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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 2011 (FFY 2010) Capitalization Grant funds. Congress appropriated these funds in FFY 2010 for $13,573,000 with a required state match of $2,714,600. The West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council (Infrastructure Council) committed funding for the required 20 percent match at its April 7, 2010 meeting.

From the FFY 2010 Capitalization Grant, $9,466,950 (along with the state match, and projected earned interest and loan repayments through June 30, 2011), shall be used to construct projects. These funds are the Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund (DWTRF). The 2% Technical Assistance is used to contract a Continuing Education Training program for water operator training and certification. The 4% Administration funding is used to manage the DWTRF program and some in-kind service is being requested to supplement staff support for program oversight. 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 for enhancing the Public Water Supply Supervision Program (PWSS). Some in-kind service is being requested from the 10% Program Management.

2. PROJECTS

A. Project Funding Requirements

Approval from the Infrastructure Council is required for any project to receive DWTRF assistance. The Infrastructure Council with recommendations from its 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) At least 15% of the funds in the DWTRF must go to systems serving less than 10,000 total persons. Federal code allows crediting prior year’s excess above the 15% for the annual requirement.

2) Disadvantaged communities must receive 30% of the capitalization awards in the form of a loan (terms: 30 year payment period, 0% interest, typically 1% administration fee). This requirement is stated in the state code, but is not a federal requirement. The 30% requirement will be calculated on a cumulative basis of awarded grants.
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B. The Project Priority List (PPL) Process

The PPL process uses an application that the water system must complete to be considered for DWTRF funding. This application process has improved the DWTRF program by listing only those systems that are truly interested in using low interest loan funds. This eliminates the need to bypass many projects that are not interested in using the DWTRF low interest loan money.

After each water system submits an application through the Infrastructure Council it:

1) Has its project scored using DWTRF criteria;

2) May be contacted concerning its 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 may 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.

Also, prior to putting the PPL out to Public Notice, water systems that have been on the prior PPL, but have not received a funding commitment, will be contacted about the status of their project(s) 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. The highest ranked projects on the PPL are contacted concerning their project status to determine if funding from the DWTRF is appropriate and the project is ready to proceed.

Projects expecting to receive assistance from the DWTRF FFY 2010 Capitalization Grant 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
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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.
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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.

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. 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. Loan Terms and Fees

Eligible public water systems use the DWTRF assistance to fund the cost of infrastructure needed to achieve or maintain compliance with the SDWA and other drinking water regulations. OEHS proposes to use $9,466,950 of federal 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 30% ($4,071,900) of the $13,573,000 capitalization grant will be provided to water systems. The required 20% ($2,714,600) will be used to fund green reserve infrastructure projects (see Green Infrastructure section below for details).

Interest Rate

a) The affordability standard for annual water user rates 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 up to 50% principal forgiveness in combination with the other half of funding at a 0% loan for disadvantaged public water systems. Non-disadvantaged water systems will be eligible for 2% loans.

c) If DWTRF funding replaces another agency’s grantor loan funds on a previously approved Infrastructure Council project, additional subsidization can be provided to maintain the approved level of affordability. If the project was determined to be disadvantaged by the Infrastructure Council prior to calendar year 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 disadvantaged community water systems loans.

Administrative Fees
OEHS administrative fee is 1% of the loan amount to be repaid. This administrative fee may be adjusted to make the project affordable. Administrative fees for principal forgiveness loans will be waived.

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

Graduated Loan Repayment
The DWTRF loan program can provide graduated 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.

E. Project Selection and Loan Activities
The PPL was developed from the projects DWTRF was not able to fund from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Capitalization Grant. Project representatives were contacted to determine if they were still desired DWTRF funding. Those projects who indicated they still desired to be considered for funding were kept on the list and any other project recently submitting an application to OEHS was added to the list. The PPL was updated and finalized on August 19, 2010.

The first project on the PPL is still being studied to determine the project scope and then complete its design. The number two project has met the readiness to proceed criteria and is ready to advertise its bid contracts. That project is the City of White Sulphur Spring’s water treatment plant upgrade, distribution system replacement, and new meters with leak detection monitoring capability. This project will use $4,252,750 of principal forgiveness funds which will be provided as subsidized assistance. Full applications were accepted by OEHS until March 2, 2010. Final project ranking was completed on August 19, 2010.

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

The ARRA requires that not less than 30% 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 one project that is eligible to receive at least $4,071,900 in subsidization for a disadvantaged water system. The 30% amount of the capitalization grant funds is $4,071,900, so OEHS has met the requirement for additional subsidization.

Green Infrastructure

The Capitalization Grant 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 project listed in the attached Fundable List includes one project with a total assistance amount of at least $5,000,000 designated as meeting one or more of the specific objectives required by this provision. This project includes $1,200,000 for categorically approved water meters with leak detection capability and at least $3,700,000 for the approved business case to improve water and energy efficiency by replacing deteriorated distribution water lines. A business case has been developed for this project and was approved by OEHS as a green infrastructure project for the purposes of this requirement.

The State has determined the green project reserve components of this project meets the green project reserve requirement and totals at least $5,000,000. The 20% green project reserve requirement for OEHS is $2,714,600 therefore; the State has met the green project reserve with the project listed in the Fundable List.

F. 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 will be managed by OEHS with assistance (through a contract agreement) from 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.
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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 2009.

TABLE 1. FUNDS AWARDED PRIOR TO STATE FISCAL YEAR 2011
(Construction & Set-Asides)

| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Total from 1998 through and including 2010)* | $119,045,324 |
| WV State Match – Infrastructure Council (Total from 1998 through and including 2010) | $19,987,900 |
| WVDHHR: 10% Set-Aside State Match (Total from 1998 through and including 2010) | $8,781,082 |
| **SUB-TOTAL** | **$147,814,306** |
| Loan Repayments (As of March 31, 2010) | $12,030,231 |
| Admin. Fee (typ. 1%)/Fee Invest Interest (As of March 31, 2010) | $1,764,782 |
| Interest Earnings WV DWTRF (As of March 31, 2010)** | $4,873,461 |
| **TOTAL** | **$166,482,780** |

* Table 1 does not include the in-kind services for the following grants:
  - FS-99390003 - $10,000 for Northbridge Environmental Program Manager Support (4%)
  - FS-99390006 - $134,176 for AWOP/PBT Contractor Support (10%)
  - 2F-99390009 - $250,000 for TetraTech Admin Support of ARRA Projects (4%)

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

TABLE 2. FUNDS AWARDED DURING STATE FISCAL YEAR 2011
(Construction & Set-Asides)

| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (FS-99390010) | $8,146,000.00 |
| WV State Match - Infrastructure Council (FS-99390010) | $1,629,200.00 |
| WVDHHR: 10% Set-Aside State Match (FS-99390010) | $69,855.00 |
| **TOTAL** | **$9,845,055.00** |

TABLE 3. ADDITIONAL FUNDS REQUESTED DURING STATE FISCAL YEAR 2011
(Construction & Set-Asides)

| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (FS-99390011) | $13,573,000.00 |
| WV State Match - Infrastructure Council (FS-99390011) | $2,714,600.00 |
| WVDHHR: 10% Set-Aside State Match (FS-99390011) | $804,095.00 |
| **TOTAL** | **$17,091,695.00** |

Table 3 includes the following in-kind services:
  - Administration - $250,000 for Project administration support
  - Program Management - $200,000 for Compliance & Enforcement support
### TABLE 4. SET-ASIDE FUNDS DISBURSED OR PROJECTED THROUGH STATE FISCAL YEAR 2011 & CONSTRUCTION LOANS AND COMMITMENTS THROUGH MARCH 2010

(Construction & Set-Asides)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set-Aside Funds</th>
<th>Funds Received Thru SFY 2010</th>
<th>Additional Funds Projected By End of SFY 2011</th>
<th>Total Income Funds</th>
<th>Funds Disbursed as of 3/31/10</th>
<th>Funds Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration (4%)*</td>
<td>$3,688,616</td>
<td>$542,920</td>
<td>$4,231,536</td>
<td>$2,974,325</td>
<td>$714,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Systems Technical Assistance (2%)</td>
<td>$1,986,511</td>
<td>$434,380</td>
<td>$2,420,891</td>
<td>$1,853,090</td>
<td>$133,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management Federal (10%)**</td>
<td>$8,688,966</td>
<td>$1,497,010</td>
<td>$10,185,976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Management State Match (10%)</td>
<td>$8,781,082</td>
<td>$873,950</td>
<td>$9,655,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Management</td>
<td>$17,470,048</td>
<td>$2,370,960</td>
<td>$19,841,008</td>
<td>$13,884,522</td>
<td>$3,585,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assistance (15%)</td>
<td>$12,749,226</td>
<td>$2,432,704</td>
<td>$15,181,930</td>
<td>$9,799,117</td>
<td>$2,950,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Set-Aside Funds</td>
<td>$35,894,401</td>
<td>$5,780,964</td>
<td>$41,675,365</td>
<td>$28,511,055</td>
<td>$7,383,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Assistance Funds</td>
<td>$91,932,005</td>
<td>$16,811,986</td>
<td>$108,743,991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% State Match</td>
<td>$19,987,900</td>
<td>$4,343,800</td>
<td>$24,331,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Repayments (As of March 31, 2010)</td>
<td>$12,030,231</td>
<td>$2,910,687</td>
<td>$14,940,918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Loans (As of March 31, 2010)</td>
<td>$2,000,999</td>
<td>$364,621</td>
<td>$2,365,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings (As of March 31, 2010)</td>
<td>$2,872,462</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$2,947,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funds For Loans</td>
<td>$128,823,597</td>
<td>$24,506,094</td>
<td>$153,329,691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Loans (As of March 31, 2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$123,636,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,173,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Future Letters of Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,520,335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Committed/Planned Funds</td>
<td>$153,229,691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Remaining To Be Committed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees on DWTRF Assistance (Including Interest Earnings)</td>
<td>$1,764,782</td>
<td>$383,591.00</td>
<td>$2,148,373</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,148,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Program Funds</td>
<td>$166,482,780</td>
<td>$30,670,649</td>
<td>$197,153,428</td>
<td>$181,840,745</td>
<td>$9,531,719</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 does not include the in-kind services for the following grants:

*FS-99390003 - $10,000 for Northbridge Environmental Program Manager Support (4%)

**FS-99390006 - $134,176 for AWOP/PBT Contractor Support (10%)

*2F-99390009 - $250,000 for TetraTech Admin Support of ARRA Projects (4%)
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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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources and Uses of Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Infrastructure &amp; Program Match</th>
<th>Admin Fee/Interest</th>
<th>Interest Earnings</th>
<th>Loan Repayments</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration**</td>
<td>$542,920</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$542,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>$271,460</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$271,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Program Management***</td>
<td>$1,357,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$804,095</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,161,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Assistance</td>
<td>$1,934,370</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,934,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$9,466,950</td>
<td>$2,714,600</td>
<td>$804,095</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,181,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$13,573,000.00</td>
<td>$2,714,600</td>
<td>$804,095</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,091,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Administrative Fees, Interest Earnings, and Loan Repayments are included in the grant application  
** Administration includes $250,000 for in-kind services  
*** State Program Management includes $200,000 for in-kind services

C. Types of projects to be funded.

OEHS is considering funding one large project as described in Attachment 3. This project includes a water treatment plant upgrade and distribution system upgrade. 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) Improve the DWTRF utilization rate to meet or exceed the regional and national average. The DWTRF fund utilization rate as determined by the EPA was 63% in 2005, 76% in 2006, 73% in 2007, 71% in 2008, and 63% in 2009. The projected 2010 utilization rate prior to the FFY 2009 Capitalization Grant Award should approach 99%. However, due to the anticipated award time of the FFY 2009 Capitalization Grant Award being late in the state fiscal year, the utilization rate will be approximately 90%. The WV state utilization rate still should exceed the national and regional utilization rates for the first time. Historically, the national average has been 86% and the average of all states within
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Region III is 88%. Activities listed below should enable West Virginia to utilize its funds at the national and EPA Region III’s average utilization rate.

In response to the SFY2006 Program Evaluation Report, OEHS submitted its top priority items to be implemented to improve the DWTRF utilization rate. These items are listed below and continue to be a focus for OEHS:

- Continue use of an application process for water systems expressing a specific interest in obtaining DWTRF funds.
- Recommend DWTRF funding for Infrastructure Council applications when the water system could take a DWTRF loan and not exceed a reasonable percent of medium household income (MHI).
- Generate and advertise a project priority list more frequently than once per year to enable water systems more access to the DWTRF fund.
- Market the DWTRF fund at funding agency meetings and utility system conferences.
- Over commit DWTRF funds but not exceed reasonable federal funding commitments, repayments, and interest.

2) Provide design loans (or grants if available) to water systems to enable them to fund the design stage of the project to move the project forward at a faster pace. Projects tend to stagnate because engineering consultants are reluctant to absorb the up-front design costs until the project goes to bid. They typically require water systems to fund the design and other soft costs through a design loan.

3) 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.

4) 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.
   - Continue collaborating with West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection’s (WVDEP) Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program.
   - Update and expand Geographic Information System (GIS) capabilities.

5) 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 current regulations and those regulations likely to be in effect, when the system initiates operations.

6) 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.

7) Continue to implement an operator training continuing education program focusing on training course/instructor criteria and operator training requirements.

8) 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.

9) Enact “Summary of OEHS Action Items” based on comments by the US EPA during the SFY 2009 Site Visit.

10) 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 2007 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.
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- 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.

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.
- 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.
- Analyze the ability to meet long term perpetuity of the fund by using the EPA financial planning model. 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 2020. The EPA financial planning model can be used to determine the amounts of upfront grants given to disadvantaged communities as well as debt forgiveness due to the inability for a community in a distressed area to pay a loan back. It can also be used to evaluate the effects of various loan rates and terms to ensure the perpetuity of the DWTRF program. OEHS believes its current interest rates and terms are competitive to other state and federal funding agencies and any increase in rates would be detrimental to the
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fund pace. The administrative fee on DWTRF loans is at an optimum level to not impede the utilization rate and provide funds for future staff use should the Capitalization Grants end.

4) Maintain the DWTRF utilization rate to the national average, or EPA Region III average.

5) Close the DWTRF loans to recipients within twelve months of a binding letter of commitment.

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. In addition to funding for staff expenses, there are also programs being undertaken to improve the health and safety of state water systems. These activities are described in more detail in the associated grant application work plan.

The different set-aside accounts are specified in the 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 ($542,920; includes $250,000 in-kind services)**

The SDWA authorizes the state to use 4% of the Capitalization Grant for administration of the DWTRF program. The full 4% is being requested for this activity. The state plans to use 4% of the Capitalization Grant solely for administration costs of the program. This grant will provide $250,000 of in-kind contract services through EPA to supplement staff oversight of the DWTRF program. Administrative tasks include but are not limited to:

1) Developing legislation regarding issues related to the DWSRF.
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 accounting of the funds.
9) Auditing of the funds.
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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 ($1,357,300 – Federal; $804,095 - State Match Cash, $553,205 - State Gift Non-Cash) ($200,000 in-kind service request included)

The SDWA authorizes the state to use up to 10% from the federal Capitalization Grant to support the Public Water Supply Supervision (PWSS), Data Information System Management, and PWS operator certification and programs. It will also support the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB), and water systems needing to improve their facilities and security. This year all of the funds are being requested. These funds require a dollar-for-dollar match and this match is made through state appropriations and the “Gift That Keeps on Giving”. Funds from prior grant awards provide the funding needed to satisfy the requirements the 10% set-aside requires. OEHS is requesting in-kind services to assist the Compliance and Enforcement section in completing its work.

C. Technical Assistance ($271,460)

The SDWA authorizes the state to use up to 2% of each capitalization grant to provide technical assistance to small water systems. The full 2% is being requested for this activity. 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 ($1,934,370)

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. Fourteen and a quarter percent (14.25%) of the funds are being requested for this set-aside. The remaining balance will be moved to construction. These set-aside funds will be used for Utility Management Institute implementation, the Wellhead Protection (WHP) Program, Data Information System Management, improving Geographical Information System (GIS) capabilities, conducting United States Geological Survey (USGS) coal studies to help water systems improve their facilities.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT PROCESS

The public comment period for this IUP was during the period of May 4 through June 4, 2010. OEHS posted the IUP on the web site and made it available at all district offices and the
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central office. The draft IUP was mailed out to key stakeholders for comment. A public notice was published in the West Virginia Register (State Register) in May 2010 concerning the web posting and public comment period. A public meeting was held on May 20 at the OEHS central office to receive public comments. One member of our legal counsel firm and two OEHS staff attended the meeting. The State Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council recommended several new projects to pursue DWTRF funds during the comment period and the water system sponsors subsequently applied for SRF funds and were added to the Project Priority List. There were no other comments received.
ATTACHMENT 1

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Health</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/Comprehensive List
## WEST VIRGINIA 10D WTRFB PROJECT PRIORITY LIST (PPL)/COMPREHENSIVE LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANKING</th>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>IBC NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DELEVANTA GED</th>
<th>POPULATI ON</th>
<th>DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
<th>DWTRF AMOUNT COMMITTED</th>
<th>GRANT AMOUNT REMAINING</th>
<th>RYPAIS RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of White Sulphur Springs</td>
<td>Ossontown</td>
<td>2008W-1021</td>
<td>Water Plant and Distribution System Improvements</td>
<td>This project will rehabilitate the existing water treatment plant and distribution system. The project will include a new treatment train to provide redundant capabilities and reduce the in-service time. The distribution system has 0% water loss at a much of deteriorated lines causing water shortages and boil water notices. Much of the pipe is made of asbestos cement and exposes workers to asbestos health hazards during repairs. Most of the lines are 50+ years old and have built up deposits in the lines reducing system pressures below acceptable standards.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,640</td>
<td>$12,232,750</td>
<td>$12,232,750</td>
<td>$12,232,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kanawha County Regional Development Authority (Ossont / Alum Creek)</td>
<td>Kanawha</td>
<td>2008W-1032</td>
<td>Kanawha County Regional Development Authority (Ossont / Alum Creek)</td>
<td>Extend water service to the Ossont and Alum Creek areas of Kanawha County from the WV WTRF - Kanawha Valley Distribution System. The project will serve 204 families who have very poor water due to low pressures, foul odors or poor aesthetic quality. The project consists of 65,000 ft of mains and includes 30 hydrants.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$3,230,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pratt, Town of</td>
<td>Kanawha</td>
<td>2009W-947</td>
<td>Repair leaks, new valves, fencing, improved raw water intake and chlorine alarm</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>$964,000</td>
<td>$1,639,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beverley, Town of</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>2007W-048</td>
<td>Upgrade of Water Treatment Plant &amp; Distribution Systems</td>
<td>Repair and rehabilitate existing 300 GPM water treatment plant, establish emergency water connections to Huntington, WV, connect Dodson Run and Fish Creek waterlines to King's Run waterline.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roaneville, Town of</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1997W-349</td>
<td>Water system upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade water system, replace steam lines, perform system repairs and improve fire flows to the Town residents. Extensions include two streets in town which will serve approximately 5 new customers.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>$5,385,276</td>
<td>$5,085,276</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City of Shinnston</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>2001W-443</td>
<td>10&quot; Waterline Replacement</td>
<td>10&quot; Waterline Replacement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,632</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Webster County EDA</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>2008W-1027</td>
<td>Diora Phase I Extension Project</td>
<td>Diora Phase I water main extension project to extend water service from Webster Springs to Diora.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,736</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Camnel-Or-Casley</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>2008W-1016</td>
<td>Camnel-Or-Casley -- construct line, gate valves, fire hydrants</td>
<td>Construct water line, install crossing, gate valves meter settings, fire hydrants, blow-off hydrants, rehabilitate storage tank and all necessary appurtenances.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>$1,402,000</td>
<td>$2,902,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Gilmer County PSD</td>
<td>Gilmer</td>
<td>2019W-1177</td>
<td>Coop Mill Water Line Extension</td>
<td>15 mile waterline extension, from Troy/Lynn distribution system, ranging from 6&quot; to 2&quot; to the Coop Mill area, in addition to a new 30 gpm booster pump station and new 56,000 gallon water storage tank.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>$1,723,000</td>
<td>$3,235,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Marshall County PSD 84</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>2019W-1179</td>
<td>Adeline Water Line Extension</td>
<td>The proposed project is to extend the Adeline area of Fish Creek. The project will include approximately 7,300 LF of 4&quot; water line, approximately 3,300 LF of 3&quot; water line, 1,500 LF of 2&quot; water line, and new services to approximately 150 homes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nativi-Leomayen PSD</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>2008W-016b</td>
<td>Nativi-Leomayen PSD (Phase I) Extension from Summersville to Canvas area</td>
<td>Waterline extension to serve Cleo and Green Valley.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>$3,133,000</td>
<td>$3,133,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hardy County PSD</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>2019W-1170</td>
<td>Dover Hollow Water Line Extension</td>
<td>Dover Hollow line extension.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Claywood Park PSD</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2008W-034</td>
<td>River Ridge - Leard Fork Water Extension for 300 customers in Wood &amp; Wet counties</td>
<td>Construction of a public water system that will serve approximately 100 households in various areas of Wood &amp; Wet counties.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7,855</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$3,330,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKING</td>
<td>SYSTEM</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>DWS NUMBER</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DISADVANTAGED</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td>DWTRF AMOUNT COMMITTED</td>
<td>GRANT AMOUNT REMAINING</td>
<td>BYPASS RATIONALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lubeck PSD</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2002W-669</td>
<td>Wedowville extension</td>
<td>Extension to serve 91 customers in the Wedowville area of Sedge District.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9,317</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$2,250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Wellsburg, City of</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>2012W-1196</td>
<td>Upgrade of Water Treatment Plant &amp; Distribution System</td>
<td>Water treatment plant repairs, reservoir cover, and replace distribution system.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Oakland PSD</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>2008W-1039</td>
<td>Oakland PSD</td>
<td>Construct a new water storage tank, refurbish the existing tank, install filtration system for iron and manganese, and construct line extension to pump up approximately 113 new customers.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>$3,292,802</td>
<td>$3,814,802</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>St. Marys, City of</td>
<td>Penders</td>
<td>2012W-1195</td>
<td>Water Line Replacement</td>
<td>This project is to re-pipe to replace water lines to serve 1,116 existing customers in the St. Marys area of Pleasants County. The project will consist of over 5 miles of 8&quot;, 6&quot;, 4&quot; and 2&quot; water line. Also included will be one 60,000 gallon water storage tank, a 100 GPM booster station, and all necessary appurtenances.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2,678</td>
<td>$4,410,000</td>
<td>$4,410,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Town of Oceana</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>2005W-1147</td>
<td>Water System Improvements</td>
<td>Water System Improvements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3,656</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Parkersburg Utility Board</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2009W-1107</td>
<td>Parkersburg Utility Board Phase II Water System Improvements</td>
<td>Phase II Water Distribution System improvements including approximately 8 miles of water main, replacement of small diameter pipe and rehabilitation of several small service areas allowing abandonment of four constant run water booster stations.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36,448</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
<td>$6,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Northern Jackson County PSD</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>2005W-1042</td>
<td>Extension and test stations, pressure reducing stations</td>
<td>Water extension to include waterlines, test stations, one pressure reducing station and necessary appurtenances.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>New Cumberland, City of</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>2005W-950</td>
<td>Water System Improvements</td>
<td>Install a pre-fabricated water treatment facility with a capacity of approximately 1,000 gallons per minute. A new potable booster station with two 900 GPM pumps, VFD's and approximately 1,000 L.F. of waterline replacement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,463</td>
<td>$1,014,000</td>
<td>$1,014,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Great County PSD</td>
<td>Coxes</td>
<td>2008W-1025</td>
<td>Deep Springs Water Line Extension</td>
<td>Extended 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.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6,214</td>
<td>$328,240</td>
<td>$999,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jefferson County PSD</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>2008W-1039</td>
<td>Glen Haven Water System Improvements</td>
<td>Glen Haven Water System Improvements</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jefferson County PSD</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>2008W-1042</td>
<td>Cawley Water Systems Improvements</td>
<td>Cawley Water Systems Improvements</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>St. Marys - Lumberton PSD</td>
<td>Ritchie</td>
<td>2006W-1107</td>
<td>Valley Ridge Water</td>
<td>Extension of water service to serve 22 new customers that currently rely on private water sources such as wells, cisterns and hauling water.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Town of Mind</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>2008W-1195</td>
<td>Water Line Improvements</td>
<td>Water Line Improvements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Town Of</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>2008W-1195</td>
<td>Lynn Camp Road Water Extension</td>
<td>Project consists of extending public water service to approximately 25 households in West County that currently rely on private water sources such as wells, cisterns and hauling water. The project is designed and ready to bid.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>City of Sherman</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>2008W-1195</td>
<td>Water System Improvements</td>
<td>Upgrades</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Clay-Russey PSD</td>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>2008W-1195</td>
<td>Water System Extension Project</td>
<td>Water System Extension</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Friendswood PSD</td>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td>2008W-1195</td>
<td>Elk Fork / Bens Run Water Extension</td>
<td>Extension to serve the Elk Fork and Bens Run areas.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,274</td>
<td>$2,215,000</td>
<td>$2,215,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hardy County PSD</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>2008W-1195</td>
<td>Trough Road Line Replacement</td>
<td>Replacement of water lines along Trough Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,429</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>$176,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANKING</td>
<td>SYSTEM</td>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>LDC NUMBER</td>
<td>PROJECT NAME</td>
<td>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>DISADVANTAGESED</td>
<td>POPULATION</td>
<td>DWTRF FUNDING REQUESTED</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
<td>DWTRF AMOUNT COMMITTED</td>
<td>GRANT AMOUNT REMAINING</td>
<td>BYPASS RATIONALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hardy County PSD</td>
<td>Hardy</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Route 55 Booster Pump Station Upgrade</td>
<td>Upgrade the Route 55 booster pump station</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,421</td>
<td>$232,000</td>
<td>$232,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Logan Water Board</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Water System Improvements</td>
<td>Tank painting and meter replacement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$3,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Southern Jackson County PSD</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Water Distribution System Upgrade and Extension Project</td>
<td>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 unmetered transmission main within the distribution system and the existing 6&quot; 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 10,000 LF of 12&quot;, 10&quot;, 8&quot; and 6&quot; water main, installation of a 100,000-gallon storage tank, upgrading of the Jim Ridge Booster Station, and construction of necessary appurtenances.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,483</td>
<td>$1,670,000</td>
<td>$1,670,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Grant County PSD</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Hebron Hill Booster Station #1</td>
<td>Additional pump to comply with standard and current sanitary survey deficiency.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Union Williams PSD</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Water Tank Improvements</td>
<td>Water Tank Improvements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6,114</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pleasants County PSD</td>
<td>Pleasants</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Helenwood Road - Beech Run Water Extension</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,514</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Salt Rock PSD - WVAW</td>
<td>Cabell</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Upper Toms Creek</td>
<td>Waterline extension on Upper Toms Creek in Cabell County to serve approximately 29 new customers who currently experience water outages of 1 week or longer.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,915</td>
<td>$599,000</td>
<td>$714,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Salt Rock PSD - WVAW</td>
<td>Cabell</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Big Cabell Creek</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,915</td>
<td>$318,000</td>
<td>$318,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Salt Rock PSD - WVAW</td>
<td>Cabell</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Lower Hebron Creek</td>
<td>Waterline extension on Lower Hebron Creek in Cabell County to serve approximately 13 new customers who currently experience water outages of 1 week or longer.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,917</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fairmont, City of</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Rosefield Acres Line Replacement</td>
<td>Replacement of Water line in Rosefield Acres consisting of approximately 7,200 LF of 6-inch waterline and all necessary appurtenances.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31,694</td>
<td>$321,000</td>
<td>$321,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fairmont, City of</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Chasapoo Road Line Replacement</td>
<td>Replacement of Water line along Chasapoo Road consisting of approximately 4,300 LF of 6-inch waterline and all necessary appurtenances.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31,695</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fairmont, City of</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Fairmount Avenue Line Replacement</td>
<td>Replacement of Water line along Fairmount Avenue consisting of approximately 7,000 LF of 6-inch waterline and all necessary appurtenances.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31,696</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$405,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>City of Fairmont</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Water Meter Replacement Program</td>
<td>Water Meter Replacement Program</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31,697</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>City of Fairmont</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Water Storage Tank Repair</td>
<td>Water Storage Tank Repair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31,698</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Kanawha Co RDA WVAW</td>
<td>Kanawha</td>
<td>none yet</td>
<td>Upper Kanawha Valley Water System Improvements</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>$10,614,000</td>
<td>$10,614,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3

Funding List Detailed Description
This project will rehabilitate the existing water treatment plant and distribution system. The project will install a second treatment train to provide redundant capabilities and reduce its 20+ hour per day operation to allow for maintenance repairs. The distribution system has 60% water loss as a result of deteriorated lines causing water outages and boil water notices. Much of the pipe is made of asbestos cement and exposes workers to an asbestos health hazard during repairs. Most of the lines are 50+ years old and has built up deposits in the lines reducing system pressures below acceptable standards. The project will install an AMI meter system to monitor leaks as a green project.

Forgiveness% = 35.00%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>$13,573,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Green Project Key: 
E = Energy Efficiency, W = Water Efficiency, G = Green Infrastructre, I = Innovative Technology
April 23, 2010

The Honorable Debra Fogus  
Mayor, City of White Sulphur Springs  
34 West Main Street  
White Sulphur Springs, WV 24986

RE: Green Infrastructure Reserve Approval  
City of White Sulphur Springs  
SRF Project No.: 07DWTRFA001  
IJDC Project No.: 2008W-1021  
Greenbrier County

Dear Mayor Fogus:

This project has been reviewed and approved to pursue funds allotted under the Green Project Reserve (GPR) up to the amounts listed below. Below is a summary of the GPR approved project.

- Installation of 1,900 advanced meters with leak detection capabilities $1,710,000  
- Replacement of 60,000 feet of water main to reduce water loss $5,136,000

Total: $6,846,000

Very truly yours,

Robert W. DeCrease, P. E., Manager  
Infrastructure & Capacity Development  
Environmental Engineering Division

CWT:snj

pc: Paul Ghosh, Ghosh Engineering  
Linda Barker, City of White Sulphur Springs
GREEN PROJECT RESERVE CHECKLIST

PROJECT NAME: White Sulphur Springs Water Treatment Plant and Distribution System Updates

TWO CATEGORIES OF PROJECTS:

- CATEGORICALLY SPECIFIED

- REQUIRES A BUSINESS CASE JUSTIFICATION

CATEGORICALLY SPECIFIED:

WATER EFFICIENCY

- Installation of Water Meter
- Retrofit or Replacement of Water Using Fixtures, Fittings, Equipment or Appliances (Can Include Rebate Program)
- Efficient Landscape or Irrigation Equipment
- Systems to Recycle Gray Water
- Reclamation, Recycling, & Reuse of Existing Rainwater, Condensate, Degraded Water, Stormwater, and/or Wastewater Streams
- Collection System Leak Detection Equipment

ENERGY EFFICIENCY

- Energy Efficient Retrofits and Upgrades to Pumps and Treatment Processes
- Leak Detection Equipment for Treatment Works
- Producing Clean Power for 212 Treatment Works On Site (Wind, Solar, Hydroelectric, Geothermal, Biogas Powered Heat and Power); Include Calculation of the Energy Efficiency of the Project

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

- Implementation of Green Streets (Combinations of Green Infrastructure Practices in Transportation ROW’s), for Either New Development, Redevelopment or Retrofits
- Implementation of Water Harvesting and Reuse Programs or Projects, Where Consistent With State and Local Laws and Policies
- Implementation of Wet Weather Management Systems for Parking Areas which Include: The Incremental Cost of Porous Pavement, Bioretention, Trees, Green Roofs, and Other Practices that Mimic Natural Hydrology and Reduce Effective Imperviousness at One or More Scales, Including Constructed Wetlands
- Hydromodification to Establish or Restore Riparian Buffers, Floodplains, Wetlands and Other Natural Features
- Downspout Disconnections to Remove Stormwater from Combined Sewers and Storm Sewers
- Comprehensive Retrofit Programs Designed to keep Wet Weather Out of All Types of Sewer Systems Using Green Infrastructure Technologies and Approaches
- Implementation of Comprehensive Street Tree or Urban Forestry Programs Including Expansion of Tree Box Sizes to Manage Additional Stormwater and Enhance Tree Health

May 18, 2009
ENVIRONMENTALLY INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

- Green infrastructure/low impact development stormwater projects
- Wetland restoration and constructed wetlands
- Decentralized wastewater treatment solutions to existent deficient or failing on site Systems
- Water reuse projects that reduce energy consumption, recharge aquifers or reduce Water withdrawals and treatment costs
- The water quality portion of projects that employ development and redevelopment Practices that preserve or restore site hydrologic processes through sustainable Landscaping and site design
- Projects that use water balance approaches (water budgets) at the project, local or State level that preserve site, local, or regional hydrology. Such an effort could Showcase efforts to plan and manage in a concerted manner, surface and Groundwater withdrawals, stream flow (aquatic species protection), wetland and Floodplain storage, groundwater recharge and regional or local reuse and Harvesting strategies using a quantified methodology
- Projects that facilitate adaptation of clean water programs & practices to Climate change
- The water quality portion of projects that demonstrate the energy savings and Greenhouse reduction benefits of sustainable site design practices and the use of green stormwater infrastructure
- Projects that incorporate differential uses of water based on the level of treatment to Reduce the costs of treating all water to potable water standards
- Projects that identify and quantify the benefits of using integrated water resources Management approaches
- Other project (description attached)

COMMENTS: The installation of water meters will include 1,900 advanced meters with leak detection capabilities. The meters will be able to collect information instantaneously through communication systems and no longer require any manual collection of water usage data. The real time data will also allow the system to do material balances around strategically positioned master meters to find and repair leaks in the distribution system.

ACCEPTED ✓ REJECTED

BPH Reviewer

DATE 4/23/2010

PROJECTS THAT REQUIRE THE DEVELOPMENT OF A BUSINESS CASE

- Projects not specified above that demonstrate water efficiency and/or energy savings: an example might be a new distribution waterline or rehabilitation of distribution lines that has lower friction that could reduce the energy needed to pump water through the system. A business case must document achievement of identifiable and substantial benefits that qualify as green project benefits (project description & documentation attached).
Components of business case for a Green Project Reserve (GPR) project:

Technical: (information from maintenance or operations records, engineering studies, planning documents)

- That identify problems (including any data on water and/or energy inefficiencies) in existing facility. **The GPR project will address what specific problem(s):**

  The water line replacement portion of the project will address the unaccounted for water loss that White Sulphur Springs is experiencing. The unaccounted for water for the distribution system is estimated to be 63%. The target for this project will be to reduce the unaccounted for water down to 25%.

- That clarify the technical benefits from project in water and/or energy efficiency terms. **The GPR project will provide what specific benefits:**

  With these proposed improvements, the water system could reduce its electric usage by approximately 38% per year. The amount of chemicals required for water treatment would decrease as well. It is estimated that the chlorine, caustic soda, fluoride, and catalytic sand consumption may required for the water treatment may be reduced by 38% each. The pipes being replaced are made of various materials including ductile iron, steel, plastic, and some other materials and with installation of new PVC pipe the frictional losses will be reduced which will in turn require less pumping for the distribution system. The leak detection capabilities associated with the new meters being installed will better help the White Sulphur Springs water system repair and maintain their distribution system. Also, an indirect benefit to document would be a reduction in plant operating time by approximately 10 hour per day due to the improvements.

Financial:

- Some estimate of the cost and water savings from projects based on technical analysis of benefits. **The estimated financial cost and anticipated savings (annual or lifetime basis) associated with the GPR project are as follows:**

  The cost to replace 60,000 linear feet of various size pipes in the distribution system is estimated to be $5,136,000. The savings that the City of White Sulphur Springs could realize from these improvements would be an approximately $18,100 per year based on the 38% reduction in electricity usage and $47,000 per year based on the 38% reduction in water treatment chemical usage.

- Assessment within total project cost that these savings compromise a substantial part of the financial justification for project.

  Based on an annual debt service of approximately $200,000 for this portion of the project, the savings mentioned above would cover about 33% of this debt.

COMMENTS: See above.

ACCEPTED: √ REJECTED: 

BPH Reviewer: Christopher T. Thomas

DATE: 4/23/2010
ATTACHMENT 4

Legal Notice/Public Hearing Summary/Response to Comments
Bureau for Public Health
Office of Environmental Health Services
2010 Intended Use Plan Review

Notice of Public Meeting and Public Comment Period

The Bureau for Public Health, Office of Environmental Health Services, will hold a public meeting on May 20, 2010 from 3:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. to accept written or oral comments on the proposed July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 Draft Intended Use Plan (IUP) for the West Virginia Drinking Water State Revolving Fund program, including the construction loan fund. The meeting will be held at the West Virginia Bureau for Public Health, Environmental Engineering Division, 1 Davis Square, Suite 200, Training Room, Capitol and Washington Streets, Charleston, WV and is open to the public.

A copy of the proposed IUP will be available for public review on or before May 4, 2010 at the following locations:

- Charleston Central Office (304) 558-6749
- Wheeling District Office (304) 238-1145
- Philippi District Office (304) 457-2296
- Kearneysville District Office (304) 725-9453
- Beckley District Office (304) 256-6666
- St. Albans District Office (304) 722-0611

A copy of the proposed IUP will also be available for public review on or before May 4, 2010 on the Bureau for Public Health website at http://www.wvdhhr.org/oehs/eed/i&cd/

The public may submit written comments by mail, e-mail, facsimile (304-558-0691) or other delivery to:

Robert W. DeCrease
Bureau for Public Health
Office of Environmental Health Services
Environmental Engineering Division
Capitol and Washington Streets
1 Davis Square, Suite 200
Charleston, WV 25301-1798
Email: robert.w.decrease@wv.gov

All comments must be received by 12:00 noon, June 4, 2010.

Please include your name, return address, e-mail address, daytime telephone number and indicate any organization that you may represent. Prior to any final action on this IUP, the Bureau for Public Health will address only comments relevant to IUP issues.
Comments on
July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011
Draft Intended Use Plan

The Public Meeting was held on May 20, 2010 at 3:00 pm to receive public comments on the proposed July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011 Draft Intended Use Plan (IUP) for the West Virginia Drinking Water State Revolving Fund program, including the construction loan fund. The meeting was 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 in May 2010. Robert DeCrease and Jeff Brady representing WVBPH, and Samme Gee were in attendance at the meeting. No one else attended the meeting. No written comments were received for this IUP. The State Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council recommended several new projects to pursue DWTRF funds during the comment period and the water system sponsors subsequently applied for SRF funds and were added to the Project Priority List.