

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008**  
**INTENDED USE PLAN**  
**for the**  
**WEST VIRGINIA DRINKING WATER**  
**STATE REVOLVING FUND**

**State of West Virginia**

**Department of Health and Human Resources**  
**Bureau for Public Health**  
**Office of Environmental Health Services**  
**Environmental Engineering Division**

**FEBRUARY 2007**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. PROJECTS	1
A. Project Funding Requirements	1
B. Project Priority List Process	1
C. Bypass Procedure	3
D. Rationale for Different Assistance	4
E. Amount to be used for Disadvantaged Communities	5
3. FINANCIAL STATUS	5
A. Total amount of funds in the DWSRF (Construction & Set-Asides)	5
B. Uses of the new funds (Construction & Set-Asides)	8
C. Types of projects to be funded	8
4. GOALS OF THE DWTRF	9
A. Short Term Goals	9
B. Long Term Goals	10
C. Program Activity Measures	11
5. SET-ASIDE ACTIVITIES	14
A. Administration	14
B. State Program Management	15
C. Technical Assistance	15
D. Local Assistance and Other State Activities	15
6. PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS	16

## **TABLES**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
TABLE 1 Funds Awarded Prior to/During State Fiscal Year 2006 (Construction & Set-Asides)	5
TABLE 2 Funds Awarded During State Fiscal Year 2007 (Construction & Set-Asides)	6
TABLE 3 Funds Requested State Fiscal Year 2007 (Construction & Set-Asides)	6
TABLE 4 Funds Disbursed or Obligated Through State Fiscal Year 2006 (Construction & Set-Asides)	7
TABLE 5 Uses of New/Requested Funds (Construction & Set-Asides)	8

## **ATTACHMENTS**

ATTACHMENT 1	DWTRF Project Priority Ranking System
ATTACHMENT 2	Project Priority List and Database
ATTACHMENT 3	Project Type Description and Funding List Detailed Description
ATTACHMENT 4	Legal Notice/Public Hearing Summary/Response to Comments

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The *Safe Drinking Water Act* (SDWA) amendments of 1996 authorized a Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) program to assist public water systems to finance the cost of the infrastructure needed to achieve or maintain compliance with SDWA requirements and protect public health. This Intended Use Plan (IUP) details the intended use for the State Fiscal Year 2008 (FFY 2007) Capitalization Grant funds. Congress appropriated these funds in FFY 2006, for \$8,229,300 with a required state match of \$1,645,860. The West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council (Infrastructure Council) committed funding for the required 20 percent match at their July 12, 2006 meeting.

From the FFY 2007 Capitalization Grant, \$5,678,217 (along with the state match, and projected earned interest and loan repayments through June 30, 2006), shall be used to construct projects through the grant's construction fund. These funds are the Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund (DWTRF). The 2% Technical Assistance is used to contract primarily for development and implementation of a Continuing Education Training program. The 4% Administration funding is used to manage the DWTRF program. The 15% Local Assistance funding is used in implementing the required state Source Water Protection Program, assessing, and assisting in the technical, managerial and financial capacity of small systems. The 10% Program Management funding is used primarily for enhancing the Public Water Supply Supervision Program (PWSS).

## **2. PROJECTS**

### **A. Project Funding Requirements**

Approval from the Infrastructure Council is required for any project to receive DWTRF assistance. The Infrastructure Council which includes the Water Technical Review Committee and the Funding Committee must approve all projects. Both of the following requirements must be considered for funding of projects:

- 1) On an annual basis, at least 15% of the funds in the construction account must go to systems serving less than 10,000 total persons.
- 2) Disadvantaged communities must receive 30% of the capitalization award in the form of a loan (terms: 30 year payment period, 0% interest, typically 1% administration fee).

### **B. The Project Priority List (PPL) Process**

The past PPL included all water projects passing through the Infrastructure Council, whether a water system wanting DWTRF loan or other state or federal funding, was replaced by a PPL with only applicants interested in using DWTRF funds. This reduced the number of projects from approximately 160 to 20. West Virginia used to have to bypass many of the projects on the list in order to get to a fundable project, which wanted to use DWTRF monies.

Each water system which submits an application through the Infrastructure Council:

- 1) Has their project scored using DWTRF criteria;
- 2) Is contacted concerning their interest in DWTRF monies; and
- 3) If the water system is interested in DWTRF, submits a form to be included on the next priority list that is put out to public notice.

Water systems that are the closest to going to bid, (e.g., the project design is complete and a PSC application has been submitted, etc.) are given top priority when giving out binding commitment letters, thus, some projects which have not received other funding or have not been designed will be bypassed in accordance with our IUP.

In the past, the DWTRF PPL has been advertised annually. In order to fund more projects, the PPL will be put out to public notice more frequently so that projects approved by the Infrastructure Council and have been scored and ranked, can be given binding letter of commitments sooner rather than having to wait a year.

Also, prior to putting the PPL out to Public Notice, water systems that have been on the PPL, but have not received their funding, will be contacted about the status of their project and if they still potentially wish to be funded by the DWTRF.

Projects approved by the Infrastructure Council are prioritized as described in Attachment 1, DWTRF Project Priority Ranking System. Three categories (public health, regulatory compliance, and affordability) are used to determine project scoring. Projects that apply for DWTRF funding are ranked on a PPL (Attachment 2). The PPL includes the name of the public water system, description of the project, priority assigned, expected financial terms, size of community served, and whether or not the system is disadvantaged. OEHS considers the highest ranked projects on the PPL to receive funding from the DWTRF. These higher ranked projects are contacted concerning their project status.

Projects expecting to receive assistance from the DWTRF FFY 2007 Funds are on the Funding List (Attachment 3). Projects that rank lower on the PPL may still receive funding should one or more of the higher ranked projects be bypassed using the bypass procedure described below. Projects on the most recent PPL are also eligible to receive funding from previously awarded capitalization grants.

### **C. Bypass Procedure**

Prior to implementing the bypass procedure, water systems listed on the PPL will be contacted to determine the status of their project. Based on the contact, OEHS will determine whether to bypass the project and select another project for funding commitment consideration. The following provisions will be used to bypass a project on the PPL:

- 1) Even though the project is for a system that is defined as a Significant Non-Complier (SNC) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, using EPA's criteria for SNC designation, it is determined the proposed project will not ensure compliance.
- 2) The project is for a system that would not have operators properly certified to operate and maintain the system by the time the project is to receive funding.
- 3) The project has been fully funded by other entities.
- 4) The project changes significantly in scope and requires re-evaluation of the proposal using the DWTRF ranking system.
- 5) The project is unable to proceed in a timely manner.
- 6) All other funding is not committed. Should the bypassed project be within the fundable range, it may be funded at a later date.
- 7) The project costs significantly exceed the anticipated loan amounts. The project scope could be reduced to within the available DWTRF loan amount provided the ranking does not change.
- 8) The system declines the assistance.
- 9) The project is not determined as technically and financially feasible by the Infrastructure Council.
- 10) The project is unable to meet the schedule developed and agreed upon by the project sponsor and OEHS.
- 11) A lower ranked project attains a higher rating due to revised information, such as an environmental or public health emergency.
- 12) The water system is not considered as having the managerial, financial, and technical capacity, even after project completion, based upon a Capacity Development Assessment by OEHS.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

When OEHS bypasses a project, the project will remain on the PPL for consideration at a future time. If the project no longer needs or wants DWTRF funding, it is removed from future PPLs. OEHS will provide technical assistance (as needed) with bypassed projects to ensure, to the maximum extent possible, that they are eligible for the future funding. The OEHS will provide low interest design loans to increase the project pace, where needed.

In cases where a project is bypassed, the next project on the list (not being bypassed) will be funded within the funds available through the criteria outlined in this section. If a funded project comes in under cost, the remaining funds are used either to fund the next project on the PPL (if the cost does not exceed the available funds) or to fund other water system project needs as deemed appropriate by OEHS.

**D. Rationale for Different Assistance**

Eligible public water systems use the DWTRF assistance for the cost of infrastructure needed to achieve or maintain compliance with the federal SDWA and other drinking water regulations. Generally, loans are committed at 0% for 30 years for disadvantaged public water systems and 2% for 20 years for non-disadvantaged public water systems. Loans are assessed an administrative fee (usually 1%). To qualify for loans at an interest rate less than 2% or extended loan terms up to 30 years, the proposed user median household income (MHI) must be disadvantaged. Disadvantaged requires that the proposed rates for 4,000 gallons must not be less than 1.25 percent of the MHI. OEHS will use this criterion for the PPL and will put this list out for public comment. In the above cases, OEHS may consider a reduction of the interest rate to keep user rates as close as possible to the disadvantaged criteria.

Although funds from the 1% administrative fee could be placed in accounts for project funding, set-aside funds, and state match funds, it is kept in a separate, non-project account. The monies from this non-project account can only be used for purposes directly related to the administration of the DWTRF. The fee will be reported separately in the annual audited financial statements.

The DWTRF provides design loans to eligible public water systems for projects on the PPL. This purpose is in order to make them more attractive for outside additional funding and to decrease the time of project closure and construction. The loans will be offered at the same terms as those deemed for infrastructure improvements. Loan payback will begin the state fiscal quarter following design loan closure.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

**E. Amount to be used for Disadvantaged Communities**

The West Virginia legislation authorizes the DWTRF requirement for disadvantaged communities. *“The division of health shall, in accordance with the provisions of the safe drinking water act, establish a program for loan subsidies to disadvantaged communities. Thirty percent of the federal capitalization grants made to this state shall be dedicated to the funding of projects for disadvantaged communities”* (Authority §16-13C-3). At least thirty percent of the cumulative federal funds will be used for disadvantaged communities as previously defined.

**3. FINANCIAL STATUS**

The DWTRF (construction fund) will be managed by OEHS with assistance (through a contract agreement) with the West Virginia Water Development Authority (WDA). The WDA maintains the financial records and insures bond conditions and audit requirements are met. OEHS manages the DWSRF set-aside funds.

**A. Total amount of funds in the DWSRF (Construction & Set-Asides)**

The amounts available for the DWSRF Program are as shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3. Table 4 shows the amounts disbursed and obligated as of the end of SFY 2006.

**TABLE 1. FUNDS AWARDED PRIOR TO/DURING STATE FISCAL YEAR 2006  
 (Construction & Set-Asides)**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Total from 1998 through 2005)	\$67,049,700
WV State Match – Infrastructure Council (Total from 1998 through 2005)	\$13,409,940
WVDHHR: 10% Set-Aside State Match (Total from 1998 through 2005)	\$5,945,612
SUB-TOTAL	\$86,405,252
Loan Repayments (As of June 30, 2006)	\$4,786,627
Admin. Fee (typ. 1%)/Fee Invest Interest (As of June 30, 2006)	\$680,756
Interest Earnings WV DWTRF (As of June 30, 2006)*	\$2,562,867
TOTAL	\$94,435,502

\* Includes loans and investment interest earnings (not including interest on administrative fee).

NOTE: Reserve appropriation from SFY 1998 was \$209,420 at end of SFY 2005.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

**TABLE 2. FUNDS AWARDED DURING STATE FISCAL YEAR 2007**  
**(Construction & Set-Asides)**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (FS-99390006)	\$8,285,500
WV State Match - Infrastructure Council (FS-993900006)	\$1,657,100
WVDHHR: 10% Set-Aside State Match (FS-993900006) (Approp. 2006)	\$828,550
TOTAL	\$10,771,150

NOTE: Reserve appropriation from SFY 1998 was \$80,870 in SFY 2006 for this grant.

**TABLE 3. FUNDS REQUESTED STATE FISCAL YEAR 2007**  
**(Construction & Set-Asides)**

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (FS-99390007)	\$8,229,300
WV State Match - Infrastructure Council (FS-993900007)	\$1,645,860
WVDHHR: 10% Set-Aside State Match (FS-993900007) (Approp. 2007)	\$780,870
TOTAL	\$10,656,030

NOTE: Reserve appropriation balance from SFY 1998 will be \$0 at the end of SFY 2007.

The full state match for the 10% set-aside is comprised of \$780,870 cash and \$42,060 from the 1993 PWSS Overmatch "Gift That Keeps on Giving".

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

**TABLE 4. SET-ASIDE FUNDS DISBURSED OR PROJECTED THROUGH STATE FISCAL YEAR 2006/CONSTRUCTION LOANS AND COMMITMENTS THROUGH DECEMBER 2006**  
**(Construction & Set-Asides)**

Set-Aside Funds	Funds Received Prior to FFY 2007	Funds Projected During FFY 2007	Total Incoming Funds	Funds Disbursed (see note 1)	Funds Remaining
Administration (4%)	\$2,383,024	\$331,420	\$2,714,444	\$1,819,571	\$894,873
Small Systems Technical	\$1,328,715	\$165,710	\$1,494,425	\$1,253,240	\$241,185
Program Management	\$5,945,612	\$828,550			
Program Management	\$5,945,612	\$828,550			
<b>Total Program Management</b>	<b>\$11,891,224</b>	<b>\$1,657,100</b>	<b>\$13,548,324</b>	<b>\$8,138,939</b>	<b>\$5,409,385</b>
Local Assistance (15%)	\$7,815,756	\$1,242,825	\$9,058,581	\$4,729,185	\$4,329,396
<b>Total Set-Aside Funds</b>	<b>\$23,418,719</b>	<b>\$3,397,055</b>	<b>\$26,815,774</b>	<b>\$15,940,935</b>	<b>\$10,874,839</b>
<b>Construction Assistance Funds</b>	<b>\$49,576,593</b>	<b>\$5,716,995</b>	<b>\$55,293,588</b>		
20% State Match	\$13,409,940	\$1,657,100	\$15,067,040		
Loan Repayments	\$3,492,180	\$1,294,447	\$4,786,627		
Interest on Loans	\$795,128	\$248,906	\$1,044,034		
Interest Earnings	\$1,087,519	\$431,314	\$1,518,833		
<b>Total Funds For Loans</b>	<b>\$68,361,360</b>	<b>\$9,348,762</b>	<b>\$77,710,122</b>		
Closed Loans (December 2006)				\$54,795,971	
Letters of Commitment				\$17,944,838	
<b>Total Committed Funds</b>				<b>\$72,740,809</b>	
<b>Funds Remaining</b>					<b>\$4,969,313</b>
Fees on DWTRF Assistance	\$483,399	\$197,357	\$680,756	\$0	\$680,756
<b>Total Program Funds</b>	<b>\$92,263,478</b>	<b>\$12,943,174</b>	<b>\$105,206,652</b>	<b>\$88,681,744</b>	<b>\$16,524,908</b>

Note 1: These disbursed set-aside funds have been reconciled to WV DWSRF Annual Reports.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

**B. Uses of the New Funds (Construction & Set-Asides)**

Below is a summary of the amounts to be used for each activity. Any funds not used for set-aside activities will be used for construction projects. Please note that the DWTRF interest earnings are utilized to supplement the construction funds, specifically for project overruns, as necessary.

**TABLE 5. USES OF NEW/REQUESTED FUNDS  
(Construction & Set-Asides)**

Uses of Funds	Sources of Funds						Total
	Federal Funds	Infrastructure Council	State Program Match	Admin Fee/Admin Interest**	Interest Earnings	Loan Repayments	
Administration	\$329,172	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$329,172
Technical Assistance	\$164,586	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$164,586
State Program Management*	\$822,930	\$0	\$780,870	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,603,800
Local Assistance	\$1,234,395	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,234,395
Construction	\$5,678,217	\$1,645,860	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,324,077
Total	\$8,229,300	\$1,645,860	\$780,870	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$10,656,030

\*The full state match for the 10% set-aside is comprised of \$780,870 cash and \$42,060 from the 1993 PWSS Overmatch "Gift That Keeps on Giving".

\*\* Administrative Fees, Interest Earnings, and Loan Repayments are included in previous grant application.

**C. Types of projects to be funded**

The list of projects OEHS is considering to fund is in Attachment 3. These projects include water treatment plant upgrades, distribution and storage upgrades, and extensions of existing systems. Projects solely for economic growth or projects solely for fire protection are not eligible for DWTRF assistance.

#### **4. GOALS OF THE DWSRF**

##### **A. Short Term Goals**

- 1) Provide financial assistance to eligible drinking water systems to eliminate drinking water problems and improve drinking water quality in the state, closing 75% of the construction loans within 18 months.
- 2) Protect source water from future contamination through Source Water Assessment and Protection (SWAP) and WHP programs:
  - Continue developing and implementing SWAP/WHP programs.
  - Determine if water sources are groundwater under the direct influence (GWUDI) of surface water.
  - Sponsor a symposium or workshop exchanging source water protection information and ideas.
  - Continue collaborating with West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection's (WVDEP) Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program.
  - Update and expand Geographic Information System (GIS) capabilities.
- 3) Continue implementation of the Capacity Development Strategy including assisting existing public water supplies in acquiring and maintaining the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with the federal SDWA. Provide assistance to ensure that all new community water supplies and new non-transient non-community supplies have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with regulations in effect, or likely to be in effect, when the system initiates operations.
- 4) Continue development, enhancement, and improvement of the Public Water Supply Supervision (PWSS) through improved methodology and consistency of the sanitary surveys. This includes completion of a full complement of staffing in the district offices and final development of an automated data collection system for private laboratories to forward results of total organic compounds.
- 5) Continue to implement an operator training continuing education program focusing on training course/instructor criteria and operator training requirements.
- 6) Continue to participate in the monthly meetings of the Infrastructure Council by performing technical reviews on all proposed water projects; and, coordinate and recommend the most feasible funding sources in accordance with established state rules and procedures.
- 7) Enact "Summary of OEHS Action Items" based on comments by the US EPA during the SFY 2006 Site Visit.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

- 8) Efficiently and effectively administer the supplemental set-aside work plan grant and contractor activities:
- Preliminary Evaluation, Planning, and Project Design Grants
  - Source Water Protection Grants
  - Geographic Information System Mapping
  - Capacity Development and Source Water Assistance Program
  - Area Wide Optimization Program Performance Based Training
  - Source Water Security Enhancements Grants
  - WV Utility Management Institute
  - Water Distribution and Chief Operator Training

**B. Long Term Goals**

- 1) Provide the necessary infrastructure replacement, upgrade, and coverage as determined in the Infrastructure Council's 2005 Public Water and Systems Inventory and Assessment Report (approximately 725 million dollars needed for drinking water infrastructure) and the 2003 EPA Drinking Water Needs Survey and Assessment. This is done with the overall goal of upgrading water quality for existing public water customers and providing water to private customers whose water currently does not comply with the SDWA. The above will be achieved through the following:
- Capacity Development Program: Continue to conduct financial, managerial and technical capacity assessments on public water systems and provide necessary assistance to ensure compliance with the SDWA.
  - Continue to participate in the Infrastructure Council process on a monthly basis to oversee the technical review committee for the technical review of applications and to maximize all available state and federal funding sources.
- 2) Continue to develop the Safe Drinking Water Information System (SDWIS) database of existing public water systems to include:
- System infrastructure mapping
  - System inventory
  - Compliance history
  - Sampling history
  - Operator certification

This can be utilized to quickly assess an existing system as well as evaluate proposed new projects/systems. The database will also have capability of interfacing with other existing databases.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

- 3) Develop the DWTRF to ensure the long term perpetuity of the fund where after the initial capitalization years, the loan repayments in the fund will be used to finance additional projects. Long term funding will be achieved as follows:
  - Conduct financial, managerial, and technical capacity assessments under the Capacity Development Program on all potential loan recipients to assure fiscal responsibility.
  - Analyze the ability to meet long term perpetuity of the fund by using the EPA financial planning model.
  - Monitor repayment activity of loan recipients and take aggressive action for collection of delinquent payments from loan recipients.
  - Market the DWTRF through various conferences (WV Rural Water Association Conference, American Water Works Association, Infrastructure Council Meetings, etc.), pamphlets/brochures, and quarterly newsletters on DWSRF program activities.
  - Provide drinking water infrastructure design loans as needed to increase the project completion rate.
- 4) Improve the DWTRF utilization rate to the national average, or EPA Region III average, by implementing activities in the Program Activity Measures section.
- 5) Close the DWTRF loans to recipients within twelve months of a binding letter of commitment.

**C. Program Activity Measures**

1) Measures with Commitments/Targets

The DWTRF fund utilization rate as determined by the EPA was 66% in 2002, 68% in 2003, and 63% in 2004, 63% in 2005, and 76% in 2006. This utilization rate, which is lower than the national average (81%) and all states within Region III (average is 79%), is impacted due to numerous reasons. We have previously submitted a report entitled “Increased Utilization of West Virginia’s Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund” (A comprehensive graduate project by Patrick A. Taylor). Activities listed below, from the project report, will enable West Virginia to utilize its funds at the national average and EPA Region III’s utilization rate.

2) Short-Term Process to Increase the Utilization Rate

Keeping in mind that there are many obstacles to increasing the utilization rate, there are specific steps that either have been started or may be taken (if appropriate) in the funding process and the loan closing process.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

Funding Process

- Market the program by providing our own staff, literature, and possibly our own booth at all potential functions that water systems and engineers might attend. Educate them about the DWTRF funds concerning the assistance that OEHS can provide to make the funding and project process go smoother, especially when having to meet the federal requirements. Develop new brochures for distribution to water systems and potential loan recipients.
- Continue discussing the Infrastructure Council funding process to incorporate all funding agencies into the funding process, based on their requirements. Work towards implementation of Infrastructure Council setting the funding, removing that responsibility from the community. This process will possibly eliminate loan shopping and provide the message that waiting for grant money or Infrastructure Council loan will not be tolerated.
- Develop a “rule of thumb” chart that provides clarity to what the best fit for project funding would be. Examples include: Distressed communities with high rates would obviously still be given grant funds. Water systems with lower rates, possibly below the state average for average customer rates and meeting the scoring criteria for DWTRF, would be required to seek DWTRF monies first. Water systems with extremely low rates would be required to seek WDA funds or go to the bond market. Continue as well to keep RUS in the process.
- Another option is to look at the way the State of Washington funds all projects. They are similar in some ways to West Virginia. They have a clearinghouse where all water systems complete one application for all state water and sewer projects, there is one priority list and the projects are funded by fitting the best funding to each project on the list depending on rates and other issues.
- Communicate with the OEHS management about the implementation of more stringent enforcement avenues, including fining the water system for not acting sooner to correcting compliance and public health issues, especially if funding is available.
- Continue the new project priority list and advertising priority list at least three times annually to issue binding letters of commitment sooner than annually.
- Over-commit funds based on expected repayment, loan interest, and predicted earned interest stream from between 1 to 2 years.
- Look at the use of 4%, 10%, and 15 set-aside DWSRF funds to provide grants to fund the planning and design of projects so that they will be ready for DWTRF

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

monies. Due to the inability to fill positions, the lack of pay raises, and other budget under runs there are substantial funds available.

Loan Closing Process

- Continue to implement the new PPL process.
- After issuing the binding letter of commitment and developing a project schedule, ensure the schedule is followed closely using the new tracking program to:
  - Red flag project milestones to advertising for bids and closing loans, incorporating comments in the status of each milestone.
  - Schedule monthly project updates for each project consisting of a conference call with the critical entities (engineer, accountant, bond council, water system, etc.).
  - Assign staff from unit, even professional staff that is typically not involved in the DWTRF projects. They would be responsible for attending meetings, holding conference calls and determining progress.
- Look at the milestone process for ways to reduce the project time:
  - Ensure that every OEHS process is performed efficiently to avoid project delays.
    - a. Environmental review and issuance of FONSI or CE:  
30 day review time/30 day mandatory public notice.
    - b. Issuance of construction permit 45 day review (by code): try to reduce to 25 days maximum if all information is available.
    - c. Review of bidding and loan closing information and issuance of approvals: 15-day review and approval of each.
    - d. Review of Minority/Women's Business Enterprise Information/  
Preparation of approval letters: 5-day review and approval.
  - Ensure that all information that the water system and their professional contractors need is easily accessible.
    - a. Provide clear direction at the meetings on DWTRF funding process and the requirements of the program, including providing all parties with a manual of the loan program.

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

- b. Provide an accessible website so that the loan recipient can find all appropriate forms and program information. (Many of the other states had very good DWSRF websites).
  - Have reviews of potential roadblocks (customer protests, bid overruns, etc.) to the project and look for ways to overcome them.
  - Continue using the binding commitment spreadsheet to evaluate the project utilization rate compared to the project schedule for loan closure.
- 3) Look at some long- term issues and their impacts on the loan fund.

Use the EPA financial Planning Model to determine the impacts of using grants, in the long term and their impacts on the long term financial viability of West Virginia DWTRF's program, especially if Congress ends the Capitalization Grant in 2018.

The EPA financial planning model can be used to determine the amounts of upfront grants given to disadvantage communities as well as debt forgiveness due to the inability for a community in a distressed area to pay a loan back. As part of the analysis, the effects of administering an administration fee on grant dollars to operate the DWTRF should be determined.

## **5. SET-ASIDE ACTIVITIES**

In addition to the DWTRF construction fund, there are four "set-aside" or non-project accounts to be administered by OEHS. These separate accounts include Administration of the Loan Program, Technical Assistance, State Program Management, and Local Assistance.

The different set-aside accounts are specified in the federal SDWA to enable the state to finance the cost of administering and managing the DWTRF program and supporting local public water systems. These accounts are described in more detail below.

The goals, objectives, methods, outputs, and outcomes for these set-asides are located in the work plan.

### **A. Administration (\$329,172)**

The SDWA authorizes the state to use 4% of the federal Capitalization Grant for administration of the DWTRF program. The state plans to use 4% of the FFY 2007 Capitalization Grant solely for administration costs of the program. Administrative tasks include but are not limited to:

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

- 1) Developing legislation.
- 2) Preparing the Capitalization Grant agreement.
- 3) Developing memorandums of understanding between federal and state agencies.
- 4) Reviewing West Virginia Infrastructure Council applications.
- 5) Preparing the IUP.
- 6) Providing project review, priority ranking procedures, environmental reviews, and required DWTRF project information coordination (project scheduling, advertisements, loan closure).
- 7) Providing project inspections, administration of the funds.
- 8) Tracking and an accounting of the funds.
- 9) Auditing of the funds.
- 10) Processing payment requests, and managing loan repayments.

The DWTRF program will fully utilize the WDA, which already administers state-funded construction loans to public wastewater and water systems. OEHS, WDA, Infrastructure Council, State Treasurer, and Auditor's Offices have been involved in coordinating efforts to expedite disbursing construction funds to the state's public water systems and meeting critical construction needs.

**B. State Program Management (\$822,930 - Federal, \$780,870 - State Match, \$42,060 - Overmatch)**

The SDWA authorizes the state to use up to 10% from the federal Capitalization Grant to support the State Public Water Supply Supervision (PWSS) program, source water protection, and operator certification programs. These funds require a dollar-for-dollar match and this match is made through state appropriations and the 1993 PWSS Overmatch. The activities subsidized from this account include enhancement of the PWSS program, Operator Training and Certification, Engineering Assistance, Area Wide Optimization Program, and Data Information System Management.

**C. Technical Assistance (\$164,586)**

The SDWA authorizes the state to use up to 2% of each capitalization grant to provide technical assistance to small water systems. Small water systems are defined as those that serve less than 10,000 persons. These set-aside funds will be used for technical, financial, and managerial continuing education training to water system operators to meet their certification and training requirements. A contractor, meeting the state requirements, will coordinate the technical assistance program.

**D. Local Assistance and Other State Activities (\$1,234,395)**

The SDWA authorizes the state to use up to fifteen percent (15%) of the federal capitalization grant for this set-aside, but no more than ten percent (10%) may be used for any one activity. These set-aside funds will be used for Capacity Development Assistance needs,

**July 1, 2007 – June 30, 2008 Intended Use Plan**  
**January 2007**

Wellhead Protection (WHP) Program, Water Awareness Program, source water symposium, underground injection control program, and improving Geographical Information System (GIS) capabilities.

**6. PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS**

Public comment period for this Draft IUP commenced February 16, 2007 through March 20, 2007. OEHS posted the IUP on the web site. A public notice was published in the West Virginia Register (state register) on February 16, 2007 concerning the web posting and public comment period.

OEHS held a public meeting between 1:30 p.m. and 3:30 p.m., March 19, 2007, at Capitol and Washington Streets, 1 Davis Square, Suite 200, Charleston, WV to accept comments on the Draft IUP. Comments received during the comment period are in Attachment 4.

ATTACHMENT 1

DWTRF Project Priority Ranking System

System: \_\_\_\_\_ County: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Project#: \_\_\_\_\_ Project: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DWTRF Project Priority Ranking System**

(1) \_\_\_\_\_ **PUBLIC HEALTH** (0 to 50 points - 50 points maximum)

Up to fifty points may be given to a project for public health. The public health categories are listed below. A particular project may apply to several categories. In such cases, the project will be given the highest rating.

(A) \_\_\_\_\_ **Projects to correct acute health hazards - (50 points)** Fifty points will be given to projects that propose to eliminate a problem that poses an acute, ongoing health hazard to the consumer. Examples are listed below.

- Projects that address documented nitrate or nitrite violations.
- Projects that address documented exceedances of primary inorganic MCL's
- Projects that address a problem where a system has been put on the EPA SNC list for turbidity violations. The project must ensure compliance in order to receive DWTRF assistance.
- Projects that address a problem where a system has been put on the EPA SNC list for microbiological violations. The project must ensure compliance in order to receive DWTRF assistance.
- Projects that propose filtration for surface water source that currently do not have filtration.
- Projects that propose disinfection for a system that currently do not have disinfection.
- Projects that address documented water outages for extended periods (1 week) due to system or design deficiencies.

(B) \_\_\_\_\_ **Correct chronic health hazards - (40 points)** Forty points will be given to projects that propose to eliminate a chronic health hazard to the consumer. Examples are listed below.

- Projects that address a turbidity violations for a system that has not yet been put on the EPA SNC list.
- Projects that address a microbiological violations for a system that has not yet been put on the EPA SNC list.
- Projects that address exceedances of the Lead and Copper Rule.
- Projects that address documented exceedances of primary organic MCL's.
- Projects that address documented exceedances of radiological MCL's.
- Projects that address treatment technologies for the SWTR.
- Projects that address documented water outages due to system or design deficiencies.

(C). \_\_\_\_\_ **Correct periodic health hazards** - (30 points) Thirty points will be awarded to projects that propose to eliminate a documented health hazard which has occurred periodically. Examples are listed below.

- Projects that address low chlorine residuals.
- Projects that address periodic exceedances of a primary MCL.
- Projects that address periodic water outages to some customers for at least a day due to design or system deficiency.
- Projects to bring existing facilities to current design standards which affect water quality: treatment, chemical application, pumping facilities, finished storage and distribution systems.

(D) \_\_\_\_\_ **Correct potential health hazards** - (20 points) Twenty points will be given to projects that propose to eliminate potential health hazards. Examples are listed below.

- Projects for line extensions to areas with poor water quality or limited quantity.
- Projects to develop new source to augment existing sources where there is no other health hazard associated with the project. Dams and reservoirs are not eligible.
- Projects for installation / upgrade of waste disposal facilities.

(E) \_\_\_\_\_ **System Improvements** - (10 points) Ten points will be given to projects that propose general system improvements. Examples are listed below.

- Projects to replace / repair old, undersized, or malfunctioning equipment.
- Projects to replace leaking water line.
- Projects to improve aesthetic quality of the water such as iron, manganese, taste and odor.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_ **REGULATORY COMPLIANCE** (0 to 20 points, 20 points maximum)

(A) \_\_\_\_\_ Correction of chronic non-compliance - 20 points

Compliance with administrative orders, agreements, statutes, or regulatory deadlines.

(B) \_\_\_\_\_ Compliance with periodic and potential non-compliance - 10 points

Compliance with sanitary survey recommendations, NPDES permits, new regulations, or design standards.

(C) \_\_\_\_\_ Protection against non-compliance -5 points

Compliance with proposed regulations.

(D) \_\_\_\_\_ Line extensions with documented cases of fecal coliform - 3 points

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ **AFFORDABILITY** (0 to 30 points)

Rates = 0% to 0.5% MHI (0 points)

Rates = 0.51% to 1.0% MHI (5 points)

Rates = 1.01% to 1.5% MHI (20 points)

Rates = 1.51% to 2.0% MHI (25 points)

Rates > 2.0% MHI (30 points)

Note: MHI = median household income by magisterial district as published by the West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council.  
Rates based on 4,000 gallons.

Public Health	
Compliance	
Affordability	
Total Points	

**Tie Breaker:**

In the event that two or more systems have the same score the following will be used as the tie breaker.

1. Whichever system has the highest public health rating will be ranked highest.
2. In the event there is still a tie, then the system with the lower population served will be ranked higher.

**Definitions**

- EPA -- Environmental Protection Agency
- MCL -- Maximum Contaminant Level
- MHI -- Median Household Income
- SNC -- Significant Non-Compliance
- SWTR -- Surface Water Treatment Rule

ATTACHMENT 2

Project Priority List

Project Priority List Database

06DWTRFA PPL Ranking Scores

Rank	POINTS	HEALTH	COMPLIANCE	AFFORDABILITY	SYSTEM	PROJECT NAME	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COUNTY	NUMBER	NEW POPULATION	DWTRF TOTAL	TOTAL COST
1	60	20	10	30	Sugar Creek PSD	Rosedale, Wilsie & Teague extensions; WTP improvements	Rosedale, Wilsie & Teague extensions; 100M gal tank; booster pump station; 17 miles of 6" & 2"; paint 2 tanks; telemetry; WTP improvements.	Braxton	2006W-897	1548	\$2,800,000.00	\$6,537,000.00
2	55	30	20	5	Weirton Area Water Board	Upgrade WTP to meet Disinfection and Disinfection By-Products Rule	Upgrade WTP to meet Disinfection and Disinfection By-Products Rule. Project includes an air stripper, equipment for improved coagulation, retrofit filters with extra filter media depth, and a UV disinfection system.	Brooke	2006W-944	24790	\$1,928,360.00	\$4,285,245.00
3	55	30	5	20	Southwestern Water PSD	Distribution system replacement	Replace water distribution system to reduce 44% water loss; upgrade booster station; new tanks; PSD currently has inadequate storage for the water use; project will add backup pumps; will add booster chlorinations for residual concentration.	Taylor	2007W-???		\$8,500,000.00	\$10,200,000.00
4	50	30	0	20	Buffalo Creek PSD	WTP pre-treatment system consisting of static mixer, (2) 3-stage flocculators, 2 sedimentation basins, transfer pumps, and solids pump station	WTP pre-treatment system consisting of static mixer, (2) 3-stage flocculators, 2 sedimentation basins, transfer pumps, and solids pump station.	Logan	2006W-936	2765	\$701,390.00	\$1,271,000.00
5	48	20	3	25	Pendleton Co. PSD	Kline & Mozer extension	Waterline extension to the communities of Kline and Mozer in Pendleton Co.	Pendleton	2004W-804	694	\$1,643,000.00	\$3,143,000.00
6	45	30	10	5	Logan County PSD	Holden Water extension	Project will acquire Holden Water System and consolidate with Logan Co PSD.	Logan	2006W-894	22320	\$3,000,000.00	\$7,600,000.00
7	45	30	10	5	Berkeley County PSD	Mill Creek water source & two wells	Mill Creek water source & two wells	Berkeley	2007W-???	39005	\$1,839,499.00	\$1,839,499.00
8	45	20	0	25	Nettie-Leivasy PSD	Upgrade WTP to 350gpm	Project will upgrade the WTP from 200 gpm to 350 gpm because the plant is operating beyond its design rate for 18-23 hours per day; one 71M gal and one	Nicholas	2006W-916a	3115	\$4,173,000.00	\$4,173,000.00
9	43	20	3	20	Mt. Zion PSD	Sand Ridge, Russett & SR 16 extensions	Sand Ridge, Russett, Route 16 extension	Calhoun	2001W-607	1320	\$1,400,000.00	\$5,300,000.00
10	40	20	0	20	Shortline PSD	Marshville extension past prior project (1997W-346)	Marshville extension past prior project (1997W-346). Residents have poor water quality (rotten egg smell & taste) and limited quantity.	Harrison	2007W-???	2640	\$3,384,930.00	\$3,384,930.00
11	40	20	0	20	Mason County PSD	Conglomo II water extension	This project is extends water service to serve 268 (potentially 315) new customers along 21 ridges and roads throughout Mason County. The project requires approximately 42 miles of 8" through 2" line, one 54,000-gallon storage tank, and a 25-GPM booster	Mason	2006W-958	11551	\$4,038,000.00	\$4,038,000.00
12	40	10	0	30	Friendly PSD (Improvement Project)	Develop new wells, add pumping stations, add 3 storage tanks	Develop new wells and improve existing pumping and transportation mains for existing and new customers. Project will install an emergency connection to Bens Run, 35gpm booster for Pleasant Ridge, 100M gallon storage tank for Pursley and Rt. 180, 97M gall	Tyler	2006W-927	1702	\$2,080,000.00	\$2,080,000.00

## *06DWTRFA PPL Database Report*

<i><b>RANKING</b></i>	<i><b>POINTS</b></i>	<i><b>HEALTH</b></i>	<i><b>COMPLIANCE</b></i>	<i><b>AFFORDABILITY</b></i>	<i><b>PWSID</b></i>	<i><b>NUMBER</b></i>
1	65	30	10	25	3302364	2006W-894
<i><b>SYSTEM</b></i>				<i><b>SYSTEM TYPES</b></i>	<i><b>COUNTY</b></i>	
Logan County PSD				PSD	Logan	
<i><b>PROJECT NAME</b></i>						
Holden Water extension						
<i><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></i>						
Project will acquire Holden Water System and consolidate with Logan Co PSD.						
<i><b>PROJECT TYPE</b></i>		<i><b>TOTAL COST</b></i>	<i><b>DWTRF TOTAL</b></i>		<i><b>DWTRF TERMS</b></i>	
3,4,5,6		\$7,600,000	\$3,000,000		1% @ 30 yrs	
<i><b>4000 PROPOSED</b></i>		<i><b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b></i>	<i><b>DISADVANTAGED</b></i>		<i><b>EXIST POPULATION</b></i>	
\$33.16		\$25.41	Yes		20,664	
<i><b>NEW POPULATION</b></i>						
22,320						

<i><b>RANKING</b></i>	<i><b>POINTS</b></i>	<i><b>HEALTH</b></i>	<i><b>COMPLIANCE</b></i>	<i><b>AFFORDABILITY</b></i>	<i><b>PWSID</b></i>	<i><b>NUMBER</b></i>
2	60	20	10	30	3300404	2006W-897
<i><b>SYSTEM</b></i>				<i><b>SYSTEM TYPES</b></i>	<i><b>COUNTY</b></i>	
Sugar Creek PSD				PSD	Braxton	
<i><b>PROJECT NAME</b></i>						
Rosedale, Wilsie & Teague extensions; WTP improvements						
<i><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></i>						
Rosedale, Wilsie & Teague extensions; 100M gal tank; booster pump station; 17 miles of 6" & 2"; paint 2 tanks; telemetry; WTP improvements.						
<i><b>PROJECT TYPE</b></i>		<i><b>TOTAL COST</b></i>	<i><b>DWTRF TOTAL</b></i>		<i><b>DWTRF TERMS</b></i>	
2a,b,e,4,5,6		\$6,537,000	\$2,800,000		1% @ 30 yr	
<i><b>4000 PROPOSED</b></i>		<i><b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b></i>	<i><b>DISADVANTAGED</b></i>		<i><b>EXIST POPULATION</b></i>	
\$41.00		\$25.78	Yes		1,128	
<i><b>NEW POPULATION</b></i>						
1,548						

<i><b>RANKING</b></i>	<i><b>POINTS</b></i>	<i><b>HEALTH</b></i>	<i><b>COMPLIANCE</b></i>	<i><b>AFFORDABILITY</b></i>	<i><b>PWSID</b></i>	<i><b>NUMBER</b></i>
3	55	30	20	5	3300516	2006W-944
<i><b>SYSTEM</b></i>				<i><b>SYSTEM TYPES</b></i>		<i><b>COUNTY</b></i>
Weirton Area Water Board				MUN		Brooke
<i><b>PROJECT NAME</b></i>						
Upgrade WTP to meet Disinfection and Disinfection By-Products Rule						
<i><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></i>						
Upgrade WTP to meet Disinfection and Disinfection By-Products Rule. Project includes an air stripper, equipment for improved coagulation, retrofit filters with extra filter media depth, and a UV disinfection system.						
<i><b>PROJECT TYPE</b></i>		<i><b>TOTAL COST</b></i>	<i><b>DWTRF TOTAL</b></i>		<i><b>DWTRF TERMS</b></i>	
2b,c,d,e		\$4,285,245	\$1,928,360		3% @ 20 yrs	
<i><b>4000 PROPOSED</b></i>		<i><b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b></i>	<i><b>DISADVANTAGED</b></i>		<i><b>EXIST POPULATION</b></i>	
\$18.96		\$36.68	No		24,790	
<i><b>NEW POPULATION</b></i>						
24,790						

<i><b>RANKING</b></i>	<i><b>POINTS</b></i>	<i><b>HEALTH</b></i>	<i><b>COMPLIANCE</b></i>	<i><b>AFFORDABILITY</b></i>	<i><b>PWSID</b></i>	<i><b>NUMBER</b></i>
4	55	30	5	20	3304603	2007W-???
<i><b>SYSTEM</b></i>				<i><b>SYSTEM TYPES</b></i>		<i><b>COUNTY</b></i>
Southwestern Water PSD				PSD		Taylor
<i><b>PROJECT NAME</b></i>						
Distribution system replacement						
<i><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></i>						
Replace water distribution system to reduce 44% water loss; upgrade booster station; new tanks; PSD currently has inadequate storage for the water use; project will add backup pumps; will add booster chlorinations for residual concentration.						
<i><b>PROJECT TYPE</b></i>		<i><b>TOTAL COST</b></i>	<i><b>DWTRF TOTAL</b></i>		<i><b>DWTRF TERMS</b></i>	
4,5,6,7		\$10,200,000	\$8,500,000		1% @ 30 yrs	
<i><b>4000 PROPOSED</b></i>		<i><b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b></i>	<i><b>DISADVANTAGED</b></i>		<i><b>EXIST POPULATION</b></i>	
\$28.00		\$27.95	Yes		5,280	
<i><b>NEW POPULATION</b></i>						
5,482						

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>POINTS</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>AFFORDABILITY</b>	<b>PWSID</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
5	50	30	0	20	3302347	2006W-936
<b>SYSTEM</b>				<b>SYSTEM TYPES</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	
Buffalo Creek PSD				PSD	Logan	
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>						
Install pre-treatment system for WTP						
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>						
WTP pre-treatment system consisting of static mixer, (2) 3-stage flocculators, 2 sedimentation basins, transfer pumps, and solids pump station.						
<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>		<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>DWTRF TOTAL</b>		<b>DWTRF TERMS</b>	
2c,c,f,g		\$1,271,000	\$701,390		3% @ 20 yrs	
<b>4000 PROPOSED</b>		<b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b>	<b>DISADVANTAGED</b>		<b>EXIST POPULATION</b>	
\$22.98		\$25.41	No		2,765	
<b>NEW POPULATION</b>						
2,765						

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>POINTS</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>AFFORDABILITY</b>	<b>PWSID</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
6	48	20	3	25	3303611	2004W-804
<b>SYSTEM</b>				<b>SYSTEM TYPES</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	
Pendleton Co. PSD				PSD	Pendleton	
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>						
Kline & Mozer extension						
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>						
Waterline extension to the communities of Kline and Mozer in Pendleton Co.						
<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>		<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>DWTRF TOTAL</b>		<b>DWTRF TERMS</b>	
6		\$3,143,000	\$1,643,000		1% @ 30 yrs	
<b>4000 PROPOSED</b>		<b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b>	<b>DISADVANTAGED</b>		<b>EXIST POPULATION</b>	
\$41.12		\$30.87	Yes		485	
<b>NEW POPULATION</b>						
694						

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>POINTS</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>AFFORDABILITY</b>	<b>PWSID</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
7	45	30	10	5	3300218	2007W-???
<b>SYSTEM</b>				<b>SYSTEM TYPES</b>		<b>COUNTY</b>
Berkeley County PSD				PSD		Berkeley
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>						
Mill Creek water source & two wells						
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>						
Mill Creek water source & two wells						
<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>		<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>DWTRF TOTAL</b>		<b>DWTRF TERMS</b>	
2a,4,5,7		\$1,839,499	\$1,839,499		3% @ 20 yr	
<b>4000 PROPOSED</b>		<b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b>	<b>DISADVANTAGED</b>		<b>EXIST POPULATION</b>	
\$26.19		\$39.78	No		39,005	
<b>NEW POPULATION</b>						
39,005						

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>POINTS</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>AFFORDABILITY</b>	<b>PWSID</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
8	45	20	0	25	WV3303403	2006W-916a
<b>SYSTEM</b>				<b>SYSTEM TYPES</b>		<b>COUNTY</b>
Nettie-Leivasy PSD				PSD		Nicholas
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>						
Upgrade WTP to 350gpm						
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>						
Project will upgrade the WTP from 200 gpm to 350 gpm because the plant is operating beyond its design rate for 18-23 hours per day; one 71M gal and one 350M gal storage tanks; improve distribution system; and paint one existing tank; one coal preparation plant in Carl; and to Green Valley.						
<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>		<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>DWTRF TOTAL</b>		<b>DWTRF TERMS</b>	
2a,c,d,f,4,5,6,7		\$4,173,000	\$2,173,000		1% @ 30 yrs	
<b>4000 PROPOSED</b>		<b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b>	<b>DISADVANTAGED</b>		<b>EXIST POPULATION</b>	
\$39.34		\$27.70	Yes		3,115	
<b>NEW POPULATION</b>						
3,115						

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>POINTS</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>AFFORDABILITY</b>	<b>PWSID</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
9	43	20	3	20	3300702	2001W-607
<b>SYSTEM</b>				<b>SYSTEM TYPES</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	
Mt. Zion PSD				PSD	Calhoun	
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>						
Sand Ridge, Russett & SR 16 extensions						
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>						
Sand Ridge, Russett, Route 16 extension						
<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>		<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>DWTRF TOTAL</b>		<b>DWTRF TERMS</b>	
4,5,6		\$5,300,000	\$1,400,000		1% @ 30 yrs	
<b>4000 PROPOSED</b>		<b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b>	<b>DISADVANTAGED</b>		<b>EXIST POPULATION</b>	
\$30.88		\$23.66	Yes		1,320	
<b>NEW POPULATION</b>						
1,759						

<b>RANKING</b>	<b>POINTS</b>	<b>HEALTH</b>	<b>COMPLIANCE</b>	<b>AFFORDABILITY</b>	<b>PWSID</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>
10	40	20	0	20		2007W-???
<b>SYSTEM</b>				<b>SYSTEM TYPES</b>	<b>COUNTY</b>	
Shortline PSD					Harrison	
<b>PROJECT NAME</b>						
Marshville extension past prior project (1997W-346)						
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>						
Marshville extension past prior project (1997W-346). Residents have poor water quality (rotten egg smell & taste) and limited quantity.						
<b>PROJECT TYPE</b>		<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>DWTRF TOTAL</b>		<b>DWTRF TERMS</b>	
		\$3,384,930	\$3,384,930		3% @ 20 yrs	
<b>4000 PROPOSED</b>		<b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b>	<b>DISADVANTAGED</b>		<b>EXIST POPULATION</b>	
\$27.75		\$32.04	No			
<b>NEW POPULATION</b>						
2,640						

<i><b>RANKING</b></i>	<i><b>POINTS</b></i>	<i><b>HEALTH</b></i>	<i><b>COMPLIANCE</b></i>	<i><b>AFFORDABILITY</b></i>	<i><b>PWSID</b></i>	<i><b>NUMBER</b></i>
11	40	20	0	20		2006W-958
<i><b>SYSTEM</b></i>				<i><b>SYSTEM TYPES</b></i>		<i><b>COUNTY</b></i>
Mason County PSD				PSD		Mason
<i><b>PROJECT NAME</b></i>						
Conglomo II water extension						
<i><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></i>						
This project is extends water service to serve 268 (potentially 315) new customers along 21 ridges and roads throughout Mason County. The project requires approximately 42 miles of 8" through 2" line, one 54,000-gallon storage tank, and a 25-GPM booster station.						
<i><b>PROJECT TYPE</b></i>		<i><b>TOTAL COST</b></i>	<i><b>DWTRF TOTAL</b></i>		<i><b>DWTRF TERMS</b></i>	
4,5,6		\$4,038,000	\$4,038,000		1% @ 30 yrs	
<i><b>4000 PROPOSED</b></i>		<i><b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b></i>	<i><b>DISADVANTAGED</b></i>		<i><b>EXIST POPULATION</b></i>	
\$32.08		\$29.30	Yes		10,908	
<i><b>NEW POPULATION</b></i>						
11,551						

<i><b>RANKING</b></i>	<i><b>POINTS</b></i>	<i><b>HEALTH</b></i>	<i><b>COMPLIANCE</b></i>	<i><b>AFFORDABILITY</b></i>	<i><b>PWSID</b></i>	<i><b>NUMBER</b></i>
12	40	10	0	30		2006W-927
<i><b>SYSTEM</b></i>				<i><b>SYSTEM TYPES</b></i>		<i><b>COUNTY</b></i>
Friendly PSD (Improvement Project)				PSD		Tyler
<i><b>PROJECT NAME</b></i>						
Develop new wells, add pumping stations, add 3 storage tanks						
<i><b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b></i>						
Develop new wells and improve existing pumping and transportation mains for existing and new customers. Project will install an emergency connection to Bens Run, 35gpm booster for Pleasant Ridge, 100M gallon storage tank for Pursley and Rt. 180, 97M gallon storage tank for Smith Ridge, two wells (150 gpm each) in the Davenport well field will replace purchase of water from Sistersville, upgrade Cow Hollow booster station to 125 gpm, a 105M gallon storage tank at Davenport, radio telemetry, and pain						
<i><b>PROJECT TYPE</b></i>		<i><b>TOTAL COST</b></i>	<i><b>DWTRF TOTAL</b></i>		<i><b>DWTRF TERMS</b></i>	
1,4,5,6,7		\$2,080,000	\$2,080,000		1% @ 30 yrs	
<i><b>4000 PROPOSED</b></i>		<i><b>1¼ PERCENT MHI</b></i>	<i><b>DISADVANTAGED</b></i>		<i><b>EXIST POPULATION</b></i>	
\$46.10		\$31.01	Yes		1,682	
<i><b>NEW POPULATION</b></i>						
1,702						

ATTACHMENT 3

PPL Project Type Description

Funding List Detailed Description

## PPL Project Type Description

The projects on the following list have been approved by the West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council as technically feasible and the most cost effective alternative for solving drinking water needs in the area.

The projects on this list are ranked according to priority. The initial projects listed are the highest in ranking. The top four projects and one lower project are recommended to receive the available funding from the Capitalization Grant and State Match and the next projects will be funded through loan repayments and earned interest (if available). Their estimated total project funding requirement is **\$14,056,245**, of which, the DWTRF amount would be **\$7,324,077 (from capitalization grant and state match)**. The projects will be funded in order of priority. Projects may be bypassed using the bypass procedures outlined in the Intended Use Plan.

The list below indicates the project type coded on the PPL database.

1. Upgrade/improve raw water source
2. Water treatment plant improvements
  - a. Intake
  - b. Chemical feed
  - c. Clarification
  - d. Filtration
  - e. Disinfection
  - f. Clearwell
  - g. Waste disposal
  - h. Other
3. Consolidation with one or more entities
4. Pumping facilities
5. Finished water storage
6. Water line extensions
7. Distribution
8. Other

**July 1, 2007 thru June 30, 2008 - Funding List Descriptions**

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>System/Funding</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Project Benefits</i>
3	Weirton Area Water Board DWTRF- \$1,928,360 PROJECT- \$4,285,245 20 year term, 2% interest, 1% administration	Brooke	<p>This water system serves 24,790 people in the Weirton area and the system has had difficulty in meeting the Disinfection By-Products Rule regarding trihalomethanes (THMs). The system currently has a MCL violation for THM's and is in the process of public notification. The source of water is primarily surface water with supplemental well water. The root cause of the THM violation is organic content in the surface water.</p> <p>This project proposes to install an air stripper, equipment for improved coagulation, retrofit filters with extra filter media depth, and an Ultraviolet disinfection system. This project should enable the water system to achieve compliance with the SDWA.</p>
4	Southwestern Water PSD DWTRF- \$4,694,327 PROJECT- \$8,500,000 30 year term, 0% interest, 1% administration	Taylor	<p>This PSD currently has a 44% water loss, less than the required two day storage, and does not have redundant pumps for its water system. The PSD serves 5,280 people between Bridgeport and Grafton and purchases all of its water from Taylor County PSD. This project will significantly reduce the water loss by replacing its distribution piping system, upgrade its pump booster station and include redundancy, provide a new storage tank, and provide a booster chlorination station to ensure the system attains the required residual chlorine concentration. The project will also include an extension to serve 84 new customers.</p>

**July 1, 2007 thru June 30, 2008 - Funding List Descriptions**

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>System/Funding</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Project Benefits</i>
5	Buffalo Creek PSD DWTRF- \$701,390 PROJECT- \$1,271,000 30 year term, 0% interest, 1% administration	Logan	<p>The PSD originally utilized wells and an abandoned mine for its water sources and currently uses direct filtration treatment followed by chlorination and fluoridation for service to 3,023 residents. These water sources have been impacted by prior mining activities and now the primary water source is surface water from the nearby Buffalo Creek. However, use of this surface water has increased the total suspended solids concentration and has resulted in decreased filter runs and higher unacceptable backwash flows because there is no flocculation and sedimentation in the current treatment plant.</p> <p>This project proposes upgrading the plant with a pre-treatment system including a static mixer, (2) 3-stage flocculators, 2 sedimentation basins, transfer pumps, and a solids pump station. This project will enable the water system to efficiently use the surface water source and meet the SDWA requirements.</p>

ATTACHMENT 4

Public Hearing Comments

## **Public Comments**

The Public Hearing was held on March 19, 2007 at 1:30 pm at the West Virginia Bureau of Public Health, Environmental Engineering Division, 1 Davis Square, Capitol and Washington Streets, Charleston, WV as advertised in the State Register on February 16, 2007 (page 35 of 39). Mr. Robert DeCrease, representing WVBPH, was in attendance at the meeting. No one else attended the meeting.

Written comments from Federal EPA (via Mary Brewster) were reviewed and responses were appropriately incorporated into the Intended Use Plan. Comments from BPH legal counsel pertaining to various word and phrase descriptions were also incorporated into the Intended Use Plan. These comments are attached.

A letter was received from Ms. Paula Davis expressing her need for public water that would be part of the Mason County PSD "Conglomo II" project (number 12 our the PPL).