West Virginia Clean Water State Revolving Fund



FY2017 Intended Use Plan

Submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region III xxxxx, 2016



west virginia department of environmental protection

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Glossary1
Preface 2
SECTION I Introduction
SECTION II Funds Identification
SECTION III Goals
SECTION IV Project Priority List
Fund Activities
SECTION VI Assurances
SECTION VII Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds
SECTION VIII Public Participation
SECTION IX Agreement17
Appendices
 A - FY 2017 Project Priority List B - Proposed Binding Commitments – by Quarter C - Projects Budgeted for IUP Available Funds D - Public Hearing Summary E - Median Household Income by County and Magisterial District E1 - Median Household Income by Municipality F - Sources and Uses Chart (for EPA use only) G - Possible Green Technology Projects H - Unemployment Data I - Population Data

Glossary

The following abbreviations are used throughout this document to denote the listed words, terms and phrases:

AgWQLP – West Virginia Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program BAN – Bond Anticipation Note CA – West Virginia Conservation Agency CWA – Federal Clean Water Act CWSRF – Clean Water State Revolving Fund DEP – West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection DWWM – Division of Water and Waste Management, DEP EBPP – Extended Bond Purchase Program EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency IJDC – West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council IUP – Intended Use Plan MHI – Median Household Income NRCS - Natural Resources Conservation Service NPS – Nonpoint Source OA – Operating Agreement OSLP – Onsite Systems Loan Program POTW – Publicly Owned Treatment Works

PSC – Public Service Commission of West Virginia

USDA- United States Department of Agriculture

SCD - Soil Conservation District

WDA – West Virginia Water Development Authority

WRRDA - 2014 Water Resources Reform and Development Act

Preface

Mission Statements

Department of Environmental Protection

To promote a healthy environment.

Division of Water and Waste Management

To protect, preserve and enhance West Virginia's land

and watersheds for the afety

and benefit of all.

Clean Water State Revolving Fund

To provide technical and financial assistance to local governmental entities to improve water quality and public health conditions.

Section I Introduction

This document is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund's Intended Use Plan for state fiscal year 2017 (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 (FY2017)). The Division of Water and Waste Management is the primary state agency that administers the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, with financial and support assistance provided by the West Virginia Water Development Authority.

As of July 1, 2016, there have been 27 federal capitalization grants and amendments awarded by the Environmental Protection Agency. The State has provided, where necessary, the required 20% matching funds for each grant and amendment.

Repayments of prior loans, bonds and investment earnings are also available within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to fund additional wastewater and nonpoint source projects. A calculation of available funds during this fiscal year is contained in Section II.

SECTION II Funds Identification

The chart on the next page identifies the revenue sources that will be used for loans and other anticipated expenditure categories.

A similar chart can be found in Appendix F, which is used by EPA for its purpose only. This chart summarizes the federal capitalization grants, state matches, repayments, earnings, etc. since the program began. It also estimates the fiscal year revenue sources to calculate a theoretical amount of funds available.

WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

Intended Use Plan – Sources and Uses of Funds*

State FY2017 (July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017)

Available funds as of December 31, 2015

Cash balance in CWSRF account = Federal funds accounts payable (Base grants) =	\$ 93,284,874 <u>\$ 0</u>
	<u>\$ 93,284,874</u>
<u>New funds available during state FY2017:</u>	
Next Federal EPA Grant = Next State Match* = Est. Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/17) = Est. Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/17) = Est. Investment earnings (to 6/30/17) =	\$ 20,829,000 \$ 4,165,800 \$ 32,820,134 \$ 2,829,799 \$ 382,738
	<u>\$ 61,027,471</u>
Less: Existing project loans payables (12/31/15) = Existing binding commitments (12/31/15) = AgWQLP reserve = OSLP reserve = DEP Administration =	\$ 96,667,741 \$ 36,520,359 \$ 150,000 \$ 300,000 <u>\$ 0</u> <u>\$ 133,638,100</u>
Net available funds during FY2017 =	\$ 20,674,245

Notes:

* State Match is provided by the IJDC and was received in March 2016.

A. Long term goals

- 1. Expand the CWSRF accessibility by creating new financial assistance programs to address NPS pollution control problems.
- 2. Ensure the CWSRF program operates in perpetuity at its maximum level to provide financial assistance to local entities.

<u>Objective 1</u> – Conduct financial capability reviews on all potential loan recipients to assure credit worthiness and fiscal responsibility.

<u>Objective 2</u> – Maximize investment opportunities.

<u>Objective 3</u> – Monitor repayment activity of loan recipients and take action for collection of delinquent payments from loan recipients.

<u>Objective 4</u> – Utilize EPA's financial planning model to ascertain the long term effects of different CWSRF policies.

- 3. Integrate the CWSRF program into DEP's Watershed Management Framework to increase program effectiveness by targeting the CWSRF funds toward higher priority watersheds.
- 4. Market the CWSRF program throughout the State to increase commitment/ utilization of funds and maintain program pace by providing articles, press releases, and presentations on CWSRF program activities and participating in meetings of federal and State associations concerned with water quality, health, and economic development issues.
- 5. Participate in the monthly meetings of the IJDC. Participation will include performing technical reviews on all proposed wastewater projects and coordinating and recommending the most feasible funding sources for all projects.
- 6. Incorporate EPA's strategic plan program activity measures into the CWSRF program by working to achieve a targeted fund utilization rate of 100% (cumulative dollar amount of loan agreements divided by cumulative amount available for projects).
- 7. Develop effective wastewater management in rural, low income West Virginia communities. This includes investigating new funding opportunities and participating with local community leaders and civic groups to develop wastewater management ideas and programs.

B. <u>Short term goals</u>

- 1. Continue outreach efforts for potential new loan recipients.
- 2. Maintain a targeted fund utilization rate "pace" goal of at least 95%. Program pace is defined by EPA as the cumulative loan assistance provided divided by the total amount of funds available. Loan assistance is defined as the cumulative assistance provided by executed loan and bond agreements (does not include preliminary binding commitment letters).
- 3. Complete the Environmental Benefits for each CWSRF project in EPA's CBR System.
- 4. Continue to work with the communities required to upgrade their wastewater systems in the State's Watershed Improvement Plan for the Chesapeake Bay and the Greenbrier River TMDL.
- 5. Keep the CWSRF flexible to be able to quickly respond to potential project shifts due to the State's economic crisis and rapid population losses.

SECTION IV Project Priority List

The FY2017 Project Priority List is contained in Appendix A. The list includes potential CWSRF binding commitments for Section 212 projects (publicly owned treatment works). Projects must appear on the priority list in order to receive consideration for a loan/bond purchase agreement or a formal loan commitment. The list was developed using fact sheets received from each applicant, consulting engineer or other representative, and should reflect current costs. If additional projects are developed during the fiscal year that do not appear on the list but would like to receive a commitment, they may be added to the list after adequate public notification procedures have been completed. This procedure generally takes 60 days.

The CWSRF will continue to commit funds to projects in order of their position on the priority list on a first-come, first-served basis, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met and the project is within six months of construction. At a minimum, the facilities plan and plans & specs must be approved. Consideration will be given to the status of rights-of-way obtainment and other items on the pre-bid checklist during this process. As projects are deemed eligible for a binding commitment, they will be funded in order of priority. Furthermore, a project will not receive a commitment from the CWSRF unless it has received a funding recommendation from the IJDC in accordance with WV State Code, Chapter 31, Article 15A. This binding commitment from the CWSRF will remain in effect until the expiration date contained in the commitment and is subject to an extension.

Individual NPS pollution control activities and projects funded by the CWSRF do not have to appear on the annual priority list. However, the funding of these projects is

described in Section V(I) and an amount has been reserved to fund these projects. These NPS projects are allowable for funding using state revolving funds in accordance with federal law and are defined under Section 319 of the CWA. Any type of NPS activities funded must be included in the DEP's approved NPS management plan. Appendix C contains a quarterly outlay estimate for all NPS activities expected to be funded this fiscal year.

SECTION V Fund Activities

A. Interest rates on POTW loans

This is the last year that eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration will be based upon 4,000 gallons of monthly water usage and the average monthly user rate must be at or above 1.5% of the median household income in order for a community to qualify for a .75% interest rate on its loan.

The DEP will use this criterion until June 30, 2017 to determine the interest rate on loans. However, the maximum allowable term of the loans will be determined using the following range of user rates and MHI data:

Less than 1.5% MHI: 2.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 20 year term 1.5% to 1.74% MHI: .75% interest rate, .25% annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year term 1.75% MHI and higher:.25% interest rate, .25% annual admin fee, 31 - 40 year term

Only projects that have a valid binding commitment letter, and if required, have filed for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity with the PSC or received rate approval from their County Commission (whichever is required) by June 30, 2017 will use the criteria above to determine the interest rate on their loan.

Beginning July 1, 2017, the DEP will be basing the loan terms upon 3,400 gallons of monthly water usage and using the following table to determine interest rates.

Less than 1.5% MHI:2.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 20 year term1.5% to 1.74% MHI:1.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year term1.75% to 2.0% MHI:.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year termGreater than 2% MHI:0% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 31 - 40 year term

The MHI data that will be used will be the 2010 census data published by the U. S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder. Interest rates will not exceed 2.5% and will not be less than 0%. For all public service districts, the MHI to be used will be the lowest of either the county(s) or magisterial district(s) that is most appropriate for the project area. Magisterial District and County

information can be found in Appendix E. Municipalities MHI data that will be used is contained in Appendix E1.

Should Congress amend the CWA or pass reform legislation that affects small disadvantaged communities, the DEP may revise this interest rate policy to consider other factors as required by federal law.

B. Additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities

This year's Clean Water Act Title VI funding allocation for West Virginia is estimated to be \$20,829,000. The Appropriations Act requires that a portion of each capitalization grant be used for additional loan subsidization and for funding green infrastructure projects. The Act requires a minimum of 20% be set aside for funding green projects. This amount will equal \$4,165,800. The allowable green project categories that will be considered for this funding are described below.

The Act also requires a minimum amount be set aside for providing additional loan subsidization in the form of grants or principal forgiveness with an additional amount allowed by WRRDA, as defined below. Therefore DEP will be setting aside 20% of the capitalization grant in the amount of \$4,165,800 to be used as principal forgiveness.

Principal forgiveness of all or part of a loan will be the mechanism that will be used to supply the additional subsidization. Additional loan subsidization is a last resort for disadvantaged communities and will only be provided when other funding options within the CWSRF program are not practical to make the project financially affordable (i.e. 40-year loan terms, deferred principal repayments, reduced debt service coverage, etc.).

The 2014 Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) amended sections of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA). Amendments to 603(i)(2) required States to develop affordability criteria that would assist in identifying applicants that would have difficulty financing projects without additional subsidization. The criteria, based upon a points system that will be used to identify these applicants as per WRRDA, are as follows:

Income based upon %MHI – Based upon the 2010 Census data for 4,000 gallons of water usage.

MHI	Points 1
1.75% - 1.99%	50
2.0% or greater	75

<u>Unemployment Data</u> – As published in June 2014 by WorkForce West Virginia. At this time, the State's average unemployment rate was 6.5% in 2013. See Appendix H.

Locality's Unemployment Rate (UR)	Points
UR < West Virginia's UR	0
UR 0% - 2% above West Virginia's UR	5
UR > 2% above West Virginia's UR	10

<u>Population Trends</u> – Based upon the percentage change for the period from 2010 to 2013 by county as published by American Fact Finder. See Appendix I.

Change in Population	Points
Greater than +2%	0
0 to +2%	5
Less than 0%	10

For applicants that receive at least 60 points, the project is eligible for the lesser of 50% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$1,000,000 in principal forgiveness.

For applicants that receive at least 90 points, the project is eligible for the lesser of 100% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$1,500,000 in principal forgiveness.

Only projects that have a valid binding commitment letter, and if required, have filed for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity with the PSC or received rate approval from their County Commission (whichever is required) by June 30, 2017 will use the criteria above to determine the amount of principal forgiveness that may be available to the project. Beginning July 1, 2017, the DEP will base the %MHI criteria on 3,400 gallons of monthly water usage.

Readiness to proceed to construction will be the primary criterion that will be used in allocating the additional subsidies. The final amount of the subsidy will be determined after receipt of bids and after a formal application is submitted. Note: As existing debt is retired, the dedicated revenue stream will rollover to pay the amount of any deferred loan.

Loan recipients eligible for additional subsidization must appear on the current priority list prior to loan closing.

C. Green Projects Reserve

In accordance with federal law, to the extent there are sufficient eligible project applications, not less than 20% of the funds in the capitalization grant shall be used to address green infrastructure projects.

Allowable green project categories will be as follows:

1. Energy Efficiency

A community may use improved technologies and practices to reduce the energy consumption of existing wastewater treatment systems, use energy in a more efficient way, and/or produce/utilize renewable energy. Only the dollar amount associated with the green component of a larger project will qualify for the green reserve. Proposed green projects in this category may be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 50% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

Projects that will <u>not</u> be allowable include but are not limited to:

- a. Infiltration and inflow pipe repair or replacement.
- b. Purchase of hybrid/alternative fuel vehicles for sewer fleets.
- c. Operation, maintenance and replacement activities.
- d. Drinking water related projects.

2. <u>Water Efficiency</u>

Water efficiency type projects will not be allowable for additional loan subsidization or green technology funding, except for WWTP water efficient appliance/plumbing projects and water reuse projects. Proposed green projects in the water reuse category may be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 50% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

3. Storm Water / Green Infrastructure

Allowable green projects to be funded under this category are:

- a. Publicly sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to treat or eliminate storm water from existing wastewater collection and treatment systems.
- b. MS4 sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to solve storm water issues.

Proposed green projects in this category may be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 50% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

4. Environmentally Innovative

Allowable green projects to be funded in this category are:

Decentralized sewer systems

- a. Publicly Owned Systems
- b. Privately Owned Onsite Systems

This category is used for constructing, upgrading, or repairing onsite/septic systems to existing eligible structures to protect water quality. The project must be sponsored by a local entity eligible to receive SRF funding.

Proposed green projects in this category may be eligible to receive loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, of 100% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs. During FY 2017, the CWSRF program will be offering a program to cover the pre-bid costs for categorically green decentralized sewer system projects only. This is based upon availability of debt forgiveness funds. The program may fund the pre-bid costs for these systems from the available green debt forgiveness funds. In order to qualify for these funds, the project sponsor must assure the CWSRF program that the project will proceed to advertising for bids within 12 - 18 months of receiving the funds. The sponsor will have to provide, at a minimum, the following documentation:

- 1. A recommendation to pursue CWSRF funds from the WVIJDC;
- 2. An engineering agreement approved by the CWSRF program;
- 3. A facilities plan approved by the CWSRF program;
- 4. Documentation of a pre-design meeting with representatives of the CWSRF program;
- 5. A project timeline with an approvable project budget;
- 6. Documentation from the project sponsor that the customer base is willing to pay the proposed sewer rate; and
- 7. PSC approval, if required by law.

Based upon the above guidelines and criteria, a list of potential green projects is included in Appendix G of this document. These projects were submitted in response to a DEP solicitation for green projects that occurred in December 2015 and January 2016 simultaneously with the project priority list solicitation. The CWSRF program will further evaluate these projects to determine funding eligibility.

D. Annual administrative fees on POTW loans

Since 1994, an annual administrative fee has been charged on all loans as a means of supporting the administrative costs of operating the CWSRF in perpetuity. These fees are maintained in a separate account outside the CWSRF. The use of these fees is restricted in accordance with *EPA's Guidance on Fees Charged by States to Recipients of Clean Water State Revolving Program Assistance* as published in the Federal Register on October 20, 2006. Funds have been expended from the account since FY1998.

The annual administrative fee is initially calculated using the outstanding principle amount of the loan over its life, but repaid over the term of loan in equal installments as contained in the loan amortization schedule. The chart in Section V (A) will be used to determine the annual administrative fee on each loan. The administrative budget is approximately \$2.2 million. This includes funding the DEP's Project WET position. The amount of the funds available as of December 31, 2015 was \$7,939,677. These funds can also be used to fund the onsite systems program. The CWSRF is also considering funding a position with the WV Rural Water Association that would provide technical and project support to local communities. This position would provide asset management support and educate local utilities on energy and water efficiency technologies. The DEP will be working closely with EPA on this concept.

E. Maximum allowable loans

In FY2017, there will not be a limit set on the amount of funds available to any single project. This practice will be reviewed annually and may change in future intended use plans.

F. <u>BAN leveraging program</u>

DEP is continuing the following option for multimillion dollar projects that cannot reduce their scope to reflect a reasonable cost. A specific dollar amount will be

issued by the entity using a BAN for the length of the construction period. The CWSRF will commit out of its second round funds a certain amount each fiscal year until the total commitment is equal to the BAN. The loan will then be closed following construction completion, retiring the BAN. This proposed closing date will also be reflected in the BAN documents. Repayment of the CWSRF loan will begin immediately using the first full calendar quarter following loan closing.

G. Extended Bond Purchase Program

1. <u>30-year bonds</u>

The EPA approval of the 30-year extended bond purchase program on April 13, 1999, allowed many disadvantaged communities in West Virginia to be funded under the CWSRF, resulting in additional water quality improvement projects and providing rate relief to local governmental entities. The more advantageous bond terms have increased the number of sewer construction projects in the State and have allowed better leveraging of other State and federal funds available for wastewater projects.

Section 603(d)(2) of the CWA allows local bonds to be purchased by the State at below market interest rates without limiting the term to 20 years as contained in Section 603(d)(1). West Virginia law governing municipalities and public service districts provides that governing bodies must issue bonds to pay the costs of wastewater projects and sets forth detailed terms regarding interest rates, maturity dates and security provisions and with certain exceptions provides that the term of such bonds shall not exceed 40 years from the date of issuance.

Under the EBPP, the CWSRF will be purchasing local bonds with up to 30-year terms only for disadvantaged communities defined in Section V (A). Extended terms up to 30 years will be available to eligible communities meeting the above definition after a request is received from the community and an affordability analysis has been performed to determine what maturity date is necessary (not exceeding 30 years) in achieving, if possible, the targeted rate equal to 1.50% MHI. In performing the analysis, an interest rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ % and an annual administrative fee of $\frac{1}{2}$ % shall be assumed.

Loans closed before July 2, 1999, cannot be refinanced or restructured using extended bond terms unless:

- a. DEP determines that such restructuring is necessary to protect the integrity of the CWSRF;
- b. the financial difficulty is due to unforeseen events (except population decline);
- c. the community has taken all reasonable steps to reduce expenses and increase revenues and such measures have not remedied the financial difficulty;
- d. the community has not discriminated in its payment of debt service on other outstanding debt;
- e. the community agrees to and implements a long term management plan; and
- f. the PSC has approved the proposed restructuring (if applicable).

2. <u>40-vear bonds</u>

In May 2001, EPA approved an extension to the 30-year extended bond purchase program by allowing bond terms to exceed 30 years, but no longer than 40 years. As with the 30-year bond program, offering up to 40-year terms requires that the long term revolving nature of the CWSRF must be protected. The offering of extended financing terms must not decrease the projected revolving level of the fund by 10% or more compared to the revolving level that the fund would have attained if extended financing terms were not available.

In implementing this 40-year program and in consideration of the federal mandates, the DEP established the following parameters that must be met by a disadvantaged community in order to be eligible for extended bond terms greater than 30 and less or equal to 40 years. The intent is to balance the financial need of the community with the long term financial health of the CWSRF.

Facilities plans will include detailed information concerning expected increases in operation and maintenance costs from years 20 to 40 including, but not limited to schedules for the repair and replacement of all facilities units / components, including equipment.

Where there has been a historical decline in population, additional information in the facilities plan will be required concerning the composition of the population base, such as age and income characteristics. Other economic indicators, such as trends in tax base, number of jobs and housing starts, may be requested to determine those communities that pose a high risk to the CWSRF program.

For revenue projection and rate-setting purposes, the CWSRF will require that only 90% of any new potential customers be used in the facilities plan. This requirement will apply during the entire preconstruction phase of the project, including the PSC certificate case. A copy of the Rule 42 exhibit (or equivalent if a PSC certificate is not required) shall be submitted to the DEP for compliance utilized with this requirement. This requirement will not apply to existing customers already served by a collection system.

At the completion of final design and prior to the project authorization to advertise for bids, the above information will be utilized for the purposes of conducting a final financial review.

H. <u>Requirements for CWSRF Commitment</u>

<u>Formal Commitments</u> – once it has been determined that a project can realistically proceed to construction within six months, a formal commitment of CWSRF funding will be made that may include such terms and conditions as deemed necessary. The CWSRF will continue to commit funds to projects in order of their position on the priority list on a first-come, first-served basis, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met. At a minimum, the facilities plan and plans & specs must be approved. Consideration will be given to the status of rights-of-way obtainment and other items on the pre-bid checklist during this process. As projects

are deemed eligible for a binding commitment, they will be funded in order of priority. Prior to loan closing, the project must appear on the current year's priority list.

I. Expanded uses of the CWSRF – Nonpoint Sources (NPS)

In addition to financing municipal sewage treatment and disposal projects, the CWSRF can finance an array of environmental projects to address NPS pollution.

NPS pollution is runoff from areas that have hard-to-trace specific sources of pollution such as farmland and suburban neighborhoods.

As with most other states, West Virginia has devoted the majority of CWSRF funds to the construction of traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. However, in 1997 the CWSRF funded its first NPS water quality projects through the DEP's Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program in partnership with the WV Conservation Agency. The purpose of the AgWQL program is to provide a source of lowinterest financing match funds to implement best management agricultural practices that will reduce NPS impacts on water quality. This program is operated in conjunction with local participating banks.

In 2000, the CWSRF began a pilot implementation of its second NPS program titled the Onsite Systems Loan Program. The purpose of this program was to eliminate existing health hazards and water quality problems due to direct sewage discharges from houses using malfunctioning septic tank systems or direct pipes to a nearby stream. This was a cooperative venture between the DEP and county health departments. After several years of frustration, this program was revived in 2008 and is now fully operational. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund and other nonprofit associations are participating in this program to make it accessible to existing individual homeowners throughout the state.

In creating the CWSRF, Congress ensured that it would be able to fund virtually any type of water quality project, including nonpoint source, wetlands, estuary, and other types of watershed projects, as well as more traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. The CWSRF provisions in the CWA give no more preference to one category or type of project than any other.

1. Agriculture Water Ouality Loan Program

With the initiation of the FY1998 pilot program in five counties (Grant, Mineral, Pendleton, Hardy, and Hampshire), DEP addressed nonpoint sources of pollution by the installation of best management practices. The pilot program was a cooperative effort among the DEP, WV Conservation Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, local Soil Conservation Districts and local banking institutions.

Agricultural producers at the local level work with the SCD, CA and NRCS to develop a conservation plan. A local participating bank then provides a 2% interest loan for construction that will be monitored by these agencies. The CWSRF loans money to local banks at 0% interest as a mechanism for the

banks to reduce their interest rate. The DEP expanded this program statewide after securing EPA approval to do so. As of June 30, 2015, more than \$13 million had been loaned under this program for installation of best management practices. Each fiscal year, an additional amount of money is set aside to fund more of these NPS projects. A one-time administrative fee is charged on each loan to cover DEP administrative expenses.

The CWSRF will continue this program with a set-aside reserve of \$150,000 to provide the necessary match to these agriculture grants.

2. <u>Onsite Systems Loan Program</u>

An OSLP guidance document is available which explains the NPS program. Individual loans are limited to \$10,000 and lender interest rates cannot exceed 2% with terms not to exceed 10 years for the replacement, repair or upgrade of onsite sewage systems. Exceptions to the \$10,000 limit are made on a case-by-case basis.

During the 2007 legislative session, the CWSRF statute was amended to expand the definition of "local entity", which allows CWSRF money to be loaned to other entities who will act as an intermediary lender in the OSLP. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund was the first entity to enter into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide low interest loans to homeowners to correct failing onsite sewage systems. SAFE Housing and Economic Development, Inc. (SHED) has also entered into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide these loans to homeowners. The CWSRF will provide \$300,000 as a set-aside for this program this fiscal year. Funds from the administrative fee account may also be used to fund this program.

3. Other CWA Section 319 Nonpoint Source Activities

Nonpoint sources of water pollution, that may include contaminated groundwater flow and runoff from agricultural and developed land, have received far less attention. This is because nonpoint sources of pollution are harder to identify and address since they are not discrete end-of-pipe pollution sources.

In West Virginia, other nonpoint sources of pollution are identified in the State nonpoint source management plan developed by DEP. We will continue to evaluate the merits of providing funds to other NPS activities.

J. <u>Federal requirements</u>

To streamline the program and reduce project costs, all new binding commitments made to POTW projects in this fiscal year will not have to meet many federal requirements. As a recipient of federal CWSRF funds, the DEP has to apply these federal requirements to loans equal to the amounts of all the federal capitalization grants. Recipients of earmark grants from Congress will still have to meet these federal requirements for the entire project, including any CWSRF funds. This will likely continue in future fiscal years. The following projects have been selected to comply with federal requirements including, but not limited to, the Single Audit Act, FFATA, etc. These projects total more than the FFY 2016 capitalization grant which is \$20,829,000.

Project Sponsor	Project Description	CWSRF Amount
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	WWTP Upgrade	\$ 2,350,000
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	WWTP/Line Ext.	\$10,878,500
Morgantown	WWTP Upgrade	\$ 5,000,000
Pennsboro	WWTP Upgrade	\$ 2,672,600
	Total	\$20,901,100

SECTION VI

Assurances

DEP has provided the necessary assurances and certifications as part of the operating agreement with EPA. The Operating Agreement defines the mutual obligations between EPA and DEP. 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 includes the requirements of the following sections of the federal Clean Water Act:

602(a)	-	Environmental Reviews – the DEP will conduct the reviews in accordance with State regulations.
602(b)(3)		Binding Commitments – the DEP will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each quarterly grant payment within one year of receipt of the payment.
602(b)(4)	-	Expeditious and Timely Expenditures – the DEP will expend all funds in the CWSRF in a timely manner.
602(b)(5)		First Use for Enforceable Requirements – the DEP has certified that all national municipal policy projects have met this requirement.

These and other procedures are described in the OA and may be examined by contacting the DEP. The OA underwent revisions this past year and has been accepted by the WV DEP and the U.S. EPA.

SECTION VII

Criteria and method for distribution of funds

The following approach was used to update the priority list, intended use plan and projection of the distribution of all funds contained in the CWSRF:

- 1. Analysis of community and financial assistance needed;
- 2. Review of project schedule to determine when the project would be in a state of readiness to proceed to construction;
- 3. Individual contact with potential loan recipient or its representative;
- 4. Allocation of funds among projects;
- 5. Development of an EPA payment schedule which will provide for making timely binding commitments to projects selected for CWSRF financial assistance;
- 6. Development of individual disbursement schedules to timely pay project costs as incurred;
- 7. Analysis of NPS activities and the extent to which reserved funds would be needed for such projects; and
- 8. Estimate of administrative expenditures that will occur during the fiscal year.

SECTION VIII Public participation

On June 2, 2016 a public hearing will be held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2017. The meeting was legally advertised in newspapers throughout the State. In addition, DEP issued a notice of the meeting by sending a mass mailing directly to consulting engineers, regional councils and other interested parties.

Appendix D contains the public hearing notice, attendance sign-in sheet and a summary of the meeting.

SECTION IX

Agreement

The DEP has agreed to provide EPA with information for the environmental results for all loans closed during this fiscal year. This documentation is being requested by EPA to better ascertain the environmental results of projects funded under the CWSRF program.

APPENDIX A

FISCAL YEAR 2017 PRIORITY LIST



CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2017 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 1 Points 220.00	Greater St. Albars PSD (Phase IIIC Tackett's Creek)County:KanawhaSRF #C:544406-03NPDES #WV:0035068Binding Date:6/30/2016Needs Category:IIIA.IIIB.IVA.IVB	\$17,970,000	Problem Failing septic systems and package treatment plants. The Coal River Group has documented water quality degradation in the area from these discharges. Solution Extend sewer service to 700 new customers and replace/rehabilitate existing sewers.
Rank 2 Points 180.00	McDowell County PSD (Coalwood)County:McDowellSRF #C:547302NPDES #WV:0000000Binding Date:6/30/2017Needs Category:XII	\$450,000 \$1,950,000	Problem Collection system discharging untreated sewage into local waterways. Solution Construct a decentralized WWTP and upgrade portions of the collection system.

Rank / Points	9 Project	SRF Loan Amount To	cal Costs Problem / Solution
Rank 3 Points 170.00	Weston, City ofCounty:LewisSRF #C:544471NPDES #WV:0028068Binding Date:6/30/2017Needs Category:IIIA.IIIB.IVA.IVB	\$6,800,000 \$8,	ProblemB333,000ProblemUnserved areas of Butchersville and Turnertown. Approximately 157 residential customers and 4 commercial customers failing septic tanks. Package plant that is unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements. Stonecoal Creek interceptor is a large source of I/I & the old WWTP site was never remediated.SolutionNew collection system to unserved areas. Send all flow to the Weston WWTP. Replace sewer interceptor pipeline running along Stonecoal Creek, and upgrading the existing Jackson's Mill pump station and remediating the site of the City's former WWTP.
Rank 4 Points 160.00	Century Volga PSDCounty:BarbourSRF #C:544556NPDES #WV:0000000Binding Date:6/30/2017Needs Category:XII	\$1,844,000 \$2,	ProblemFailing septic tanks and drain fields along with failing HAUs. Raw sewage and grey water being discharged into the streams and ditches.SolutionInstall a gravity collection system to serve the 57 residences of Century along with the UMWA Hall, community center and a church. A new 16,000 GPD WWTP would treat the wastewater collected. The nearest public sewer to the community is approximately 9 miles away and therefore it is not economical to pump the wastewater that distance for treatment.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Morgantown, Ci		\$5,000,000	\$90,000,000	Problem
5	TP/Poponoe Run County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	n Upgrades) Monongalia 544520 0023124 10/31/2016			WWTP has insufficient wet weather capacity for combined flows resulting in high frequency of CSO discharges. RBCs functionally inadequate & beyond their useful life. Customer growth requires expansion of domestic capacity. Digester & interceptor nearing capacity.
Points	Ū	10,01,2010			Solution
160.00	Needs Category:	VA			Replace RBC's with activated sludge and clarifiers, upgrade and expand digesters, upgrade Poponoe Run interceptor and provide storage for CSO discharges. This project is in accordance with DEP Order #6684.
Rank	New Haven PSD	(Winona)	\$487,544	\$3,282,320	Problem
Rank 6	New Haven PSD	(Winona)	\$487,544	\$3,282,320	No existing wastewater collection/treatment system. Fecal
	New Haven PSD County:	(Winona) Fayette	\$487,544	\$3,282,320	
			\$487,544	\$3,282,320	No existing wastewater collection/treatment system. Fecal
	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Fayette 547850 0000000	\$487,544	\$3,282,320	No existing wastewater collection/treatment system. Fecal
6	County: SRF #C:	Fayette 547850	\$487,544	\$3,282,320	No existing wastewater collection/treatment system. Fecal
	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Fayette 547850 0000000 10/31/2016	\$487,544	\$3,282,320	No existing wastewater collection/treatment system. Fecal coliform levels in Keeney Creek are high.

Rank / Points	Project	SF	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Pennsboro, City of	Γ	\$2,672,600	\$5,172,600	Problem
7 Points	NPDES #WV: 0025	409-03			Current plant cannot handle the existing peak flow, which creates a permitted sanitary sewer overflow at the facility. The contact stabilization treatment is incapable of meeting the ammonia- nitrogen limitations listed in the City's NPDES permit. Solution
150.00	Needs Category: I				New secondary treatment system of a sequential batch reactor (SBR) sized for a maximum of 2.10 mgd will be capable of regularly meeting the NPDES permit limits and will remove the temporary sanitary sewer overflow from the WWTP.
Rank	Auburn, Town of	Γ	\$714,725	\$2,714,725	Problem
8		,			Raw sewage discharges to roadside ditches and to Bone Creek.
	County: Ritch SRF #C: 5472 NPDES #WV: 0000	201			
Points	Binding Date: 3/31/	1/2017			Solution
Points 145.00	Needs Category: XII				Installation of 50 individual Orenco AX20 treatment units and appurtenances to serve the Town of Auburn.

Rank / Points	Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	<u>Wellsburg, City of</u>	Γ	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	Problem
9 Points	SRF #C: 54 NPDES #WV: 00	rooke 44570 026832 /30/2017			Proposed project is the next step in the City's compliance with the USEPA Water Quality Standard for CSO Communities. Will eliminate I/I from entering the system thus reducing the volume of sanitary and storm combined sewer overflows. Solution
145.00	Needs Category: I.V	/A			Separation of storm and sanitary sewers, upgrades at WWTP such as the dechlorination unit. This work is in accordance with DEP Order #5860.
Rank	Belle, Town of (Pha	ase III)	\$4,045,000	\$5,045,000	Problem
10	SRF #C: 54 NPDES #WV: 00	anawha 44177-04 021946	0		WWTP has outlived its expected useful life, upgrades are needed to meet NPDES permit limits DEP Order #5753.
Points	Binding Date: 12	2/31/2016			Solution
140.00	Needs Category: I				Replacement of wastewater treatment plant with a package treatment system in one circular tank, and upgrade of both the main pump station and the headworks.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Webster Springs	PSD (Bergoo)	\$2,353,000	\$1,193,575	Problem
Points	SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Webster 544334 0497875 6/30/2017			Bergoo is reportedly being presently served by individual septic tank and absorption fields, some of which may be failing. Three discharge pipes are visible in Leatherwood Creek and Elk River. Solution
140.00	Needs Category:	XII			Construct a new decentralized wastewater collection system and wastewater treatment plant.
Rank	Benwood, City of	f (Phase I)	\$3,775,400	\$3,775,400	Problem
12	SRF #C:	Marshall 544531 0020648	0-		Large amount of infiltration and inflow associated with the combined sewer system overwhelms Lift Station D and creates CSO events. Also, diversion structure for CSO C-008 is approximately 200' down a drainage tunnel and it is dangerous for staff to check on the structure's condition.
Points	Binding Date:	12/31/2016			Solution
135.00	Needs Category:	VA			Install a new sanitary sewer system with the existing combined sewer system left in place to serve as a storm drainage system.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Welch, City of (N	lorth Welch)	\$6,625,502	\$6,875,502	Problem
13	County: SRF #C:	McDowell 544217			Unserved area, direct discharge sewer in the Trail Fork & Browns Creek, impaired/affected by Fecal Coliform. Failing septic systems.
Points	NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	0024589 6/30/2017			Solution
125.00	Needs Category:	IVA			Construct a new sanitary sewer system in the North Welch area. Hopefully reducing the Fecal Coliform impairment in the Trail Fork and Browns Creek streams. Will provide sewer service to approximately 92 additional customers.
Rank	Brooke County F	PSD (Phase III	\$4,116,000	\$4,116,000	Problem
14	Eldersville Rd) County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Brooke 544006-03 0084182	2	Y	Existing leach fields for proposed customers are saturated, thus not percolating into the ground. The proposed customers will be served with a new public collection system, thus eliminating their onsite septic systems.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	IVA, IVB			An extension of the Mahan Lane, Eldersville Road and St. John's Road project. 6" or 8" lines will gravity feed into the existing system installed in the Phase I and Phase IIA projects.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Greater Harrison Co. PSD (Enterprise	\$8,694,000	\$8,694,000	Problem
Points	County: Harrison SRF #C: 544296 NPDES #WV: 0105213 Binding Date: 12/31/2016	,		Enterprise is lacking a public sewage collection system. Residences reply on septic systems or directly discharge into the local streams and tributaries of the West Fork River. DEP samples of the river tested positive for fecal matter.
120.00	Needs Category: IVA.IVB			Construct a standard gravity sewer collection system to serve the area of Enterprise. Would provide service to approximately 397 customers. The collected sewage would be pumped to the Town of Worthington's WWTP for treatment.
Rank	Kanawha PSD (Lens Creek)	\$110,000	\$5,100,000	Problem
16	County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544222-03 NPDES #WV: 0021784	0	5	Outdated and failing septic tank systems which drain into Lens Creek causing high volumes of fecal material being transported into Kanawha River.
Points	Binding Date: 3/31/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category: IVA,VB			Construct 5,000 LF of 10" gravity sewer, 27,350 LF of 8" gravity sewer, 3,700 LF of 6" PVC, 6,630 LF of 4" PVC laterals and 5,000 LF of 6" Force Main along with 185 manholes, 1 Pump Station, 2 stream crossings and 1 connection & master meter at the WWTP.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Logan County P	SD (Phase III B2)	\$1,000,000	\$4,900,000	Problem
17			r	r	Failing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
	County:	Logan			
	SRF #C:	544460-02			
	NPDES #WV:	0033821			
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	IVA.IVB			Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing onsite wastewater treatment systems. Project will serve approximately 168 new customers.
Rank	Logan County P	<u>SD (Phase III B3)</u>	\$1,000,000	\$4,780,000	Problem
18			,		Failing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
	County:	Logan			
	SRF #C:	544460-03			
	NPDES #WV:	0033821			
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	JIVA, IVB			Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing onsite wastewater treatment systems. Project will serve approximately 115 new customers.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Logan, City of (P	<u>hase III Stollings)</u>	\$17,803,000	\$18,803,000	Problem
19	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Logan 544364-03 0033821			Direct discharges of untreated sewage from 400 residences in McConnel and Stollings and partially treated sewage discharges from 200 residences along Dingess Run.
Points	Binding Date:	3/31/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	IVA.IVB			Extend gravity sewer system to serve McConnel, Stollings and Dingess Run. Sewage to be treated at Logan County PSD sewage treatment plant.
Rank	Matewan, Town	of (Red Jacket)	\$2,380,000	\$5,380,000	Problem
20					Failing vacuum collection system and onsite systems.
	County: SRF #C:	Mingo 544474			
	NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	0024783			
Points	Dinuing Date.	10/30/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	IVA,IVB			Construction of a new gravity collection system to replace the failing existing vacuum system and failing onsite systems.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	McMechen Sewa	age Disposal System	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000	Problem WWTP has reached the end of useful life. Collection System dated
Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Marshall 544553 0020141 6/30/2017			& degraded materials is inaccessible due to multiple HMA overlays. I/I 54.09% of system flow. Surface storm water inlets-large debris entering collection system, lift stations not operating, failing pumps. Administrative Orders #6705 & #8243.
120.00	Needs Category:	IIIB,VA			Complete required upgrades and improvements to the facility and equipment within the WWTP, remove and replace sections of the collection system with potential storm/sewer system separation and rehabilitation/upgrades to both lift stations.
Rank	Monongah, Tow	<u>ın of</u>	\$2,280,000	\$2,280,000	Problem
Rank 22	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Marion 544565 0027324	\$2,280,000	\$2,280,000	Problem Existing sanitary sewer collection system is in poor condition and allows I/I into the collection system. Steep and/or rocky terrain hinder the maintenance crew to access the right-of-ways with the equipment they have available.
22	County: SRF #C:	Marion 544565	\$2,280,000	\$2,280,000	Existing sanitary sewer collection system is in poor condition and allows I/I into the collection system. Steep and/or rocky terrain hinder the maintenance crew to access the right-of-ways with the
	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Marion 544565 0027324 6/30/2017	\$2,280,000	\$2,280,000	Existing sanitary sewer collection system is in poor condition and allows I/I into the collection system. Steep and/or rocky terrain hinder the maintenance crew to access the right-of-ways with the equipment they have available.

Rank / Points	Project	SRI	F Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Montgomery, City of Sani	tary Board	\$664,742	\$768,120	Problem
23 Points	County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544297 NPDES #WV: 0020621 Binding Date: 6/30/201				Sanitary Board's existing Sixth Avenue Pump Station is over 50 years old, and has reached the end of its useful life. The station requires frequent repairs and is located in the middle of Sixth Avenue which creates an unsafe situation for Sanitary Board workers who need to work on it. Solution
120.00	Needs Category: IIIB				Upgrade and relocate the Sixth Avenue Sewage Pumping Station in Montgomery, West Virginia.
Rank	North Beckley PSD (Phase	IIIB Piney	\$4,119,500	\$5,619,500	Problem
24	<u>View)</u>	,	+ .,===,===		142 failing septic tanks/soil absorption systems along Piney Creek
	County: Raleigh				drainage which is on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform.
	SRF #C: 544522 NPDES #WV: 0027740				
	Binding Date: 6/30/201	7			
Points					Solution
120.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB				Providing a new gravity sewer system to replace failing septic tanks.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Norton-Harding-Ji	imtown PSD	\$1,272,500	\$1,486,500	Problem
25 Points 120.00	SRF #C: 5 NPDES #WV: 6 Binding Date: 6	Randolph 544567 0106054 5/30/2017 VA.IVB			Failing existing sewer lines and septic systems. Discharge of raw sewage. Solution Near Norton Area install new gravity sewer lines, manholes, station and force main that ties into the PSD existing force main. Second area is County Route 151 proposed to install new gravity sewer lines, manholes, 2 lift stations, and 2 force mains.
Rank	Nutter Fort		\$1,549,800	\$1,549,800	Problem
26					The system currently has significant Inflow and Infiltration into it's system. In addition the system is a combined system and has
		Harrison 544314			CSO's. Separation of the sanitary sewage from the storm water needs to be addressed and separated.
	-	0010090			
Points	Binding Date:	5/30/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	/A			The project includes conducting smoke/dye testing to identify problem areas affected by Inflow and Infiltration and installing corrective measures where they are located. The corrective measures will include replacement of existing sewer lines, installing storm sewer structures, to separate sanitary sewer flows from storm water, and installing a flow meter between Nutter Fort and

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Oak Hill, City of		\$14,000,000	\$23,625,000	Problem
27 Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Fayette 544535 0022028 3/31/2017		r — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —	The existing collection system has high I&I resulting in numerous bypasses at the Minden Road & Rt. 61 WWTP's. Both WWTP's are approaching their design treatment capacities at average daily flow & exceed their design capacities during wet weather events. Arbuckle PSD's system is in failing condition. Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	I.IIIA. IIIB			Consolidate Arbuckle PSD(APSD) into Oak Hill Sanitary Board(OHSB) system, construct a sewer pumping station with associated forcemain to transport flows from the existing APSD WWTP to OHPSD Minden WWTP. Rehab the OHSB collection system, upgrade 2 existing OHSB WWTPs.
Rank	Oceana, Town of	f	\$6,695,750	\$6,695,750	Problem
28	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	McDowell 544525 0024431	0		Pump station equipment is failing & WWTP's is exceeding its rated permitted capacity. This is causing NPDES violations & the DEP has issued Order #8268.
Points	Binding Date:	3/31/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	JII,IIIB			Increase the existing 500,000 gpd wastewater treatment plant to 750,000 gpd.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 29	<u>Philippi, City of</u>		\$5,227,900	\$5,227,900	Problem Excessive I/I in combined sewers.
Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Barbour 544355 0021857 6/30/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	VA			Separate portion of collection system in northern section of city and replace North lift station force main. This will address the second compliance task from the LTCP implementation schedule.
Rank	Rowlesburg, Tov	<u>wn of</u>	\$7,778,000	\$8,778,000	Problem
30	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Preston 544307 0027481			WWTP is very old and in desperate need of upgrades, treatment ponds in poor condition in need of sludge removal, aeration system needs replaced, plant needs new chlorination/dechlorination system. Collection system is old and has to be repaired periodically. Separate storm/sanitary sewer flow.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
120.00	Needs Category:	I,IIIA,IIIB,IVA,IVB			Install a new chlorination/dechlorination station, install a WWTP liner for both ponds, WWTP sludge removal for both ponds, install a WWTP aeration system, replace (3) pump stations, and replace/separate approximately 25,000 LF of sanitary & storm sewer lines. DEP Order #8269.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 31	Sophia, Town ofCounty:RaleighSRF #C:544085	\$2,000,000 \$12,900,000	Problem Unserved area of Raleigh Co. (Coal City). Significant need for sewer service.
Points	NPDES #WV:0024422Binding Date:6/30/2017Needs Category:I.IVA.IVB		Solution Extend sewer service to 440 new customers in the Coal City area,
			plus improvements to the existing WWTP to serve these additional flows.
Rank	South Charleston Sanitary Board	\$5,000,000 \$5,000,000	Problem
32	County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544275 NPDES #WV: 0023116		South Charleston is addressing I/I to reduce the number of overflows throughout the collection system. The work being proposed is for the Green Valley Sewer Shed.
Points	Binding Date: 6/30/2017		Solution
120.00	Needs Category: IIIB		The work will include a study and report phase on their current system, I&I Reduction, replacement of existing sewer line, and possible increase in collection system capacity.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 33	<u>Colfax PSD</u>		\$641,500	\$2,141,500	Problem
Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Marion 544333 0032131 6/30/2017			WWTP on unstable ground has reached its useful life and is failing. Need to comply with NOV. Excessive I/I, overflows during high flow periods.
115.00	Needs Category:	IIIA.IIIB.IVB			Construct new sanitary sewer system; abandon WWTP and connect the system to Kingmill Valley PSD.
Rank	Mason, Town of	E	\$2,884,500	\$3,634,500	Problem
34	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Mason 544452-02 0021849	0	V	DEP Consent Order #6891, improve WWTP effluent & efficiency, and decrease I/I.
Points	Binding Date:	10/31/2016			Solution
110.00	Needs Category:	I,IIIA,IIIB			Upgrade WWTP, rehabilitate 2 pump stations and rehab/replace 64 manholes.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Delbarton, Towr	<u>n of</u>	\$2,000,000	\$5,181,000	Problem
35					Failing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
	County:	Mingo			
	SRF #C:	544201			
	NPDES #WV:	0042374			
Dointo	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
Points 100.00	Needs Category:	IVA.IVB			Installation of a centralized gravity wastewater collection system to approximately 200 customers in the Ragland area.
Rank	Gilbert, Town of	(Justice)	\$928,000	\$4,428,000	Problem
36			,		Failing on site wastewater treatment systems.
	County:	Mingo			
	SRF #C:	544502			
	NPDES #WV:	0071820			
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
100.00	Needs Category:	IVA,IVB			New centralized gravity collection system to replace the existing failing onsite treatment systems.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	McDowell County PSD (laeger-Phase I)	\$2,000,000 \$6,400,000	Problem
37 Points 100.00	County:MingoSRF #C:544513NPDES #WV:0115011Binding Date:6/30/2017Needs Category:I.IVA.IVB		Failing onsite septic systems in the laeger area. Solution Construction of a centralized wastewater collection and treatment system.
Rank 38	<u>Morgantown Utility Board (Scotts Run</u> <u>Phase III)</u>	\$7,200,000 \$7,800,000	Problem Residents currently rely on private sewage systems of unknown
	County:MonongaliaSRF #C:544545NPDES #WV:0023124		integrity.
Points	Binding Date: 6/30/2017		Solution
100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB		Extend sanitary sewer service to +80 residents. Install +/-25,000 lf of 8" gravity sewer, +/-7,000 lf of 6" force main, and 2 pump stations.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Shady Spring PS	D (Pluto Road)	\$5,375,171	\$5,375,171	Problem
39	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Raleigh 544410 0080403 6/30/2017	, ,		Failing septic systems are creating health issues in the Pluto Road area and also contributing to the pollution of Glade Creek of New River.
Points 100.00	Needs Category:	IVA.IVB			Construct a conventional gravity/grinder pump pressure sewer collection system to eliminate failing septic systems. Collected wastewater will be pumped to existing wastewater treatment plant at Glen Morgan.
Rank	Union PSD		\$3,510,000	\$7,020,000	Problem
40	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Kanawha 544573 0037486	0-		Individual septic systems are in failing condition. Treatment equipment at the Rocky Fork WWTP are in deteriorating condition and has reached the end of their useful lives.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
100.00	Needs Category:	I,IIIB,IVA,IVB			Extend service area of Union PSD. Extension consists of constructing conventional gravity collection lines and associated manholes, sewage pumping stations and associated forcemains, as well as upgrades to existing wastewater treatment plant.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	<u>Gary, City of</u>		\$1,543,000	\$1,543,000	Problem
41	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	McDowell 544501 0020044			The City is under consent order #7442 from the WVDEP. Excessive I/I and system is also deteriorated.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2018			Solution
95.00	Needs Category:	IIIA,IIIB			Repair/replace existing WWTP to optimize operation and maintenance. Repair/replacement of existing sewer collection mains to minimize I/I.
Rank	Greater Harrisor	n County PSD (Phase	\$10,478,000	\$21,865,000	Problem
42	<u>II/Rt. 73)</u>		, , , , , , , , , , , ,		Failing package plants, failing septic systems, and direct discharges.
	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Harrison 544451 0084301			
	Binding Date:	10/31/2016			Solution
Points 95.00	Needs Category:	I,IVA,IVB			Construct new WWTP and collection system to serve 749 new customers.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Greater Paw Paw	v PSD (Phase II)	\$2,915,000	\$2,930,000	Problem
43 Points		Marion 544509 0084310 6/30/2017			Excessive I/I, piping in disrepair and in many locations there are no manholes or means to access the existing piping. Location of piping is not known in many places and some lines cross under houses.
95.00	Needs Category:	VA			A new gravity Sanitary Sewer System is being installed and the old system abandoned in many locations. This will eliminate the excessive I/I in the Orchard Hill area and around the Elementary School. This is in accordance with Ph. II of their approved LTCP.
Rank	Greater Paw Paw	v PSD (Phase III)	\$1,690,000	\$3,380,000	Problem
44		Marion 544558 0084310	0-		Excessive I/I, piping is in disrepair and no manholes or means to access the existing piping in many locations. Location of piping is not known and some of the lines cross under houses.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
95.00	Needs Category:	VA			New gravity Sanitary Sewer System is being installed and the old system abandoned in many locations. This will eliminate a large amount of the I/I problems in Granttown and around Greenhill section of Rivesville. This is in accordance with Ph. III of their approved LTCP.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	<u>Logan, City of</u>		\$4,618,000	\$4,618,000	Problem
45 Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Logan 544563 0033821 6/30/2017	,		City discharges combined storm and sanitary sewage flows during wet weather. Existing treatment plant is failing mechanically and treated effluent violates WVNPDES permit limits.
95.00	Needs Category:	VA			Connect city's collection system to Logan County PSD for treatment of ADF. Convert existing treatment plant to CSO treatment facility.
Rank	Parsons, City of		\$500,000	\$500,000	Problem
46	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Tucker 544311 0022063	0		Separation of storm water & sanitary sewer flows. This is to reduce overflows in the system.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
95.00	Needs Category:	VA			New secondary treatment system of a sequential batch reactor (SBR) sized for a maximum of 2.10 mgd will be capable of regularly meeting the NPDES permit limits and will remove the temporary sanitary sewer overflow from the WWTP.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	White Sulphur S	<u>prings</u>	\$1,730,760	\$2,889,600	Problem
P	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Greenbrier 544035 0084000 10/31/2016			POTW will have to incorporate chemical addition and tertiary filtration in its treatment stream to reduce algae in the Greenbrier River. WVDEP has imposed new more stringent phosphorus level in the discharge permit for the City.
Points 95.00	Needs Category:	II			Treated effluent from the clarifier will be directed to a tank for chemical addition and detention. Chemically treated water will then have to be filtered prior to disinfection & discharge into the Howard Creek.
Rank	Winfield, City of		\$7,480,000	\$7,480,000	Problem
48	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Putnam 544487 0024503	0-		Existing lagoon wastewater treatment plant fails to meet NPDES compliance, has numerous NOV's, and is under DEP Order #8125.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
95.00	Needs Category:	J			Install a new WWTP.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Piedmont, City o	<u>əf</u>	\$1,026,000	\$1,266,000	Problem
49 Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Mineral 544546 0105279 3/31/2017			Pearl Street pump station and force main are non-operable. City is manually pumping the contents of the station & trucking it to the UPRC's treatment plant in Westernport, Maryland. Not a cost effective method of collecting and transporting the sewage and can not continue indefinitely. Solution
90.00	Needs Category:	IIIB			Emergency upgrades and improvements to 2 pump stations, replace Pearl St. pump station and force main, replace non functioning pumps, install screening system, perform structural repairs, replace flow meters at pump station and plant pump station.
Rank	Greater Harrison	n PSD (WWTP)	\$2,350,000	\$2,835,000	Problem
50	County: SRF #C:	Harrison 544551			Administrative Order for numerous violations of effluent limitations fecal coliform & ammonia nitrogen.
	NPDES #WV:	0084301			
Points	NPDES #WV: Binding Date:				Solution

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Boone County PSD (West Madison	\$4,690,800	\$4,725,000	Problem
51	County: Boone SRF #C: 544494 NPDES #WV: 0035939 Binding Date: 3/31/2017			Certain items at the WWTP have outlived their useful life and it is time to replace these units. I/I is causing excessive flows when rain events occur.
Points		_		
80.00	Needs Category: I.VA			Upgrade certain collection system components in/and near West Madison and upgrade the Danville WWTP, replacing belt filter press with a fan press, upgrade capacity via addition of 3rd clarifier. Will help the LTCP compliance.
Rank	Charleston, City of (Woodward Br	anch) \$7,020,000	\$7,020,000	Problem
52	County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544557 NPDES #WV: 0023205			This project is part of the CSO Long-term Control Plan submitted to WVDEP 12/27/2005. The project will help reduce excessive infiltration/inflow (I/I) in this section of the wastewater collection system.
Points	Binding Date: 6/30/2017			Solution
75.00	Needs Category: VA			The project will replace existing sewers in the Woodward Branch service area of the City of Charleston and provide for the abandonment of existing sewers that are allowing excessive I/I.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	<u>Hinton, City of</u>		\$2,024,000	\$4,024,000	Problem
Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Summers 544550 0024732 6/30/2017			To reduce the frequency and duration of the discharge from permitted discharge CSO 007. Solution
75.00	Needs Category:	VA			Replacement of existing outdated wastewater collection system and pumping station which will reduce the frequency and duration of the discharge from permitted discharge from CSO 007.
Rank	Kanawha Falls P	<u>SD</u>	\$1,000,000	\$4,503,000	Problem
54	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Fayette 544562 0034991			Deficient equipment at the WWTP such as the plant lift stations, headworks, treatment basins, wash waster system, and replacement of an oversized forcemain, that is causing septic conditions in the system.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
75.00	Needs Category:	IIIB			Install new main pumping station components, new bar screen, new grit unit and compactors, refurbish treatment basins and other pertinent repairs at the WWTP. Also replace oversized forcemain.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 55	Preston County Sewer PSD (Bru Mills)	seton \$4,100,000	\$4,100,000	Problem WWTP operating with out of date equipment & failing
Points	County: Preston SRF #C: 544538 NPDES #WV: 0025101 Binding Date: 6/30/2017			infrastructure. Comminutor & tertiary filter are both out of service. Air piping needs replaced as well as controls. Pump station is in need of full upgrades, control panel replacements, increased storage, and more effective pumps. Excessive I/I issues. Solution
75.00	Needs Category: I.IIIB			Replace the damaged baffles, clarifiers, controls, blowers, piping, tankage fence, and grating. Relocate the influent pump and install a new emergency generator with an automatic transfer switch. Upgrade Pump Station to include new pumps, controls, hoist systems, & other appurtenances. Project will reduce burden of I&I on the system.
Rank	Boone County PSD (Foster Phas	se I) \$3,000,000	\$4,500,000	Problem
56	County: Boone SRF #C: 544554 NPDES #WV: 0035939			Need to improve quality of Rock Creek and tributaries as well as Little Coal River. Eliminate problematic onsite systems and package WWTPs. Eliminate impediments to growth. Improve viability of sanitary sewer utility.
Points	Binding Date: 6/30/2017			Solution
70.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			Install approximately 21,500 LF of 12", 8", and 6" gravity sanitary sewer line, 4,200 LF of 6" and 1 1/2" force main sanitary sewer line, 5 pump stations to provide service to approximately 63 residences, 6 commercial, 91 customers.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	<u>Chapmanville, To</u>	<u>own of</u>	\$7,877,000	\$7,877,000	Problem
57 Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Logan 544483-02 0024678 12/31/2016			Pump station equipment is failing, and bypassing of raw sewage is occurring. Treatment plant equipment is failing, and capacity of plant has been reached. Solution
70.00	Needs Category:	I,IIIB			Replace 3 pump stations and upgrade sewage treatment plant to 400,000 gpd SBR treatment plant.
Rank	Franklin, Town o	<u>ıf</u>	\$1,140,900	\$3,040,900	Problem
58 Points 70.00	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date: Needs Category:	Pendleton 544472 0024970 6/30/2017			Wastewater Treatment plant improvements to prolong the life expectancy of the existing WWTP. Excessive I/I in the collection system. Treatment system lagoon cell liners are failing and the existing downtown area Terra Cotta collection lines are failing. Solution Collection system improvements includes pipe lining, manhole inserts, new gravity sewer line & new manholes. Treatment system improvements include a new influent pumping station, liners & baffle replacement & chlorination system, aeration system & bar screen upgrades.

of Chattaroy, WV are using failing ng into the nearby Buffalo Creek. vithin the existing system are in a
lents and 3 of the most sting system will be replaced.
re deteriorating and the steel oding and the electrical equipment uipment is also failing. Excessive I/I.
t and refurbish pump stations,
re

Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<u>Central Boaz PSE</u>	<u>)</u>	\$2,602,000	\$2,607,000	Problem Unserved area along WV RT 14 and existing WWTP aeration &
County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Wood 544059 0084221 3/31/2017			decanting systems aren't functioning properly & UV disinfection and vacuum pits have reached the end of their useful lives.
Needs Category:	I.IVA.IVB			Construct a pressure sewer system to serve the WV RT 14 area, upgrade the existing WWTP and replace vacuum pits.
Harpers Ferry-Bo	olivar PSD	\$2,599,779	\$2,599,779	Problem
County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Jefferson 544504 0039136			Replace aging critical assets identified in the Asset Management Plan. The existing WWTP is almost 38 years old and can fail at any time.
Binding Date:	12/31/2016			Solution
Needs Category:	I			Upgrade existing system, includes the replacement of blowers, diffusers, air piping, outdated switch gear, controls, power distribution and separates chlorination and dechlorination.
	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date: Needs Category: Harpers Ferry-Bo County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Central Boaz PSDCounty:WoodSRF #C:544059NPDES #WV:0084221Binding Date:3/31/2017Needs Category:I.IVA.IVBHarpers Ferry-Bolivar PSDCounty:SRF #C:544504NPDES #WV:0039136	Central Boaz PSD \$2,602,000 County: Wood SRF #C: 544059 NPDES #WV: 0084221 Binding Date: 3/31/2017 Needs Category: I.IVA.IVB Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD \$2,599,779 County: Jefferson SRF #C: 544504 NPDES #WV: 0039136 Binding Date: 12/31/2016	Central Boaz PSD \$2,602,000 \$2,607,000 County: Wood \$\$ SRF #C: \$44059 \$\$ NPDES #WV: 0084221 \$\$ Binding Date: 3/31/2017 \$\$ Needs Category: I.IVA.IVB \$\$ Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD \$2,599,779 \$2,599,779 County: Jefferson \$\$ \$\$ SRF #C: \$44504 \$\$ \$\$ NPDES #WV: 0039136 \$\$ \$\$ Binding Date: 12/31/2016 \$\$ \$\$

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	St. Albans Munic	cipal Utility	\$2,287,150	\$2,287,150	Problem
63 Points	Commission County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Kanawha 544489 0023175 10/31/2016			Current UV disinfection system is nearing the end of it's useful life and is becoming problematic. The system does not have flow pacing and is inefficient causing excessive energy use. The current sludge belt filter press is beyond its useful life and requires excessive reoccurring maintenance.
55.00	Needs Category:	1			The proposed project will replace the existing UV disinfection system with a new system that is more energy efficient. The new system will also provide flow pacing further reducing energy consumption. The project will also replace the existing belt filter press allowing for dependable operation.
Rank	Clarksburg Sanit	ary Board	\$7,250,000	\$7,250,000	Problem
64 Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Harrison 544549 0023302 6/30/2017			Gravity sewer lines are being overloaded with storm sewer flows during periods of wet weather. Tide-Flex valves are in need of replacement. Solution
50.00	Needs Category:	JVA			Removal and replacement of concrete gravity sewer pipe with PVC gravity sewer pipe as well as the installation of HDPE storm sewer pipe. Install new manholes, storm sewer inlets, and concrete wingwalls. Tide-Flex valves are to be installed on CSO's of high priority and in need of replacement.

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment -IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI Storm Water Controls - XII Green

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Farmington, Town of	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	Problem
65 Points	County: Marion SRF #C: 544561 NPDES #WV: 0024865 Binding Date: 6/30/2017			WWTP needs upgrades to the clarifiers, installation of a skid mounted RAS/WAS pump station, installation of a manual bar screen, electrical improvements. Manholes and existing sewer lines need rehabilitated.
50.00	Needs Category: I,IIIB			Install skid mounted RAS/WAS pump station, manual bar screen with drying deck, new flow meter, upgrade clarifiers, remove/dispose of existing telescoping valves ,replace roof, update electrical at the sewer plant. Rehabilitate existing manholes/pipes.
Rank	Jefferson County PSD (Industrial Park)	\$3,575,000	\$7,150,000	Problem
66	County: Jefferson SRF #C: 544546 NPDES #WV: 0084361	0		Collection system operating near its capacity. Deferred maintenance and improvements to collection system, have experienced backups into a basement at the Breckenridge pump station, civil suites, additional capacity needed.
Points	Binding Date: 10/31/2016			Solution
50.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			Construct gravity interceptors & new pump station, upgrade 3 pump stations & construct a force main. Eliminate 5 existing pump stations, improve capacity, reliability & safety of conveyance system to City of Charles Town's WWTP. Capacity for Jefferson County.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Oakvale Road P	SD (Phase II)	\$5,256,000	\$5,256,000	Problem
67	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Mercer 544524 0080489 6/30/2017			Areas described to receive service consists of unserved residents and developable lands. Green Acres WWTP wish to discontinue providing sewer treatment to the Green Acres Subdivision. Sewer effluent from Green Acres WWTP discharges to a tributary of Christian Fork.
Points					
50.00	Needs Category:	IVA.IVB			Extension of existing sewer collection mains to unserved areas and construction of multiple lift stations. Connection of the Green Acres subdivision to the new extensions and abandonment of the existing Green Acres WWTP. Green Acres Consent Order #7731.
Rank	Salem, Town of		\$971,000	\$1,971,000	Problem
68			1 1 1 1 1 1		Excessive inflow which is inundating the system causing permit
	County: SRF #C:	Harrison 544541			exceedances.
	NPDES #WV:	0020257			
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
50.00	Needs Category:	ШВ			Modification of existing system to remove the connection of approximately 27 catch basins which allows rain/surface water to inundate the collection system and overrun the treatment plant.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	<u>Beverly, Town of</u>	:	\$5,300,000	\$6,905,390	Problem
69 Points	SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Randolph 544336-02 0084000 6/30/2017			Monthly flow at the POTW has been exceeding 90% of the design flow on a consistent basis. WVDEP's Permits Section mandated the Town to correct the situation. Plant has no redundancy equipment, some structures at treatment plant need replaced. Solution
45.00	Needs Category:	I,IIIA			Eliminate all known sources of inflow. Sewage pumping stations will be rehabilitated for longer service life. Major upgrade of treatment plant to increase capacity. Some treatment units will be replaced/rehabilitated.
Rank	Canaan Valley PS	<u>SD</u>	\$2,350,000	\$2,350,000	Problem
70	SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Davis 544560 0606011	0		Areas of Deerfield, Windwood, Canaan Village, own and operate private sewer systems. These 3 systems suffer from deteriorating wastewater collection & treatment systems.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
45.00	Needs Category:	IVA,IVB			PSD to take over the treatment of flows from these communities. Install sewer lift stations at Deerfield facility and Windwood facility. Flow transported by way of a standard gravity flow system. Both lift stations will pump sewer flows through separate forcemains to County route 35, combining into 1 forceman to the plant.

oject	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
zabeth, Town of	\$2,271,000	\$2,271,000	Problem
Wirt F #C: 544552 PDES #WV: 0041505 oding Date: 6/30/2017			I/I entering the collection system. Sludge in the old plant lagoons needs to be dewatered through a belt press and taken to a nearby landfill. The 2 vacuum process sewage pump stations are old and in a state of disrepair, difficult to find replacement parts. Solution
eds Category: I.IIIA.IIIB			Repair areas found to be causing the I/I to enter the collection system. Remove and replace 4 major sections of the collection system and replace many manholes found to be leaking. Process the sludge from old aerated lagoons using a portable belt press and dispose of it in the local landfill. Replace the old sewage pump stations with up-to-date submersible pumps and wet wells.
enna	\$2,676,000	\$2,676,000	Problem
			Existing lift stations and package plant have maintenance issues.
wood F #C: 544233 PDES #WV: 0023221			
nding Date: 6/30/2017			Solution
eds Category: IVA,IVB			Extending gravity sewers along 46th Street to Rosemar Road in order to eliminate a package plant serving an industrial complex and three smaller lift stations that serve residential developments.
	abeth, Town of Inty: Wirt #C: 544552 DES #WV: 0041505 ding Date: 6/30/2017 eds Category: I.IIIA.IIIB Inna Inty: Wood #C: 544233 DES #WV: 0023221 ding Date: 6/30/2017	abeth, Town of \$2,271,000 Inty: Wirt #C: 544552 DES #WV: 0041505 ding Date: 6/30/2017 eds Category: I.IIIA.IIIB Inty: Wood #C: 544233 DES #WV: 0023221 ding Date: 6/30/2017	abeth, Town of \$2,271,000 \$2,271,000 inty: Wirt #C: \$44552 DES #WV: 0041505 0041505 ding Date: \$6/30/2017 \$2,676,000 eds Category: I.IIIA.IIIB nna \$2,676,000 \$2,676,000 mty: Wood #C: \$44233 DES #WV: 0023221 6/30/2017

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	<u>West Dunbar</u>		\$6,000,000	\$7,500,000	Problem
73 Points 45.00	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date: Needs Category:	Kanawha 544168 0089591 3/31/2017			Proposing to rehabilitate its system in order to reduce the storm weather flow at the Dunbar POTW. Solution Replace majority of the vitrified clay collection lines that are old & deteriorated beyond repair, rehabilitate some of the pumping stations and relocate 2 of the stations to a new location above 100- yr flood levels.
Rank	Williamson, City	of	¢2,000,000	\$4.024.000	Problem
74	<u>willianison, city</u>		\$3,000,000	\$4,024,000	Outdated & failing wastewater pumping stations, correction of
	County:	Mingo			structural issues at the existing wastewater treatment facility &
	SRF #C:	544544			extend service to (3) unserved customers.
	NPDES #WV:	0026271			
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
45.00	Needs Category:	IIIB			Modifications to existing wastewater collection system, replace
					aged pumping stations, correct structural issues, and extend small collection system to add three customers to existing system.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF	Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Page Kincaid PSD		\$904,211	\$3,204,211	Problem
75 Points	County: Fayette SRF #C: 544500 NPDES #WV: 008442 Binding Date: 6/30/2)8 125			Unserved areas depend on private septic systems, which are often ineffective in treating the sewer due to the inability of the soils to percolate the effluent discharging from the septic tanks.
40.00	Needs Category: XII				Construct a decentralized wastewater system for 52 customers in Robson area. install a STEP (Septic Tank Effluent Pump) and STEG (Septic Tank Effluent Gravity) system.
Rank	Hancock County PSD		\$5,500,000	\$6,300,000	Problem
76 Points 35.00	County:HancoundSRF #C:54443NPDES #WV:004513Binding Date:12/31/Needs Category:IVA.IVE	31 136 /2016			Discharge of semi treated or not treated wastewater into the local waterways. Solution Project will serve 160 users along US Rt. 30 and WV-PA state line. Collected wastewater will be transported to the city of Chester POTW for treatment and final disposal. Collection system will be conventional gravity sewer with occasional sewage pumping stations.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Center PSD		\$2,165,900	\$4,063,000	Problem
77 Points	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Wyoming 544268-01 0027138 6/30/2017			Inflow, Infiltration, and deterioration of the existing collection system that results in backups and overflows. Needed improvements at the WWTP to help reduce maintenance and operation costs. Solution
25.00	Needs Category:	I.IIIA.IIIB			Phase 1 - Replacement of approximately 1250 ft. of 15" pipe, 4,812 ft. of 12" pipe, and 38 existing manholes, install a rotary fan press, changing pre-treatment screens motor placement, and install a non-potable water system, (Work orders and PSC Case) documenting issues and complaints).
Rank	Enlarged Hepzib	ah PSD	\$2,720,000	\$2,720,000	Problem
78	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Harrison 544559 0021001	0		2 pump stations need to be replaced. Residences and businesses along Route 24 currently use septic tanks or HAU's to treat sanitary sewer.
Points	Binding Date:	6/30/2017			Solution
25.00	Needs Category:	IIIB,IVA			Replace both pump stations at Pete Dry Golf Course with duplex submersible stations with concrete wet wells and valve vaults. Install a standard gravity sewer collection system, and 3 pump stations to convey sewer into the Spelter collection system.

Rank / Points	Project		SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank	Northern Wayne	e County PSD	\$2,771,311	\$3,771,311	Problem
P	County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV: Binding Date:	Wayne 544402 0089621 12/31/2016			In the Dock Creek and Miller Creek drainage area major operational problems which can be attributed to high wastewater flow rates & high operating head conditions on the grinder pump units. Also a large industrial area and subdivision that is unserved. Solution
Points 25.00	Needs Category:	IVA			Reroute the force main in the Pine Hills subdivision to a new sewage pumping station, construct a gravity sewer system to serve 90 to 95 unsewered homes, new service to 4 industries, pump the wastewater from this area to the Huntington WWTP for treatment.
Rank		acArthur PSD (Marsh	\$15,500,000	\$15,500,000	Problem
80	<u>Fork)</u> County: SRF #C: NPDES #WV:	Raleigh 544484 0082309			Failing onsite sewage treatment systems are polluting Marsh Fork of the Coal River. Existing Holly Hills WWTP has reached the end of its useful life and has reached capacity.
Points	Binding Date:	3/31/2017			Solution
20.00	Needs Category:	I,IVA,IVB			Extend gravity sewer system from Holly Hills WWTP to Glen Daniel, and replace existing WWTP with 175,000 gpd SBR treatment plant.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Lo	oan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 81	Lubeck PSD County: Woo SRF #C: 5440	bd	\$312,000	\$2,312,000	Problem 2 unserved commercial customers in the Washington Bottom area.
Points	NPDES #WV: 0032	2590 31/2016			Solution Extend service to the 2 potential customers by connection to the
20.00					existing Lubeck PSD system with approximately 5,000 ft. of 10" and smaller diameter gravity pipe, 15,210 ft. of 5" and small diameter forcemain, 19 manholes, 1 major pumping station, 1 duplex grinder pumping station, service laterals and other related appurtenances.
Rank	Buffalo Creek PSD	\$13	\$,839,000	14,839,000	Problem
82	County:LogaSRF #C:5445NPDES #WV:0038Binding Date:6/30	555			Increase the capacity of the WWTP for future extension projects. Due to DEP regulations , the existing RBC plant cannot be modified or expanded so a new plant will need to be constructed. Failing onsite treatment units.
Points	,				Solution
00.00	Needs Category: 1,IVA	A,IVB			Construction a new WWTP and extension of a centralized wastewater collection system in the areas of Taplin and RITA.



PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS BY QUARTER



Appendix B - Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2016 Grant

				State Fiscal Year 2017 (\$1,000)			(000
Name	Project Scope	Proj Num	Activity	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr
		C-544	Code	July-Sept	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-June
Greater Harrison Co. PSI	New WWTP/Ext.	451	D3		10,878		
Greater Harrison Co. PSI	WWTP Upgrade	551	D3	2,350			
Morgantown	WWTP Upgrade	520	D2	5,000			
Oak Hill	WWTP Upgrade	535	D2				14,000
Pennsboro	WWTP Upgrade	409-03	D3		2,672		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
Total Projects and Admin				7,350	13,550	0	14,000

Federal Share (0.8333)		\$6,124.76	11,291	0	11,662	29,078
State Share (0.1667)		\$1,225.25	2,259	0	2,338	5,822
Total**		\$7,350.00	13,550	0	14,000	34,900

Payment Schedule for the CWSRF Program: CS-540001-16

Federal Quarter	Payment Date	CWSRF Amount	Cumulative Amount
		\$20,829,000	\$20,829,000

Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway

* No administrative costs will be used in this grant.

** Any amounts exceeding the grant amount will come from repayments.

<u>Appendix C</u>

PROJECTS BUDGETED FOR IUP AVAILABLE FUNDS



Appendix	C -	Projects	Budgeted	for the	Intended	Use Plan
трренил	C	Trojecto	Duagetta	101 the	Intended	

				State	Fiscal Ye	ar 2017 (\$1	,000)
Name	Project Scope	Proj Num	Activity	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr
		C-544	Code	July-Sept	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-June
Benwood	CSO	531	D2			2,000	
Franklin	WWTP/CS Upgrades	а	D3		1,140		
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	WWTP Upgrade	551	D3	2,350			
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	New WWTP/Sewer Ext	451	D3		10,878		
Hancock Co. PSD	Sewer Extension	431					5,500
Montgomery	PS Upgrade	297	D2		782		
Morgantown	WWTP Upgrade	520	D2	5,000			
New Haven PSD	Dec. WWTP	700	D2	1,000			
Oak Hill	WWTP Upgrade	535	D2				14,000
Oceana	WWTP Upgrade	525-02					5,370
Pennsboro	WWTP Upgrade	409-03	D3		2,672		
Weston (Turnertown)	CSO/Sewer Ext.	471					6,800
White Sulphur Springs	Greenbrier R. WWTP	542	D3	2,037			
	,	,	,				
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
		NT/A	NT/A	25	25	25	25
NPS - Agriculture	various	N/A	N/A	25		25	25
NPS - Onsite	various	N/A	N/A	300			
			sub-total	10,712	15,497	2,025	31,695
					-		
						grand total	59,929

The projects identified above are forecasted based upon the known current status of the project and individual knowledge as to readiness to proceed to construction within one year of receiving a binding commitment. Other projects not identified here may also receive a binding commitment if they proceed on a faster pace than expected or receive funding commitments from other agencies which requires a CWSRF commitment.

Activity Codes

- P facilities planning underway
- D design underway
- D2 design under review at DEP
- D3 design approved by DEP/bid process underway
- R refinancing

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY

<u>Appendix E</u>

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY COUNTY AND MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT



WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

2010 CENSUS

COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS

	Median HH			
County/Magisterial District	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Barbour	31,212	39.02	45.52	52.02
North district	32,009	40.01	46.68	53.35
South district	31,628	39.54	46.12	52.71
West district	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92
Berkeley	52,857	66.07	77.08	88.10
Adam Stephens district	31,280	39.10	45.62	52.13
Norborne district	76,826	96.03	112.04	128.04
Potomac district	54,637	68.30	79.68	91.06
Shenandoah district	58,956	73.70	85.98	98.26
Tuscarora district	52,756	65.95	76.94	87.93
Valley district	59,740	74.68	87.12	99.57
Boone	38,783	48.48	56.56	64.64
District 1	43,910	54.89	64.04	73.18
District 2	37,721	47.15	55.01	62.87
District 3	40,033	50.04	58.38	66.72
Braxton	32,158	40.20	46.90	53.60
Eastern district	38,803	48.50	56.59	64.67
Northern district	35,273	44.09	51.44	58.79
Southern district	26,131	32.66	38.11	43.55
Western district	28,681	35.85	41.83	47.80
Brooke	39,475	49.34	57.57	65.79
Follansbee district	40,775	50.97	59.46	67.96
Weirton district	36,615	45.77	53.40	61.03
Wellsburg district	41,674	52.09	60.77	69.46
Cabell	34,492	43.12	50.30	57.49
District 1	35,245	44.06	51.40	58.74
District 2	23,279	29.10	33.95	38.80
District 3	28,683	35.85	41.83	47.81
District 4	46,647	58.31	68.03	77.75
District 5	43,378	54.22	63.26	72.30
Calhoun	26,922	33.65	39.26	44.87
District 1	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08
District 2	29,601	37.00	43.17	49.34
District 3	27,134	33.92	39.57	45.22
District 4	24,745	30.93	36.09	41.24
District 5	23,345	29.18	34.04	38.91
Clay	30,789	38.49	44.90	51.32
District A	25,764	32.21	37.57	42.94
District B	28,594	35.74	41.70	47.66
District C	40,651	50.81	59.28	67.75
Doddridge	30,019	37.52	43.78	50.03

Beech district	33,207	41.51	48.43	55.35
Maple district	27,250	34.06	39.74	45.42
Oak district	37,115	46.39	54.13	61.86
Pine district	25,891	32.36	37.76	43.15
Fayette	31,912	39.89	46.54	53.19
New Haven district	35,399	44.25	51.62	59.00
Plateau district	28,757	35.95	41.94	47.93
Valley district	31,392	39.24	45.78	52.32
Gilmer	29,706	37.13	43.32	49.51
Center district	25,482	31.85	37.16	42.47
City district	30,951	38.69	45.14	51.59
De Kalb - Troy district	32,552	40.69	47.47	54.25
Glenville district	29,375	36.72	42.84	48.96
Grant	35,593	44.49	51.91	59.32
Grant district	34,750	43.44	50.68	57.92
Milroy district	34,260	42.83	49.96	57.10
Union district	41,204	51.51	60.09	68.67
Greenbrier	33,732	42.17	49.19	56.22
Central district	39,284	49.11	57.29	65.47
Eastern district	31,720	39.65	46.26	52.87
Western district	29,478	36.85	42.99	49.13
Hampshire	31,792	39.74	46.36	52.99
Bloomery district	40,192	50.24	58.61	66.99
Capon district	27,148	33.94	39.59	45.25
Gore district	32,254	40.32	47.04	53.76
Mill Creek district	35,759	44.70	52.15	59.60
Romney district	22,923	28.65	33.43	38.21
Sherman district	34,321	42.90	50.05	57.20
Springfield district	35,884	44.86	52.33	59.81
Hancock	38,565	48.21	56.24	64.28
Butler district	42,197	52.75	61.54	70.33
Clay district Grant district	38,300	47.88	55.85	63.83
Hardy	32,378	40.47	47.22	53.96
Capon district	<u> </u>	41.51	45.71	52.25
Lost River district	26,889	33.61	39.21	55.35 44.82
Moorefield district	25,131	31.41	36.65	44.82
Old Fields district	37,064	46.33	54.05	61.77
South Fork district	40,969	51.21	59.75	68.28
Harrison	39,191	48.99	57.15	65.32
Eastern district	55,881	69.85	81.49	93.14
Northern district	34,730	43.41	50.65	57.88
North Urban district	26,415	33.02	38.52	44.03
Southern district	42,144	52.68	61.46	70.24
South Urban district	37,945	47.43	55.34	63.24
Southeast district	39,241	49.05	57.23	65.40
Jackson	41,406	51.76	60.38	69.01

02/1	5/1	3
------	-----	---

Eastern district	43,823	54.78	63.91	73.04
Northern district	36,288	45.36	52.92	60.48
Western district	45,315	56.64	66.08	75.53
Jefferson	65,603	82.00	95.67	109.34
Charles Town district	48,734	60.92	71.07	81.22
Harpers Ferry district	72,779	90.97	106.14	121.30
Kabletown district	75,167	93.96	109.62	125.28
Middleway district	55,957	69.95	81.60	93.26
Shepherdstown district	85,289	106.61	124.38	142.15
Kanawha	42,669	53.34	62.23	71.12
District 1	36,969	46.21	53.91	61.62
District 2	46,625	58.28	67.99	77.71
District 3	43,952	54.94	64.10	73.25
District 4	41,904	52.38	61.11	69.84
Lewis	33,293	41.62	48.55	55.49
Courthouse - Collins Settlement district	28,196	35.25	41.12	46.99
Freemans Creek district	36,753	45.94	53.60	61.26
Hackers Creek - Skin Creek district	33,431	41.79	48.75	55.72
Lincoln	30,868	38.59	45.02	51.45
Carroll district	30,764	38.46	44.86	51.27
Duval district	39,592	49.49	57.74	65.99
Harts district	32,543	40.68	47.46	54.24
Jefferson district	24,714	30.89	36.04	41.19
Laurel Hill district	29,329	36.66	42.77	48.88
Sheridan district	26,800	33.50	39.08	44.67
Union district	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08
Washington district	29,485	36.86	43.00	49.14
Logan	35,465	44.33	51.72	59.11
Central district	33,298	41.62	48.56	55.50
Eastern district	35,511	44.39	51.79	59.19
Western district	38,145	47.68	55.63	63.58
Marion	38,115	47.64	55.58	63.53
Middletown district	32,983	41.23	48.10	54.97
Palatine district	42,667	53.33	62.22	71.11
West Augusta district	37,506	46.88	54.70	62.51
Marshall	34,419	43.02	50.19	57.37
District 1	37,141	46.43	54.16	61.90
District 2	29,383	36.73	42.85	48.97
District 3	36,174	45.22	52.75	60.29
Mason	36,027	45.03	52.54	60.05
Arbuckle district	39,885	49.86	58.17	66.48
Clendenin district	32,445	40.56	47.32	54.08
Cologne district	33,042	41.30	48.19	55.07
Cooper district	40,000	50.00	58.33	66.67
Graham district	32,104	40.13	46.82	53.51
Hannan district	34,761	43.45	50.69	57.94
Lewis district	42,410	53.01	61.85	70.68

Robinson district	28,875	36.09	42.11	48.13
Union district	31,190	38.99	45.49	51.98
Waggener district	35,609	44.51	51.93	59.35
McDowell	22,154	27.69	32.31	36.92
Big Creek district	19,494	24.37	28.43	32.49
Browns Creek district	25,486	31.86	37.17	42.48
North Elkin district	23,273	29.09	33.94	38.79
Sandy River district	22,137	27.67	32.28	36.90
Mercer	32,131	40.16	46.86	53.55
District I	30,510	38.14	44.49	50.85
District II	32,496	40.62	47.39	54.16
District III	33,617	42.02	49.02	56.03
Mineral	36,571	45.71	53.33	60.95
District 1	38,969	48.71	56.83	64.95
District 2	27,951	34.94	40.76	46.59
District 3	43,517	54.40	63.46	72.53
Mingo	32,902	41.13	47.98	54.84
Beech Ben Mate district	32,796	41.00	47.83	54.66
Kermit Harvey district	24,899	31.12	36.31	41.50
Lee district	38,553	48.19	56.22	64.26
Magnolia district	33,142	41.43	48.33	55.24
Stafford district	32,940	41.18	48.04	54.90
Tug Hardee district	41,042	51.30	59.85	68.40
Williamson district	28,829	36.04	42.04	48.05
Monongalia	39,167	48.96	57.12	65.28
Central district	26,069	32.59	38.02	43.45
Eastern district	45,192	56.49	65.91	75.32
Western district	44,689	55.86	65.17	74.48
Monroe	39,574	49.47	57.71	65.96
Central district	38,342	47.93	55.92	63.90
Eastern district	43,874	54.84	63.98	73.12
Western district	35,943	44.93	52.42	59.91
Morgan	37,281	46.60	54.37	62.14
District 1	25,271	31.59	36.85	42.12
District 2	36,315	45.39	52.96	60.53
District 3	44,375	55.47	64.71	73.96
Nicholas	38,457	48.07	56.08	64.10
Beaver district	26,623	33.28	38.83	44.37
Grant district	41,488	51.86	60.50	69.15
Hamilton district	44,718	55.90	65.21	74.53
Jefferson district	37,420	46.78	54.57	62.37
Kentucky district	43,425	54.28	63.33	72.38
Summersville district	43,114	53.89	62.87	71.86
Wilderness district	45,163	56.45	65.86	75.27
Ohio	39,669	49.59	57.85	66.12
District 1	48,107	60.13	70.16	80.18
District 2	28,470	35.59	41.52	47.45

District 3	41,625	52.03	60.70	69.38
Pendleton	33,323	41.65	48.60	55.54
Central district	40,000	50.00	58.33	66.67
Eastern district	31,607	39.51	46.09	52.68
Western district	30,742	38.43	44.83	51.24
Pleasants	38,882	48.60	56.70	64.80
District A	51,893	64.87	75.68	86.49
District B	26,851	33.56	39.16	44.75
District C	40,446	50.56	58.98	67.41
District D	48,750	60.94	71.09	81.25
Pocahontas	32,161	40.20	46.90	53.60
Edray district	31,923	39.90	46.55	53.21
Greenbank district	37,188	46.49	54.23	61.98
Huntersville district	31,161	38.95	45.44	51.94
Little Levels district	30,755	38.44	44.85	51.26
Preston	40,753	50.94	59.43	67.92
Fifth district	37,666	47.08	54.93	62.78
First district	45,297	56.62	66.06	75.50
Fourth district	34,673	43.34	50.56	57.79
Second district	44,432	55.54	64.80	74.05
Third district	42,798	53.50	62.41	71.33
Putnam	52,618	65.77	76.73	87.70
Buffalo - Union district	44,398	55.50	64.75	74.00
Curry district	45,387	56.73	66.19	75.65
Pocatalico district	41,023	51.28	59.83	68.37
Scott district	67,500	84.38	98.44	112.50
Teays district	75,385	94.23	109.94	125.64
Raleigh	38,036	47.55	55.47	63.39
District 1	41,325	51.66	60.27	68.88
District 2	33,871	42.34	49.40	56.45
District 3	37,058	46.32	54.04	61.76
Randolph	36,176	45.22	52.76	60.29
Beverly district	37,020	46.28	53.99	61.70
Dry Fork district	35,634	44.54	51.97	59.39
Huttonsville district	27,117	33.90	39.55	45.20
Leadsville district	37,736	47.17	55.03	62.89
Middle Fork district	35,469	44.34	51.73	59.12
Mingo district	30,972	38.72	45.17	51.62
New Interest district	46,042	57.55	67.14	76.74
Roaring Creek district	32,561	40.70	47.48	54.27
Valley Bend district	41,786	52.23	60.94	69.64
Ritchie Clau district	32,619	40.77	47.57	54.37
Clay district Grant district	34,702	43.38	50.61	57.84
Murphy district	34,948	43.69	50.97	58.25
Union district	25,602	32.00	37.34	42.67
	30,972	38.72	45.17	51.62
Roane	27,428	34.29	40.00	45.71

02/15	5/13
-------	------

				0
District 1	31,866	39.83	46.47	53.11
District 2	22,823	28.53	33.28	38.04
District 3	28,614	35.77	41.73	47.69
Summers	27,720	34.65	40.43	46.20
Bluestone River district	27,857	34.82	40.62	46.43
Greenbrier River district	29,984	37.48	43.73	49.97
New River district	26,483	33.10	38.62	44.14
Taylor	36,956	46.20	53.89	61.59
Eastern district	32,669	40.84	47.64	54.45
Tygart district	30,592	38.24	44.61	50.99
Western district	46,278	57.85	67.49	77.13
Tucker	32,712	40.89	47.71	54.52
Black Fork district	35,813	44.77	52.23	59.69
Clover district	30,234	37.79	44.09	50.39
Davis district	17,961	22.45	26.19	29.94
Dry Fork district	50,052	62.57	72.99	83.42
Fairfax district	31,417	39.27	45.82	52.36
Licking district	9,333	11.67	13.61	15.56
St. George district	39,688	49.61	57.88	66.15
Tyler	33,496	41.87	48.85	55.83
Central district	29,138	36.42	42.49	48.56
North district	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42
South district	32,440	40.55	47.31	54.07
West district	31,944	39.93	46.59	53.24
Upshur	36,114	45.14	52.67	60.19
First district	35,595	44.49	51.91	59.33
Second district	33,974	42.47	49.55	56.62
Third district	38,009	47.51	55.43	63.35
Wayne	35,079	43.85	51.16	58.47
Butler district	35,114	43.89	51.21	58.52
Ceredo district	38,555	48.19	56.23	64.26
Stonewall district	28,994	36.24	42.28	48.32
Union district	39,031	48.79	56.92	65.05
Westmoreland district	36,239	45.30	52.85	60.40
Webster	28,025	35.03	40.87	46.71
Central district	26,198	32.75	38.21	43.66
Northern district	23,686	29.61	34.54	39.48
Southern district	32,089	40.11	46.80	53.48
Wetzel	36,636	45.80	53.43	61.06
District 1	36,370	45.46	53.04	60.62
District 2	37,556	46.95	54.77	62.59
District 3	36,282	45.35	52.91	60.47
Wirt	36,705	45.88	53.53	61.18
Central district	42,712	53.39	62.29	71.19
Northeast district	34,821	43.53	50.78	58.04
Southwest district	31,643	39.55	46.15	52.74
Wood	42,146	52.68	61.46	70.24

2010 Census MHI Tables - County/Magisterial District

02/15/13

Clay district	45,625	57.03	66.54	76.04
Harris district	38,229	47.79	55.75	63.72
Lubeck district	48,184	60.23	70.27	80.31
Parkersburg district	34,208	42.76	49.89	57.01
Slate district	53,295	66.62	77.72	88.83
Steele district	47,000	58.75	68.54	78.33
Tygart district	35,710	44.64	52.08	59.52
Union district	55,192	68.99	80.49	91.99
Walker district	56,458	70.57	82.33	94.10
Williams district	53,094	66.37	77.43	88.49
Wyoming	36,343	45.43	53.00	60.57
District 1	35,580	44.48	51.89	59.30
District 2	36,975	46.22	53.92	61.63
District 3	35,440	44.30	51.68	59.07

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/guided_search.xhtml

<u>Appendix E1</u>

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY MUNICIPALITY



WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2010 CENSUS MUNICIPALITIES

Median HH Average Bill based on % MHI					
	Median HH				
MUNICIPALITIES	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	
Α				-	
Addison (Webster Springs), town	22,283	27.85	32.50	37.14	
Albright, town	33,036	41.30	48.18	55.06	
Alderson , town	25,469	31.84	37.14	42.45	
Anawalt, town	41,750	52.19	60.89	69.58	
Anmoore, town	22,756	28.45	33.19	37.93	
Ansted, town	27,885	34.86	40.67	46.48	
Athens, town	46,944	58.68	68.46	78.24	
Auburn, town	10,625	13.28	15.49	17.71	
В					
Bancroft, town	30,288	37.86	44.17	50.48	
Barboursville, village	51,574	64.47	75.21	85.96	
Barrackville, town	44,427	55.53	64.79	74.05	
Bath (Berkeley Springs), town	36,350	45.44	53.01	60.58	
Bayard, town	30,156	37.70	43.98	50.26	
Beckley, city	31,480	39.35	45.91	52.47	
Beech Bottom, village	30,667	38.33	44.72	51.11	
Belington, town	29,803	37.25	43.46	49.67	
Belle, town	33,824	42.28	49.33	56.37	
Belmont, city	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92	
Benwood, city	29,955	37.44	43.68	49.93	
Bethany, town	45,938	57.42	66.99	76.56	
Bethlehem, village	60,896	76.12	88.81	101.49	
Beverly, town	25,481	31.85	37.16	42.47	
Blacksville, town	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08	
Bluefield, city	31,371	39.21	45.75	52.29	
Bolivar, town	52,045	65.06	75.90	86.74	
Bradshaw, town	17,292	21.62	25.22	28.82	
Bramwell, town	26,563	33.20	38.74	44.27	
Brandonville, town	19,375	24.22	28.26	32.29	
Bridgeport, city	66,318	82.90	96.71	110.53	
Bruceton Mills, town	64,583	80.73	94.18	107.64	
Buckhannon, city	34,425	43.03	50.20	57.38	
Buffalo, town	39,286	49.11	57.29	65.48	
Burnsville, town	27,031	33.79	39.42	45.05	
С	,				
Cairo, town	24,688	30.86	36.00	41.15	
Camden-on-Gauley, town	21,875	27.34	31.90	36.46	
Cameron, city	22,500	28.13	32.81	37.50	
Capon Bridge, town	30,690	38.36	44.76	51.15	
Carpendale, town	37,946	47.43	55.34	63.24	
Cedar Grove, town	30,370	37.96	44.29	50.62	
Ceredo, city	23,244	29.06	33.90	38.74	

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2010 CENSUS

MUNICIPALITIES

	Median HH	HH Average Bill based on % MHI			
MUNICIPALITIES	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	
Chapmanville, town	41,471	51.84	60.48	69.12	
Charleston, city	42,133	52.67	61.44	70.22	
Charles Town, city	56,926	71.16	83.02	94.88	
Chesapeake, town	36,958	46.20	53.90	61.60	
Chester, city	38,795	48.49	56.58	64.66	
Clarksburg, city	32,078	40.10	46.78	53.46	
Clay, town	16,750	20.94	24.43	27.92	
Clearview, village	52,083	65.10	75.95	86.81	
Clendenin, town	32,045	40.06	46.73	53.41	
Cowen, town	30,652	38.32	44.70	51.09	
D	,				
Danville, town	28,000	35.00	40.83	46.67	
Davis, town	18,947	23.68	27.63	31.58	
Davy, town	23,594	29.49	34.41	39.32	
Delbarton, town	24,074	30.09	35.11	40.12	
Dunbar, city	43,217	54.02	63.02	72.03	
Durbin, town	27,273	34.09	39.77	45.46	
E					
East Bank, town	45,938	57.42	66.99	76.56	
Eleanor, town	30,150	37.69	43.97	50.25	
Elizabeth, town	25,417	31.77	37.07	42.36	
Elk Garden, town	30,690	38.36	44.76	51.15	
Elkins, city	34,705	43.38	50.61	57.84	
Ellenboro, town	34,375	42.97	50.13	57.29	
F					
Fairmont, city	33,110	41.39	48.29	55.18	
Fairview, town	32,500	40.63	47.40	54.17	
Falling Spring, town	33,438	41.80	48.76	55.73	
Farmington, town	33,250	41.56	48.49	55.42	
Fayetteville, town	42,667	53.33	62.22	71.11	
Flatwoods, town	22,153	27.69	32.31	36.92	
Flemington, town	39,792	49.74	58.03	66.32	
Follansbee, city	40,625	50.78	59.24	67.71	
Fort Gay, town	17,727	22.16	25.85	29.55	
Franklin, town	32,784	40.98	47.81	54.64	
Friendly, town	25,833	32.29	37.67	43.06	
G					
Gary, city	23,594	29.49	34.41	39.32	
Gassaway, town	31,667	39.58	46.18	52.78	
Gauley Bridge, town	20,750	25.94	30.26	34.58	
Gilbert, town	26,250	32.81	38.28	43.75	
Glasgow, town	31,458	39.32	45.88	52.43	
Glen Dale, city	48,869	61.09	71.27	81.45	

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2010 CENSUS MUNICIPALITIES

	Median HH		ge Bill based on % MHI			
MUNICIPALITIES	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%		
Glenville, town	29,333	36.67	42.78	48.89		
Grafton, city	26,494	33.12	38.64	44.16		
Grantsville, town	28,173	35.22	41.09	46.96		
Grant Town, town	27,115	33.89	39.54	45.19		
Granville, town	29,375	36.72	42.84	48.96		
н						
Hambleton, town	35,417	44.27	51.65	59.03		
Hamlin, town	26,343	32.93	38.42	43.91		
Handley, town	23,000	28.75	33.54	38.33		
Harman, town	18,000	22.50	26.25	30.00		
Harpers Ferry, town	69,167	86.46	100.87	115.28		
Harrisville, town	34,545	43.18	50.38	57.58		
Hartford City, town	32,697	40.87	47.68	54.50		
Hedgesville, town	41,458	51.82	60.46	69.10		
Henderson, town	16,771	20.96	24.46	27.95		
Hendricks, town	45,833	57.29	66.84	76.39		
Hillsboro, town	20,625	25.78	30.08	34.38		
Hinton, city	18,750	23.44	27.34	31.25		
Hundred, town	22,292	27.87	32.51	37.15		
Huntington, city	27,858	34.82	40.63	46.43		
Hurricane, city	54,770	68.46	79.87	91.28		
Huttonsville, town	17,917	22.40	26.13	29.86		
laeger, town	21,500	26.88	31.35	35.83		
J	=		01100	55105		
Jane Lew, town	29,130	36.41	42.48	48.55		
Junior, town	16,667	20.83	24.31	27.78		
K	10,007	20:05	27.91	27.70		
Kenova, city	31,406	39.26	45.80	52.34		
Kermit, town	37,862	47.33	55.22	63.10		
Keyser, city	28,321	35.40	41.30	47.20		
Keystone, city	26,563	33.20	38.74	47.20		
Kimball, town	34,688	43.36	50.59			
,		43.30	49.46	57.81		
Kingwood, city L	33,914	42.39	49.40	56.52		
	41.075	F2 24	C1 07	<u> </u>		
Leon, town	41,875	52.34	61.07	69.79		
Lester, town	28,500	35.63	41.56	47.50		
Lewisburg, city	39,207	49.01	57.18	65.35		
Logan, city	26,651	33.31	38.87	44.42		
Lost Creek, town	43,929	54.91	64.06	73.22		
Lumberport, town	38,625	48.28	56.33	64.38		
M			<u> </u>			
Mabscott, town	46,813	58.52	68.27	78.02		

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2010 CENSUS

MUNICIPALITIES

Median HH Average Bill based on % MH					
MUNICIPALITIES	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	
McMechen, city	27,450	34.31	40.03	45.75	
Madison, city	43,894	54.87	64.01	73.16	
Man, town	36,696	45.87	53.52	61.16	
Mannington, city	37,727	47.16	55.02	62.88	
Marlinton, town	24,415	30.52	35.61	40.69	
Marmet, city	33,490	41.86	48.84	55.82	
Martinsburg, city	34,799	43.50	50.75	58.00	
Mason, town	27,083	33.85	39.50	45.14	
Masontown, town	33,063	41.33	48.22	55.11	
Matewan, town	16,522	20.65	24.09	27.54	
Matoaka, town	11,917	14.90	17.38	19.86	
Meadow Bridge, town	22,917	28.65	33.42	38.20	
Middlebourne, town	29,196	36.50	42.58	48.66	
Mill Creek, town	23,600	29.50	34.42	39.33	
Milton, town	34,141	42.68	49.79	56.90	
Mitchell Heights, town	58,472	73.09	85.27	97.45	
Monongah, town	38,917	48.65	56.75	64.86	
Montgomery, city	21,914	27.39	31.96	36.52	
Montrose, town	20,000	25.00	29.17	33.33	
Moorefield, town	24,886	31.11	36.29	41.48	
Morgantown, city	25,495	31.87	37.18	42.49	
Moundsville, city	28,496	35.62	41.56	47.49	
Mount Hope, city	19,746	24.68	28.80	32.91	
Mullens, city	32,667	40.83	47.64	54.45	
N					
Newburg, town	39,306	49.13	57.32	65.51	
New Cumberland, city	24,760	30.95	36.11	41.27	
New Haven, town	29,527	36.91	43.06	49.21	
New Martinsville, city	36,282	45.35	52.91	60.47	
Nitro, city	40,322	50.40	58.80	67.20	
Northfork, town	16,250	20.31	23.70	27.08	
North Hills, town	90,000	112.50	131.25	150.00	
Nutter Fort, town	31,790	39.74	46.36	52.98	
0					
Oak Hill, city	31,835	39.79	46.43	53.06	
Oakvale, town	24,821	31.03	36.20	41.37	
Oceana, town	30,032	37.54	43.80	50.05	
Р					
Paden City, city	35,026	43.78	51.08	58.38	
Parkersburg, city	33,916	42.40	49.46	56.53	
Parsons, city	31,682	39.60	46.20	52.80	
Paw Paw, town	16,190	20.24	23.61	26.98	
Pax, town	12,308	15.39	17.95	20.51	

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2010 CENSUS

MUNICIPALITIES

Median H	Median HH Average Bill based on % MHI			
MUNICIPALITIES Income				
Pennsboro, city 26,				
Petersburg, city 32,				
Peterstown, town 31,				
Philippi, city 31,9				
Piedmont, town 23,				
Pine Grove, town 30,				
Pineville, town 43,				
Pleasant Valley, city 37,9				
Poca, town 54,				
Point Pleasant, city 41,9				
Pratt, town 51,				
Princeton, city 26,				
Pullman, town 47,				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	515 59.77 09.75 79.0			
Q Ouinwood town 27	794 34.74 40.53 46.3			
Quinwood, town 27,	794 54.74 40.55 40.5			
R 28				
Rainelle, town 28,				
Ranson Town, corporation of 39,				
Ravenswood, city 32,7				
Reedsville, town 55,3				
Reedy, town 24,				
Rhodell, town 28,				
Richwood, city 24,				
Ridgeley, town 33,				
Ripley, city 34,				
Rivesville, town 38,				
Romney, city 24,				
Ronceverte, city 35,	931 44.91 52.40 59.8			
Rowlesburg, town 44,	750 55.94 65.26 74.5			
Rupert, town 25,	549 31.94 37.26 42.5			
S				
St. Albans, city 41,9	956 52.45 61.19 69.9			
St. Marys, city 41,0	063 51.33 59.88 68.4			
Salem, city 25,4	481 31.85 37.16 42.4			
Sand Fork, town 24,2	250 30.31 35.36 40.4			
Shepherdstown, town 62,9	917 78.65 91.75 104.8			
Shinnston, city 33,4	468 41.84 48.81 55.7			
Sistersville, city 31,	786 39.73 46.35 52.9			
Smithers, city 21,	019 26.27 30.65 35.0			
	375 10.47 12.21 13.9			
Sophia, town 32,				
South Charleston, city 42,				
	206 24.01 28.01 32.0			

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2010 CENSUS MUNICIPALITIES

	Median HH	Average Bill based on % MHI			
MUNICIPALITIES	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	
Star City, town	33,684	42.11	49.12	56.14	
Stonewood, city	33,105	41.38	48.28	55.18	
Summersville, town	47,083	58.85	68.66	78.47	
Sutton, town	25,625	32.03	37.37	42.71	
Sylvester, town	58,125	72.66	84.77	96.88	
Т		/ 2100	0	50.00	
Terra Alta, town	32,500	40.63	47.40	54.17	
Thomas, city	31,750	39.69	46.30	52.92	
Thurmond, town	23,750	29.69	34.64	39.58	
Triadelphia, town	38,077	47.60	55.53	63.46	
Tunnelton, town	23,125	28.91	33.72	38.54	
U					
Union, town	41,490	51.86	60.51	69.15	
V	,				
Valley Grove, village	43,047	53.81	62.78	71.75	
Vienna, city	42,616	53.27	62.15	71.03	
w	,				
War, city	21,923	27.40	31.97	36.54	
Wardensville, town	33,333	41.67	48.61	55.56	
Wayne, town	24,194	30.24	35.28	40.32	
Weirton, city	39,699	49.62	57.89	66.17	
Welch, city	25,125	31.41	36.64	41.88	
Wellsburg, city	33,089	41.36	48.25	55.15	
West Hamilin, town	19,417	24.27	28.32	32.36	
West Liberty, town	35,673	44.59	52.02	59.46	
West Logan, town	35,625	44.53	51.95	59.38	
West Milford, town	45,526	56.91	66.39	75.88	
Weston, city	27,066	33.83	39.47	45.11	
Westover, city	42,900	53.63	62.56	71.50	
West Union, town	26,324	32.91	38.39	43.87	
Wheeling, city	32,779	40.97	47.80	54.63	
White Hall, town	54,091	67.61	78.88	90.15	
White Sulphur Springs, city	33,843	42.30	49.35	56.41	
Whitesville, town	39,306	49.13	57.32	65.51	
Williamson, city	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92	
Williamstown, city	54,818	68.52	79.94	91.36	
Windsor Heights, village	43,750	54.69	63.80	72.92	
Winfield, town	65,368	81.71	95.33	108.95	
Womelsdorf (Coalton), town	26,563	33.20	38.74	44.27	
Worthington, town	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42	

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t

APPENDIX F

Sources and Uses Chart (For EPA use only)



West Virginia Clean Water State Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan - Sources and Uses of Funds (for EPA use only)

Cumulative Sources as of December 31, 2015

Capitalization Grants (27)	\$ 618,162,586	
State Matches (actual)	\$ 111,414,095	
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319)	\$ 367,500,890	
Investment Earnings	\$ 27,660,786	
Sources sub-total (a)		\$ 1,124,738,357
Cumulative Uses as of December 31, 2015		
Loan Assistance (212+319)	\$ 1,114,212,180	
DEP Administration (4%)	\$ 14,143,540	
Uses sub-total (b)		\$ 1,128,355,720
FY2017 Sources of Funds		
Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	\$ (3,617,363)	
Capitalization Grant #28 (FFY2016 Funds)	\$ 20,829,000	
State Match	\$ 4,165,800	
Earnings	\$ 382,738	
Repayments	\$ 35,649,933	
Sources of Funds (c)		\$ 57,410,108
Less		
Appendix C Projects	\$ 59,929,000	
AgWQLP Reserves	\$ 150,000	
OSLP Reserve	\$ 300,000	
Total		\$ 60,379,000

APPENDIX G

POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS



CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

"Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2017 IUP

Project	Category	Description	Cost Estimate
		Decentralized individual	
Auburn, Town of	decentralized sewer system	treatment untis	\$2,714,725
Cairo, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	\$2,503,325
Century Volga PSD	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized recirculating sand filter with subsurface discharge	\$2,844,000
Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD - Rhodel	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	\$4,510,200
Greater Harrison PSD	energy efficiency	Biodome Instalation reducing energy requirement	\$2,000,000
Jefferson Co. PSD	energy efficiency	Sewer interceptor construction removing 5 pump stations	\$6,990,000
McDowell Co. PSD - Coalwood	decentralized sewer system	Packaged MBBR plant and collection system	\$1,950,000
Montgomery, City of	energy efficiency	pump station replacement	\$768,120
New Haven PSD	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$3,282,320
Page-Kincaid PSD	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$3,204,211
St. Albans, City of	energy efficiency	replacement of UV system	\$2,287,150
Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo)	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$2,353,000
	· · · ·	TOTAL	\$35,407,051

<u>Appendix H</u>

UNEMPLOYMENT DATA



Labor Force Data by County 2013

County	Rate		
Barbour	6.4		
Berkeley	6.0		
Boone	7.4		
Braxton	8.9		
Brooke	8.4		
Cabell	5.7		
Calhoun	9.8		
Clay	11.5		
Doddridge	6.0		
Fayette	7.9		
Gilmer	5.8		
Grant	9.5		
Greenbrier	7.1		
Hampshire	6.9		
Hancock	8.3		
Hardy	6.9		
Harrison	5.3		
Jackson	7.2		
Jefferson	4.6		
Kanawha	5.7		
Lewis	5.5		
Lincoln	8.4		
Logan	8.9		
McDowell	10.0		
Marion	5.6		
Marshall	7.1		
Mason	10.1		
Mercer	7.1		
Mineral	6.3		
Mingo	11.0		
Monongalia	4.1		
Monroe	5.7		
Morgan	5.9		
Nicholas	5.9 9.1		
Ohio	9.1 6.0		
Pendleton	5.1		
Pleasants Pocahontas	7.1		
Preston	8.7		
Putnam	5.7 5.3		
Raleigh	6.6		
Randolph	6.9		
Ritchie	5.9		
Roane	9.7		
Summers	7.5		
Taylor	5.5		
Tucker	8.0		
Tyler	8.0		
Upshur	6.3		
Wayne	6.7		
Webster	11.5		
Wetzel	9.7		
Wirt	9.0		
Wood	6.1		
Wyoming	8.8		
WV Source: from www.workforcey	6.5		

Source: from www.workforcewv.org

<u>Appendix I</u>

POPULATION DATA



Population Data

	2010	2013	% Change
County	Census	Estimate	*red reflects negative
Barbour	16,589	16,770	1.09
Berkeley	104,169	108,706	4.36
Boone	24,629	24,224	1.64
Braxton	14,523	14,502	0.14
Brooke	24,069	23,737	1.38
Cabell	96,319	97,133	0.85
Calhoun	7,627	7,564	0.83
Clay	9,386	9,244	1.51
Doddridge	8,202	8,344	1.73
Fayette	46,039	45,599	0.96
Gilmer	8,693	8,672	0.24
Grant	11,937	11,759	1.49
Greenbrier	35,480	35,644	0.46
Hampshire	23,964	23,445	2.17
Hancock	30,676	30,291	1.26
Hardy	14,025	13,920	0.75
Harrison	69,099	68,972	0.18
Jackson	29,211	29,178	0.11
Jefferson	53,498	55,073	2.94
Kanawha	193,063	191,275	0.93
Lewis	16,372	16,452	0.49
Lincoln		21,559	0.49
	21,720	35,987	
Logan	36,743	-	2.06
McDowell	22,113	20,876	5.59
Marion	56,418	56,868	0.80
Marshall	33,107	32,459	1.96
Mason	27,324	27,126	0.72
Mercer	62,264	61,984	0.45
Mineral	28,212	27,704	1.80
Mingo	26,839	25,900	3.50
Monongalia	96,189	102,274	6.33
Monroe	13,502	13,483	0.14
Morgan	17,541	17,498	0.25
Nicholas	26,233	25,965	1.02
Ohio	44,443	43,727	1.61
Pendleton	7,695	7,471	2.91
Pleasants	7,605	7,577	0.37
Pocahontas	8,719	8,669	0.57
Preston	33,520	33,859	1.01
Putnam	55,486	56,650	2.10
Raleigh	78,859	78,833	0.03
Randolph	29,405	29,415	0.03
Ritchie	10,449	10,073	3.60
Roane	14,926	14,656	1.81
Summers	13,927	13,563	2.61
Taylor	16,895	16,973	0.46
Tucker	7,141	6,968	2.42
Tyler	9,208	8,995	2.31
Upshur	24,254	24,665	1.69
Wayne	42,481	41,437	2.46
Webster	9,154	8,893	2.85
Wetzel	16,583	16,204	2.29
Wirt	5,717	5,901	3.22
Wood	86,956	86,569	0.45
Wyoming	23,796	23,019	3.27
	23,796 ttp://factfinder.census.gov		

Source: http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index/xhtml