

**West Virginia
Clean Water State Revolving Fund**



FY2015 Intended Use Plan

Submitted to the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
July 1, 2014



west virginia department of environmental protection

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Glossary.....	1
Preface.....	2
SECTION I	
Introduction.....	3
SECTION II	
Funds Identification	3
SECTION III	
Goals.....	5
SECTION IV	
Project Priority List.....	6
SECTION V	
Fund Activities.....	6
SECTION VI	
Assurances	15
SECTION VII	
Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds	16
SECTION VIII	
Public Participation.....	16
SECTION IX	
Agreement.....	17

Appendices

- A - FY 2015 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

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 2015 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015). 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, 2014, there have been 25 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 FY2015 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 during FY2015.

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 FY2015 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 FY2015 (July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015)

Available funds as of March 31, 2014

Cash balance in CWSRF account =	\$ 84,706,202	
Federal funds accounts payable (Base grants) =	\$ <u>0</u>	
		<u>\$ 84,706,202</u>

New funds available during state FY2015:

Next Federal EPA Grant =	\$ 21,856,000	
Next State Match =	\$ 4,371,200	
Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/15) =	\$ 31,485,974	
Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/15) =	\$ 2,963,843	
Investment earnings (to 6/30/15) =	\$ 453,495	
Anticipated SB 245 repayment	<u>\$ 11,615,980</u>	
		<u>\$ 72,746,492</u>

Less:

Existing project loans payables (3/31/14) =	\$ 85,434,216	
Existing binding commitments (3/31/14) =	\$ 73,221,468*	
AgWQLP reserve =	\$ 150,000	
OSLP reserve =	\$ 300,000	
DEP Administration =	<u>\$ 0</u>	
		<u>\$ 159,105,684</u>

Net available funds during FY2015 = **\$ (1,652,990)**

Notes:

1. There is \$2,161,818 that must still be allocated to green projects to meet the 2012 and 2013 grant conditions.

* 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 FY2016 funds will also pay for some of these costs.

* State Match is provided by the IJDC and should be received by July 2014.

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 for FY2015

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 develop American Iron & Steel guidance in accordance with the most recent grant requirement.

SECTION IV

Project Priority List

The FY2015 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 on a first-come, first-served basis regardless of their position on the priority list, 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 must be approved and an approvable set of plans & specs must be submitted. Consideration will be given to the status of rights-of-way obtainment and other items on the pre-bid checklist during this process. 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 in FY2015.

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 \$21,856,000. The Appropriations Act requires that a portion of each capitalization grant be used for additional loan subsidization and for funding green

infrastructure projects. The Act requires a minimum of 10% be set aside for funding green projects. This amount will equal \$2,185,600. The allowable green project categories that will be considered for this funding are described below.

The Act also requires a minimum amount be set aside for providing additional loan subsidization in the form of grants or principal forgiveness to qualifying communities. This minimum amount is \$1,189,352. The Act also allows for a maximum amount to be set aside, which may be equal to \$1,784,029. 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. The criteria for projects to be eligible for additional subsidization are as follows:

1. 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.).
2. The proposed average sewer rate based upon 4,000 gallons of water usage after project completion must be equal to or greater than 1.75% of the median household income based upon the census data as described in Section V(A). The additional loan subsidization provided will be the lesser of 50% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$1,000,000.

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 FY2015 priority list prior to loan closing.

FY 2015 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 2015, 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 facility 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.

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

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 2015, 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 facility 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 February and March 2014 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 FY2015 is \$2,202,559. This includes funding the DEP's Project WET position. The amount of the funds available as of March 31, 2013 was \$6,767,373. These funds can also be used to fund the onsite systems program and the pilot planning/design program as discussed in this document.

E. Maximum allowable loans

In FY2015, 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.

Facility 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 facility units / components, including equipment.

Where there has been a historical decline in population, additional information in the facility 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 facility 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

Preliminary Commitments – when IJDC or another funding agency commits funds to a project that includes CWSRF as a funding partner, the DEP may also commit its funding to the project at that time, conditioned upon program requirements being met in the future as the project proceeds.

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. 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, 2013, 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 in FY2015 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 in FY2015. 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 FY2015 will not have to meet many federal requirements. As a recipient of federal CWSRF funds, the DEP has to apply these federal requirements to loans equal to the cumulative amounts of all the federal capitalization grants. The DEP has consistently applied these federal requirements to all loans since the beginning of the program in 1991. DEP has met this federal requirement at 117% of what is required, as of June 30, 2013. Therefore, many federal requirements will not be imposed on projects in FY2015, such as minority/woman-owned business

enterprise goals, presidential executive orders, just to name a few. Recipients of earmark grants from Congress will still have to meet these federal requirements for the entire project, including any CWSRF funds. This will likely continue in future fiscal years.

In order to minimize the burden on borrowers with compliance with the Single Audit Act (OMB A-133), the following projects have been selected to comply with these requirements. These borrowers will submit single audit reports in all years when disbursements of federal funds (both CWSRF and non-CWSRF federal funds) are greater than \$750,000.

Project Sponsor	Project Description	CWSRF amount
City of Keyser	Chesapeake Bay WWTP Upgrade	\$20,400,000
Pea Ridge PSD	New WWTP & Collection System	\$ 9,926,000

This project's total is more than the FFY 2014 capitalization grant which is \$21,856,000.

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 19, 2014 a public hearing was held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2015. 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 sheets for all loans closed during FY2015. This new documentation is being requested by EPA to better ascertain the environmental results of projects funded under the CWSRF program.

APPENDIX A

FISCAL YEAR 2015
PRIORITY LIST

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2015 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>1</div>	Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IIIC Tackett's Creek) County: <div>Kanawha</div> SRF #C: <div>544406-03</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0035068</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIA,IIIB,IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$16,165,331</div>	<div>\$16,195,331</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic systems and excessive I/I</div> Solution <div>Extend sewer service to unserved areas and replace/rehabilitate existing sewers.</div>
Points <div>210.00</div>				
Rank <div>2</div>	Beckley, City of (Phase III Red Brush) County: <div>Raleigh</div> SRF #C: <div>544439-03</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0023183</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIA</div>	<div>\$5,047,720</div>	<div>\$5,097,720</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic systems & CSO rehabilitation for compliance</div> Solution <div>Improvements include replacing existing sewer & extending sewer to provide service to an unserved area</div>
Points <div>200.00</div>				
Rank <div>3</div>	Weston, City of County: <div>Lewis</div> SRF #C: <div>544471</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0028068</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$5,940,000</div>	<div>\$7,140,000</div>	Problem <div>Unserved areas & package plant that is unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements. (Turnertown area)</div> Solution <div>New collection system to unserved areas & eliminate the package plant and send all flow to the Weston WWTP</div>
Points <div>200.00</div>				

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>4</div>	Frankfort PSD <div> County: Mineral SRF #C: 544411-02 NPDES #WV: 0010598 Binding Date: 12/31/2014 Needs Category: II,IIIA,IIIB,IVA. </div>	<div>\$17,350,000</div>	<div>\$23,700,000</div>	Problem Four failing package plants and septic tanks serving a total of 600 customers along Plum Run which is on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform; excessive I&I Solution Construct new gravity collection sewer, expand WWTP, I & I remediation
Points <div>185.00</div>				
Rank <div>5</div>	Ronceverte, City of <div> County: Greenbrier SRF #C: 544267 NPDES #WV: 0023246 Binding Date: 12/31/2014 Needs Category: I,II </div>	<div>\$18,760,463</div>	<div>\$27,660,468</div>	Problem Need to comply with Greenbrier River phosphorus limits Solution Upgrade WWTP
Points <div>185.00</div>				
Rank <div>6</div>	Greenbrier PSD #1 <div> County: Greenbrier SRF #C: 544449G NPDES #WV: 0089010 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Needs Category: I,IIIB,IVA,IVB,XII </div>	<div>\$4,048,917</div>	<div>\$5,296,145</div>	Problem Failing septic systems & a failing system that is under DEP order in the Meadowbrook Estates subdivision Solution Extend sewer service to unserved areas. Replace failing package plant (Meadowbrook Estates)
Points <div>180.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>7</div>	Elkins, City of <div> County: Randolph SRF #C: 544067 NPDES #WV: 0020028 Binding Date: 12/31/2014 Needs Category: VA </div>	<div>\$3,132,600</div>	<div>\$3,132,600</div>	Problem Excessive I/I and CSO system under EPA compliance schedule. Solution Rehabilitate collection system and separate combined sewers
Points <div>170.00</div>				
Rank <div>8</div>	Logan, City of (Phase III Stollings) <div> County: Logan SRF #C: 544364-03 NPDES #WV: 0033821 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: IVA.IVB </div>	<div>\$11,006,960</div>	<div>\$12,006,960</div>	Problem Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas Solution Extend sewer service to unserved areas and eliminate direct discharges.
Points <div>170.00</div>				
Rank <div>9</div>	Morgantown, City of (Star City TP/Poponoe Run Upgrades) <div> County: Monongalia SRF #C: 544520 NPDES #WV: 0023124 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: I.IVB </div>	<div>\$40,000,000</div>	<div>\$75,000,000</div>	Problem Excessive I/I and antiquated equipment, insufficient digester capacity in Pocono Run Solution Replace RBC's with activated sludge and clarifiers, upgrade and expand digesters, upgrade Pocono Run interceptor and provide storage for CSO discharges
Points <div>170.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 10	Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Rhodell) County: Raleigh SRF #: 547151 NPDES #WV: 0082309 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 150.00 Needs Category: XII	\$2,010,200	\$4,510,200	Problem Failing septic systems and direct discharges to Stonecoal & Tommy Creeks Solution Collection system and WWTP to service Rhodell area
Rank 11	Pocahontas PSD (Snowshoe/Linwood Area) County: Pocahontas SRF #: 544415 NPDES #WV: 0023311 Binding Date: 12/31/2014 Points 150.00 Needs Category: I,II,IVA,IVB	\$27,159,990	\$27,234,990	Problem Orders from DEP and PSC to upgrade existing facilities and provide a regional facility Solution Provide regional system in the Valley & extend service to unserved areas
Rank 12	Belle, Town of (Phase III) County: Kanawha SRF #: 544177-04 NPDES #WV: 0021946 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 145.00 Needs Category: I	\$3,599,500	\$4,599,500	Problem Antiquated WWTP not meeting permit requirements Solution 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
Rank <div>13</div>	New Haven PSD <div> County: <div>Fayette</div> SRF #C: <div>547850</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0000000</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>XII</div> </div>	<div>\$3,282,319</div>	<div>\$3,302,319</div>	Problem <div>No existing wastewater collection/treatment system</div> Solution <div>Construct a decentralized wastewater collection and treatment system, new septic tanks installed</div>
Points <div>145.00</div>				
Rank <div>14</div>	Nutter Fort <div> County: <div>Harrison</div> SRF #C: <div>544314</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0010090</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIA,VI</div> </div>	<div>\$1,549,800</div>	<div>\$1,549,800</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I, direct discharge</div> Solution <div>Corrective measures including replacement for existing sewer, install storm sewers, flow meter.</div>
Points <div>145.00</div>				
Rank <div>15</div>	Philippi, City of <div> County: <div>Barbour</div> SRF #C: <div>544355</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0021857</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>VA</div> </div>	<div>\$5,102,000</div>	<div>\$5,102,000</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I in combined sewers</div> Solution <div>Separate portion of collection system in northern section of city and replace North lift station force main</div>
Points <div>145.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>16</div>	Point Pleasant, City of (Phase II) <div> County: Mason SRF #C: 544082-02 NPDES #WV: 0022039 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: VA </div>	<div>\$1,662,000</div>	<div>\$1,662,000</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I</div> Solution <div>Improvements to City's combined sewer system</div>
Points <div>145.00</div>				
Rank <div>17</div>	Ripley, City of <div> County: Jackson SRF #C: 544526 NPDES #WV: 0027791 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB </div>	<div>\$12,790,000</div>	<div>\$13,415,000</div>	Problem <div>Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, excessive I/I</div> Solution <div>I/I study, interim measures to meet limits; replace a portion of the collection system & pump stations. Select site for regional WWTP</div>
Points <div>145.00</div>				
Rank <div>18</div>	Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IV Thomas Hollow Rd) <div> County: Kanawha SRF #C: 547251 NPDES #WV: 0035068 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: XII </div>	<div>\$3,415,000</div>	<div>\$3,445,000</div>	Problem <div>Direct discharge & failing septic systems along Thomas Hollow near Tornado</div> Solution <div>Construct a decentralized treatment system with a recirculating sand filter with subsurface discharge & a new gravity collection system.</div>
Points <div>140.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 19	Auburn, Town of County: Ritchie SRF #C: 547201 NPDES #WV: 0000000 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 135.00 Needs Category: XII	\$2,714,725	\$2,714,725	Problem Entire community without a collection and treatment system. Direct discharges causing documented water quality violations. Solution New decentralized sewer system
Rank 20	New Creek PSD County: Mineral SRF #C: 544527 NPDES #WV: 0085456 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 135.00 Needs Category: IVA.IVB	\$6,716,000	\$6,716,000	Problem 150 failing septic tanks/soil absorption systems along New Creek (trout stream) and Limestone Run which are on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform Solution Providing a new gravity sewer system to replace failing septic tanks
Rank 21	Nitro County: Kanawha/Pu SRF #C: 544273 NPDES #WV: 0023299 Binding Date: 9/30/2014 Points 135.00 Needs Category: I.IIIA.IIIB.IVA	\$8,350,000	\$8,350,000	Problem Interceptor in poor condition, needs relined, pump station parts not available needs replaced, adjacent areas needs sewer service, belt press too small Solution Sewer extension, replace pump stations, sewer separation, reline sewer, new belt press

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>22</div>	Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Marsh Fork) <div> County: Raleigh SRF #C: 544476 NPDES #WV: 0082309 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: I.IVA.IVB </div>	<div>\$25,100,000</div>	<div>\$25,100,000</div>	Problem The current service area utilizes straight pipes and insufficient septic tanks. Solution Construct WWTP and collection system to remove these insufficiencies.
Points <div>130.00</div>				
Rank <div>23</div>	Keyser, City of <div> County: Mineral SRF #C: 544023-03 NPDES #WV: 0084042 Binding Date: 9/30/2014 Needs Category: II </div>	<div>\$20,400,000</div>	<div>\$30,724,500</div>	Problem Working toward Chesapeake Bay compliance Solution Construct new WWTP that will meet nutrient criteria
Points <div>130.00</div>				
Rank <div>24</div>	Benwood, City of (Phase I) <div> County: Marshall SRF #C: 544531 NPDES #WV: 0020648 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: VA </div>	<div>\$1,665,000</div>	<div>\$3,665,000</div>	Problem Excessive I/I Solution Separation of storm and sanitary sewers
Points <div>125.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>25</div>	North Beckley PSD (Phase IIIB Piney View) <div> County: Raleigh SRF #C: 544522 NPDES #WV: 0027740 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$4,776,250</div>	<div>\$4,786,250</div>	Problem 142 failing septic tanks/soil absorption systems along Piney Creek drainage which is on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform Solution Providing a new gravity sewer system to replace failing septic tanks
Points <div>125.00</div>				
Rank <div>26</div>	Parsons, City of <div> County: Tucker SRF #C: 544311 NPDES #WV: 0022063 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$500,000</div>	<div>\$500,000</div>	Problem Overflows in the system Solution Separate storm water and sanitary sewer flows
Points <div>125.00</div>				
Rank <div>27</div>	Pea Ridge PSD (Green Bottom) <div> County: Cabell SRF #C: 544442 NPDES #WV: 0027413 Binding Date: 9/30/2014 Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$9,926,000</div>	<div>\$10,426,000</div>	Problem 171 customers with failing septic systems in Green Bottom Solution The failing septic systems will be replaced by a sewer collection system and WWTP. The treatment plant will also treat wastewater from the Alcon manufacturing facility.
Points <div>125.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>28</div>	Boone County PSD (West Madison/Danville) County: <div>Boone</div> SRF #C: <div>544494</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0035939</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2015</div> Points <div>120.00</div> Needs Category: <div>I.IIIB</div>	<div>\$2,900,000</div>	<div>\$4,370,000</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I, antiquated equipment at WWTP</div> Solution <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>
Rank <div>29</div>	Chapmanville, Town of (Hidden Valley/Sunset Court) County: <div>Logan</div> SRF #C: <div>544147</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024678</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2015</div> Points <div>120.00</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA, IVB</div>	<div>\$5,835,000</div>	<div>\$5,865,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas. Not consistently meeting the NPDES permit requirements at the WWTP.</div> Solution <div>Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site wastewater treatment systems. Upgrade the WWTP to handle more flow and meet the NPDES requirements.</div>
Rank <div>30</div>	Cottageville PSD County: <div>Jackson</div> SRF #C: <div>544499</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0044466</div> Binding Date: <div>12/31/2014</div> Points <div>120.00</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$1,200,000</div>	<div>\$2,700,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas</div> Solution <div>Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site wastewater treatment systems</div>

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>31</div>	Delbarton, Town of <div> County: <div>Mingo</div> SRF #C: <div>544201</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0042374</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,000,000</div>	<div>\$5,181,000</div>	Problem <div>200 customers with failing septic systems in the Ragland area.</div> Solution <div>Construct new gravity collection system.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>32</div>	Logan County PSD (Phase III B1) <div> County: <div>Logan</div> SRF #C: <div>544460-01</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0033821</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,340,000</div>	<div>\$4,570,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas</div> Solution <div>Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site wastewater treatment systems</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>33</div>	Logan County PSD (Phase III B2) <div> County: <div>Logan</div> SRF #C: <div>544460-02</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0033821</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,600,000</div>	<div>\$4,900,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic system and direct discharges from unserved areas</div> Solution <div>Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site wastewater treatment systems</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>34</div>	Logan County PSD (Phase III B3) <div> County: <div>Logan</div> SRF #C: <div>544460-03</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0033821</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,580,000</div>	<div>\$4,780,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic tanks and on-site treatment systems</div> Solution <div>Extend sewer service to approximately 115 customers in this unserved area.</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>35</div>	Matewan, Town of (Red Jacket) <div> County: <div>Mingo</div> SRF #C: <div>544474</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024783</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$3,000,000</div>	<div>\$5,380,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing vacuum collection system and on-site systems</div> Solution <div>New gravity system</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>36</div>	McDowell County PSD (Coalwood) <div> County: <div>McDowell</div> SRF #C: <div>544462</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0000000</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$1,372,500</div>	<div>\$4,372,500</div>	Problem <div>Collection System discharging untreated sewage into local waterways</div> Solution <div>Construct a WWTP and upgrade portions of the collection system</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>37</div>	McDowell County PSD (laeger-Phase I) County: <div>Mingo</div> SRF #C: <div>544513</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0115011</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$5,710,000</div>	<div>\$6,400,000</div>	Problem <div>130 customers with failing septic systems in the laeger area</div> Solution <div>New collection system and WWTP</div>
Points <div>120.00</div>				
Rank <div>38</div>	Brooke County PSD (Phase III Eldersville Rd) County: <div>Brooke</div> SRF #C: <div>544006-03</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0084182</div> Binding Date: <div>9/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA, IVB</div>	<div>\$1,000,000</div>	<div>\$2,500,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic systems</div> Solution <div>New gravity system to serve 89 customers in the areas of St. Johns Rd & Eldersville Rd</div>
Points <div>115.00</div>				
Rank <div>39</div>	Wellsburg, City of County: <div>Brooke</div> SRF #C: <div>5444362</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0026832</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>VA</div>	<div>\$4,000,000</div>	<div>\$4,000,000</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I - CSO</div> Solution <div>Separation of storm and sanitary sewers</div>
Points <div>115.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>40</div>	Charleston, City of (Porter Hollow) <div> County: <div>Kanawha</div> SRF #C: <div>544270</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0023205</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$15,884,030</div>	<div>\$15,884,030</div>	Problem <div>Combined sewer system</div> Solution <div>Replace/rehab areas of the collection system in compliance with the LTCP</div>
Points <div>110.00</div>				
Rank <div>41</div>	Shady Spring PSD (Phase II Cool Ridge/Flat Top) <div> County: <div>Raleigh</div> SRF #C: <div>544300-02</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0010575</div> Binding Date: <div>12/31/2014</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA.IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$8,600,858</div>	<div>\$8,605,858</div>	Problem <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> Solution <div>Providing a new pressure sewer system to replace failing septic tanks serving 317 customers</div>
Points <div>105.00</div>				
Rank <div>42</div>	Gilbert, Town of (Justice) <div> County: <div>Mingo</div> SRF #C: <div>544502</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0071820</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA.IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$4,398,000</div>	<div>\$4,428,000</div>	Problem <div>83 customers with failing septic systems in the Justice area.</div> Solution <div>Extend sewer service to unserved area</div>
Points <div>100.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>43</div>	Mason, Town of <div> County: Mason SRF #C: C544452-02 NPDES #WV: 0021849 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB </div>	<div>\$2,711,000</div>	<div>\$3,461,000</div>	Problem DEP Consent Order, improve WWTP effluent & efficiency, and decrease I/I Solution Upgrade WWTP, rehabilitate 2 pump stations and rehab/replace 64 manholes
Points <div>100.00</div>				
Rank <div>44</div>	Page Kincaid PSD <div> County: Fayette SRF #C: 544396 NPDES #WV: 0084425 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: I, IVA </div>	<div>\$800,000</div>	<div>\$3,000,000</div>	Problem Inadequate private septic systems, on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform Solution New service to the Robinson area.
Points <div>100.00</div>				
Rank <div>45</div>	Pennsboro, City of <div> County: Ritchie SRF #C: 544409-03 NPDES #WV: 0025739 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: I </div>	<div>\$2,672,600</div>	<div>\$5,172,600</div>	Problem WWTP unable to meet permit limits and under DEP order Solution Install SBR and conversion of existing units to sludge holding tanks
Points <div>100.00</div>				

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>46</div>	Shady Spring PSD (Pluto) <div> County: <div>Raleigh</div> SRF #C: <div>544410</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0080403</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,959,500</div>	<div>\$2,964,500</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic tanks/leachfields along Glade Creek which is on the 303(d) list for impaired streams for Fecal Coliform.</div> Solution <div>Providing a new pressure sewer system to replace failing septic tanks serving 72 customers</div>
Points <div>100.00</div>				
Rank <div>47</div>	Westover, City of <div> County: <div>Monongalia</div> SRF #C: <div>544435</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024449</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA,IVB,V</div> </div>	<div>\$2,349,000</div>	<div>\$2,364,000</div>	Problem <div>Failing septic systems and working toward CSO compliance</div> Solution <div>Extend sewer service to unserved areas and development of a CSO Long-Term Control Plan and system mapping</div>
Points <div>100.00</div>				
Rank <div>48</div>	Center PSD <div> County: <div>Wyoming</div> SRF #C: <div>544268-01</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0027138</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$3,634,000</div>	<div>\$3,664,000</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I, deterioration of existing collection system</div> Solution <div>Complete I/I study and perform recommended upgrades to the sewer system</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>49</div>	Gary, City of <div> County: <div>McDowell</div> SRF #C: <div>544501</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0020044</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$483,000</div>	<div>\$483,000</div>	Problem <div>DEP consent order, excessive I/I, and deteriorated existing system</div> Solution <div>Repair/replace existing WWTP along with collection mains to minimize I & I</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				
Rank <div>50</div>	Greater Paw Paw PSD (Phase II) <div> County: <div>Marion</div> SRF #C: <div>544509</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0084310</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>V</div> </div>	<div>\$2,915,000</div>	<div>\$2,930,000</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I & construct Phase II of the LTCP to reduce CSO outfalls</div> Solution <div>Replace portions of collection system in Fairview and Orchard Hill areas</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				
Rank <div>51</div>	Green Valley Glenwood PSD <div> County: <div>Mercer</div> SRF #C: <div>544017</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0083186</div> Binding Date: <div>9/30/2014</div> Needs Category: <div>VIB</div> </div>	<div>\$1,140,000</div>	<div>\$1,140,000</div>	Problem <div>DEP order to eliminate SSO</div> Solution <div>Construct pump station & force main to send flow to UV disinfection</div>
Points <div>95.00</div>				

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>52</div>	Mannington <div> County: Marion SRF #C: 544511 NPDES #WV: 0024953 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: I,II,IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$2,850,000</div>	<div>\$4,570,000</div>	Problem Inadequate capacity due to additional new customers Solution Upgrade WWTP and extend sewer system to serve 38 customers
Points <div>95.00</div>				
Rank <div>53</div>	Pratt, Town of <div> County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544464 NPDES #WV: 0021784 Binding Date: 9/30/2014 Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB,IVA </div>	<div>\$1,434,700</div>	<div>\$1,434,700</div>	Problem Pump stations are unreliable, need to reduce I/I from their system and make improvements at the WWTP to comply with order # 6464 Solution Rehab/abandoned pump stations and manholes and install necessary equipment at the WWTP
Points <div>95.00</div>				
Rank <div>54</div>	Welch, City of (North Welch) <div> County: McDowell SRF #C: 544217 NPDES #WV: 0024589 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: IIIB, IVA, IVB </div>	<div>\$3,838,824</div>	<div>\$5,089,824</div>	Problem Unserved area & existing collection system near failing septic systems. Flow meter not functional. Solution WWTP collection system extension to serve 98 new customers
Points <div>95.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>55</div>	West Union, Town of (Wabash Area) County: <div>Doddridge</div> SRF #C: <div>544441</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0020109</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Points <div>95.00</div> Needs Category: <div>V</div>	<div>\$1,276,800</div>	<div>\$2,776,800</div>	Problem <div>Working toward CSO compliance</div> Solution <div>Construction of new sanitary sewer system</div>
Rank <div>56</div>	Oceana, Town of County: <div>McDowell</div> SRF #C: <div>544525</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024431</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Points <div>90.00</div> Needs Category: <div>II</div>	<div>\$5,370,250</div>	<div>\$5,370,250</div>	Problem <div>Equipment failure, exceeding over 90% rated permitted capacity</div> Solution <div>Increase the existing 500,000 gallons per day (gpd) wastewater treatment plant to 750,000 gpd.</div>
Rank <div>57</div>	Durbin, Town of County: <div>Pocahontas</div> SRF #C: <div>544334</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024571</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Points <div>85.00</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IVA,IVB</div>	<div>\$523,805</div>	<div>\$2,623,805</div>	Problem <div>Separate storm & sanitary systems old & deteriorated, UV system needs replaced</div> Solution <div>Upgrade sewage treatment plant, replace disinfection system, replace storm and sanitary mains</div>

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>58</div>	Huntington, City of (13th St) <div> County: Cabell SRF #C: 544443 NPDES #WV: 0023159 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: I,IIIB,VI </div>	<div>\$11,996,656</div>	<div>\$11,996,656</div>	Problem Pump station is 50 years old, suffering pipe failures, 54" mainline & magnetic meter is failing due to hydrogen sulfide, WWTP effluent line has buckled, existing fly ash lagoon is being closed out Solution Rehabilitate the 13 St pump station, replace 230' of 54" in force main and the magnetic meter, replace the WWTP outfall/diffuser & construct bio-retention basin to replace the fly ash lagoon.
Points <div>85.00</div>				
Rank <div>59</div>	Masontown, Town of <div> County: Preston SRF #C: 544124 NPDES #WV: 0015627 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Needs Category: I,II </div>	<div>\$7,680,000</div>	<div>\$9,280,000</div>	Problem Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements Solution Upgrade existing WWTP
Points <div>85.00</div>				
Rank <div>60</div>	Montgomery, 6th Avenue (Interceptors) <div> County: Fayette SRF #C: 544297 NPDES #WV: 0020261 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Needs Category: IIIB </div>	<div>\$779,324</div>	<div>\$782,324</div>	Problem Failing septic systems and working toward CSO compliance, unsafe location Solution Upgrade/relocate pumping station, provide energy savings and safer location.
Points <div>85.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 61	Beckley, City of (Phase IIIB Mool & Koch Ave) County: Raleigh SRF #C: 544491 NPDES #WV: 0023183 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 75.00 Needs Category: VA	\$3,575,600	\$3,602,600	Problem Excessive I/I Solution New sanitary sewers, rehab existing sewers
Rank 62	Montgomery, City of (CS Rehab) County: Fayette SRF #C: 544515 NPDES #WV: 0020621 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 75.00 Needs Category: IIIA	\$565,000	\$2,065,000	Problem Excessive I/I Solution Rehabilitate existing system
Rank 63	Rowlesburg, Town of County: Preston SRF #C: 544307 NPDES #WV: 0027481 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 75.00 Needs Category: I,IIIA,IVA,IVB,VI	\$7,778,000	\$8,778,000	Problem Antiquated WWTP, Excessive I/I Solution Install new chlorine/dechlor station, pond liners, sludge removal, aeration system, replace 3 pump stations, and replace 25,000 LF of sewer.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 64	Cedar Grove, Town of County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544280-02 NPDES #WV: 0035637 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 70.00 Needs Category: IIIB,VA	\$500,000	\$1,500,000	Problem Severe I/I, working towards CSO compliance Solution Line existing clay sewer lines, smoke test existing sewers & prepare CSO Long-Term Control Plan
Rank 65	Deckers Creek PSD County: Monongalia SRF #C: 544252 NPDES #WV: 0040517 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 70.00 Needs Category: IIIA	\$2,585,000	\$2,585,000	Problem Excessive I/I Solution Rehab/Replace areas of the collection system
Rank 66	Mingo County PSD (Chattaroy) County: Mingo SRF #C: 544312 NPDES #WV: 0037699 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 70.00 Needs Category: IIIB,IVA,IVB	\$1,013,000	\$2,513,000	Problem Failing septic systems & sections of existing collection system are near collapse Solution Extend sewer service to approximately 51 customers & replace sections of existing system.

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 67	Montgomery, City of (WWTP Improvements) County: Fayette SRF #C: 544516 NPDES #WV: 0020621 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 70.00 Needs Category: I	\$5,335,000	\$6,835,000	Problem WWTP is unable to handle peak flows Solution Construct two new clarifiers & upgrade the disinfection system
Rank 68	Oak Hill, City of County: Fayette SRF #C: 544535 NPDES #WV: 0022028 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Points 70.00 Needs Category: I.IIIA	\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000	Problem Excessive I/I, causing bypasses at the WWTP Solution Upgrade both WWTP's and repair and/or replace collection system
Rank 69	Franklin, Town of County: Pendleton SRF #C: 544289 NPDES #WV: 0024970 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Points 60.00 Needs Category: I.IIIA	\$1,140,900	\$3,040,900	Problem Failing septic systems, Excessive I/I, collection lines are failing Solution Upgrade WWTP, new pump station, replace existing liners, replace floating baffles, upgrade chlorination system, bar screen improvements, new manholes & sewer line

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>70</div>	Berkeley County PSSD (WWTP Upgrades) <div> County: <div>Berkeley</div> SRF #C: <div>544492</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0082759</div> Binding Date: <div>9/30/2014</div> Needs Category: <div>II</div> </div>	<div>\$37,072,922</div>	<div>\$47,738,000</div>	Problem Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient discharge requirements Solution Upgrade (4) WWTPs to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient discharge requirements
Points <div>55.00</div>				
Rank <div>71</div>	Culloden PSD <div> County: <div>Cabell</div> SRF #C: <div>544360</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0027731</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIB,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$1,790,313</div>	<div>\$3,790,313</div>	Problem Not connected to public collection and treatment system. Solution Extend CS to serve 117 customers in the Holly Brook, Martin Lane, Pine Grove, Columbia Road, and Cloverleaf Circle areas.
Points <div>55.00</div>				
Rank <div>72</div>	St. Albans <div> County: <div>Kanawha</div> SRF #C: <div>544489</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0023175</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IVA</div> </div>	<div>\$4,447,980</div>	<div>\$4,447,980</div>	Problem Aged UV disinfection system has become problematic, aged problematic sludge press & digester aeration equipment, aged problematic lift stations Solution Improve plant electrical efficiency, new disinfection system, sludge press, aeration equipment, replace 6 lift stations, force mains
Points <div>55.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>73</div>	Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD <div> County: <div>Jefferson</div> SRF #C: <div>544504</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0039136</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>I</div> </div>	<div>\$2,011,695</div>	<div>\$2,011,695</div>	Problem <div>Replace aging critical assets identified in the Asset Management Plan</div> Solution <div>Upgrade existing system, (i.e. blowers, diffusers, disinfection, & electrical controls)</div>
Points <div>50.00</div>				
Rank <div>74</div>	Meadow Creek PSD <div> County: <div>Summers</div> SRF #C: <div>544514</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0055074</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>I,IVA,IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$570,000</div>	<div>\$2,348,112</div>	Problem <div>Deteriorated WWTP, customers not connected to public collection and treatment system.</div> Solution <div>Replace WWTP and extend CS to serve 24 customers.</div>
Points <div>50.00</div>				
Rank <div>75</div>	Paden City <div> County: <div>Wetzel/Tyler</div> SRF #C: <div>544418</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0020613</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIA</div> </div>	<div>\$2,919,480</div>	<div>\$2,919,480</div>	Problem <div>Excessive I/I</div> Solution <div>Reduce I/I, replace a portion of existing sewer system, rehabilitate manholes, separate storm structures</div>
Points <div>50.00</div>				

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 76	Cairo, Town of County: Ritchie SRF #C: 547101 NPDES #WV: 0084212 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 45.00 Needs Category: I.IIIA	\$1,503,325	\$2,503,325	Problem Failing WWTP and Pumping equipment Solution Build a new WWTP, rehabilitate 6 pump stations, replace manholes and part of gravity sewer.
Rank 77	Matewan, Town of (WWTP replacement) County: Mingo SRF #C: 544534 NPDES #WV: 0024783 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 45.00 Needs Category: I	\$6,135,000	\$6,160,000	Problem DEP Enforcement Action; unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements Solution Upgrade WWTP
Rank 78	Mount Zion PSD County: Calhoun SRF #C: 544521 NPDES #WV: 0101702 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 45.00 Needs Category: I.IIIB	\$1,035,000	\$1,035,000	Problem Antiquated WWTP and pump stations Solution Construct new WWTP, rehabilitate pump stations and upgrade portion of collection system

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>79</div>	Preston County Sewer PSD (Bruceton Mills) County: <div>Preston</div> SRF #C: <div>544538</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0025101</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Points <div>45.00</div> Needs Category: <div>I.IIIB</div>	<div>\$2,867,500</div>	<div>\$2,872,500</div>	Problem Antiquated equipment at both the WWTP and Brandonville pump station Solution Upgrade WWTP and pump station
Rank <div>80</div>	West Dunbar PSD County: <div>Kanawha</div> SRF #C: <div>544168</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0089591</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Points <div>45.00</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIA, IIIB</div>	<div>\$6,000,000</div>	<div>\$7,500,000</div>	Problem Excessive I/I Solution Rehabilitate all existing pump stations & replace/rehab all VCP lines
Rank <div>81</div>	Alderson, Town of County: <div>Greenbrier</div> SRF #C: <div>544034</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0024881</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2015</div> Points <div>40.00</div> Needs Category: <div>I,II,IIIB</div>	<div>\$3,770,229</div>	<div>\$5,154,564</div>	Problem Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, need to comply with Greenbrier River restoration plan and failing lift stations beyond useful life. Solution Add tertiary treatment process for phosphorus, add UV disinfection, and replace 3 lift stations.

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>82</div>	Petersburg, City of <div> County: <div>Grant</div> SRF #C: <div>544536</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0021792</div> Binding Date: <div>12/31/2014</div> Needs Category: <div>II</div> </div>	<div>\$4,682,203</div>	<div>\$8,658,475</div>	Problem <div>Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES permit requirements, need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient discharge requirements</div> Solution <div>Retrofit existing oxidation ditches and adding a 4th oxidation ditch & filters</div>
Points <div>40.00</div>				
Rank <div>83</div>	Williamstown (CS Rehab) <div> County: <div>Wood</div> SRF #C: <div>544386</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0022071</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IIIB</div> </div>	<div>\$295,000</div>	<div>\$300,000</div>	Problem <div>Four problematic sewer lines that cross under the CSX railroad</div> Solution <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>
Points <div>40.00</div>				
Rank <div>84</div>	White Sulphur Springs, City of <div> County: <div>Greenbrier</div> SRF #C: <div>544035</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0084000</div> Binding Date: <div>3/31/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>I,II</div> </div>	<div>\$1,730,760</div>	<div>\$2,889,600</div>	Problem <div>Existing WWTP can't meet Greenbrier River phosphorus requirements.</div> Solution <div>Add phosphorus removal process to WWTP</div>
Points <div>30.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 85	Beverly, Town of County: Randolph SRF #C: 544336-02 NPDES #WV: 0045136 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 25.00 Needs Category: I.IIIA	\$5,300,000	\$6,905,390	Problem WWTP exceeding design flow because of excessive I/I and pumping stations are deteriorated. Solution Upgrade existing WWTP increase capacity to 500,000 GPD, rehab existing pump stations
Rank 86	Central Boaz PSD County: Wood SRF #C: 544059 NPDES #WV: 0084221 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 25.00 Needs Category: IVA.IVB	\$2,059,400	\$2,069,400	Problem Unserved area along WV RT 14 and existing WWTP aeration & decanting systems aren't functioning properly & UV disinfection has reached the end of its useful life. Solution Construct a pressure sewer system to serve the WV RT 14 area, upgrade the existing WWTP and replace vacuum pits.
Rank 87	Colfax PSD County: Marion SRF #C: 544333 NPDES #WV: 0032131 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Points 25.00 Needs Category: IIIA.IVA.IVB	\$641,500	\$2,141,500	Problem WWTP on unstable ground, excessive I/I, overflows during high flow periods Solution Construct new sanitary sewer system; abandon WWTP and connect the system to Kingmill Valley PSD

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 88	Greater Harrison County PSD (Phase II/Rt. 73) County: Harrison SRF #C: 544451 NPDES #WV: 0084301 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Points 25.00 Needs Category: I.IVA.IVB	\$21,071,600	\$21,571,600	Problem Failing package plant and severe I/I issues Solution Construct new WWTP and collection system
Rank 89	Malden PSD County: Kanawha SRF #C: 544480 NPDES #WV: 0050610 Binding Date: 3/31/2015 Points 25.00 Needs Category: I.IIIA.IIIB	\$20,070,238	\$20,107,000	Problem Inadequate capacity to treat peak flows, excessive I/I, deteriorated force mains. Under Consent Order. Solution Construct a new WWTP, install new force mains, & line existing gravity sewers to eliminate I/I
Rank 90	Morgantown, City of (Sunshine Estates) County: Monongalia SRF #C: 544518 NPDES #WV: 0083071 Binding Date: 9/30/2014 Points 25.00 Needs Category: IVA.IVB	\$662,300	\$1,640,000	Problem Failing package plant in Sunshine Estates area. Solution Extension to eliminate the package plant and upgrade collection system

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>91</div>	Vienna <div> County: <div>Wood</div> SRF #C: <div>544233</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0023221</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$2,676,000</div>	<div>\$2,676,000</div>	Problem <div>Lift station and package plant maintenance issues</div> Solution <div>Extension of service along 46th Street and Rosmar Rd. in order to eliminate a package plant and 3 lift stations.</div>
Points <div>25.00</div>				
Rank <div>92</div>	Center PSD <div> County: <div>Wyoming</div> SRF #C: <div>544268-02</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0027138</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA.IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$1,485,000</div>	<div>\$9,805,000</div>	Problem <div>150 additional customers needs sewer service</div> Solution <div>Sewer collection system extension and pump stations, as needed to serve 150 new customers.</div>
Points <div>20.00</div>				
Rank <div>93</div>	Morgantown, City of (Bakers Ridge) <div> County: <div>Monongalia</div> SRF #C: <div>544512</div> NPDES #WV: <div>0023124</div> Binding Date: <div>6/30/2015</div> Needs Category: <div>IVA.IVB</div> </div>	<div>\$3,380,000</div>	<div>\$5,500,000</div>	Problem <div>Package plants not meeting permit limits</div> Solution <div>Extend collection system to eliminate the package plants</div>
Points <div>20.00</div>				

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <div>94</div>	Oakvale Road PSD <div> County: Mercer SRF #C: 544524 NPDES #WV: 0080489 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$1,500,000</div>	<div>\$4,484,000</div>	Problem Not connected to public collection and treatment system. Solution 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.
Points <div>20.00</div>				
Rank <div>95</div>	Sun Valley PSD <div> County: Harrison SRF #C: 544359 NPDES #WV: 0010466 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: IVA, IVB </div>	<div>\$3,020,000</div>	<div>\$3,040,000</div>	Problem Not connected to public collection and treatment system. Solution Extend CS to serve 95 customers in the Davisson Run, Old Davisson Run, and Wilsonburg areas.
Points <div>20.00</div>				
Rank <div>96</div>	Hancock PSD <div> County: Hancock SRF #C: 544431 NPDES #WV: 0105848 Binding Date: 6/30/2015 Needs Category: IVA,IVB </div>	<div>\$5,500,000</div>	<div>\$6,300,000</div>	Problem Unserved area in Chester Solution Sewer extension to 160 customers along US Rt. 30
Points <div>00.00</div>				

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

Rank / Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank <input type="text" value="97"/>	Northern Wayne County PSD (Dock's Creek) County: <input type="text" value="Wayne"/> SRF #C: <input type="text" value="544402"/> NPDES #WV: <input type="text" value="0089621"/> Binding Date: <input type="text" value="6/30/2015"/> Points <input type="text" value="00.00"/>	<input type="text" value="\$3,203,588"/>	<input type="text" value="\$4,203,588"/>	Problem <input type="text" value="Undersized/high maintenance grinder system & failing septic systems."/> Solution <input type="text" value="Replace system with gravity collection & pick up 256 new customers"/>
	Needs Category: <input type="text" value="IVA,IVB"/>			

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS
BY QUARTER

Appendix B - Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality
Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2014 Grant

Name	Equiv.	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
Keyser Ronceverte	N	Ch. Bay Upgrade		D2	20,400			
	N	Greenbrier River Upgrade		D3		17,863		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
Total Projects and Admin					20,400	17,863	0	0

Federal Share (0.8333)					\$16,999.32	14,885	0	0	31,885
State Share (0.1667)					\$3,400.68	2,978	0	0	6,378
Total**					\$20,400.00	17,863	0	0	38,263

Payment Schedule for the CWSRF Program: CS-540001-13

Federal Quarter	Payment Date	CWSRF Amount	Cumulative Amount
		\$21,856,000	\$21,856,000

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 2015 Intended Use Plan

Name	Equiv.	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
Frankfort PSD	N	Coll. Sys. Ext.	411-02	D3	17,350			
Green Valley/Glenwood PSD	N	WWTP Upgrade	17	D3		1,135		
Keyser	N	C. Bay WWTP	023-03	D2	20,400			
Pea Ridge PSD	N	Coll. Sys. Ext./WWTP	442	D3			9,926	
Pratt	N	Coll. Sys. Upgrade	464	D3	1,434			
Ronceverte	N	Greenbrier R. WWTP	267	D3		17,863		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
NPS - Agriculture	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	25	25	25	
NPS - Onsite	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	300			
sub-total					39,509	19,023	9,951	0
grand total								68,483

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

Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway

R - refinancing

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC HEARING
SUMMARY

IUP Public Hearing Minutes

Samme Gee: If the bond issue would be slightly larger that may increase the amount coming back?

Kathy Emery: Yes

Samme Gee: Or reduce the amount of the loans that have existing binding commitments.

Kathy Emery: It would be both. It would increase the amount that we have coming back in because we have funded projects like Shepherdstown, Charles Town, and Warm Springs so we would get more of the debt back from them from the initial loan and then reduce the ones on the IUP like Keyser and Ronceverte ones we've already issued binding commitments to.

Jeff Brady: Will each project get an equal percentage?

Dan Ferrell: Is there an update on when the 245 is going? Do we have any more than this fall, which is the last I heard? Am I allowed to ask a question like this?

Kathy Emery: what I understand is they are proceeding on moving on the bond issue in July so I am not sure how long it will take once they actually start that process. So if they start in July I would think they would be finished in September, October I'm not sure how long that process takes. Do you have any idea Samme?

Samme Gee: I think the big question is going be the ones that the bonds are being paid back from lottery dollars. And the question will be whether are the under writers and the financial advisors required the 2014 audit for the lottery and also the rating agencies or whether they are able the 2013 audited financials. So I think the audit question will be if they can use the 2013 audited financials then they should be able to get it done by September. If there has to be a real audit that may add another month to it. And I'm only giving you a schedule based on what I'm feeling sir.

Dan Ferrell: You're staying with the 4,000 gallons. Everything is based on the 4,000 gallons. The rates?

Kathy Emery: Yes

John Tingley: What are we going to be looking for as documentation for public support?

Kathy Emery: They can have a public meeting; they can have signatures from residents in the communities, because most of these communities are very small. It should not be difficult for those types of communities to get some type of documentation on what the proposed rates are going to be and that they are willing to do this. We don't want to get to the end of the project,

like we have previously where everything is designed, everything is ready to go, and there is an outcry from the community that they don't want the project and they are pulling back.

Dan Ferrell: Can you use the bond bans if you don't have money available for next year. You see what I'm saying don't you? You write a ban knowing that you are in the negative this coming year, not really because you are going to cash flow. Can you write a ban if your project is ready?

Kathy Emery: We can but it would have to be very very limited. I would have to look at the future year's cash flow to see how much we can afford to do because I can only really look at how much we are getting in from our principal and interest repayments. I would not be able to commit higher than that because I have no way of knowing what our future grants or state match amounts are going to be. So it's possible, but it's going to be a limited number of projects we can do that on.

Dan Ferrell: So if you are further into the year and you are seeing how your cash flow is working that may be a possibility of moving quicker if you have a project that meets the readiness to proceed that may be one you guys could consider a ban to move that one along to start the public service commission process.

Kathy Emery: Yes we could consider that.

Dan Ferrell: I do want to comment on how well I think the program is run. I do wish the federal government would have given more money to the Clean Water SRF because I think we are making a lot of progress around the state. And I appreciate from my clients point of view all the good we have been able to do with your all's help and I wanted that to be on the record.

Public Hearing Sign In Sheet

Topic: CWSRF IUP Public Hearing

Date, Time & Location: June 19, 2014 - 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)	Address	Organization	Phone/Fax	E-mail	Comment Yes/No
Jeff Brady		DEP	926-0499 x141	jefferson.e.brady@wv.gov	No
Daniel Ferrell		Thruslow	(304) 326-6135	Dferrell@Thruslowinc.com	Yes.
Ric Bencicotti		DEP	926-0499 x1342	Richard.O.Bencicotti@wv.gov	No
David Byrd		DEP	926-0499 x1593	David.W.Byrd@wv.gov	No
John Rogers		DEP	926-0499 x1602	John.R.Rogers@wv.gov	No
Thomas Casad		DEP	" x1048	Thomas.A.Casad@wv.gov	No
Tina Perdue		DEP	x1604	Tina.J.Perdue@wv.gov	No
John Tingley		DEP	x1603	John.L.Tingley@wv.gov	No
Rose Brodersen		DEP	x1608	Rosalie.M.Brodersen@wv.gov	No
Samme Coee		Tacksonkelly LLC	304 340138 7272	Syone@tacksonkelly.com	No
Kathy Emery		DEP	x1596	Kathryn.A.Emery@wv.gov	No
Dugdale		DEP			No

APPENDIX E

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY
COUNTY AND MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS

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

Beech district	33,207	41.51	48.43	55.35
Maple district	27,250	34.06	39.74	45.42
Oak district	37,115	46.39	54.13	61.86
Pine district	25,891	32.36	37.76	43.15
Fayette	31,912	39.89	46.54	53.19
New Haven district	35,399	44.25	51.62	59.00
Plateau district	28,757	35.95	41.94	47.93
Valley district	31,392	39.24	45.78	52.32
Gilmer	29,706	37.13	43.32	49.51
Center district	25,482	31.85	37.16	42.47
City district	30,951	38.69	45.14	51.59
De Kalb - Troy district	32,552	40.69	47.47	54.25
Glenville district	29,375	36.72	42.84	48.96
Grant	35,593	44.49	51.91	59.32
Grant district	34,750	43.44	50.68	57.92
Milroy district	34,260	42.83	49.96	57.10
Union district	41,204	51.51	60.09	68.67
Greenbrier	33,732	42.17	49.19	56.22
Central district	39,284	49.11	57.29	65.47
Eastern district	31,720	39.65	46.26	52.87
Western district	29,478	36.85	42.99	49.13
Hampshire	31,792	39.74	46.36	52.99
Bloomery district	40,192	50.24	58.61	66.99
Capon district	27,148	33.94	39.59	45.25
Gore district	32,254	40.32	47.04	53.76
Mill Creek district	35,759	44.70	52.15	59.60
Romney district	22,923	28.65	33.43	38.21
Sherman district	34,321	42.90	50.05	57.20
Springfield district	35,884	44.86	52.33	59.81
Hancock	38,565	48.21	56.24	64.28
Butler district	42,197	52.75	61.54	70.33
Clay district	38,300	47.88	55.85	63.83
Grant district	32,378	40.47	47.22	53.96
Hardy	31,347	39.18	45.71	52.25
Capon district	33,207	41.51	48.43	55.35
Lost River district	26,889	33.61	39.21	44.82
Moorefield district	25,131	31.41	36.65	41.89
Old Fields district	37,064	46.33	54.05	61.77
South Fork district	40,969	51.21	59.75	68.28
Harrison	39,191	48.99	57.15	65.32
Eastern district	55,881	69.85	81.49	93.14
Northern district	34,730	43.41	50.65	57.88
North Urban district	26,415	33.02	38.52	44.03
Southern district	42,144	52.68	61.46	70.24
South Urban district	37,945	47.43	55.34	63.24
Southeast district	39,241	49.05	57.23	65.40
Jackson	41,406	51.76	60.38	69.01

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

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

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

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

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

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

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

APPENDIX E1

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY
MUNICIPALITY

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

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

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

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

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

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

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

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

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

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

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

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

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

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

APPENDIX F

SOURCES AND USES CHART
(FOR EPA USE ONLY)

West Virginia Clean Water State Revolving Fund
Intended Use Plan - Sources and Uses of Funds
FY2015
(for EPA use only)

Cumulative Sources as of March 31, 2014

Capitalization Grants (25)	574,418,586	
State Matches (actual)	102,665,295	
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319)	328,051,570	
Investment Earnings	<u>29,620,205</u>	
Sources sub-total (a)		1,034,755,656

Cumulative Uses as of March 31, 2014

Loan Assistance (212+319)	1,014,538,031	
DEP Administration (4%)	<u>14,143,540</u>	
Uses sub-total (b)		1,028,681,571

FY2014 Sources of Funds

Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	6,074,085	
Capitalization Grant #26 (FFY2014 Funds)	21,856,000	
State Match	4,371,200	
Earnings	453,495	
Repayments	<u>34,449,817</u>	
FY2014 Sources of Funds (c)		67,204,597

Less

Appendix C Projects	68,483,000	
AgWQLP Reserves	150,000	
OSLP Reserve	<u>300,000</u>	
Total		68,933,000

APPENDIX G

POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECT

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

"Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2015 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
Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD - Rhodel	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	\$4,510,200
Greater St. Albans PSD - Phase IV Thomas Hollow	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized - low pressure sys in Thomas Hollow	\$3,445,000
Greenbrier PSD #1	decentralized sewer system	Meadowbrook plant / system ext	\$5,296,145
Huntington Sanitary Board	green infrastructure	bioretention basin	\$11,996,656
Lincoln Co. Comm.	decentralized sewer system	Ph. VI of individual/cluster systems	\$656,750
Montgomery, City of	energy efficiency	PS rehab / construction	\$782,324
Mount Zion PSD	environmentally innovative	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant w/subsurface discharge	\$1,035,000
St. Albans MUC	energy efficiency/savings	UV replacement & Blower Controls	\$4,447,980
TOTAL			\$37,388,105