

**West Virginia
Clean Water State Revolving Fund**



FY2017 Intended Use Plan

Submitted to the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
June 3, 2016



west virginia department of environmental protection

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Glossary.....	1
Preface.....	2
SECTION I	
Introduction.....	3
SECTION II	
Funds Identification	3
SECTION III	
Goals.....	5
SECTION IV	
Project Priority List.....	6
SECTION V	
Fund Activities.....	7
SECTION VI	
Assurances	16
SECTION VII	
Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds	17
SECTION VIII	
Public Participation.....	17
SECTION IX	
Agreement.....	17

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 safety
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 =	\$ 93,284,874
Federal funds accounts payable (Base grants) =	\$ <u>0</u>
	<u>\$ 93,284,874</u>

New funds available during state FY2017:

Next Federal EPA Grant =	\$ 20,829,000
Next State Match* =	\$ 4,165,800
Est. Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/17) =	\$ 32,820,134
Est. Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/17) =	\$ 2,829,799
Est. Investment earnings (to 6/30/17) =	\$ <u>382,738</u>
	<u>\$ 61,027,471</u>

Less:

Existing project loans payables (12/31/15) =	\$ 96,667,741
Existing binding commitments (12/31/15) =	\$ 36,520,359
AgWQLP reserve =	\$ 150,000
OSLP reserve =	\$ 300,000
DEP Administration =	\$ <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.

SECTION III

Goals

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.

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

Objective 2 – Maximize investment opportunities.

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

Objective 4 – 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. Short term goals

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 term

1.5% to 1.74% MHI: 1.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year term

1.75% to 2.0% MHI: .5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year term

Greater 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 10% be set aside for funding green projects. This amount will equal \$2,082,900. 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.

<u>MHI</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.75% - 1.99%	50
2.0% or greater	75

Unemployment Data – 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.

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

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

<u>Change in Population</u>	<u>Points</u>
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 10% 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 not 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. Water Efficiency

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. BAN leveraging program

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. 30-year bonds

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 ½% and an annual administrative fee of ½% 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. 40-year bonds

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. Requirements for CWSRF Commitment

Formal Commitments – 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 low-interest 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 Quality 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. Onsite Systems Loan Program

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. Federal requirements

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)(2) - Anticipated Cash Draw Ratio (Proportionality) – State match funds are disbursed prior to using capitalization grant funds.
- 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	Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IIIC Tackett's Creek) County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544406-03 NPDES #WV: 0035068 Binding Date: 6/30/2016 Needs Category: IIIA, IIIB, IVA, IVB	\$17,970,000	\$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.
Points 220.00				
Rank 2	McDowell County PSD (Coalwood) County: McDowell SRF #C: 547302 NPDES #WV: 0000000 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs 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.
Points 180.00				

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 <div>3</div>	Weston, City of <div> County: <div>Lewis</div> SRF #C: <div>544471</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0028068</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIA,IIIB,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$6,800,000</div>	<div>\$8,333,000</div>	Problem <div>Unserved 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.</div> Solution <div>New 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.</div>
Points <div>170.00</div>				
Rank <div>4</div>	Century Volga PSD <div> County: <div>Barbour</div> SRF #C: <div>544556</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0000000</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>XII</div> </div>	<div>\$1,844,000</div>	<div>\$2,844,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic tanks and drain fields along with failing HAUs. Raw sewage and grey water being discharged into the streams and ditches.</div> Solution <div>Install 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.</div>
Points <div>160.00</div>				

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 5	Morgantown, City of (Star City TP/Poponoe Run Upgrades) County: Monongalia SRF #C: 544520 NPDES #WV: 0023124 Binding Date: 10/31/2016 Needs Category: VA	\$5,000,000	\$90,000,000	Problem 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. Solution 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.
Points 160.00				
Rank 6	New Haven PSD (Winona) County: Fayette SRF #C: 547850 NPDES #WV: 0000000 Binding Date: 10/31/2016 Needs Category: XII	\$487,544	\$3,282,320	Problem No existing wastewater collection/treatment system. Fecal coliform levels in Keeney Creek are high. Solution Construct a decentralized wastewater collection and treatment system, new septic tanks installed.
Points 155.00				

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 <div>7</div>	Pennsboro, City of <div> County: <div>Ritchie</div> SRF #C: <div>544409-03</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0025739</div> Binding Date: <div>3/13/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>I</div> </div>	<div>\$2,672,600</div>	<div>\$5,172,600</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>150.00</div>				
Rank <div>8</div>	Auburn, Town of <div> County: <div>Ritchie</div> SRF #C: <div>547201</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0000000</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>XII</div> </div>	<div>\$714,725</div>	<div>\$2,714,725</div>	Problem <div>Raw sewage discharges to roadside ditches and to Bone Creek.</div> Solution <div>Installation of 50 individual Orenco AX20 treatment units and appurtenances to serve the Town of Auburn.</div>
Points <div>145.00</div>				

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 <div>9</div>	Wellsburg, City of <div> County: <div>Brooke</div> SRF #C: <div>544570</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0026832</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>I,VA</div> </div>	<div>\$3,400,000</div>	<div>\$3,400,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>Separation of storm and sanitary sewers, upgrades at WWTP such as the dechlorination unit. This work is in accordance with DEP Order #5860.</div>
Points <div>145.00</div>				
Rank <div>10</div>	Belle, Town of (Phase III) <div> County: <div>Kanawha</div> SRF #C: <div>544177-04</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0021946</div> Binding Date: <div>12/31/2016</div> Needs Category: <div>I</div> </div>	<div>\$4,045,000</div>	<div>\$5,045,000</div>	Problem <div>WWTP has outlived its expected useful life, upgrades are needed to meet NPDES permit limits DEP Order #5753.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>140.00</div>				

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 11	Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo) County: Webster SRF #C: 544334 NPDES #WV: 0497875 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: XII	\$2,353,000	\$1,193,575	Problem 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 Construct a new decentralized wastewater collection system and wastewater treatment plant.
Points 140.00				
Rank 12	Benwood, City of (Phase I) County: Marshall SRF #C: 544531 NPDES #WV: 0020648 Binding Date: 12/31/2016 Needs Category: VA	\$3,775,400	\$3,775,400	Problem 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. Solution Install a new sanitary sewer system with the existing combined sewer system left in place to serve as a storm drainage system.
Points 135.00				

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 13	Welch, City of (North Welch) County: McDowell SRF #C: 544217 NPDES #WV: 0024589 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IVA	\$6,625,502	\$6,875,502	Problem Unserved area, direct discharge sewer in the Trail Fork & Browns Creek, impaired/affected by Fecal Coliform. Failing septic systems. Solution 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.
Points 125.00				
Rank 14	Brooke County PSD (Phase III Eldersville Rd) County: Brooke SRF #C: 544006-03 NPDES #WV: 0084182 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IVA, IVB	\$4,116,000	\$4,116,000	Problem 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. Solution 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.
Points 120.00				

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 <div>15</div>	Greater Harrison Co. PSD (Enterprise) <div> County: Harrison SRF #C: 544296 NPDES #WV: 0105213 Binding Date: 12/31/2016 Needs Category: IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$8,694,000</div>	<div>\$8,694,000</div>	Problem <div>Enterprise is lacking a public sewage collection system. Residences rely 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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>16</div>	Kanawha PSD (Lens Creek) <div> County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544222-03 NPDES #WV: 0021784 Binding Date: 3/31/2017 Needs Category: IVA,VB </div>	<div>\$110,000</div>	<div>\$5,100,000</div>	Problem <div>Outdated and failing septic tank systems which drain into Lens Creek causing high volumes of fecal material being transported into Kanawha River.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				

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

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 19	Logan, City of (Phase III Stollings) County: Logan SRF #C: 544364-03 NPDES #WV: 0033821 Binding Date: 3/31/2017 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$17,803,000	\$18,803,000	Problem Direct discharges of untreated sewage from 400 residences in McConnell and Stollings and partially treated sewage discharges from 200 residences along Dingess Run. Solution Extend gravity sewer system to serve McConnell, Stollings and Dingess Run. Sewage to be treated at Logan County PSD sewage treatment plant.
Points 120.00				
Rank 20	Matewan, Town of (Red Jacket) County: Mingo SRF #C: 544474 NPDES #WV: 0024783 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$2,380,000	\$5,380,000	Problem Failing vacuum collection system and onsite systems. Solution Construction of a new gravity collection system to replace the failing existing vacuum system and failing onsite systems.
Points 120.00				

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 21	McMechen Sewage Disposal System <div> County: Marshall SRF #C: 544553 NPDES #WV: 0020141 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IIIB,VA </div>	\$3,750,000	\$3,750,000	Problem WWTP has reached the end of useful life. Collection System dated & 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. Solution 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.
Points 120.00				
Rank 22	Monongah, Town of <div> County: Marion SRF #C: 544565 NPDES #WV: 0027324 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IIIA,IIIB </div>	\$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. Solution A portion of the gravity sewer system will be rehabilitated or replaced to remove I&I and allow for more efficient operation of the system.
Points 120.00				

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 <div>23</div>	Montgomery, City of Sanitary Board <div> County: <div>Kanawha</div> SRF #C: <div>544297</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0020621</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$664,742</div>	<div>\$768,120</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>Upgrade and relocate the Sixth Avenue Sewage Pumping Station in Montgomery, West Virginia.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>24</div>	North Beckley PSD (Phase IIIB Piney View) <div> County: <div>Raleigh</div> SRF #C: <div>544522</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0027740</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,119,500</div>	<div>\$5,619,500</div>	Problem <div>142 failing septic tanks/soil absorption systems along Piney Creek drainage which is on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform.</div> Solution <div>Providing a new gravity sewer system to replace failing septic tanks.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				

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 <div>25</div>	Norton-Harding-Jimtown PSD <div> County: Randolph SRF #C: 544567 NPDES #WV: 0106054 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$1,272,500</div>	<div>\$1,486,500</div>	Problem <div>Failing existing sewer lines and septic systems. Discharge of raw sewage.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>26</div>	Nutter Fort <div> County: Harrison SRF #C: 544314 NPDES #WV: 0010090 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: VA </div>	<div>\$1,549,800</div>	<div>\$1,549,800</div>	Problem <div>The system currently has significant Inflow and Infiltration into it's system. In addition the system is a combined system and has CSO's. Separation of the sanitary sewage from the storm water needs to be addressed and separated.</div> Solution <div>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</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				

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 <div>27</div>	Oak Hill, City of <div> County: <div>Fayette</div> SRF #C: <div>544535</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0022028</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IIIA, IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$14,000,000</div>	<div>\$23,625,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>28</div>	Oceana, Town of <div> County: <div>McDowell</div> SRF #C: <div>544525</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024431</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>II,IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$6,695,750</div>	<div>\$6,695,750</div>	Problem <div>Pump station equipment is failing & WWTP's is exceeding its rated permitted capacity. This is causing NPDES violations & the DEP has issued Order #8268.</div> Solution <div>Increase the existing 500,000 gpd wastewater treatment plant to 750,000 gpd.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				

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 <div>29</div>	Philippi, City of <div> County: <div>Barbour</div> SRF #C: <div>544355</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0021857</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> </div> <div> Needs Category: <div>VA</div> </div>	<div>\$5,227,900</div>	<div>\$5,227,900</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I in combined sewers.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>30</div>	Rowlesburg, Town of <div> County: <div>Preston</div> SRF #C: <div>544307</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0027481</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> </div> <div> Needs Category: <div>I,IIIA,IIIB,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$7,778,000</div>	<div>\$8,778,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				

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 31	Sophia, Town of <div> County: Raleigh </div> <div> SRF #C: 544085 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0024422 </div> <div> Binding Date: 6/30/2017 </div> <div> Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB </div>	\$2,000,000	\$12,900,000	Problem Unserved area of Raleigh Co. (Coal City). Significant need for sewer service. Solution Extend sewer service to 440 new customers in the Coal City area, plus improvements to the existing WWTP to serve these additional flows.
Points 120.00				
Rank 32	South Charleston Sanitary Board <div> County: Kanawha </div> <div> SRF #C: 544275 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0023116 </div> <div> Binding Date: 6/30/2017 </div> <div> Needs Category: IIIB </div>	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	Problem 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. Solution 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.
Points 120.00				

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 33	Colfax PSD County: Marion SRF #C: 544333 NPDES #WV: 0032131 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IIIA,IIIB,IVB	\$641,500	\$2,141,500	Problem 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. Solution Construct new sanitary sewer system; abandon WWTP and connect the system to Kingmill Valley PSD.
Points 115.00				
Rank 34	Mason, Town of County: Mason SRF #C: 544452-02 NPDES #WV: 0021849 Binding Date: 10/31/2016 Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB	\$2,884,500	\$3,634,500	Problem DEP Consent Order #6891, improve WWTP effluent & efficiency, and decrease I/I. Solution Upgrade WWTP, rehabilitate 2 pump stations and rehab/replace 64 manholes.
Points 110.00				

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

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 <div>37</div>	McDowell County PSD (laeger-Phase I) <div> County: <div>Mingo</div> SRF #C: <div>544513</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0115011</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,000,000</div>	<div>\$6,400,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing onsite septic systems in the laeger area.</div> Solution <div>Construction of a centralized wastewater collection and treatment system.</div>
Points <div>100.00</div>				
Rank <div>38</div>	Morgantown Utility Board (Scotts Run Phase III) <div> County: <div>Monongalia</div> SRF #C: <div>544545</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0023124</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$7,200,000</div>	<div>\$7,800,000</div>	Problem <div>Residents currently rely on private sewage systems of unknown integrity.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>100.00</div>				

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 <div>39</div>	Shady Spring PSD (Pluto Road) <div> County: Raleigh SRF #C: 544410 NPDES #WV: 0080403 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$5,375,171</div>	<div>\$5,375,171</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic systems are creating health issues in the Pluto Road area and also contributing to the pollution of Glade Creek of New River.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>100.00</div>				
Rank <div>40</div>	Union PSD <div> County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544573 NPDES #WV: 0037486 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: I,IIIB,IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$3,510,000</div>	<div>\$7,020,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>100.00</div>				

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

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 <div>43</div>	Greater Paw Paw PSD (Phase II) <div> County: Marion SRF #C: 544509 NPDES #WV: 0084310 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: VA </div>	<div>\$2,915,000</div>	<div>\$2,930,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				
Rank <div>44</div>	Greater Paw Paw PSD (Phase III) <div> County: Marion SRF #C: 544558 NPDES #WV: 0084310 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: VA </div>	<div>\$1,690,000</div>	<div>\$3,380,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				

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 45	Logan, City of County: Logan SRF #C: 544563 NPDES #WV: 0033821 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: VA	\$4,618,000	\$4,618,000	Problem City discharges combined storm and sanitary sewage flows during wet weather. Existing treatment plant is failing mechanically and treated effluent violates WVNPDES permit limits. Solution Connect city's collection system to Logan County PSD for treatment of ADF. Convert existing treatment plant to CSO treatment facility.
Points 95.00				
Rank 46	Parsons, City of County: Tucker SRF #C: 544311 NPDES #WV: 0022063 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: VA	\$500,000	\$500,000	Problem Separation of storm water & sanitary sewer flows. This is to reduce overflows in the system. Solution 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.
Points 95.00				

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 <div>47</div>	White Sulphur Springs <div> County: <div>Greenbrier</div> SRF #C: <div>544035</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0084000</div> Binding Date: <div>10/31/2016</div> Needs Category: <div>II</div> </div>	<div>\$1,730,760</div>	<div>\$2,889,600</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				
Rank <div>48</div>	Winfield, City of <div> County: <div>Putnam</div> SRF #C: <div>544487</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024503</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>I</div> </div>	<div>\$7,480,000</div>	<div>\$7,480,000</div>	Problem <div>Existing lagoon wastewater treatment plant fails to meet NPDES compliance, has numerous NOV's, and is under DEP Order #8125.</div> Solution <div>Install a new WWTP.</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				

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 <div>49</div>	Piedmont, City of <div> County: Mineral </div> <div> SRF #C: 544546 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0105279 </div> <div> Binding Date: 3/31/2017 </div> <div> Points <div>90.00</div> </div> <div> Needs Category: IIIB </div>	<div>\$1,026,000</div>	<div>\$1,266,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Rank <div>50</div>	Greater Harrison PSD (WWTP) <div> County: Harrison </div> <div> SRF #C: 544551 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0084301 </div> <div> Binding Date: 10/31/2016 </div> <div> Points <div>85.00</div> </div> <div> Needs Category: I </div>	<div>\$2,350,000</div>	<div>\$2,835,000</div>	Problem <div>Administrative Order for numerous violations of effluent limitations fecal coliform & ammonia nitrogen.</div> Solution <div>Bio-Shell units will be installed in the polishing cell of Pond #2. Sludge Removal of Pond #2 to make room for the Bio-Shells. Consent Order #8227 and #8413 are both in place, and this project will remedy both issues.</div>

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 51	Boone County PSD (West Madison)	\$4,690,800	\$4,725,000	Problem 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	County: Boone SRF #C: 544494 NPDES #WV: 0035939 Binding Date: 3/31/2017 Needs Category: I,VA			Solution 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 52	Charleston, City of (Woodward Branch)	\$7,020,000	\$7,020,000	Problem 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 75.00	County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544557 NPDES #WV: 0023205 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: VA			Solution 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.

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 53	Hinton, City of County: Summers SRF #C: 544550 NPDES #WV: 0024732 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: VA	\$2,024,000	\$4,024,000	Problem To reduce the frequency and duration of the discharge from permitted discharge CSO 007. Solution 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.
Points 75.00				
Rank 54	Kanawha Falls PSD County: Fayette SRF #C: 544562 NPDES #WV: 0034991 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IIIB	\$1,000,000	\$4,503,000	Problem 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. Solution 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.
Points 75.00				

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 55	Preston County Sewer PSD (Bruceton Mills) County: Preston SRF #C: 544538 NPDES #WV: 0025101 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: I,IIIB	\$4,100,000	\$4,100,000	Problem WWTP operating with out of date equipment & failing 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 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.
Points 75.00				
Rank 56	Boone County PSD (Foster Phase I) County: Boone SRF #C: 544554 NPDES #WV: 0035939 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$3,000,000	\$4,500,000	Problem 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. Solution 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.
Points 70.00				

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 57	Chapmanville, Town of <div> County: Logan </div> <div> SRF #C: 544483-02 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0024678 </div> <div> Binding Date: 12/31/2016 </div> <div> Needs Category: I,IIIB </div>	\$7,877,000	\$7,877,000	Problem <p>Pump station equipment is failing, and bypassing of raw sewage is occurring. Treatment plant equipment is failing, and capacity of plant has been reached.</p> Solution <p>Replace 3 pump stations and upgrade sewage treatment plant to 400,000 gpd SBR treatment plant.</p>
Points 70.00				
Rank 58	Franklin, Town of <div> County: Pendleton </div> <div> SRF #C: 544472 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0024970 </div> <div> Binding Date: 6/30/2017 </div> <div> Needs Category: I,IIIA </div>	\$1,140,900	\$3,040,900	Problem <p>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.</p> Solution <p>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.</p>
Points 70.00				

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 59	Mingo County PSD County: Mingo SRF #C: 544312 NPDES #WV: 0037699 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IIIB,IVA	\$2,513,000	\$2,513,000	Problem 51 residents in the eastern end of Chattaroy, WV are using failing septic systems. Sewage is leaking into the nearby Buffalo Creek. Several sections of sewer pipe within the existing system are in a state of near collapse. Solution Extend sewer service to 51 residents and 3 of the most deteriorated sections of the existing system will be replaced.
Points 70.00				
Rank 60	Cairo, Town of County: Ritchie SRF #C: 547101 NPDES #WV: 0084212 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Needs Category: IIIA,XII	\$1,503,325	\$2,503,325	Problem Existing manholes and sewers are deteriorating and the steel package treatment plant is corroding and the electrical equipment is beginning to fail. Pumping equipment is also failing. Excessive I/I. Solution Replace existing treatment plant and refurbish pump stations, manhole and sewer lines.
Points 65.00				

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 61	Central Boaz PSD	\$2,602,000	\$2,607,000	Problem Unserved area along WV RT 14 and existing WWTP aeration & decanting systems aren't functioning properly & UV disinfection and vacuum pits have reached the end of their useful lives.
Points 60.00	County: Wood SRF #C: 544059 NPDES #WV: 0084221 Binding Date: 3/31/2017 Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			Solution Construct a pressure sewer system to serve the WV RT 14 area, upgrade the existing WWTP and replace vacuum pits.
Rank 62	Frankfort PSD	\$3,700,000	\$3,700,000	Problem Existing lines in poor condition and undersized, installed sewer lines are failing and have I&I problems. Work was originally planned as part of Phase 2 but had to be eliminated due to bid overrun.
Points 60.00	County: Mineral SRF #C: 544411-03 NPDES #WV: 105988 Binding Date: 10/31/2016 Needs Category: IIIA			Solution This project is to replace all the existing sewer lines throughout Sunrise Heights, Sherwood Acres, Nobley Estates, and Moreland Mobile Home Park. These developments were connected to the system during Phase I.

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 63	Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD County: Jefferson SRF #C: 544504 NPDES #WV: 0039136 Binding Date: 12/31/2016 Points 55.00 Needs Category: I	\$2,599,779	\$2,599,779	Problem Replace aging critical assets identified in the Asset Management Plan. The existing WWTP is almost 38 years old and can fail at any time. Solution Upgrade existing system, includes the replacement of blowers, diffusers, air piping, outdated switch gear, controls, power distribution and separates chlorination and dechlorination.
Rank 64	St. Albans Municipal Utility Commission County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544489 NPDES #WV: 0023175 Binding Date: 10/31/2016 Points 55.00 Needs Category: I	\$2,287,150	\$2,287,150	Problem 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. Solution 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.

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 65	Clarksburg Sanitary Board <div> County: Harrison </div> <div> SRF #C: 544549 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0023302 </div> <div> Binding Date: 6/30/2017 </div> <div> Needs Category: VA </div>	\$7,250,000	\$7,250,000	Problem Gravity sewer lines are being overloaded with storm sewer flows during periods of wet weather. Tide-Flex valves are in need of replacement. Solution 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.
Points 50.00				
Rank 66	Farmington, Town of <div> County: Marion </div> <div> SRF #C: 544561 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0024865 </div> <div> Binding Date: 6/30/2017 </div> <div> Needs Category: I,IIIB </div>	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	Problem 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. Solution 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.
Points 50.00				

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 67	Jefferson County PSD (Industrial Park) County: Jefferson SRF #C: 544546 NPDES #WV: 0084361 Binding Date: 10/31/2016 Points 50.00 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$3,575,000	\$7,150,000	Problem 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. Solution 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 68	Oakvale Road PSD (Phase II) County: Mercer SRF #C: 544524 NPDES #WV: 0080489 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Points 50.00 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$5,256,000	\$5,256,000	Problem 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. Solution 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.

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 69	Salem, Town of <div> County: Harrison </div> <div> SRF #C: 544541 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0020257 </div> <div> Binding Date: 6/30/2017 </div> <div> Points 50.00 </div> <div> Needs Category: IIIB </div>	\$971,000	\$1,971,000	Problem Excessive inflow which is inundating the system causing permit exceedances. Solution 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 70	Beverly, Town of <div> County: Randolph </div> <div> SRF #C: 544336-02 </div> <div> NPDES #WV: 0084000 </div> <div> Binding Date: 6/30/2017 </div> <div> Points 45.00 </div> <div> Needs Category: I,IIIA </div>	\$5,300,000	\$6,905,390	Problem 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 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.

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 <div>71</div>	Canaan Valley PSD <div> County: <div>Davis</div> SRF #C: <div>544560</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0606011</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,350,000</div>	<div>\$2,350,000</div>	Problem <div>Areas of Deerfield, Windwood, Canaan Village, own and operate private sewer systems. These 3 systems suffer from deteriorating wastewater collection & treatment systems.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>45.00</div>				
Rank <div>72</div>	Elizabeth, Town of <div> County: <div>Wirt</div> SRF #C: <div>544552</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0041505</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IIIA,IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,271,000</div>	<div>\$2,271,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>45.00</div>				

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 73	Vienna County: Wood SRF #C: 544233 NPDES #WV: 0023221 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Points 45.00 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$2,676,000	\$2,676,000	Problem Existing lift stations and package plant have maintenance issues. Solution 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.
Rank 74	West Dunbar County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544168 NPDES #WV: 0089591 Binding Date: 3/31/2017 Points 45.00 Needs Category: IIIA,IIIB	\$6,000,000	\$7,500,000	Problem 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.

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 <div>75</div>	Williamson, City of <div> County: <div>Mingo</div> SRF #C: <div>544544</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0026271</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$3,000,000</div>	<div>\$4,024,000</div>	Problem <div>Outdated & failing wastewater pumping stations, correction of structural issues at the existing wastewater treatment facility & extend service to (3) unserved customers.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>45.00</div>				
Rank <div>76</div>	Page Kincaid PSD <div> County: <div>Fayette</div> SRF #C: <div>544508</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0084425</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>XII</div> </div>	<div>\$904,211</div>	<div>\$3,204,211</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>40.00</div>				

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 <div>77</div>	Hancock County PSD <div> County: <div>Hancock</div> SRF #C: <div>544431</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0045136</div> Binding Date: <div>12/31/2016</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$5,500,000</div>	<div>\$6,300,000</div>	Problem <div>Discharge of semi treated or not treated wastewater into the local waterways.</div> Solution <div>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.</div>
Points <div>35.00</div>				
Rank <div>78</div>	Center PSD <div> County: <div>Wyoming</div> SRF #C: <div>544268-01</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0027138</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2017</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IIIA,IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,165,900</div>	<div>\$4,063,000</div>	Problem <div>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.</div> Solution <div>Phase I - 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).</div>
Points <div>25.00</div>				

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 79	Enlarged Hepzibah PSD County: Harrison SRF #C: 544559 NPDES #WV: 0021001 Binding Date: 6/30/2017 Points 25.00 Needs Category: IIIB,IVA	\$2,720,000	\$2,720,000	Problem 2 pump stations need to be replaced. Residences and businesses along Route 24 currently use septic tanks or HAU's to treat sanitary sewer. Solution 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 80	Northern Wayne County PSD County: Wayne SRF #C: 544402 NPDES #WV: 0089621 Binding Date: 12/31/2016 Points 25.00 Needs Category: IVA	\$2,771,311	\$3,771,311	Problem 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 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.

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 81	Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Marsh Fork) County: Raleigh SRF #C: 544484 NPDES #WV: 0082309 Binding Date: 3/31/2017 Points 20.00 Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB	\$15,500,000	\$15,500,000	Problem 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. Solution Extend gravity sewer system from Holly Hills WWTP to Glen Daniel, and replace existing WWTP with 175,000 gpd SBR treatment plant.
Rank 82	Lubeck PSD County: Wood SRF #C: 544072 NPDES #WV: 0032590 Binding Date: 12/31/2016 Points 20.00 Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$312,000	\$2,312,000	Problem 2 unserved commercial customers in the Washington Bottom area. Solution Extend service to the 2 potential customers by connection to the 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.

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 <input type="text" value="83"/>	Buffalo Creek PSD <div> County: <input type="text" value="Logan"/> </div> <div> SRF #C: <input type="text" value="544555"/> </div> <div> NPDES #WV: <input type="text" value="003851"/> </div> <div> Binding Date: <input type="text" value="6/30/2017"/> </div> <div> Needs Category: <input type="text" value="I,IVA,IVB"/> </div>	<input type="text" value="\$13,839,000"/>	<input type="text" value="\$14,839,000"/>	Problem <div> <p>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.</p> </div> Solution <div> <p>Construction a new WWTP and extension of a centralized wastewater collection system in the areas of Taplin and RITA.</p> </div>
Points <input type="text" value="00.00"/>				

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS
BY QUARTER

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

Name	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544____	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2017 (\$1,000)			
				1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr 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.

APPENDIX C

PROJECTS BUDGETED
FOR IUP AVAILABLE FUNDS

Appendix C - Projects Budgeted for the Intended Use Plan

Name	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2017 (\$1,000)			
				1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Benwood	CSO	531	D2			2,000	
Franklin	WWTP/CS Upgrades	a	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	D2				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	D2				5,370
Pennsboro	WWTP Upgrade	409-03	D3		2,672		
Weston (Turnertown)	CSO/Sewer Ext.	471	P				6,800
White Sulphur Springs	Greenbrier R. WWTP	542	D3	2,037			
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
NPS - Agriculture	various	N/A	N/A	25	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

Clean Water State Revolving Fund
FY 2017 Intended Use Plan
Public Hearing
June 2, 2016

Kathy Emery

Good morning. It is 10:10, June 2, 2016 and we can started on the public hearing for the FY2017 Intended Use Plan (IUP). We have just a couple of members from the public here so if you have any questions as we proceed, feel free to stop me and we can discuss it at that point. I am just going to go thru the IUP and hit the highlights of major programmatic issues and/or changes and we can discuss it as we go.

On page 4 is the FY2017 Sources and Uses of Funds Chart. This information is as of December 31, 2015. Cash balance in the CWSRF account, the Federal Fiscal year grant that we have applied for is \$20,829,000, state match we have received from the WV Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council is \$4,165,800, then you see the estimated principal, interest, and investment earnings for the fund. It shows the existing loan payables as of December 31, 2015, as well as the binding commitments at that time. The reserve funds we have held out for our AgWQLP as well as our OSLP and you will also see we are still not taking any money from our fund for the Administration of the program. At that point in time, our estimated net available funds were \$20,674,245.

Then we go into the Long Term and the Short Term Goals for the program. Long Term Goals we have not really made any changes since last year's IUP. The Short Term Goals on page 6, a couple of the primary targets are to continue to get the Chesapeake Bay and Greenbrier River TMDL projects under construction and also be able to adjust the CWSRF program quickly to respond to the potential project shifts because of the current economic crisis and population losses in some of our communities.

As for the Project Priority List we did add one project during the comment period. Frankfort PSD's funding changed. It switched to an SRF project at the WVIJDC meeting, so they immediately put in their project priority list application, so it has been added to our Project Priority List, and we are also continuing to commit funds in the 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 and then we will give consideration to the status of rights-of-way, easements, and other pre-bid checklist items in determining whether or not 6 months is a possibility for closing on a project.

We are going to be making some adjustments to the terms of our loans over the next couple of years. The only thing we have done in the current year, so that it does not impact any of our communities is reduce the administrative fee on each of the loans slightly, and move that over to an interest rate on each of the loans. The net impact should be negligible on any of the current projects on our priority list. If you note one page 7, 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) we use the criteria laid out above that for their terms. If you do not have that by June 30, 2017 then beginning July 1, 2017, next year's IUP, there are going to be rate changes on our loans that these communities will have to pay attention to. We are moving from 4,000 to 3,400 gallons, consistent with the other funding agencies. And for the loans where the MHI is less than 1.5 % the terms are 2.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 20 years, MHI

1.5% to 1.74%, 1.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21-30 year term, MHI 1.75% to 2.00%, .5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21-30 term, Greater than 2% MHI; 0% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 31-40 year term.

The MHI we are currently using is the 2010 census data. We will be moving from that when the IJDC moves to the next census data from the American Fact Finder website, which should be in another year or two, so we will stay consistent with the Council on the census data that we use for our program.

Additional subsidization, or as we refer to it as principal forgiveness, is still part of the program as well as requirements that we fund green infrastructure projects to the extent that these projects are available. At the time this was drafted, EPA felt that our requirement was going to be 20% of our grant for green projects however only 10% was required, so the required amount of green projects we need to make every effort to fund is equal to \$2,082,900 out of the federal fiscal year 16 grant. This was changed during the comment period. It still requires us to give additional subsidization in the form of principal forgiveness. We will be setting aside 20% in the amount of \$4,165,800 to be used as principal forgiveness out of this grant. As always, the principal forgiveness is generally used as a last resort and will only be used when other funding options are not practical.

Below this is the requirements to become eligible for principal forgiveness as required by the WRRDA, passed by Congress in 2014. It's based upon a point system on currently 4,000 gallons. This changes to 3,400 gallons on next year's IUP. This year based upon 4,000, if the MHI is 1.75% -1.99% - 50 points, MHI 2.0% or greater 75 points.

The unemployment data, we have a chart, Appendix H, of this IUP. This lays out the point values based upon the local community's unemployment rate according to that chart. If the unemployment rate is less than WV which at that time is less than 6.5%, the community is not eligible for any additional points. If the unemployment rate is above 0% to 2% they are eligible for 5. If the unemployment rate is above 2% they are eligible for 10 additional points.

We are also required to give consideration based upon population and there is a chart Appendix I. It shows that if the population change is greater than 2% the community is not eligible for any additional points, 0 to 2% increase then additional 5 points, less than 0% increase - 10 points.

For applicants that receive at least 60 points, the project is eligible for the lesser of 50% of the total eligible CWSRF 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 cost or \$1,500,000 in principal forgiveness.

And the same requirements as mentioned previously, to receive a binding commitment, based upon this current criteria is still in effect until June 30, 2017, the same grandfather provisions. And as mentioned a minute ago beginning July 1, 2017 the same criteria is going to be in place but the MHI is going to be based on 3,400 gallons.

Michael Griffith

Kathy I have a question on the population trends, what about 2013 until now. There is going to be some big changes in the last year or two are you going to take those into effect?

Kathy Emery

Next year's IUP will have that in there. We will probably will not go any more than 2 years with the same data running concurrently. We figure will see a big change in what American Fact Finder has laid out by next year's IUP. We will update the charts then.

Michael Griffith

Because we got a few that is losing 13 customers a month. One in Raleigh County that you are familiar with.

Kathy Emery

Oh I believe it.

Michael Griffith

13 homes in a month.

Kathy Emery

And that is why we are waiting, we are giving everyone time before we adjust this to 3,400, we will adjust the chart so you will see some household changes in next year IUP.

The green project reserve, we are only required to try to find eligible green projects not less than 10% of the current capitalization grant.

A couple of changes that we did make this year in the IUP to further encourage green projects is we raised the amount of principle forgiveness available for the energy efficiency, water efficiency, and storm water green infrastructure projects. We increased the principal forgiveness to the lesser of 50% of the eligible green costs or \$500,000. Hopefully we can encourage a few more green projects to come to us for funding.

And as always under the environmentally innovative category we are still trying to fund up to 100% of the eligible green cost for decentralized wastewater treatment systems. We are also still offering the pre-bid costs for categorically green decentralized sewer system projects only and going ahead and funding upfront costs if the community needs those funded. And then we have below that the criteria to be eligible for that. We have to be assured that the project will be advertising for bids between 12-18 months of receiving the funds. And they will have to meet the documentation showing that they have a recommendation to pursue SRF funds from the IJDC. We will need to approve any engineering agreement, the facilities plan, have a predesign meeting with the representatives of the community. We need a project timeline with an approvable budget. We need documentation from the project sponsor that the customer base is will to pay the proposed rates. And PSC approval if required by law.

Then we do have a list of projects in Appendix G of this IUP that have given us some indication that they are interested in pursuing these funds.

We are still continuing the annual administrative fees on our loans. One thing, that we have changed with this is that in addition to funding the DEP's Project Wet position, we are working on and have received approval from the EPA to fund a position with the WV Rural Water Association that will be able to provide technical and project support to local communities. This position will work on Asset Management Support, training on energy and water efficiency technologies and we will be working closely with EPA on that. That money will come out of the Administrative account not the project account.

We still have not set a limit on the amount of funds available to any single project and, as always, BAN leveraging is an option for our communities.

30 & 40 year bonds are still available to our communities like always. Nothing changed with that.

I mentioned previously, that in order to get an actual binding commitment letter, this is based upon order of position on the priority list on a first-come first-serve basis, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met.

We are still funding nonpoint source projects with the CWSRF fund. The two programs are the Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program and the Onsite Systems Loan Program. We have set aside a reserve of \$150,000 to provide the necessary match for any agriculture grants or applicants that are interested.

The Onsite System Loan Program is doing very well. We are still partners with SHED and the WVHDF and have set aside \$300,000 for that program in the upcoming fiscal year.

Underneath the Federal Requirements – these are our equivalency projects. This means they are required to meet but not limited to the Single Audit Act, FFATA, etc.

Greater Harrison Co. PSD (2) Projects

Morgantown

Pennsboro

Due to changes that EPA has made on the proportionally of how we draw down our federal funds, we are choosing to expend the state match funds prior to the capitalization grant funds in order to meet EPA's requirements for disbursement.

That pretty much covers the IUP and any changes that have been made for this current fiscal year and anticipated changes for the next fiscal year.

Are there any questions?

Michael Griffith

Have you thought about the impact on the SRF when you go to the 3,400?

Kathy Emery

We have considered that and the problem and in order to be sustainable we do have to make some changes to incur some interest on some of the loans that we are funding. Which is why we did not eliminate the possibility of 0% interest loans, we are moving the criteria to the most distressed areas.

Any other questions?

Samme Gee

If you have communities who are losing large population numbers, will there be the ability to go forward and restructure their loans?

Kathy Emery

I will say at this point I can't imagine that would be possible, but I will not completely eliminate that possibility. I think that will be something that we will have to address when it hits.

Samme Gee

That because of the population loss between the time of the 2016 numbers and the 2014 numbers that were put together by the workforce, and projects that might be coming in now. If you know going into the project that the customer numbers are not the same, then I think that everyone is going to have to be very careful about trying to close an issue where you know you are going to have a default from the very start. So you will need to look closer at customer numbers

Kathy Emery

That is one of the reasons we did not choose to go to 3,400 until we updated our charts with the updated population and unemployment impacts. That will go hand in hand next year so that we will have access to the latest unemployment data, latest population date, when we go to 3,400. We should be able to see where the community really is in terms with those numbers. We wanted to give everyone at least a year to know these changes were coming so that they can make whatever adjustments they need.

If there are no further questions I consider the FY2017 IUP public hearing adjourned.

From: [Owen, Jonathan](#)
To: [Emery, Kathryn D](#)
Cc: [Adkins, Suzanna S](#); [Davis, Michael](#); [Sheena Hunt \(sheenahunt@regionvi.com\)](#); [Joe Cross \(westunioncityhall@zoominternet.net\)](#)
Subject: 2017 Draft Intended Use Plan - West Union Project
Date: Monday, April 18, 2016 4:38:55 PM
Attachments: [West Union FY2017 Clean Water SRF Priority List Application.pdf](#)
[RE West Union Priority List Application.msg](#)

Ms. Emery,

Upon reviewing the Draft 2017 Intended Use Plan for the CWSRF, I found that the Town of West Union's Wabash Sewer Separation project is not listed on the priority list.

Attached is the Priority List Application as submitted along with an e-mail confirming receipt of the application. If necessary, could you please call to discuss?

Thanks,

JONATHAN R. OWEN, PE

Burgess & Niple, Inc. | Parkersburg Office

4424 Emerson Avenue | Parkersburg, WV 26104

304-485-8541, Ext. 5115

740-444-2211 (mobile)

Email: jonathan.owen@burgessniple.com

www.burgessniple.com | *When the results matter now...and years from now.*

BURGESS & NIPLE
Engineers ■ Architects ■ Planners

From: [Emery, Kathryn D](#)
To: [Owen, Jonathan](#)
Cc: [Adkins, Suzanna S](#); [Davis, Michael](#); [Sheena Hunt \(sheenahunt@regionvi.com\)](#); [Joe Cross \(westunioncityhall@zoominternet.net\)](#)
Subject: RE: 2017 Draft Intended Use Plan - West Union Project
Date: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 9:37:50 AM

Mr. Owen,

I appreciate the fact that you have taken the time to read our draft 2017 Intended Use Plan. Concerning the West Union project, the funding recommendation from the IJDC is only for an IJDC loan and a SCBG. In addition to this, your application indicates that the Town will not be seriously pursuing this project until after receipt of the requested SCBG. Since the Town did not receive a grant this year, your application indicates that they would wait another year to begin this project in hopes of receiving a SCBG. If the Town wants to seriously pursue CWSRF funding, you would need to reapply to the IJDC to get a CWSRF funding recommendation and then proceed through our process.

All of this being said, the application gave no indication that the Town was seriously interested in pursuing CWSRF funds and if this were to change at some time in the future, we (most likely) wouldn't be closing on the financing until after July 1, 2017 at which time the 2018 IUP would be in effect and we could place the project on the priority list at that time. If we have misunderstood anything, please feel free to contact me.

Kathy

Katheryn Emery, P. E.
Assistant Director, DWWM
Clean Water State Revolving Fund
WV DEP
601 57th Street, SE
Charleston, WV 25304
Telephone: (304) 926-0499 ext 1596
Fax: (304) 926-0496
Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov

From: Owen, Jonathan [mailto:jonathan.owen@burgessniple.com]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2016 4:39 PM
To: Emery, Kathryn D <Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov>
Cc: Adkins, Suzanna S <Suzanna.S.Adkins@wv.gov>; Davis, Michael <michael.davis@burgessniple.com>; Sheena Hunt (sheenahunt@regionvi.com) <sheenahunt@regionvi.com>; Joe Cross (westunioncityhall@zoominternet.net) <westunioncityhall@zoominternet.net>
Subject: 2017 Draft Intended Use Plan - West Union Project

Ms. Emery,

Upon reviewing the Draft 2017 Intended Use Plan for the CWSRF, I found that the Town of West Union's Wabash Sewer Separation project is not listed on the priority list.

Attached is the Priority List Application as submitted along with an e-mail confirming receipt of the application. If necessary, could you please call to discuss?

Thanks,

JONATHAN R. OWEN, PE

Burgess & Niple, Inc. | Parkersburg Office

4424 Emerson Avenue | Parkersburg, WV 26104

304-485-8541, Ext. 5115

740-444-2211 (mobile)

Email: jonathan.owen@burgessniple.com

www.burgessniple.com | *When the results matter now...and years from now.*

BURGESS & NIPLE
Engineers ■ Architects ■ Planners

From: [Emery, Kathryn D](#)
To: [Adkins, Suzanna S](#)
Subject: FW: Comments - CWSRF FY2017 IUP
Date: Friday, June 03, 2016 8:47:25 AM

From: Tim Ball [mailto:tball@mub.org]
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2016 3:40 PM
To: Emery, Kathryn D <Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov>
Subject: Comments - CWSRF FY2017 IUP

Ms Emery:

I am pleased to offer these comments regarding the draft FY 2017 IUP for the CWSRF:

Morgantown Utility Board supports the draft IUP proposed by WV DEP for its CWSRF FY 2017.

The subject IUP demonstrates the continued excellence of WVDEP's management of its SRF program, and maximizes the benefits of the program to the citizens of our State.

MUB applauds WV DEP's ability to continue its tradition of excellence despite the challenges of recent budget constraints which have significantly reduced the total funds available to the program.

Timothy L. Ball P.E.
General Manager
Morgantown Utility Board
Phone: 304-292-8443 Ext. 121
www.mub.org

Follow us on Facebook and on Twitter: @MUBWater

MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET

Subject:	FY2017 CWSRF IUP Public Hearing	Meeting Date:	June 2, 2016
-----------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	--------------

Meeting Date: June 2, 2016

Facilitator: Kathy Emery	Place/Room: WVDEP/Room 2129
---------------------------------	------------------------------------

Place/Room: WVDEP/Room 2129

[illegible]

“NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING”

The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection has scheduled a public hearing on June 2, 2016, at 10:00 am to discuss the **Draft Fiscal Year 2017 Intended Use Plan** for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF). A part of the Intended Use Plan is the Fiscal Year 2017 Priority List. The hearing will take place at the DEP headquarters in Charleston in the New River Conference Room (Room #2129). A copy of the draft Fiscal Year 2017 Intended Use Plan is available, and may be requested by calling, writing or sending an email request to the address below. The plan can also be viewed on DEP's web site.

Contact

Katheryn Emery
WV Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Water & Waste Management
Clean Water State Revolving Fund
601 57th Street, SE
Charleston, WV 25304
(304) 926-0499 Ext. 1596
Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov

APPENDIX E

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY
COUNTY AND MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS

County/Magisterial District	Median HH 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	38,300	47.88	55.85	63.83
Grant district	32,378	40.47	47.22	53.96
Hardy	31,347	39.18	45.71	52.25
Capon district	33,207	41.51	48.43	55.35
Lost River district	26,889	33.61	39.21	44.82
Moorefield district	25,131	31.41	36.65	41.89
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

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	32,619	40.77	47.57	54.37
Clay district	34,702	43.38	50.61	57.84
Grant district	34,948	43.69	50.97	58.25
Murphy district	25,602	32.00	37.34	42.67
Union district	30,972	38.72	45.17	51.62
Roane	27,428	34.29	40.00	45.71

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

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

APPENDIX E1

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY
MUNICIPALITY

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
A				
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
B				
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
C				
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

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		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

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		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
H				
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
I				
laeger, town	21,500	26.88	31.35	35.83
J				
Jane Lew, town	29,130	36.41	42.48	48.55
Junior, town	16,667	20.83	24.31	27.78
K				
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	44.27
Kimball, town	34,688	43.36	50.59	57.81
Kingwood, city	33,914	42.39	49.46	56.52
L				
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				
Mabscott, town	46,813	58.52	68.27	78.02

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		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
O				
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
P				
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

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Pennsboro, city	26,848	33.56	39.15	44.75
Petersburg, city	32,383	40.48	47.23	53.97
Peterstown, town	31,563	39.45	46.03	52.61
Philippi, city	31,974	39.97	46.63	53.29
Piedmont, town	23,125	28.91	33.72	38.54
Pine Grove, town	30,625	38.28	44.66	51.04
Pineville, town	43,150	53.94	62.93	71.92
Pleasant Valley, city	37,931	47.41	55.32	63.22
Poca, town	54,934	68.67	80.11	91.56
Point Pleasant, city	41,915	52.39	61.13	69.86
Pratt, town	51,111	63.89	74.54	85.19
Princeton, city	26,705	33.38	38.94	44.51
Pullman, town	47,813	59.77	69.73	79.69
Q				
Quinwood, town	27,794	34.74	40.53	46.32
R				
Rainelle, town	28,017	35.02	40.86	46.70
Ranson Town, corporation of	39,596	49.50	57.74	65.99
Ravenswood, city	32,242	40.30	47.02	53.74
Reedsville, town	55,313	69.14	80.66	92.19
Reedy, town	24,844	31.06	36.23	41.41
Rhodell, town	28,125	35.16	41.02	46.88
Richwood, city	24,149	30.19	35.22	40.25
Ridgeley, town	33,618	42.02	49.03	56.03
Ripley, city	34,625	43.28	50.49	57.71
Rivesville, town	38,317	47.90	55.88	63.86
Romney, city	24,875	31.09	36.28	41.46
Ronceverte, city	35,931	44.91	52.40	59.89
Rowlesburg, town	44,750	55.94	65.26	74.58
Rupert, town	25,549	31.94	37.26	42.58
S				
St. Albans, city	41,956	52.45	61.19	69.93
St. Marys, city	41,063	51.33	59.88	68.44
Salem, city	25,481	31.85	37.16	42.47
Sand Fork, town	24,250	30.31	35.36	40.42
Shepherdstown, town	62,917	78.65	91.75	104.86
Shinnston, city	33,468	41.84	48.81	55.78
Sistersville, city	31,786	39.73	46.35	52.98
Smithers, city	21,019	26.27	30.65	35.03
Smithfield, town	8,375	10.47	12.21	13.96
Sophia, town	32,083	40.10	46.79	53.47
South Charleston, city	42,034	52.54	61.30	70.06
Spencer, city	19,206	24.01	28.01	32.01

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		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
T				
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 Hamlin, 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	\$	<u>27,660,786</u>	
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%)	\$	<u>14,143,540</u>	
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	\$	<u>35,649,933</u>	
Sources of Funds (c)			\$ 57,410,108

Less

Appendix C Projects	\$	59,929,000	
AgWQLP Reserves	\$	150,000	
OSLP Reserve	\$	<u>300,000</u>	
Total			\$ <u>60,379,000</u>

APPENDIX G

POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

"Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2017 IUP

Project	Category	Description	Cost Estimate
Auburn, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized individual treatment units	\$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 - Rhodell	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	\$4,510,200
Greater Harrison PSD	energy efficiency	Biodome Installation 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

APPENDIX H

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	9.1
Ohio	6.0
Pendleton	5.1
Pleasants	7.1
Pocahontas	8.7
Preston	5.7
Putnam	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	6.5

Source: from www.workforcewv.org

APPENDIX I

POPULATION DATA

Population Data

County	2010 Census	2013 Estimate	% Change *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	21,720	21,559	0.74
Logan	36,743	35,987	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

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