

Intended Use Plan American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 2009

Introduction

The Intended Use Plan (IUP) accompanies the State of West Virginia application for a \$19,500,000 capitalization grant for its Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (DWSRF) under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA).

West Virginia Office of Environmental Health Services (OEHS) is eligible for \$19,500,000 in federal ARRA funds. OEHS will allocate \$19,250,000 for drinking water infrastructure improvement projects. \$250,000 will be used for 4% Set-Aside (administrative in-kind services) activities. OEHS reserves the authority to take the unused portions of available set-asides from future base DWSRF grants.

There is no state match required for the ARRA. There will not be any transfer of funds between the Drinking Water and Clean Water programs. No changes to the state's regulations or policies are needed to enable the DWTRF to comply with the requirements of the ARRA legislation, including the subsidization requirement.

ARRA Goals

OEHS is committed to using the capitalization grant for which it is applying to provide assistance to water systems for capital improvement projects which will quickly proceed to construction, creating jobs, providing economic benefits, and furthering the public health protection objectives of the Safe Drinking Water Act. The OEHS goal is to enter into binding commitments for projects which will proceed to construction or award of construction contracts by February 17, 2010. OEHS intends to award all assistance available under this capitalization grant in full conformance with the deadlines established under the ARRA and the terms and conditions of the capitalization grant award.

OEHS recognizes that the goal of the ARRA is to expeditiously fund eligible projects that will simultaneously create jobs, promote economic recovery, and generate long-term benefits from infrastructure investment. In this grant, the State is being called upon to accomplish goals that may not previously been priorities in its base DWSRF program. Some priorities and activities in the State's base program that may not be attainable within the timeframes associated with the ARRA will be pursued using funds made available through the base DWSRF program.

ARRA funds may be used to provide assistance for restructuring project loans closed after October 1, 2008. OEHS will give preference to projects that can be initiated within 120 days of ARRA enactment to attain at least 50% of available ARRA assistance.

Sources and Uses of Funds

OEHS is applying for a capitalization grant in the amount of \$19,500,000. This represents the amount USEPA Region III informed OEHS that we are eligible to receive

under the State's allocation from the supplemental appropriation enacted under the ARRA. Note that the ARRA has waived the State match that the State is normally required to provide in order to receive a capitalization grant.

OEHS intends to take part of the 4% (\$250,000) set-aside of for DWSRF program administration. The remainder of the eligible 4% set-aside along with the 2% and 10% set-aside will be available for future use if requested by OEHS from other future base DWSRF grants.

Loan Terms and Fees

OEHS proposes to use \$19,250,000 of federal ARRA funds to provide loans to public water systems for infrastructure improvements. Additional subsidization in the form of grants, debt forgiveness, or negative interest amounting to at least 50% or \$9,750,000 of the ARRA grant will be provided to water systems. The required 20% or \$3,900,000 will be used to fund green infrastructure projects (see below for details).

Interest Rate

- a) The affordability standard for annual water user charges is set at 1.5% of Median Household Income (MHI) for 4,000 gallon monthly usage. Water rates equal to or greater than this standard will be considered disadvantaged. Water rates below this standard will be considered non-disadvantaged.
- b) Funding will be provided at 0% or less (including debt forgiveness or grants) up to 30 years for disadvantaged public water systems.
- c) If DWSRF funding replaces another agency's grantor loan funds on a previously approved Infrastructure Council project, additional subsidization will be provided to maintain the approved level of affordability. If the project was determined to be disadvantaged by the Infrastructure Council prior to 2008, that determination will carry over to this grant.

Loan Terms

Terms are given up to 20 years for non-disadvantaged loans and up to 30 years for loans that qualify for the disadvantaged community water systems.

Administrative Fees

OEHS will waive the administrative fee on all ARRA loans.

Deferred Loan Repayment

The DWTRF loan program can provide deferred loan repayment schedules to make projects more affordable to water systems. In this case, the water system will start repayments following construction completion, but the initial payments will be reduced until one or more existing debts are paid in full. Then, the water system will make accelerated DWTRF payments within the loan period. This will allow a level debt service payment for water systems to make infrastructure projects more affordable.

Project Selection and Loan Activities

ARRA funds were treated in the same manner as DWSRF funds with project selection and loan activities. OEHS alerted potential borrowers of the ARRA through the WV Planning and Development Councils in February. Information was distributed to this group as details changed and regulations were finalized. As a result of this effort, over \$200 Million in project applications were received by April 8, 2009.

One project has met the readiness to proceed criteria and is ready to close a loan immediately. That project is the City of Petersburg's water treatment plant upgrade and storage tank replacement. This project will use \$5,000,000 of ARRA funds of which 50% will be provided as subsidized assistance. Full applications were accepted by OEHS until April 8. Final project ranking was completed on April 9, 2009.

Refer to the PPL Fundable List for more information on projects.

Additional Subsidization

The ARRA requires that not less than 50% of assistance provided is in the form of additional subsidies. OEHS has the authority to offer principal forgiveness and negative interest loans in an amount up to 100% of a loan made by the State's DWSRF program. The Fundable List includes six projects that potentially could receive up to \$10,415,000 in additional subsidization for disadvantaged water systems. The 50% amount of ARRA funds is \$9,750,000, so OEHS has met the requirement for additional subsidization.

Green Infrastructure

The ARRA requires that, to the extent there are sufficient eligible project applications, not less than 20% of the funds provided for projects be used for water efficiency, energy efficiency, green infrastructure, or other environmentally innovative activities. The projects listed in the attached Fundable List of projects includes three projects with a total assistance amount of \$7,401,260 designated as potentially meeting one or more of the specific objectives required by this provision. A business case will be developed for each of these projects for review by EPA to determine final qualification as a green infrastructure project for purposes of this requirement. OEHS must identify green infrastructure projects by August 17, 2009.

The State has determined that the components of these projects should qualify towards the green project reserve totals \$7,401,260. As the 20% requirement for OEHS amounts to a required total of \$3,900,000, the State has met this requirement of the ARRA.

Repayments

OEHS will deposit repayments of ARRA funds in the DWSRF accounts according to DWSRF guidelines.

Bypass Procedures

In accordance with federal guidance, projects will have to move quickly to ensure ARRA funding. Projects that are not ready to proceed will be bypassed.

Since a primary criterion for this IUP is to fund projects that are “shovel ready”, a checklist will be utilized to determine if a project should be by-passed. Funding commitments will be based on the checklist for those projects that can proceed to construction as soon as possible. OEHS will use the DWTRF - Ready to Proceed Checklist (Attachment 3) to determine the status of projects for funding consideration. It will be the water system’s or their representative’s responsibility to communicate to OEHS the current project status or any changes to the project’s readiness to proceed status. A water system must indicate its readiness to proceed status to OEHS to determine funding assistance commitment.

Priority for Projects Ready to Proceed to Construct in 12 Months/ Preference for Expeditious Activities

OEHS required that all applicants submit a readiness to proceed checklist with their application for DWSRF funds. The checklist indicates the documents required to verify the status of the project to ensure they are truly ready to proceed. The IUP has been advertised and states all loans for ARRA projects must be in construction or contracts awarded by February 17, 2010. Preference will be given to projects ready to proceed to construction within twelve (12) months of ARRA enactment.

In addition, OEHS is working with bond counsel to determine language that will be incorporated with Binding Commitments and Loan Documents that will require projects to be in construction or contracts awarded by February 17, 2010.

Avoidance of Re-allotment/Relationship to Base Program

In order to meet the requirements and deadlines of the ARRA for the expeditious and timely commitment and expenditure of funds, OEHS will regularly review the data reported to EPA on the progress of loan recipients under the statutory deadlines specified in the IUP to identify any issues with the timeliness of this progress. If such issues are identified, OEHS intends to work with EPA to resolve such issues. The State will include conditions in its assistance agreements to ensure that loan recipients make timely progress with respect to entering into contracts and/or construction. If a recipient fails to maintain progress with these conditions, they may receive funding from other DWSRF (or alternate agency’s) monies so that ARRA funding can be provided for a project that is ready to proceed.

The State understands that the USEPA may de-obligate grant funds from States that fail to meet requirements on use of ARRA funds. However, if the State is eligible for additional funds made available by a re-allotment or ARRA funds, the State will provide EPA with a list of projects from its PPL and certify that they are immediately prepared to proceed to construction within 120 days of re-allotment.

In addition to the aforementioned timeline, DWSRF bypass procedures will be utilized. Upon written notice, OEHS can bypass a project on the PPL based on the following:

- Project is withdrawn by applicant
- Project is not ready to proceed

- Municipality is unwilling to address Significant Non-Compliance issues
- System is lacking technical, managerial, or financial capacity

OEHS will provide applicants written notice if their project(s) will be bypassed. OEHS will reinstate bypassed projects if funds become available and the project is ready to proceed. Funds that become available due to project bypass will become available to the next project on the PPL.

DBE Participation

Loans using the ARRA grant will conform to Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) steps as outlined by EPA. Borrowers must document and demonstrate good faith efforts consistent with federal regulations under 40CFR Part 31.36(e).

Tie Breaking Procedures

The project with the greatest number of points under the Public Health section of the ranking criteria sheet will receive the higher ranking. If there is still a tie, the system with the lower population will receive the higher ranking.

Set-Asides

The ARRA allows states to use part of the grant to support Set-Aside activities. OEHS is applying for \$250,000 for 4% or program administration use. OEHS will administer the ARRA with the assistance of in-kind services from an EPA contractor to save time which will benefit the State's efforts to process the ARRA workload. OEHS will provide administrative support through financial reviews and loan maintenance.

Public Review

A public hearing was held on March 26, 2009 to discuss this IUP and project selection. Public comment was held open from March 9, 2009 to April 8, 2009. Comments received have been taken into consideration for this final IUP.

Assurances

OEHS agrees to comply with federal program requirements as required by the ARRA grant. Davis-Bacon Act wage rules at a minimum will apply to all funding assistance. All iron, steel, and manufactured goods used in each project must be produced in the United States. All other federal cross-cutter requirements apply to this Capitalization Grant.

Reporting

OEHS will report weekly in the EPA Project Tracking System status of ARRA projects on an on-going basis.

List of Attachments

- 1- Project Priority List—Fundable List
- 2- Project Priority List—Comprehensive
- 3- Readiness to Proceed Checklist
- 4- DWTRF Project Priority Ranking System

Attachment 1 - Fundable List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	Estimated Date of Construction	Green Project Designation	Green Project Reserve	Principal Forgiveness	Estimated Total DWTRF Assistance	Funding Source	TOTAL COST
1	Whitmer Water Association, Inc.	Construct a new water treatment and distribution system. This project will ensure a safe, reliable source of water for customers. The system was originally constructed in 1907 and has not been maintained resulting in significant water loss and water outages.	-4% @ 30 yrs	89	Jun-09			\$2,000,000	\$2,265,000	ARRA	\$3,765,000
3	Sun Valley PSD / City of Salem	Take Salem WTP off-line; Extensions: Turkeyfoot, Lake Floyd, Katy Lick, Halls Run, Jarvisville, Raccoon Run, Flinderation ... for 457 new customers	-4% @ 30 yrs	2054	Aug-09	E,W	\$2,151,260	\$2,700,000	\$3,900,000	ARRA	\$7,950,000
10	Town of Bath (Berkeley Springs)	Replace existing potable water distribution lines in the Town. The Town is under a mandatory moratorium on new connections until water loss is reduced allowing the plant production time to be reduced.	-4% @ 30 yrs	4042	Dec-09	W	\$4,500,000	\$2,250,000	\$4,500,000	ARRA	\$4,500,000
22	New Haven PSD/Fayette County Commission	Construct waterline, a storage tank, valves, hydrants, service lines, meter settings and all appurtenances. This project will serve 89 new customers in the Stringtown Road area of Fayette county. 50% of the homes tested were positive for E. Coli. The project consists of 24,275 LF of 8" DIP, 7,200 LF of 6" DIP, 4,250 LF of 2" PVC, a 104M gallon tank and other appurtenances. Originally was part of 2002W-708.	-4% @ 30 yrs	5119	Aug-09			\$340,000	\$680,000	ARRA	\$2,265,000
36	Welch, City Of	In order to maintain reliable service this project consists of repair and replacement of Water Storage Tanks. This will help ensure consistent water quality and quantity to customers.	-4% @ 30 yrs	3120	Jun-09			\$625,000	\$1,250,000	ARRA	\$1,380,169
48	Petersburg, City of	Upgrade City's existing water treatment plant to 2400 GPM; replace existing storage tank and install new tank feed line. This project will enable the utility to meet design standards for storage and reduce plant operating time to the recommended level. It will also mitigate a non-compliant waste discharge.	-4% @ 30 yrs	6000	May-09			\$2,500,000	\$5,000,000.00	ARRA	\$10,700,000
66	Charles Town Utility Board	Purchase and installation of Radio Read meters to convert from bimonthly reading of meters allowing for quick assessment of flow conditions to better isolate leaks and thus reduce the loss of water.	2% @ 20 yrs	16879	Jun-09	W	\$750,000		\$1,655,000	ARRA	\$2,000,000
Total							\$7,401,260	\$10,415,000	\$19,250,000		\$32,560,169

Green Project Key E = Energy Efficiency, W = Water Efficiency, G = Green Infrastructure, I = Innovative Technology
 ARRA = American Recovery & Reinvestment Act, DWTRF = Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund, U = Undetermined
 Source Key Undetermined

\$3,900,000
20% Green Infrastructure Goal
 \$9,750,000
50% Principal Forgiveness Goal
 \$19,250,000
Amount of Grant minus set-aside

Principal Forgiveness may be in the form of Grant or Negative Interest Rate

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
1	Whitmer Water Association, Inc.	Construct a new water treatment and distribution system.	-4% @ 30 yrs	89	\$2,265,000	\$3,765,000
2	War, City Of	Phase V of a six phase replacement of the badly deteriorated water distributions system originally constructed in the 1920's. Excessive water losses and lack of pressure result in inadequate supply to residents and insufficient fire flow. The disinfection system currently used is inadequate and results in inconsistent water quality throughout the system.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1131	\$579,240	\$1,158,480
3	Sun Valley PSD	Take Salem WTP off-line; Extensions: Turkeyfoot, Lake Floyd, Katy Lick, Halls Run, Jarvisville, Racoon Run, Flinderation ... for 457 new customers	-4% @ 30 yrs	2054	\$3,900,000	\$7,950,000
4	Fairmont, City Of	To provide the needed pretreatment process of the raw water source; correct deficiencies in the design of the membrane reject and recycle treatment; and correct deficiencies in the design of the sludge solids and residual handling.	-4% @ 30 yrs	31694	\$9,688,900	\$8,745,000
5	Jefferson Utilities	Replacement of the Keyes Ferry Acres, Westridge Hills, Harpers Ferry Campsites distribution systems and wells.	-4% @ 30 yrs	915	\$10,250,000	\$10,250,000
6	Clay County PSD	Project involves extension of service to the PSD's recently constructed system in Southern Clay County. Approximately 240 customers can be supplied water by gravity (no new tanks/boosters needed).	-4% @ 30 yrs	960	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000
7	Queen Shoals PSD	The proposed distribution system improvements consist of the construction of a storage tank, two pressure reducing stations, booster station, and replacement of metering equipment, installation of waterline and necessary appurtenances.	-4% @ 30 yrs	384	\$850,000	\$950,000
8	Coons Run PSD	Waterline extension to serve approximately 37 new customers some of which hav contaminated wells, as well as system-wide upgrades to correct chronic non-compliance of the system.	-4% @ 30 yrs	732	\$2,400,000	\$2,400,000
9	Taylor County PSD	Installation of 8,500 feet of 4" water main, 2,300 feet of 2" water main, 3 gate valves and 11 water services.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1296	\$126,000	\$280,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
10	Town of Bath (Berkeley Springs)	Replace existing potable water distribution lines in the Town. The Town is under a mandatory moratorium on new connections until water loss is reduced allowing the plant production time to be reduced.	-4% @ 30 yrs	4042	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000
11	Putnam County Commission - WVAW	Waterline extension on Jim Ridge in northern Putnam County to serve approximately 61 new customers.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$2,000,000	\$2,300,000
11	Putnam County Commission - WVAW	Construction of Five separate waterline extensions in northern Putnam County that will provide water service to approximately 56 new customers.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000
11	Putnam County Commission - WVAW	Construction of four separate waterline extensions in southern Putnam County that will provide water service to approximately 70 new customers.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$1,982,000	\$2,150,000
11	Putnam County Commission - WVAW	Waterline extension on Fishers Ridge in northern Putnam County to serve approximately 36 new customers.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$1,600,000	\$1,600,000
11	Putnam County Commission - WVAW	Waterline extension on Manila Ridge in northern Putnam County to serve approximately 53 new customers.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$1,500,000	\$1,700,000
16	Salt Rock PSD - WVAW	Waterline extension on Upper Toms Creek in Cabell County to serve approximately 39 new customers who currently experience water outages of 1 week or longer.	2% @ 20 yrs	7915	\$597,000	\$714,000
16	Salt Rock PSD - WVAW	Waterline extension on Big Cabell Creek in Cabell County to serve approximately 21 new customers who currently experience water outages of 1 week or longer.	2% @ 20 yrs	7915	\$318,000	\$381,000
16	Salt Rock PSD - WVAW	Waterline extension on Lower Heath Creek in Cabell County to serve approximately 13 new customers who currently experience water outages of 1 week or longer.	2% @ 20 yrs	7915	\$126,000	\$165,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
19	Kanawha County RDA (Derrick's Creek Ridge)	Extend water service to the Derrick's Creek Ridge area of northern Kanawha County from the WVAW - Kanawha Valley Distribution System. The project will serve 45 families who have very poor water due to low amounts, fecal coliform and/or poor aesthetic quality.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$500,000	\$1,181,000
19	Kanawha County Regional Development Authority (Olcott / Alum Creek)	Extend water service to the Olcott and Alum Creek areas of Kanawha County from the WVAW - Kanawha Valley Distribution System. The project will serve 204 families who have very poor water due to low amounts, fecal coliform or poor aesthetic quality. The project consists of 65,000 feet of main and includes 30 hydrants.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$2,300,000	\$3,230,000
21	Pratt, Town of	Project will repair leaks and improve pressure and fire flow. New valves will improve system control. Fencing will provide security to tank sites. Project will improve raw water intake and provide a chlorine alarm in the chlorine room and office.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1114	\$964,000	\$964,000
22	New Haven PSD/Fayette County Commission	Construct waterline, a storage tank, valves, hydrants, service lines, meter settings and all appurtenances. This project will serve 89 new customers in the Stringtown Road area of Fayette county. 50% of the homes tested were positive for E. Coli. The project consists of 24,275 LF of 8" DIP, 7,200 LF of 6" DIP, 4,250 LF of 2" PVC, a 104M gallon tank and other appurtenances. Originally was part of 2002W-708.	-4% @ 30 yrs	5119	\$680,000	\$2,265,000
23	Boone County PSD (Phase I- Prenter Road / Route 5)	Phase I to extend water to the northern area of Prenter Road / Route 5.	-4% @ 30 yrs	21033	\$1,300,000	\$2,237,500
24	Reedy, Town of	Repaint existing 100M gal storage tank, grading and stone for access road, 7' security fence, miscellaneous repairs to tank, tank cleaning, and altitude valve work.	-4% @ 30 yrs	410	\$130,000	\$130,000
25	Frankfort PSD	Phase I purchase of Wiley Ford Water Company only. Take Wiley Ford Water Company off-line; upgrade system; new water wells; connect to Frankfort PSD; provide water to Industrial Park	-4% @ 30 yrs	912	\$940,000	\$940,000
26	Jane Lew PSD	Remove and replace existing gate valves, install new gate valves and bypass meters, replace waterline, install PVC, booster pump station, fence, solenoid valve flow control station, booster chlorination station, and replace a river crossing water line. Replace 12,500 LF of water line; install a 37 gpm booster station; fence existing tank; install booster chlorination station; replace river crossing line; decommission WTP (plant to connect to Greater Harrison County PSD for water).	-4% @ 30 yrs	1344	\$792,464	\$888,664
27	City of Cameron	Replace the remaining old distribution lines within the existing system. This project will reduce the City's water loss to meet standards.	2% @ 20 yrs	1159	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
28	Grant Town, Town of	Replac. existing cast iron water lines, valves, hydrants and recon. of serv. lines. Clean. and paint. of water storage tank and an exten. to serv. 26 new custom.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1330	\$1,610,000	\$3,110,000
29	Rivesville, Town of	Upgrade water system, replace stream crossings, perform storage system repairs and improve fire flows to the Town residents. Extensions include two streets in town which will serve approximately 5 new customers.	2% @ 20 yrs	1498	\$1,707,893	\$5,085,276
30	Shortline PSD	Tank Replacement	2% @ 20 yrs	2505	\$600,000	\$600,000
31	City of Philippi	WTP upgrades including a new raw water intake, chemical feed system, chlorination system, and improvements to the flocculation/sedimentation basins and filters to meet Federal Regs and improve operations.	-4% @ 30 yrs	3161	\$2,103,400	\$2,898,000
32	Hardy County PSD	Upgrade the Route 55 booster pump station	2% @ 20 yrs	4420	\$325,000	\$325,000
32	Hardy County PSD	Replacement of water lines along Trough Road	2% @ 20 yrs	4420	\$176,000	\$176,000
34	Grant County PSD	Additional pump to comply with standard and correct sanitary survey deficiency.	2% @ 20 yrs	5573	\$100,000	\$100,000
35	Sugar Creek PSD	Painting two (2) existing tanks, new telemetry system and minor upgrades to the water treatment plant.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1128	\$480,000	\$880,000
36	Welch, City Of	Water Storage Tanks repair and replacement project.	-4% @ 30 yrs	3120	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
37	Southwestern Water PSD	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.	-4% @ 30 yrs	4944	\$6,100,000	\$10,100,000
38	Webster County Commission / EDA	Diana Phase I water main extension project to extend water service from Webster Springs to Diana.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1776	\$2,600,000	\$2,500,000
39	Hardy County PSD	Extension to Marvin Chapel	2% @ 20 yrs	4420	\$1,315,800	\$1,315,800
39	Hardy County PSD	Dover Hollow line extension	2% @ 20 yrs	4420	\$500,000	\$500,000
39	Clay County PSD	Ext. to Big Otter/Nebo	-4% @ 30 yrs	960	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000
42	Oakvale Road PSD	Extension from Poplar Groves Estates to Oakville (including the town) along Rt.12, Cheesy Creek Road, and part of Greasy Ridge Road for 354 new customers	-4% @ 30 yrs	4507	\$5,968,000	\$6,266,000
43	Keyser, City of	Upgrade existing water treatment plant, paint existing tank, extend water service to 79 homes in the Hollywood Road area and replace existing cast iron water main along Limestone Run Road. Also, construct a new storage tank.	-4% @ 30 yrs	6223	\$1,500,000	\$11,000,000
44	Camden-On-Gauley	Construct water line, river crossing, gate valves meter settings, fire hydrants, blow-off hydrants, rehabilitate storage tank and all necessary appurtenances.	-4% @ 30 yrs	442	\$939,000	\$2,439,500
45	Pendleton Co. PSD	Waterline extension to the communities of Kline and Mozer in Pendleton Co.	-4% @ 30 yrs	485	\$690,000	\$3,143,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
46	Pleasant Hill PSD	Project consists of extending public water service to approximately 45 new customer in the Ritchie County that currently rely on private sources such as wells, cisterns and hauling water. Several well sources in the project area have tested positive for fecal coliform.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1584	\$800,000	\$800,000
47	Century Volga PSD	Extend water service to approximately 60 residential customers along the Brushy Fork Road area, Spawlick Road, & the Scales Road of rural Barbour County.	-4% @ 30 yrs	2184	\$750,000	\$2,389,000
48	Petersburg, City of	Upgrade City's existing water treatment plant to 2400 GPM; replace existing storage tank and install new tank feed line.	2% @ 20 yrs	6000	\$7,768,600	\$10,700,000
49	Town of Pax	Extension of water lines to Town Creek and Horse Creek north of Pax. Project will include installation of main, service lines, stream crossings, railroad crossings, meters, valves, hydrants and all appurtenances.	-4% @ 30 yrs	821	\$900,000	\$900,000
50	Pleasant Hill PSD	Extension to 45 new customers near the community of Smithville in southern Ritchie county. Construction consists of 33,000 LF of 8-, 6-, 2-inch waterline, 13 hydrants and necessary appurtenances.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1584	\$1,465,000	\$1,465,000
51	Gauley River PSD	Provide water service to approximately 136 new customers in the area along Route 39 from Jerry Fork to the Town of Summersville.	-4% @ 30 yrs	2177	\$2,064,670	\$2,323,890
52	Chestnut Ridge PSD	Extension to 257 new customers in Preston Co, Pea Ridge, Teter Creek, Colebank & Rt. 250N of Philippi in Barbour. Plus 342 new customers in Preston and sell water to Tunnelton (363) and Denver Water Assoc (132) customers.	-4% @ 30 yrs	2405	\$800,000	\$1,645,000
53	Nettie-Leivasy PSD	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.	-4% @ 30 yrs	3216	\$2,173,000	\$4,173,000
53	Nettie-Leivasy PSD	Waterline extension to serve Carl and Green Valley.	-4% @ 30 yrs	3216	\$3,153,000	\$3,153,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
55	Lashmeet PSD	Construct Spanishburg Water System Extension Project - Phase 2B to provide water service to approximately 65 bonafide (81 potential) customers in the Spanishburg, Wolf Cfreek and Gardner Road Area of Mercer County.	-4% @ 30 yrs	3449	\$328,000	\$1,898,000
56	Mineral Wells PSD	Project consists to extending public water service to approximately 25 new customers in the Central Ridge - Bogal Ridge - Pond Creek areas of Wood County that currently rely on private water sources such as wells, cisterns and hauling water. The project is designed and was removed from a previous contract due to cost.	2% @ 20 yrs	4223	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
57	Summersville, City of	Glade Creek Phase II extension, which includes Lower Glade Creek Road, Armstrong Road, Maria Estates, Phillips Run, Old Route 19, and McMillion Creek.	-4% @ 30 yrs	4862	\$372,000	\$5,888,000
58	Boone County PSD	Turtle Creek/Corridor G water line extension will extend service to approximately 115 new customers. This water line extension will allow for future water line extensions to be constructed by Boone County, and will allow for improved infrastructure along Corridor G which is believed to improve commercial growth potential.	-4% @ 30 yrs	21033	\$2,129,000	\$2,635,000
59	Kanawha County Regional Development Authority (Sissonville Areas)	Extend water service to twelve areas of Sissonville from the WVAW - Kanawha Valley distribution system.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$1,500,000	\$2,547,000
60	Claywood Park PSD	Construction of a public water system that will serve approximately 300 households in various areas of Wood & Wirt counties.	2% @ 20 yrs	7855	\$3,742,000	\$5,242,000
61	Hodgesville PSD	Installation of a water line extension along Red Rock to serve 8 customers and a water line extension along Sauls Run and Spruce Fork to serve 43 customers	-4% @ 30 yrs	2606	\$1,500,000	\$1,873,115
62	Lubeck PSD	Extension to serve 91 customers in the Wadesville area of Steele District.	2% @ 20 yrs	9317	\$3,325,000	\$3,325,000
63	Morgantown Utility Board	Installation of membrane filtration, and new chemical processes to reduce DBP.	2% @ 20 yrs	53854	\$10,000,000	\$49,990,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
64	Pleasants County PSD	Project consists of extending public water service to approximately 65 new customers that currently rely on private water sources such as wells, cisterns and hauling water. The project was cut from a previous construction project and is designed.	2% @ 20 yrs	7514	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
65	Oakland PSD	Construct a new water storage tank, refurbish the existing tank, install filtration system for iron and manganese, and construct line extension to pick up approximately 115 new customers.	2% @ 20 yrs	1982	\$3,267,686	\$3,789,686
66	Charles Town Utility Board	Purchase and installation of Radio Read meters to convert from bimonthly reading of meters allowing for quick assessment of flow conditions to better isolate leaks and thus reduce the loss of water.	2% @ 20 yrs	16879	\$1,655,000	\$2,000,000
67	Frankfort PSD	Phase II Total Upgrade of water system; construction of water wells and connection to the existing Frankfort PSD water system.	-4% @ 30 yrs	926	\$3,640,000	\$5,500,000
68	Kanawha Co. RDA WVAW Upper Kanawha Valley	This project will reinforce the water distribution system from the Kanawha Valley Water Plant along Route 60 to allow for the ultimate elimination of the Montgomery WTP, Pratt WTP, and Cedar Grove WTP.	-4% @ 30 yrs	240000	\$10,614,000	\$10,614,000
69	Ellenboro - Lamberton PSD	Extension of water service to approximately 35 new customers that currently rely on private water sources such as wells, cisterns and hauling water.	2% @ 20 yrs	455	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000
70	Clover PSD	Construction of waterline, two pressure reducing stations and necessary appurtenances.	-4% @ 30 yrs	770	\$1,000,000	\$2,750,000
71	Clay, Town Of	Water line extension of approximately 3.5 miles with a tank and booster station to serve approximately 50 customers in the Blue Knob area due to low water quantity.	-4% @ 30 yrs	1341	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
72	Northern Jackson County PSD	Water extension to include waterline, test stations, one pressure reducing station and necessary appurtenances.	-4% @ 30 yrs	2534	\$1,910,000	\$1,910,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
73	Friendly PSD	Extensions to serve the Elk Fork and Bens Run areas.	-4% @ 30 yrs	4274	\$1,875,000	\$1,875,000
74	Boone County PSD	Water extension to provide public water to approximately 20 customers in the Long Branch area due to low water quantity from existing wells.	-4% @ 30 yrs	21033	\$540,000	\$600,000
74	Boone County PSD	AML project to serve approximately 140 new customer in the Cameo area. Existing well have been judged to be impacted by pre-law mining cause quantity issues.	-4% @ 30 yrs	21033	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000
74	Boone County PSD	Mainline extension to serve 5 customers in the Stollings Rd. area due to low water quantity from existing wells.	-4% @ 30 yrs	21033	\$300,000	\$550,000
74	Boone County PSD	Water extension to serve approximately 45 new customers from Lick Creek to Corridor G along Stollings Rd. Existing wells produce low quantity and sulphur laden water.	-4% @ 30 yrs	21033	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000
78	Fairmont, City of	Replacement of Water line along Fairmont Avenue consisting of approximately 7,000 LF of 8-inch waterline and all necessary appurtanences.	-4% @ 30 yrs	31694	\$405,000	\$405,000
78	Fairmont, City of	Replacement of Water line in Rayford Acres consisting of approximately 7,200 LF of 6-inch waterline and all necessary appurtanences.	-4% @ 30 yrs	31694	\$321,000	\$321,000
78	Fairmont, City of	Replacement of Water line along Cheasapeake Road consisting of approximately 4,200 LF of 6-inch water line and all necessary appurtanences.	-4% @ 30 yrs	31694	\$175,000	\$175,000
81	Elizabeth, Town Of	Project consists of extending public water service to approximately 25 households in Wirt County that currently rely on private water sources such as wells, cisterns and hauling water. The project is designed and ready to bid.	2% @ 20 yrs	1598	\$600,000	\$600,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
82	Parkersburg Utility Board	Phase II Water Distribution system improvements including approximately 8 miles of water main. Replacement of small diameter pipe and interconnection of several small service areas allowing abandonment of four constant run water booster stations.	2% @ 20 yrs	36448	\$5,800,000	\$6,800,000
83	Boone Raleigh PSD	Rehabilitation/Replacement of the existing 1936 plant.	2% @ 20 yrs	845	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000
84	Romney, City Of	Purchase and installation of emergency generator(s) to provide electrical power during emergency situations.	2% @ 20 yrs	1935	\$480,000	\$480,000
85	Southern Jackson County PSD	Due to customer growth, portions of the District's existing system are in need of upgrading. The Jim Ridge Booster Station is operating at full capacity and is in need of modifications to increase capacity. The Mountain View Storage Tank cannot maintain a full operating level due to being served by undersized transmission mains within the distribution system and the existing 6" transmission main proceeding south along County Route 21 from the Coleman Run Booster Station is insufficient to provide service to the southern half of the system and is in need of replacement. The proposed upgrade to the Southern Jackson County PSD Water Distribution System consists of the replacement of approximately 30,000 l.f. of 12", 10", 8" and 6" water main; installation of a 100,000-gallon storage tank; upgrading of the Jim Ridge Booster Station, and construction of necessary appurtenances.	2% @ 20 yrs	5483	\$1,850,000	\$1,850,000
85	Southern Jackson County PSD	The residents of Faber Hollow, Pigeonroost Run, and US Route 33 East have expressed a dire need for public water service from the District due to lack of suitable private water supplies. The majority of the residents report either a lack of quantity or substandard quality of water for domestic purposes. The proposed extension to the Southern Jackson County PSD Water System includes installation of approximately 27,000 l.f. of 8", 6", and 2" waterline; 250,000-gallon storage tank; and necessary appurtenances to serve approximately 53 new users.	2% @ 20 yrs	5483	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
87	Grant County PSD	Extend water lines into an area of the county that currently relies on wells for water. This area has poor quality groundwater and low producing wells.	2% @ 20 yrs	6214	\$528,240	\$990,000
87	Grant County PSD	Upgrade 2700 meters to radio read technology.	2% @ 20 yrs	6214	\$680,575	\$680,575
89	WVAW - Fayette Co.	Upgrade of 12,000 meters in Fayette County with automatic metering and an acoustic monitoring system.	-4% @ 30 yrs	20192	\$3,850,000	\$4,200,000
90	East Bank, Town Of	Construction of a new water storage tank and pump station.	2% @ 20 yrs	1093	\$350,000	\$650,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
91	Clarksburg, City of	Replacement of valves coordinating with the City's valve replacement plan.	2% @ 20 yrs	18152	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
91	Clarksburg, City of	Replacement of approximately 1 mile of waterline along Pike and Main Streets due to frequent breaks and extreme age.	2% @ 20 yrs	18152	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000
91	Clarksburg, City of	The original 1950's tank interior paint has never been removed or overcoated. The original paint was lead-based. The exterior have been overcoated twice. New paint to comply with applicable standards.	2% @ 20 yrs	18152	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
91	Clarksburg, City of	Construction of a second tank to provide equalization and distribution storage.	2% @ 20 yrs	18152	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000
91	Clarksburg, City of	Emergency/stand-by generator for the WTP which is subject to periodic power interruption to ensure uninterrupted service to the new hospital.	2% @ 20 yrs	18152	\$650,000	\$650,000
96	Putnam PSD	Replacement/rehabilitation of the plant clarifier.	2% @ 20 yrs	21762	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
96	Putnam PSD	Replacement/rehabilitation of the plant filter.	2% @ 20 yrs	21762	\$727,000	\$727,000
98	Berkeley County PSD	Main replacement	2% @ 20 yrs	44926	\$432,000	\$480,000
98	Berkeley County PSD	Main replacement	2% @ 20 yrs	44926	\$2,800,000	\$2,800,000

Attachment 2 - Comprehensive Project Priority List

RANKING	SYSTEM	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	DWTRF TERMS	EXIST POPULATION	DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED	TOTAL COST
98	Berkeley County PSD	Filter insallation	2% @ 20 yrs	44926	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000
101	New Cumberland, City of	Install a pre-fabricated water treatment facility with a capacity of approximately 1,000 gallons per minute. A new potable booster station with two 500 GPM pumps, VFD's and approximately 1000 L.F. of waterline replacement.	2% @ 20 yrs	1463	\$1,014,000	\$1,014,000
		TOTAL			\$200,538,468	\$302,441,486

(Attachment 3)

DWTRF - Ready to Proceed Checklist:

Instructions: Please complete and return this form as soon as possible to:

*Robert W. DeCrease, P.E.
1 Davis Square, Suite 200
Capitol & Washington Sts.
Charleston, WV 25301-1798
Phone: (304)558-6749 Fax:(304)558-0691
Email: robert.w.decrease@wv.gov*

Date: _____
Contact Person: _____
Company/Organization: _____
Contact Phone Number: _____
Contact E-Mail: _____

Applicant: _____
Project Name: _____
IJDC Number: _____
County: _____

Check the appropriate answer for each item:

Complete	Incomplete	Not Applicable	
			IJDC review and approval (Attach IJDC approval letter)
			Capacity Development Assessment (BPH files contain report)
			FONSI or CE issued by Health Department (Attach cover letter)
			Preliminary Title Opinion (Attach if complete)
			Final Title Opinion (Attach if complete)
			Health Department Permit (Attach if complete)
			Design Loan / Grant (Attach summary page(s) of agreement)
			80% of User Agreements (Attach listing of all users and status of agreement)
			Other Committed Funds (Attach Commitment letters)
			List Sources and Amounts:
			1
			2
			3
			Rule 42 covering the project costs (Attach CPA cover letter for Rule 42)
			Rate Ordinance / 19A Rate Case (Attach ordinance, PSC final order, or CPA cert.)
			PSD Boundary Adjustment (Attach authorization letter from County Commission)
			Contract Bids advertised (Send copy of advertisement). If not, when are bids planned to be advertised: _____
			Contract Bids in hand (Send copy of bid tabs). If not, when will bids planned to be in hand: _____

(Attachment 4)

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