

**West Virginia  
Clean Water State Revolving Fund**



---

# **FY2019 Intended Use Plan**

Submitted to the  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Region III  
xxxx, 2018



**west virginia department of environmental protection**

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Glossary.....	1
Preface.....	2
<b>SECTION I</b>	
Introduction.....	3
<b>SECTION II</b>	
Funds Identification.....	3
<b>SECTION III</b>	
Goals.....	5
<b>SECTION IV</b>	
Project Priority List.....	6
<b>SECTION V</b>	
Fund Activities.....	7
<b>SECTION VI</b>	
Assurances .....	15
<b>SECTION VII</b>	
Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds .....	16
<b>SECTION VIII</b>	
Public Participation.....	17
<b>SECTION IX</b>	
Agreement.....	17

## Appendices

- A - Project Priority List
- B - Proposed Binding Commitments – by Quarter
- C - Projects Budgeted for IUP Available Funds
- D - Public Hearing Summary
- E - Median Household Income by County and Magisterial District
- E1 - Median Household Income by Municipality
- F - Sources and Uses Chart (for EPA use only)
- G - Possible Green Technology Projects
- H - Unemployment Data
- I - Population Data

# Glossary

---

The following abbreviations are used throughout this document to denote the listed words, terms and phrases:

AgWQLP – West Virginia Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program  
ARC – Appalachian Regional Commission  
BAN – Bond Anticipation Note  
CA – West Virginia Conservation Agency  
CWA – Federal Clean Water Act  
CWSRF – Clean Water State Revolving Fund  
DEP – West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection  
DWM – Division of Water and Waste Management  
DEP EBPP – Extended Bond Purchase Program  
EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency  
IJDC – West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council  
IUP – Intended Use Plan  
MHI – Median Household Income  
NRCS – Natural Resources Conservation Service  
NPS – Nonpoint Source  
OA – Operating Agreement  
OSLP – Onsite Systems Loan Program  
POTW – Publicly Owned Treatment Works  
PSC – Public Service Commission of West Virginia  
USDA – United States Department of Agriculture  
SCD – Soil Conservation District  
WDA – West Virginia Water Development Authority  
WRRDA – 2014 Water Resources Reform and Development Act

# Preface

---

## **Mission Statements**

### **Department of Environmental Protection**

To promote a healthy environment.

---

### **Division of Water and Waste Management**

To protect, preserve and enhance West Virginia's land  
and watersheds for the safety  
and benefit of all.

---

### **Clean Water State Revolving Fund**

To provide technical and financial assistance to local  
governmental entities to improve water quality and  
public health conditions.

## SECTION I

# Introduction

---

This document is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund's Intended Use Plan for state fiscal year 2019 (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019 (FY2019)). The Division of Water and Waste Management is the primary state agency that administers the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, with financial and support assistance provided by the West Virginia Water Development Authority.

As of July 1, 2018, there have been 29 federal capitalization grants and amendments awarded by the Environmental Protection Agency. The State has provided, where necessary, the required 20% matching funds for each grant and amendment.

Repayments of prior loans, bonds and investment earnings are also available within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to fund additional wastewater and nonpoint source projects. A calculation of available funds during this fiscal year is contained in Section II.

## SECTION II

# Funds Identification

---

The chart on the next page identifies the revenue sources that will be used for loans and other anticipated expenditure categories.

A similar chart can be found in Appendix F, which is used by EPA for its purpose only. This chart summarizes the federal capitalization grants, state matches, repayments, earnings, etc., since the program began. It also estimates the fiscal year revenue sources to calculate a theoretical amount of funds available.

# WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

## Intended Use Plan – Sources and Uses of Funds

State FY2019 (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019)

### Available funds as of December 31, 2017

Cash balance in CWSRF account =	\$101,444,115	
Federal funds accounts payable (base grants) =	<u>\$ 0</u>	
		<u>\$101,444,115</u>

### New funds available during state FY2019:

Next Federal EPA Grant (estimated)	\$ 25,020,000	
Next State Match (estimated)	\$ 5,004,000	
Est. Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/19) =	\$ 34,782,920	
Est. Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/19) =	\$ 2,727,749	
Est. Investment Earnings (to 6/30/19) =	<u>\$ 676,000</u>	
		<u>\$ 68,210,669</u>

### Less:

Existing project loans payables (12/31/17) =	\$ 62,809,993	
Existing binding commitments (12/31/17) =	\$ 46,355,533	
AgWQLP reserve =	\$ 150,000	
OSLP reserve =	\$ 300,000	
DEP Administration =	<u>\$ 0</u>	
		<u>\$109,615,526</u>

**Net available funds during FY2019 = \$ 60,039,258**

Notes:

A request for the state match will be sent to the IJDC as soon as final appropriation amounts are determined. It is anticipated that the match will be received within June 2018.

## SECTION III

# Goals

---

### A. Long term goals

1. Expand the CWSRF accessibility by creating new financial assistance programs to address NPS pollution control problems.
2. Ensure the CWSRF program operates in perpetuity at its maximum level to provide financial assistance to entities approved by law.

Objective 1 – Conduct financial capability reviews on all potential loan recipients to assure credit worthiness and fiscal responsibility.

Objective 2 – Maximize investment opportunities.

Objective 3 – Monitor repayment activity of loan recipients and take action for collection of delinquent payments from loan recipients.

Objective 4 – Utilize EPA’s financial planning model to ascertain the long term effects of different CWSRF policies.

3. Integrate the CWSRF program into DEP’s Watershed Management Framework to increase program effectiveness by targeting the CWSRF funds toward higher priority watersheds.
4. Market the CWSRF program throughout the State to increase commitment/utilization of funds and maintain program pace by providing articles, press releases, and presentations on CWSRF program activities and participating in meetings of Federal and State associations concerned with water quality, health, and economic development issues.
5. Participate in the monthly meetings of the IJDC. Participation will include performing technical reviews on all proposed wastewater projects and coordinating and recommending the most feasible funding sources for all projects.
6. Incorporate EPA’s strategic plan program activity measures into the CWSRF program by working to achieve a targeted fund utilization rate of 100% (cumulative dollar amount of loan agreements divided by cumulative amount available for projects).
7. Develop effective wastewater management in rural, low income West Virginia communities. This includes investigating new funding opportunities and participating with local community leaders and civic groups to develop wastewater management ideas and programs.

## **B. Short term goals**

1. Continue outreach efforts for potential new loan recipients.
2. Maintain a targeted fund utilization rate “pace” goal of at least 95%. Program pace is defined by EPA as the cumulative loan assistance provided divided by the total amount of funds available. Loan assistance is defined as the cumulative assistance provided by executed loan, bond, and funding assistance agreements (does not include preliminary binding commitment letters).
3. Provide outreach and requested technical assistance to several communities in the Tygart River Watershed as they consider biological nutrient removal processes in their systems.
4. Continue to work with the communities required to upgrade their wastewater systems in the State’s Watershed Improvement Plan for the Greenbrier River TMDL.
5. Keep the CWSRF flexible to be able to quickly respond to potential project shifts due to the State’s economic crisis and rapid regional population adjustments.

## SECTION IV

# Project Priority List

---

The Project Priority List is contained in Appendix A. The list includes potential CWSRF binding commitments for Section 212 projects (publicly owned treatment works). Projects must appear on the priority list in order to receive consideration for a loan/bond purchase agreement or a formal loan commitment. The list was developed using fact sheets received from each applicant, consulting engineer or other representative, and should reflect current costs. If additional projects are developed during the fiscal year that do not appear on the list but would like to receive a commitment, they may be added to the list after adequate public notification procedures have been completed. This procedure generally takes 60 days.

The CWSRF will continue to commit funds to projects in order of their position on the priority list on a first-come, first-served basis, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met and the project is within six months of construction. At a minimum, the facilities plan and plans and specifications must be approved. Consideration will be given to the status of rights-of-way obtainment and other items on the pre-bid checklist during this process. As projects are deemed eligible for a binding commitment, they will be funded in order of priority. Furthermore, a project will not receive a commitment from the CWSRF unless it has received a funding recommendation from the IJDC in accordance with WV State Code, Chapter 31, Article 15A. This binding commitment from the CWSRF will remain in effect until the expiration date contained in the commitment and is subject to an extension.

Individual NPS pollution control activities and projects funded by the CWSRF do not have to appear on the annual priority list. However, the funding of these projects is



described in Section V(I) and an amount has been reserved to fund these projects. These NPS projects are allowable for funding using state revolving funds in accordance with federal law and are defined under Section 319 of the CWA. Any type of NPS activities funded must be included in the DEP's approved NPS management plan. Appendix C contains a quarterly outlay estimate for all NPS activities expected to be funded this fiscal year.

## SECTION V

# Fund Activities

---

### A. Interest rates on POTW loans

The eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration will be based upon 3,400 gallons of monthly water usage. The DEP will be using this criterion to determine its interest rate on loans. The maximum allowable term of the loans will be determined using the following range of user rates and MHI data:

*Less than 1.5% MHI: 2.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 20-year term*

*1.5% to 1.74% MHI: 1.5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21 - 30-year term*

*1.75% to 2.0% MHI: .5% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 21 - 30-year term*

*Greater than 2% MHI: 0% interest rate, .5% annual admin fee, 31 - 40-year term*

The MHI data is derived from the 2015 census data published by the U. S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder. Interest rates will not exceed 2.5% and will not be less than 0%. For all public service districts, the MHI to be used will be the lowest of either the county(s) or magisterial district(s) that is most appropriate for the project area. Magisterial District and County information can be found in Appendix E. Municipal MHI data is contained in Appendix E1.

Should Congress amend the CWA or pass reform legislation that affects small disadvantaged communities, the DEP may revise this interest rate policy to consider other factors as required by federal law.

### B. Additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities

This year's Clean Water Act Title VI funding allocation for West Virginia is anticipated to be \$25,020,000. The Appropriations Act requires that a portion of each capitalization grant be used for additional loan subsidization and for funding green infrastructure projects. The Act requires a minimum of 10% be set aside for funding green projects. This amount will equal \$2,502,000. The allowable green project categories that will be considered for this funding are described below.

The Act also requires a minimum amount be set aside for providing additional loan subsidization in the form of grants or principal forgiveness. Therefore, DEP will be

setting aside 20% of the capitalization grant in the amount of \$5,004,000 to be used as principal forgiveness.

Principal forgiveness of all or part of a loan will be the mechanism that will be used to supply the additional subsidization. Additional loan subsidization is a last resort for disadvantaged communities and will only be provided when other funding options within the CWSRF program are not practical to make the project financially affordable (i.e. 40-year loan terms, deferred principal repayments, reduced debt service coverage, etc.).

The 2014 Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA) amended sections of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (FWPCA). Amendments to 603(i)(2) required States to develop affordability criteria that would assist in identifying applicants that would have difficulty financing projects without additional subsidization. The criteria, based upon a points system that will be used to identify these applicants as per WRRDA, are as follows:

Income based upon %MHI – Based upon the 2015 Census data for 3,400 gallons of water usage.

<u>MHI</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.75% - 1.99%	50
2.0% or greater	75

Unemployment Data – As published in May 2016 by WorkForce West Virginia, the State’s average unemployment rate was 6.7% in 2015. See Appendix H.

<u>Locality’s Unemployment Rate (UR)</u>	<u>Points</u>
UR < West Virginia’s UR	0
UR 0% - 2% above West Virginia’s UR	5
UR > 2% above West Virginia’s UR	10

Population Trends – Based upon the percentage change for the period from 2013 to 2015 (calendar years) by county as published by American Fact Finder. See Appendix I.

<u>Change in Population</u>	<u>Points</u>
Greater than +2%	0
0 to +2%	5
Less than 0%	10

For applicants that receive at least 60 points, the project is eligible for the lesser of 50% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$1,000,000 in principal forgiveness.

For applicants that receive at least 90 points, the project is eligible for the lesser of 100% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or \$1,500,000 in principal forgiveness.

Readiness to proceed to construction is the primary criterion that will be used in allocating the additional subsidies. The final amount of the subsidy will be determined after receipt of bids and after a formal application is submitted. Note: As existing debt is retired, the

dedicated revenue stream will rollover to pay the amount of any deferred loan.

Loan recipients eligible for additional subsidization must appear on the current priority list prior to loan closing.

### **C. Green Projects Reserve**

In accordance with federal law and to the extent there are sufficient eligible project applications, not less than 10% of the funds in the capitalization grant shall be used to address green infrastructure projects.

Allowable green project categories will be as follows:

#### **1. Energy Efficiency**

A community may utilize improved technologies and practices to reduce the energy consumption of existing wastewater treatment systems, use energy in a more efficient way, and/or produce/utilize renewable energy. Only the dollar amount associated with the green component of a larger project will qualify for the green reserve. Proposed green projects in this category may be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of principal forgiveness, to the lesser of 50% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

Projects that will not be allowable include but are not limited to:

- a. Infiltration and inflow pipe repair or replacement.
- b. Purchase of hybrid/alternative fuel vehicles for sewer fleets.
- c. Operation, maintenance and replacement activities.
- d. Drinking water related projects.

#### **2. Water Efficiency**

Water efficiency type projects that are not eligible for additional loan subsidization or green technology funding, except for WWTP water efficient appliance/plumbing projects and water reuse projects. Proposed green projects in the water reuse category may be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of principal forgiveness, to the lesser of 50% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

#### **3. Storm Water / Green Infrastructure**

Allowable green projects to be funded under this category are:

- a. Publicly sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to treat or eliminate storm water from existing wastewater collection and treatment systems.

- b. MS4 sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to solve storm water issues.

Proposed green projects in this category may be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of principal forgiveness, to the lesser of 50% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or \$500,000.

#### **4. Environmentally Innovative**

Allowable green projects to be funded in this category are:

Decentralized sewer systems

- a. Publicly Owned Systems
- b. Privately Owned Onsite Systems

This category is used for constructing, upgrading, or repairing onsite/septic systems to existing eligible structures to protect water quality. The project must be sponsored by a local entity eligible to receive SRF funding.

Proposed green projects in this category may be eligible to receive loan subsidization, in the form of principal forgiveness, of 100% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs. During FY2019, the CWSRF program will be offering a program to cover the pre-bid costs for categorically green decentralized sewer system projects only. This is based upon availability of principal forgiveness funds. The program may fund the pre-bid costs for these systems from the available green principal forgiveness funds. To qualify for these funds, the project sponsor must assure the CWSRF program that the project will proceed to advertising for bids within 12 – 18 months of receiving the funds. The sponsor will have to provide, at a minimum, the following documentation:

1. A recommendation to pursue CWSRF funds from the WVIJDC;
2. An engineering agreement approved by the CWSRF program;
3. A facilities plan approved by the CWSRF program;
4. Documentation of a pre-design meeting with representatives of the CWSRF program;
5. A project timeline with an approvable project budget;
6. Documentation from the project sponsor that the customer base is willing to pay the proposed sewer rate; and
7. PSC approval, if required by law.

Based upon the above guidelines and criteria, a list of potential green projects is included in Appendix G of this document. These projects were submitted in response to a DEP solicitation for green projects that occurred in December 2017 simultaneously with the project priority list solicitation. The CWSRF program will further evaluate these projects to determine funding eligibility.

#### **D. Annual administrative fees on POTW loans**

Since 1994, an annual administrative fee has been charged on all loans as a means of supporting the administrative costs of operating the CWSRF in perpetuity. These

fees are maintained in a separate account outside the CWSRF. The use of these fees is restricted in accordance with *EPA's Guidance on Fees Charged by States to Recipients of Clean Water State Revolving Program Assistance* as published in the Federal Register on October 20, 2006. Funds have been expended from the account since FY1998.

The annual administrative fee is initially calculated using the outstanding principal amount of the loan over its life but repaid over the term of loan in equal installments as contained in the loan amortization schedule. The chart in Section V (A) will be used to determine the annual administrative fee on each loan. The administrative budget is approximately \$2.2 million. This includes funding the DEP's Project WET position. The amount of the funds available as of December 31, 2017 was \$10,529,782. These funds can also be used to fund the onsite systems program and are being used to match an ARC grant to provide sewer system mapping to several communities in the southern part of the State. The CWSRF is also funding a position with the WV Rural Water Association that provides technical and project support to WV communities. This position also provides asset management support and educates local utilities on energy and water efficiency technologies. It may also be used for additional project funding.

#### **E. Maximum allowable loans**

In FY2019, there will not be a limit set on the amount of funds available to any single project. This practice will be reviewed annually and may change in future intended use plans.

#### **F. BAN leveraging program**

DEP is continuing the following option for multimillion dollar projects that cannot reduce their scope to reflect a reasonable cost. A specific dollar amount will be issued by the entity using a BAN for the length of the construction period. The CWSRF will commit out of its repayment stream a certain amount each fiscal year until the total commitment is equal to the BAN. The loan will then be closed following construction completion, retiring the BAN. This proposed closing date will also be reflected in the BAN documents. Repayment of the CWSRF loan will begin immediately using the first full calendar quarter following loan closing.

#### **G. Extended Bond Purchase Program**

##### **1. 30-year bonds**

The EPA approval of the 30-year extended bond purchase program on April 13, 1999, allowed many disadvantaged communities in West Virginia to be funded under the CWSRF, resulting in additional water quality improvement projects and providing rate relief to local governmental entities. The more advantageous bond terms have increased the number of sewer construction projects in the State and have allowed better leveraging of other State and Federal funds available for wastewater projects.

Section 603(d)(2) of the CWA allows local bonds to be purchased by the State at below market interest rates without limiting the term to 20 years as contained in Section

603(d)(1). West Virginia law governing municipalities and public service districts provides that governing bodies must issue bonds to pay the costs of wastewater projects and sets forth detailed terms regarding interest rates, maturity dates and security provisions and with certain exceptions provides that the term of such bonds shall not exceed 40 years from the date of issuance.

Under the EBPP, the CWSRF will be purchasing local bonds with up to 30-year terms only for disadvantaged communities defined in Section V (A). Extended terms up to 30 years will be available to eligible communities meeting the above definition after a request is received from the community and an affordability analysis has been performed to determine what maturity date is necessary (not exceeding 30 years) in achieving, if possible, the targeted rate equal to 1.50% MHI.

Loans closed before July 2, 1999, cannot be refinanced or restructured using extended bond terms unless:

- a. DEP determines that such restructuring is necessary to protect the integrity of the CWSRF;
- b. the financial difficulty is due to unforeseen events (except population decline);
- c. the community has taken all reasonable steps to reduce expenses and increase revenues and such measures have not remedied the financial difficulty;
- d. the community has not discriminated in its payment of debt service on other outstanding debt;
- e. the community agrees to and implements a long-term management plan; and
- f. the PSC has approved the proposed restructuring (if applicable).

## **2. 40-year bonds**

In May 2001, EPA approved an extension to the 30-year extended bond purchase program by allowing bond terms to exceed 30 years, but no longer than 40 years. As with the 30-year bond program, offering up to 40-year terms requires that the long term revolving nature of the CWSRF must be protected. The offering of extended financing terms must not decrease the projected revolving level of the fund by 10% or more compared to the revolving level that the fund would have attained if extended financing terms were not available.

In implementing this 40-year program and in consideration of the federal mandates, the DEP established the following parameters that must be met by a disadvantaged community in order to be eligible for extended bond terms greater than 30 and less than or equal to 40 years. The intent is to balance the financial need of the community with the long term financial health of the CWSRF.

Facilities plans will include detailed information concerning expected increases in operation and maintenance costs from years 20 to 40 including, but not limited to schedules for the repair and replacement of all facilities units / components, including equipment.

Where there has been a historical decline in population, additional information in the facilities plan will be required concerning the composition of the population base, such as age and income characteristics. Other economic indicators, such as

trends in tax base, number of jobs and housing starts, may be requested to determine those communities that pose a high risk to the CWSRF program.

For revenue projection and rate-setting purposes, the CWSRF will require that only 90% of any new potential customers be used in the facilities plan. This requirement will apply during the entire preconstruction phase of the project, including the PSC certificate case. A copy of the Rule 42 exhibit (or equivalent if a PSC certificate is not required) shall be submitted to the DEP to document compliance with this requirement. This requirement will not apply to existing customers already served by a collection system.

At the completion of final design and prior to the project authorization to advertise for bids, the above information will be utilized for the purposes of conducting a final financial review.

#### **H. Requirements for CWSRF Commitment**

Formal Commitments – once it has been determined that a project can realistically proceed to construction within six months, a formal commitment of CWSRF funding will be made that may include such terms and conditions as deemed necessary. The CWSRF will continue to commit funds to projects in order of their position on the priority list on a first-come, first-served basis, if all applicable program requirements have been met. At a minimum, the facilities plan and plans and specifications must be approved. Consideration will be given to the status of rights-of-way obtainment and other items on the pre-bid checklist during this process. As projects are deemed eligible for a binding commitment, they will be funded in order of priority. Prior to loan closing, the project must appear on the current year's priority list.

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

In addition to financing municipal sewage treatment and disposal projects, the CWSRF can finance an array of environmental projects to address NPS pollution.

NPS pollution is runoff from areas that have hard-to-trace specific sources of pollution such as farmland and suburban neighborhoods.

As with most other states, West Virginia has devoted the majority of CWSRF funds to the construction of traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. However, in 1997 the CWSRF funded its first NPS water quality projects through the DEP's Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program in partnership with the West Virginia Conservation Agency. The purpose of the AgWQL program is to provide a source of low-interest financing match funds to implement best management agricultural practices that will reduce NPS impacts on water quality. This program is operated in conjunction with local participating banks.

In 2000, the CWSRF began a pilot implementation of its second NPS program titled the Onsite Systems Loan Program. The purpose of this program was to eliminate existing health hazards and water quality problems due to direct sewage discharges from houses using malfunctioning septic tank systems or direct pipes

to a nearby stream. This was a cooperative venture between the DEP and county health departments. After several years of frustration, this program was revived in 2008 and is now fully operational. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund and other nonprofit associations are participating in this program to make it accessible to existing individual homeowners throughout the state.

In creating the CWSRF, Congress ensured that it would be able to fund virtually any type of water quality project, including nonpoint source, wetlands, estuary, and other types of watershed projects, as well as more traditional municipal wastewater treatment systems. The CWSRF provisions in the CWA give no more preference to one category or type of project than any other.

### **1. Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program**

With the initiation of the FY1998 pilot program in five counties (Grant, Mineral, Pendleton, Hardy, and Hampshire), DEP addressed nonpoint sources of pollution by the installation of best management practices. The pilot program was a cooperative effort among the DEP, West Virginia Conservation Agency, United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, local Soil Conservation Districts and local banking institutions.

Agricultural producers at the local level work with the SCD, CA and NRCS to develop a conservation plan. A local participating bank then provides a 2% interest loan with terms not to exceed 10 years for construction that will be monitored by these agencies. The CWSRF loans money to local banks at 0% interest as a mechanism for the banks to reduce their interest rate. The DEP expanded this program statewide after securing EPA approval to do so. As of June 30, 2017, more than \$13million had been loaned under this program for installation of best management practices. Each fiscal year, an additional amount of money is set aside to fund more of these NPS projects. A one-time administrative fee is charged on each loan to cover DEP administrative expenses.

The CWSRF will continue this program with a set-aside reserve of \$150,000 to provide the necessary match to these agriculture grants.

### **2. Onsite Systems Loan Program**

An OSLP guidance document is available which explains the NPS program. Individual loans are limited to \$10,000 and lender interest rates cannot exceed 2% with terms not to exceed 10 years for the replacement, repair or upgrade of onsite sewage systems. Exceptions to the \$10,000 limit are made on a case-by-case basis.

During the 2007 legislative session, the CWSRF statute was amended to expand the definition of “local entity”, which allows CWSRF money to be loaned to other entities who will act as an intermediary lender in the OSLP. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund was the first entity to enter into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide low interest loans to homeowners to correct failing onsite sewage systems. SAFE Housing and Economic Development, Inc. (SHED) has also entered into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide these loans to homeowners.



The CWSRF will provide \$300,000 as a set-aside for this program this fiscal year. Funds from the administrative fee account may also be used to fund this program. As of June 30, 2017, more than \$2 million had been loaned under this program.

**3. Other CWA Section 319 Nonpoint Source Activities**

Nonpoint sources of water pollution, that may include contaminated groundwater flow and runoff from agricultural and developed land, have received far less attention. This is because nonpoint sources of pollution are harder to identify and address since they are not discrete end-of-pipe pollution sources.

In West Virginia, other nonpoint sources of pollution are identified in the State nonpoint source management plan developed by DEP. We will continue to evaluate the merits of providing funds to other NPS activities.

**J. Federal requirements**

To streamline the program and reduce project costs, all new binding commitments made to POTW projects in this fiscal year will not have to meet many federal requirements. As a recipient of federal CWSRF funds, the DEP has to apply these federal requirements to loans equal to the amounts of all the federal capitalization grants. Recipients of earmark grants from Congress will still have to meet these federal requirements for the entire project, including any CWSRF funds. This will likely continue in future fiscal years.

The following projects have been selected to comply with federal requirements including, but not limited to, the Single Audit Act, FFATA, etc. These projects total more than the FFY 2018 capitalization grant which is \$25,020,000.

<b>Project Sponsor</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	<b>CWSRF Amount</b>
Oceana	WWTP Upgrade	\$6,905,850
Greater Harrison County PSD	WWTP/Line Extension	\$10,878,500
Union PSD	WWTP Upgrade/Line Extension	\$8,597,000
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$26,381,350</b>

SECTION VI

**Assurances**

---

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

- 602(a) - Environmental Reviews – the DEP will conduct the reviews in accordance with State regulations.
- 602(b)(2) - Anticipated Cash Draw Ratio (Proportionality) – State match funds are disbursed prior to using capitalization grant funds.
- 602(b)(3) - Binding Commitments – the DEP will enter into binding commitments for 120% of each quarterly grant payment within one year of receipt of the payment.
- 602(b)(4) - Expeditious and Timely Expenditures – the DEP will expend all funds in the CWSRF in a timely manner.
- 602(b)(5) - First Use for Enforceable Requirements – the DEP has certified that all national municipal policy projects have met this requirement.

These and other procedures are described in the OA and may be examined by contacting the DEP.

#### SECTION VII

## Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds

---

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

1. Analysis of community and financial assistance needed;
2. Review of project schedule to determine when the project would be in a state of readiness to proceed to construction;
3. Individual contact with potential loan recipient or its representative;
4. Allocation of funds among projects;
5. Development of an EPA payment schedule which will provide for making timely binding commitments to projects selected for CWSRF financial assistance;
6. Development of individual disbursement schedules to timely pay project costs as incurred;
7. Analysis of NPS activities and the extent to which reserved funds would be needed for such projects; and
8. Estimate of administrative expenditures that will occur during the fiscal year.

## SECTION VIII

# Public Participation

---

On June 19, 2018 at 1:30 pm, a public hearing will be held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2019. The meeting was legally advertised in newspapers throughout the State. In addition, DEP issued a notice of the meeting by sending a mass mailing directly to consulting engineers, regional councils and other interested parties.

Appendix D contains the public hearing notice, attendance sign-in sheet and a summary of the meeting.

## SECTION IX

# Agreement

---

The DEP has agreed to provide EPA with information for the environmental results for all loans closed during this fiscal year. This documentation is being requested by EPA to better ascertain the environmental results of projects funded under the CWSRF program.

APPENDIX A

FISCAL YEAR 2019  
PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

---

DRAFT

# 2019 Priority List

Project	SRF #C	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Ansted, Town of (Turkey Creek)	544593	72	20.00
Ansted, Town of (WWTP)	544584	66	45.00
Auburn, Town of	547201-02	3	205.00
Beverly, Town of	544336-02	47	95.00
Bluewell PSD	544594	57	70.00
Boone County PSD (West Madison )	544494	46	95.00
Bradshaw, Town of	544595	62	55.00
Brooke County PSD (Phase II-B Eldersville Rd)	544006-03	69	25.00
Buffalo Creek PSD	544555	24	120.00
Burnsville PSD	544578	28	120.00
Cairo, Town of	547101-02	58	70.00
Canaan Valley PSD	544560	63	50.00
Capon Bridge, Town of	544608	61	65.00
Century Volga PSD	544556-02	7	155.00
Chapmanville, Town of	544483-02	34	120.00
Charleston, City of (Woodward Branch)	544557	36	110.00
Clarksburg Sanitary Board	544549	13	145.00
Clay, Town of	544596	65	45.00
Colfax PSD	544333	14	140.00
Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Marsh Fork)	544484	11	145.00
Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Rhodell)	544462	1	235.00
Craigsville PSD	544597	68	35.00
Culloden PSD	544360	41	100.00
Delbarton, Town of	544201	21	120.00
Elizabeth, Town of	544552	42	100.00
Elkins, City of	544585	29	120.00
Flatwoods-Canoe Run PSD	544598	71	20.00

Project	SRF #C	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Follansbee, City of	544599	67	40.00
Fort Gay, Town of	544607	39	110.00
Gilbert, Town of	544502	45	100.00
Grafton, City of	544600	26	120.00
Greater Harrison Co. PSD (Enterprise)	544296	33	120.00
Greater Harrison County PSD (Phase II/Rt. 73)	544451	59	70.00
Greater Paw Paw PSD (Phase III)	544558	49	95.00
Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IIIC Tackett's Creek)	544406-03	4	195.00
Hinton, City of	544550	10	145.00
Huttonsville PSD	544569	17	135.00
Kanawha Falls PSD	544562	51	75.00
Logan County PSD (Phase III B2)	544460-02	74	20.00
Logan, City of	544563	5	185.00
Logan, City of (Phase III Stollings)	544364-03	18	135.00
Lubeck PSD	544072	73	20.00
Matewan, Town of	544482	75	20.00
Matewan, Town of (Red Jacket)	544474	35	120.00
McDowell County PSD (Coalwood)	547302	15	140.00
McDowell County PSD (laeger-Phase I)	544513	6	180.00
Mingo County PSD	544312	70	20.00
Mount Hope, City of	544586	20	125.00
Mt. Zion PSD	544521	50	85.00
North Beckley PSD (Phase IIIB Piney View)	544522	32	120.00
Nutter Fort, Town of	544314	9	145.00
Oceana, Town of	544525-02	19	125.00
Page Kincaid PSD	544508-02	56	70.00
Pea Ridge PSD (Holiday Park)	544609	31	120.00
Pea Ridge PSD (Rt. 2, Phase 2)	544576	27	120.00

Project	SRF #C	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Pine Grove, Town of (Phase III)	544603	30	120.00
Pocahontas County PSD	544604	43	100.00
Preston County Sewer PSD (Bruceeton Mills)	544538	37	110.00
Ravenswood, City of	544428	60	65.00
Ripley, City of Sanitary Board	544575	48	95.00
Romney, City of	544588	38	110.00
Shady Spring PSD (Pluto Road)	544410	40	100.00
Sissonville PSD	544570	22	120.00
Smithers Sanitary Board, City of	544583	52	75.00
South Charleston Sanitary Board	544580	44	100.00
Union PSD	544573	53	75.00
Warm Springs PSD	544574	23	120.00
Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo)	544334	12	145.00
Wellsburg, City of	544577	8	155.00
West Dunbar Public Service District	544168	55	70.00
West Fork Onsite Community Cooperative, Inc.	544605	16	140.00
Weston Sanitary Board, City of	544471	2	220.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of	544606	25	120.00
Williamson, City of	544544	64	45.00
Winfield, City of	544566	54	75.00

## Wastewater Treatment Needs Categories Definitions

I	CWT- SECONDARY TREATMENT
II	CWT – ADVANCED TREATMENT
III	CWT – INFILTRATION/INFLOW
IV	CWT – SEWER SYSTEM REHABILITATION
V	CWT – NEW COLLECTOR SEWERS
VI	CWT – NEW INTERCEPTORS
VII	CWT – CSO CORRECTION
VIII	STORMWATER – GRAY INFRASTRUCTURE
IX	STORMWATER – GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE
X	ENERGY CONSERVATION – ENERGY EFFICIENCY
XI	ENERGY CONSERVATION – RENEWABLE ENERGY
XII	WATER CONSERVATION – WATER EFFICIENCY
XIII	WATER CONSERVATION – WATER REUSE
XIV	NPS – AGRICULTURAL BMP'S, CROPLAND
XV	NPS – AGRICULTURAL BMPS, ANIMALS
XVI	BROWNFIELDS
XVII	INDIVIDUAL/DECENTRALIZED SYSTEMS



# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Rhodell)</b>	\$2,659,180	\$5,159,180	<b>Problem</b>
1				Elimination of direct discharges of raw sewage into Stone Coal and Tommy Creeks
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544462	XVII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Raleigh			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0082309			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
235.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Weston Sanitary Board, City of</b>	\$9,430,000	\$12,755,000	<b>Problem</b>
2				Unserved areas of Butchersville and Turnertown. Approximately 157 residential customers and 4 commercial customers with failing septic tanks. Package plant that is unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements. Stonecoal Creek interceptor is a large source of I/I & the old WWTP site was never remediated.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544471	V,VI,VII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Lewis			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0028068			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	12/31/2018			
<b>Points</b>				
220.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Auburn, Town of</b>	\$2,714,725	\$2,714,725	<b>Problem</b>
3				Raw sewage discharges to roadside ditches and to Bone Creek.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
547201-02	XVII			
<b>County:</b>				
Ritchie				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
000000				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
3/31/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
205.00				Installation of 50 individual Orenco AX20 treatment units and appurtenances to create a decentralized system to serve the Town of Auburn.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IIIC Tackett's Creek)</b>	\$17,970,000	\$17,970,000	<b>Problem</b>
4				Failing septic systems and package treatment plants. The Coal River Group has documented water quality degradation in the area from these discharges.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544406-03	V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Kanawha				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0035068				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
195.00				Extend sewer service to 700 new customers and replace/rehabilitate existing sewers.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Logan, City of</b>	\$4,618,000	\$4,618,000	<b>Problem</b>
5				City discharges combined storm and sanitary sewage flows during wet weather. Existing treatment plant is failing mechanically and treated effluent violates WVNPDES permit limits.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544563	I,VII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Logan			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0033821			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
185.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>McDowell County PSD (laeger-Phase I)</b>	\$1,500,000	\$6,400,000	<b>Problem</b>
6				Failing onsite septic systems in the laeger area.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544513	I,V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Mingo			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0115011			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
180.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Century Volga PSD</b>	\$1,870,000	\$2,870,000	<b>Problem</b>
7				Failing septic tanks and drain fields along with failing HAU's. Raw sewage and grey water being discharged into the streams and ditches.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544556-02	XVII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Barbour			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	000000			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
155.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Wellsburg, City of</b>	\$6,250,000	\$6,250,000	<b>Problem</b>
8				The proposed project is the next step in the City's compliance with the USEPA Water Quality Standard for CSO Communities. The project will help eliminate inflow and infiltration from entering the system thus reducing the volume of sanitary and storm combined sewer overflows.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544577	VII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Brooke			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0026832			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
155.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<u>Nutter Fort, Town of</u>	\$2,101,000	\$2,101,000	<b>Problem</b>
9				The system currently has significant I/I into it's system. In addition the system is a combined system and has CSO's. Separation of the sanitary sewage from the storm water needs to be addressed and separated.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544314	VII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Harrison			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0010090			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
145.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<u>Hinton, City of</u>	\$2,000,000	\$3,550,000	<b>Problem</b>
10				To reduce the frequency and duration of the discharge from permitted discharge CSO 007.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544550	VII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Summers			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0024732			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	3/31/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
145.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Marsh Fork)</b>	\$8,600,000	\$15,500,000	<b>Problem</b>
11				Failing onsite sewage treatment systems are polluting Marsh Fork of the Coal River. Existing Holly Hills WWTP has reached the end of its useful life and has reached capacity.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544484	I,V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Raleigh			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0082309			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
145.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo)</b>	\$1,193,575	\$2,692,500	<b>Problem</b>
12				Bergoo is reportedly being presently served by individual septic tank and absorption fields, some of which may be failing. Three discharge pipes are visible in Leatherwood Creek and Elk River.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544334	XVII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Webster			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0497875			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	3/31/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
145.00				
	<b>Solution</b>			
	Construct a new decentralized wastewater collection system and wastewater treatment plant to serve 54 customers.			

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Clarksburg Sanitary Board</b>	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000	<b>Problem</b>
13				Gravity sewer lines are being overloaded with storm sewer flows during periods of wet weather. Tide-Flex valves are in need of replacement.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544549	VII			
<b>County:</b>				
Harrison				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0023302				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
145.00				Removal and replacement of concrete gravity sewer pipe with PVC gravity sewer pipe as well as the installation of HDPE storm sewer pipe. Install new manholes, storm sewer inlets, and concrete wingwalls. Tide-Flex valves are to be installed on CSO's of high priority and in need of replacement.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Colfax PSD</b>	\$300,000	\$2,460,500	<b>Problem</b>
14				WWTP on unstable ground has reached its useful life and is failing. Need to comply with NOV. Excessive I/I, overflows during high flow periods.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544333	III,IV,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Marion				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0032131				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
3/31/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
140.00				Construct new sanitary sewer system; abandon WWTP and connect the system to Kingmill Valley PSD.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>McDowell County PSD (Coalwood)</b>	\$600,000	\$2,100,000	<b>Problem</b>
15				Failing onsite systems and old orphan mining community sewer collection systems with no treatment result in health and sanitary hazards which could lead to health risks associated with the possible bacteriological contamination of ground and surface waters in the area. A letter dated February 24, 2015 from the McDowell County Health Department is attached.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	547302	I,V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	McDowell			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	000000			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	3/31/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
140.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>West Fork Onsite Community Cooperative, Inc.</b>	\$4,300,000	\$7,559,254	<b>Problem</b>
16				Primary problems to be rectified by the proposed project are those acute health and environmental consequences of discharge of raw or partially treated sewage into the local waterways.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544605	XVII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Harrison			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
140.00				



# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Huttonsville PSD</b>	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	<b>Problem</b>
17				The Mill Creek WWTP is not able to meet Ammonia discharge requirements outlined in the NPDES Permit. Order #8454
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544569	I,X			
<b>County:</b>				
Randolph				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0080535				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
135.00				The project proposes to upgrade the Mill Creek WWTP by installing Bio Domes in the secondary ponds in order to meet discharge parameters outlined in the NPDES permit.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Logan, City of (Phase III Stollings)</b>	\$17,803,000	\$18,803,000	<b>Problem</b>
18				Direct discharges of untreated sewage from 400 residences in McConnel and Stollings and partially treated sewage discharges from 200 residences along Dingess Run.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544364-03	V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Logan				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0033821				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
135.00				Extend gravity sewer system to serve McConnel, Stollings and Dingess Run. Sewage to be treated at Logan County PSD sewage treatment plant.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Oceana, Town of</b>	\$6,905,850	\$6,905,850	<b>Problem</b>
19				Pump station equipment is failing & WWTP is exceeding its rated permitted capacity. This is causing NPDES violations & the DEP has issued Order #8268.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544525-02	IV,I		
	<b>County:</b>			
	McDowell			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0024431			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	8/31/2018			
<b>Points</b>				
125.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Mount Hope, City of</b>	\$2,700,000	\$3,201,610	<b>Problem</b>
20				The inflows and infiltrations to the city's sewer system has caused bypasses of its sewage treatment plant when the flows exceed the plants hydraulic capacity to treat those flows.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544586	I		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Fayette			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0021776			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	3/31/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
125.00				
		<b>Solution</b>		
		To bring their sanitary sewer system into compliance with their NPDES permit, the City needs to construct a 2.0 million gallon flow equalization tank to contain the bypasses until they can be treated at the wastewater treatment plant. This project will construct the tank and associated systems.		

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b> 21	<b>Delbarton, Town of</b>	\$2,000,000	\$5,181,000	<b>Problem</b> Failing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
<b>SRF #C:</b> 544201	<b>*Needs Categories:</b> V,VI			
<b>County:</b> Mingo				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0042374				
<b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b> 120.00				
				<b>Solution</b> Installation of a centralized gravity wastewater collection system to approximately 200 customers in the Ragland area with treatment provided by the Town.

<b>Rank</b> 22	<b>Sissonville PSD</b>	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000	<b>Problem</b> Portions of the WWTP have reached the end of their useful life and need rehabilitated or replaced. The collection system experiences moderate to high rates of I/I; and some unserved residents within the service area have undersized or failing septic systems.
<b>SRF #C:</b> 544570	<b>*Needs Categories:</b> I,IV,V,VI			
<b>County:</b> Kanawha				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0029530				
<b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b> 120.00				
				<b>Solution</b> Upgrade wastewater treatment plant by making repairs, replacing old equipment, & making improvements; rehabilitate 6 lift stations by increasing capacity, decreasing O&M costs & time, & provide emergency power; extend collection system to serve 105 customers along Route 21, Wolfe Pen Road & Honaker Lane.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Warm Springs PSD</b>	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	<b>Problem</b>
23				Berkeley Springs WWTP: Unable to operate at 100% during power outages due to undersized standby generator. Both clarifiers boundary walls experience snow build up causing the walkways and arms to stop turning. Collection System: The PSC reports I&I accounts for 73.77% of system flow to the WWTP. Multiple residential and development areas are requesting sanitary service.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544574	I,III,V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Morgan			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0027707			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Buffalo Creek PSD</b>	\$13,839,000	\$14,839,000	<b>Problem</b>
24				Increase the capacity of the WWTP for future extension projects. Failing onsite treatment units are also a problem in the area.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544555	I,V		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Logan			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0003851			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<u>White Sulphur Springs, City of</u>	\$1,100,000	\$3,083,000	<b>Problem</b>
25				<p>The objective of the proposed project is to construct the necessary facilities to provide wastewater collection services for approximately 95 residence in the community of Caldwell.</p>
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544606	V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Greenbrier				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				<b>Solution</b>
0084000				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				<p>The proposed project would provide public wastewater collection and treatment services and eliminate current onsite treatment of residences which allow untreated and partially treated wastewater to discharge to the Greenbrier River.</p>
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<u>Grafton, City of</u>	\$2,416,000	\$2,416,000	<b>Problem</b>
26				<p>Grafton currently owns and operates a combined sewer collection system. In accordance with The City's LTCP they are looking to eliminate CSOs numbers 11 and 12 and separate the systems in that area.</p>
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544600	VII			
<b>County:</b>				
Taylor				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				<b>Solution</b>
0021822				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				<p>The City is proposing to rehabilitate a portion of their system by separating the storm and sanitary sewer in the area off of US Route 19 along the Tygart Valley River.</p>
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Pea Ridge PSD (Rt. 2, Phase 2)</b>	\$18,280,000	\$29,280,000	<b>Problem</b>
27				The PDS's A Plant is currently experiencing flows in excess of the design treatment capacity of the plant. The surrounding areas have 15 existing package plants, and 2 industrial parks in need of access to public sewer. The District's existing A Plant currently experiences an average daily flow of 0.926 MGD which is greater than the design capacity of 0.850 MGD.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544576	I,V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Cabell			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0027413			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Burnsville PSD</b>	\$1,250,000	\$2,839,000	<b>Problem</b>
28				Remove excess inflow and infiltration from the existing wastewater collection system due to connected drop inlets and outdated wastewater collection lines in low lying areas near waterways. Remove a package treatment facility and provide service approximately to 50 new customers.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544578	III,IV,V		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Braxton			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0024945			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				
		<b>Solution</b>		
		Construction of approximately 500 feet of 18" stormwater collection line, 6 drop inlets, 11,150 ft. of 10" and smaller gravity wastewater collection line, 7,800 ft. of 6" & smaller diameter forcemain, 4 new pumping stations, and various other related appurtenances.		

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Elkins, City of</b>		\$4,187,600	<b>Problem</b>
29				Significant I/I associated with combined sewers.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544585	VII			
<b>County:</b>				
Randolph				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0020028				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
120.00				Separate sewers along Lavalette Avenue and Elm Street by installing new sanitary sewers and keeping existing combined sewers for storm drains.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Pine Grove, Town of (Phase III)</b>	\$1,000,000	\$3,255,000	<b>Problem</b>
30				The 1994 vacuum system has aged and is unable to handle and transport sewage flows effectively. This proposed project (Phase III) is the next phase which will eliminate all remaining vacuum lines. The Vacuum System's inability to transport sewage to the sewer plant has resulted in numerous violations from the WVDEP.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544603	V			
<b>County:</b>				
Wetzel				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0027413				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
120.00				The Phase III project consists of installing 3 additional lift stations, pressure lines, and gravity sewer lines to replace the remaining Vacuum System. All collected sewage will then be effectively transported to the sewer plant for treatment.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Pea Ridge PSD (Holiday Park)</b>	\$2,345,000	\$2,345,000	<b>Problem</b>
31				<p>There are currently health concerns concerning wastewater overflow, sewer gas odors, and I&amp;I into the ground and the Guyandotte River that would be addressed by this proposed project.</p> <p><b>Solution</b></p> <p>This proposed project is to decommission and remove the existing Holiday Park WWTP and installing a new package plant. Replace the existing collection system with a new collection system with updated equipment and lines. Sanitary sewer flows collected are proposed to be transported to the proposed Holiday Park package treatment plant for treatment.</p>
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544609	XVII			
<b>County:</b>				
Cabell				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0027413				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>North Beckley PSD (Phase IIIB Piney View)</b>	\$4,119,500	\$5,619,500	<b>Problem</b>
32				<p>Eliminating discharge of domestic waste and wash water discharge into the small streams and drains in the Piney View area of Raleigh County that will eventually enter Piney Creek and the New River.</p> <p><b>Solution</b></p> <p>Installation of a gravity collection to collect and transport the flow from approximately 142 residences and convey to a lift station that will pump the sewage into the existing collection system plant for treatment prior to discharge.</p>
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544522	V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Raleigh				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0027740				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				



# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Greater Harrison Co. PSD (Enterprise)</b>	\$8,694,000	\$8,694,000	<b>Problem</b>
33				Enterprise is lacking a public sewage collection system. Residences rely on septic systems or directly discharge into the local streams and tributaries of the West Fork River. DEP samples of the river tested positive for fecal matter.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544296	V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Harrison			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0105213			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Chapmanville, Town of</b>	\$7,300,000	\$7,300,000	<b>Problem</b>
34				Pump station equipment is failing, and bypassing of raw sewage is occurring. Treatment plant equipment is failing, and capacity of plant has been reached.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544483-02	I,IV		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Logan			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0024678			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	12/31/2018			
<b>Points</b>				
120.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Matewan, Town of (Red Jacket)</b>	\$3,000,000	\$5,380,000	<b>Problem</b>
35				Failing vacuum collection system and onsite systems.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544474	V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Mingo				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0024783				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
120.00				Construction of a new gravity collection system to replace the failing existing vacuum system and failing onsite systems.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Charleston, City of (Woodward Branch)</b>	\$10,876,000	\$10,876,000	<b>Problem</b>
36				This project is part of the CSO Long-term Control Plan submitted to WVDEP 12/27/2005. The project will help reduce excessive I/I in this section of the wastewater collection system.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544557	VII			
<b>County:</b>				
Kanawha				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0023205				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
110.00				The project will replace existing sewers in the Woodward Branch service area of the City of Charleston and provide for the abandonment of existing sewers that are allowing excessive I/I.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b> 37	<b>Preston County Sewer PSD (Bruceton Mills)</b>	\$4,160,000	\$4,225,000	<b>Problem</b> WWTP operating with out of date equipment & failing infrastructure. Comminutor & tertiary filter are both out of service. Air piping needs replaced as well as controls. Pump station is in need of full upgrades, control panel replacements, increased storage, and more effective pumps. Excessive I/I issues.
<b>SRF #C:</b> 544538	<b>*Needs Categories:</b> II,IV			
<b>County:</b> Preston				<b>Solution</b> This project proposes to construct a new WWTP adjacent to the WWTP. The Brandonville pump station will be upgraded and the dosing siphon station will be decommissioned and replaced with a new lift station and river crossing. A new pump station will be constructed to replace several individual lift stations and river crossings with a singular force main crossing. I & I burden on system will be reduced.
<b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0025101				
<b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b> 110.00				

<b>Rank</b> 38	<b>Romney, City of</b>	\$807,050	\$1,614,099	<b>Problem</b> System construction consists of dated and degraded pipes that are busted or contain separated joints and root invasion. The reported Inflow and Infiltration accounts for significant flows that exceed 250% of the estimated dry weather average.
<b>SRF #C:</b> 544588	<b>*Needs Categories:</b> III,IV			
<b>County:</b> Hampshire				<b>Solution</b> Complete required upgrades and improvements through removal and replacement of existing sanitary sewer lines and manholes along Bolton Street, Washington Street, and Rannels Acres.
<b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0020699				
<b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b> 110.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Fort Gay, Town of</b>	\$1,500,000	\$3,400,000	<b>Problem</b>
39				The system is under an EPA consent order because the Town has failed to properly operate and maintain the system. Not all pump stations are operational or only have one pump. The lagoon is only using half of the needed aerators, the baffle dividers were damaged and removed, and there is no screening of the wastewater prior to entering the lagoon.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544607	I,IV		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Wayne			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0085359			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
110.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Shady Spring PSD (Pluto Road)</b>	\$5,717,095	\$5,717,095	<b>Problem</b>
40				Failing septic systems are creating health issues and also contributing to the pollution of Glade Creek of the New River.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544410	V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Raleigh			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0080403			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
100.00				
		<b>Solution</b>		
		Pluto/Fire Trail Road Sanitary Sewer System Extensions- Construction of a conventional gravity/grinder pump pressure sewer collection system to eliminate failing septic systems. Collected wastewater from an estimated 157 customers will be pumped to the existing wastewater treatment plant at Glen Morgan, WV.		

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Culloden PSD</b>	\$1,336,163	\$2,086,163	<b>Problem</b>
41				<p>The Culloden PSD has an aged wastewater collection system that allows a high percentage of I/I. Additionally the Culloden PSD operates a lift station named Sovine that has regular maintenance issues with limited access.</p> <p><b>Solution</b></p> <p>The project will replace gravity sewer lines along Virginia Avenue which are believed to be a major contributor to the I/I problem. Additionally a new lift station will be built to replace the existing Sovine lift station providing better reliability and access.</p>
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544360	IV,III			
<b>County:</b>				
Cabell				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0027731				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				
100.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Elizabeth, Town of</b>	\$1,386,500	\$3,386,500	<b>Problem</b>
42				<p>It has been determined that inflow to the WWTP is much greater than anticipated, especially during rainfall events. The smoke test also identified areas where storm drains are connected directly to the sanitary sewer system.</p> <p><b>Solution</b></p> <p>This project proposes to rehab the areas of the collection system as well as separating the storm sewer from the sanitary system. In addition the project will upgrade 2 lift stations.</p>
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544552	III,IV			
<b>County:</b>				
Wirt				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0041505				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				
100.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Pocahontas County PSD</b>	\$760,000	\$3,640,000	<b>Problem</b>
43				Construction of a public wastewater collection system to serve the customers in Frank and Bartow will decrease the raw sewage and inadequately treated wastewater that is currently being discharged into the local waterways.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544604	V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Pocahontas			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0082937			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
100.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>South Charleston Sanitary Board</b>	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	<b>Problem</b>
44				South Charleston is addressing I/I to reduce the number of overflows throughout the collection system. The work being proposed is for the Green Valley Sewer Shed.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544580	III		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Kanawha			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0023116			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
100.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Gilbert, Town of</b>	\$928,000	\$4,428,000	<b>Problem</b>
45				Failing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544502	V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Mingo				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0103748				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
100.00				Construct a new centralized gravity collection system to replace the existing failing on-site treatment systems to serve 77 new customers.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Boone County PSD (West Madison )</b>	\$4,690,800	\$4,725,000	<b>Problem</b>
46				Certain items at the WWTP have outlived their useful life and it is time to replace these units. I/I is causing excessive flows when rain events occur.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544494	I,IV			
<b>County:</b>				
Boone				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0035939				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
95.00				Upgrade certain collection system components in/and near West Madison and upgrade the Danville WWTP, replacing belt filter press with a fan press and upgrade capacity via addition of 3rd clarifier. This will help the LTCP compliance.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Beverly, Town of</b>	\$5,300,000	\$6,905,390	<b>Problem</b>
47				<p>The collection system experiences high I/I that results in high peak flows at the WWTP. The treatment plant was constructed in 1977 and the majority of the equipment are at the end of their useful life. Four of 5 pump stations are also at the end of their useful life.</p> <p><b>Solution</b></p> <p>Pump Station 1 is located in flood plain and will be relocated. The rest of the pump stations will be rehabilitated. Two new generators will be added to stations 3 and 4. Twenty-five percent of all manholes will be rehabilitated or replaced. WWTP plant will be increased to 700,000 gpd. The design will incorporate future advance treatment for phosphorus and nitrogen.</p>
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544336-02	II,IV		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Randolph			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0084000			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
95.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Ripley, City of Sanitary Board</b>	\$11,500,000	\$26,500,000	<b>Problem</b>
48				<p>Both sewer systems are under Order to upgrade the WWTP's because they are unable to consistently meet the permitted effluent limits.</p> <p><b>Solution</b></p> <p>The project consists of constructing a new, centralized wastewater treatment facility that will treat flows collected from both Ripley and Evans. Sewage from the Evans system will be pumped to the new facility. The existing ponds in Ripley and Evans will be closed after the new facility is placed in service. This will consist of dewatering, and sludge removal and disposal.</p>
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544575	II,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Jackson			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0045543			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
95.00				



# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Greater Paw Paw PSD (Phase III)</b>	\$1,690,000	\$3,380,000	<b>Problem</b>
49				Excessive I/I, piping is in disrepair and no manholes or means to access the existing piping in many locations. Location of piping is not known and some of the lines cross under houses.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544558	VII			
<b>County:</b>				
Marion				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0084310				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
95.00				New gravity sanitary sewer system is being installed and the old system abandoned in many locations. This will eliminate a large amount of the I/I problems in Granttown and around the Greenhill section of Rivesville. This is in accordance with Ph. III of their approved LTCP.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Mt. Zion PSD</b>	\$810,000	\$2,310,000	<b>Problem</b>
50				The steel treatment plant tankage is severely corroded and the blowers, pumps, control's and instrumentation are failing. The pumps and controls have reached the end of their useful lives and are failing. Spills of raw sewage have occurred because of equipment failures and the PSD has been ordered by the WVDEP Order No. 8770 to remedy the situation.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544521	XVII			
<b>County:</b>				
Calhoun				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0101702				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
85.00				Replace the existing package plant with new HDPE tankage (MBBR treatment technology) and replace existing pumps and controls. Also, install telemetry equipment and emergency generators.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Kanawha Falls PSD</b>	\$6,582,000	\$6,707,000	<b>Problem</b>
51				Deficient equipment at the WWTP such as the plant lift stations, headworks, treatment basins, wash water system, and replacement of an oversized forcemain, that is causing septic conditions in the system.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544562	IV,I			
<b>County:</b>				
Fayette				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0034991				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
75.00				Install new main pumping station components, new bar screen, new grit unit and compactors, refurbish treatment basins and other pertinent repairs at the WWTP. Also replace oversized force main.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Smithers Sanitary Board, City of</b>	\$677,549	\$1,377,549	<b>Problem</b>
52				Currently experiencing higher than normal treatment costs due to the storm drains being connected to the main collection system and the outdated piping. Both of these outstanding issues are causing excessive wastewater flows to Kanawha Falls PSD.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544583	III			
<b>County:</b>				
Fayette				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0021741				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
75.00				This project proposes to rehabilitate and separate the existing sanitary sewer system and stormwater sewer system. Replacement and/or installation of sewer lines, manholes, cleanouts, drop inlets, and an outfall will also be included in the project.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Union PSD</b>	\$8,597,000	\$8,637,000	<b>Problem</b>
53				Individual septic systems are in failing condition. Treatment equipment at the Rock Fork WWTP are in deteriorating condition and have reached the end of their useful lives.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544573	I,VI,V		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Kanawha			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0037486			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	12/31/2018			
<b>Points</b>				
75.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Winfield, City of</b>	\$9,900,000	\$9,900,000	<b>Problem</b>
54				The plant is hydraulically overloaded and fails to maintain compliance with permit requirements on a regular basis. Several occurrences of overflows at the bar screen and the ponds, allow untreated wastewater to find its way into the river.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544566	I,IV		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Putnam			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0024503			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	3/31/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
75.00				
		<b>Solution</b>		
		The construction of a new 0.5 MGD SBR WWTP will allow the City to achieve compliance with their current NPDES permit requirements and ensure compliance for the foreseeable future. The plant will also be hydraulically expandable to 1.0 MGD design flow if additional capacity is needed. It is also recommended that two lift stations be replaced due to their age and frequent maintenance requirements.		

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>West Dunbar Public Service District</b>	\$6,895,000	\$8,045,000	<b>Problem</b>
55				Proposing to rehabilitate its system in order to reduce the storm weather flow at the Dunbar POTW.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544168	VII			
<b>County:</b>				
Kanawha				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0089591				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
70.00				Replace majority of the vitrified clay collection lines that are old & deteriorated beyond repair, rehabilitate some of the pumping stations and relocate 2 of the stations to a new location above 100-yr flood levels.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Page Kincaid PSD</b>	\$2,920,000	\$3,000,000	<b>Problem</b>
56				Unserved areas depend on private septic systems, which are often ineffective in treating the sewer due to the inability of the soils to percolate the effluent discharging from the septic tanks.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544508-02	XVII			
<b>County:</b>				
Fayette				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0084425				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
70.00				This project proposes to extend sanitary sewer service to approximately 52 potential customers in the community of Robson.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Bluewell PSD</b>	\$7,600,000	\$12,500,000	<b>Problem</b>
57				The existing 400,000 gpd WWTP located in Montcal, which is 53 years old and is at the end of its useful life. Four existing lift stations are at the end of their useful life. Existing wet well/underground dry pump pit stations also present safety issues for personnel in maintaining the pumping and electrical equipment. Reduce I/I in gravity sewer collection system to reduce sanitary sewer overflows.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544594	II,IV		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Mercer			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0028134			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
70.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Cairo, Town of</b>	\$417,500	\$2,523,250	<b>Problem</b>
58				The existing steel treatment tank is severely corroded and the pumps and controls are deteriorated. Significant I/I in 10 manholes and 500 LF of sewers.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	547101-02	XVII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Ritchie			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0084212			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	3/31/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
70.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Greater Harrison County PSD (Phase II/Rt. 73)</b>	\$10,878,500	\$22,265,500	<b>Problem</b>
59				The Clarksburg Country Club and Laurel Park areas are currently served by failing septic systems, and failing package plants at the end of their useful lives, and direct stream discharges.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544451	I,V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Harrison				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0084301				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
3/31/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
70.00				Installation of gravity sewer collection system, pump stations, force mains and construction of a new 100,000 GPD wastewater treatment plant. Areas to be served include, Clarksburg Country Club, Laurel Park, and Route 73.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Ravenswood, City of</b>	\$15,133,500	\$15,133,000	<b>Problem</b>
60				The lagoons have had recurring problems meeting the design effluent ammonia limit of 15 mg/l; WVNPDES permit lowered the limit to 4.7 mg/l and contained a compliance schedule that mandates a facility upgrade. The equipment and controls in the 8 sewage pumping stations has exceeded their useful lives and need to be replaced. No telemetry or emergency power generation equipment.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544428	II,IV			
<b>County:</b>				
Jackson				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0021989				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
65.00				Replace pumps and controls in all 8 pumping stations with telemetry and emergency generation equipment. A new 0.6 MGD, 2 basin Sequencing Batch Reactor type treatment plant will be constructed on the site of the City's initial WWTP. The new WWTP will include a headworks, aerobic digester, belt filter press and a lab and control building.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Capon Bridge, Town of</b>	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	<b>Problem</b>
61				The Town of Capon Bridge has been issued several Notices of Violation from the WVDEP due to quality of discharge, and solids and grease within the plant. Equipment has reached the end of its useful life. Excessive I/I.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544608	I,III,IV		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Hampshire			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	551350			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
65.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Bradshaw, Town of</b>	\$1,500,000	\$6,156,000	<b>Problem</b>
62				The proposed project will eliminate the problematic vacuum collection system located throughout a large portion of Town, eliminate a significant number of grinder pumping stations resulting in a reduction of power consumption and operation and maintenance cost, and address deferred operation and maintenance items at the WWTP.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544595	IV,V		
	<b>County:</b>			
	McDowell			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0103110			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
55.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Canaan Valley PSD</b>	\$2,295,000	\$2,295,000	<b>Problem</b>
63				Areas of Deerfield, Windwood, and Canaan Village, own and operate private sewer systems. These 3 systems suffer from deteriorating wastewater collection & treatment systems.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544560	VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Davis				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0606011				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
50.00				PSD to take over the treatment of flows from these communities. Install sewer lift stations at Deerfield facility and Windwood facility. Flow transported by way of a standard gravity flow system. Both lift stations will pump sewer flows through separate forcemains to County Route 35, combining into one force main to the plant.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Williamson, City of</b>	\$3,000,000	\$4,024,000	<b>Problem</b>
64				Outdated & failing wastewater pumping stations, correction of structural issues at the existing wastewater treatment facility & extend service to (3) unserved customers.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544544	IV,V			
<b>County:</b>				
Mingo				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0026271				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
45.00				Modifications to existing wastewater collection system, replace aged pumping stations, correct structural issues, and extend small collection system to add three customers to existing system.



# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Clay, Town of</b>	\$1,433,000	\$2,433,000	<b>Problem</b>
65				The Town's existing wastewater treatment plant and its components have surpassed their useful life or are outdated for todays treatment practices.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544596	I		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Clay			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0022055			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
45.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Ansted, Town of (WWTP)</b>	\$5,790,500	\$7,290,500	<b>Problem</b>
66				The treatment plant was last upgraded in 2000, and average daily flows have exceeded permitted capacity 11 times in the last 18 months (10 of the last 12 months), and capacity needs to be increased.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544584	I,IV		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Fayette			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0020672			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
45.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Follansbee, City of</b>	\$14,401,028	\$14,401,028	<b>Problem</b>
67				Frequent failures of pump stations that have reached the end of their useful life are overflowing sewage into local waterways. Portions of the combined sewer system have brick manholes and deteriorated sewer lines that are allowing infiltration into the system as well as causing basement flooding and odor problems. The WWTP is 20 years old and equipment has reached the end of its useful life.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544599	I,IV,VII		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Brooke			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0020273			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
40.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Craigsville PSD</b>	\$500,000	\$5,362,500	<b>Problem</b>
68				The wastewater collection system has many sections that have past or are approaching the end of their useful lifespans. The increased likelihood of breakages poses an increased risk of untreated wastewater, disease, and contamination effecting the local groundwater sources.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544597	III,IV,X		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Nicholas			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0045730			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
35.00				
		<b>Solution</b>		
		This project proposes to improve the energy efficiency of Craigsville's existing sanitary sewer collection system and reduce I&I by replacing damaged sections of sewer line, by implementing VFD's in controls of the upgraded pumping stations and eliminate 2 existing lift stations. Includes upgrading 8 lift stations within Craigsville's collection system by installing new submersible pumps, controls and generator hook-ups.		

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b> 69	<b>Brooke County PSD (Phase II-B Eldersville Rd)</b>	\$2,740,000	\$2,805,000	<b>Problem</b> Area residents are exposed to raw sewage discharging into area streams and drainage ditches from failing septic systems. Area streams are impaired from fecal coliform.
	<b>SRF #C:</b> 544006-03	<b>*Needs Categories:</b> V		<b>Solution</b> Provide sewer service to 122 customers in the Eldersville Road area of the PSD.
	<b>County:</b> Brooke			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0084182			
	<b>Binding Date:</b> 12/31/2018			
<b>Points</b> 25.00				

<b>Rank</b> 70	<b>Mingo County PSD</b>	\$2,513,000	\$2,513,000	<b>Problem</b> Fifty-one residents in the eastern end of Chattaroy, WV are using failing septic systems. Sewage is leaking into the nearby Buffalo Creek. Several sections of sewer pipe within the existing system are in a state of near collapse.
	<b>SRF #C:</b> 544312	<b>*Needs Categories:</b> IV,V,VI		<b>Solution</b> Extend sewer service to 51 residents and 3 of the most deteriorated sections of the existing system will be replaced.
	<b>County:</b> Mingo			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b> 0037699			
	<b>Binding Date:</b> 6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b> 20.00				

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Flatwoods-Canoe Run PSD</b>	\$2,516,000	\$3,266,000	<b>Problem</b>
71				Sewage disposal in the project area is by individual septic tanks, self-contained aeration units, and /or direct, untreated discharge to nearby waterways. Many of these systems are failing and contribute to the degradation of water quality in the project area, including tributaries of the Elk River.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544598	V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Braxton			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0084042			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
20.00				

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Ansted, Town of (Turkey Creek)</b>	\$3,556,300	\$3,556,300	<b>Problem</b>
72				Homes in Turkey Creek utilize substandard septic tank/soil absorption fields or discharge untreated sewage directly to Turkey Creek, which discharges to the New River at Hawks Nest.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544593	V,VI		
	<b>County:</b>			
	Fayette			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0020672			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				
20.00				
				<b>Solution</b>
				Install approximately 10,000 LF of 6" and 8" gravity sewers, 24 simplex grinder pumping stations, 2 duplex submersible pumping stations and 14,000 LF of 1 1/2" to 3" forcemain. Treatment will be performed at Ansted's existing WWTP. Will provide service to 60 homes.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Lubeck PSD</b>	\$312,000	\$2,312,000	<b>Problem</b>
73				Providing sanitary sewer service to two (2) commercial customers in the Washington Bottom area of Wood County
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544072	V			
<b>County:</b>				
Wood				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0032590				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
20.00				Extend service to 2 potential customers by connecting to the existing Lubeck PSD system, 19 manholes, 1 major pumping stations, 1 duplex grinder pumping station, service laterals and other related appurtenances.

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Logan County PSD (Phase III B2)</b>	\$1,000,000	\$4,900,000	<b>Problem</b>
74				Failing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>			
544460-02	V,VI			
<b>County:</b>				
Logan				
<b>NPDES #WV:</b>				
0033821				
<b>Binding Date:</b>				
6/30/2019				
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
20.00				Construct a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing onsite wastewater treatment systems. Project will serve approximately 168 new customers.

# CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND 2019 PRIORITY LIST

Rank / Points Project

SRF Loan Amount

Total Costs

Problem / Solution

<b>Rank</b>	<b>Matewan, Town of</b>	\$3,160,000	\$6,160,000	<b>Problem</b>
75				The existing RBC Wastewater Treatment Facility is not meeting discharge permit limits and is the subject of DEP Enforcement Action.
	<b>SRF #C:</b>	<b>*Needs Categories:</b>		
	544482			
	<b>County:</b>			
	Mingo			
	<b>NPDES #WV:</b>			
	0024783			
	<b>Binding Date:</b>			
	6/30/2019			
<b>Points</b>				<b>Solution</b>
20.00				Upgrade the existing wastewater treatment facility to address more stringent discharge limits and comply with DEP requirements.

DRAFT

PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS  
BY QUARTER

---

DRAFT

Appendix B - Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality  
Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2018 Grant

Name	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2019 (\$1,000)			
				1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	New WWTP/Sewer Ext.	451	D3			\$10,878	
Oceana	WWTP Upgrade	525-02	D3	\$6,905			
Union PSD	Sewer Ext./WWTP Upgrade	573	D3		\$8,597		
DEP Administration*	n/a	n/a	n/a		\$0		
<b>Total Projects and Admin</b>				\$6,905	\$8,597	\$10,878	\$0

Federal Share (0.8333)				\$5,754	\$7,164	\$9,061	\$0	\$21,979
State Share (0.1667)				\$1,151	\$1,433	\$1,817	\$0	\$4,401
<b>Total**</b>				\$6,905	\$8,597	\$10,878	\$0	\$26,380

**Payment Schedule for the CWSRF Program: CS-540001-18**

Federal Quarter	Payment Date	CWSRF Amount(est.)	Cumulative Amount(est.)
		\$25,020,000	\$25,020,000

Activity Codes

- P - facilities planning underway
- D - design underway
- D2 - design under review at DEP
- D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway

\* No administrative costs will be used in this grant.

\*\* Any amounts exceeding the grant amount will come from repayments.



APPENDIX C

PROJECTS BUDGETED  
FOR IUP AVAILABLE FUNDS

---

DRAFT

**Appendix C - Projects Budgeted for the Intended Use Plan Available Funds**

Name	Project Scope	Proj Num C-54__	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2019 (\$1,000)			
				1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Auburn	New Decentralized WWTP	7201-02	D2			\$2,411	
Brooke Co. PSD	Sewer Extension	4006-03	D3		\$2,740		
Chapmanville	WWTP Upgrade	4483-01	D3		\$7,930		
Charleston	CSO Separation	4557	P				\$10,794
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	New WWTP/Sewer Extension	4451	D3			\$10,878	
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	New WWTP/Sewer Extension	4296	D				\$8,694
McDowell Co. PSD	New WWTP/Sewer Extension	7302	D		\$600		
Mount Hope	WWTP Upgrade	4586	D2			\$2,700	
Oceana	WWTP Upgrade	4525-02	D2	\$6,905			
Preston Co. PSD	WWTP Upgrade/Sewer Extension	4538	D2				\$4,160
Romney	I/I Rehab Project	4588	D2				\$1,500
Union PSD	WWTP & Sewer Extension	4573	D3		\$8,597		
West Dunbar	CSO Replacement	4168	D3				\$7,904
Weston	CSO Replacement/Sewer Extension	4297	D2		\$10,430		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a		\$0		
NPS - Agriculture	various	n/a	n/a	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25
NPS - Onsite	various	n/a	n/a	\$300			
Sub-total				\$7,230	\$30,322	\$16,014	\$33,077
						Grand total	\$86,643

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

Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway

R - refinancing

PUBLIC HEARING  
SUMMARY

---

DRAFT

APPENDIX E

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY  
COUNTY AND MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT

---

DRAFT

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Barbour	37,066	46.33	54.05	61.78
North district	30,994	38.74	45.20	51.66
South district	39,421	49.28	57.49	65.70
West district	45,206	56.51	65.93	75.34
Berkeley	55,239	69.05	80.56	92.07
Adam Stephens district	35,137	43.92	51.24	58.56
Norborne district	73,240	91.55	106.81	122.07
Potomac district	56,184	70.23	81.94	93.64
Shenandoah district	57,319	71.65	83.59	95.53
Tuscarora district	55,729	69.66	81.27	92.88
Valley district	56,250	70.31	82.03	93.75
Boone	39,958	49.95	58.27	66.60
District 1	38,725	48.41	56.47	64.54
District 2	40,042	50.05	58.39	66.74
District 3	41,075	51.34	59.90	68.46
Braxton	32,750	40.94	47.76	54.58
Eastern district	31,583	39.48	46.06	52.64
Northern district	38,832	48.54	56.63	64.72
Southern district	31,946	39.93	46.59	53.24
Western district	32,563	40.70	47.49	54.27
Brooke	46,215	57.77	67.40	77.03
Follansbee district	48,375	60.47	70.55	80.63
Weirton district	46,887	58.61	68.38	78.15
Wellsburg district	41,804	52.26	60.96	69.67
Cabell	38,344	47.93	55.92	63.91
District 1	38,410	48.01	56.01	64.02
District 2	23,014	28.77	33.56	38.36
District 3	29,743	37.18	43.38	49.57
District 4	46,574	58.22	67.92	77.62
District 5	48,610	60.76	70.89	81.02
Calhoun	35,568	44.46	51.87	59.28
District 1	31,300	39.13	45.65	52.17
District 2	32,222	40.28	46.99	53.70
District 3	42,390	52.99	61.82	70.65
District 4	41,111	51.39	59.95	68.52
District 5	33,885	42.36	49.42	56.48
Clay	31,325	39.16	45.68	52.21
District A	34,688	43.36	50.59	57.81
District B	25,383	31.73	37.02	42.31
District C	33,446	41.81	48.78	55.74
Doddridge	39,974	49.97	58.30	66.62

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Beech district	42,875	53.59	62.53	71.46
Maple district	39,301	49.13	57.31	65.50
Oak district	45,363	56.70	66.15	75.61
Pine district	34,750	43.44	50.68	57.92
Fayette	36,293	45.37	52.93	60.49
New Haven district	38,339	47.92	55.91	63.90
Plateau district	34,320	42.90	50.05	57.20
Valley district	34,683	43.35	50.58	57.81
Gilmer	37,536	46.92	54.74	62.56
Center district	34,148	42.69	49.80	56.91
City district	33,315	41.64	48.58	55.53
De Kalb - Troy district	39,259	49.07	57.25	65.43
Glenville district	40,673	50.84	59.31	67.79
Grant	39,088	48.86	57.00	65.15
Grant district	44,146	55.18	64.38	73.58
Milroy district	32,102	40.13	46.82	53.50
Union district	37,805	47.26	55.13	63.01
Greenbrier	39,746	49.68	57.96	66.24
Central district	44,606	55.76	65.05	74.34
Eastern district	37,617	47.02	54.86	62.70
Western district	36,543	45.68	53.29	60.91
Hampshire	27,995	34.99	40.83	46.66
Bloomery district	33,591	41.99	48.99	55.99
Capon district	25,578	31.97	37.30	42.63
Gore district	30,995	38.74	45.20	51.66
Mill Creek district	35,595	44.49	51.91	59.33
Romney district	29,375	36.72	42.84	48.96
Sherman district	23,739	29.67	34.62	39.57
Springfield district	29,926	37.41	43.64	49.88
Hancock	39,959	49.95	58.27	66.60
Butler district	42,852	53.57	62.49	71.42
Clay district	38,306	47.88	55.86	63.84
Grant district	39,258	49.07	57.25	65.43
Hardy	40,303	50.38	58.78	67.17
Capon district	37,344	46.68	54.46	62.24
Lost River district	52,159	65.20	76.07	86.93
Moorefield district	37,313	46.64	54.41	62.19
Old Fields district	32,454	40.57	47.33	54.09
South Fork district	40,595	50.74	59.20	67.66
Harrison	43,987	54.98	64.15	73.31
Eastern district	60,777	75.97	88.63	101.30

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Northern district	39,554	49.44	57.68	65.92
North Urban district	31,951	39.94	46.60	53.25
Southern district	46,911	58.64	68.41	78.19
South Urban district	44,450	55.56	64.82	74.08
Southwest district	41,443	51.80	60.44	69.07
Jackson	41,314	51.64	60.25	68.86
Eastern district	35,275	44.09	51.44	58.79
Northern district	32,016	40.02	46.69	53.36
Western district	56,220	70.28	81.99	93.70
Jefferson	66,677	83.35	97.24	111.13
Charles Town district	51,318	64.15	74.84	85.53
Harpers Ferry district	66,920	83.65	97.59	111.53
Kabletown district	90,929	113.66	132.60	151.55
Middleway district	60,354	75.44	88.02	100.59
Shepherdstown district	75,274	94.09	109.77	125.46
Kanawha	45,882	57.35	66.91	76.47
District 1	40,602	50.75	59.21	67.67
District 2	51,167	63.96	74.62	85.28
District 3	48,819	61.02	71.19	81.37
District 4	42,912	53.64	62.58	71.52
Lewis	37,849	47.31	55.20	63.08
Courthouse - Collins Settlement district	34,452	43.07	50.24	57.42
Freemans Creek district	36,160	45.20	52.73	60.27
Hackers Creek - Skin Creek district	43,981	54.98	64.14	73.30
Lincoln	35,800	44.75	52.21	59.67
Carroll district (2012)	38,348	47.94	55.92	63.91
Duval district (2012)	34,256	42.82	49.96	57.09
Harts district (2012)	37,431	46.79	54.59	62.39
Jefferson district (2011)	25,417	31.77	37.07	42.36
Laurel Hill district (2012)	29,010	36.26	42.31	48.35
Sheridan district (2012)	30,347	37.93	44.26	50.58
Union district (2011)	33,826	42.28	49.33	56.38
Washington district (2012)	33,196	41.50	48.41	55.33
Logan	36,763	45.95	53.61	61.27
Central district	36,569	45.71	53.33	60.95
Eastern district	39,054	48.82	56.95	65.09
Western district	34,975	43.72	51.01	58.29
Marion	43,165	53.96	62.95	71.94
Middletown district	34,750	43.44	50.68	57.92
Palatine district	53,678	67.10	78.28	89.46
West Augusta district	42,347	52.93	61.76	70.58

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Marshall	45,182	56.48	65.89	75.30
District 1	48,181	60.23	70.26	80.30
District 2	37,885	47.36	55.25	63.14
District 3	47,977	59.97	69.97	79.96
Mason	36,448	45.56	53.15	60.75
Arbuckle district	45,844	57.31	66.86	76.41
Clendenin district	32,616	40.77	47.57	54.36
Cologne district	25,132	31.42	36.65	41.89
Cooper district	54,623	68.28	79.66	91.04
Graham district	34,525	43.16	50.35	57.54
Hannan district	22,178	27.72	32.34	36.96
Lewis district	35,930	44.91	52.40	59.88
Robinson district	40,417	50.52	58.94	67.36
Union district	50,977	63.72	74.34	84.96
Waggener district	36,265	45.33	52.89	60.44
McDowell	24,921	31.15	36.34	41.54
Big Creek district	24,558	30.70	35.81	40.93
Browns Creek district	26,263	32.83	38.30	43.77
North Elkin district	30,069	37.59	43.85	50.12
Sandy River district	19,844	24.81	28.94	33.07
Mercer	36,195	45.24	52.78	60.33
District I	33,933	42.42	49.49	56.56
District II	37,309	46.64	54.41	62.18
District III	36,775	45.97	53.63	61.29
Mineral	31,790	39.74	46.36	52.98
District 1	30,985	38.73	45.19	51.64
District 2	26,837	33.55	39.14	44.73
District 3	38,157	47.70	55.65	63.60
Mingo	33,221	41.53	48.45	55.37
Beech Ben Mate district	28,284	35.36	41.25	47.14
Kermit Harvey district	36,288	45.36	52.92	60.48
Lee district	30,676	38.35	44.74	51.13
Magnolia district	28,780	35.98	41.97	47.97
Stafford district	29,560	36.95	43.11	49.27
Tug Hardee district	48,723	60.90	71.05	81.21
Williamson district	34,827	43.53	50.79	58.05
Monongalia	45,467	56.83	66.31	75.78
Central district	33,539	41.92	48.91	55.90
Eastern district	50,876	63.60	74.19	84.79
Western district	48,735	60.92	71.07	81.23
Monroe	36,918	46.15	53.84	61.53



**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Central district	39,000	48.75	56.88	65.00
Eastern district	34,383	42.98	50.14	57.31
Western district	38,010	47.51	55.43	63.35
Morgan	39,324	49.16	57.35	65.54
District 1	33,426	41.78	48.75	55.71
District 2	39,255	49.07	57.25	65.43
District 3	43,643	54.55	63.65	72.74
Nicholas	39,171	48.96	57.12	65.29
Beaver district	31,233	39.04	45.55	52.06
Grant district (2014)	48,171	60.21	70.25	80.29
Hamilton district	44,736	55.92	65.24	74.56
Jefferson district	35,817	44.77	52.23	59.70
Kentucky district	46,441	58.05	67.73	77.40
Summersville district	41,791	52.24	60.95	69.65
Wilderness district	44,833	56.04	65.38	74.72
Ohio	40,569	50.71	59.16	67.62
District 1	47,810	59.76	69.72	79.68
District 2	32,878	41.10	47.95	54.80
District 3	44,553	55.69	64.97	74.26
Pendleton	36,953	46.19	53.89	61.59
Central district	36,380	45.48	53.05	60.63
Eastern district	41,458	51.82	60.46	69.10
Western district	31,641	39.55	46.14	52.74
Pleasants	44,288	55.36	64.59	73.81
District A	42,727	53.41	62.31	71.21
District B	42,239	52.80	61.60	70.40
District C	40,439	50.55	58.97	67.40
District D	54,643	68.30	79.69	91.07
Pocahontas	36,827	46.03	53.71	61.38
Edray district	39,479	49.35	57.57	65.80
Greenbank district	32,569	40.71	47.50	54.28
Huntersville district	32,727	40.91	47.73	54.55
Little Levels district	39,537	49.42	57.66	65.90
Preston	45,064	56.33	65.72	75.11
Fifth district	45,050	56.31	65.70	75.08
First district	44,920	56.15	65.51	74.87
Fourth district	43,295	54.12	63.14	72.16
Second district	51,804	64.76	75.55	86.34
Third district	40,644	50.81	59.27	67.74
Putnam	56,774	70.97	82.80	94.62
Buffalo - Union district	46,288	57.86	67.50	77.15

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Curry district	46,275	57.84	67.48	77.13
Pocatalico district	44,982	56.23	65.60	74.97
Scott district	62,282	77.85	90.83	103.80
Teays district	76,175	95.22	111.09	126.96
Raleigh	41,032	51.29	59.84	68.39
District 1	41,317	51.65	60.25	68.86
District 2	37,351	46.69	54.47	62.25
District 3	44,367	55.46	64.70	73.95
Randolph	39,457	49.32	57.54	65.76
Beverly district	41,200	51.50	60.08	68.67
Dry Fork district	32,614	40.77	47.56	54.36
Huttonsville district	29,545	36.93	43.09	49.24
Leadsville district	40,971	51.21	59.75	68.29
Middle Fork district	37,009	46.26	53.97	61.68
Mingo district	42,736	53.42	62.32	71.23
New Interest district	54,688	68.36	79.75	91.15
Roaring Creek district	36,842	46.05	53.73	61.40
Valley Bend district	38,810	48.51	56.60	64.68
Ritchie	37,636	47.05	54.89	62.73
Clay district	37,153	46.44	54.18	61.92
Grant district	37,333	46.67	54.44	62.22
Murphy district	42,303	52.88	61.69	70.51
Union district	37,171	46.46	54.21	61.95
Roane	31,813	39.77	46.39	53.02
District 1	37,549	46.94	54.76	62.58
District 2	28,727	35.91	41.89	47.88
District 3	32,699	40.87	47.69	54.50
Summers	36,651	45.81	53.45	61.09
Bluestone River district	34,125	42.66	49.77	56.88
Greenbrier River district	37,913	47.39	55.29	63.19
New River district	37,056	46.32	54.04	61.76
Taylor	43,970	54.96	64.12	73.28
Eastern district	38,338	47.92	55.91	63.90
Tygart district	39,833	49.79	58.09	66.39
Western district	55,305	69.13	80.65	92.18
Tucker	40,533	50.67	59.11	67.56
Black Fork district	41,281	51.60	60.20	68.80
Clover district	27,750	34.69	40.47	46.25
Davis district	38,750	48.44	56.51	64.58
Dry Fork district	47,000	58.75	68.54	78.33
Fairfax district	37,344	46.68	54.46	62.24

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Licking district (2014)	8,676	10.85	12.65	14.46
St. George district	27,016	33.77	39.40	45.03
Tyler	38,854	48.57	56.66	64.76
Central district	37,708	47.14	54.99	62.85
North district	41,397	51.75	60.37	69.00
South district	35,294	44.12	51.47	58.82
West district	40,833	51.04	59.55	68.06
Upshur	40,330	50.41	58.81	67.22
First district	37,524	46.91	54.72	62.54
Second district	39,080	48.85	56.99	65.13
Third district	43,613	54.52	63.60	72.69
Wayne	36,318	45.40	52.96	60.53
Butler district	43,936	54.92	64.07	73.23
Ceredo district	36,822	46.03	53.70	61.37
Stonewall district	28,829	36.04	42.04	48.05
Union district	30,814	38.52	44.94	51.36
Westmoreland district	42,880	53.60	62.53	71.47
Webster	29,086	36.36	42.42	48.48
Central district	27,632	34.54	40.30	46.05
Northern district	28,415	35.52	41.44	47.36
Southern district	34,330	42.91	50.06	57.22
Wetzel	39,096	48.87	57.02	65.16
District 1	34,025	42.53	49.62	56.71
District 2	43,036	53.80	62.76	71.73
District 3	40,039	50.05	58.39	66.73
Wirt	39,352	49.19	57.39	65.59
Central district	38,269	47.84	55.81	63.78
Northeast district	36,875	46.09	53.78	61.46
Southwest district	44,375	55.47	64.71	73.96
Wood	41,884	52.36	61.08	69.81
Clay district	47,452	59.32	69.20	79.09
Harris district	38,657	48.32	56.37	64.43
Lubeck district	49,139	61.42	71.66	81.90
Parkersburg district	35,098	43.87	51.18	58.50
Slate district	61,463	76.83	89.63	102.44
Steele district	37,813	47.27	55.14	63.02
Tygart district	30,420	38.03	44.36	50.70
Union district	50,288	62.86	73.34	83.81
Walker district	23,988	29.99	34.98	39.98
Williams district	55,439	69.30	80.85	92.40
Wyoming	33,730	42.16	49.19	56.22

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income			
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
District 1	36,620	45.78	53.40	61.03
District 2	27,009	33.76	39.39	45.02
District 3	34,583	43.23	50.43	57.64

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

[http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/guided\\_search.xhtml](http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/guided_search.xhtml)

DRAFT

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY  
MUNICIPALITY

---

DRAFT

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
MUNICIPALITIES**

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
<b>A</b>				
Addison (Webster Springs), town	35,595	44.49	51.91	59.33
Albright, town	28,438	35.55	41.47	47.40
Alderson, town	24,643	30.80	35.94	41.07
Anawalt, town	24,219	30.27	35.32	40.37
Anmoore, town	26,429	33.04	38.54	44.05
Ansted, town	41,000	51.25	59.79	68.33
Athens, town	33,542	41.93	48.92	55.90
Auburn, town (2014)	17,083	21.35	24.91	28.47
<b>B</b>				
Bancroft, town	75,278	94.10	109.78	125.46
Barboursville, village	39,068	48.84	56.97	65.11
Barrackville, town	47,344	59.18	69.04	78.91
Bath (Berkeley Springs), town	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42
Bayard, town	31,875	39.84	46.48	53.13
Beckley, city	34,944	43.68	50.96	58.24
Beech Bottom, village	39,464	49.33	57.55	65.77
Belington, town	34,438	43.05	50.22	57.40
Belle, town	44,583	55.73	65.02	74.31
Belmont, city	39,375	49.22	57.42	65.63
Benwood, city	29,276	36.60	42.69	48.79
Bethany, town	56,364	70.46	82.20	93.94
Bethlehem, village	63,587	79.48	92.73	105.98
Beverly, town	22,917	28.65	33.42	38.20
Blacksville, town	46,250	57.81	67.45	77.08
Bluefield, city	34,972	43.72	51.00	58.29
Bolivar, town	49,236	61.55	71.80	82.06
Bradshaw, town	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92
Bramwell, town	40,417	50.52	58.94	67.36
Brandonville, town	64,286	80.36	93.75	107.14
Bridgeport, city	79,324	99.16	115.68	132.21
Bruceton Mills, town	45,179	56.47	65.89	75.30
Buckhannon, city	30,833	38.54	44.96	51.39
Buffalo, town	37,115	46.39	54.13	61.86
Burnsville, town	34,000	42.50	49.58	56.67
<b>C</b>				
Cairo, town	32,500	40.63	47.40	54.17
Camden-on-Gauley, town	27,500	34.38	40.10	45.83
Cameron, city	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08
Capon Bridge, town	27,500	34.38	40.10	45.83
Carpendale, town	39,659	49.57	57.84	66.10
Cedar Grove, town	38,958	48.70	56.81	64.93
Ceredo, city	41,146	51.43	60.00	68.58

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
MUNICIPALITIES**

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Chapmanville, town	34,469	43.09	50.27	57.45
Charleston, city	48,442	60.55	70.64	80.74
Charles Town, city	59,483	74.35	86.75	99.14
Chesapeake, town	40,286	50.36	58.75	67.14
Chester, city	34,508	43.14	50.32	57.51
Clarksburg, city	37,036	46.30	54.01	61.73
Clay, town	24,073	30.09	35.11	40.12
Clearview, village	60,625	75.78	88.41	101.04
Clendenin, town	42,461	53.08	61.92	70.77
Cowen, town	35,240	44.05	51.39	58.73
<b>D</b>				
Danville, town	26,875	33.59	39.19	44.79
Davis, town	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42
Davy, town	23,667	29.58	34.51	39.45
Delbarton, town	30,833	38.54	44.96	51.39
Dunbar, city	41,287	51.61	60.21	68.81
Durbin, town	31,477	39.35	45.90	52.46
<b>E</b>				
East Bank, town	52,083	65.10	75.95	86.81
Eleanor, town	51,414	64.27	74.98	85.69
Elizabeth, town	31,691	39.61	46.22	52.82
Elk Garden, town	17,813	22.27	25.98	29.69
Elkins, city	38,214	47.77	55.73	63.69
Ellenboro, town	35,694	44.62	52.05	59.49
<b>F</b>				
Fairmont, city	36,086	45.11	52.63	60.14
Fairview, town	34,583	43.23	50.43	57.64
Falling Spring, town	55,000	68.75	80.21	91.67
Farmington, town	46,518	58.15	67.84	77.53
Fayetteville, town	36,429	45.54	53.13	60.72
Flatwoods, town	30,625	38.28	44.66	51.04
Flemington, town	30,417	38.02	44.36	50.70
Follansbee, city	51,144	63.93	74.59	85.24
Fort Gay, town	12,454	15.57	18.16	20.76
Franklin, town	42,361	52.95	61.78	70.60
Friendly, town	23,929	29.91	34.90	39.88
<b>G</b>				
Gary, city	31,667	39.58	46.18	52.78
Gassaway, town	34,375	42.97	50.13	57.29
Gauley Bridge, town	37,344	46.68	54.46	62.24
Gilbert, town	43,333	54.17	63.19	72.22
Glasgow, town	41,648	52.06	60.74	69.41
Glen Dale, city	52,262	65.33	76.22	87.10

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
MUNICIPALITIES**

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Glenville, town	30,474	38.09	44.44	50.79
Grafton, city	34,844	43.56	50.81	58.07
Grantsville, town	28,646	35.81	41.78	47.74
Grant Town, town	33,750	42.19	49.22	56.25
Granville, town	32,242	40.30	47.02	53.74
<b>H</b>				
Hambleton, town	26,250	32.81	38.28	43.75
Hamlin, town	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42
Handley, town	35,250	44.06	51.41	58.75
Harman, town	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92
Harpers Ferry, town	65,714	82.14	95.83	109.52
Harrisville, town	40,900	51.13	59.65	68.17
Hartford City, town	33,625	42.03	49.04	56.04
Hedgesville, town	55,938	69.92	81.58	93.23
Henderson, town	25,250	31.56	36.82	42.08
Hendricks, town	45,000	56.25	65.63	75.00
Hillsboro, town	27,614	34.52	40.27	46.02
Hinton, city	31,019	38.77	45.24	51.70
Hundred, town	32,778	40.97	47.80	54.63
Huntington, city	29,873	37.34	43.56	49.79
Hurricane, city	52,347	65.43	76.34	87.25
Huttonsville, town	27,396	34.25	39.95	45.66
<b>I</b>				
laeger, town	20,313	25.39	29.62	33.86
<b>J</b>				
Jane Lew, town	34,464	43.08	50.26	57.44
Junior, town	32,222	40.28	46.99	53.70
<b>K</b>				
Kenova, city	32,140	40.18	46.87	53.57
Kermit, town	48,333	60.42	70.49	80.56
Keyser, city	24,450	30.56	35.66	40.75
Keystone, city	22,125	27.66	32.27	36.88
Kimball, town	38,250	47.81	55.78	63.75
Kingwood, city	44,886	56.11	65.46	74.81
<b>L</b>				
Leon, town	31,786	39.73	46.35	52.98
Lester, town	43,750	54.69	63.80	72.92
Lewisburg, city	49,904	62.38	72.78	83.17
Logan, city	29,712	37.14	43.33	49.52
Lost Creek, town	53,250	66.56	77.66	88.75
Lumberport, town	38,750	48.44	56.51	64.58
<b>M</b>				
Mabscott, town	54,856	68.57	80.00	91.43



**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
MUNICIPALITIES**

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
McMechen, city	41,000	51.25	59.79	68.33
Madison, city	46,559	58.20	67.90	77.60
Man, town	55,250	69.06	80.57	92.08
Mannington, city	43,750	54.69	63.80	72.92
Marlinton, town	28,633	35.79	41.76	47.72
Marmet, city	36,382	45.48	53.06	60.64
Martinsburg, city	37,843	47.30	55.19	63.07
Mason, town	33,859	42.32	49.38	56.43
Masontown, town	46,488	58.11	67.80	77.48
Matewan, town	14,135	17.67	20.61	23.56
Matoaka, town	26,875	33.59	39.19	44.79
Meadow Bridge, town	35,192	43.99	51.32	58.65
Middlebourne, town	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08
Mill Creek, town	29,702	37.13	43.32	49.50
Milton, town	35,500	44.38	51.77	59.17
Mitchell Heights, town	64,583	80.73	94.18	107.64
Monongah, town	36,739	45.92	53.58	61.23
Montgomery, city	24,716	30.90	36.04	41.19
Montrose, town	58,125	72.66	84.77	96.88
Moorefield, town	32,775	40.97	47.80	54.63
Morgantown, city	34,090	42.61	49.71	56.82
Moundsville, city	34,628	43.29	50.50	57.71
Mount Hope, city	21,218	26.52	30.94	35.36
Mullens, city	43,942	54.93	64.08	73.24
<b>N</b>				
Newburg, town	46,875	58.59	68.36	78.13
New Cumberland, city	25,045	31.31	36.52	41.74
New Haven, town	36,750	45.94	53.59	61.25
New Martinsville, city	40,039	50.05	58.39	66.73
Nitro, city	43,434	54.29	63.34	72.39
Northfork, town	31,786	39.73	46.35	52.98
North Hills, town	92,344	115.43	134.67	153.91
Nutter Fort, town	39,583	49.48	57.73	65.97
<b>O</b>				
Oak Hill, city	39,316	49.15	57.34	65.53
Oakvale, town (2014)	25,625	32.03	37.37	42.71
Oceana, town	29,125	36.41	42.47	48.54
<b>P</b>				
Paden City, city	35,898	44.87	52.35	59.83
Parkersburg, city	31,876	39.85	46.49	53.13
Parsons, city	35,450	44.31	51.70	59.08
Paw Paw, town	29,821	37.28	43.49	49.70
Pax, town	33,625	42.03	49.04	56.04

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
MUNICIPALITIES**

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Pennsboro, city	29,038	36.30	42.35	48.40
Petersburg, city	31,792	39.74	46.36	52.99
Peterstown, town	34,875	43.59	50.86	58.13
Philippi, city	21,698	27.12	31.64	36.16
Piedmont, town	22,353	27.94	32.60	37.26
Pine Grove, town	19,750	24.69	28.80	32.92
Pineville, town	53,375	66.72	77.84	88.96
Pleasant Valley, city	45,563	56.95	66.45	75.94
Poca, town	49,464	61.83	72.14	82.44
Point Pleasant, city	31,827	39.78	46.41	53.05
Pratt, town	48,472	60.59	70.69	80.79
Princeton, city	30,856	38.57	45.00	51.43
Pullman, town	17,917	22.40	26.13	29.86
<b>Q</b>				
Quinwood, town	24,063	30.08	35.09	40.11
<b>R</b>				
Rainelle, town	25,000	31.25	36.46	41.67
Ranson Town, corporation of	43,464	54.33	63.39	72.44
Ravenswood, city	30,546	38.18	44.55	50.91
Reedsville, town	34,943	43.68	50.96	58.24
Reedy, town	48,438	60.55	70.64	80.73
Rhodell, town	37,813	47.27	55.14	63.02
Richwood, city	27,234	34.04	39.72	45.39
Ridgeley, town	21,389	26.74	31.19	35.65
Ripley, city	31,162	38.95	45.44	51.94
Rivesville, town	41,741	52.18	60.87	69.57
Romney, city	25,925	32.41	37.81	43.21
Ronceverte, city	37,898	47.37	55.27	63.16
Rowlesburg, town	29,766	37.21	43.41	49.61
Rupert, town	30,125	37.66	43.93	50.21
<b>S</b>				
St. Albans, city	44,758	55.95	65.27	74.60
St. Marys, city	42,664	53.33	62.22	71.11
Salem, city	35,438	44.30	51.68	59.06
Sand Fork, town	72,578	90.72	105.84	120.96
Shepherdstown, town	31,583	39.48	46.06	52.64
Shinnston, city	47,039	58.80	68.60	78.40
Sistersville, city	31,042	38.80	45.27	51.74
Smithers, city	28,333	35.42	41.32	47.22
Smithfield, town	20,781	25.98	30.31	34.64
Sophia, town	33,929	42.41	49.48	56.55
South Charleston, city	46,390	57.99	67.65	77.32
Spencer, city	22,453	28.07	32.74	37.42

**WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME  
2015 CENSUS  
MUNICIPALITIES**

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Star City, town	40,833	51.04	59.55	68.06
Stonewood, city	45,000	56.25	65.63	75.00
Summersville, town (2012)	34,924	43.66	50.93	58.21
Sutton, town	35,938	44.92	52.41	59.90
Sylvester, town	52,500	65.63	76.56	87.50
<b>T</b>				
Terra Alta, town	36,513	45.64	53.25	60.86
Thomas, city	33,000	41.25	48.13	55.00
Thurmond, town (2000 again)	23,750	29.69	34.64	39.58
Triadelphia, town	29,063	36.33	42.38	48.44
Tunnelton, town	46,042	57.55	67.14	76.74
<b>U</b>				
Union, town	28,409	35.51	41.43	47.35
<b>V</b>				
Valley Grove, village	35,357	44.20	51.56	58.93
Vienna, city	46,968	58.71	68.50	78.28
<b>W</b>				
War, city	20,625	25.78	30.08	34.38
Wardensville, town	35,000	43.75	51.04	58.33
Wayne, town	17,559	21.95	25.61	29.27
Weirton, city	39,832	49.79	58.09	66.39
Welch, city	28,112	35.14	41.00	46.85
Wellsburg, city	31,288	39.11	45.63	52.15
West Hamlin, town	16,094	20.12	23.47	26.82
West Liberty, town (2014)	21,250	26.56	30.99	35.42
West Logan, town	40,750	50.94	59.43	67.92
West Milford, town	48,125	60.16	70.18	80.21
Weston, city	31,776	39.72	46.34	52.96
Westover, city	35,792	44.74	52.20	59.65
West Union, town	30,583	38.23	44.60	50.97
Wheeling, city	36,989	46.24	53.94	61.65
White Hall, town	63,333	79.17	92.36	105.56
White Sulphur Springs, city	30,363	37.95	44.28	50.61
Whitesville, town	24,375	30.47	35.55	40.63
Williamson, city	33,872	42.34	49.40	56.45
Williamstown, city	49,890	62.36	72.76	83.15
Windsor Heights, village	41,607	52.01	60.68	69.35
Winfield, town	56,300	70.38	82.10	93.83
Womelsdorf (Coalton), town	47,222	59.03	68.87	78.70
Worthington, town	26,875	33.59	39.19	44.79

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

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

SOURCES AND USES CHART  
(FOR EPA USE ONLY)

---

DRAFT

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

**Cumulative Sources as of December 31, 2017**

Capitalization Grants (29)	\$ 680,184,586	
State Matches (actual)	\$ 123,842,073	
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319)	\$ 422,015,831	
Investment Earnings	<u>\$ 29,454,718</u>	
Sources sub-total (a)		<u>\$ 1,255,497,208</u>

**Cumulative Uses as of December 31, 2017**

Loan Assistance (212+319)	\$ 1,225,847,346	
DEP Administration (4%)	<u>\$ 14,143,540</u>	
Uses sub-total (b)		<u>\$ 1,239,990,886</u>

**FY2019 Sources of Funds**

Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	\$ 15,506,322	
Capitalization Grant #30 (FFY2018 Funds) (est.)	\$ 25,020,000	
State Match (estimate)	\$ 5,004,000	
Earnings (estimate)	\$ 676,000	
Repayments (estimate)	<u>\$ 37,510,669</u>	
Sources of Funds ( c )		<u>\$ 83,716,991</u>

**Less**

Appendix C Projects	\$ 643,000	
AgWQLP Reserves	\$ 150,000	
OSLP Reserve	<u>\$ 300,000</u>	
Total		<u>\$ 87,093,000</u>

UNEMPLOYMENT DATA

---

DRAFT

**Labor Force Data by County  
2015**

County	Rate
Barbour	7.4
Berkeley	5.0
Boone	9.6
Braxton	9.0
Brooke	7.3
Cabell	5.4
Calhoun	12.5
Clay	11.2
Doddridge	5.7
Fayette	8.5
Gilmer	7.8
Grant	7.6
Greenbrier	6.5
Hampshire	5.5
Hancock	7.8
Hardy	7.5
Harrison	6.4
Jackson	7.2
Jefferson	4.1
Kanawha	6.0
Lewis	8.2
Lincoln	9.7
Logan	11.4
McDowell	13.0
Marion	6.9
Marshall	8.4
Mason	8.5
Mercer	7.3
Mineral	7.3
Mingo	13.1
Monongalia	4.7
Monroe	5.6
Morgan	5.5
Nicholas	9.1
Ohio	5.6
Pendleton	4.7
Pleasants	8.5
Pocahontas	8.2
Preston	6.0
Putnam	5.5
Raleigh	7.3
Randolph	7.0
Ritchie	7.0
Roane	11.5
Summers	7.0
Taylor	6.0
Tucker	6.1
Tyler	9.4
Upshur	8.0
Wayne	6.9
Webster	7.7
Wetzel	10.0
Wirt	10.3
Wood	6.2
Wyoming	9.7
WV	6.7

Source: from [www.workforcewv.org](http://www.workforcewv.org)

APPENDIX I

POPULATION DATA

---

DRAFT



## Population Data

County	2013	2015	delta	% Change
	Estimate	Estimate		*red reflects negative
Barbour	16,781	16,704	77	0.46
Berkeley	108,589	111,901	3312	3.05
Boone	24,077	23,372	705	2.93
Braxton	14,436	14,415	21	0.15
Brooke	23,712	23,350	362	1.53
Cabell	96,987	96,844	143	0.15
Calhoun	7,540	7,470	70	0.93
Clay	9,204	8,910	294	3.19
Doddridge	8,291	8,176	115	1.39
Fayette	45,596	44,997	599	1.31
Gilmer	8,639	8,518	121	1.40
Grant	11,796	11,766	30	0.25
Greenbrier	35,781	35,516	265	0.74
Hampshire	23,453	23,353	100	0.43
Hancock	30,235	29,815	420	1.39
Hardy	13,989	13,852	137	0.98
Harrison	68,982	68,714	268	0.39
Jackson	29,233	29,237	4	0.01
Jefferson	54,958	56,482	1524	2.77
Kanawha	191,373	188,332	3041	1.59
Lewis	16,450	16,448	2	0.01
Lincoln	21,540	21,415	125	0.58
Logan	35,985	34,707	1278	3.55
McDowell	20,874	19,835	1039	4.98
Marion	56,769	56,925	156	0.27
Marshall	32,577	31,978	599	1.84
Mason	27,172	27,037	135	0.50
Mercer	61,829	61,164	665	1.08
Mineral	27,728	27,451	277	1.00
Mingo	25,956	25,292	664	2.56
Monongalia	101,938	104,236	2298	2.25
Monroe	13,510	13,506	4	0.03
Morgan	17,447	17,524	77	0.44
Nicholas	25,935	25,594	341	1.31
Ohio	43,694	43,066	628	1.44
Pendleton	7,416	7,229	187	2.52
Pleasants	7,593	7,674	81	1.07
Pocahontas	8,669	8,607	62	0.72
Preston	33,697	33,940	243	0.72
Putnam	56,621	56,848	227	0.40
Raleigh	78,585	77,510	1075	1.37
Randolph	29,555	29,126	429	1.45
Ritchie	10,077	9,982	95	0.94
Roane	14,623	14,435	188	1.29
Summers	13,543	13,239	304	2.24
Taylor	16,994	16,912	82	0.48
Tucker	6,954	6,966	12	0.17
Tyler	8,981	8,975	6	0.07
Upshur	24,638	24,758	120	0.49
Wayne	41,626	40,971	655	1.57
Webster	8,868	8,755	113	1.27
Wetzel	16,181	15,816	365	2.26
Wirt	5,874	5,880	6	0.10
Wood	86,487	86,452	35	0.04
Wyoming	22,947	22,151	796	3.47

Source: <http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>

POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

---

DRAFT

**CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND**

**"Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2019 IUP**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Total Project Cost Estimate</b>
Auburn, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized individual treatment units	\$2,714,725
Bradshaw, Town of	energy efficiency	Replacement of Vacuum Sewer system with Gravity system	\$6,156,000
Cairo, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	\$2,523,250
Century Volga PSD	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized recirculating sand filter with subsurface discharge	\$2,870,000
Crab Orchard MacArthur PSD - Rhodell	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$5,159,180
Craigsville PSD	energy efficiency	Pumpstation replacement	\$5,362,500
Fort Gay, Town of	energy efficiency	Treatment plant rehabilitation	\$3,400,000
Huttonsville PSD	energy efficiency	Biodome project	\$2,000,000
McDowell Co. PSD - Coalwood	decentralized sewer system	Packaged MBBR plant and collection system	\$2,100,000
McDowell Co. PSD - Iager	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized system for unsewered area	\$6,400,000
Mount Zion PSD	decentralized sewer system	Treatment plant replacement	\$2,310,000
Page Kincaid PSD	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized system for unsewered area	\$2,920,000
Pea Ridge PSD (Holiday Park)	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized Wastewater Treatment Plant	\$2,345,000
Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo)	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$2,692,500
West Fork Cooperative	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$7,559,254
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$56,512,409</b>