



Commonwealth of Massachusetts  
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs

## Department of Environmental Protection

Address: 100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900, Boston MA 02114 | Phone: 617-292-5500

**Maura T. Healey**  
Governor

**Kim Driscoll**  
Lieutenant Governor

**Rebecca Tepper**  
Secretary

**Bonnie Heiple**  
Commissioner

# 2026 INTENDED USE PLAN For the CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND April 1, 2026



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Introduction

The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) is pleased to present the Calendar Year 2026 Intended Use Plan (IUP). The federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) requires Massachusetts to annually prepare an IUP – a plan identifying the intended use of funds in its Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF). The State issues a Final IUP annually after a public review and comment period. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) must receive the Final IUP before it awards its annual Capitalization Grant to the CWSRF.

The CWSRF is a joint federal-state financing program managed jointly by MassDEP and the Massachusetts Clean Water Trust (Trust) that provides subsidized loans and grants to improve and protect water quality and public health in Massachusetts. The CWSRF is funded with federal funding received through the EPA, which is supplemented by state matching funds, repayment of loans, and interest earned.

The IUP details the intended projects, total project costs, and amount of funding being offered through the CWSRF. This year, MassDEP and the Trust are offering \$728 million in financial support to wastewater projects across Massachusetts, subject to the availability of funding. Approximately \$413 million is being offered to finance 29 new construction projects, \$289 million is being offered to finance 12 previously approved multi-year projects, and \$300,000 is being allocated to fund two Asset Management Planning (AMP) Grant projects. Additionally, approximately \$25 million will be allocated to programs that will be available to communities on a rolling basis throughout the year. A summary of the CWSRF financing can be found in the table below.

**2026 Clean Water SRF IUP Summary**

<b>Project Specific Offered Funding</b>	<b>2026 IUP Funding</b> (\$ in millions)
29 New Construction Projects	\$413.3
12 Previously Approved "Carry-Over" Projects	289.3
2 AMP Grants	0.3
<b><i>Project Specific Subtotal</i></b>	<b><i>\$702.8</i></b>
<b>Reserve Allocations</b>	
Planning and PFAS Design Loan Program	\$13.0
Community Septic Management Program (CSMP)	5.0
Sewer Overflow and Reuse (OSG) Rolling Grant Program	4.3
Emergency Project Reserve	3.0
<b><i>Set-Aside Subtotal</i></b>	<b><i>\$25.3</i></b>
<b>TOTAL Clean Water Offered Funding</b>	<b>\$728.1</b>

A list of projects being supported in the IUP can be found in *Table 1* on page 21. A list of AMP grant project awards can be found in *Table 2* on page 23. Projects included in the IUP were selected based on MassDEP's established rating system. MassDEP evaluates and ranks projects based upon the severity of the public health or environmental problem that is being addressed and the effectiveness of the proposed solution.

The public comment period for the Draft IUP was held from February 20, 2026, through March 24, 2026. MassDEP accepted written testimony and held a virtual public hearing on March 24, 2026 to receive oral testimony. A summary of public comments received can be found on page 28.

## 2026 SRF Program Discussion

The CWSRF is an essential tool that enables communities to deliver clean water infrastructure projects that protect public health and water resources in an increasingly challenging environment. Aging infrastructure, emerging public health risks, and the need to adapt to a changing climate continue to put extraordinary pressure on local communities that are tasked with addressing these needs in the face of rising construction costs, constrained resources, and economic uncertainty.

Like local communities, the CWSRF also faces challenges. The 2021 Infrastructure Investment and Job's Act (IIJA) provided unprecedented levels of federal funding for the CWSRF, resulting in a spike in projects supported through the program. However, IIJA funding is set to expire in 2026, and federal base grants have continued to decrease; this will result in less funding the SRF will be able to offer to communities in future IUPs. Additionally, a significant portion of the CWSRF's capacity will be allocated toward previously approved projects moving through their multi-year project delivery process in the upcoming years. With more resources needed to support these continuing projects, there will be less capacity available to fund new projects in subsequent IUPs. Further, increasing project costs and larger, more complex projects, like nitrogen remediation and combined sewer overflows (CSOs), are placing additional pressure on available resources.

The CWSRF plays a vital role in addressing longstanding environmental challenges and strengthening the resilience of local ecosystems and economies. MassDEP and the Trust are committed to leveraging federal and state resources to maximize benefits for Massachusetts communities, while maintaining strong financial stewardship. To that end, MassDEP and the Trust will continue to evaluate strategies to mitigate funding limitations and support CWSRF's short- and long-term goals (See *Section IV. Short-And Long-Term Goals*). The CWSRF uses the following administrative objectives to inform its policies and practices:

1. Utilizing funds in an efficient and timely manner: Failure to spend funds efficiently increases public health and environmental risks by addressing problems less quickly than they otherwise would have been addressed. It also jeopardizes future federal funding for Massachusetts. A key priority of the EPA is ensuring funds are put to use in a timely fashion.
2. Maximizing the number of projects the fund can support: Balancing the need to continue to support previously approved projects with the need to provide consistent capacity for new projects ensures continued progress to address clean water challenges.

## Key Milestones

Compliance with SRF project deadlines is critical to the effective use of limited funding and the efficient administration of the SRF program. The table below provides an overview of key milestones designed to ensure projects are able to utilize funding when needed while ensuring timely replenishment of the SRF.

### 2026 CWSRF Milestone Timeline for IUP Project Awardees

Date	Deliverable
June 30, 2026	<b>Communities must have appropriated the necessary local project funds</b>
October 2, 2026	Completed project loan applications must have been submitted to MassDEP
December 31, 2026	Following receipt of completed project loan application package, MassDEP must issue a Project Approval Certificate (PAC), certifying the total costs of the project determined to be eligible for financial assistance, subject to PAC requirements
June 30, 2027	<b>Executed construction contracts</b>
June 30, 2029	Trust will contact community regarding process for permanent financing for repayment
January 2030	Permanent financing completed
July 15, 2030	First interest payment due from communities under their repayment agreements with the Trust
January 15, 2031	First principal payment due from communities under their repayment agreements with the Trust

Accommodations may be made for projects encountering limited delays due to circumstances outside of the project proponent's control that can be remedied in an expeditious manner to keep the project on track. MassDEP and the Trust encourage project teams to identify any challenges to meeting deadlines as early as possible. A project on the IUP Project Listing may be bypassed if MassDEP and the Trust determine that the project will not be ready to proceed during the financing period. Project(s) bypassed may be replaced by the highest ranked priority project(s) on the Priority Project List (*Table 3* on page 24) that are ready to proceed, subject to the availability of funds. Additionally, projects without signed contracts by June 30, 2027 likely would not receive loan forgiveness.

### Annual IUP Project Allocations

MassDEP and the Trust are committed to maximizing the number of projects they can support while maintaining financial stability in a declining revenue environment. The CWSRF will continue to implement an applicant cap of \$50 million for the 2026 financing period. Additionally, a project's financing will be capped at the IUP project cost amount for that IUP year given the constraints on available resources. It is critically important for awardees to closely manage and control project costs. Refer to *Section V. (B) Applicant Cap and Carry-Over Costs* for more details on annual project allocations.

MassDEP and the Trust recognize that estimating project costs can be difficult during periods of economic uncertainty and at times, bids are higher than the engineer's estimates which are used in the Project Evaluation Forms that a project team submits when applying to the program. Therefore, requests for increases may be submitted for consideration after the bid has been received. Refer to *Section I*.

*CWSRF Background – Application Process* for more details on the application process. All requests will be evaluated against available funding. The Trust and MassDEP are unable to provide assurances that the difference between the engineer’s estimate and the bid will be funded.

### *PFAS Loan Program*

In January 2020, the SRF began a pilot program to offer 0% interest rate loans to help communities meet the requirements of the new Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) drinking water regulations. The program, as intended, resulted in an increase in PFAS projects across the state and a subsequent rise in 0% interest financings overall. To date, the Trust has committed to financing \$731 million in drinking water and clean water projects resulting in a projected total cost attributed to the 0% PFAS loan program of \$189 million in contract assistance funds. The program is now approaching the limit of what can be afforded using available funding resources. Given this constraint, the SRF is unable to offer the 0% interest rate for any 2026 IUP PFAS project loans. This includes both new and carry-over projects. Below market interest rates and loan forgiveness will still be available to eligible projects. Loan forgiveness will be funded using IIJA Emerging Contaminants Grant; MassDEP and the Trust intend to use 100% of the Emerging Contaminants Grant on loan forgiveness. These subsidies will continue to provide significant financing savings to communities.

## **2026 IUP Highlights**

- **Federal Funding:** Massachusetts estimates the CWSRF will receive approximately \$115 million in federal funding from the EPA consisting of:
  - \$24 million from the EPA’s annual CWSRF capitalization allotment, known as the “Base Grant;” and
  - \$91 million in supplemental funding authorized through IIJA.

Note the Federal Fiscal Year 2026 Appropriation for the Base Grant is not yet confirmed.

Using supplemental IIJA funds, Massachusetts anticipates being able to offer additional loan forgiveness for eligible projects on the 2026 IUP. The additional loan forgiveness is anticipated to be consistently applied to the IUPs covered under the IIJA federal grants, subject to the availability of funds. MassDEP, in consultation with the Trust, may amend this IUP as necessary based on EPA guidance to states on the implementation of the SRF program. The CWSRF anticipates IIJA funding will continue through 2026, which is when the program is set to expire.

For more details on funding available for the 2026 IUP, please refer to *Section VI. (A) Sources and Uses*.

- **2026 CWSRF Financial Offerings:** MassDEP and the Trust are offering a total of \$728 million to support clean water projects across the state, including:
  - \$432 million to finance 30 new construction projects;
  - \$270 million to support the continued finance of 12 previously approved multi-year projects;
  - \$300,000 to fund two Asset Management Planning (AMP) Grant projects; and
  - \$25 million in set-aside allocations to support planning and PFAS design initiatives, the Community Septic Management Program, the Sewer Overflow and Reuse Grant Program and an emergency reserve.

- **CWSRF Grant Programming:** The CWSRF program is offering two grant programs in 2026:
  1. Asset Management Planning (AMP) Grants: The IUP supports 2 clean water AMP project proposals by providing \$300,000 in grant support. A list of the awarded clean water AMP grants can be found in *Table 2* on page 23. A list of all AMP grant applicants can be found in *Table 4* on page 27.
  2. Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants (OSG): The IUP includes \$4.3 million in set-asides to support the OSG rolling grant program. Applications are accepted on a rolling basis, subject to the availability of funds.

- **Previously Approved Project Carry-over Costs:** With the influx of supplemental IIJA funding, the Trust and MassDEP have been able to support an increasing number of projects and project costs since 2022. Many of these large project costs have been necessarily phased over several years, leading to an increase in “carry-over costs,” or costs extending beyond the project’s first year.

The IUP includes approximately \$270 million in carry-over costs to support 12 continuing projects. The estimated carry-over cost for these projects over the next five years is \$945 million. The Trust and MassDEP will continue to support these carry-over project commitments for projects programmed in previous IUPs and new projects programmed in this IUP.

A project’s carry-over cost should be based on the project’s projected needs for the year covered by the IUP. This ensures that funds are not unnecessarily tied up, limiting the CWSRF’s capacity to support new projects and increasing the risk that funds are not spent in a timely and effective manner.

- **Additional Subsidies:** The CWSRF will continue to offer loan forgiveness for Disadvantaged Communities that might otherwise be unable to afford to undertake a project. MassDEP and the Trust will continue to provide loan forgiveness as a percentage of principal. Additional details regarding subsidies may be found in *Section III. (A) Additional Subsidy and Disadvantaged Communities*. Information about the Trust’s Annual Affordability Calculation may be found on the following webpage: [The Disadvantaged Community Program](#).

The CWSRF is also offering Tier 1 loan forgiveness for projects with a renewable energy component regardless of Disadvantaged Community status, unless the community is already a Tier 2 or 3.

- **Encouraging Planning Efforts:** To encourage communities and public utilities to engage in planning activities, MassDEP is accepting planning loan applications on a rolling basis, subject to the availability of funds.
- **Federal Requirements** A number of federal requirements apply to CWSRF projects, including but not limited to:
  - Single Audit Act (2 CFR 200 Subpart F)
  - Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) reporting
  - Federal environmental crosscutters (all projects)
  - American Iron and Steel (all treatment works projects, regardless of funding source)

- Build America, Buy America (BABA) Act (group of projects)
- Davis-Bacon Wage Rates

Additional details regarding federal requirements may be found in *Section V. Program Management (B-D)*.

MassDEP appreciates the efforts that all project proponents have invested in the development of project proposals and recognizes their intent to enhance and protect the quality of waters of the Commonwealth.

## I. CWSRF BACKGROUND

In 1987, Congress established a program of Base Capitalization Grants for states to create CWSRF loan programs. These programs provide state-administered subsidized loans to finance the construction of publicly-owned water pollution abatement projects. Under the CWSRF program, states provide a 20% match to the federal Base Capitalization Grant to create loan funds. Projects to be financed are selected using a priority ranking system based upon the public health and environmental protection benefits of the proposed projects and improved compliance.

The CWSRF is jointly administered by MassDEP and the Trust. MassDEP manages the technical aspects of the project development, while the Trust manages the disbursement of funds and the sale of bonds to provide additional capital to the program.

### Application Process

In May 2025, MassDEP launched the annual SRF project solicitation for new construction projects, Asset Management Planning Grants, and Sewer Overflow and Stormwater Reuse Municipal Grants, for the 2026 calendar year's financing cycle. The notification can be found by clicking the following link: [2026 IUP Project Solicitation Notification](#). The applications, called Project Evaluation Forms (PEF), along with supporting documentation, were due by the end of July. The information provided in the PEF allowed MassDEP to evaluate and rank projects based upon the severity of the public health or environmental problem that is being addressed and the effectiveness of the proposed solution. For more information on the ranking system, please click [here](#).

In addition to the annual project solicitation period, MassDEP accepts applications on a rolling basis, subject to the availability of funds, for planning projects, the Community Management Septic Program, and OSG planning/design grants.

MassDEP accepts applications online through the use of an electronic system called the [eSRF portal](#). For those wishing to submit a project or loan application, please contact the SRF support team by email at [SRFMADEP@mass.gov](mailto:SRFMADEP@mass.gov) for access to the portal.

### The Intended Use Plan/Project Priority List (IUP/PPL)

Pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972, as amended, Chapter 21 of the General Laws, and 310 CMR 44.00, MassDEP has developed its Calendar Year 2026 Intended Use Plan (IUP) Project Priority List (PPL). *Table 3* on page 24 details the PPL which includes all project applications for loan financing, ranked by priority. The MassDEP surface water discharge permit (NPDES) numbers for all applicable projects are also included in *Table 3*. New projects listed below the red line in *Table 3* have been identified as PPL projects but are not being offered financing at this time given SRF funding constraints.

A project must appear on the PPL to receive financial assistance under the CWSRF program. A list of

projects being offered financing in the IUP Project List can be found in *Table 1* on page 21. A project on the IUP Project List may be bypassed if MassDEP determines that the project will not be ready to proceed during the financing period. Subject to the availability of funds, project(s) bypassed may be replaced by the highest ranked priority project(s) on the PPL that are ready to proceed.

MassDEP will not add projects to the IUP or the PPL beyond those that may qualify for funding through rolling programs funded through set-aside allocations.

## **Loan Interest Rates**

All new projects receiving financial assistance from the CWSRF will be eligible for 2% interest rate loans or, in certain instances, an interest rate below 2%. The Commonwealth subsidizes these loans, funding the spread between market interest rates and the awarded loan interest rates. Certain priority projects, or those with the primary purpose of nutrient enrichment reduction, may be eligible for 0% interest rate loans. A determination by MassDEP will be made as to the eligibility for 0% interest rate loans before the loan is permanently financed and put into repayment status.

The standard term for construction loans is 20 years; however, loans with a demonstrated useful life can be financed up to a 30-year term. Loans with financing terms longer than 20 years receive a slightly higher interest rate based on market rates at the time of closing. The interest rate for 30-year loans has been 2.20% for the last four financing cycles.

Communities that have earned the [Housing Choice](#) designation at the time of the SRF project solicitation are eligible to have their loan's interest rate reduced by 0.5% (for example from 2% to 1.5% for a standard term loan). However, under no circumstance can the interest rate fall below 0%. For example, if a community qualifies for a 0% interest rate loan for a nutrient reduction project, it cannot receive an added discount through the Housing Choice designation. Housing Choice initiative communities must also certify to the enterprise fund requirements noted in Section III. (A).

Additionally, communities that implement Community Septic Management Program (CSMP) loans and offer an interest rate reduction to homeowners earning below the area median income (AMI) threshold, may be eligible for a 0% interest rate on the portion of the CSMP loan issued to eligible homeowners. Eligibility for the loan is subject to review by MassDEP and an affirmative vote by Trust's Board of Trustees.

## **2026 CWSRF Program Deadlines**

To be considered for financing priority, communities must have appropriated the necessary local project funds by **June 30, 2026**.

**Completed loan applications must be submitted to MassDEP at the earliest possible time, but not later than October 2, 2026. A complete application must contain the local debt authorization and the required supporting documentation. Any project not meeting these deadlines will be removed from the IUP Project Listing.** A project on the IUP Project Listing may be bypassed if MassDEP and the Trust determine that the project will not be ready to proceed during the financing period. Subject to the availability of funds, project(s) bypassed may be replaced by the highest ranked priority project(s) on the PPL that are ready to proceed. Following receipt of a complete loan application package, MassDEP must issue a Project Approval Certificate (PAC) to the Trust, no later than **December 31, 2026**, certifying the total costs of the project determined to be eligible for financial assistance, subject to the requirements of the PAC. The Trust then proceeds to execute loan commitments.

Projects that cannot meet deadlines may be dropped from the IUP, potentially enabling projects that are

ready to proceed to move forward. Additionally, projects without signed contracts by June 30 would likely not receive loan forgiveness.

MassDEP and the Trust encourage project teams to identify challenges to meeting deadlines as early as possible. A project on the IUP Project Listing may be bypassed if MassDEP determines that the project will not be ready to proceed during the financing period. Project(s) bypassed may be replaced by the highest ranked priority project(s) on the Priority Project List (PPL) that are ready to proceed, subject to the availability of funds. The PPL can be found in *Table 3* on page 24.

## **CWSRF Information and Resources**

All SRF related documents, including this IUP, the [priority ranking system](#), loan application forms, regulations, and IUPs from the previous year, may be found on the MassDEP website at: [State Revolving Fund \(SRF\) Loan Program](#).

## **II. CALENDAR YEAR 2026 PROJECT FINANCING**

In calendar year 2026, MassDEP expects to finance 30 new construction projects and 12 previously approved multiyear projects totaling nearly \$703 million, subject to the availability of funding. Refer to *Table 1* on page 21 for a full listing of projects recommended for financing in 2026.

The CWSRF program is also funding two Asset Management Planning (AMP) grants. The AMP assists eligible entities with completing asset management plans for drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater systems. The program funds 60% of the project cost, up to \$150,000, as a grant from the Trust, with the remaining project costs to be funded by local contributions of cash, a combination of cash and in-kind services, or an SRF loan. This IUP supports two clean water AMP project proposals with \$300,000 in grant funding. A list of AMP projects can be found in *Table 2* on page 23. The AMP program guidelines and ranking criteria can be found [here](#).

Additionally, the CWSRF program is allocating approximately \$25 million in set-asides as follows:

- \$13 million for Planning projects that evaluate the cost and effectiveness of a construction project such as a Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan or a Project Evaluation Report.
- \$5 million for the Community Septic Management Program (CSMP) to address environmental risks posed by failing septic systems under Massachusetts' Title 5 regulations. Title 5 sets stringent standards for the design, operation, and maintenance of on-site septic systems, requiring upgrades or replacements when systems fail to prevent groundwater and surface water contamination. The program provides low-cost loans to communities to assist homeowners with replacing failing septic systems. In September 2022, the CWSRF began offering 0% interest loans to communities that provide reduced interest rates to income-eligible homeowners to increase the affordability of septic replacement.
- \$4 million for the Sewer Overflow and Reuse (OSG) Grant Program (also known as the Overflow Stormwater Grant to assist communities with mitigation of combined sewer overflows (CSO), sanitary sewer overflows (SSO), and stormwater management. The IUP includes \$4.3 million in set-asides to support OSG rolling application, subject to the availability of funds. Project priority will be focused on rural communities (populations of 10,000 or less) or disadvantaged communities. Eligible communities may apply for up to \$250,000 to implement planning and/or design activities by submitting an online grant application which can be found using [this link](#).

- \$3 million for an Emergency Project Reserve. The CWSRF maintains an emergency reserve to finance unanticipated problems of acute public health concern that may arise during the year and require immediate attention.

Applications for programs funded with set-aside allocations are accepted on a rolling basis, subject to the availability of funding.

MassDEP may cap project costs based on the scope of the project and the availability of funds.

All federal fund grant recipients must comply with the Uniform Grant Guidance, including the procurement provisions, as outlined here. MassDEP reserves the right to monitor project proposal costs and cap project costs based on the availability of funds.

### III. CWSRF PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND REQUIREMENTS

#### A. Additional Subsidy and Disadvantaged Communities

Federal law applicable to the 2026 CWSRF Base Grant requires that a minimum of 20% of the grant amount, but no more than 40%, be provided as additional subsidy to Disadvantaged Communities based on the affordability tier system, provided eligible applicants exist. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) added two grants to fund CW projects, each with required additional subsidy as shown in the table below.

**IIJA Additional Subsidy Overview**

Grant	Types of Projects Eligible for Additional Subsidy	Minimum % of Grant for Additional Subsidy
CWSRF Base Grant	CW Construction Projects	10% - 30% CWA 10% Congress (*)
CWSRF Supplemental Grant	CW Construction Projects	49%
CW Emerging Contaminants Grant	Emerging Contaminant Projects Construction Projects	100%

(\*) The Clean Water Act (CWA) establishes an additional subsidy range of 10% to 30% for the annual CWSRF Base Grant. Congress also requires that states use 10% of the annual CWSRF Capitalization Grant for additional subsidy. These percentages are added, resulting in an expected minimum subsidy of 20%, based on prior years.

Eligible construction projects in Disadvantaged Communities will receive additional subsidy, subject to the availability of funds, in the form of loan forgiveness. In *Table 1* on page 21, projects with a (PF) next to the applicant name are projects that the SRF program anticipates will receive subsidies. Massachusetts has established affordability criteria to identify Disadvantaged Communities, which serves as the basis of the distribution of loan forgiveness. The assignment of communities to an affordability tier is based on an adjusted per capita income (APCI) calculation. Tier rankings are calculated annually by comparing a community’s APCI as a percentage of the Commonwealth’s APCI. See the following table for the tier breakdown.

### Disadvantaged Community Tiers

Tier	Percent of State APCI	Minimum Loan Forgiveness
1	80% or greater, but less than 100%	3.3%
2	60% or greater, but less than 80%	6.6%
3	Less than 60%	9.9%

Information about the Trust's Annual Affordability Calculation may be found on the following webpage: [The Disadvantaged Community Program](#)

IIJA funding may increase the amount of loan forgiveness to Disadvantaged Communities beyond these standard offerings.

Projects that have a renewable energy component will qualify as a Tier 1 community and receive loan forgiveness for the portion of the loan that is financing the renewable energy component, accept where the community is already a Tier 2 or 3.

**Loan forgiveness will be awarded to construction contracts that are executed by June 30, 2026,** and may be limited to the lesser of the executed contracts or the IUP cost. Planning projects are not eligible for loan forgiveness.

In addition to meeting the [Affordability Criteria](#), under Massachusetts General Law Chapter 259 of the Acts of 2014, *An Act Improving Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure*, applicants for additional subsidy are required to:

- Establish water enterprise funds (or equivalent separate restricted accounts); and,
- Not have made any transfers from such enterprise fund in the last five years to fund the community's general operating budget.

## B. Green Infrastructure

Congress requires that at least 10% of the federal CWSRF Base and IIJA Supplemental CWSRF grants be dedicated to Green Infrastructure projects, or components, as defined by the EPA. For Massachusetts, this may require that approximately \$10.7 million be allocated towards Green Infrastructure projects that minimize greenhouse gas emissions and energy use. For 2026, MassDEP will work to determine the value of the Green Infrastructure projects or portions of projects that qualify as Green Infrastructure projects. The total value of green components of those projects will be determined when detailed project applications are submitted. MassDEP expects to meet the minimum \$10.7 million that EPA requires to be allocated towards Green Infrastructure projects.

## C. Fiscal Sustainability Planning

For treatment works proposed for repair, replacement, or expansion, the EPA requires that borrowers develop and implement a fiscal sustainability plan that includes:

- a. An inventory of critical assets that are a part of the treatment works;
- b. An evaluation of the condition and performance of inventoried assets or asset groupings;

- c. A certification that the recipient has evaluated and will be implementing water and energy conservation efforts as part of the plan; and
- d. A plan for maintaining, repairing, and, as necessary, replacing the treatment works, and a plan for funding such activities; or
- e. A certification that the borrower has developed and implemented a plan that meets these requirements.

At project completion, MassDEP requires certification from the borrower's Project Engineer stating that a fiscal sustainability plan has been developed and implemented.

## **D. Cost and Effectiveness**

EPA requires a certification that the borrower:

- a. Has studied and evaluated the cost and effectiveness of the processes, materials, techniques, and technologies for carrying out the proposed project; and
- b. Has selected, to the maximum extent practicable, a project that maximizes the potential for efficient water use, reuse, recapture, conservation, and energy conservation, considering: the cost of constructing the project, the cost of operating and maintaining the project over its life; and the cost of replacing the project.

MassDEP expects that applicants will have evaluated the cost of their project, as well as the effectiveness of the solution, in the required planning element such as a Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan or a Project Evaluation Report. These reports typically evaluate alternatives and compare their various life cycle costs. The only additional work is to evaluate that the project maximizes the potential for efficient water use and energy conservation. This evaluation, if not already complete, can be appended to the planning document.

A Cost and Effectiveness Certification form is required to be submitted with each Loan Application package.

## **E. Architectural and Engineering (A/E) Services Procurement**

The EPA requires that A/E services that are paid with federal funds be procured using the qualifications-based selection process under 40 U.S. Code § 11 or an equivalent state qualifications-based requirement.

There are two Massachusetts statutes for procuring A/E services: Chapter 149 for vertical construction; and Chapter 30B for horizontal construction. Chapter 149 appears to meet the qualifications-based selection requirement while Chapter 30B does not.

Rather than add a third method of procurement or forcing communities into using a different method of procurement for horizontal construction and/or owner's project manager services, the Trust has chosen to not use federal funds for any A/E services. SRF federal funds will still be available for construction services. However, for projects that receive federal funds for construction, the A/E services may be split out into a separate loan using non-federal funds.

## **F. Project Accounting**

The EPA requires that project accounts be maintained in accordance with the most recent applicable standard. The current standard is Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No.

34, which was issued in June 1999 and details governmental reporting requirements including standards for reporting infrastructure assets.

## IV. SHORT- AND LONG-TERM GOALS

The following are the goals that Massachusetts has set for its CWSRF.

### Short-Term Goals

- Solicit projects and prioritize projects that assist the Commonwealth in maximizing the utilization of the IIJA grant funds.
- Efficiently allocate and distribute the IIJA funds.
- Increase flexibility for proactive planning with a rolling application process for planning projects.
- Prioritize projects that promote nutrient removal in Nitrogen Sensitive Areas.
- Prioritize projects that eliminate or abate Combined Sewer Overflow discharges.
- Allocate at least 10% of the annual Base and Supplemental CWSRF annual federal grants to Green Infrastructure projects, or components.
- Ensure that wastewater treatment projects financed through the SRF fully consider cost-effective energy efficiency measures and/or renewable energy strategies.
- Finance eligible projects addressing unanticipated problems of acute public health concern that arise during the year and constitute an imminent public health threat.
- Utilize CWSRF set-aside grant funds to ensure that small and rural communities can participate in the SRF program by providing additional assistance.
- Assist small or disadvantaged communities manage wastewater or stormwater by making OSG planning/design grants available on a rolling application basis.
- Provide targeted outreach and engage with communities across the Commonwealth about SRF program benefits, priorities, and opportunities to improve water quality, reduce project costs, and enhance resiliency and cybersecurity.

### Long-Term Goals

- Identify and prioritize additional subsidy for projects in the IUP that serve Disadvantaged Communities.
- Assist stormwater and wastewater treatment plant operators to finance projects to address the impact of climate change and resiliency as indicated in the Commonwealth's [Hazard Mitigation and Climate Adaptation Plan](#), by encouraging resiliency and climate adaptation in the design and construction of water infrastructure.
- Promote systematic asset management planning for water, wastewater, and stormwater utilities to achieve long-term sustainability, implementable climate change mitigation and resiliency measures, and deliver consistent service in a cost-efficient manner by awarding additional points in the ranking system.
- Promote public engagement and program transparency by publishing informative and readily accessible program materials and reports.
- Encourage regionalization and partnerships by awarding additional points in the ranking system for multi-community or regional approaches to addressing environmental or public

health problems.

## V. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS

### A. Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds

Massachusetts seeks to finance projects that mitigate documented threats to public health and/or impacts to the environment, and for which proponents have completed comprehensive planning and alternatives analysis. Details supplied through the PEFs help MassDEP determine the extent to which projects meet the goals of the program. Once all project proposals have been reviewed and ranked utilizing the [CWSRF PEF Construction Ranking System](#), the Project Priority List (PPL) is developed. Refer to *Table 3* on page 24 for the PPL. With input from the Trust, MassDEP identifies all the sources of funds and spending limits and develops the IUP Project Listing as shown in *Table 1* on page 21.

To be considered eligible for financing, projects must meet state and federal eligibility requirements, must be ready to proceed during the financing period, have appropriated local funds necessary to finance the entire project, and have a MassDEP approved planning element. An approvable planning element can be a Project Evaluation Report, Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan, Long-Term Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Strategy, Stormwater Management Plan, or other MassDEP sanctioned planning document. Eligibility includes consistency with the assurances described in this document and the requirements contained within MassDEP's financial assistance regulations: [310 CMR 44.00: The Clean Water State Revolving Fund | Mass.gov](#). Projects on Cape Cod are required to be consistent with the Cape Cod Area-Wide Section 208 Water Quality Management Plan (Cape Cod 208 Plan). Nine Cape Cod communities: Barnstable, Dennis, Falmouth, Harwich, Mashpee, Provincetown, Chatham, Orleans and Yarmouth have proposals on this IUP; the Cape Cod Commission has determined that these projects are consistent with the Cape Cod 208 Plan.

MassDEP reserves the right to increase the amount allocated to any project appearing on this IUP, should additional federal or state funding or program loan capacity become available.

### B. Applicant Cap & Carry-Over Costs

The Massachusetts SRF regulations (310 CMR 44) place a limit on any one proponent receiving any more than 33% of the available financing each year. Because of the shortfall of available funds relative to the number of worthwhile projects, and to extend financial assistance to as many highly ranked projects as possible, MassDEP is implementing an applicant cap of \$50 million for the 2026 financing period.

Additionally, a project's financing will be capped at the IUP project cost amount for that IUP year given the constraints on available resources. It is critically important for awardees to closely manage and control project costs.

MassDEP and the Trust recognize that estimating project costs can be difficult during periods of economic uncertainty and at times, bids are higher than the engineer's estimates which are used in the Project Evaluation Forms that a project team submits when applying to the program. Therefore, requests for increases may be submitted for consideration after the bid has been received. See *CWSRF Background* for additional details on the application process. All requests will be evaluated against available funding. The Trust and MassDEP are unable to provide assurances that the difference between the engineer's estimate and the bid will be funded.

MassDEP reserves the right to waive the applicant cap limitation if MassDEP and the Trust determines that one or more projects on the IUP Project Listing are not ready to proceed. If the applicant cap is waived,

communities may see an increase in financing for projects not fully financed on the IUP listing.

With the influx of supplemental IIJA funding, the Trust and MassDEP have been able to support an increasing number of projects and project costs since 2022. Many of these large project costs have been necessarily phased over several years, leading to an increase in “carry-over costs,” or costs extending beyond the project’s first year in this and subsequent IUPs.

The IUP includes approximately \$270 million in carry-over costs to support 12 continuing IUP projects. The estimated carry-over cost for these projects over the next five years is \$945 million. The Trust and MassDEP will continue to support these carry-over project commitments for projects programmed in previous IUPs and new projects programmed in this IUP.

A project’s carry-over cost should be based on the project’s projected needs for the year covered by the IUP. This ensures that funds are not unnecessarily tied up, limiting the CWSRF’s capacity to support new projects and increasing the risk that funds are not spent in a timely and effective manner.

Applicants should be aware that for future IUP’s, MassDEP and the Trust will review available funding and determine if multi- year project approval for new projects is possible.

### **C. Project Bypass Procedure**

A project on the IUP Project Listing may be bypassed if MassDEP determines that the bypassed project will not be ready to proceed during the financing period. Subject to the availability of funds, projects bypassed may be replaced by the highest ranked priority projects on the PPL that are ready to proceed. **Complete project applications not received by MassDEP by October 2, 2026, will be automatically considered for bypassing.**

Compliance with SRF project deadlines is critical to the effective use of limited funding and the efficient administration of the SRF program. Projects that cannot meet deadlines may be dropped from the IUP, potentially enabling projects that are ready to proceed to move forward. Additionally, projects without signed contracts by June 30 would likely not receive loan forgiveness.

The Trust and MassDEP will not add projects to the PPL/IUP beyond those that may qualify for emergency assistance, planning, PFAS design. MassDEP, considering any material program change that would require amendments to this IUP, will provide public notice and an appropriate comment period before issuing an amended IUP.

## **D. Types of Projects to be Financed**

For an eligible borrower's water pollution abatement project to receive financial assistance from the Trust, the project must meet eligibility guidelines. Such eligible projects include, but are not limited to:

- Wastewater Treatment Projects, as defined in 310 CMR 44.03;
- Infiltration Inflow (I/I) Projects, as defined in 310 CMR 44.03;
- Collection System Projects, as defined in 310 CMR 44.03. However, 85% of the expected wastewater flow into the proposed collection system must be for wastewater flows in existence as of July 1, 1995;
- Nonpoint Source Projects, as defined in 310 CMR 44.03;
- Nutrient Management Projects, as defined in 310 CMR 44.03 and evaluated in accordance with 310 CMR 44.04(2);
- Stormwater Projects;
- Green Infrastructure Projects; and,
- The planning or design for any project in one of the categories identified above.

Costs of construction that MassDEP determines as being necessary for the completion of the project are eligible for financing through the loan and can receive a subsidy under the loan, subject to the applicant cap. Costs for planning projects are eligible for financing during the 2026 financing period. Although costs for design are eligible under SRF regulations, only PFAS design and OSG project design will be funded during this financing period. MassDEP may limit the SRF loan for PFAS design to 10% of the total estimated cost of the PFAS mitigation construction project.

## **VI. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

### **A. Sources and Uses Table**

The sources of funds available to the Massachusetts CWSRF include the federal Base Grant, the federal supplemental IIJA grants, state matching funds, and borrower loan repayments. The Trust utilizes a leveraged financing model that utilizes these sources as security for municipal bonds, thereby increasing program capacity. Using these sources, the Trust issues revenue bonds, rated AAA by all three major rating agencies, approximately once a year. This approach preserves the Trust's cash resources, enabling the continuous provision of interim loans for new projects identified in the annual IUPs. Additional details on CWSRF sources and uses can be found in the table below.

## 2026 Clean Water IUP Sources & Uses

Funding Sources	\$ Amount
2026 CWSRF Base Grant	\$24,258,000
2026 IIJA CWSRF Supplemental Grant	83,639,000
2026 IIJA Emerging Contaminants Grant	7,220,000
State Matching Funds	21,579,400
Leveraged Bond Funds	410,000,000
Other Program Funds	207,221,692
<b>Total Sources</b>	<b>\$ 753,918,092</b>
Funding Uses	
Project Loans and Grants*	\$676,179,902
Minimum Loan Forgiveness	47,641,390
Transfer to DWSRF	25,780,920
Administrative Costs	4,315,880
<b>Total Uses</b>	<b>\$ 753,918,092</b>
<i>*Includes 2026 costs associated with the CW projects being offered financing and does not represent the full program demand. There is approximately \$166 million in CW project costs associated with the unfunded projects listed on the Project Priority List (PPL) listed in Table 3 on page 24.</i>	

### B. Source of State Match

Based on the anticipated 2026 CWSRF Base and IIJA grants, the state matching funds in the amount listed above are provided to the Trust from the Commonwealth's Capital Plan prior to the receipt of the 2026 EPA grant awards.

### C. Fee Income

Recipients of SRF loans are charged an annual administrative fee of 0.15% (15 basis points) against the outstanding loan principal to fund salaries and expenses of the Trust and MassDEP related to SRF project development and loan management. As of September 30, 2025, the Trust has a balance of approximately \$50.6 million in its Administrative Account. Additionally, the Trust may charge an amount not to exceed \$5.50 per \$1,000 as a loan origination fee to offset the costs incurred during its bond issuance. The Trust did not charge a loan origination fee for the last series financing. All fee income is CWSRF program income.

### D. Program Administration

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts intends to use the full 4% of the federal Base Grant and the CWSRF IIJA Supplemental Grant funds for administrative support of activities related to the CWSRF. Use of those funds is detailed in the CWSRF Grant Application that the Trust files each year with the EPA.

## **E. Anticipated Cash Draw Ratio**

Massachusetts will draw 100% of the state match funds before drawing federal grant funds.

## **F. Transfer of Funds Between CWSRF and DWSRF**

*Section 302 of the 1996 Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments* allows states the flexibility to move funds between the CWSRF and the Drinking Water SRF (DWSRF) programs to better address specific state priorities. The EPA allows an equivalent of up to 33% of the DWSRF Base grant to be transferred between the CWSRF and DWSRF Base Grant.

The level of federal grant funding for the DWSRF is insufficient to meet desired project financing. Transferring a limited amount of funds from the CWSRF to the DWSRF this year and in the future will help increase the overall capacity of the DWSRF and reduce the number of unfinanced projects with minimal impacts to the CWSRF IUP.

Massachusetts will transfer funds from the CWSRF to the DWSRF program in the amount of 33% of the anticipated 2026 DWSRF base grant, IJA supplemental grant amount, and the Emerging Contaminant grant. This transfer will not adversely impact CWSRF project financing in this IUP.

## **G. Additional Subsidy Amounts**

In the 2026 CWSRF IUP, Massachusetts intends to award between 20% and 30% of the \$24 million Base Grant in additional subsidy to eligible projects. In addition, the Supplemental Grant of \$83 million is required to provide 49%, or \$41 million as additional subsidy. The Emerging Contaminant Grant requires 100% of the grant to be provided as additional subsidy for eligible projects.

# **VII. Program Management**

## **A. Assurances and Special Conditions**

MassDEP and the Trust have provided the required assurances and certifications as part of the Operating Agreement (OA) between Massachusetts and the EPA. The OA describes the mutual obligations among EPA, MassDEP, and the Trust. The purpose of the OA is to provide a framework of procedures to be followed in the management and administration of the CWSRF.

The OA addresses the commitment to key CWSRF requirements, including:

- Section 602(a) Environmental Reviews: The CWSRF will conduct environmental reviews according to the [State Environmental Review Process](#) developed for the SRF.
- Section 603(b) (3) Binding Commitments: The CWSRF will enter binding commitments for 120 percent of each quarterly grant payment within one year of receipt of the payment.
- Section 602(b) (4) Expeditious and Timely Expenditures: The CWSRF will expend all funds in the CWSRF in a timely manner.

- Consistency with Planning. The Commonwealth agrees that it will not provide assistance to any project unless that project is consistent with plans developed under Section 205(j), 208, 303(e), 319, or 320.

## **B. Federal Requirements**

A number of federal requirements apply to CWSRF projects in an amount equal to the Base Grant and IIJA Grants including:

- Single Audit Act (2 CFR 200 Subpart F)
- Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) reporting
- Federal environmental crosscutters (all projects)
- Project signage to enhance the public awareness of EPA assistance (“[Guidelines for Enhancing Public Awareness of SRF Assistance Agreements](#),” June 3, 2015).
- American Iron and Steel (all treatment works projects, regardless of funding source)
- Build America, Buy America (BABA) Act (group of projects)
- Ineligible Costs: any costs that are prohibited including but not limited to: 2 CFR 200.216, Prohibition on Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment.

All projects should anticipate adhering to all Federal Requirements listed above. MassDEP and the Trust will identify and notify eligible borrowers that will comprise the group of projects (projects receiving federal grants and reported in FFATA), that must comply with these requirements in the EPA grant applications. Frequently, the group of projects changes as projects move towards construction, usually due to attrition. If changes are made to the group of projects, appropriate amendments to the grant application will be made.

## **C. Davis-Bacon Wage Rates**

The amendments to the Clean Water Act, as part of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, apply the Davis-Bacon Act requirements to all treatment works projects going forward. The Davis-Bacon requirements do not apply to nonpoint source or decentralized wastewater treatment projects. MassDEP ensures that the required Davis-Bacon language is included in contracts and conducts field verifications of project compliance with the wage rate requirements.

## **D. American Iron and Steel and the Build America, Buy America Act**

On November 15, 2021, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) made the American Iron and Steel (AIS) procurement requirement permanent for all treatment works projects. Furthermore, with the inclusion of the Build America, Buy America (BABA), the IIJA expands domestic sourcing requirements to CWSRF projects funded with federal capitalization grants going forward. Additionally, per the EPA, projects being co-funded by the SRF loan and Congressional Directed Spending grant are required to comply with the BABA Act. Additional details are available at the EPA [Build America, Buy America](#)

[\(BABA\)](#) webpage.

## **E. Audits and Annual Reports**

MassDEP and the Trust will comply with all the auditing and reporting requirements of the EPA. A single audit is conducted annually and reporting to the EPA is done through the Office of Water State Revolving Fund (OWSRF) data system (with data updated quarterly), the Annual Report, and FFATA reporting; for details visit the Trust's [Investor Resources page](#).

## **F. The MBTA Communities Act**

The receipt of state funding is contingent upon the awardee being able to certify that it will comply with the Massachusetts General Laws, including G.L. c. 40A, § 3A, the MBTA Communities Act. Compliance with the MBTA Communities Act is determined by the Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities.

## **VIII. Public Review and Comment**

Notice of the availability of the Draft Calendar Year 2026 IUP/PPL and upcoming public hearing was made on February 20, 2026. [The 2026 Draft SRF Intended Use Plans and Public Hearing Notice](#) were published in the Boston Globe, on the Commonwealth's website, Mass.gov, and on social media. Additionally, the notice was sent out via email to municipalities, water utilities, and the environmental consultants who have assisted SRF project proponents.

MassDEP accepted written testimony and held a virtual public hearing to receive oral testimony on March 24, 2026. A summary of written comments and a transcript of the oral comments is included in this IUP starting on page 28.

Any material program changes would require an amendment to this IUP. MassDEP would be required to provide public notice and an appropriate comment period before issuing an amended IUP.

**TABLE 1  
CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND  
Calendar Year 2026 CWSRF Intended Use Plan**

**NEW PROJECTS**

Rating	Applicant	SRF ID	Project	Project Cost	2026 IUP Cost
556	HULL #(PF)(BG)	19258	Secondary Clarifiers, Grit, and Building Upgrades	\$9,630,000	\$9,630,000
552	LOWELL (H)(PF)	19295	Phase 3A Sewer System Separation Project	\$47,567,730	\$12,000,000
551	LOWELL #(H)(PF)	19289	Centralville Phase 2A Sewer Separation Project	\$37,900,000	\$12,000,000
551	LOWELL #(H)(PF)(BG)	19300	Centralville Phase 2B Sewer Separation Project	\$63,900,000	\$2,000,000
550	NEW BEDFORD #(PF)	19308	Wastewater Collection System Improvements	\$22,620,000	\$22,620,000
548	ROCKLAND #(PF)(SG)	19307	Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades	\$32,358,000	\$32,358,000
546	DENNIS (PF)(SG)	19254	Phase 1 - Conveyance & Effluent Recharge Site 2	\$39,000,000	\$25,000,000
546	NANTUCKET (H)	19331	Phase 2B Surfside WWTF Improvements	\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000
544	BARNSTABLE (H)(PF)	19320	Long Pond Sewer Expansion Project	\$43,787,111	\$5,000,000
542	NANTUCKET (H)(BG)	19209	Somerset Needs Area Sewer Extension	\$36,800,000	\$36,800,000
540	LOWELL (H)(PF)	19327	Downtown Sewer Improvements - Phase 2	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
539	BILLERICA #(H)(PF)	19214	Lowell Street and River Crossing Sewer Rehab	\$2,733,675	\$2,733,675
539	REVERE (H)(PF)	19260	Wonderland Area Sewer Improvements	\$12,200,000	\$12,200,000
538	SAUGUS #(PF)	19269	Comprehensive Sewer System Rehabilitation - 1D	\$5,512,470	\$5,512,470
537	MONTAGUE (PF)	19253	Montague Collections System Rehab - Phase 2	\$1,774,190	\$1,774,190
536	HAVERHILL (PF)(SG)	19263	WWTF and South Mill Street Pump Station Upgrades	\$66,497,000	\$50,000,000
536	SWAMPSCOTT #(H)	19251	Phase 2C Sewer Improvements	\$3,410,000	\$3,410,000
535	NEWTON (H)	19314	PCP Structural Stormwater Control Implementation	\$4,329,664	\$4,329,664
534	LYNN WATER AND SEWER COMMISSION #	19271	CSO 005 Sewer Separation	\$32,170,438	\$32,170,438
534	SCITUATE (H)(SG)	19313	North Scituate Sewer Expansion	\$27,000,000	\$27,000,000
532	MARION	19267	WPCF Phosphorus Mitigation	\$2,450,000	\$2,450,000
530	NAHANT #	19212	Sewer Collection System Repair & Replacement 2026	\$16,999,000	\$16,999,000
530	BROCKTON #(PF)	19221	Cashman Road Sewer	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000
530	SOMERVILLE #(H)(SG)	19286	MORRISON AVENUE LINEAR STORAGE	\$130,392,395	\$50,000,000
529	QUINCY #(H)(PF)	19282	FY27 Sewer and Drain Improvements	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
526	BROCKTON #(PF)	19220	Sewer System Rehabilitation Phase 5	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
525	FALL RIVER (PF)	19284	Ferry Street Pump Station Rehabilitation	\$2,900,670	\$2,900,670
524	QUINCY (H)(PF)	19274	Wollaston Stormwater Capacity Improvements Phase I	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000
522	CHELSEA (H)(PF)	19312	CHE-004 Sewer Separation and Utility Upgrades-Ph.2	\$15,385,068	\$15,385,068
<b>TOTAL OF NEW PROJECTS</b>				<b>\$686,317,411</b>	<b>\$413,273,175</b>

(Count: 29)

(Average Rating: 538.)

(BG) - Base Capitalization Grant

(D) - Dropped by Applicant

(H) - Housing Choice Communities

(PF) - Affordability Criteria applicable, eligible for Principal Forgiveness. All eligible projects are anticipated to receive subsidy.

(RE) - Potential Renewable Energy Projects

(SG) - BIL CWSRF General Supplemental Grant

# - Projects contains Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy and/or meets EPA's definition of a Green Project (<https://www.epa.gov/greeningepa/energy-and-emissions-epa>)



**TABLE 2**  
**CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND**  
**Calendar Year 2026 CWSRF ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROJECTS**

**ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROJECTS**

Rating	Applicant	SRF ID	Project	Project Cost	Grant Amount
79	SOUTH HADLEY	19296	Asset Management Plan	\$250,000	\$150,000
61	SOMERSET	19210	Stormwater Asset Management	\$250,000	\$150,000
<b>TOTAL OF ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROJECTS</b>				<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>

(Count: 2)

<b>TOTAL OF PROJECT PRIORITY LIST</b>	<b>\$500,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>
---------------------------------------	------------------	------------------

\* - small systems

**TABLE 3  
CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND  
Calendar Year 2026 CWSRF Project Priority List**

**NEW PROJECTS**

Rating	Applicant	NPDES/PERMIT	SRF ID	Project	Project Cost
556	HULL #(PF)(BG)	MAG590037	19258	Secondary Clarifiers, Grit, and Building Upgrades	\$9,630,000
552	LOWELL (H)(PF)	MA0100633	19295	Phase 3A Sewer System Separation Project	\$47,567,730
551	LOWELL #(H)(PF)	MA0100633	19289	Centralville Phase 2A Sewer Separation Project	\$37,900,000
551	LOWELL #(H)(PF)(BG)	MA0100633	19300	Centralville Phase 2B Sewer Separation Project	\$63,900,000
550	NEW BEDFORD #(PF)	MA0100781	19308	Wastewater Collection System Improvements	\$22,620,000
548	ROCKLAND #(PF)(SG)	MAG590038	19307	Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrades	\$32,358,000
546	DENNIS (PF)(SG)	Ground Water	19254	Phase 1 - Conveyance & Effluent Recharge Site 2	\$39,000,000
546	NANTUCKET (H)	Ground Water	19331	Phase 2B Surfside WWTF Improvements	\$8,000,000
544	BARNSTABLE (H)(PF)	Not Applicable	19320	Long Pond Sewer Expansion Project	\$43,787,111
542	NANTUCKET (H)(BG)	Ground Water	19209	Somerset Needs Area Sewer Extension	\$36,800,000
541	BARNSTABLE (H)(PF)	Not Applicable	19228	Long Beach Area Sewer Expansion Project	\$0
540	LOWELL (H)(PF)	MA0100633	19327	Downtown Sewer Improvements - Phase 2	\$2,000,000
539	REVERE (H)(PF)	Not Applicable	19260	Wonderland Area Sewer Improvements	\$12,200,000
539	BILLERICA #(H)(PF)	MA0101711	19214	Lowell Street and River Crossing Sewer Rehab	\$2,733,675
538	SAUGUS #(PF)	Not Applicable	19269	Comprehensive Sewer System Rehabilitation - 1D	\$5,512,470
537	MONTAGUE (PF)	MA0100137, MAG590020	19253	Montague Collections System Rehab - Phase 2	\$1,774,190
536	SWAMPSCOTT #(H)	Not Applicable	19251	Phase 2C Sewer Improvements	\$3,410,000
536	HAVERHILL (PF)(SG)	MA0101621	19263	WWTF and South Mill Street Pump Station Upgrades	\$66,497,000
535	NEWTON (H)	Storm Water	19314	PCP Structural Stormwater Control Implementation	\$4,329,664
534	LYNN WATER AND SEWER COMMISSION #	MA0100552	19271	CSO 005 Sewer Separation	\$32,170,438
534	SCITUATE (H)(SG)	MAG590041	19313	North Scituate Sewer Expansion	\$27,000,000
532	MARION	MA0100030	19267	WPCF Phosphorus Mitigation	\$2,450,000
530	NAHANT #	Storm Water	19212	Sewer Collection System Repair & Replacement 2026	\$16,999,000
530	SOMERVILLE #(H)(SG)	MA0101982	19286	MORRISON AVENUE LINEAR STORAGE	\$130,392,395
530	BROCKTON #(PF)	MA0101010	19221	Cashman Road Sewer	\$4,500,000
529	QUINCY #(H)(PF)	Not Applicable	19282	FY27 Sewer and Drain Improvements	\$5,000,000
526	BROCKTON #(PF)	MA0101010	19220	Sewer System Rehabilitation Phase 5	\$2,500,000
525	FALL RIVER (PF)	MA0100382	19284	Ferry Street Pump Station Rehabilitation	\$2,900,670

**TABLE 3  
CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND  
Calendar Year 2026 CWSRF Project Priority List**

**NEW PROJECTS - continued**

Rating	Applicant	NPDES/PERMIT	SRF ID	Project	Project Cost
524	QUINCY (H)(PF)	Storm Water	19274	Wollaston Stormwater Capacity Improvements Phase I	\$7,000,000
522	CHELSEA (H)(PF)	MA0101877	19312	CHE-004 Sewer Separation and Utility Upgrades-Ph.2	\$15,385,068
448	NEW BEDFORD (PF)	MA0100781	19328	WWTP Improvements	\$11,250,000
436	GREAT BARRINGTON (H)(PF)	MAG590025	19292	WWTF Nitrogen Removal and Avery Lane PS Upgrades	\$18,334,800
433	BILLERICA (H)(PF)	MA0101711	19319	Brown Street Force Main Rehabilitation/Replacement	\$20,646,400
432	TYNGSBOROUGH (PF)	MA0100633	19243	Phalanx Street Sewer Extension and Pump Station	\$2,263,000
427	WAREHAM (PF)	Not Applicable	19242	Narrows Pump Station Forcemain Replacement Project	\$16,250,000
423	ORANGE (PF)	MAG590019	19280	East Main Street Sewer Replacement (Phase 2)	\$1,575,000
420	MERRIMAC (PF)	MAG580030	19240	Merrimac Wastewater Treatment Facility Upgrade	\$33,628,700
338	BILLERICA (H)(PF)	MA0101711	19318	Darby and Waterview Avenue Pump Stations	\$4,770,000
238	BARNSTABLE (H)(PF)	Ground Water	19316		\$7,440,000
235	BROCKTON (PF)	MA0101010	19222	AWRF Biosolids Management Improvements	\$25,000,000
231	NEW BEDFORD (PF)	Not Applicable	19273	Water Quality Improvements	\$8,220,000
222	SHREWSBURY (H)	MA0100412	19275	Harvey Place & Jordan Pond Pump Station Upgrades	\$4,000,000
217	CONCORD	MAG590030	19259	Concord WWTP Upgrades - Phase 1	\$4,252,000
217	WORCESTER (H)(PF)	MA0102369	19317	Dunkirk Ave Pump Station Upgrade	\$6,333,756
216	NORTH BROOKFIELD (PF)	MAG580037	19252	No. Brookfield Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade	\$2,521,495
<b>TOTAL OF NEW PROJECTS</b>					<b>\$852,802,562</b>

(Count: 45)

(Average Rating: 468.36)

(BG) - Base Capitalization Grant

(D) - Dropped by Applicant

(H) - Housing Choice Communities

(PF) - Affordability Criteria applicable, eligible for Principal Forgiveness. All eligible projects are anticipated to receive subsidy.

(RE) - Potential Renewable Energy Projects

(SG) - BIL CWSRF General Supplemental Grant

# - Projects contains Energy Efficiency, Renewable Energy and/or meets EPA's definition of a Green Project (<https://www.epa.gov/greeningepa/energy-and-emissions-epa>)

**TABLE 3  
CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND  
Calendar Year 2026 CWSRF Project Priority List**

**MULTI-YEAR CARRYOVER AND STATUTORY PROJECTS**

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>NPDES/PERMIT</b>	<b>SRF ID</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>
BARNSTABLE (H)(PF)	Storm Water	16683	Route 28 West Sewer Expansion Project	\$49,474,313
BARNSTABLE (H)(PF)	Not Applicable	19003	Phinney's Lane Neighborhoods Sewer Expansion	\$45,070,464
BARNSTABLE (H)(PF)	Not Applicable	19085	Centerville Village Sewer Expansion - South Phase	\$15,000,000
BARNSTABLE (PF)(SG)(H)	Other	16677	Nitrogen Removal Improv. & New Headworks Facility	\$95,788,720
BOSTON WATER AND SEWER COMMISSION (H)#	MA0101192	16690	East Boston Sewer Separation Phase IV	\$135,368,310
DENNIS (PF)	Ground Water	16676	Phase 1 - WRRF and Collection System	\$184,986,656
EASTHAM (H)(PF)	Not Applicable	18984	Eastham Wastewater Phase 1	\$170,000,000
LOWELL (H)#(PF)	MA0100633	19108	Phase 3A Sewer System Separation Project	\$24,164,994
MASHPEE (PF)	Ground Water	16791	Phase 2 Mashpee Treatment and Collection System	\$95,200,000
MWRA	MA0103284	6822	DITP Clarifier #2	\$289,359,690
NEW BEDFORD (PF)#	Not Applicable	16873	Wastewater Collection System Improvements	\$58,964,807
YARMOUTH (PF)	GW Permit	8349	Phase I - WRRF and Collection System	\$205,841,464
<b>TOTAL OF MULTI-YEAR CARRYOVER AND STATUTORY PROJECTS</b>				<b>\$1,369,219,418</b>

(Count: 12)

**MassDEP PRIORITY PROJECTS**

<b>Applicant</b>	<b>NPDES/PERMIT</b>	<b>SRF ID</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>Project Cost</b>
COMMUNITY SEPTIC MANAGEMENT	N/A	3850	Community Septic Management Program	\$5,000,000
EMERGENCY SRF SET-ASIDE	N/A	2977		\$3,000,000
PLANNING SRF SET-ASIDE		13575		\$13,000,000
SEWER OVERFLOW AND STORMWATER REUSE SET-ASIDE		18972		\$4,400,000
<b>TOTAL OF MassDEP PRIORITY PROJECTS</b>				<b>\$25,400,000</b>

(Count: 4)

**TOTAL OF PROJECT PRIORITY LIST** **\$2,247,421,980**

**TABLE 4**  
**CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND**  
**Calendar Year 2026 CWSRF ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROJECTS**

**ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROJECTS**

Rating	Applicant	SRF ID	Project	Project Cost
79	SOUTH HADLEY	19296	Asset Management Plan	\$250,000
61	SOMERSET	19210	Stormwater Asset Management	\$250,000
58	HARDWICK (GMNM)	19245	Sewer Asset Management Plan (Phase 1)	\$227,986
58	BUCKLAND (GMNM)	19261	Sewer Asset Management Plan (Phase 1)	\$247,519
56	HILLCREST SEWER DISTRICT (GMNM)	19232	Sewer Asset Management Plan	\$212,612
56	STOCKBRIDGE (GMNM)	19250	Wastewater Asset Management Plan	\$245,483
55	ASHBURNHAM (GMNM)	19247	Ashburnham Stormwater Asset Management Plan	\$125,000
54	WEST STOCKBRIDGE (GMNM)	19287	Wastewater Asset Management Plan	\$217,487
50	STURBRIDGE (GMNM)	19277	Sturbridge Stormwater Asset Management Plan	\$186,700
47	AGAWAM SPRINGS WATER COMPANY (GMNM)	19256	ASWC/Redbrook Asset Management	\$157,000
39	HARWICH (GMNM)	19330	Harwich Water and Sewer Asset Management Program	\$280,000
39	BEVERLY (GMNM)	19283	Sanitary Sewer Asset Management Development	\$260,000
39	ROCKPORT (GMNM)	19323	Rockport Asset Management Grant Project	\$250,000
39	WAYLAND (GMNM)	19326	Wayland Water and Wastewater AMP	\$125,000
38	WAGON WHEEL COMMUNITY (GMNM)	19262	Wagon Wheel Community Clean Water	\$63,200
36	LEE (GMNM)	19249	Stormwater Asset Management Plan (Phase 1)	\$247,783
36	NORTON (GMNM)	19337	Norton Asset Management	\$185,000
35	HOLYOKE (GMNM)	19266	City of Holyoke - Wastewater System Asset Planning	\$250,000
33	MIDDLEBOROUGH (GMNM)	19231	Stormwater Asset Management	\$250,000
33	NORTHBOROUGH (GMNM)	19304	Northborough Culvert Asset Management Plan	\$124,000
32	UPTON (GMNM)	19297	Sewer System Asset Management Plan	\$138,400
27	FOXBOROUGH (GMNM)	19230	Stormwater Asset Management	\$250,000
24	MARLBOROUGH (GMNM)	19291	Wastewater Pump Station Asset Management Plan	\$175,600
22	WOBURN (GMNM)	19265	Stormwater Asset Management Plan	\$90,000
21	BILLERICA (GMNM)	19324	Billerica Asset Management Grant Project	\$250,000
19	WINCHESTER (GMNM)	19244	Winchester Asset Management Program - WW & SW	\$250,000
17	HOPKINTON (GMNM)	19321	Hopkinton, MA Asset Management Plan Update	\$90,000
15	FRANKLIN (GMNM)	19281	Sewer Pipelines Asset Management Plan	\$250,000

**TOTAL OF ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROJECTS**

**\$5,648,770**

(Count: 28)

**TOTAL OF PROJECT PRIORITY LIST**

**\$5,648,770**

\* - small systems  
(GMNM) - Grant Metrics Not Met

## Summary of Responses to Testimonies Received via Email and Correspondence for the 2026 Draft Intended Use Plan

---

**Date:** 3/12/2026  
**Commenter:** Christopher Gallagher, P.E., Director of Public Works, Town of Foxborough  
**Subject:** CW and DW PFAS Loan Program  
**Comment Summary:** Testimony urges MassDEP to continue providing 0% interest financing for the full balance of funding for all PFAS carryover projects that were originally approved under that program structure.  
**MassDEP's Response:** Not directly related to the approved IUP project list. Testimony was reviewed with no change to the discussion within the IUP document.

---

**Date:** 3/16/2026  
**Commenter:** Christopher Dillon, Billerica Town Manager  
**Subject:** CW-19319 Brown Street Force Main Rehabilitation/Replacement  
**Comment Summary:** Letter received by mail requesting that this project be included in the 2026 CWSRF IUP.  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project's was reviewed and there is no change.

---

**Date:** 3/16/2026  
**Commenter:** Marc T. Lombardo, State Representative  
**Subject:** CW-19319 Brown Street Force Main Rehabilitation/Replacement  
**Comment Summary:** Letter received by mail requesting that this project be included in the 2026 CWSRF IUP.  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project was reviewed and there is no change.

---

**Date:** 3/20/2026  
**Commenter:** John Walkey  
**Subject:** CW-19312 CHE-004 Sewer Separation and Utility Upgrades-Ph.2  
**Comment Summary:** GreenRoots' written testimony in support of the City of Chelsea's Phase II Sewer Separation Project.  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project is funded on the draft and final IUP.

---

**Date:** 3/23/2026  
**Commenter:** Abigail J. Charest, Ph.D., P.E.  
**Subject:** CW-14012 Wayland Water and Wastewater AMP  
**Comment Summary:** RESCORING REQUEST: Letter requesting review and clarification of several evaluation categories associated with their Water and Wastewater Asset Management Plan application (PEF No. CW-14012).  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project's PEF score was reviewed and there is no change.

---

## Summary of Responses to Testimonies Received via Email and Correspondence for the 2026 Draft Intended Use Plan

---

**Date:** 3/23/2026  
**Commenter:** Ken Carlson for 22nd Middlesex District Rep. Marc Lombardo and Billerica Town Manager Christopher Dillon  
**Subject:** CW-19319 Brown Street Force Main Rehabilitation/Replacement  
**Comment Summary:** Letters from 22nd Middlesex District Rep. Marc Lombardo and Billerica Town Manager Christopher Dillon as testimony in support of considering the Brown Street Force Main Rehabilitation/Replacement Project (SRF ID No. 19319) for the 2026 SRF Clean Water IUP  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project was reviewed and there is no change.

---

**Date:** 3/23/2026  
**Commenter:** Ken Carlson for Frederick Russell  
**Subject:** CW-19319 Brown Street Force Main Rehabilitation/Replacement  
**Comment Summary:** Letter and Attachment A from the Town of Billerica as testimony in support of considering the Brown Street Force Main Rehabilitation/Replacement Project (SRF ID No. 19319) for the 2026 SRF Clean Water IUP.  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project was reviewed and there is no change.

---

**Date:** 3/23/2026  
**Commenter:** Griffin Beaudoin, P.E. for Daniel W. Santos, Barnstable DPW Director  
**Subject:** CW-19228 Long Beach Area Sewer Expansion Project  
**Comment Summary:** WITHDRAW REQUEST: Request from Daniel W. Santos, Barnstable DPW Director to withdraw the Long Beach Area Sewer Expansion Project from consideration on the 2026 CWSRF IUP and redistribute the money to increase the 2026 funding for the Town's other various  
**MassDEP's Response:** Comments considered in development of final IUP.

---

**Date:** 3/24/2026  
**Commenter:** Josie Ahlberg for Adam Chapdelaine, MMA  
**Subject:** CW / DW PFAS Loan Program  
**Comment Summary:** Letter from Adam Chapdelaine, Executive Director & CEO of Massachusetts Municipal Association. They express their strong concerns with the decision to sunset the zero percent interest loan program for PFAS remediation projects.  
**MassDEP's Response:** Not directly related to the approved IUP project list. Testimony was reviewed with no change to the discussion within the IUP document.

---

## Summary of Responses to Testimonies Received via Email and Correspondence for the 2026 Draft Intended Use Plan

---

**Date:** 3/24/2026  
**Commenter:** Jess Richard  
**Subject:** CW-14004, CW-13974, CW-13968, CW-13929 various Asset Management Plans  
**Comment Summary:** RESCORING REQUEST: Written testimony regarding the AMP scoring for the following communities:• Needham DWSRF AMP - Water System Asset Management Plan• Hopkinton CWSRF AMP - Asset Management Plan Update• Upton CWSRF AMP - Sewer System Asset Management P  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project's PEF score was reviewed and there is no change.

---

**Date:** 3/24/2026  
**Commenter:** Britany Woodhouse for John Coderre, Ashburnham Town Administrator  
**Subject:** CW-13898 Ashburnham Stormwater Asset Management Plan  
**Comment Summary:** RESCORING REQUEST: Letter and supporting Attachments from John Coderre, Ashburnham Town Administrator requesting a reevaluation of the project's scoring.  
**MassDEP's Response:** This project's PEF score was reviewed and there is no change.

## Public Review and Comment Summary

Transcript of the 2026 Draft Intended Use Plans Public Hearing for Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, Held Virtually via Zoom on Monday, March 24, 2026, at 1:00 PM

Public Hearing Officer: Kaitlyn Connors, Director of Division of Water Investment, Mass DEP

Assistant to Public Hearing Officer: Gregory Devine, Environmental Engineer, Mass DEP

Commentors:

13:07:07 [Thomas Holder] : Tom Holder, Town of Wayland, DPW Director

13:12:35 [Barbara Turkington] : Barbara Turkington, Lunenburg Resident

13:14:41 [Andrew Starvaski] : Andrew Starvaski, Lunenburg Resident

13:19:56 [Abigail Charest] : Abigail Charest, Town of Wayland, Town Engineer

13:22:11 [Mark Ells, Barnstable] : Mark Ells, Barnstable Town Manager

13:25:50 [John Fortune]: John Fortune, Lunenburg Resident

13:27:46 [Jennifer Pederson] : Jennifer Pederson, Mass Water Works Association, Executive Director

13:31:53 [Fred Russell] : Fred Russell, Town of Billerica, DPW Director and Nick Evans, Wastewater Superintendent

13:34:28 [Patrick Hill] : Patrick Hill, City of Brockton, DPW Commissioner

13:38:27 [Joan Pease] : Joan Pease, Lunenburg Resident

13:44:33 [Cate Fox-Lent] : Cate Fox-Lent, City of Chelsea, Public Works Commissioner

13:44:36 [Michael Wegerbauer] : Michael Wegerbauer, Town of Wayland, Board of Public Works

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:00:16

Good afternoon, everyone. It's just about 1 o'clock. I still see some folks trickling in, so we're going to give it maybe another minute, before we officially...kick things off. Thanks for your patience and thank you for being here with us today. All right, there's still a few folks joining, so bear with us as we get everyone in. Welcome, everyone. We're still trying to get everyone into the meeting, so hold on, just...a minute or so longer. Thanks for your patience. All right, so it looks like most folks have...entered into the meeting. And we do... Thank you, Greg. We do, in fact, have critical mass, so I think we can get started.

Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for being here today. My name is Caitlin Connors, and I'm representing MassDEP at today's virtual hearing. On the SRF's 2026 draft intended use plans. Please note that this virtual hearing is being recorded. I believe it started recording now, is that correct, Greg? Just want to confirm we're good to go?

[Gregory Devine] 13:03:11

We are good to go.

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:03:12

Excellent. So, before we begin, I'd like to provide a brief overview of how the hearing will proceed and share a few housekeeping matters. To minimize background noise, all attendees have been placed on mute. We ask that everyone remain muted during the hearing to reduce background noise. There will be an opportunity to provide oral testimony, at which point we will unmute those who wish to speak. If you have joined online and would like to provide oral testimony. Please enter your full name and affiliation in the chat box located in the Zoom control panel. Thanks to those of you who have already done so. Uh, if you're joining by phone today, we will unmute callers one at a time and ask for this information and provide an opportunity. For those callers to testify as well. If you're facing technical difficulties, please alert us through the chat function. However, we ask that you do not use the chat function to provide testimony. With me today is Greg Devine of MassDEP, and Greg will be calling on individuals who have indicated in the chat that they would like to provide testimony. And with that, I will now officially begin the hearing. Um, it is 1.04 PM.

So, this is a public hearing for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. My name is Caitlin Connors, and I'm the Director for the Division of Water Investment at MassDEP, and I'm the hearing officer on this matter today. You are reminded that this hearing is being recorded. We are here today at...1PM, or 1.04 PM, on Tuesday, March 24th, 2026. On a virtual public hearing to accept testimony concerning the 2026 Draft intended use plans for the clean water and the drinking water state revolving funds.

On February 20th, 2026, MassDEP published the draft IUPs and provided notice of their availability. In compliance with Mass General Laws Chapter 38, the Public Hearing Notice was published in the Boston Globe, and in Mass DEP's website. Outreach was conducted by email and social media. The draft intended use plans list by priority ranking, those projects that Mass DEP is recommending for financing. Please note that MassDEP will not be responding to the testimony during this hearing. All testimony received during the public comment period will be taken into consideration before finalizing the intended use plan. The public comment period closes at the conclusion of this hearing. In a moment, we'll begin to unmute those who have identified themselves as wishing to provide oral testimony. We will also prompt the phone participants to identify those who wish to testify.

Each speaker may speak once. Comment should be limited to those related to the draft IUPs. To ensure all who wish to testify are able to do so, we encourage participants to keep oral testimony to roughly 3 minutes. In order to allow everyone the opportunity to speak, I may limit each person's time. Before you proceed to provide your testimony, please state your full name and affiliation. When providing testimony, please be sure to identify the applicable project name and SRF ID number if appropriate. We also encourage those testifying to speak clearly and distinctly. And with that, I will now open the oral testimony and turn it over to Greg to begin inviting speakers to provide their comments.

[Gregory Devine] 13:06:55

Okay, thank you, Kaitlyn. Our first speaker today will be Tom Holder, Town of Wayland.

[Tom Holder] 13:07:07

Good afternoon. Everybody hear me, okay?

[Gregory Devine] 13:07:11

Yes.

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:07:11

Yes, loud and clear.

[Tom Holder] 13:07:12

Great. My name is Tom Holder. I am the DPW Director in Wayland. I am referencing, um, the Wayland MWRA interconnection, and Happy Hollow PFAS Treatment Facility. Uh, labeled drinking water 13886. I thank you for the opportunity to provide a clearer picture of Waylon's situation and propose solution. I believe there are a number of folks attending this hearing on behalf of Whalen, including Don Millett, our water superintendent. Mike Wegebauer, the Vice Chair of the Board of Public Works, and Kirsten Ryan of Kleinfelder Engineering. We submitted written testimony earlier today of what I am speaking of this afternoon.

With the 20 part per trillion PFAS maximum contamination level. We are presently needing to treat one of our groundwater supplies, the Happy Hollow Wellfield. With the federal MCL reduction to 4 parts per trillion, the three remaining supplies will exceed that MCL. The curve...

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:08:25

Tom, one moment, you were muted. Are you able to unmute yourself?

[Tom Holder] 13:08:30

How does this sound?

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:08:31

Much better, thank you, sorry about that.

[Tom Holder] 13:08:32

When...Uh, I'm trying to... when did you lose me?

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:08:36

Maybe, uh, I don't know, 10 seconds ago?

[Tom Holder] 13:08:40

Okay, I'll just, uh...I just want to make sure we don't miss anything.

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:08:43

Yeah.

[Tom Holder] 13:08:44

Um, with the 20 part per trillion PFAS maximum contamination level, we are presently needing to treat one of our groundwater supplies. The Happy Hollow Wellfield, um, with the federal MCL reduction of 4 parts per trillion, the 3 remaining supplies will exceed that MCL. The current ion exchange treatment system at our Happy Hollow Supply is a lease system and is permitted with mass DEP as a temporary pilot system. It is housed in a temporary fabric enclosure and is located within a floodplain. It is not intended to be, nor can it become, a sustainable solution to our PFAS contamination. In knowing this, Whalen has performed an extensive evaluation of alternatives that will allow us to maintain PFAS compliance. This thoughtful evaluation has resulted in the current approved plan to construct a new treatment plant at the Happy Hollow Well Field and make a permanent connection to the MWRA water system to supplement the local supply during high demands. We are presently at the 60% design threshold and are intending to bid and construct the solution beginning a year from now. So, in essence, we are...to be shovel-ready on the SRF timeline. As evidence of our dire situation, we have had to construct an emergency connection to the MWRA to supplement our local supplies when aged and outdated equipment fails as it regularly does. As I speak, this afternoon, the Happy Hollow Treatment System is offline due to repairs, and the MWRA emergency connection is operating. This connection has had to be used for about 123 days over the past 2 years. It can only be activated upon MassDEP issuing an emergency declaration along with a formal vote of the MWRA Board of Directors. Each time we have a need for the supplemental MWRA water, these mentioned mass DEP and MWRA formalities need to occur. Whalen cannot meet elevated demands of any single source goes offline. Whalen cannot meet even average day demands if either of its two largest sources go offline Wayland must pump its sources excessively without sufficient rest periods. It would appear that our project evaluation form submitted last year may have been misunderstood to not meet the criteria of a Tier 5 project and therefore did not receive the associated 500-point ranking. Our written testimony submitted earlier provides clarifying evidence that we meet Tier 5 criteria, namely that three of our four sources, our three largest, all need PFAS mitigation. I spoke of the Happy Hollow Source, which only meets Finnish Water MCLs through the operation of a failure-prone temporary system. We have one source with finished water with all samples exceeding 10 par per trillion of the PFAS-6. We have two sources with more than half of its samples exceeding 80% of the federal 4 par-per-trillion for PFOA and PFAS. I would like to assure decision makers that Wayland's project of a new treatment plant and permanent MWRA connection do indeed address compliance associated with federal and state standards, correct a contamination issue, and furthermore, reduce PFAS levels to below regulated standards.

We would very much like to be reconsidered as a Tier 5 project, be assigned that appropriate rating. And furthermore, be categorized to receive the extremely important SRF loan. I thank you for your consideration. And if, you know, appropriate, I'm...willing and happy to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you.

[Gregory Devine] 13:12:24

Thank you, Tom. Um...Our next participant will be...Barbara Turkington from Lunenburg.

[Barbara Turkington] 13:12:35

Hello, thank you. I am a resident of Lunenburg, as was just mentioned. My name is Barbara Turkington. I'd like to speak to the readiness of the Lunenburg Water District to proceed with the use of any SRF funding. Lunenburg Water District's application for SRF...is premature.

The Lunenburg Water District does not own the property around the Hickory Hills Well, which is listed in their application. They have an easement which was granted in 1993, which is for a small portion of Zone 1. Their ability to enforce Zone 1 restrictions may be limited due to an open legal question concerning partial extinguishment of the easement. This is a hurdle which impacts Lunenburg Water District. To begin this project for which SRF funding may be allocated.

In addition to the lack of readiness, the water source proposal has not been updated to meet current needs. In May of 2024, the Lunenburg Water District presented this exact same proposal to the Water District voters. And the voters overwhelmingly voted against this loan by a two-thirds vote. Nothing has changed in the proposal. And it's unlikely that the Water District voters will approve the same plan they rejected in 2024. This means that SRF funds, if allocated to the Lunenburg Water District, will most likely not be used. These funds could be allocated and better put to another to use by another town. Thank you for allowing my comments.

[Gregory Devine] 13:14:23

Thank you. Our next participant is Andrew Starvaski, Resident, Town of Lunenburg.

[Andrew Starvaski] 13:14:41

Thank you. My name is A.S. Andrew Starvaski, I'm a resident of Lunenburg, Mass., I'm a water user, I'm a rate payer, and a water district voter. Thank you for this opportunity to address the Mass DEP today. I'm talk... I'm addressing you about the Lunenburg Mass. clean drinking water treatment facility DW13876. The Lunenburg plan before you today does not represent an agreed-upon treatment plan. In fact, the Lunenburg Water District Commissioners are still evaluating and debating on the best path forward. They have made no final decisions on what Lunenburg's way forward should be and are still seeking water users' input via a survey. They're investigating the most appropriate technical way forward, how to treat Lunenburg's drinking water, and nothing, nothing has been finalized on. In fact, the plan in front of you today is the very same plan that the Lunenburg Water District submitted 3 years ago and was voted down. The plan submitted to the DEP is without the approval, or even the knowledge of the Lunenburg Water District's Commission. And it's against their specific direction not to submit a plan for drinking water funding this year. The plan you are considering today was never intended to be submitted by the Lunenburg Water District commissioners. This very day, the district does not have an executable plan to move forward. I'm specifically speaking because on the May 14th, 2025, Lunenburg Water District meeting, the commissions were still debating on the path forward. And they had decided not to request SRF funding that year. They stated we are not ready to

push forward for funding. And to quote the May 14, 2025, Lunenburg official meeting minutes from that meeting, quote, It was agreed that the WADA district would hold off this year applying for funding while investigating all options after the public has responded to the survey, end quote. I'd like to point out that Superintendent Francis McNamara was present at this meeting and agreed with the Commissioner's decision. But despite this, but the superintendent McNamara ignored the Commissioner's direction, and without their knowledge or approval, unilaterally and improperly directed the engineering firm of Tighe and Bond to prepare and resubmit the previous rejected 3-year-old proposal for consideration today. It was not until 5...Five months later that, at the December 3rd, 2025, meeting, when the commissioners were still discussing a way forward, that Superintendent McNamara finally inform the Lunenburg Water Commissioner that he already submitted an SRF request without their knowledge. To quote Mr. McNamara, you guys, the Lunenburg Water Commissioners, you guys aren't aware of this, but I've already applied for SRF funding. And upon hearing this, the commissioners appeared confused on exactly what undecided proposal the superintendent had submitted. After even more discussion, the superintendent then states, he has no idea if it will pass and maybe we'll get lucky. Maybe we'll get lucky. What I've just stated is not opinion. There's a matter of public record. Lunenburg has no approved plan and is not ready to move ahead, and the commissioners did not approve, or even were aware, of this project being submitted. This is gravely concerning to me, and I think to you as well. A Massachusetts water superintendent circumventing his own water commissioners' specific direction and knowingly submitting a plan that is not ready...or approved by the commissioners and not ready to be implicated. Implemented, excuse me. This is not only unethical, it shows a complete disregard to the DEP's procedures. And it's in complete disregard to every other Massachusetts community that's legitimately seeking funding and has an approved plan that's ready to move out. Once again, the plan you have before you today was never intended by the Lunenburg Water Commissioners to be submitted this year. It is outdated, unauthorized, not supported by the voters, and to this very day, I want to underscore the Lunenburg Water Commissioners do not have any agreed-upon plan. I'm asking the MassDEP to bypass this request. Do not allow it to move forward and tie up valuable funds, \$41 million, that could be better utilized by other communities that have an approved plan, that are better suited to use these limited funds. Thank you very much for listening to me today.

[Gregory Devine] 13:19:47

Our next participant is Abigail Charest, Town Engineer, Town of Wayland.

[Abigail Charest] 13:19:56

Hi, how are ya? Uh, good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name's Abby Charest, I'm the Wayland Town Engineer. I'm here on behalf of the Town of Wayland regarding our water and wastewater Asset Management Plan application. That's PEF number CW-14012. Additionally, I sent in a letter detailing, uh, these comments yesterday. First, I want to acknowledge and thank Master EP for its continued support of municipalities. Working to improve critical infrastructure, we truly value this program. However, after reviewing the scoring for our application, we were surprised to see several evaluation criteria receiving a score of 0. Even though the required information was included in our submissions, specifically our application clearly included a detailed project narrative, comprehensive scope of our work addressing all five required asset management components. And a thorough cost breakdown with a task-level detail in-kind services. For example, the scope of work outlines asset inventory, condition assessment, level of service development, risk

and criticality analysis, lifecycle cost evaluation, and a thorough cost breakdown. Um, which includes a Tesla, um, I'm sorry. Which includes, um, the level of service for development, the risk and criticality analysis, life cycle cost evaluation. And the long-term funding strategy, along with the final asset management plan report. Because of this, we are respectfully requesting a review of those scoring categories to ensure that all submitted materials were fully considered based on our review, correcting these areas would result in a score increase from 39 to 89. This project is an important step for Wayland. It will help us better manage our infrastructure, prioritize investments and ensure long-term financial stability for our water and wastewater infrastructure. Uh, we respectfully request an SDEP reevaluate the identified categories and adjust the scoring to accurately reflect the materials submitted. Thank you.

[Gregory Devine] 13:22:04

Our next participant is Mark Ells, Town Manager, Town of Barnstable. Mr. Ells

[Mark Ells, Barnstable] 13:22:11

Thank you, and good afternoon. Um, as identified on Mark Ellis, Barnstable Town Manager. Well, I just want to note that our Director of Public Works, Dan Santos, submitted a letter to Michelle Higgins, relevant to specific project comments. Um, I will not be reading those into the record. I wanted to take the time, much like the previous speaker, to thank you all. Um, for the... the efforts, whether you're in Boston or in the region. And specifically, Michelle is always there for, um, to answer questions as we move through. Um, you know, this somewhat cumbersome process to secure funds. I think you're all aware, it's probably why we're here, that this is one of the only um, you know, opportunities for communities to secure funding for their clean water and water supply projects. Barnstable's been an active participants, it's the creation, in 1991, um, as a form of Public Works Director and now Town Manager. I think I have a unique perspective on it. I also want to thank...you all for continuing the discussion of how to navigate this fiscally, challenged period of time. I think as much as... much of what will be discussed today relates to technical um, aspects. Uh, certainly the challenges that DEP and the state of Massachusetts have relevant to continuing this this... these funds for...prioritize projects, um, is critical in all of our abilities to move forward. The involvement, certainly, of our community and others in those in those discussions with DEP has been, um, you know, greatly expanded. And we appreciate that. We see it reflected in your draft 2026, we certainly have many questions moving forward into the next 5 years. As Barnstable alone has almost \$600 million worth of projects that they hope to come to Mass DEP, um, you know, SRF program to finance. Um, specifically on Cape Cod, you're aware that you know, we also have the Cape and Islands Trust Fund, which since it's its creation several years ago, is contributing 25% principal subsidy against eligible projects, eligibility determination being listed in the IUP. So, it is critical, that we collectively, communities and DEP, for all, whether you're on Gape Cod or anywhere in the Commonwealth, continue these discussions. Identify the means to subsidize um, you know, to the degree necessary in achievement of the priorities that our state and we...State establishes we, um, adopt and bring forward to you in our requests. Um, as we move forward from here. So, I... I came to say thank you, I came to say we... we remain available, both technically, financially, and any other way, and as town manager, um, personally available for this. So, thank you all, and please take a look at the, uh, the actual comments that Director Santos provided relevant to specific projects. Thank you all. Have a good day.

[Gregory Devine] 13:25:43

Our next participant is John Fortune, Resident, Town of Lunenburg.

[John Fortune] 13:25:50

Good afternoon, John Fortune, Lunenburg speaking on...DW14876. I'd like to confirm the previous speaker Starvaski's statements that the Lunenburg Water District district commissioners were not aware of the SRF proposal being submitted. I spoke to one of those commissioners personally, and when I told them the SRF request was for just 2 of the 3 well fields we have in town, uh, he adamantly disagreed. He said the commissioner's plan was to include all three from the very beginning. I then said to him, then you didn't look at the SRF submission, because I went in uh, and it includes only two of the well fields. This exact plan failed 2 years ago because our current well sources exceed the town's needs, and all the current state requirements. This SRF submission main intent is to restart a previously mentioned failed well that has not been in use for nearly 15 years. As mentioned, it does not...that well does not even have a protected Zone 1. Most of the Zone 1 is on adjacent private property. And the Lunenburg Water District has no rights to force compliance with Zone 1 restrictions on those properties. To spend nearly \$50 million on a partial plan not previously vetted by the commissioners or the voters, to restart a failed well, just trying to get SRF funding, does not seem compelling enough to change the minds of those same voters who overwhelmingly disapprove this plan, two years ago. If the new EPA PFAS requirements hold up in court, and Massachusetts adopts and provides funding for those requirements, that's when the Lunenburg Water District should present a plan to the voters to adequately provide water to the town and then go for SRF funding. Thank you.

[Gregory Devine] 13:27:41

Our next participant is Jennifer Pederson, Mass Water Works Association.

[Jennifer Pederson] 13:27:46

Uh, thank you. My name is Jennifer Pederson, I'm the Executive Director of Massachusetts Water Works Association. Mass Water Works represents public water systems across the Commonwealth that are responsible for delivering safe, reliable drinking water to millions of residents. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I did also submit written comments. We appreciate the effort by MassDEP and the Clean Water Trust to manage the SRF in what is clearly a very challenging funding environment. We recognize the competing demands on the program and the difficult trade-offs that come with that. That said, we did want to share some concerns regarding the decision to eliminate 0% interest loans for PFAS remediation projects, in the 2026 IUP, PFAS treatment projects are not discretionary. They are required to meet state and federal standards, often on aggressive timelines, and they come with significant costs. The availability of 0% financing has been a key tool for communities as they work to move these projects forward, and secure local approval. While we understand that other forms of subsidy will remain available, 0% financing provides a level of certainty that is particularly important at the local level. Without it, communities may face additional challenges in advancing these projects in a timely and affordable way. We are also hearing from some members that have already begun educating their communities on the need to address PFAS, with the

expectation that 0% financing would be part of the package. Changes at this stage can create real challenges locally, erode confidence in the water system, and over time can make it more difficult to build support for infrastructure investments. We understand that this change is driven by broader SRF capacity constraints, but from our perspective, reducing financial assistance does not solve that problem. It shifts the burdens directly onto ratepayers. As we have consistently emphasized, the Commonwealth is facing significant and growing infrastructure needs, and additional investment not reduce subsidy is needed to meet them. If the cost of providing 0% loans is contributing to those constraints. We believe the focus should be on increasing investment through increased appropriation to contract assistance in the state budget, an additional capitalization through the Mass Readies Act. Additionally, we believe continued advocacy to the congressional delegation, particularly as IJJA funding, is set to expire, is critically important. I also want to touch briefly on the lead service line funding. If there are remaining IJJA funds available, we strongly encourage MassDEP and the Trust to consider reinstating the grant program. As we saw previously, participation increased significantly when funding was offered as grants rather than loans.

That approach may be most successful in ensuring those funds are fully utilized within federal timelines, while helping communities meet their compliance obligations. Finally, Mass Water Works strongly encourages MassDEP and the Trust to issue the draft IUP as early as practicable, but no later than December 31st, as specified in 310 CMR 4505. Public water systems must navigate local approval processes often tied to town meeting or municipal budget cycles, that requires sufficient lead time to secure borrowing authorization, advance design, and prepare complete applications. When the draft IUP is released later than December, it compresses these already tight timelines and can delay or even jeopardize otherwise ready projects. In closing, the SRF remains the cornerstone of drinking water infrastructure financing in Massachusetts. At a time when costs and regulatory demands are increasing, maintaining strong and predictable financial assistance tools is essential to ensuring timely compliance and protecting public health. We thank MassDEP and the Trust staff for the important work you do for this program, and we look forward to continuing to work with you to find solutions that support both program sustainability and ratepayer affordability. Thank you for your time.

[Gregory Devine] 13:31:43

Our next participant, Fred Russell, Public Works Director, Town of Billerica.

[Fred Russell] 13:31:53

Good afternoon, um... Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. Um, I'm speaking about the town of Billerica Brown Street Forest Main Rehabilitation Project, SRF funding ID number 19319. Um, I had also submitted some written correspondence, as well as, um, State Representative Mark Lobato, and Town Manager Chris Jelen on our behalf. Uh, so to begin, the town of Berick is Brown Street Sewer Pump Station, um, the force main is in critical need of replacement. The forest main was constructed nearly 50 years ago, was recommended for replacement for the town's Comprehensive Boy Wastewater Management Plan. In 2011. It plays a critical role in the town's sewer infrastructure, conveying approximately 30% of the town's wastewater flow 3 miles from Brown Street Pump Station, almost 2 miles of it, which lies within the MBT right-of-way, less than 20 feet from the Lowell Branch commuter rail mainline, a critical transportation route in and out of Boston. The force may experience two catastrophic failures within the MBTA right-of-way, in June of 2020 and in March of 2021, negatively impacting both rail lines operations and the environment as the

commuter rail traffic was interrupted. And adjacent wetlands were contaminated by the resulting SSO. The town absorbed an excess of \$1 million in repair costs for these failures and engineers determined that the force main was in danger of additional failures in the near future due to severe corrosion and pipe age. It became apparent that the town could not rely on this force main any longer in its current condition as a long-term wastewater conveyance pipeline. Any future failure will result in environmental damage and major disruption to the state's commuter rail transportation system. Now, um, although this project was included in prior intended use plans through 2024, it was not carried forward into the 2025 or 2026 plans. The project appears on the draft calendar year 2026 intended use plan with a rating of 433, just 3 projects below the IUP, given the past and potential impacts to one of the state's critical transportation routes and the environment. The town respectfully requests that this project be included in the 2026 IUP. I want to, again, to thank you for the opportunity to speak. And I also want to thank the, uh, the trust staff for all the hard work they do. Thank you.

[Gregory Devine] 13:34:20

Our next participant is Patrick Hill, Public Works Commissioner, City of Brockton.

[Patrick Hill] 13:34:28

Good afternoon, everybody. I'm presenting for the City of Brockton for DWSRF project number 19223 for the purchase of the Aquaria desalination Plant, which is a...PFAS-free, underutilized source here in the South Coast. It's important to note that this purchase is not just for the City of Brockton, but more of a regional purchase. Because we will be providing, or we're looking to provide, PFAS-free water, not only to Brockton, but to other communities that are tied into the pipeline. Last year, there was an extensive study done with the Old Colony Planning Council, which determined two things. One, that the most reasonable solution to the region, the 13 communities that it looked at, was to... to...for the City of Brockton to make the acquisition of this plant and to provide water, not just for water quality purposes, but for other issues, um, within those communities. Under its current standing, the City of Brockton owns the entire capacity that comes out of the plant, which has made use of the plant almost impossible for other communities. We have currently engaged with the Town of Bridgewater, as I'm sure most of you know. They've been suffering from...some substantial discolored water, and they have other organic issues within their water system. The water quality issue there has impacted them in a couple of negative ways, one being that they, uh...certainly have upset their residents, but it has basically paused all the new growth in construction in their town. We also know that includes a skilled nursing facility, um, that the... that is ready to with permitting, and some campus upgrades at Bridgewater State University. So we recognize... the city recognizes that not only is this a...acquisition, yes, for the city, but it will have a regional impact. It's not just Brockton, it's not just Bridgewater, but other communities have also reached out to us as well. Communities like East Bridgewater, communities like Pembroke, communities like Avon, um, all people that are struggling not only with water quality issues, but with growth issues. The realization is that there is not substantial groundwater to support wells or new wells in any of these other communities anymore. And this plant, under its current capacity, could...alleviate a lot of those issues and spur new growth in these other communities. Brockton is just looking to be a partner. And we recognize that this is the third, or I would like to recognize that this is the third time that this project has died, number one, under the funding line. We strongly urge...the... the SRF...folks in... and the state folks to take a long look at this project and the positive impact it has in the region, not just to Brockton, but in the region.

We have a very expensive feasible source that could be used, uh, we're just looking for a little assistance from the state so that we can provide water to the rest of the region. Thank you.

[Gregory Devine] 13:38:03

Our next participant is Joan Pease, Town of Lunenburg. Joan, I'm sorry, could you bring yourself off of mute and start again? That's great, thank you

[Joan Pease] 13:38:27

Joan Pease, Lunenburg, Massachusetts. Um, water customer, I'm speaking to DW14876. Not only do I agree wholeheartedly with the past speakers from Lunenburg, John Fortune, Andrew Starvaski, and Barbara Turkington, but I, myself, was invited to attend the May 14th, 2025, Water District Commissioner's meeting by a commissioner. And at that meeting, I personally heard the commissioner state that they are not ready to apply for SRF funds this year. It's not only in the minutes, I witnessed it. And then, on December 3rd, the Commissioner's meeting, the superintendent did indeed state, oh, you guys don't know this, but I applied. Not only did the commissioners not know it, but the Water District voters did not know it. That's inappropriate. And it seems kind of...I'll just stop there. In addition to that, one of the criteria for SRF funds is that it be a primary water source. This application for the two wells will actually reduce the water supply in Lunenburg by 30%. Eliminating our primary well of Keatings. So I feel the plant... the pro... uh...the plan to apply does not meet the primary well consideration. And lastly, there are legal hurdles, the area around the well is only partially covered by an easement. Some of the area around the well is not covered by any...uh, legal document, which gives the water... the water district any ability to control activities on it. And the easement does have some legal questions as to partial extinguishment due to a history of non-enforcement. Thank you for this opportunity to speak, and I hope the DEP will consider this. Um, testimony. Last time they awarded the money to Lunenburg, it was voted down overwhelmingly, not by a small group, by over two-thirds of the voters that day. Thank you very much.

[Gregory Devine] 13:41:01

Our next participant is Cate Fox-Lent Public Works Commissioner, City of Chelsea. Yes.

[Cate Fox-Lent] 13:41:12

At the moment, my name is Kate Fox-Lent. I'm the Commissioner of Public Works for the City of Chelsea. I am speaking today on CW19312, and I... today, I just want to provide some additional context for our application, which is, Chelsea is a CSO community, and when these stormwater overflows occur, the water quality impacts directly affect the state-owned Mary O'Malley Park. Which is one of the very few places in Chelsea where residents can actually access the water directly, um, where people may cool off, where people fish. It's, you know, the water quality is critically important in this area. It also directly affects our neighbors across the river in East Boston. Chelsea has put in a lot of thought and work into addressing our CSOs. We have put together a 50-year plan to eliminate CSOs through complete sewer separation that we are diligently working through. In 2018, we started one project, uh, upstream section of Chelsea 4, which is the overflow of interest here, to do

separation, we followed that up with a second project started in 2024, and this current project that's been proposed is the final step that will connect all of the improvements. In those prior projects to the MWRA interceptor, and finally achieve separation that will, in fact, redirect, uh, just the sewage into the treatment, pipeline, and just the stormwater out to the river. So, this is a critically important project to really realize those prior improvements. And over the past decade, construction costs have increased significantly. This is also the deepest part of the system, which makes it complicated to construct and... and consequently more expensive. So, with a project estimated to be over \$15 million, this will be the largest project that Chelsea has undertaken to date, and we really can't do something like this without a large program like the SRF. So, I am mostly saying, uh, thank you to MassDEP and Clean Water Trust for recognizing the importance of this project. We hope it will remain on the IEP, and um...you know, this will be a huge step for the future of Chelsea. Thank you.

[Gregory Devine] 13:43:44

in reviewing the list, Director Connors, everyone has...who's indicated that they would like to participate has done so.

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:43:53

Great. I just want to make sure that everyone who's on and wanted to speak, has done so. Um, if...if you would like to speak, please enter your name in the chat now. Otherwise, um...I can move to close the hearing, but I do want to give folks just...Just a moment. I think there's one more.

[Gregory Devine] 13:44:21

Um, we have an additional... yes. Mr. Wegebauer, Town of Wayland.

[Michael Wegerbauer] 13:44:33

Great, thank you. Can you hear me?

[Gregory Devine] 13:44:35

Yes.

[Michael Wegerbauer] 13:44:36

Great. Well, I think, uh, Tom and Abby both did a great job of presenting, um, the reasons why we feel that we...should be scored higher, and uh...just in terms of background, we spent about 5 years, volunteers, elected volunteers, staff, consultants, engineers to, um, explore a very wide range of, um, options to deal with PFAS in Wayland. And we've come up with what we think is a very good dual-source solution to replace the temporary solution we currently have in place. And, um, that... that solution and design went to town meeting. Um, last year, and it was approved. And, uh, we're hopeful

this year to go forward, uh...for approval of the construction. We have, ideally, SRF funds as a primary funding source. Um, that's all I had to say.

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:45:42

Great, I'll put the call out one last time for anyone who's on the call. Whether it be virtually through Zoom or on the phone, to indicate...you'd like to speak.

[Gregory Devine] 13:45:59

We do not have any telephone participants, no one to unmute.

[Kaitlyn Connors] 13:46:04

Okay. Great. Well, with that, I'd like to thank everybody for attending today's public hearing. We truly value all the feedback that we've received, and...As indicated at the top of this meeting, all written commentary, oral testimony that we've received during the public comment period um, will be considered, while we finalize the IUPs. So, thank you all again for the interest in the program and attending today's hearing. The final intended use plans will be posted on MassDEP's website when ready, and we'll send out a notification when that occurs, and with that, I think, uh, we can officially close the hearing. It is...1:46, a big thank you again to all attendees, and thank you to folks on the SRF and Trust team. For all your help in this process. Thanks, everyone.