

**West Virginia  
Clean Water State Revolving Fund**



---

# **FY2016 Intended Use Plan**

Submitted to the  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region III  
June 25, 2015



**west virginia department of environmental protection**



---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Glossary.....	1
Preface.....	2
<b>SECTION I</b>	
Introduction.....	3
<b>SECTION II</b>	
Funds Identification .....	3
<b>SECTION III</b>	
Goals.....	5
<b>SECTION IV</b>	
Project Priority List.....	6
<b>SECTION V</b>	
Fund Activities.....	7
<b>SECTION VI</b>	
Assurances .....	16
<b>SECTION VII</b>	
Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds .....	17
<b>SECTION VIII</b>	
Public Participation.....	17
<b>SECTION IX</b>	
Agreement.....	18

## Appendices

- A - FY 2016 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

USDA– United States Department of Agriculture

SCD – Soil Conservation District

WDA – West Virginia Water Development Authority

# 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 2016 (July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016). 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, 2015, there have been 26 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 their purpose only. This chart summarizes the federal capitalization grants, state matches, repayments, earnings, etc. since the program began. It also estimates the FY2016 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 FY2016 (July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2016)

#### **Available funds as of March 31, 2015**

Cash balance in CWSRF account =	\$ 91,814,661
Federal funds accounts payable (Base grants) =	\$ <u>0</u>
	<u>\$ 91,814,661</u>

#### **New funds available during state FY2016:**

Next Federal EPA Grant =	\$ 21,888,000
Next State Match =	\$ 4,377,600
Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/16) =	\$ 32,417,562
Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/16) =	\$ 2,996,936
Investment earnings (to 6/30/16) =	\$ <u>376,320</u>
	<u>\$ 62,056,418</u>

#### **Less:**

Existing project loans payables (3/31/15) =	\$ 97,763,785
Existing binding commitments (3/31/15) =	\$ 30,579,168*
AgWQLP reserve =	\$ 150,000
OSLP reserve =	\$ 300,000
DEP Administration =	\$ <u>0</u>
	<u>\$ 128,792,953</u>

**Net available funds during FY2016 = \$ 25,078,126**

#### Notes:

1. There is \$6,536,218 that should be allocated to green projects.

\* The CWSRF is operating on a cash flow basis. While the program has committed this to upcoming projects, it is understood that not all of these funds will be drawn down in the next fiscal year. Therefore FY2017 funds will also pay for some of these costs.

\* State Match is provided by the IJDC and was received in April 2015.

## 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 aggressive 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 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 sewer projects and coordinating and recommending the most feasible funding sources.
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 in groups to develop wastewater management ideas and programs.



## **B. Short term goals**

1. Continue outreach efforts on potential new loan recipients.
2. Achieve a targeted fund utilization rate “pace” goal of 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 systems in the State’s Watershed Improvement Plan for the Chesapeake Bay and the Greenbrier River TMDL.
5. Work with EPA to implement all necessary requirements of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA).

## **SECTION IV**

# **Project Priority List**

---

The FY2016 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 the 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 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.

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

The eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration is still based upon 4,000 gallons of 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 ½% interest rate on its loan.

The DEP will be using this criterion to determine its 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% interest rate, 1% annual admin fee, 20 year term*

*1.5% to 1.74% MHI: ½ % interest rate, ½ % annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year term*

*1.75% MHI and higher: 0% interest rate, ½% 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% 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 or magisterial district that is most appropriate for the project area. Magisterial district information can be found in Appendix E. Municipalities and County specific 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 \$21,888,000. 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 does not require a minimum amount be set aside for providing additional loan subsidization in the form of grants or principal forgiveness. The Act allows for a maximum amount to be set aside, which is equal to \$6,566,400. In accordance with the CWSRF state statute, which says in part, "...moneys in the fund shall be used to make grants for projects to the extent allowed or authorized by federal law", the DEP will be setting aside the maximum amount which will be used for providing additional loan subsidies for disadvantaged communities.

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) requires States to develop affordability criteria that will assist in identifying applicants that will 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.

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.

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, it 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.

### **FY 2016 Planning and Design Pilot Program**

Proposed disadvantaged projects in this category may be eligible to receive loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, of 50% of the total CWSRF eligible planning and design engineering costs. During FY 2016, the CWSRF program will be offering a pilot program to partially cover the planning/design costs for disadvantaged sewer system projects only. This is based upon availability of funds. In order to qualify for these funds, the project sponsor must assure the CWSRF program that the project will receive authorization to advertise 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 SRF funds from the WV Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council;
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 showing advertisement for construction bids within 18 months;
6. An approvable project budget;
7. Documentation from the project sponsor that the customer base is willing to pay the proposed sewer rate;
8. PSC approval, if required by law.
9. Deferral of costs to the construction phase for costs not covered by this program.

Disadvantaged Community Qualifications: Rate for 4,000 gallons of water must be 2% of the MHI or higher and the project must meet the definition of decentralized.

Funds Available: \$1,000,000. These funds will be available on a first come, first served basis and once they are committed, no other funds will be available.

### **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. This amount will equal \$2,188,800.

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 20% 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 water reuse type 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 20% 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 20% 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 2016, 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 SRF funds from the WV Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council;
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;
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 January and February 2015 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 calculated annually 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 for state FY2016 is \$2,221,559. This includes funding the DEP's Project WET position. The amount of the funds available as of March 31, 2015 was \$7,622,084. These funds can also be used to fund the onsite systems program and the

pilot planning/design program as discussed in this document. The fund is also considering funding a position that would provide technical and project support to local communities. This position would also 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 FY2016, 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 interim financing. This proposed closing date will also be reflected in the BAN documents. Repayment of the CWSRF loan will begin immediately using the first full Municipal Bond Commission 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 sewer 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 Public Service Commission certificate case. A copy of the Rule 42 exhibit shall be submitted to the DEP for compliance review 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 reviewed 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 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 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, 2014, more than \$13 million has 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 FY2016 will not have to meet many federal requirements. As a recipient of federal CWSRF funds, the DEP has to only 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.

The following projects have been selected to comply with federal requirements including, but not limited to, the Single Audit Act, FFATA, etc...

<b>Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>CWSRF amount</b>
Greater St. Albans PSD	Collection System Extension	\$18,000,000
Ronceverte	WWTP Upgrade	\$18,760,000

These projects total more than the FFY 2015 capitalization grant which is \$21,888,000.

## **SECTION VI**

# **Assurances**

---

DEP has provided the necessary assurances and certifications as part of the operating agreement with EPA. The Operating Agreement defines the mutual obligations between EPA and DEP. The purpose of the OA is to provide a framework of procedures to be followed in the management and administration of the CWSRF. The OA includes the requirements of the following sections of the federal Clean Water Act:

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

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

## SECTION VII

# Criteria and method for distribution of funds

---

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

1. Analysis of community and financial assistance needed;
2. Review of project schedule to determine when the project would be in a state of readiness to proceed to construction;
3. Individual contact with potential loan recipient or its representative;
4. Allocation of funds among projects;
5. Development of an EPA payment schedule which will provide for making timely binding commitments to projects selected for CWSRF financial assistance;
6. Development of individual disbursement schedules to 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 18, 2015 a public hearing was held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2016. 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 potential 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 2016  
PRIORITY LIST

---

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2016 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>1</div>	<b>Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IIIC Tackett's Creek)</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Kanawha</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544406-03</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0035068</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIA,IIIB,IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$17,970,000</div>	<div>\$17,970,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing septic systems and excessive I/I.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Extend sewer service to 683 customers and replace/rehabilitate existing sewers.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>220.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>2</div>	<b>Logan, City of (Phase III Stollings)</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Logan</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544364-03</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0033821</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$11,194,460</div>	<div>\$12,006,960</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Extend sewer service to 500 customers and eliminate direct discharges in McConnell, Stollings, and Dingess Run.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>190.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>3</div>	<b>Morgantown, City of (Star City TP/Poponoe Run Upgrades)</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Monongalia</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544520</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0023124</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I.IVB.VA</div>	<div>\$40,000,000</div>	<div>\$75,000,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive I/I and antiquated equipment, insufficient digester capacity in Poponoe Run.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Replace RBC's with activated sludge and clarifiers, upgrade and expand digesters, upgrade Poponoe Run interceptor and provide storage for CSO discharges.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>175.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>4</div>	<b>Point Pleasant, City of (Phase II)</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Mason</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544082-02</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0022039</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>VA</div>	<div>\$1,662,000</div>	<div>\$1,662,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive I/I.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Separation of the City's combined sewer system.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>170.00</div>				



Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>5</div>	<b>Ronceverte, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Greenbrier</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544267</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0023246</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,II</div> </div>	<div>\$18,418,576</div>	<div>\$27,660,468</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Need to comply with Greenbrier River phosphorus limits.</div> <b>Solution</b> <div>Upgrade WWTP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>165.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>6</div>	<b>Auburn, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Ritchie</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>547201</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0000000</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>XII</div> </div>	<div>\$2,714,725</div>	<div>\$2,714,725</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Entire community without a collection and treatment system. Direct discharges causing documented water quality violations.</div> <b>Solution</b> <div>New decentralized sewer system.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>160.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>7</div>	<b>Benwood, City of (Phase I)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Marshall</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544531</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0020648</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>VA</div> </div>	<div>\$1,665,000</div>	<div>\$3,665,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Large amounts of I/I is causing CSO discharges.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Separation of storm and sanitary sewers.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>160.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>8</div>	<b>New Haven PSD (Winona)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Fayette</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>547850</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0000000</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>12/31/2015</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>XII</div> </div>	<div>\$487,544</div>	<div>\$3,248,480</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>No existing wastewater collection/treatment system in the Winona area. The situation is causing high fecal coliform counts in Keeney Creek.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct a decentralized wastewater collection and treatment system for 76 customers and new septic tanks will be installed.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>155.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>9</div>	<b>Weston, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Lewis</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544471</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0028068</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$7,094,000</div>	<div>\$7,494,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Unserved areas &amp; package plant that is unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements. (Turnertown area).</div> <b>Solution</b> <div>New collection system to unserved areas &amp; eliminate the package plant and send all flow to the Weston WWTP. Will provide adequate service to 267 new customers.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>155.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>10</div>	<b>Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Marsh Fork)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Raleigh</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544484</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0082309</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>3/31/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$15,500,000</div>	<div>\$15,500,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>The current service area utilizes straight pipes and insufficient septic tanks.</div> <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct WWTP and collection system to remove these insufficiencies.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>150.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>11</div>	<b>Wellsburg, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Brooke</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544362-02</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0026832</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>VA</div> </div>	<div>\$4,000,000</div>	<div>\$4,000,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive I/I - CSO.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Separation of storm and sanitary sewers.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>150.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>12</div>	<b>Philippi, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Barbour</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544355</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0021857</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>VA</div> </div>	<div>\$5,102,000</div>	<div>\$5,102,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive I/I in combined sewers.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Separate portion of collection system in northern section of city and replace North lift station force main.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>145.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>13</div>	<b>Charleston, City of (Porter Hollow)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Kanawha</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544270</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0023205</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>12/31/2015</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>VA</div> </div>	<div>\$15,884,030</div>	<div>\$15,884,030</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Combined sewer system.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Replace/rehab areas of the collection system in compliance with the LTCP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>140.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>14</div>	<b>McDowell County PSD (Coalwood)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>McDowell</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>547302</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0000000</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>XII</div> </div>	<div>\$450,000</div>	<div>\$1,508,500</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Collection system discharging untreated sewage into local waterways.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct Phase I of a decentralized sewer system and upgrade portions of the collection system.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>140.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>15</div>	<b>Sophia, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Raleigh</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544085</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0024422</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,000,000</div>	<div>\$12,900,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Unservd area of Raleigh Co. (Coal City). Significant need for sewer service.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Extend sewer service to 458 new customers in the Coal City area, plus improvements to the existing WWTP to serve these additional flows.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>130.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>16</div>	<b>Greater Harrison Co. PSD (Enterprise)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Harrison</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544296</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0105213</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$7,694,000</div>	<div>\$8,694,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Enterprise is lacking a public sewage collection system. Residences reply on septic systems or directly discharge into the local streams and tributaries of the West Fork River. DEP samples of the river tested positive for fecal matter.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <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>
<b>Points</b> <div>125.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>17</div>	<b>Malden PSD</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Kanawha</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544480</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0050610</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>12/31/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIA,IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$5,000,000</div>	<div>\$21,924,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Inadequate capacity to treat peak flows, excessive I/I, deteriorated force mains. Under Consent Order.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct a new WWTP, install new force mains, &amp; line existing gravity sewers to eliminate I/I.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>125.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>18</div>	<b>Nitro</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Kanawha/Pu</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544273</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0023299</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>12/31/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIA,IIIB,IVA</div> </div>	<div>\$8,350,000</div>	<div>\$8,350,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Interceptor in poor condition, needs relined, pump station parts not available and needs replaced, adjacent areas needs sewer service, belt press too small.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Sewer extension, replace pump stations, sewer separation, reline sewer, new belt press.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>125.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 19	<b>Nutter Fort</b>  County: Harrison SRF #C: 544314 NPDES #WV: 0010090 Binding Date: 6/30/2016  Points 120.00  Needs Category: VA	\$1,549,800	\$1,549,800	<b>Problem</b> Excessive I/I causing CSO discharges.  <b>Solution</b> Corrective measures including replacement for existing sewer, install storm sewers, flow meter.
<b>Rank</b> 20	<b>Belle, Town of (Phase III)</b>  County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544177-04 NPDES #WV: 0021946 Binding Date: 3/31/2016  Points 115.00  Needs Category: I	\$4,045,000	\$5,045,000	<b>Problem</b> Antiquated WWTP not meeting permit requirements.  <b>Solution</b> Replace WWTP with package plant, repair existing tanks to serve as equalization basins and clarifier.



Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>21</div>	<b>Oak Hill, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Fayette</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544535</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0022028</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>3/31/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIA</div> </div>	<div>\$14,000,000</div>	<div>\$23,625,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> Oak Hill's collection system has extremely high I&I resulting in numerous bypasses at the Minden Road & Rt. 61 WWTP's. Arbuckle's WWTP is failing and causing discharges in violation of the NPDES permit.  <b>Solution</b> Upgrade both of Oak Hill's WWTP's and repair and/or replace collection system. Connect to and decommission Arbuckle's WWTP and send the flow to the upgraded Minden WWTP.
<b>Points</b> <div>115.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>22</div>	<b>Alderson, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Greenbrier</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544034</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0024881</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,II,IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$3,497,104</div>	<div>\$5,494,225</div>	<b>Problem</b> Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, need to comply with Greenbrier River restoration plan and failing lift stations beyond useful life.  <b>Solution</b> Add tertiary treatment process for phosphorus, add UV disinfection, and replace 3 lift stations.
<b>Points</b> <div>110.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>23</div>	<b>Beckley, City of (Phase III Red Brush)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> Raleigh  <b>SRF #C:</b> 544439-03  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0023183  <b>Binding Date:</b> 12/31/2015   <b>Needs Category:</b> IVA, IVB, VA </div>	<div>\$4,851,320</div>	<div>\$4,851,320</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing septic systems &amp; I/I is prevalent in areas of the system. This work is in compliance with the LTCP.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Improvements include replacing existing sewer &amp; extending sewer to 96 customers providing service to an unserved area.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>110.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>24</div>	<b>McDowell County PSD (laeger-Phase I)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> Mingo  <b>SRF #C:</b> 544513  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0115011  <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2016   <b>Needs Category:</b> I,IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$5,710,000</div>	<div>\$6,400,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>130 customers with failing septic systems in the laeger area.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>New collection system and WWTP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>105.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>25</div>	<b>Pennsboro, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Ritchie</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544409-03</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0025739</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>3/31/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I</div> </div>	<div>\$2,672,600</div>	<div>\$5,172,600</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>WWTP unable to meet permit limits and under DEP order.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Install SBR and conversion of existing units to sludge holding tanks.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>105.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>26</div>	<b>Shady Spring PSD (Phase II Cool Ridge/Flat Top)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Raleigh</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544300-02</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0010575</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$8,600,858</div>	<div>\$8,605,858</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing septic tanks/leachfields along Glade Creek and Little Beaver Creek which are on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Providing a new pressure sewer system to replace failing septic tanks serving 317 customers.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>105.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>27</div>	<b>Brooke County PSD (Phase III Eldersville Rd)</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Brooke</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544006-03</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0084182</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>3/31/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA, IVB</div>	<div>\$2,679,450</div>	<div>\$2,681,450</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing septic systems.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>New gravity system to serve 89 customers in the areas of St. Johns Rd &amp; Eldersville Rd.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>28</div>	<b>Delbarton, Town of</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Mingo</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544201</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0042374</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$2,000,000</div>	<div>\$5,181,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>200 customers with failing septic systems in the Ragland area.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct new gravity collection system.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>29</div>	<b>Gilbert, Town of (Justice)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Mingo</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544502</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0071820</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,398,000</div>	<div>\$4,428,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>83 customers with failing septic systems in the Justice area.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Extend sewer service to unserved area.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>30</div>	<b>Logan County PSD (Phase III B1)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Logan</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544460-01</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0033821</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,340,000</div>	<div>\$4,570,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site wastewater treatment systems for 131 customers in Lower Island Creek, Cherry Tree, Whites Addition, Yuma Camp &amp; surrounding areas.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>31</div>	<b>Logan County PSD (Phase III B2)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Logan</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544460-02</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0033821</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,600,000</div>	<div>\$4,900,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site wastewater treatment systems for 168 customers in Lower Island Creek, Wilkinson and surrounding areas.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>32</div>	<b>Matewan, Town of (Red Jacket)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Mingo</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544474</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0024783</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$3,000,000</div>	<div>\$5,380,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing vacuum collection system and on-site systems.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construction of a new gravity collection system to replace the failing existing vacuum system and failing on-site systems.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>33</div>	<b>North Beckley PSD (Phase IIIB Piney View)</b> <div> <b>County:</b> Raleigh  <b>SRF #C:</b> 544522  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0027740  <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2016  <b>Needs Category:</b> IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$4,776,250</div>	<div>\$4,786,250</div>	<b>Problem</b> 142 failing septic tanks/soil absorption systems along Piney Creek drainage which is on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform.  <b>Solution</b> Providing a new gravity sewer system to replace failing septic tanks.
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>34</div>	<b>Shady Spring PSD (Pluto)</b> <div> <b>County:</b> Raleigh  <b>SRF #C:</b> 544410  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0080403  <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2016  <b>Needs Category:</b> IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$5,101,600</div>	<div>\$5,101,600</div>	<b>Problem</b> Failing septic tanks/leachfields along Glade Creek which is on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform.  <b>Solution</b> Providing a new pressure sewer system to replace failing septic tanks serving 72 customers.
<b>Points</b> <div>100.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>35</div>	<b>Boone County PSD (West Madison/Danville)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Boone</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544494</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0035939</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2015</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIA</div> </div>	<div>\$2,900,000</div>	<div>\$4,370,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive I/I, antiquated equipment at WWTP.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Replace/rehabilitate areas of the existing collection system; replace mechanical bar screen, UV unit, belt filter press; upgrade orbal unit and clarifier capacity.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>95.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>36</div>	<b>Gary, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>McDowell</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544501</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0020044</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$386,400</div>	<div>\$483,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>DEP consent order, excessive I/I, and deteriorated existing system.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Complete the SSES to prepare a plan for repair/replacement of the existing system to reduce the I/I.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>95.00</div>				



Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>37</div>	<b>West Union, Town of (Wabash Area)</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Doddridge</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544441</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0020109</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>VA</div>	<div>\$1,276,800</div>	<div>\$2,776,800</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Working toward CSO compliance.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construction of new sanitary sewer system.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>95.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>38</div>	<b>Greater Harrison PSD (WWTP)</b>  <b>County:</b> <div>Harrison</div> <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544551</div> <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0084301</div> <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I</div>	<div>\$2,000,000</div>	<div>\$2,000,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Administrative Order for numerous violations of effluent limitations of fecal coliform &amp; ammonia nitrogen.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Energy efficient upgrades to the West Milford WWTP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>90.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>39</div>	<b>Mason, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> Mason  <b>SRF #C:</b> C544452-02  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0021849  <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2016   <b>Needs Category:</b> I,IIIA,IIIB </div>	<div>\$2,884,500</div>	<div>\$3,634,500</div>	<b>Problem</b> DEP Consent Order, improve WWTP effluent & efficiency, and decrease I/I.  <b>Solution</b> Upgrade WWTP, rehabilitate 2 pump stations and rehab/replace 64 manholes.
<b>Points</b> <div>90.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>40</div>	<b>Clarksburg Sanitary Board</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> Harrison  <b>SRF #C:</b> 544549  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0023302  <b>Binding Date:</b> 3/31/2016   <b>Needs Category:</b> IIIA,IIIB,VA </div>	<div>\$7,250,000</div>	<div>\$7,250,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> Gravity sewer lines are overloaded, gravity interceptor line needs cleaned, lift stations need emergency power source, Tide-Flex valves need replaced.  <b>Solution</b> Separate storm sewer from sanitary sewer. Purchase backup generators for lift stations, purchase additional Tide-Flex valves for CSO points, clean 35" and 48" gravity sewer lines.
<b>Points</b> <div>75.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>41</div>	<b>Greater Paw Paw PSD (Phase II)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> Marion  <b>SRF #C:</b> 544509  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0084310  <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2016   <b>Needs Category:</b> VA </div>	<div>\$2,915,000</div>	<div>\$2,930,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> Excessive I/I & construct Phase II of the LTCP to reduce CSO outfalls.  <b>Solution</b> Replace portions of collection system in Fairview and Orchard Hill areas.
<b>Points</b> <div>75.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>42</div>	<b>Oceana, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> McDowell  <b>SRF #C:</b> 544525  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0024431  <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2016   <b>Needs Category:</b> II </div>	<div>\$5,370,250</div>	<div>\$5,370,250</div>	<b>Problem</b> Equipment failure, exceeding over 90% rated permitted capacity.  <b>Solution</b> Increase the existing 500,000 gallons per day (gpd) wastewater treatment plant to 750,000 gpd.
<b>Points</b> <div>75.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>43</div>	<b>Parsons, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Tucker</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544311</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0022063</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>VA</div> </div>	<div>\$500,000</div>	<div>\$500,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Separation of storm water and sanitary sewer flows. This is to reduce CSO's in the system as per the approved LTCP.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>This project consists of installing a 24" storm sewer line in order to separate storm sewer from sanitary sewer. The City of Parsons is a CSO community.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>75.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>44</div>	<b>Welch, City of (North Welch)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>McDowell</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544217</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0024589</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>3/31/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIB, IVA, IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$6,659,002</div>	<div>\$6,909,002</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Unserved area &amp; existing collection system with I/I problems. Unserved area with failing septic's in the Browns Creek area.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>WWTP collection system extension to serve 98 new customers and replace/rehab the portion of the collection system in which the extension will connect.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>75.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>45</div>	<b>Winfield, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Putnam</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544487</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0024503</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I</div> </div>	<div>\$7,480,000</div>	<div>\$7,480,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Existing lagoon wastewater treatment plant fails to meet NPDES compliance.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Install a new WWTP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>75.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>46</div>	<b>Morgantown, City of (Sunshine Estates)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Monongalia</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544518</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0083071</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$662,300</div>	<div>\$1,640,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing package plant in Sunshine Estates area.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Extension to eliminate the package plant and upgrade collection system.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>70.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>47</div>	<b>Oakvale Road PSD</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Mercer</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544524</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0080489</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$9,664,910</div>	<div>\$12,216,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Not connected to public collection and treatment system. Green Acres package plant is under a Censent Order.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Extend CS to serve 288 customers in Hilltop Drive, Halls Ridge Road, Pisgah Road, and Green Acres subdivision and to abandon the Green Acres package plant.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>70.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>48</div>	<b>Williamstown (CS Rehab)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Wood</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544386</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0022071</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$300,000</div>	<div>\$300,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Four problematic sewer lines that cross under the CSX railroad.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Eliminate 3 of the crossings with a new 8" gravity line and replace the 4th with a new 12" bored gravity sewer line.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>65.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>49</div>	<b>Chapmanville, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Logan</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544483-02</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0024678</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>3/31/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIB,IVA</div> </div>	<div>\$7,877,000</div>	<div>\$7,877,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>The current plant capacity is not large enough to handle the amount of flow the system is experiencing &amp; equipment has passed its life expectancy. Existing pump stations are problematic causing overflows &amp; are a safety hazard. Aging collection system.</div> <b>Solution</b> <div>Rehabilitation of system pumping stations and upgrade WWTP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>60.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>50</div>	<b>Central Hampshire PSD</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Hampshire</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>547401</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0081850</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,II,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$6,400,000</div>	<div>\$6,400,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Frenchburg WWTP is organically and hydraulically overloaded.</div> <b>Solution</b> <div>Energy efficient upgrade &amp; expansion of the Frenchburg WWTP, as well as the decommissioning of the Harvest Hills package plant &amp; construction of a pump station &amp; force main to connect to the existing system.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>55.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 51	<b>Greater Harrison County PSD (Phase II/Rt. 73)</b>  <b>County:</b> Harrison <b>SRF #C:</b> 544451 <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0084301 <b>Binding Date:</b> 12/31/2015  <b>Needs Category:</b> I,IVA,IVB	\$4,878,500	\$22,265,578	<b>Problem</b> Failing package plant and severe I/I issues.  <b>Solution</b> Construct new WWTP and collection system.
<b>Points</b> 55.00				
<b>Rank</b> 52	<b>Piedmont, City of</b>  <b>County:</b> Mineral <b>SRF #C:</b> 544546 <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0105279 <b>Binding Date:</b> 9/30/2015  <b>Needs Category:</b> IIIB	\$1,036,000	\$1,266,000	<b>Problem</b> Raw sewage overflow into the Potomac River, Pearl Street pump station completely inoperable, flow meters do not operate, structural repairs needed, station lacks screening mechanism, piping and valves rusted.  <b>Solution</b> 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.
<b>Points</b> 55.00				



Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 53	<b>Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD</b>  County: Jefferson SRF #C: 544504 NPDES #WV: 0039136 Binding Date: 6/30/2016  Points 50.00 Needs Category: I.IIIB	\$2,011,695	\$2,011,695	<b>Problem</b> Replace aging critical assets identified in the Asset Management Plan.  <b>Solution</b> Upgrade existing system, (i.e. blowers, diffusers, disinfection, & electrical controls).
<b>Rank</b> 54	<b>Hinton, City of</b>  County: Summers SRF #C: C544550 NPDES #WV: 0024732 Binding Date: 6/30/2016  Points 50.00 Needs Category: VA	\$3,532,000	\$3,532,000	<b>Problem</b> Modifications to the existing wastewater collection system to replace aging collection lines allowing I/I into the system in the areas of Greenbrier & Riverside Dr. to alleviate flow at CSO 007.  <b>Solution</b> Replacement of existing outdated wastewater collection system and pumping station which will reduce the frequency and duration of the discharge from permitted discharge from CSO 007.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 55	<b>Meadow Creek PSD</b>  County: Summers SRF #C: 544514 NPDES #WV: 0055074 Binding Date: 9/30/2015  Points 50.00  Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB		\$2,379,000	<b>Problem</b> Deteriorated WWTP, customers not connected to public collection and treatment system.  <b>Solution</b> Replace WWTP and extend collection system to 24 customers.
<b>Rank</b> 56	<b>Morgantown Utility Board (Scotts Run Phase III)</b>  County: Monongalia SRF #C: 544545 NPDES #WV: 0023124 Binding Date: 6/30/2016  Points 50.00  Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$4,600,000	\$5,000,000	<b>Problem</b> Residents currently rely on private sewage systems of unknown integrity.  <b>Solution</b> Extend sanitary sewer service to +80 residents.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>57</div>	<b>Salem, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Harrison</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>C544541</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0020257</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIA</div> </div>	<div>\$971,000</div>	<div>\$1,971,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive inflow which is inundating the system causing permit exceedances.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct 2,700 LF storm drain, 32 catch basins, 11 headwalls, 3 storm manholes, 7 sanitary manholes, 1,750 LF gravity sewer.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>50.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>58</div>	<b>Williamson, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Mingo</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544544</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0026271</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIB, IVA, I</div> </div>	<div>\$3,000,000</div>	<div>\$4,024,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Outdated &amp; failing wastewater pumping stations, correction of structural issues at the existing wastewater treatment facility &amp; extend service to (3) unserved customers.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <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>
<b>Points</b> <div>50.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 59	<b>Cairo, Town of</b>  County: Ritchie SRF #C: 547101 NPDES #WV: 0084212 Binding Date: 6/30/2016  Points 45.00  Needs Category: XII, IIIB	\$1,503,325	\$2,503,325	<b>Problem</b> 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.  <b>Solution</b> Replace 10 manholes, 500 LF of 8 inch PVC gravity sewers, rehabilitate 6 pumping stations and replace existing 40,000 gpd decentralized WWTP.
<b>Rank</b> 60	<b>Morgantown, City of (Bakers Ridge)</b>  County: Monongalia SRF #C: 544512 NPDES #WV: 0023124 Binding Date: 6/30/2016  Points 45.00  Needs Category: IVA,IVB	\$3,380,000	\$5,500,000	<b>Problem</b> Package plants not meeting permit limits.  <b>Solution</b> Extend collection system to eliminate the package plants.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>61</div>	<b>New Cumberland, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Hancock</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>C544543</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0021559</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIA,IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,000,000</div>	<div>\$4,000,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Antiquated equipment, unable to meet NPDES permit requirements, excessive I/I, failing system.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Repair/replacement of various items at WWTP and pumping stations and line replacement.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>45.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>62</div>	<b>Pax, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Fayette</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544546</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0040541</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>  <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA</div> </div>	<div>\$400,000</div>	<div>\$2,200,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Failing onsite wastewater treatment system.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site wastewater treatment systems. Provide new service to approximately 52 customers along Willis Branch and enhance existing lagoon to reduce effluent ammonia.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>45.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 63	<b>Preston County Sewer PSD</b> <b>(Bruceton Mills)</b>  County: Preston SRF #C: 544538 NPDES #WV: 0025101 Binding Date: 6/30/2016  Points 45.00  Needs Category: I,IIIB	\$2,867,500	\$2,872,500	<b>Problem</b> Antiquated equipment at both the WWTP and Brandonville pump station.  <b>Solution</b> Upgrade WWTP and pump station.
<b>Rank</b> 64	<b>Central Boaz PSD</b>  County: Wood SRF #C: 544059 NPDES #WV: 0084221 Binding Date: 6/30/2015  Points 40.00  Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB	\$2,602,000	\$2,607,000	<b>Problem</b> 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.  <b>Solution</b> Construct a pressure sewer system to serve the WV RT 14 area, upgrade the existing WWTP and replace vacuum pits.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>65</div>	<b>Franklin, Town of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Pendleton</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544289</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0024970</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>12/31/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIA</div> </div>	<div>\$1,140,900</div>	<div>\$3,040,900</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive I/I, collection lines are failing, existing lagoon liners are failing &amp; other equipment at the WWTP needs replaced.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Upgrade WWTP and I/I work that includes MH inserts, pipe lining and line replacement.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>40.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>66</div>	<b>White Sulphur Springs, City of</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Greenbrier</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544035</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0084000</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>9/30/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,II</div> </div>	<div>\$2,037,166</div>	<div>\$3,500,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Existing WWTP can't meet Greenbrier River phosphorus requirements.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Add phosphorus removal process to WWTP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>40.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> 67	<b>Jefferson County PSD (Flowing Springs Interceptor)</b>  <b>County:</b> Jefferson <b>SRF #C:</b> 544546 <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0084361 <b>Binding Date:</b> 3/31/2016  <b>Points</b> 35.00  <b>Needs Category:</b> IVB & IIIB	\$3,495,000	\$6,990,000	<b>Problem</b> 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 suit, additional capacity needed.  <b>Solution</b> 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 Co
<b>Rank</b> 68	<b>Albright, Town of</b>  <b>County:</b> Preston <b>SRF #C:</b> 544445 <b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0551384 <b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2016  <b>Points</b> 25.00  <b>Needs Category:</b> IIIA,IVA	\$857,000	\$2,357,000	<b>Problem</b> Excessive I/I. During wet weather WWTP operates as much as 3 times above its design conditions. Areas just outside of the existing service boundary in which the population must utilize individual septic systems which are in poor to failing condition.  <b>Solution</b> Rehab existing sewer collection system by replacing select manholes with watertight frames, covers as well as plug previously abandoned service laterals to reduce effects of I/I. Extend service to areas of Ruth Bell, Snake Den Road add 32 customers.



Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>69</div>	<b>Center PSD (Phase I)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Wyoming</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544268-01</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0027138</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>I,IIIA</div> </div>	<div>\$1,634,000</div>	<div>\$3,664,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Excessive I/I, deterioration of existing collection system, and repair issues at the WWTP.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Complete I/I study and perform recommended upgrades to the sewer system as well as replacing certain processes at the WWTP.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>25.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>70</div>	<b>Colfax PSD</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Marion</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544333</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0032131</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIA,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$641,500</div>	<div>\$2,141,500</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>WWTP on unstable ground, excessive I/I, overflows during high flow periods.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Construct new sanitary sewer system; abandon WWTP and connect the system to Kingmill Valley PSD.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>25.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>71</div>	<b>Vienna</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Wood</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544233</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0023221</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,676,000</div>	<div>\$2,676,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Lift station and package plant maintenance issues.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Extension of service along 46th Street and Rosmar Rd. in order to eliminate a package plant and 3 lift stations.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>25.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>72</div>	<b>Frankfort PSD (Phase III)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Mineral</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544411-03</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0105988</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IIIA</div> </div>	<div>\$3,647,000</div>	<div>\$3,647,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Existing lines in poor condition and undersized, I&amp;I problems.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Line replacement in (2) subdivisions.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>15.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
<b>Rank</b> <div>73</div>	<b>Center PSD (Phase II)</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Wyoming</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544268-02</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0027138</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2015</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$9,805,000</div>	<div>\$9,805,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>150 residents do not have sewer service.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Sewer collection system extension and pump stations, as needed to serve 150 new customers.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>00.00</div>				
<b>Rank</b> <div>74</div>	<b>Hancock PSD</b>  <div> <b>County:</b> <div>Hancock</div>  <b>SRF #C:</b> <div>544431</div>  <b>NPDES #WV:</b> <div>0105848</div>  <b>Binding Date:</b> <div>6/30/2016</div>   <b>Needs Category:</b> <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$5,500,000</div>	<div>\$6,300,000</div>	<b>Problem</b> <div>Unserved area in Chester - Route 30 between the Pennsylvania and WV border. Also the community of West Lake.</div>  <b>Solution</b> <div>Sewer extension to 160 customers along US Rt. 30 and to 48 new customers in the West Lake area.</div>
<b>Points</b> <div>00.00</div>				

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS  
BY QUARTER

---

Appendix B - Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality  
Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2015 Grant

Name	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544____	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2015 (\$1,000)			
				1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
<b>Greater St. Albans PSD Ronceverte</b>	Ext. & Upgrades WWTP Upgrade	406-03 267	D3	18,000			
			D3	18,760			
<b>DEP Administration</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
<b>Total Projects and Admin</b>				36,760	0	0	0

Federal Share (0.8333)				\$30,632.11	0	0	0	30,632
State Share (0.1667)				\$6,127.89	0	0	0	6,128
<b>Total**</b>				<b>\$36,760.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>36,760</b>

**Payment Schedule for the CWSRF Program: CS-540001-14**

Federal Quarter	Payment Date	CWSRF Amount	Cumulative Amount
		\$21,888,000	\$21,888,000

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 FY 2016 Intended Use Plan

Name	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544____	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2015 (\$1,000)			
				1st Qtr July-Sep	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Alderson	Greenbrier R. WWTP	034	D2		3,770		
Beckley - Ph. III	CSO/Sewer Ext.	439-03	D2		4,253		
Franklin	WWTP/CS Upgrades	472	D2		1,140		
Greater St. Albans PSD	Ext. & Upgrade	406-03	D3	18,000			
Ronceverte	Greenbrier R. WWTP	267	D3	18,760			
Shady Spring	Sewer Extension	300-02	D3		7,176		
Wellsburg	CSO Upgrade	362-02	D3	4,000			
Williamstown	Line Replacement	386	D3	300			
White Sulphur Springs	Greenbrier R. WWTP	542	D3		1444		
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				41,385	17,808	25	25
grand total							59,243

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. Projects will be funded until available funds are exhausted.

### 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

---



## IUP PUBLIC HEARING

**Kathy Emery**

### *Introduction*

Welcome. We can go ahead and start the public hearing on our FY2016 Intended Use Plan. We have three visitors here today and I would like to thank you for coming. If you want I can just go through and hit the highlights and then have any questions you need to ask answered, or if you have questions right up front we can get to that right from the beginning.

**Clay Riley**

Could you please cover the whole document?

**Kathy Emery**

Alright, does everyone have a copy?

### *Section II - Funds Identification*

*Sources and Uses of Funds - please note that this is as of March 31<sup>st</sup>.*

### *Section III – Goals*

*Long Term Goals*

*Short Term Goals*

### *Section IV – Project Priority List*

### *Section V – Fund Activities*

*Interest rates on POTW loans*

*Additional subsidization for disadvantage communities*

**Samme Gee**

In regards to additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities, this only applies to principle forgiveness?

**Kathy Emery**

The new criteria only applies to that. We completely separated it according to WRRDA. We only had to look at this for additional subsidization. We did not have to look at the loans. So we made that distinction in our IUP to simplify things. So for communities that just want a loan, and there is no debt forgiveness you don't even have to look at this. The chart before applies, straight MHI. Any questions on that?

**Clay Riley**

If they qualify based upon the point system then they are eligible to receive that debt forgiveness upon request? When they request the binding commitment since that is a change I've seen from previous filing and preliminary application reports, so if I have a utility that has a over 2%MHI and a decrease in population that already has an approved facility plan, can they then request upon binding commitment to be included, considered to be disadvantage community to receive some of that debt forgiveness?

**Kathy Emery**

They would only be available if they meet this criteria at this point and time, so yes.

**Clay Riley**

So if they are over 2% and they have a decrease in population which would put them over the limit with the points and they qualify for up to \$1,000,000 they could request that upon binding commitment? Is that the appropriate time?

**Kathy Emery**

Yes, we are still looking at these as they go through Council to see if there is any other way to make it work without the debt forgiveness. If not then we will go towards that.

**Jenelle Armstrong**

Debt forgiveness becomes the last resort?

**Kathy**

Yes.

**Craig Richards**

Kathy why just a 3 year period for the population?

**Kathy Emery**

Well that was just a 3 year rolling average of what the population trends were doing and we felt that was more recent data for 2010 – 2013.

**Samme Gee**

Plus theMHI is based on the 2010 Census.

**Kathy Emery**

Yes.

**Jeff Brady**

And it's also the available data from the American Fact Finder. It was somewhat limited.

**Kathy Emery**

If any of you have clients from Virginia you are going to see this chart. It's a bit modified from Virginia's as well.

**Clay Riley**

Appendix I, population data for Harrison County, shows an increase but I think it should show a decrease.

**Kathy Emery**

We will check that. Thank you.

***FY2016 Planning & Design Pilot Program***

***Green Project Reserve***

- 1. Energy Efficiency***
- 2. Water Efficiency***
- 3. Storm Water/Green Infrastructure***
- 4. Environmentally Innovative***

**Clay Riley**

For new, for project going through the facility plan, for projects requesting binding commitment, for projects that have binding commitments?

**Kathy Emery**

If you already have your binding commitment we are not going to make you go back.

**Jeff Brady**

If we have an approved facilities plan.

**Kathy Emery**

We need to look at the date on that to see when the eligibility is. On the design, they gave us a grandfather period.

**Jeff Brady**

After October 2014.

**Kathy Emery**

On design we did not have to go back for the AIS, but I don't think they did that for the facilities plans. We may have to get some kind of amendment to a facility plan. We will be checking that.

**Jeff Brady**

We are in the process of discussing the procedure or how that would be accomplished. We perceive a paper exercise that could be fairly quickly done for something like that. Treatment plants might be more involved.

**Clay Riley**

If there are questions of eligibility can we question DEP?

**Kathy Emery**

Yes.

**Kathy Emery**

For the water efficiency projects, we are only looking for water reuse projects under that category. The traditional storm water green infrastructure, these are projects that utilize green technology to eliminate or treat stormwater from existing wastewater/collection treatment systems or even MS4 projects that utilize green technology to solve stormwater issues. So if you have an MS4 community, they have permitting requirements they need to meet, that is actually eligible for Clean Water SRF money.

**Kathy Emery**

The Environmentally Innovative is decentralized sewer systems and that's when we are getting into the other way of paying for the upfront costs out of the available debt forgiveness from our traditional funding sources. You have to meet the definition of decentralized and I will be working with Jeff to make sure that meets our definition, prior to being eligible. These projects may be eligible to receive debt forgiveness of 100% of the eligible green costs, so if you hand me a disadvantaged sewer system and we have the money available in debt forgiveness, they are eligible for up to 100%. And we are also continuing to offer the program to cover the pre-bid costs for categorical green decentralized sewer system projects only. And we have done that on one project and we are getting ready to move on another project to do that. So we would pay for design, accounting, all of the upfront prebid costs out of debt forgiveness for those eligible projects. And it has the same criteria as before, the recommendation from the Council, engineering and facility plan approval, pre-design meeting, project timeline with approvable

budget, documentation from the sponsor that the customer base is willing to pay the proposed sewer rate and PSC approval if required.

And we have done some solicitation; Appendix G has those that have requested to be considered green. Just because they are on the list, does not mean we are going to consider them green, but they had demonstrated to say that we are a green project. We will be further evaluating those projects. Just because you are not on the list does not mean we will not consider you. So if one pops up out of the woodwork, bring it to our attention and we will see if we can do something with it.

**Clay Riley**

Privately owned Onsite Systems allowable for green projects? Can you elaborate?

**Kathy Emery**

The best example we have for that is Lincoln County. They have an improvement association. Basically we worked with them and we put in onsite peat systems. This is an area that would never be reached by any kind of centralized sewer system. An area where, there is not enough space for the on lot septic system with separate leach system. So out of debt forgiveness money, we funded onsite peat systems for groups of houses, 20 or more, for several years. We have done almost 64 in there. It has been a good experience, learning what works and what doesn't work, that kind of thing.

**Clay Riley**

Is it only for existing structures?

**Kathy Emery**

Yes, DEP/SRF we can only fix water quality problems. In this case there was a serious documented fecal coliform issue in the area streams and water ways. They are also continuing to do studies to document reduction in fecal as a result of doing this project. This is considered very innovative, very green and actually was reported as a success story by EPA in their publication for this type of project.

**Jeff Brady**

The funds were funneled through the County Commission. And the reason it is privately owned is once the unit is placed on the property it becomes the property of the property owners. And then the maintenance association has a yearly fee on this structure, so that the O&M on these systems is paid for cooperatively by the property owner and a portion of the monthly fee to the maintenance association.

**Kathy Emery**

It's almost like an insurance program that they are paying for so they would not have to pay the full cost for the peat replacement. They would only be responsible for a small percentage of that because they have been paying into it all these years.

**Clay Riley**

I've been asked to ask this question. The Utility has studied an area that has already been classified as decentralized and they are entering the next phase of that project. Would they be able to use that previous determination to future expand on, to come back and say hey this was previously considered furthering that along...

**Kathy Emery**

What do you mean furthering that along?

**Clay Riley**

It was broken up into (5) five phases, of decentralized sewer.

**Kathy Emery**

Canaan Valley?

**Clay Riley**

Yes. Canaan Valley is looking into solving some of the rest of those issues and has actually filed an initiation form with the IJDC Phase 3.

**Kathy Emery**

We would have to look at it, but obviously we would give that due consideration, on the how it is being applied. Expanding an existing system that was defined as a decentralized sewer system you are almost beginning to regionalize it. Decentralized definition is the water is discharged almost right where it is generated, so if you are expanding that then we may not look at that. Now if you are doing an entirely different area that cannot be connected then we would look at that. But any evaluation for that, say if there is a treatment plant over here and you are wanting to put in a decentralized system over here we are going to ask you first to evaluate to cost effectiveness of connecting it to another system.

**Clay Riley**

If one had the capacity. But if it wasn't even considered decentralized, it could maybe still be considered disadvantaged if the unemployment rate in Tucker County would be higher than 5.3 and the population would be a decrease and their rates would be over 2%

**Kathy Emery**

That's two different things...

**Clay Riley**

But if they were not considered decentralized, they could be considered disadvantaged?

**Kathy Emery**

Yes.

**Kathy Emery**

***Annual Administrative Fees on POTW loans***

Annual Administrative Fee, we are still charging that on all SRF loans. It pays for all of our administrative expenses, pays for our Project Wet program in the Agency, our Accountant, those types of costs. Our total Administrative Budget is \$2.2 million dollars, starting this upcoming Fiscal Year, starting July 1<sup>st</sup>. This is where some of those funds are coming from on that one pilot program we were talking about, with the up to 50% engineering costs. We are also considering funding a position that would provide technical and project support to local communities, and we are working with EPA on that concept. To see what kind of value that would add to our program. And that would be paid out of that fund as well.

***Maximum Allowable Loans***

Maximum Allowable Loans – we have still chosen not to set a limit on the amount of funds available to any single project.

***BAN leveraging program***

The Bond Anticipated Note program - that is still an option. As always that is based upon available funds. And generally considered the last resort to look at.

***Extended Bond Purchase Program***

We are still able to do the Extended Bond Purchase Program for both 30-year and 40-year bonds. That has not changed in any recent years.

***Requirements for CWSRF Commitment***

The requirements for binding commitment has changed slightly. Once it is determined that a project realistically proceed to construction within 6 months you can request a binding commitment letter.

We will continue to commit funds on a first-come, first-serve in order of priority as discussed previously as long as all applicable program requirements have been met. At a minimum facility plans and specs must be approved, and also consideration on the status of rights-of-way obtainment, and other items on the pre-bid checklist. For example if you have a project and you need 600 rights-of-way and easements and you've only acquired 50 of them and you say I'm ready for a binding commitment letter I'm going to tell you to come back when you have more than 50 of them. When it can be realistically considered to proceed to construction within 6 months; understanding that things can get hung up. They can get hung up with the PSC, these things happen. But if it's realistically considered ready to proceed we will give a binding commitment letter.

### **Jeff Brady**

This should not be construed as requiring the 80 % title opinion prior to receiving the binding commitment. However we reserve the right to invoke that if necessary.

### ***Expanded uses of the CWSRF – Nonpoint Sources (NPS)***

### **Kathy Emery**

The Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program, which we partnered with the WV Conservation Agency, Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, local Soil Conservation Districts and local banking institutions to fund best management practices for farmers across the state. It is not limited to any one county. Set aside monies of \$150,000 to contribute towards those projects.

The Onsite Systems Loan Program we partnered with the West Virginia Housing Development Fund and SAFE Housing and Economic Development (SHED) for this program. It's limited to \$10,000 with 2% interest, terms not to exceed 10 years for the replacement, repair or upgrade of onsite sewer systems. If anybody is interested in proceeding with that they need to file the application with the WV Housing Development Fund or SAFE Housing and Economic Development. And we have set aside \$300,000 for that program this fiscal year.

### ***Federal Requirements***

Federal Requirements – we have selected 2 projects that will be required to do what we call our equivalency requirements, the single audit act, the FFATA which is the transparency federal requirement which is something we do internally. Any kind of DBE or any other requirements that would be necessary, these 2 projects have been chosen to do that. We have to meet equivalency requirements for the amount of the federal grants received from EPA. And that is all I have to cover on our Intended Use Plan.

Are there any other questions?



**Samme Gee**

If one of those 2 projects didn't go during FY2016, would you have to substitute another project?

**Kathy Emery**

Yes and I would notify that project. And then that would be reported in our Annual Report that fiscal year.

**Clay Riley**

On behalf of Greater Harrison County PSD the Board asked that I make a statement on their behalf thanking you for consideration of the BIO Dome project in the energy efficiency on the Green Reserve. At their board meeting yesterday they asked me to do that.

**Kathy Emery**

Okay.

**Clay Riley**

Also, not Greater Harrison County PSD, just for clarification purposes, I have received a couple of questions on the point allocation, however I do recognize that it is on first-come first-serve, but can you elaborate on point allocation of the Utilities on the Intended Use Plan and how those points were achieved. For example say project number 17?

**Kathy Emery**

That is based upon the Priority List Application that was submitted by that community and any information given to us by that community. This is based upon any kind of health hazards, environmental issues, they get points for solving issues of that nature, CSO projects or an SSO project, if there is not existing treatment and you are going out and serving areas where we have failing septic systems, points are available for that. If they have any orders, depending on the level anywhere from NOV to actual penalty consent orders from DEP points are available for that. Are we correcting a problem that is on our 303d list? Are you actually improving something that might be on the TMDL? Do they have an approved Asset Management Program, and this is solving an issue that's listed in their Asset Management Plan. Some other equivalent report that they can provide documentation of. Readiness to proceed. Are the plans and specs approved? They receive points for that, but that's far less than some of the other categories. And then if it is a Green Project. If you provided Green technology, whether it's a categorical or a business case there are additional points available for that. So all of those combine into a total rating. And it is based upon information given to us. If information is not provided we can't really help that. If we don't have anything documented, they may not get points for something that they think they should receive.

**Clay Riley**

Is there a specific number for each of those documented numbers?

**Kathy Emery**

Do you want me to go over every single one?

**Clay Riley**

No I didn't see it within the IUP

**Kathy Emery**

No that is an internal document that we use that has been approved by EPA.

**Clay Riley**

If a Utility owner wanted to evaluate to see how they scored individually could they request a copy of that?

**Kathy Emery**

Everything is FOIA-able. They can submit a FOIA request. Because they disagree with it, does not necessarily mean we will change it. So I am really hoping we don't get into the battling the number of points. Because if the information was not provided at the time we evaluated it and they want to submit it later then the answer is I'm sorry, you will have to try that next year.

**Jeff Brady**

It should also be noted that they are placed in alphabetical order if their point values are the same.

**Kathy Emery**

And I am assuming your number 17 should really be happy because more information was provided this year than last year and you will note that they have gone further up on the priority list than they were previously.

**Clay Riley**

That was just the page that I opened to.

**Clay Riley**

I read in here previously, I thought, that if there is a Utility that is not on the current Intended Use Plan Priority List, and has not contemplated a project yet prior to the deadline February whatever that if they go through the process they can request to be included with the 60 day notification and a request for public hearing. Is that correct?

**Kathy Emery**

Yes that is correct. We can add people to the priority list. We are only going to do that though if that project is going to close by June 30<sup>th</sup> the end of the fiscal year. Otherwise there is no value to us going through that process. If they are not going to close on a loan, they don't need to be on this year's list.

**Samme Gee**

Which you have actually done in the past...

**Kathy Emery**

Yes, which is why our priority list is actually so big. There is no way we can actually fund everybody that is on the priority list but a lot of people want on it knowing that some projects may not make it this year, they may make it next year but they wanted to be on this year's list anyway. We allow that.

Any other questions? Is there any other public comments? If not then I consider our 2016 Intended Use Plan hearing at a close.

# Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

## Topic: CWSR IUP Public Hearing

### June 18, 2016 - 1:30pm

The Department of Environmental Protection asks for the information below so that agency staff may provide responses and information about decisions to you. The information you voluntarily provide on this sheet becomes part of the public record related to this topic and may be released if requested under the

#### Freedom of Information Act.

Name (please print)	Organization	Phone	E-mail	Comment Y/N
Juanita Canaway	WV DEP			
David Byrd	WV DEP	304-926-0499 X-1593	David.W.Byrd@dpw.wv.gov	
Kathy Emery	"	" X 1596	Katherine.d.emery@wv.gov	
Kimberly Henderson	WV DEP	304 926 - 0499 X 1608	Kimberly.M.Henderson@wv.gov	
Tina Hall	WV DEP	926-0499 X 1604	Tina.J.Hall@wv.gov	
Elbert Monton	WV DEP	X 1596	Elbert.monton@wv.gov	
JENELLE ARMSTRONG	THRASHER	304-553-4291	jarmstrong@thrashereng.com	
CLAY RILEY	THRASHER	304-288 5011	<del>clay</del> cpriley@thrashereng.com	
Thomas Cazed	WV DEP	304-926-0499 X 1048	thomas.a.cazed@wv.gov	
Sammy Lee	Tucker Kelly LLC	304 382 1318	sgoo@jack-judy.com	
Craig Richards	Progressive Nyle	304 485-8541	craig.richards@progressive-nyle.com	
Suzi Adkins	WV DEP	304 926-0495	Suzanna.S.Adkins@wv.gov	

## **“NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING”**

The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection has scheduled a public hearing on June 18, 2015, at 1:30 pm to discuss the **Draft Fiscal Year 2016 Intended Use Plan** for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF). A part of the Intended Use Plan is the Fiscal Year 2016 Priority List. The hearing will take place at the DEP headquarters in Charleston in the Dolly Sods Conference Room (Room #1125). A copy of the draft Fiscal Year 2016 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 57<sup>th</sup> Street, SE  
Charleston, WV 25304  
(304) 926-0499 Ext. 1596  
[Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov](mailto: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](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%
<b>A</b>				
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>B</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
<b>C</b>				
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
<b>D</b>				
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
<b>E</b>				
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
<b>F</b>				
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
<b>G</b>				
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
<b>H</b>				
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
<b>I</b>				
laeger, town	21,500	26.88	31.35	35.83
<b>J</b>				
Jane Lew, town	29,130	36.41	42.48	48.55
Junior, town	16,667	20.83	24.31	27.78
<b>K</b>				
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
<b>L</b>				
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
<b>M</b>				
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
<b>N</b>				
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
<b>O</b>				
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
<b>P</b>				
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
<b>Q</b>				
Quinwood, town	27,794	34.74	40.53	46.32
<b>R</b>				
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
<b>S</b>				
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
<b>T</b>				
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
<b>U</b>				
Union, town	41,490	51.86	60.51	69.15
<b>V</b>				
Valley Grove, village	43,047	53.81	62.78	71.75
Vienna, city	42,616	53.27	62.15	71.03
<b>W</b>				
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  
FY2016  
(for EPA use only)

**Cumulative Sources as of March 31, 2015**

Capitalization Grants (26)	596,274,586	
State Matches (actual)	107,036,495	
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319) (estimate)	364,422,406	
Investment Earnings (estimate)	<u>29,886,435</u>	
Sources sub-total (a)		1,097,619,922

**Cumulative Uses as of March 31, 2015**

Loan Assistance (212+319)	1,094,547,721	
DEP Administration (4%)	<u>14,143,540</u>	
Uses sub-total (b)		1,108,691,261

**FY2016 Sources of Funds**

Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b) *	-11,071,339	
Capitalization Grant #27 (FFY2015 Funds)	21,888,000	
State Match	4,377,600	
Earnings	376,320	
Repayments	<u>35,414,498</u>	
Sources of Funds ( c )		50,985,079

**Less**

Appendix C Projects	59,243,000	
AgWQLP Reserves	150,000	
OSLP Reserve	<u>300,000</u>	
Total		59,693,000

\* The number represented here is loan agreements, not the funds expended as of this time period. As of 3/31/15, the existing loan payables was \$97,763,785.

## APPENDIX G

# POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECT

---

## CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

### "Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2016 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
Central Hampshire PSD - Frenchburg	energy efficiency	WWTP upgrade with BNR and energy efficient blowers	\$6,400,000
Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD - Rhodell	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	\$4,510,200
McDowell Co. PSD - Coalwood	decentralized sewer system	Packaged MBBR plant and collection system	\$1,950,000
New Haven PSD	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$3,248,480
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
TOTAL			\$30,316,730



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](http://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>