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	2
458	Delight	Pike	0.116	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
459	Princeton	Dallas	0.015	4.0	4.0	2.5	3	1	2
460	Jamestown	Johnson	0.028	2.0	8.0	4.0	1	1	2
461	Mountain Home SID #4	Baxter	0.112	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
462	Oak Manor WA	Union	0.112	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
463	Phillips Co PFB	Phillips	0.224	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	2
464	Washington	Hempstead	0.055	2.0	8.0	1.0	2	1	2
465	Gilmore	Crittenden	0.109	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
466	Redfield	Jefferson	0.433	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
467	Hardy	Sharp	0.216	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
468	Watson	Desha	0.108	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
469	Georgetown	White	0.047	4.0	1.0	9.0	1	1	2
470	Prattsville	Grant	0.105	2.0	8.0	0.5	2	1	2
471	Foreman	Little River	0.421	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
472	Pine Bluff SID #37	Jefferson	0.420	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	2
473	Portland	Ashley	0.206	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	2
474	Griffithville	White	0.098	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
475	Dyess	Mississippi	0.193	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	2
476	Edmonson	Crittenden	0.192	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	2
477	Concord	Cleburne	0.095	2.0	8.0	1.0	1	1	2
478	Delaplaine	Greene	0.048	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	2
479	Coal Hill	Johnson	0.374	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
480	Donaldson	Hot Spring	0.122	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
481	Mitchelville	Desha	0.186	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
482	Higden	Cleburne	0.038	8.0	8.0	0.2	1	1	1
483	Waldenburg	Poinsett	0.030	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
484	Pineville	Izard	0.092	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
485	Greenway	Clay	0.091	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
486	LaGrange	Lee	0.046	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
487	Norfolk	Baxter	0.181	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
488	Portia	Lawrence	0.181	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
489	Pollard	Clay	0.090	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings

Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
490	Tillar	Drew	0.090	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
491	Alicia	Lawrence	0.054	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
492	Rondo	Lee	0.089	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
493	Ravenden Springs	Randolph	0.051	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
494	Wilson	Mississippi	0.351	2.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
495	Saint Charles	Arkansas	0.098	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
496	Burdette	Mississippi	0.048	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
497	Williford	Sharp	0.024	8.0	1.0	2.0	1	1	1
498	Fulton	Hempstead	0.092	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
499	Black Springs	Montgomery	0.043	2.0	4.0	4.0	1	1	1
500	Campbell Station	Jackson	0.085	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
501	Minturn	Lawrence	0.043	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
502	Russell	White	0.085	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
503	Suburban SID	Jefferson	0.022	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
504	Victoria	Mississippi	0.022	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
505	Oil Trough	Independence	0.082	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
506	Oakhaven	Hempstead	0.020	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
507	Ogden	Little River	0.080	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
508	Plumerville	Conway	0.319	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
509	Bear Creek SID	Lee	0.019	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
510	Cedar Mountain SID	Garland	0.037	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
511	Amagon	Jackson	0.036	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
512	Pindall	Searcy	0.036	2.0	8.0	0.5	1	1	1
513	Plainview	Yell	0.282	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
514	Haynes	Lee	0.080	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
515	Pine Bluff SID #39	Jefferson	0.318	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
516	Cammack Village	Pulaski	0.311	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
517	Birdsong	Mississippi	0.015	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
518	Jerome	Drew	0.017	2.0	4.0	3.0	3	1	1
519	Bigelow	Perry	0.123	4.0	1.0	2.5	1	1	1
520	Ulm	Prairie	0.077	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
521	Altus	Franklin	0.306	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
522	Fourche	Perry	0.022	4.0	1.0	2.5	1	1	1
523	Summit	Marion	0.219	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
524	O'Kean	Randolph	0.075	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
525	Mount Pleasant	Izard	0.150	2.0	4.0	0.5	2	1	1
526	Gilbert	Searcy	0.012	8.0	2.0	0.0	1	1	1
527	Leola	Grant	0.193	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
528	DeValls Bluff	Prairie	0.293	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
529	Louann	Ouachita	0.073	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
530	McDougal	Clay	0.073	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
531	Peach Orchard	Clay	0.073	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
532	Parkdale	Ashley	0.141	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
533	Perry	Perry	0.117	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1

ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION									
Clean Water Revolving Loan Fund Priority System Rankings									
Rank	Community	County	Population Factor	Receiving Stream Class	Receiving Stream Flow	Septic Tank Failure	Septic Tank Suitability	Expired Permit	Total Points
534	Colt	St. Francis	0.138	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
535	Franklin	Izard	0.069	8.0	4.0	0.5	1	1	1
536	Jericho	Crittenden	0.069	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
537	Oppelo	Conway	0.271	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
538	Blue Eye	Carroll	0.013	2.0	8.0	5.0	1	1	1
539	Cantrell Rd SID	Pulaski	0.009	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
540	Biggers	Randolph	0.133	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
541	Pine Bluff SID #40	Jefferson	0.011	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
542	Bassett	Mississippi	0.063	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
543	Widener	St. Francis	0.125	8.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
544	North Little Rock	Pulaski	22.605	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	0	1
545	Fifty Six	Stone	0.061	2.0	8.0	0.0	1	1	1
546	Tollette	Howard	0.121	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
547	Fountain Hill	Ashley	0.059	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
548	Felsenthal	Union	0.057	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
549	Bates	Scott	0.028	4.0	8.0	1.0	1	1	1
550	Cale	Nevada	0.028	2.0	8.0	2.0	1	1	1
551	Poplar Grove SID	Phillips	0.028	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
552	Pulaski Co SID #239	Pulaski	0.112	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
553	Salem SID #10	Saline	0.056	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
554	Cash	Craighead	0.110	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
555	Harrell	Calhoun	0.110	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
556	Magness	Independence	0.071	4.0	1.0	1.0	3	1	1
557	Clinton	Van Buren	0.854	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
558	Caddo Valley	Clark	0.211	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
559	Davis Drive SID	Garland	0.026	4.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
560	Lands End SID #5	Pope	0.052	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
561	Wiederkehr Village	Franklin	0.017	2.0	8.0	1.0	3	1	1
562	Gentry	Benton	0.810	1.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
563	Fisher	Poinsett	0.099	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
564	Calion	Union	0.193	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
565	Perrytown	Hempstead	0.095	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
566	Saint Francis	Clay	0.094	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
567	Roe	Monroe	0.046	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
568	Hindsville	Madison	0.028	2.0	8.0	1.5	1	1	1
569	Sedgwick	Lawrence	0.042	4.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
570	Aubrey	Lee	0.083	2.0	4.0	0.0	0	1	1
571	Salesville	Baxter	0.163	8.0	1.0	0.5	1	1	1
572	Marie	Mississippi	0.040	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
573	Egypt	Craighead	0.038	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
574	Nimmons	Clay	0.037	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
575	Oak Shadows SID	Pulaski	0.037	2.0	8.0	0.0	0	1	1
576	Guion	Izard	0.034	8.0	1.0	0.7	3	1	1
577	Pine Bluff SID #36	Jefferson	0.136	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1
578	Faulkner Lake Rd SID	Pulaski	0.067	4.0	2.0	0.0	0	1	1
579	Garland	Miller	0.132	4.0	1.0	0.0	0	1	1

# CHARTS

**CHART 1: TOTAL BINDING COMMITMENTS (BC)**  
**ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION**  
**CLEAN WATER RLF**  
**FOR SFY 2018**

PROJECT NAMES COMMUNITIES SERVED	PROJ # CS050	NPDES Permit AR00	Loan Closing DATE	PROJECTED BINDING COMMITMENTS STATE FISCAL YEAR 2018				SFY 2017 TOTAL
				QTR 1	QTR 2	QTR 3	QTR 4	
Amity	028	51101	6/15/18 T		-		285,000	\$ 285,000
Little Rock			6/15/18 T				61,500,000	\$ 61,500,000
Lockesburg			6/15/18 T				350,000	\$ 350,000
Magnolia	861	43613	6/15/18 T				250,000	\$ 250,000
McNeil	010	21555	6/15/18 T				250,000	\$ 250,000
								\$ -
								\$ -
								\$ -
<b>SECTION 212 BC TOTAL</b>				-	-	-	62,635,000	\$ 62,635,000
<b>CUM SECTION 212 BC TOTAL</b>				\$ 638,519,529	\$ 638,519,529	\$ 638,519,529	\$ 701,154,529	
				-	-			\$ -
<b>SECTION 319 BC TOTAL</b>				-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>CUM SECTION 319 BC TOTAL</b>				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
<b>PROGRAM ADM</b>				-	-	-	349,160	\$ 349,160
<b>CUM PROGRAM ADM</b>				\$ 8,893,162	\$ 8,893,162	\$ 8,893,162	\$ 9,242,322	
<b>SUMMARY BINDING COMMITMENTS</b>								
SECTION 212				-	-	-	62,635,000	\$ 62,635,000
SECTION 319				-	-	-	-	\$ -
PROGRAM ADM				-	-	-	-	\$ -
<b>QUARTERLY BINDING COMMITMENT TOTALS</b>				-	-	-	62,635,000	\$ 62,635,000
<b>CUMULATIVE BINDING COMMITMENT TOTALS</b>				\$ 647,412,691	\$ 647,412,691	\$ 647,412,691	\$ 710,047,691	
<b>** REQUIRED BINDING COMMITMENTS</b>				-	10,474,800	-	-	\$ 10,474,800
<b>** CUM REQ'D BINDING COMMITMENTS</b>				\$ 289,696,866	\$ 300,171,666	\$ 300,171,666	\$ 300,171,666	
<b>CUMULATIVE EQUIVALENT BC TOTALS</b>								
<b>AS A % OF REQ'D BC AMOUNT</b>				223%	216%	216%	237%	

NOTES: See expanded project description in IUP.

\*1 = SECONDARY TREATMENT; 2 = ADVANCED TREATMENT; 3A = INFILTRATION/INFLOW; 3B = MAJOR REHABILITATION; 4A = NEW COLLECTORS;

4B = NEW INTERCEPTORS \*\* 120% OF FEDERAL EPA/ACH PAYMENTS LAGGED BY ONE YEAR

A= Actual T= Target

CHART 1-2 ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
 CLEAN WATER REVOLVING LOAN FUND  
 GREEN PROJECT RESERVE AND ADDITIONAL SUBSIDIZATION  
 FOR 2012 - 2017 CAPITALIZATION GRANT/ALLOTMENT

2012 Cap Grant	2012 Cap Grant Requirements	Conway Energy Eff. GPR	Bearden West Fork P/F Loan Add. Sub	2013 Cap Grant	2013 Allotment Requirements	TBD Energy Eff. GPR	Bearden West Fork P/F Loan Add. Sub
1. Cap Grant Allotments	\$ 9,239,000			1. Allotments	\$ 8,722,000		
2 Min Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 513,470		\$ 513,470	2 Min Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 410,843	\$ -	\$ 410,843
3 Green Project Reserved Required	\$ 923,900	\$ 923,900		Max Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 616,265		\$ -
				3 Green Project Reserved Required	\$ 872,200	\$ 872,200	\$ 410,843
2014 Cap Grant	2014 Cap Grant Requirements	TBD Energy Eff. GPR	Bearden West Fork P/F Loan Add. Sub	2015 Cap Grant	2015 Allotment Requirements	TBD Energy Eff. GPR	Magnolia TBD P/F Loan Add. Sub
1. Cap Grant Allotments	\$ 9,165,000			1. Allotments	\$ 9,117,000		
2 Min Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 498,738	\$ -	\$ 498,738	2 Min Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Max Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 748,107			Max Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 2,735,100		\$ 2,735,100
3 Green Project Reserved Required	\$ 916,500	\$ 916,500	\$ -	3 Green Project Reserved Required	\$ 911,700	\$ 911,700	
2016 Cap Grant	2016 Allotment Requirements	TBD GPR	TBD P/F Loan Add. Sub	2017 Cap Grant	2017 Allotment Requirements	TBD GPR	TBD P/F Loan Add. Sub
1. Allotments	\$ 8,729,000			1. Allotments	\$ 8,729,000		
2 Min Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 872,900	\$ -	\$ 872,900	2 Min Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 872,900	\$ -	\$ 872,900
Max Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 2,618,700			Max Amount of Subsidization Required	\$ 2,618,700		
3 Green Project Reserved Required	\$ 1,745,800	\$ 872,900	\$ -	3 Green Project Reserved Required	\$ 1,745,800	\$ 872,900	\$ -

\*\*Note Add. Sub = Additional Subsidy P/F = Principal Forgiveness GPR = Green Project Reserve TBD=To Be Determined  
 \*\*\*\*Expanded project descriptions begins on page 6 of the IUP.

CHART 1-3 :CLEAN WATER PRIORITY FUNDABLE LIST

IUP Year	Project Name	Total Assistance	Interest Rate	Term	Green Project Reserve			Additional Subsidy		Cap Grant	Binding Commitment Date	Brief Project Description
					Bus. Case	Green Project Reserve Amt	Cap Grant	Additional Subsidy Amt	Principal Forgiveness			
	Section 212						GPR			Ad Sub		
2018	Amity	\$285,000	TBD	20		TBD					6/15/18 T	Rehab collection system
2017	Lockesburg	\$350,000	TBD	20		TBD					6/15/18 T	Improvements at treatment plant
2018	Little Rock	\$61,500,000	TBD	20		TBD					6/15/18 T	Improvements at treatment plant
2017	Magnolia	\$250,000	TBD	20		TBD		250,000	\$250,000	15	6/15/18 T	Improvements at treatment plant
2017	McNeil	\$250,000	TBD	20		TBD					6/15/18 T	Improvements at treatment plant
	Section 212 Total	\$62,635,000				\$0		\$250,000	\$250,000			
	Section 319											
	Section 319 Total	\$0										
	Grand Total	\$62,635,000				\$0		\$250,000				

See project descriptions in IUP beginning on page 6



CHART 1-4: STATUTORY LIMITS ON RLF FUNDS  
ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
CLEAN WATER RLF  
STATE FISCAL YEARS 2011 THROUGH 2017

	Cap Grants 2011	Cap Grants 2012	Cap Grants 2013	Cap Grants 2014	Cap Grants 2015	Cap Grants 2016	Cap Grants 2017
MINIMUM AMOUNT OF FUNDS TO BE							
1. USED FOR 212 PROJECTS WHICH MEET TITLE II REQUIREMENTS.	\$9,657,000	\$9,239,000	\$8,722,000	\$9,165,000	\$9,117,000	\$8,729,000	\$8,729,000
2. MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF EPA/ACH FUNDS TO BE USED FOR RLF ADMINISTRATION.	\$386,280	\$369,560	\$348,880	\$366,600	\$364,680	\$349,160	\$349,160
3. Minimum amount of subsidization	\$894,875	\$513,470	\$410,843	\$498,738	\$0	\$872,900	\$872,900
Maximum amount of subsidization	\$2,982,915	\$770,205	\$616,265	\$748,107	\$2,735,100	\$2,618,700	\$2,618,700
4. Green Project Reserve	\$1,931,400	\$923,900	\$872,200	\$916,500	\$911,700	\$872,900	\$872,900
5. AMOUNT OF STATE MATCH	\$1,931,400	\$1,847,800	\$1,744,400	\$1,833,000	\$1,823,400	\$1,745,800	\$1,745,800
MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF FUNDS AVAILABLE							
6. FOR 212 PROJECTS WHICH DO NOT HAVE TO MEET TITLE II REQUIREMENTS.	\$1,931,400	\$1,847,800	\$1,744,400	\$1,833,000	\$1,823,400	\$1,745,800	\$1,745,800
7. CUM TOTAL WHICH DO NOT HAVE TO MEET TITLE II REQUIREMENTS.	\$214,288,051	\$223,527,051	\$232,249,051	\$241,414,051	\$250,531,051	\$259,260,051	\$267,989,051

**CHART 2 SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS STATEMENT  
ARKANSAS NATURAL RESOURCES COMMISSION  
CLEAN WATER RLF  
FOR STATE FISCAL YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2018 & 2017**

	2018	2017
<b>SOURCES:</b>		
Revolving Loan Fund Balance	\$ 102,362,475	\$ 104,367,652
Federal Cap Grant/Allotment (2015)		\$ 5,001,950
Federal Cap Grant/Allotment (2016)	-	8,729,000
Federal Cap Grant/Allotment (2017)	8,729,000	-
State Match	1,745,800	-
Bond Proceeds	-	-
Loan Repayments-principal	19,546,814	17,862,693
Loan Repayments-interest	4,764,570	4,830,353
Earnings on Investments	-	-
	-	-
<b>TOTAL SOURCES</b>	<b>\$ 137,148,659</b>	<b>\$ 140,791,648</b>
<b>USES:</b>		
Section 212:		
<i>Projected</i> Project Loan Disb.	\$ 30,675,013	\$ 30,675,013
Section 319:		
<i>Projected</i> Project Loan Disb.	-	-
Administration Expense (Federal portion only)	349,160	349,160
Debt Service on Leveraged Bonds:		
Principal + Interest	7,405,000	7,405,000
Amortized issuance costs	-	-
	-	-
<b>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</b>	<b>38,429,173</b>	<b>38,429,173</b>
Resources carried over to following year	<u>98,719,486</u>	<u>102,362,475</u>
<b>TOTAL USES</b>	<b>\$ 137,148,659</b>	<b>\$ 140,791,648</b>
	<b>06/30/18</b>	<b>06/30/17</b>
Remaining Balances on Loans to be disbursed	\$ 127,523,369	\$ 92,563,382
Resources available	<u>\$ 98,719,486</u>	<u>\$ 102,362,475</u>
Funds (needed)/available	\$ (28,803,883)	\$ 9,799,093