West Virginia Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund

FY2026 Intended Use Plan

Submitted to the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
June 30, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Glossary	•••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
SECTION I Introduction	
SECTION II Funds Identification.	
SECTION III Goals	
SECTION IV Project Priority List.	,
SECTION V Fund Activities	
SECTION VI Assurances	1
SECTION VII Public Participation.	15
	Appendices
A - B - C - D - D1 - E - F - G - H - I -	Comprehensive Project Priority List (Base, Emerging Contaminant, and Lead Projects) Fundable Project Priority List Public Meeting Summary Median Household Income by County and Magisterial District Median Household Income by Municipality Unemployment Data Population Data Potential Lead Service Line Projects Potential Emerging Contaminants Projects Sources and Uses Chart (for EPA use only)

Glossary

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

ACT – WV Code Chapter 22, Article 36

BAN – Bond Anticipation Note

BCL – Binding Commitment Letter

BIL – 2022 Bipartisan Infrastructure Law

BPH – West Virginia Bureau for Public Health

CWSRF - Clean Water State Revolving Fund

DWTRF – Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund

DEP – West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

DH – Department of Health

EPA – United States Environmental Protection Agency

ETT – Enforcement Targeting Tool

IIJA - 2022 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

IJDC – West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council

IUP – Intended Use Plan

LSL – Lead Service Line

MHI – Median Household Income

OA – Operating Agreement

OEHS – West Virginia Office of Environmental and Health Services

PFAS – Polyfluoroalkyl Substances

PPL – Project Priority List

PSC – Public Service Commission of West Virginia

PWS – Public Water System

PWSS – Public Water Supply Supervision Program

SDWA – Safe Drinking Water Act

USGS – U. S. Geological Survey

WDA – West Virginia Water Development Authority

SECTION I

Introduction

This document is the Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund's (DWTRF) Intended Use Plan (IUP) for state fiscal year 2026 (July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026 (FY2026)).

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) amendments of 1996 authorized a DWTRF program to assist public water systems in financing the cost of the infrastructure needed to achieve or maintain compliance with SDWA requirements and protect public health. The WV Legislature created the DWTRF in 1997. In addition to federal capitalization grants and amendments awarded by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the State has provided, where required, the matching funds for each grant and amendment. Repayments of loans, dedicated settlements, and investment earnings are also available within the Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund to fund drinking water projects. Funds available during this fiscal year are listed in Section II.

The West Virginia Legislature, at the 2023 Regular Session, passed House Bill 561, which transferred administration of the DWTRF from BPH to the DEP effective July 1, 2023. The DEP will be working in collaboration with the Office of Environmental and Health Services (OEHS) to provide funding to necessary projects and to provide financial support to the OEHS to carry out set-aside activities funded under Sections 1452 (g)(2)(A), (B), (C), and (D) and Sections 1452 (k)(1)(B), (C), and (D) of the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act.

As a result, the DEP is responsible for issuing and implementing the IUP and providing the necessary funding from the set-asides to fund all eligible expenditures in support of the OEHS Environmental Engineering Division.

SECTION II

Funds Identification

The chart on the next page identifies the sources that will be used for loans and other anticipated expenditure categories. The 2% Technical Assistance funding is used to contract for a Continuing Education Training program for water operator training and certification. The 10% Program Management funding is used for enhancing the Public Water Supply Supervision Program (PWSS). The 15% Local Assistance funding is used in implementing the state source water protection program, operator training and certification program, and public water system technical assistance, emergency response assistance, and sanitary surveys. Projects will be added to the IUP from the PPL in priority order, subject to readiness to proceed. The DWTRF is also reserving the authority to transfer to or receive funds from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund as needed to accomplish program objectives and demand in accordance with the SDWA. The DWTRF also reserves the authority to leverage the Fund as needed as well as use the flexibility to cross-collateralize the CWSRF and DWTRF as needed.

WEST VIRGINIA DRINKING WATER TREATMENT REVOLVING FUND

Intended Use Plan – Sources and Uses of Funds State FY2026 (July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026)

Available funds as of March 31, 2025:

Cash balance in DWTRF account	\$ 41,407,199
Federal funds accounts payable	\$117,687,602

\$ 159,094,801

New funds available during state FY2026:

Next Federal EPA Base Grant	\$ 10,935,000
Next Base State Match	\$ 2,187,000
Next Federal IIJA Grant	\$ 24,898,000
Next IIJA State Match	\$ 4,979,600
Emerging Contaminants Grant**	\$ 7,857,000
Lead Service Line Replacement funds**	\$ 28,650,000
Est. Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/26)*	\$ 10,274,830
Est. Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/26)*	\$ 1,458,957
Est. Investment Earnings (to 6/30/26)*	\$ 1,891,972

\$ 93,132,359

Less:

Existing project loans payables (3/31/25) =	\$1	67,790,294
Existing binding commitments $(3/31/25) =$	\$:	21,407,014
2 percent set-aside for Technical Assistance	\$	500,000
4 percent set-aside for Program Administration	\$	0
10 percent set-aside for State Program Management	\$	1,493,149
15 percent set-aside for Local Assistance	\$	4,823,825

\$196,014,282

Net available funds during FY2026 =

\$ 56,212,878

Notes:

The matches should be received from the IJDC by July 2025.

^{*}These are estimates at this time. Project funding will be adjusted to accommodate the actual funds received.

^{**} No match is required

SECTION III

Goals

A. Short Term Goals

- 1. Fill vacant staff positions within the OEHS, Environmental Engineering Division (EED). There are currently multiple positions vacant throughout the Division.
- 2. Work with appropriate agencies in the implementation of West Virginia's PFAS Protection Act.
- 3. Work with Public Water Systems (PWS) to reduce health-based violations.
- 4. DEP and OEHS will continue to work together to implement House Bill 561 and implement the agreed upon Memorandum of Understanding.
- 5. Maintain a pace goal of at least 95%.
- 6. Work with EPA to amend the Operating Agreement.

B. Long Term Goals

- 1. Assist with and fund the necessary infrastructure to upgrade water quality for existing public water customers and to provide water to individuals whose water currently does not comply with the SDWA or is unreliable.
- 2. Ensure the DWTRF program operates in perpetuity at its maximum level to provide financial assistance to qualified entities.
- 3. Continue implementation of the Capacity Development Strategy including assisting public water systems in acquiring and maintaining the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with the SDWA. Provide assistance to ensure that all new community water supplies and new non-transient non-community supplies have the technical, managerial, and financial capacity to comply with current regulations and those regulations likely to be in effect, when the proposed systems initiate operations.
- 4. Funding will be provided to OEHS from available set-aside funding to continue development, enhancement, and improvement of the PWSS through improved methodology and consistency of the sanitary surveys. This includes completion of a full complement of staffing in the district offices and implementation of an automated data collection system for laboratories to forward results to OEHS.

- 5. Funding will be provided to OEHS from available set-aside funding to protect source water from future contamination through Source Water Assessment and Protection (SWAP) and Well Head Protection (WHP) programs.
- 6. Funding will be provided to OEHS from available set-aside funding to continue to implement an operator training continuing education program focusing on training course/instructor criteria and operator training requirements.
- 7. Funding will be provided to OEHS for implementation of new regulations.
- 8. Continue to strive to minimize unliquidated obligations (ULOs) by expeditiously disbursing both set-aside and construction funds in a timely manner. The goal is to attain a half year or less balance for the 2%, 10% and 15% set-asides at the time a new grant is awarded. Set-aside amounts requested in this IUP are supportive of minimizing ULOs.

SECTION IV

Project Priority List

Projects requesting DWTRF funding assistance are prioritized using the DWTRF Project Priority Ranking System. Three categories (public health, regulatory compliance, and affordability) are used to determine project scoring. Projects that apply for DWTRF funding are ranked and are listed in the Comprehensive Project Priority List (Appendix A). The highest ranked projects on the PPL are contacted concerning their project status to determine if funding from the DWTRF is appropriate and the project is ready to proceed. The PPL ranking system allows for higher public health ranking for utilities that have multiple violations as reflected in the Enforcement Targeting Tool (ETT). The ranking system allows coordination of projects funded with consideration of the enforcement agency.

Projects expecting to receive assistance from the DWTRF are on the Fundable Project Priority List (Appendix B). These projects include distribution system upgrades, water treatment plant improvements, extensions to new customers, lead service line inventories, lead service line replacements, and emerging contaminant treatment. Projects solely for economic growth or projects solely for fire protection are not eligible for DWTRF assistance.

Projects that rank lower on the PPL may still receive funding should one or more of the higher ranked projects be bypassed using the bypass procedure described below.

A. **Bypass Procedure**

Prior to implementing the bypass procedure, projects listed on the PPL will be reviewed to determine their readiness to proceed. Based on the review, DWTRF staff will determine whether to bypass the project and select another project for funding commitment consideration. A project will be bypassed based upon readiness to proceed and ability to receive a binding commitment prior to the end of the term of this IUP. To be considered

ready to proceed and eligible to receive a BCL, the project must be able to meet all DWTRF programmatic requirements, have approved plans and specifications, have all funding sources identified, and be ready to proceed to construction within six months of receiving the BCL. If, during the year, a project that was anticipating funding based upon Appendix B, has a substantial scope change that would require it to be re-ranked below another project that is ready to proceed, this project will be re-evaluated for funding at a later date. Any projects with any technical, managerial, and financial capacity concerns that are not expected to be resolved by the proposed project will only be considered after the issues have been resolved.

When a project is bypassed, the project will remain on the PPL for consideration at a future time. DEP will provide technical assistance (as needed) with bypassed projects to assist them in becoming eligible for future funding.

If additional projects are developed during the fiscal year that do not appear on the list, but would like to be considered, they may be added to the list after adequate public notification procedures have been completed. This procedure generally takes 60 days.

B. Emergency Projects

Projects to remediate an imminent significant hazard to a community's public health may be considered an emergency project if approved by OEHS and DEP. An emergency project may not be required to be on the approved PPL if the evaluation by OEHS and DEP verifies the urgency of the project execution to avoid a major impact to the water system's customers. Emergency projects may be reviewed and approved by the IJDC.

C. Requirements for a Binding Commitment

Once it has been determined that a project can realistically proceed to construction within six months, a formal commitment of DWTRF funding will be made that may include such terms and conditions as deemed necessary. At a minimum, the plans and specifications must be approved, and consideration will be given to the status of rights-of-way and real estate obtainment and other items on the pre-bid checklist during this process.

SECTION V Fund Activities

The SDWA regulations, 40CFR35.3525(a)(5), require that at least 15% of the funds in the DWTRF must go to systems serving less than 10,000 total persons. The SDWA allows banking the prior year's excess above the 15% toward meeting the current fiscal year's requirement. In accordance with the above regulation, the projects listed in the Funding List, Appendix B, will ensure that at least 15% of the funds will meet this requirement.

West Virginia legislation establishes the DWTRF requirement for disadvantaged communities. "The Department of Environmental Protection shall, in accordance with the provisions of the

federal Safe Drinking Water Act, establish a program for loan subsidies to disadvantaged communities. Thirty percent of the federal capitalization grants made to this state shall be dedicated to the funding of projects for disadvantaged communities" (WV Code §22-36-2(d)). The 30% requirement will be calculated on a cumulative basis of awarded grants. The projects listed on the Fundable List, Appendix B, will ensure that this requirement has been met.

Disadvantaged communities are those that have a monthly water user rate equal to or greater than 1.5% of the MHI and/or receive principal forgiveness because of income, unemployment, population loss, providing service to failing and/or unserved areas, and poverty rates.

A. <u>Interest rates for PWS loans</u>

The eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration will be based upon 3,400 gallons of monthly water usage. The DEP will use this criterion to determine the 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: Terms will be based upon the 25-Bond Revenue Index. At BCL issuance, the DWTRF will use the last published rate less 5 basis points (.05) for a 20-year term. At no point will the terms exceed 2.75% interest rate, .25% annual admin fee, 20-year term*

1.5% to 1.74% MHI: 1.75% interest rate, .25% annual admin fee, 21 - 30-year term

1.75% to 2.0% MHI: .75% interest rate, .25% annual admin fee, 21 - 30-year term

Greater than 2% MHI: .25% interest rate, .25% annual admin fee, 31 - 40-year term

The MHI data is derived from the 2020 census data published by the U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau. Interest rates will not exceed 2.75%. For 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 D. Municipal MHI data is contained in Appendix D1.

Due to concerns over the 2020 Census data, the use of income surveys to verify the MHI of individual communities will be allowed. Please see the website for further guidance. https://dep.wv.gov/WWE/Programs/SRF/Pages/default.aspx

Should Congress amend the SDWA 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.

^{*} The term of the loan will start on the date of the loan closing.

^{**} For extension projects, a 30-year term will be considered if a substantial rate impact can be documented.

B. Additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities

This year's base funding allocation for West Virginia is \$10,935,000. A portion of each capitalization grant must be used for additional loan subsidization. Therefore, the DEP will be setting aside an amount up to \$5,348,000 (14% - \$1,526,840 and SDWA - \$3,817,100) from the base capitalization grant to be used as principal forgiveness.

This year's IIJA (also known as BIL) funding allocation for West Virginia is \$24,898,000. IIJA requires 49 percent of the allotment (\$12,200,020) to be in the form of additional subsidy as a principal forgiveness loan.

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 DWTRF program are not practical to make the project financially affordable (i.e. 40-year loan terms, graduated principal repayments, adjusting debt service coverage, etc.). A requirement of additional subsidy eligibility will be that the project must be able to show a reduction in the rate to be charged to the project related customers with an award of principal forgiveness. The agency may ask for a specific calculation showing the rate difference with or without the additional subsidy.

Additional subsidization eligibility will be on the following basis:

<u>Income based upon %MHI</u> – Based upon the 2020 Census data for 3,400 gallons of water usage.

MHI	Point
1.25% - 1.74%	20
1.75% - 1.99%	30
2.0% - 2.4%	40
2.5% or greater	50

<u>Unemployment Data</u> – As published by WorkForce West Virginia, the State's average unemployment rate was 3.6% in 2024. See Appendix E.

Locality's Unemployment Rate (UR)	Points
UR < West Virginia's UR	0
UR 0% - 2% above West Virginia's UR	10
UR > 2% above West Virginia's UR	20

<u>Population Trends</u> – Based upon the percentage change for the period from 2020 to 2023 (calendar years) by county as published by the Census. See Appendix F.

Change in Population	Points
Greater than +2%	0
0 to +2%	10
Less than 0%	20

Consolidation and extensions to serve unserved areas and failing systems: 10 Points

<u>Poverty Rate greater than or equal to 20% as found on the following Census site:</u> 10 Points https://data.census.gov/cedsci/

For applicants that receive at least 40 points, the project is eligible for the lesser of 50% of the total eligible DWTRF project costs or \$1,000,000 in principal forgiveness.

For applicants that receive at least 70 points, the project is eligible for the lesser of 100% of the total eligible DWTRF project costs or \$1,500,000 in principal forgiveness.

The final amount of the subsidy will be determined after receipt of bids, documentation of rate impact as a result of the subsidy, and after a formal application is submitted. Note: For wrap loans, as existing debt is retired, the dedicated revenue stream will rollover to pay the amount of any deferred loan.

C. Lead Service Line Replacement Loans

The DWTRF program will provide Lead Service Line Replacement Project loans at 0% interest for both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged community water systems. Disadvantaged community water systems will also be eligible for principal forgiveness loans to complete service line inventories. These projects will be subject to the same loan term lengths as described previously. This year's IIJA funding allocation for West Virginia is \$28,650,000*. IIJA requires 49 percent of the allotment (\$14,038,500*) be in the form of additional subsidy as a principal forgiveness loan. Principal forgiveness will be distributed in the same method as described in paragraph B above. A list of potential lead service line projects is included in Appendix G of this document.

For a project to be eligible for this funding, it must meet the following definition: Any part of a service line made of lead, which connects the water main to the building inlet. A lead service line may be owned by the water system, owned by the property owner, or both. A galvanized service line is considered a lead service line if it ever was or is currently downstream of any lead service line or service line of unknown material. This can include the replacement of lead goosenecks, pigtails, and connectors as eligible expenses, whether standalone or connected to a lead service line. Lead service line inventories are also eligible for this funding.

For FFY 2024 and 2025 LSL funding, galvanized lines that are currently or ever were downstream of known lead service lines or components are the only galvanized lines eligible for this funding. Therefore, if the galvanized lines are downstream of a service line of unknown material, these lines are not eligible for this funding from the FFY 2024 and 2025 LSL allotment, but are still eligible for funding from the base or supplemental allotments.

To assist communities with projects, the DEP and DH used set-aside funds to hire two contractors to assist communities with completing their lead service line inventories. These services are free of charge to the communities and are still available to those that did not complete the inventory by the due date.

• Systems with a service population of 1,000 or less, please reach out to Mary Hutson, WV RCAP at mhutson@wvrcap.org if you are in the St. Albans and Beckley

Districts. If you are in the Fairmont, Kearneysville, and Wheeling Districts, please contact Chris Hannah, Stantec, at chris.hannah@stantec.com or Richard Gaines, Stantec, at richard.gaines@stantec.com.

- Systems with a service population of 1,000 to 10,000, please reach out to the WV Rural Water Association at LSLI@wvrwa.org.
- Systems with a service population greater than 10,000, please contact Kathy Emery, DEP, at katheryn.d.emery@wv.gov if you need funding to hire a contractor to complete your inventory.

D. Emerging Contaminants

The IIJA created a DWTRF funding stream for projects that address emerging contaminants. The funding must be in the form of additional subsidy as a principal forgiveness loan. West Virginia's allotment is \$7,857,000. This allotment requires that at least 25 percent of the grant be awarded to a disadvantaged community or a public utility serving a population less than 25,000. A list of potential emerging contaminants projects is included in Appendix H of this document.

For a project to receive funding under this program, it must be DWTRF eligible and the primary purpose must be to address emerging contaminants in drinking water with a focus on perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS). Projects that address any contaminant listed on any of EPA's Contaminant Candidate Lists are eligible (i.e., CCL1 – CCL5). Projects for which the primary purpose is to address contaminant(s) with a National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (PFAS exception) are not eligible. Eligible applicants must be a PWS, and sampling is only eligible when used as part of project design and construction for eligible projects. Applicants do not need to be eligible for additional subsidization under Section V.B to be eligible for this funding.

E. Set-Aside Activities

In addition to the DWTRF construction fund, there are four "set-aside" or non-project accounts administered by DEP and OEHS. These separate accounts include Administration of the Loan Program, Technical Assistance, State Program Management, and Local Assistance. In addition to funding for staff expenses, there are also programs being undertaken to improve the health and safety of State water systems.

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

Anticipated Set-Asides (Non-Project Funds)

Technical Assistance (up to 2%) IIJA & LSLR	\$	500,000
DWTRF Admin. Expenses (up to 4%)	\$	0*
Drinking Water Program Support (up to 10%) Base & IIJA	\$ 1	1,493,149
Local Assistance/State Activities (up to 15%) Base, IIJA, LSLR	\$ 4	4,823,825

*DWTRF Admin. Expenses will be funded from the Administrative Fee account.

The State is reserving the amounts unused from this grant to be potentially used at a later date and will apply for it when needed.

F. Annual Administrative Fees on PWS loans

Administrative fees are charged on all loans as a means of supporting the administrative costs of operating the DWTRF in perpetuity. These fees are maintained in a separate account outside of the DWTRF. 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. This fund will also be used to support the Capacity Development Program staff and other administrative expenses.

G. Design Loans

The DWTRF can provide design loans to eligible public water systems for projects on the PPL. The loans will be offered at the terms for which the applicant is eligible at the time of the design loan closing. See Section V(A). Design loan repayment will begin within the first quarter after the anticipated design submittal date.

H. Cyber Security

Free vulnerability assessments are available through CISA at www.cisa.gov/water and EPA is providing additional resources at www.epa.gov/waterresilience/epa-cybersecurity-water-sector. Any necessary upgrades resulting from an assessment are eligible project expenses.

I. Federal Requirements

As a recipient of DWTRF funds, the DEP must apply federal requirements to loans equal to the amounts of all the federal capitalization grants. Recipients of Congressionally Directed Spending grants from Congress are required to meet these federal requirements for the entire project, including any DWTRF funds.

The projects listed in Appendix B that have been designated as equivalency projects are required to comply with federal requirements including, but not limited to, the Single Audit Act, DBE, FFATA, Buy America Build America Act (BABAA), etc. These projects total more than the Base and IIJA FFY 2025 capitalization grants.

J. Green Infrastructure (Green Project Reserve – GPR)

The Capitalization Grant does not require any of the funds provided for projects to be used for water efficiency, energy efficiency, green infrastructure, or other environmentally innovative activities. However, these projects are encouraged and are eligible for funding.

K. Asset Management Implementation Effect on Loan Rates

The DWTRF program has required loan recipients to implement an approved asset management plan (AMP) since 2009 to help ensure sustainability of water systems by properly managing their assets. The systems that have maintained, updated, and implemented their AMP are eligible for a reduction of the eligible loan rate by up to 0.5% on their next project.

L. Loan Prepayment

DWTRF loan prepayment may be allowed under certain conditions upon prior written approval from the DEP and the WDA. All requests will be evaluated against Program policy and will not be considered earlier than ten years from loan closing unless under special circumstances. Refinancing through the DWTRF will be the preferred option.

M. Financial Status

The DWTRF will be managed by DEP with assistance, through a contract agreement, from the West Virginia Water Development Authority (WDA). The WDA maintains the financial records and ensures bond conditions and audit requirements are met. DEP oversees OEHS's expenditure of the grant set-aside funds. The DWTRF program financial status is healthy with a principal and interest repayment stream from loans at approximately \$9,900,000 per year. The Administrative fee from loans has an annual income stream of approximately \$800,000 which will be used for the administrative costs of managing the DWTRF.

SECTION VI

Assurances

- Anticipated Cash Draw Ratio (Proportionality) State match funds are disbursed prior to using capitalization grant funds.
- The DEP has agreed to provide EPA with information for the public health results for all loans closed during this fiscal year. This documentation is being requested by EPA to better ascertain the public health results of projects funded under the DWTRF program. The DEP also agrees to add any projects that count as a Green Project Reserve project into the database.
- Projects will be uploaded into EPA's SRF database at least quarterly.

SECTION VII

Public Participation

Comments will be received on the DWTRF IUP for FY2026 until June 30, 2025. A public meeting for both the CWSRF and DWSRF Intended Use Plans will be held at 9:30 am on June 18, 2025, at the WV DEP Headquarters in Charleston, WV. The option to attend virtually will also be offered. The notice will be legally advertised in newspapers throughout the State. In addition, the DEP issued a notice of the IUP comment period by sending a mass email directly to consulting engineers, regional councils, and other interested parties.

Appendix C will contain the public comment notice and a summary of the comments.

APPENDIX A

FISCAL YEAR 2026 COMPREHENSIVE PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

72026 Priority List			
Project	SRF#	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Alderson, Town of	22DWTRFA013	62	45.00
Anmoore Water Department, Town of	22DWTRFA030	63	45.00
Athens, Town of	D-144026	172	20.00
Athens, Town of	D-144165	173	20.00
Belington, City of (Water Department)	D-144027	31	55.00
Benwood, City of	D-144124	99	35.00
Berkeley Springs Water Works (Town of Bath)	D-144166	126	30.00
Beverly, Town of	D-144087	155	25.00
Big Bend PSD	D-144088	127	30.00
Big Bend PSD (River Crossing)	D-144236	79	40.00
Bingamon PSD	D-144180	174	20.00
Birch River PSD (Keener Ridge)	D-144089	80	40.00
Birch River PSD (Mill Creek Phase II)	D-144228	64	45.00
Branchland-Midkiff PSD (Six Mile Creek)	D-144090	65	45.00
Branchland-Midkiff PSD (Trace Fork & West Hamlin)	D-144094	66	45.00
Branchland-Midkiff PSD (Two Mile Creek)	D-144091	38	50.00
Buckhannon Water Department	D-144162	81	40.00
Buffalo Creek PSD (Lorado)	D-144092	128	30.00
Buffalo Creek PSD (South Man)	D-144093	129	30.00
Burnsville Public Utility Board (Rehab)	D-144095	175	20.00
Burnsville Public Utility Board (Route 4)	D-144230	130	30.00
Cameron, City of	D-144208	82	40.00
Canaan Valley PSD	D-144068	13	70.00
Century Volga PSD	D-144096	1	85.00
Chestnut Ridge PSD (Phase II)	D-144209	39	50.00
Clarksburg Water Board (Phase 3B)	D-144151	21	65.00
Clay-Roane PSD (Little Lefthand Rd)	D-144201	83	40.00

Thursday, June 26, 2025

Project	SRF#	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Clay-Roane PSD (Phase I Water System Improv.)	D-144126	32	55.00
Cool Ridge-Flat Top PSD (Ellison Ridge Rd)	D-144030	131	30.00
Cool Ridge-Flat Top PSD (Water Loss)	D-144227	22	65.00
Cowen PSD	D-144183	84	40.00
Cowen PSD (Phase III)	D-144029	85	40.00
Cowen PSD (Pleasant Ridge)	D-144191	40	50.00
Craigsville PSD	19DWTRFA018	41	50.00
Crum PSD	D-144097	7	75.00
Danese PSD	D-144013	132	30.00
Davis, Town of	D-144129	14	70.00
Davy, Town of (Phase II)	D-144064	86	40.00
Elizabeth, Town of	D-144203	42	50.00
Ellenboro, Town of	D-144193	67	45.00
Enlarged Hepzibah PSD	D-144179	100	35.00
Fairview, Town of (Phase III)	D-144196	15	70.00
Flatwoods-Canoe Run PSD	D-144032	78	43.00
Fort Gay, Town of	D-144065	87	40.00
Fountain PSD	D-144159	43	50.00
Frankfort PSD	D-144216	68	45.00
Franklin, Town of (Entry Mountain Rd)	D-144195	133	30.00
Franklin, Town of (Phase II)	D-144197	156	25.00
Gary, Town of	D-144005	3	80.00
Gauley River PSD (Critical Needs)	D-144002	88	40.00
Gauley River PSD (Route 39)	D-144033	101	35.00
Gilbert Town of	D-144098	44	50.00
Glen Dale, City of	D-144237	4	80.00
Glenville Utility Board, City of	D-144221	191	10.00
Grafton, City of (Downtown)	D-144200	186	15.00


Project	SRF#	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Grafton, City of (Water Tank)	D-144199	187	15.00
Grant Town, Town of	D-144034	102	35.00
Grantsville, Town of	D-144035	134	30.00
Greenbrier PSD # 2 (Phase III)	D-144190	45	50.00
Hardy County PSD (Baker)	D-144069	5	80.00
Hardy County PSD (PFAS)	D-144184	2	85.00
Harman, Town of	D-144157	46	50.00
Harpers Ferry, Corporation of-Harpers Ferry Water Works	D-144234	135	30.00
Harrisville, Town of (Mellin Ridge)	D-144132	103	35.00
Hodgesville PSD	D-144010	157	25.00
Hughes River Water Board	D-144133	176	20.00
Ice's Run Route 250 PSD	D-144160	47	50.00
Jane Lew PSD	D-144204	158	25.00
Jumping Branch-Nimitz PSD (Broomstraw Rd)	22DWTRFA027	35	53.00
Jumping Branch-Nimitz PSD (Madams Creek)	D-144024	60	48.00
Kanawha Falls PSD	D-144039	69	45.00
Kermit, Town of	D-144202	136	30.00
Keyser, City of	D-144134	8	75.00
Kingwood Water Works	D-144164	177	20.00
Lashmeet PSD (Brick Yard)	D-144058	70	45.00
Lashmeet PSD (Hiwatha-Springton)	D-144154	33	55.00
Lashmeet PSD (Nubbins Ridge-Stovall Ridge-Camp Cree	D-144222	48	50.00
Lavalette PSD (Big Lynn)	D-144099	137	30.00
Leadsville PSD	D-144194	23	65.00
Lewis County Economic Development Authority	D-144135	49	50.00
Lewis County Economic Development Authority (Phase II	D-144198	89	40.00
Lincoln County PSD	D-144018	138	30.00
Lincoln PSD (Phase IV)	D-144189	139	30.00

Project	SRF#	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Lincoln PSD (Phase VII)	D-144188	140	30.00
Lincoln PSD (Water System Improvements)	D-144001	104	35.00
Logan County PSD (Big Ugly - Phase 1)	D-144100	178	20.00
Logan County PSD (Greenville WTP)	D-144101	159	25.00
Logan County PSD (Island Creek)	D-144102	160	25.00
Logan County PSD (Justice Addition)	D-144104	141	30.00
Logan County PSD (Northern Regional WTP)	D-144084	9	75.00
Logan County PSD (Stollings & McConnell)	D-144103	142	30.00
Logan Utility Board, City of	N/A	34	55.00
Lubeck PSD (Pine Run Rd)	D-144206	6	80.00
Lubeck PSD (WTP Upgrades)	D-144205	50	50.00
Marlinton, Town of	D-144025	71	45.00
Marshall County PSD No. 4 (Water System Improv.)	D-144040	143	30.00
Mason County PSD (Ashton)	D-144173	179	20.00
Mason County PSD (Lakin)	D-144172	180	20.00
Mason County PSD (North Phase I)	D-144137	161	25.00
Mason County PSD (North Phase II)	D-144170	181	20.00
Mason County PSD (North Phase III)	D-144168	182	20.00
Mason County PSD (South Phase I)	D-144167	183	20.00
Mason County PSD (South Phase II)	D-144169	184	20.00
Mason, Town of	D-144042	105	35.00
McDowell County PSD (Anawalt-Phase I)	D-144020	25	60.00
McDowell County PSD (Bradshaw)	D-144043	72	45.00
McDowell County PSD (Elkhorn Phase III)	D-144044	106	35.00
McDowell County PSD (Elkhorn Phase IV)	D-144105	73	45.00
McDowell County PSD (Jolo Phase V)	D-144106	51	50.00
McMechen, City of (Phase II)	D-144138	185	20.00
Meadow Creek PSD	D-144153	74	45.00


Project	SRF#	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Mercer County PSD (McComas)	D-144045	16	70.00
Mercer County PSD (Pocahontas)	22DWTRFA135	162	25.00
Mercer County PSD (Route 19)	D-144107	107	35.00
Milton Municipal Utilities Commission	D-144211	52	50.00
Milton Municipal Utilities Commission	D-144219	144	30.00
Mingo County PSD (Hanover)	D-144085	145	30.00
Mingo County PSD (Ikes Fork Phase IV)	D-144108	108	35.00
Mingo County PSD (Little Huff Creek Phase II)	D-144109	109	35.00
Mingo County PSD (Naugatuck)	D-144233	17	70.00
Mingo County PSD (North Spring Phase III)	D-144110	110	35.00
Mingo County PSD (Pigeon Creek)	D-144231	53	50.00
Mingo County PSD (Rockhouse Br Phase V)	D-144111	111	35.00
Mingo County PSD (Upper Gilbert Creek)	D-144112	90	40.00
Monumental PSD	D-144163	10	75.00
Morgantown Utility Board (Meter)	D-144214	188	15.00
Morgantown Utility Board (Storage Tank)	D-144212	189	15.00
Morgantown Utility Board (Water Main)	D-144213	26	60.00
Morgantown Utility Board (WTP)	D-144215	75	45.00
Nettie-Leivasy PSD	D-144014	91	40.00
New Creek Water Association	D-144220	54	50.00
New Haven PSD (Lucas Rd)	D-144048	97	38.00
New Haven PSD (Old Gwinn Rd)	D-144049	61	48.00
New Haven PSD (White Rd)	D-144050	36	53.00
New Martinsville Water & Sanitary Sewer Board (Beechw	D-144174	146	30.00
New Martinsville Water & Sanitary Sewer Board (PFAS)	D-144210	27	60.00
Norton-Harding-Jimtown PSD	D-144071	112	35.00
Nutter Fort, Town of	D-144140	163	25.00
Oceana, Town of (Phase II)	D-144008	113	35.00

Project	SRF#	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Parkersburg Utility Board	D-144051	18	70.00
Parsons, City of	D-144052	114	35.00
Paw Paw, Town of	D-144077	115	35.00
Pax, Town of	D-144086	55	50.00
Pennsboro, City of	D-144182	92	40.00
Pineville, Town of (Brenton-Baileysville-JPBS)	D-144141	116	35.00
Pineville, Town of (Guyandotte River)	D-144238	147	30.00
Pineville, Town of (In-Town Final)	20DWTRFB010	164	25.00
Preston County PSD No. 1	D-144150	93	40.00
Rainelle, Town of	D-144229	24	65.00
Raleigh County PSD	D-144113	165	25.00
Ravencliff-Mcgraws-Saulsville PSD (Glen Rogers)	D-144078	166	25.00
Richwood, City of	D-144178	19	70.00
Romney, Town of (Secondary Source)	D-144142	76	45.00
Romney, Town of (Water Line Extension)	D-144181	37	53.00
Rupert, Town of	D-144114	117	35.00
Salem, City of	D-144207	94	40.00
St. Albans Municipal Utility Commission, City of	D-144239	28	60.00
St. Marys, City of (PFAS)	D-144226	11	75.00
Sugar Creek PSD (Water Ext. Phase I)	D-144186	148	30.00
Sugar Creek PSD (WTP)	D-144185	167	25.00
Summersville County Commission (Forest Hill Ph I)	D-144225	118	35.00
Summersville, City of	D-144080	192	10.00
Summit Park PSD	D-144083	168	25.00
Sun Valley PSD	D-144081	98	38.00
Terra Alta, Town of (Water Meter)	D-144143	119	35.00
Thomas, City of (Phase 1)	D-144060	56	50.00
Tomlinson PSD	D-144235	57	50.00


Project	SRF#	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Union Williams PSD	D-144192	12	75.00
Union, Town of (Waterline)	D-144072	120	35.00
Union, Town of (WTP)	D-144073	121	35.00
Walton PSD (Camp Shepard)	D-144144	122	35.00
Walton PSD (PFAS)	D-144176	123	35.00
Walton PSD (Storage Tanks)	D-144177	169	25.00
Wardensville, Town of	D-144217	95	40.00
Weirton Water Board (Pressure Alleviation)	D-144146	190	15.00
Welch, City of (Jr. Poca)	D-144082	58	50.00
Wellsburg, City of	D-144187	29	60.00
West Hamlin, Town of (Phase I)	D-144147	124	35.00
West Hamlin, Town of (Phase II)	D-144175	149	30.00
West Virginia American Water	D-144218	30	60.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of (Big Draft)	D-144232	150	30.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of (Lewisburg Connection)	D-144115	151	30.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of (Mapledale)	D-144116	152	30.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of (Ridges)	D-144117	96	40.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of (Villa Park)	D-144118	153	30.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of (Waterline Replacement)	D-144119	125	35.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of (WTP Improvements)	D-144120	154	30.00
Wilderness PSD (Water Syst. Improv. Ph II)	D-144121	59	50.00
Williamson, City of (Water System Upgrades)	D-144122	170	25.00
Williamson, City of (Waterline Replacement Phase II)	D-144123	171	25.00
Williamstown, City of (PFAS)	D-144224	20	70.00
Worthington, Town of (Phase II)	D-144067	77	45.00




30-Jun-25 Page 1 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 2 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 3 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 4 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 5 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 6 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 7 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 8 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 9 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 10 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 11 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 12 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 13 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 14 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 15 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 16 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 17 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 18 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 19 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 20 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 21 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 22 of 96



30-Jun-25 Page 23 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 24 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 25 of 96


Points 50.00




30-Jun-25 Page 26 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 27 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 28 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 29 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 30 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 31 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 32 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 33 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 34 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 35 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 36 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 37 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 38 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 39 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 40 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 41 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 42 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 43 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 44 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 45 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 46 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 47 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 48 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 49 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 50 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 51 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 52 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 53 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 54 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 55 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 56 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 57 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 58 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 59 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 60 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 61 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 62 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 63 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 64 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 65 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 66 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 67 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 68 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 69 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 70 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 71 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 72 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 73 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 74 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 75 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 76 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 77 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 78 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 79 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 80 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 81 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 82 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 83 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 84 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 85 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 86 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 87 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 88 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 89 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 90 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 91 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 92 of 96




30-Jun-25 Page 93 of 96



30-Jun-25 Page 94 of 96



30-Jun-25 Page 95 of 96



30-Jun-25 Page 96 of 96

Intended Use Plan, July 1, 2025-June 30, 2026

System:	County: Date		 	
Project#:	Project:		 	
	DWTRF Project Priority Ranking System			
(1)	PUBLIC HEALTH (0 to 50 points - 50 points maximum)	TO!		4.4

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

- (A) **50 points** Projects to correct acute health hazards Fifty points will be given to projects that propose to eliminate a provlem that poses an acute, ongoing health hazard to the consumer. Violations should be included in the Enforcement Tracking Tool (ETT). Examples are listed below.
 - Projects that address documented nitrate or nitrite violations.
 - Projects that address documented exceedances of primary inorganic MCL's
 - Projects that address a problem where a system has significant turbidity violations. The project must ensure compliance to receive DWTRF assistance.
 - Projects that address a problem where a system has significant microbiological violations. The project must ensure compliance to receive DWTRF assistance.
 - Projects that propose filtration for surface water source that currently do not have filtration.
 - Projects that propose disinfection for a system that currently do not have disinfection.
 - Projects that address documented or potential water outages for extended periods (1 week or more) due to contamination or system/design deficiencies.
- (B) **40 points** Correct chronic health hazards Forty points will be given to projects that propose to eliminate a chronic health hazard to the consumer. Examples are listed below.
 - Projects that address occasional turbidity violations for a system that has a moderate ETT score.
 - Projects that address occasional microbiological violations for a system that has a moderate ETT score.
 - Projects that address exceedances of the Lead and Copper Rule.
 - Projects that address documented exceedances of primary organic MCL's.

- Projects that address documented exceedances of radiological MCL's.
- Projects that address treatment technologies for the SWTR.
- Projects that address documented or potential water outages (1 to 6 days) due to contamination or system/design deficiencies.
- Projects that enhance source water protection to prevent widespread contamination throughout the distribution system via alternate water sources or additional storage.
- (C) **30 points** Correct periodic health hazards Thirty points will be awarded to projects that propose to eliminate a documented health hazard which has oc curred periodically. Examples are listed below.
 - Projects that address low chlorine residuals.
 - Projects that address periodic exceedances of a primary MCL.
 - Projects that address periodic water outages to some customers for at least a day due to design or system deficiency.
 - Projects to bring existing facilities to current design standards which affect water quality: treatment, chemical application, pumping facilities, finished storage and distribution systems.
- (D) **20 points** Correct potential health hazards Twenty points will be given to projects that propose to eliminate potential health hazards. Examples are listed below.
 - Projects for line extensions to areas with poor water quality or limited quantity.
 - Projects to develop new source to augment existing sources where there is no other health hazard associated with the project. Dams and reservoirs are not eligible.
 - Projects for installation / upgrade of waste disposal facilities.
- (E) **10 points System Improvements** Ten points will be given to projects that propose general system improvements. Examples are listed below.
 - Projects to replace / repair old, undersized, or malfunctioning equipment.
 - Projects to replace leaking water line.
 - Projects to improve aesthetic quality of the water such as iron, manganese, taste and odor.
- (2) _____ REGULATORY COMPLIANCE (0 to 20 points, 20 points maximum)
 - (A) **20 points** Correction of chronic non-compliance Compliance with administrative orders, agreements, statutes, or regulatory requirements.
 - (B) 10 points Compliance with periodic and potential non-compliance Compliance with sanitary survey recommendations, NPDES permits, new

regulations, or design standards.

(C) **5 points** Protection against non-compliance - Compliance with proposed regulations.

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

(3) _____ AFFORDABILITY (0 to 30 points) (Based on post-project user rates)

Rates = 0% to 0.49% MHI (0 points) **Projected Rate:**

Rates = 0.50% to 0.99% MHI (5 points) MHI:

Rates = 1.00% to 1.24% MHI (10 points) Mun./County/Mag. Dist. Used:

Rates = 1.25% to 1.49% MHI (15 points)

Rates = 1.50% to 1.74% MHI (20 points) % MHI:

Rates = 1.75% to 1.99% MHI (25 points)

Rates \geq 2.0% MHI (30 points)

Note: MHI = median household income by county or municipality as published by the West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council (IJDC) at time of approval for funding by IJDC. If the project sponsor can clearly show that a magisterial district census income reflects the affordability more appropriately the magisterial district census data may be used in place of the county census data.

Rates are based on 3,400 gallons.

Public Health	
Compliance	
Affordability	
Total Points	

Tie Breaker:

If two or more systems have the same score, the following will be used as the tie-breaker.

- 1. Whichever system has the highest public health rating will be ranked highest. **Shown in above table.**
- 2. In the event there is still a tie, then the system with the smaller population served will be ranked higher. **Population:**

Definitions

MCL -- Maximum Contaminant Level ETT -- Enforcement Tracking Tool SWTR -- Surface Water Treatment Rule

Notes:

WVDH Review: Completed Date:

Reviewed by PM: Completed Date:

Reviewed by Eng: Completed Date:

APPENDIX B

FUNDABLE PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

Appendix B - Fundable Project List Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2025 Base (\$10,935,000) and IIJA Grants (\$24,898,000)

Name	Project Scope	Project	Activity	Equivalency	Base Program	Base Program	IIJA General	IIJA Principal	IIJA Emerging		LSLR Principal	System's	Binding
		Number	Code	Designation	Loan	Principal	Supplemental	Forgiveness	Contaminants	LSLR Loan	Forgiveness	Service Area	Commitment
		D-144			\$9,077,435	Forgiveness	\$7,963,991	\$12,200,020	\$7,857,000	\$14,357,080*	\$14,038,500*	Population	Date
Anmoore	Distribution System Upgrade	22DWTRFA030	D3	Е	\$944,500							951	
Clarksburg - Ph. 3B	LSL and watermain replacement	151	P	Е			\$600,000					18,006	
Craigsville PSD	WTP & Distribution System Upgrade	19DWTRFA018	D3	Е	\$6,007,900			\$1,000,000				4,711	7/24/2025
Danese PSD	Maplewood Water System Upgrade	013	D3	E			\$6,175,000	\$1,500,000				2,294	6/18/2024
Davis	LSL and watermain replacement	129	P	Е			\$600,000					884	
Hardy County PSD	PFAS treatment	184	P	Е			\$1,950,000		\$1,500,000			150	
Hodgesville PSD	Distribution System Upgrade & Extension	010	D3	NE	\$993,000			\$820,000				2,688	6/27/2024
Jumping Branch Nimitz PSD - Broomstraw	Waterline Extension	22DWTRFA027	D3	Е				\$1,705,000				214	 I
Jumping Branch Nimitz PSD - Madams Creek	Waterline Extension	024	D3	E	\$1,021,361	\$770,214		\$35,359				214	
Kanawha Co. Regional Development Authority	Waterline Extension	156	D3	E			\$9,209,240					103	
Lashmeet PSD - Mary's Branch Ext.	Waterline Extension	19DWTRFA011	D3	NE			\$946,453	\$514,661				1,833	9/8/2022
Lewis Co. EDA - Corridor H	Waterline Extension and Upgrade	135	D2	E				\$1,500,000				1,144	
Lubeck PSD	Waterline Ext. to PFAS impacted customers	206	P	E					\$1,500,000			10,377	
Marlinton - design loan	Distribution System Upgrade	025	P	NE	\$214,500							1,930	
Mercer Co. PSD	Pocahontas Waterline Replacement	22DWTRFA135	D2	E				\$1,000,000				123	
Milton	Emergency Potable Water Connection	139	D2	NE				\$425,000				5,466	
Oceana - Ph. 2	Distribution System Upgrade	008	D	E			\$1,950,000	\$700,000				3,796	
Nettie-Leivasy PSD - Ward/McCutchen	Distribution System Upgrade	014	D	E			\$1,379,380	\$500,000				3,343	
Parkersburg	PFAS Treatment	051	D2	E	\$1,474,300							34,251	
Paw Paw PSD	WTP & Distribution System Upgrade	077	D3	NE			\$950,000	\$1,500,000				1,257	10/1/2025
Pineville	Water Intake & Distribution System Upgrade	20DWTRFB0010-01	D3	NE				\$1,000,000				2,162	5/28/2024
Williamstown	PFAS/Manganese treatment	224	P	Е			\$570,000		\$4,640,000			3,469	
Total Projects					\$10.655.561	\$770,214	\$24.220.072	\$12,200,020	\$7,640,000	\$0	\$0		I
Total Projects					\$10,655,561	\$110,214	\$24,330,073	\$12,200,020	\$7,640,000	ΦU	\$ 0		

Equivalency Designation
E - Equivalency (See Section V. J. of the IUP for federal requirements)
NE - Non-Equivalency

49.00%

Activity Codes and Binding Commitment dates P - facilities planning underway - Summer 2026

D - design underway - Winter 2026

D2 - design under review at DEP - Fall 2025

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway - Summer 2025 unless a specific date is provided

Appendix B - Fundable Project List Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2024 Base (\$4,661,000) and IIJA Grants (\$22,985,000)

Equivalency Designation E - Equivalency (See Section V. J. of the IUP for federal requirements)

NE - Non-Equivalency

Name	Project Scope	Project	Activity	Equivalency	Base	IIJA General	IIJA Emerging		LSLR Principal	System's	Binding
		Number	Code	Designation	Program	Supplemental	Contaminants	LSLR Loan	Forgiveness	Service Area	Commitment
		D-144			\$3,690,799	\$17,485,073	\$7,640,000	\$12,292,950	\$15,114,050	Population	Date
Parkersburg	PFAS Treatment	051	D2	E			\$7,640,000			34,251	
Equivalency Projects Closed to Date					\$3,690,799	\$17,485,073	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Total Projects					\$3,690,799	\$17,485,073	\$7,640,000	\$0	\$0		

Activity Codes and Binding Commitment dates

P - facilities planning underway - Summer 2026 D - design underway - Winter 2026

D2 - design under review at DEP - Fall 2025

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway - Summer 2025 unless a specific date is provided

Appendix B - Fundable Project List (amended 7/1/24) Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2023 Base (\$4,938,000) and IIJA Grants (\$21,055,000)

Name	Project Scope	Proj Num	Activity	Equivalency	Base	IIJA General	IIJA Emerging		LSLR Principal	System's	Binding
		D-144	Code	Designation	Program	Supplemental	Contaminants	LSLR Loan	Forgiveness	Service Area	Commitment
					\$3,802,500	\$16,191,875	\$7,265,000	\$10,778,293	\$14,038,500	Population	Date
Clarksburg - Ph. 3 B	LSL and watermain replacement	151	P	Е				\$4,416,554	\$867,306	18,006	
Davis	LSL and watermain replacement	129	P	Е					\$600,000	884	
Parkersburg	PFAS Treatment	051	P	E			\$7,265,000			34,251	
WV American Water Company Huntington	LSL Replacement		P	Е				\$508,600		84,004	
White Sulphur Springs - Villa	LSL Replacement		P	E				\$629,212	\$604,538	3,845	
Equivalency Projects closed to					\$3,802,500	\$16,191,875					
date					\$5,602,500	\$10,191,873					
Total Projects					\$3,802,500	\$16,191,875	\$7,265,000	\$5,554,366	\$2,071,844		

Activity Codes and Binding Commitment dates

P - facilities planning underway - Summer 2026

D - design underway - Winter 2026

D2 - design under review at DEP - Fall 2025

Equivalency Designation

E - Equivalency (See Section V. J. of the IUP for federal requirements)

NE - Non-Equivalency

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway - Summer 2025 unless a specific date is provided

Appendix B - Fundable Project List (amended as of 7/1/24) Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2022 Base (\$7,008,000) and IIJA Grants (\$17,992,000)

Name	Project Scope	Project Number D-144	Activity Code	Equivalency Designation	Base Program plus 4% SA \$5,115,840	IIJA Supplemental plus 4% SA \$15,937,480	IIJA Emerging Contaminants \$7,403,900	LSLR Loan \$10,680,517	LSLR Principal Forgiveness \$13,891,500	System's Service Area Population	Binding Commitment Date
Clarksburg - Ph. 3B	LSL Replacement	151	P	Е				\$3,412,966	\$6,655,174	18,006	
Glen Dale	PFAS Treatment	22DWTRFA002	D	Е			\$3,286,000			2,495	
Parkersburg	PFAS Treatment	051	P	Е			\$517,900			34,251	
Equivalency Projects closed to date					\$5,115,840	\$15,937,480	\$3,600,000	\$7,267,551	\$7,236,326		
Total Projects					\$5,115,840	\$15,937,480	\$7,403,900	\$10,680,517	\$13,891,500		

Activity Codes and Binding Commitment dates

Equivalency Designation

P - facilities planning underway - Summer 2026

E - Equivalency (See Section V. J. of the IUP for federal requirements)

D - design underway - Winter 2026

NE - Non-Equivalency

D2 - design under review at DEP - Fall 2025

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway - Summer 2025 unless a specific date is provided

APPENDIX C

PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

The FY2026 IUP Public Meeting was scheduled for June 18, 2025, at 9:30am. The meeting took place at the WV DEP's Headquarters in Charleston, WV. An option to attend remotely or call-in was also given.

Question No. 1 – David Altizer with Thompson & Litton submitted an application for the Big Bend PSD River Crossing project for inclusion on the FY2026 Priority List.

Answer to Question No. 1 – The Big Bend PSD River Crossing project was included in the FY2026 Priority List.

Question No. 2 – A. C. Wiethe with Bel-O-Mar Regional Council submitted an application for the City of Glen Dale Emerging Contaminants Water System Improvements project for inclusion on the FY2026 Priority List.

Answer to Question No. 2 – The City of Glen Dale Emerging Contaminants Water System Improvements project was included in the FY2026 Priority List and the FY2026 IUP Appendix H-Potential Emerging Contaminants Projects.

Question No. 3 – Matthew Allen with Thompson & Litton submitted an application for the Town of Pineville Guyandotte River project for inclusion on the FY2026 Priority List.

Answer to Question No. 3 – The Town of Pineville Guyandotte River project was included in the FY2026 Priority List.

Question No. 4 – Matt Tanner with Chapman Technical Group submitted an application for the St. Albans Utility Commission Water Treatment Plant Improvements project for inclusion on the FY2026 Priority List.

Answer to Question No. 4 – The St. Albans Utility Commission Water Treatment Plant Improvements project was included in the FY2026 Priority List.

Question No. 5 – What is the difference between the Clean Water and the Drinking Water additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities?

Answer to Question No. 5 – The difference is the amount. We don't have as much money in the Drinking Water as we do the Clean Water allotments. For 40 points rather than \$1,500,000 it's \$1,000,000 and for 70 points instead of \$2,000,000 it's \$1,500,000 in principal forgiveness.

Question No. 6 – The Town of Pineville has a project that is number 113 on the ranking list. They received 35 priority points but they meet every requirement. What determines the priority points?

Answer to Question No. 6 – There are two different things. That is the points to be eligible for principal forgiveness. We do have a ranking criterion approved by EPA that is in our appendix. That is how the points are assigned for the priority list. The Drinking Water SRF has already committed \$1,000,000 in principal forgiveness to the Town of Pineville to upgrade their water treatment system. They have to be on our Priority List to get the money so we can close on it. We have already committed that because they are ready to proceed.

Question No. 7 – Regarding the Town of Gary, number 3, they have \$500,000 in principal forgiveness or SRF funds and a total project cost of over \$3,000,000. If they do not have the remaining funds they can't move forward, correct? If they don't have the funding to proceed, why are they ranked so high?

Answer to Question No. 7 – No. We cannot move to commitment and construction until the project in its entirety is funded. That is one of the reasons why, even if a project is not even asking for SRF funding and they are trying to obtain Congressionally Directed Spending Grant, for example, they ask to be on the Project Priority List so they can show that it is an SRF eligible project. That doesn't mean Gary won't be funded. More often than not what tends to happen is once they get the remaining funding, generally there is still money available, and they will get funded and they will proceed.

Question No. 8 – Can you explain why Gary isn't moving forward?

Answer to Question No. 8 – I can't explain that. I haven't been working with Gary directly. From what is being said, it sounds like they don't have their other funding ready. In West Virginia we co-fund almost every project. That is a big challenge for our small communities. Gary is working towards a design loan. We do that so design funding is available so they can pay for the upfront costs. The accounting, the legal, and engineering. They may not have their construction funding available, but that doesn't mean we can't give them a design loan so they can get it ready and move higher on the other funding sources lists.

Question No. 9 – Am I correct in saying that the Trump administration is cutting 90% of the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds?

Answer to Question No. 9 – That is correct. The budget that was proposed would essentially eliminate the Capitalization Grants from the State Revolving Funds, for the most part.

Question No. 10 – Does that start this fiscal year?

Answer to Question No. 10 – This fiscal year we are already applying for the federal fiscal year 2025 grants. That would impact the federal fiscal year 2026 grants. If no more federal grants come to SRF, the principal forgiveness that the communities rely on would no longer be available.

Also, the set-a-side money that supports the Department of Health's team that administers the Safe Drinking Water Act, they would need to find another funding mechanism to pay for that staff as well.

Question No. 11 – If the Town of Gary is only going to get \$500,000, what can we do? Where can we apply?

Answer to Question No. 11 – As mentioned earlier by Samme Gee, they are working on a design loan. We are more than happy to do that. That will help pay for engineering, accounting, and legal so they are getting that project ready to fund from whatever other funding sources are available.

Question No. 12 – How do we request a meeting in order to get the design loan and more aid?

Answer to Question No. 12 – Send an email to Kathy Emery to schedule a meeting.



WV Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund FY2026 IUP Public Meeting Attendance Sheet

June 18, 2025 – 9:30am

Name	Organization
Marie Preziosa	WV WDA
Mary Loy Lilly	Concerned Citizen 9663
Libby Lilly Landeree Tulie Meron	11
Julie Meron	Jacreson Kelly
Justin Mo Hitt	WV DEP
SAMNE GEE	JAckson Kelly PLLC
Kathy (Indersor	WV DE/-
Susan Williams	304-779-9367
John Giroir	WVDEP
Rachel Howston	WYDEP
Paul Daniels	WU DEP
Thomas Cared	WYDEP
Caitlin Lizarraga	WAN
Dominique Madison	WVDEP
Spencer fultincer	WOEP
Allxis 20 threo	THRASHER
JASON Billups	MNDEL
ZACH Thompson	Thrasher
CATIN WARE	From Below
maggie pans	Univ of Southern California grad sprelent
Lindy Wilson	Kay Casto & Chancy



WV Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Fund FY2026 IUP Public Meeting

Virtual Attendance Sheet

June 18, 2025 – 9:30am

Name	Organization
MICHELLE BRENNER	WV DEP
PAIGE PARRISH	WV DEP
JAINNIE KOON	AUDRA STATE PARK
MICHAEL STONE	CHAPMAN TECHNICAL GROUP
STACY FOWLER	THOMPSON & LITTON
ALI SADEGHIAN	CARPENTER MARY TRANSPORTATION
DANIEL BAILEY	WV DEP
MARIAH CLAY	WV RIVERS
PATRICK & MICHELLE PARK	CARPENTER MARY TRANSPORTATION
RYAN WHITE	RESOURCE ENVIR. TRANSPORTATION
KELLEY O'NEILL	EPA REGION 3
PAYTON WOOD	EPA REGION 3
BETH GARIA	EPA REGION 3
JOZY	NRGRDA/WV HIVE
GWEN CLAYTON	REGION 2 P&DC
MIKE TONY	CHARLESTON GAZETTE-MAIL
MARLAN ZWOLL	WV DEP
KRISTI BAKER	WV DEP
CHARLES BELCHER	WV DEP

MELANIE BOOTHE	MOVRC
TINA HALL	WV DEP
CHARLES ROBINSON	WV RIVERS
BRAD DAVIS	WELCH CHARGE UNITED METH CHURCH
DANA TACKETT	MOVRC
ANDY HARTLEBEN	MOVRC
LARRY ORR	TRI UNLIMITED
KEVANNA TYLER	WV DEP
KATHY EMERY	WV DEP

APPENDIX D

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY COUNTY AND MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Barbour	\$38,906	40.53	48.63	56.74	64.84	81.05
North district, Barbour County	\$37,148	38.70	46.44	54.17	61.91	77.39
South district, Barbour County	\$40,087	41.76	50.11	58.46	66.81	83.51
West district, Barbour County	\$39,470	41.11	49.34	57.56	65.78	82.23
Berkeley	\$65,286	68.01	81.61	95.21	108.81	136.01
Adam Stephens district, Berkeley County	\$41,773	43.51	52.22	60.92	69.62	87.03
Norborne district, Berkeley County	\$68,544	71.40	85.68	99.96	114.24	142.80
Potomac district, Berkeley County	\$63,184	65.82	78.98	92.14	105.31	131.63
Shenandoah district, Berkeley County	\$68,007	70.84	85.01	99.18	113.35	141.68
Tuscarora district, Berkeley County	\$68,874	71.74	86.09	100.44	114.79	143.49
Valley district, Berkeley County	\$72,155	75.16	90.19	105.23	120.26	150.32
Boone	\$45,297	47.18	56.62	66.06	75.50	94.37
District 1, Boone County	\$47,530	49.51	59.41	69.31	79.22	99.02
District 2, Boone County	\$38,274	39.87	47.84	55.82	63.79	79.74
District 3, Boone County	\$51,151	53.28	63.94	74.60	85.25	106.56
Braxton	\$43,819	45.64	54.77	63.90	73.03	91.29
Eastern district, Braxton County	\$41,019	42.73	51.27	59.82	68.37	85.46
Northern district, Braxton County	\$39,803	41.46	49.75	58.05	66.34	82.92
Southern district, Braxton County	\$43,945	45.78	54.93	64.09	73.24	91.55
Western district, Braxton County	\$51,295	53.43	64.12	74.81	85.49	106.86
Brooke	\$48,168	50.18	60.21	70.25	80.28	100.35
Follansbee district, Brooke County	\$43,149	44.95	53.94	62.93	71.92	89.89
Weirton district, Brooke County	\$51,392	53.53	64.24	74.95	85.65	107.07
Wellsburg district, Brooke County	\$47,863	49.86	59.83	69.80	79.77	99.71
Cabell	\$41,472	43.20	51.84	60.48	69.12	86.40
District 1, Cabell County	\$44,500	46.35	55.63	64.90	74.17	92.71
District 2, Cabell County	\$26,474	27.58	33.09	38.61	44.12	55.15
District 3, Cabell County	\$30,835	32.12	38.54	44.97	51.39	64.24
District 4, Cabell County	\$50,013	52.10	62.52	72.94	83.36	104.19
District 5, Cabell County	\$53,699	55.94	67.12	78.31	89.50	111.87
Calhoun	\$38,668	40.28	48.34	56.39	64.45	80.56
District 1, Calhoun County	\$45,029	46.91	56.29	65.67	75.05	93.81
District 2, Calhoun County	\$40,556	42.25	50.70	59.14	67.59	84.49
District 3, Calhoun County	\$40,921	42.63	51.15	59.68	68.20	85.25
District 4, Calhoun County	\$38,125	39.71	47.66	55.60	63.54	79.43
District 5, Calhoun County	\$35,521	37.00	44.40	51.80	59.20	74.00
Clay	\$35,154	36.62	43.94	51.27	58.59	73.24
District A, Clay County	\$33,542	34.94	41.93	48.92	55.90	69.88
District B, Clay County	\$26,362	27.46	32.95	38.44	43.94	54.92
District C, Clay County	\$42,750	44.53	53.44	62.34	71.25	89.06
Doddridge	\$51,300	53.44	64.13	74.81	85.50	106.88
Beech district, Doddridge County	\$37,807	39.38	47.26	55.14	63.01	78.76
Maple district, Doddridge County	\$69,620	72.52	87.03	101.53	116.03	145.04

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Oak district, Doddridge County	\$50,935	53.06	63.67	74.28	84.89	106.11
Pine district, Doddridge County	\$57,833	60.24	72.29	84.34	96.39	120.49
Fayette	\$43,722	45.54	54.65	63.76	72.87	91.09
New Haven district, Fayette County	\$46,316	48.25	57.90	67.54	77.19	96.49
Plateau district, Fayette County	\$42,921	44.71	53.65	62.59	71.54	89.42
Valley district, Fayette County	\$42,268	44.03	52.84	61.64	70.45	88.06
Gilmer	\$42,883	44.67	53.60	62.54	71.47	89.34
Center district, Gilmer County	\$39,693	41.35	49.62	57.89	66.16	82.69
City district, Gilmer County	\$34,250	35.68	42.81	49.95	57.08	71.35
De Kalb-Troy district, Gilmer County	\$44,280	46.13	55.35	64.58	73.80	92.25
Glenville district, Gilmer County	\$48,750	50.78	60.94	71.09	81.25	101.56
Grant	\$43,313	45.12	54.14	63.16	72.19	90.24
Grant district, Grant County	\$41,649	43.38	52.06	60.74	69.42	86.77
Milroy district, Grant County	\$41,321	43.04	51.65	60.26	68.87	86.09
Union district, Grant County	\$52,152	54.33	65.19	76.06	86.92	108.65
Greenbrier	\$39,807	41.47	49.76	58.05	66.35	82.93
Central district, Greenbrier County	\$45,283	47.17	56.60	66.04	75.47	94.34
Eastern district, Greenbrier County	\$35,338	36.81	44.17	51.53	58.90	73.62
Western district, Greenbrier County	\$41,261	42.98	51.58	60.17	68.77	85.96
Hampshire	\$48,528	50.55	60.66	70.77	80.88	101.10
Bloomery district, Hampshire County	\$66,930	69.72	83.66	97.61	111.55	139.44
Capon district, Hampshire County	\$62,228	64.82	77.79	90.75	103.71	129.64
Gore district, Hampshire County	\$54,732	57.01	68.42	79.82	91.22	114.03
Mill Creek district, Hampshire County	\$50,547	52.65	63.18	73.71	84.25	105.31
Romney district, Hampshire County	\$33,943	35.36	42.43	49.50	56.57	70.71
Sherman district, Hampshire County	\$47 <i>,</i> 578	49.56	59.47	69.38	79.30	99.12
Springfield district, Hampshire County	\$42,159	43.92	52.70	61.48	70.27	87.83
Hancock	\$48,140	50.15	60.18	70.20	80.23	100.29
Butler district, Hancock County	\$55,773	58.10	69.72	81.34	92.96	116.19
Clay district, Hancock County	\$45,966	47.88	57.46	67.03	76.61	95.76
Grant district, Hancock County	\$44,854	46.72	56.07	65.41	74.76	93.45
Hardy	\$46,513	48.45	58.14	67.83	77.52	96.90
Capon district, Hardy County	\$45,756	47.66	57.20	66.73	76.26	95.33
Lost River district, Hardy County	\$51,406	53.55	64.26	74.97	85.68	107.10
Moorefield district, Hardy County	\$47,500	49.48	59.38	69.27	79.17	98.96
Old Fields district, Hardy County	\$42,034	43.79	52.54	61.30	70.06	87.57
South Fork district, Hardy County	\$47,207	49.17	59.01	68.84	78.68	98.35
						108.61
Harrison	\$52,134	54.31	65.17	76.03	86.89	
Eastern district, Harrison County	\$75,050	78.18	93.81	109.45	125.08	156.35
Northern district, Harrison County	\$53,343	55.57	66.68	77.79	88.91	111.13
North Urban district, Harrison County	\$40,375	42.06	50.47	58.88	67.29	84.11

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Southern district, Harrison County	\$55,080	57.38	68.85	80.33	91.80	114.75
South Urban district, Harrison County	\$52,275	54.45	65.34	76.23	87.13	108.91
Southwest district, Harrison County	\$50,752	52.87	63.44	74.01	84.59	105.73
Jackson	\$49,115	51.16	61.39	71.63	81.86	102.32
Eastern district, Jackson County	\$45,818	47.73	57.27	66.82	76.36	95.45
Northern district, Jackson County	\$49,528	51.59	61.91	72.23	82.55	103.18
Western district, Jackson County	\$53,156	55.37	66.45	77.52	88.59	110.74
Jefferson	\$82,551	85.99	103.19	120.39	137.59	171.98
Charles Town district, Jefferson County	\$67,962	70.79	84.95	99.11	113.27	141.59
Harpers Ferry district, Jefferson County	\$76,905	80.11	96.13	112.15	128.18	160.22
Kabletown district, Jefferson County	\$115,469	120.28	144.34	168.39	192.45	240.56
Middleway district, Jefferson County	\$72,136	75.14	90.17	105.20	120.23	150.28
Shepherdstown district, Jefferson County	\$88,523	92.21	110.65	129.10	147.54	184.42
Kanawha	\$47,122	49.09	58.90	68.72	78.54	98.17
District 1, Kanawha County	\$43,831	45.66	54.79	63.92	73.05	91.31
District 2, Kanawha County	\$51,916	54.08	64.90	75.71	86.53	108.16
District 3, Kanawha County	\$50,204	52.30	62.76	73.21	83.67	104.59
District 4, Kanawha County	\$42,112	43.87	52.64	61.41	70.19	87.73
Lewis	\$43,894	45.72	54.87	64.01	73.16	91.45
Courthouse-Collins Settlement district, Lewis	\$34,800	36.25	43.50	50.75	58.00	72.50
Freemans Creek district, Lewis County	\$49,030	51.07	61.29	71.50	81.72	102.15
Hackers Creek-Skin Creek district, Lewis County	\$46,667	48.61	58.33	68.06	77.78	97.22
Lincoln	\$42,064	43.82	52.58	61.34	70.11	87.63
District 1, Lincoln County	\$55,826	58.15	69.78	81.41	93.04	116.30
District 2, Lincoln County	\$33,011	34.39	41.26	48.14	55.02	68.77
District 3, Lincoln County	\$36,772	38.30	45.97	53.63	61.29	76.61
Logan	\$36,250	37.76	45.31	52.86	60.42	75.52
Central district, Logan County	\$38,605	40.21	48.26	56.30	64.34	80.43
Eastern district, Logan County	\$33,014	34.39	41.27	48.15	55.02	68.78
Western district, Logan County	\$45,396	47.29	56.75	66.20	75.66	94.58
Marion	\$52,856	55.06	66.07	77.08	88.09	99.11
Middletown district, Marion County	\$45,274	47.16	56.59	66.02	75.46	94.32
Palatine district, Marion County	\$60,511	63.03	75.64	88.25	100.85	126.06
West Augusta district, Marion County	\$53,660	55.90	67.08	78.25	89.43	111.79
Marshall	\$48,179	50.19	60.22	70.26	80.30	100.37
District 1, Marshall County	\$53,311	55.53	66.64	77.75	88.85	111.06
District 2, Marshall County	\$36,161	37.67	45.20	52.73	60.27	75.34
District 3, Marshall County	\$56,442	58.79	70.55	82.31	94.07	117.59
Mason	\$51,820	53.98	64.78	75.57	86.37	107.96

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Arbuckle district, Mason County	\$34,234	35.66	42.79	49.92	57.06	71.32
Clendenin district, Mason County	\$40,938	42.64	51.17	59.70	68.23	85.29
Cologne district, Mason County	\$55,476	57.79	69.35	80.90	92.46	115.58
Cooper district, Mason County	\$56,473	58.83	70.59	82.36	94.12	117.65
Graham district, Mason County	\$51,073	53.20	63.84	74.48	85.12	106.40
Hannan district, Mason County	\$66,319	69.08	82.90	96.72	110.53	138.16
Lewis district, Mason County	\$55,025	57.32	68.78	80.24	91.71	114.64
Robinson district, Mason County	\$57,232	59.62	71.54	83.46	95.39	119.23
Union district, Mason County	\$51,278	53.41	64.10	74.78	85.46	106.83
Waggener district, Mason County	\$34,779	36.23	43.47	50.72	57.97	72.46
McDowell	\$26,072	27.16	32.59	38.02	43.45	54.32
Big Creek district, McDowell County	\$24,688	25.72	30.86	36.00	41.15	51.43
Browns Creek district, McDowell County	\$24,663	25.69	30.83	35.97	41.11	51.38
North Elkin district, McDowell County	\$31,959	33.29	39.95	46.61	53.27	66.58
Sandy River district, McDowell County	\$27,590	28.74	34.49	40.24	45.98	57.48
Mercer	\$40,716	42.41	50.90	59.38	67.86	84.83
District I, Mercer County	\$36,048	37.55	45.06	52.57	60.08	75.10
District II, Mercer County	\$44,071	45.91	55.09	64.27	73.45	91.81
District III, Mercer County	\$41,144	42.86	51.43	60.00	68.57	85.72
Mineral	\$51,723	53.88	64.65	75.43	86.21	107.76
District 1, Mineral County	\$50,583	52.69	63.23	73.77	84.31	105.38
District 2, Mineral County	\$49,922	52.00	62.40	72.80	83.20	104.00
District 3, Mineral County	\$53,750	55.99	67.19	78.39	89.58	111.98
Mingo	\$35,454	36.93	44.32	51.70	59.09	73.86
Beech Ben Mate district, Mingo County	\$27,634	28.79	34.54	40.30	46.06	57.57
Kermit Harvey district, Mingo County	\$35,338	36.81	44.17	51.53	58.90	73.62
Lee district, Mingo County	\$39,388	41.03	49.24	57.44	65.65	82.06
Magnolia district, Mingo County	\$30,313	31.58	37.89	44.21	50.52	63.15
Stafford district, Mingo County	\$42,154	43.91	52.69	61.47	70.26	87.82
Tug Hardee district, Mingo County	\$36,325	37.84	45.41	52.97	60.54	75.68
Williamson district, Mingo County	\$27,267	28.40	34.08	39.76	45.45	56.81
Monongalia	\$54,198	56.46	67.75	79.04	90.33	112.91
Central district, Monongalia County	\$43,545	45.36	54.43	63.50	72.58	90.72
Eastern district, Monongalia County	\$56,628	58.99	70.79	82.58	94.38	117.98
Western district, Monongalia County	\$58,311	60.74	72.89	85.04	97.19	121.48
Monroe	\$44,828	46.70	56.04	65.37	74.71	93.39
Central district, Monroe County	\$37,703	39.27	47.13	54.98	62.84	78.55
Eastern district, Monroe County	\$43,500	45.31	54.38	63.44	72.50	90.63
Western district, Monroe County	\$49,631	51.70	62.04	72.38	82.72	103.40

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Morgan	\$57,116	59.50	71.40	83.29	95.19	118.99
District 1, Morgan County	\$43,813	45.64	54.77	63.89	73.02	91.28
District 2, Morgan County	\$59,213	61.68	74.02	86.35	98.69	123.36
District 3, Morgan County	\$69,643	72.54	87.05	101.56	116.07	145.09
Nicholas	\$40,318	42.00	50.40	58.80	67.20	84.00
Beaver district, Nicholas County	\$39,628	41.28	49.54	57.79	66.05	82.56
Grant district, Nicholas County	\$26,392	27.49	32.99	38.49	43.99	54.98
Hamilton district, Nicholas County	\$45,045	46.92	56.31	65.69	75.08	93.84
Jefferson district, Nicholas County	\$35,278	36.75	44.10	51.45	58.80	73.50
Kentucky district, Nicholas County	\$37,020	38.56	46.28	53.99	61.70	77.13
Summersville district, Nicholas County	\$42,946	44.74	53.68	62.63	71.58	89.47
Wilderness district, Nicholas County	\$44,096	45.93	55.12	64.31	73.49	91.87
Ohio	\$48,056	50.06	60.07	70.08	80.09	100.12
District 1, Ohio County	\$64,075	66.74	80.09	93.44	106.79	133.49
District 2, Ohio County	\$34,227	35.65	42.78	49.91	57.05	71.31
District 3, Ohio County	\$50,934	53.06	63.67	74.28	84.89	106.11
Pendleton	\$46,358	48.29	57.95	67.61	77.26	96.58
Central district, Pendleton County	\$48,350	50.36	60.44	70.51	80.58	100.73
Eastern district, Pendleton County	\$38,750	40.36	48.44	56.51	64.58	80.73
Western district, Pendleton County	\$50,357	52.46	62.95	73.44	83.93	104.91
Pleasants	\$55,508	57.82	69.39	80.95	92.51	115.64
District A, Pleasants County	\$65,457	68.18	81.82	95.46	109.10	136.37
District B, Pleasants County	\$56,463	58.82	70.58	82.34	94.11	117.63
District C, Pleasants County	\$48,191	50.20	60.24	70.28	80.32	100.40
District D, Pleasants County	\$77,386	80.61	96.73	112.85	128.98	161.22
Pocahontas	\$37,642	39.21	47.05	54.89	62.74	78.42
Edray district, Pocahontas County	\$30,543	31.82	38.18	44.54	50.91	63.63
Greenbank district, Pocahontas County	\$38,178	39.77	47.72	55.68	63.63	79.54
Huntersville district, Pocahontas County	\$63,370	66.01	79.21	92.41	105.62	132.02
Little Levels district, Pocahontas County	\$47,768	49.76	59.71	69.66	79.61	99.52
Preston	\$51,992	54.16	64.99	75.82	86.65	108.32
Fifth district, Preston County	\$49,677	51.75	62.10	72.45	82.80	103.49
First district, Preston County	\$54,167	56.42	67.71	78.99	90.28	112.85
Fourth district, Preston County	\$49,205	51.26	61.51	71.76	82.01	102.51
Second district, Preston County	\$57,649	60.05	72.06	84.07	96.08	120.10
Third district, Preston County	\$44,367	46.22	55.46	64.70	73.95	92.43
Putnam	\$63,954	66.62	79.94	93.27	106.59	133.24
District 1, Putnam County	\$50,563	52.67	63.20	73.74	84.27	105.34
District 2, Putnam County	\$79,152	82.45	98.94	115.43	131.92	164.90

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
District 3, Putnam County	\$68,599	71.46	85.75	100.04	114.33	142.91
Raleigh	\$43,283	45.09	54.10	63.12	72.14	90.17
District 1, Raleigh County	\$43,343	45.15	54.18	63.21	72.24	90.30
District 2, Raleigh County	\$40,816	42.52	51.02	59.52	68.03	85.03
District 3, Raleigh County	\$44,582	46.44	55.73	65.02	74.30	92.88
Randolph	\$45,206	47.09	56.51	65.93	75.34	94.18
Beverly district, Randolph County	\$50,750	52.86	63.44	74.01	84.58	105.73
Dry Fork district, Randolph County	\$25,804	26.88	32.26	37.63	43.01	53.76
Huttonsville district, Randolph County	\$38,287	39.88	47.86	55.84	63.81	79.76
Leadsville district, Randolph County	\$41,330	43.05	51.66	60.27	68.88	86.10
Middle Fork district, Randolph County	\$40,703	42.40	50.88	59.36	67.84	84.80
Mingo district, Randolph County	\$37,052	38.60	46.32	54.03	61.75	77.19
New Interest district, Randolph County	\$51,667	53.82	64.58	75.35	86.11	107.64
Roaring Creek district, Randolph County	\$48,018	50.02	60.02	70.03	80.03	100.04
Valley Bend district, Randolph County	\$65,625	68.36	82.03	95.70	109.38	136.72
Ritchie	\$44,328	46.18	55.41	64.65	73.88	92.35
Clay district, Ritchie County	\$55,094	57.39	68.87	80.35	91.82	114.78
Grant district, Ritchie County	\$46,486	48.42	58.11	67.79	77.48	96.85
Murphy district, Ritchie County	\$35,304	36.78	44.13	51.49	58.84	73.55
Union district, Ritchie County	\$41,531	43.26	51.91	60.57	69.22	86.52
Roane	\$38,895	40.52	48.62	56.72	64.83	81.03
District I, Roane County	\$38,483	40.09	48.10	56.12	64.14	80.17
District II, Roane County	\$29,778	31.02	37.22	43.43	49.63	62.04
District III, Roane County	\$45,225	47.11	56.53	65.95	75.38	94.22
Summers	\$37,769	39.34	47.21	55.08	62.95	78.69
Bluestone River district, Summers County	\$41,432	43.16	51.79	60.42	69.05	86.32
Greenbrier River district, Summers County	\$34,907	36.36	43.63	50.91	58.18	72.72
New River district, Summers County	\$35,634	37.12	44.54	51.97	59.39	74.24
Taylor	\$52,958	55.16	66.20	77.23	88.26	110.33
Eastern district, Taylor County	\$49,788	51.86	62.24	72.61	82.98	103.73
Tygart district, Taylor County	\$41,808	43.55	52.26	60.97	69.68	87.10
Western district, Taylor County	\$61,250	63.80	76.56	89.32	102.08	127.60
Tucker	\$47,527	49.51	59.41	69.31	79.21	99.01
Black Fork district, Tucker County	\$43,935	45.77	54.92	64.07	73.23	91.53
Clover district, Tucker County	\$41,250	42.97	51.56	60.16	68.75	85.94
Davis district, Tucker County	\$45,833	47.74	57.29	66.84	76.39	95.49
Dry Fork district, Tucker County	\$52,121	54.29	65.15	76.01	86.87	108.59
Fairfax district, Tucker County	\$44,063	45.90	55.08	64.26	73.44	91.80
Licking district, Tucker County	\$50,515	52.62	63.14	73.67	84.19	105.24

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
St. George district, Tucker County	\$46,202	48.13	57.75	67.38	77.00	96.25
Tyler	\$47,598	49.58	59.50	69.41	79.33	99.16
Central district, Tyler County	\$46,875	48.83	58.59	68.36	78.13	97.66
North district, Tyler County	\$49,295	51.35	61.62	71.89	82.16	102.70
South district, Tyler County	\$45,590	47.49	56.99	66.49	75.98	94.98
West district, Tyler County	\$45,208	47.09	56.51	65.93	75.35	94.18
Upshur	\$40,802	42.50	51.00	59.50	68.00	85.00
First district, Upshur County	\$41,353	43.08	51.69	60.31	68.92	86.15
Second district, Upshur County	\$38,750	40.36	48.44	56.51	64.58	80.73
Third district, Upshur County	\$42,837	44.62	53.55	62.47	71.40	89.24
Wayne	\$43,710	45.53	54.64	63.74	72.85	91.06
Butler district, Wayne County	\$50,849	52.97	63.56	74.15	84.75	105.94
Ceredo district, Wayne County	\$43,477	45.29	54.35	63.40	72.46	90.58
Stonewall district, Wayne County	\$32,314	33.66	40.39	47.12	53.86	67.32
Union district, Wayne County	\$48,571	50.59	60.71	70.83	80.95	101.19
Westmoreland district, Wayne County	\$52,073	54.24	65.09	75.94	86.79	108.49
Webster	\$33,358	34.75	41.70	48.65	55.60	69.50
Central district, Webster County	\$23,540	24.52	29.43	34.33	39.23	49.04
Northern district, Webster County	\$38,729	40.34	48.41	56.48	64.55	80.69
Southern district, Webster County	\$39,453	41.10	49.32	57.54	65.76	82.19
Wetzel	\$44,539	46.39	55.67	64.95	74.23	92.79
District 1, Wetzel County	\$37,144	38.69	46.43	54.17	61.91	77.38
District 2, Wetzel County	\$51,418	53.56	64.27	74.98	85.70	107.12
District 3, Wetzel County	\$45,303	47.19	56.63	66.07	75.51	94.38
Wirt	\$45,315	47.20	56.64	66.08	75.53	94.41
Central district, Wirt County	\$36,761	38.29	45.95	53.61	61.27	76.59
Northeast district, Wirt County	\$45,750	47.66	57.19	66.72	76.25	95.31
Southwest district, Wirt County	\$47,065	49.03	58.83	68.64	78.44	98.05
Wood	\$48,711	50.74	60.89	71.04	81.19	101.48
Clay district, Wood County	\$58,935	61.39	73.67	85.95	98.23	122.78
Harris district, Wood County	\$64,464	67.15	80.58	94.01	107.44	134.30
Lubeck district, Wood County	\$58,692	61.14	73.37	85.59	97.82	122.28
Parkersburg district, Wood County	\$38,432	40.03	48.04	56.05	64.05	80.07
Slate district, Wood County	\$63,893	66.56	79.87	93.18	106.49	133.11
Steele district, Wood County	\$56,983	59.36	71.23	83.10	94.97	118.71
Tygart district, Wood County	\$40,867	42.57	51.08	59.60	68.11	85.14
Union district, Wood County	\$73,304	76.36	91.63	106.90	122.17	152.72
Walker district, Wood County	\$41,288	43.01	51.61	60.21	68.81	86.02
Williams district, Wood County	\$66,761	69.54	83.45	97.36	111.27	139.09

Magisterial District	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Wyoming	\$44,095	45.93	55.12	64.31	73.49	91.86
District 1, Wyoming County	\$42,449	44.22	53.06	61.90	70.75	88.44
District 2, Wyoming County	\$40,907	42.61	51.13	59.66	68.18	85.22
District 3, Wyoming County	\$46,215	48.14	57.77	67.40	77.03	96.28

2020 ACS Tables, U.S. Census Bureau

APPENDIX D1

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY MUNICIPALITY

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2020 CENSUS MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Addison (Webster Springs), town	\$22,062	22.98	27.58	32.17	36.77	45.96
Albright, town	\$58,750	61.20	73.44	85.68	97.92	122.40
Alderson , town	\$26,053	27.14	32.57	37.99	43.42	54.28
Anawalt, town	\$22,778	23.73	28.47	33.22	37.96	47.45
Anmoore, town	\$23,100	24.06	28.88	33.69	38.50	48.13
Ansted, town	\$38,261	39.86	47.83	55.80	63.77	79.71
Athens, town	\$52,760	54.96	65.95	76.94	87.93	109.92
Auburn, town (2014)	\$23,000	23.96	28.75	33.54	38.33	47.92
Bancroft, town	\$59,750	62.24	74.69	87.14	99.58	124.48
Barboursville, village	\$57,599	60.00	72.00	84.00	96.00	120.00
Barrackville, town	\$59,333	61.81	74.17	86.53	98.89	123.61
Bath (Berkeley Springs), town	\$42,686	44.46	53.36	62.25	71.14	88.93
Bayard, town	\$27,273	28.41	34.09	39.77	45.46	56.82
Beckley, city	\$42,972	44.76	53.72	62.67	71.62	89.53
Beech Bottom, village	\$42,500	44.27	53.13	61.98	70.83	88.54
Belington, town	\$36,944	38.48	46.18	53.88	61.57	76.97
Belle, town	\$50,972	53.10	63.72	74.33	84.95	106.19
Belmont, city	\$50,083	52.17	62.60	73.04	83.47	104.34
Benwood, city	\$35,685	37.17	44.61	52.04	59.48	74.34
Bethany, town	\$57,500	59.90	71.88	83.85	95.83	119.79
Bethlehem, village	\$71,042	74.00	88.80	103.60	118.40	148.00
Beverly, town	\$28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93	47.92	59.90
Blacksville, town	\$52,917	55.12	66.15	77.17	88.20	110.24
Bluefield, city	\$35,650	37.14	44.56	51.99	59.42	74.27
Bolivar, town	\$77,000	80.21	96.25	112.29	128.33	160.42
Bradshaw, town	\$19,142	19.94	23.93	27.92	31.90	39.88
Bramwell, town	\$49,063	51.11	61.33	71.55	81.77	102.21
Brandonville, town	\$73,250	76.30	91.56	106.82	122.08	152.60
Bridgeport, city	\$84,295	87.81	105.37	122.93	140.49	175.61
Bruceton Mills, town	\$39,306	40.94	49.13	57.32	65.51	81.89
Buckhannon, city	\$42,287	44.05	52.86	61.67	70.48	88.10
Buffalo, town	\$50,568	52.68	63.21	73.75	84.28	105.35
Burnsville, town	\$72,375	75.39	90.47	105.55	120.63	150.78
Cairo, town	\$24,215	25.22	30.27	35.31	40.36	50.45
Camden-on-Gauley, town	\$38,889	40.51	48.61	56.71	64.82	81.02
Cameron, city	\$24,167	25.17	30.21	35.24	40.28	50.35
Capon Bridge, town	\$57,734	60.14	72.17	84.20	96.22	120.28
Carpendale, town	\$70,172	73.10	87.72	102.33	116.95	146.19
Cedar Grove, town	\$52,313	54.49	65.39	76.29	87.19	108.99

MUNICIPALITIES	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Ceredo, city	\$36,731	38.26	45.91	53.57	61.22	76.52
Chapmanville, town	\$30,337	31.60	37.92	44.24	50.56	63.20
Charleston, city	\$49,769	51.84	62.21	72.58	82.95	103.69
Charles Town, city	\$77,552	80.78	96.94	113.10	129.25	161.57
Chesapeake, town	\$40,650	42.34	50.81	59.28	67.75	84.69
Chester, city	\$47,993	49.99	59.99	69.99	79.99	99.99
Clarksburg, city	\$41,226	42.94	51.53	60.12	68.71	85.89
Clay, town	\$17,708	18.45	22.14	25.82	29.51	36.89
Clearview, village	\$69,643	72.54	87.05	101.56	116.07	145.09
Clendenin, town	\$42,778	44.56	53.47	62.38	71.30	89.12
Cowen, town	\$27,813	28.97	34.77	40.56	46.36	57.94
Danville, town	\$43,125	44.92	53.91	62.89	71.88	89.84
Davis, town	\$42,019	43.77	52.52	61.28	70.03	87.54
Davy, town	\$28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93	47.92	59.90
Delbarton, town	\$28,140	29.31	35.18	41.04	46.90	58.63
Dunbar, city	\$39,688	41.34	49.61	57.88	66.15	82.68
Durbin, town	\$47,917	49.91	59.90	69.88	79.86	99.83
East Bank, town	\$46,645	48.59	58.31	68.02	77.74	97.18
Eleanor, town	\$64,625	67.32	80.78	94.24	107.71	134.64
Elizabeth, town	\$23,098	24.06	28.87	33.68	38.50	48.12
Elk Garden, town	\$41,250	42.97	51.56	60.16	68.75	85.94
Elkins, city	\$38,910	40.53	48.64	56.74	64.85	81.06
Ellenboro, town	\$50,625	52.73	63.28	73.83	84.38	105.47
Fairmont, city	\$45,540	47.44	56.93	66.41	75.90	94.88
Fairview, town	\$54,265	56.53	67.83	79.14	90.44	113.05
Falling Spring, town	\$38,750	40.36	48.44	56.51	64.58	80.73
Farmington, town	\$66,000	68.75	82.50	96.25	110.00	137.50
Fayetteville, town	\$52,083	54.25	65.10	75.95	86.81	108.51
Flatwoods, town	\$42,411	44.18	53.01	61.85	70.69	88.36
Flemington, town	\$56,250	58.59	70.31	82.03	93.75	117.19
Follansbee, city	\$41,870	43.61	52.34	61.06	69.78	87.23
Fort Gay, town	\$18,667	19.44	23.33	27.22	31.11	38.89
Franklin, town	\$57,857	60.27	72.32	84.37	96.43	120.54
Friendly, town	\$26,667	27.78	33.33	38.89	44.45	55.56
Gary, city	\$32,663	34.02	40.83	47.63	54.44	68.05
Gassaway, town	\$53,073	55.28	66.34	77.40	88.46	110.57
Gauley Bridge, town	\$27,313	28.45	34.14	39.83	45.52	56.90
Gilbert, town	\$42,917	44.71	53.65	62.59	71.53	89.41
Glasgow, town	\$49,412	51.47	61.77	72.06	82.35	102.94
Glen Dale, city	\$64,779	67.48	80.97	94.47	107.97	134.96
Glenville, town	\$31,779	33.10	39.72	46.34	52.97	66.21

MUNICIPALITIES	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Grafton, city	\$34,555	35.99	43.19	50.39	57.59	71.99
Grantsville, town	\$28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93	47.92	59.90
Grant Town, town	\$45,352	47.24	56.69	66.14	75.59	94.48
Granville, town	\$27,457	28.60	34.32	40.04	45.76	57.20
Hambleton, town	\$35,000	36.46	43.75	51.04	58.33	72.92
Hamlin, town	\$36,136	37.64	45.17	52.70	60.23	75.28
Handley, town	\$45,923	47.84	57.40	66.97	76.54	95.67
Harman, town	\$22,788	23.74	28.49	33.23	37.98	47.48
Harpers Ferry, town	\$94,914	98.87	118.64	138.42	158.19	197.74
Harrisville, town	\$36,161	37.67	45.20	52.73	60.27	75.34
Hartford City, town	\$50,245	52.34	62.81	73.27	83.74	104.68
Hedgesville, town	\$70,813	73.76	88.52	103.27	118.02	147.53
Henderson, town	\$20,179	21.02	25.22	29.43	33.63	42.04
Hendricks, town	\$43,409	45.22	54.26	63.30	72.35	90.44
Hillsboro, town	\$20,833	21.70	26.04	30.38	34.72	43.40
Hinton, city	\$35,042	36.50	43.80	51.10	58.40	73.00
Hundred, town	\$35,208	36.68	44.01	51.35	58.68	73.35
Huntington, city	\$33,012	34.39	41.27	48.14	55.02	68.78
Hurricane, city	\$62,308	64.90	77.89	90.87	103.85	129.81
Huttonsville, town (2015)	\$27,396	28.54	34.25	39.95	45.66	57.08
laeger, town	\$39,063	40.69	48.83	56.97	65.11	81.38
Jane Lew, town	\$45,944	47.86	57.43	67.00	76.57	95.72
Junior, town	\$25,000	26.04	31.25	36.46	41.67	52.08
Kenova, city	\$29,921	31.17	37.40	43.63	49.87	62.34
Kermit, town	\$28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93	47.92	59.90
Keyser, city	\$44,679	46.54	55.85	65.16	74.47	93.08
Keystone, city (2015)	\$22,125	23.05	27.66	32.27	36.88	46.09
Kimball, town	\$48,750	50.78	60.94	71.09	81.25	101.56
Kingwood, city	\$54,190	56.45	67.74	79.03	90.32	112.90
Leon, town (2015)	\$31,786	33.11	39.73	46.35	52.98	66.22
Lester, town	\$26,202	27.29	32.75	38.21	43.67	54.59
Lewisburg, city	\$31,851	33.18	39.81	46.45	53.09	66.36
Logan, city	\$40,980	42.69	51.23	59.76	68.30	85.38
Lost Creek, town	\$50,750	52.86	63.44	74.01	84.58	105.73
Lumberport, town	\$62,578	65.19	78.22	91.26	104.30	130.37
Mabscott, town	\$33,021	34.40	41.28	48.16	55.04	68.79
McMechen, city	\$36,915	38.45	46.14	53.83	61.53	76.91
Madison, city	\$40,938	42.64	51.17	59.70	68.23	85.29
Man, town	\$53,125	55.34	66.41	77.47	88.54	110.68
Mannington, city	\$54,605	56.88	68.26	79.63	91.01	113.76
Marlinton, town	\$31,400	32.71	39.25	45.79	52.33	65.42

MUNICIPALITIES	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Marmet, city	\$41,875	43.62	52.34	61.07	69.79	87.24
Martinsburg, city	\$44,363	46.21	55.45	64.70	73.94	92.42
Mason, town	\$27,500	28.65	34.38	40.10	45.83	57.29
Masontown, town	\$34,704	36.15	43.38	50.61	57.84	72.30
Matewan, town	\$16,176	16.85	20.22	23.59	26.96	33.70
Matoaka, town	\$40,000	41.67	50.00	58.33	66.67	83.33
Meadow Bridge, town	\$30,536	31.81	38.17	44.53	50.89	63.62
Middlebourne, town	\$43,929	45.76	54.91	64.06	73.22	91.52
Mill Creek, town	\$39,352	40.99	49.19	57.39	65.59	81.98
Milton, town	\$35,145	36.61	43.93	51.25	58.58	73.22
Mitchell Heights, town	\$66,406	69.17	83.01	96.84	110.68	138.35
Monongah, town	\$48,750	50.78	60.94	71.09	81.25	101.56
Montgomery, city	\$27,045	28.17	33.81	39.44	45.08	56.34
Montrose, town	\$66,250	69.01	82.81	96.61	110.42	138.02
Moorefield, town	\$44,299	46.14	55.37	64.60	73.83	92.29
Morgantown, city	\$42,474	44.24	53.09	61.94	70.79	88.49
Moundsville, city	\$33,399	34.79	41.75	48.71	55.67	69.58
Mount Hope, city	\$29,444	30.67	36.81	42.94	49.07	61.34
Mullens, city	\$50,688	52.80	63.36	73.92	84.48	105.60
Newburg, town	\$41,853	43.60	52.32	61.04	69.76	87.19
New Cumberland, city	\$30,078	31.33	37.60	43.86	50.13	62.66
New Haven, town	\$39,295	40.93	49.12	57.31	65.49	81.86
New Martinsville, city	\$45,303	47.19	56.63	66.07	75.51	94.38
Nitro, city	\$43,564	45.38	54.46	63.53	72.61	90.76
Northfork, town	\$20,750	21.61	25.94	30.26	34.58	43.23
North Hills, town	\$114,861	119.65	143.58	167.51	191.44	239.29
Nutter Fort, town	\$50,598	52.71	63.25	73.79	84.33	105.41
Oak Hill, city	\$43,083	44.88	53.85	62.83	71.81	89.76
Oakvale, town (2014)	\$21,354	22.24	26.69	31.14	35.59	44.49
Oceana, town	\$40,000	41.67	50.00	58.33	66.67	83.33
Paden City, city	\$50,739	52.85	63.42	73.99	84.57	105.71
Parkersburg, city	\$37,933	39.51	47.42	55.32	63.22	79.03
Parsons, city	\$42,109	43.86	52.64	61.41	70.18	87.73
Paw Paw, town	\$53,074	55.29	66.34	77.40	88.46	110.57
Pax, town (2015)	\$33,625	35.03	42.03	49.04	56.04	70.05
Pennsboro, city	\$41,673	43.41	52.09	60.77	69.46	86.82
Petersburg, city	\$40,387	42.07	50.48	58.90	67.31	84.14
Peterstown, town	\$40,868	42.57	51.09	59.60	68.11	85.14
Philippi, city	\$36,371	37.89	45.46	53.04	60.62	75.77
Piedmont, town	\$35,250	36.72	44.06	51.41	58.75	73.44
Pine Grove, town	\$53,438	55.66	66.80	77.93	89.06	111.33

MUNICIPALITIES	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Pineville, town	\$60,938	63.48	76.17	88.87	101.56	126.95
Pleasant Valley, city	\$53,994	56.24	67.49	78.74	89.99	112.49
Poca, town	\$59,167	61.63	73.96	86.29	98.61	123.26
Point Pleasant, city	\$42,927	44.72	53.66	62.60	71.55	89.43
Pratt, town	\$54,722	57.00	68.40	79.80	91.20	114.00
Princeton, city	\$41,925	43.67	52.41	61.14	69.88	87.34
Pullman, town	\$48,125	50.13	60.16	70.18	80.21	100.26
Quinwood, town (2015)	\$24,063	25.07	30.08	35.09	40.11	50.13
Rainelle, town	\$29,536	30.77	36.92	43.07	49.23	61.53
Ranson Town, corporation of	\$69,544	72.44	86.93	101.42	115.91	144.88
Ravenswood, city	\$37,012	38.55	46.27	53.98	61.69	77.11
Reedsville, town	\$47,614	49.60	59.52	69.44	79.36	99.20
Reedy, town	\$28,125	29.30	35.16	41.02	46.88	58.59
Rhodell, town (2015)	\$37,813	39.39	47.27	55.14	63.02	78.78
Richwood, city	\$27,327	28.47	34.16	39.85	45.55	56.93
Ridgeley, town	\$32,813	34.18	41.02	47.85	54.69	68.36
Ripley, city	\$34,107	35.53	42.63	49.74	56.85	71.06
Rivesville, town	\$58,458	60.89	73.07	85.25	97.43	121.79
Romney, city	\$32,880	34.25	41.10	47.95	54.80	68.50
Ronceverte, city	\$43,482	45.29	54.35	63.41	72.47	90.59
Rowlesburg, town	\$39,306	40.94	49.13	57.32	65.51	81.89
Rupert, town	\$26,989	28.11	33.74	39.36	44.98	56.23
St. Albans, city	\$50,969	53.09	63.71	74.33	84.95	106.19
St. Marys, city	\$49,836	51.91	62.30	72.68	83.06	103.83
Salem, city	\$40,114	41.79	50.14	58.50	66.86	83.57
Sand Fork, town	\$52,857	55.06	66.07	77.08	88.10	110.12
Shepherdstown, town	\$80,610	83.97	100.76	117.56	134.35	167.94
Shinnston, city	\$59,215	61.68	74.02	86.36	98.69	123.36
Sistersville, city	\$40,125	41.80	50.16	58.52	66.88	83.59
Smithers, city	\$40,135	41.81	50.17	58.53	66.89	83.61
Smithfield, town	\$15,000	15.63	18.75	21.88	25.00	31.25
Sophia, town	\$28,255	29.43	35.32	41.21	47.09	58.86
South Charleston, city	\$51,021	53.15	63.78	74.41	85.04	106.29
Spencer, city	\$21,139	22.02	26.42	30.83	35.23	44.04
Star City, town	\$51,450	53.59	64.31	75.03	85.75	107.19
Stonewood, city	\$45,236	47.12	56.55	65.97	75.39	94.24
Summersville, town	\$43,287	45.09	54.11	63.13	72.15	90.18
Sutton, town	\$40,469	42.16	50.59	59.02	67.45	84.31
Sylvester, town	\$56,000	58.33	70.00	81.67	93.33	116.67
Terra Alta, town	\$40,774	42.47	50.97	59.46	67.96	84.95
Thomas, city	\$51,429	53.57	64.29	75.00	85.72	107.14

MUNICIPALITIES	2020 MHI	1.25%	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	2.50%
Thurmond, town (2000)	\$23,750	24.74	29.69	34.64	39.58	49.48
Triadelphia, town	\$50,119	52.21	62.65	73.09	83.53	104.41
Tunnelton, town	\$48,571	50.59	60.71	70.83	80.95	101.19
Union, town	\$26,151	27.24	32.69	38.14	43.59	54.48
Valley Grove, village	\$32,750	34.11	40.94	47.76	54.58	68.23
Vienna, city	\$55,181	57.48	68.98	80.47	91.97	114.96
War, city	\$16,563	17.25	20.70	24.15	27.61	34.51
Wardensville, town	\$42,500	44.27	53.13	61.98	70.83	88.54
Wayne, town	\$24,000	25.00	30.00	35.00	40.00	50.00
Weirton, city	\$50,822	52.94	63.53	74.12	84.70	105.88
Welch, city	\$25,227	26.28	31.53	36.79	42.05	52.56
Wellsburg, city	\$43,152	44.95	53.94	62.93	71.92	89.90
West Hamilin, town	\$33,646	35.05	42.06	49.07	56.08	70.10
West Liberty, town (2014)	\$27,708	28.86	34.64	40.41	46.18	57.73
West Logan, town	\$33,542	34.94	41.93	48.92	55.90	69.88
West Milford, town	\$53,750	55.99	67.19	78.39	89.58	111.98
Weston, city	\$36,728	38.26	45.91	53.56	61.21	76.52
Westover, city	\$51,304	53.44	64.13	74.82	85.51	106.88
West Union, town	\$68,839	71.71	86.05	100.39	114.73	143.41
Wheeling, city	\$41,911	43.66	52.39	61.12	69.85	87.31
White Hall, town	\$63,250	65.89	79.06	92.24	105.42	131.77
White Sulphur Springs, city	\$32,125	33.46	40.16	46.85	53.54	66.93
Whitesville, town	\$20,313	21.16	25.39	29.62	33.86	42.32
Williamson, city	\$25,707	26.78	32.13	37.49	42.85	53.56
Williamstown, city	\$71,442	74.42	89.30	104.19	119.07	148.84
Windsor Heights, village	\$37,750	39.32	47.19	55.05	62.92	78.65
Winfield, town	\$69,432	72.33	86.79	101.26	115.72	144.65
Womelsdorf (Coalton), town	\$41,250	42.97	51.56	60.16	68.75	85.94
Worthington, town	\$20,750	21.61	25.94	30.26	34.58	43.23

2020 ACS Tables, U.S. Census Bureau

APPENDIX E

UNEMPLOYMENT DATA

Labor Force Data	a by County 2024
County	Unemployment Rate
Barbour	4.5
Berkeley	3
Boone	3.9
Braxton	5.9
Brooke	4.6
Cabell	3.3
Calhoun	9.8
Clay	6.6
Doddridge	3.2
Fayette	4.1
Gilmer	5.5
Grant Greenbrier	3.4
Hampshire	2.7
Hancock	5
Hardy	4.1
Harrison	3.2
Jackson	4.1
Jefferson	2.4
Kanawha	3.3
Lewis	4.3
Lincoln	4.5
Logan	4.3
Marion	3.7
Marshall	4.1
Mason	4.1
McDowell	6.6
Mercer	4.1
Mineral	4
Mingo	5.1
Monongalia	2.8
Monroe Morgan	2.7
Nicholas	4.7
Ohio	3
Pendleton	2.5
Pleasants	5.5
Pocahontas	3.2
Preston	3.4
Putnam	3
Raleigh	3.3
Randolph	4.6
Ritchie	4.8
Roane	6.2
Summers	3.6
Taylor	3.4
Tucker	3.2
Tyler	5.5
Upshur	4.4
Wayne	3.6
Webster Wetzel	5.4
Wirt	5.8
Wood	5.3 3.6
Wyoming	3.9
WV	3.9
	orkforcewv.org
Source. www.w	orkioree w.org

APPENDIX F

POPULATION DATA

Population Data

		lation Data	l	
County	2020	2023	Delta	% Change
	Estimate	Estimate		*red reflects negative
Barbour	16,543	15,454	1,089	6.58
Berkeley	117,615	126,165	8,550	7.27
Boone	21,897	21,312	585	2.67
Braxton	14,032	12,345	1,687	12.02
Brooke	22,162	22,053	109	0.49
Cabell	93,328	93,300	28	0.03
Calhoun	7,185	6,158	1,027	14.29
Clay	8,599	7,946	653	7.59
Doddridge	8,499	7,767	732	8.61
Fayette	43,087	39,987	3,100	7.19
Gilmer	7,970	7,376	594	7.45
Grant	11,565	10,972	593	5.13
Greenbrier	34,893	32,688	2,205	6.32
Hampshire	23,304	23,340	36	0.15
Hancock	29,118	28,658	460	1.58
Hardy	13,789	14,236	447	3.24
Harrison	67,620	65,407	2,213	3.27
Jackson	28,793	27,753	1,040	3.61
Jefferson	56,922	58,546	1,624	2.85
Kanawha	181,014	178,198	2,816	1.56
Lewis	16,024	16,808	784	4.89
Lincoln	20,617	20,170	447	2.17
Logan	32,593	31,826	767	2.35
McDowell	18,083	18,413	330	1.82
Marion	56,233	56,042	191	0.34
Marshall	30,900	30,129	771	2.50
Mason	26,700	25,214	1,486	5.57
Mercer	59,370	59,062	308	0.52
Mineral	27,047	26,922	125	0.46
Mingo	23,808	22,979	829	3.48
Monongalia	106,196	106,520	324	0.31
Monroe	13,344	12,401	943	7.07
Morgan	17,800	17,327	473	2.66
Nicholas	24,857	24,446	411	1.65
Ohio	41,875	41,904	29	0.07
Pendleton	6,968	6,111	857	12.30
Pleasants	7,457	7,572	115	1.54
Pocahontas	8,382	7,855	527	6.29
Preston	33,610	34,204	594	1.77
Putnam	56,604	57,250	646	1.14
Raleigh	74,452	73,666	786	1.06
Randolph	28,763	27,782	981	3.41
Ritchie	9,747	8,372	1,375	14.11
Roane	13,831	13,921	90	0.65
Summers	12,710	11,833	877	6.90
Taylor	16,817	16,543	274	1.63
Tucker	6,943	6,698	245	3.53
Tyler	8,736	8,181	555	6.35
Upshur	24,451	23,758	693	2.83
Wayne	39,952	38,498	1,454	3.64
Webster	8,289	8,253	36	0.43
Wetzel	15,291	14,233	1,058	6.92
Wirt	5,764	5,131	633	10.98
Wood	84,387	83,829	558	0.66
Wyoming	20,890	20,948	58	0.28
vv yonning	20,030	<u> </u>	20	0.20

Source: https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2023.B01003?q=ACS+2023+5-year+B01003&g=040XX00US54,54\$0500000&tp=true

APPENDIX G

POTENTIAL LEAD SERVICE LINE PROJECTS

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

"Lead Service Line" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2026 IUP

Project	Description	Total Project Cost Estimate	Total LSL Cost
Clarksburg Water Board (Phase 3B)	Lead Service Line Replacement and Associated Main Line Water Line Replacement.	\$30,000,000	\$15,352,000
Davis, Town of	Replace 3,000 LF of the raw water line with new 8-inch PVC water line to reduce the lead concentration of the raw water. Sections of failing and/or lead contaminated main water lines in the distribution system are proposed to be replaced with 600 LF of 6-inch PVC water line.	\$1,260,000	\$600,000
Gary, City of	Complete a lead service line inventory and then develop a plan of action.	\$3,821,000	\$150,000
Tomlinson Public Service District	plant, refurbishment and upgrade of existing wells, refurbish existing 1.7 MG storage tank, one new 12" raw water line, and one new 12" finished water line connecting back to the distribution	\$14,343,150	\$203,150
West Virginia American Water	Remove and replace 18 identified lead or galvanized service lines in the WVAW Huntington water system.	\$508,600	\$508,600
White Sulphur Springs, City of (Villa Park)	Replace existing water lines throughout the Villa Park area of White Sulphur Springs in Greenbrier County, West Virginia. Approximately 14,400 LF of 6" waterline is to be installed as well as 2,450 LF of 2" waterline, 214 service reconnections, 13 fire hydrants, valves, and other necessary appurtenances.	\$4,935,000	\$1,233,750
	TOTAL	\$54,867,750	\$18,047,500

APPENDIX H

POTENTIAL EMERGING CONTAMINANTS PROJECTS

DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

"Emerging Contaminants" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2026 IUP

Project	Description	Total Project Cost Estimate	Total EC Cost
Benwood, City of	Address the Iron & Manganese issue as well as the PFAS Chemicals.	\$4,800,000	\$4,000,000
Glen Dale, City of	Provide a 5,500 LF 10-inch connector line between the City of Glen Dale WTP and the City of Moundsville WTP. A master meter and PRV will also be apart of the project to equalize the hydraulic grades.	\$1,721,000	\$1,721,000
Hardy County Public Service District	Upgrade the existing WTP with a new pretreatment system utilizing ion exchange to remove PFAS from the water supply.	\$3,450,000	\$1,500,000
Lubeck Public Service District	Installation of approximately 18,000 linear feet of 6" water line along Pine Run Road.	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
Lubeck Public Service District	Installation of an additional GAC filtration process at the Water Treatment Plant.	\$15,000,000	\$7,500,000
New Martinsville Water & Sanitary Sewer Board	Install greensand filters for iron and manganese control and GAC filters for PFAS treatment.	\$20,480,000	\$20,480,000
Parkersburg Utility Board	GAC for PFAS treatment	\$21,584,100	\$21,584,100
St. Marys, City of	Install greensand filters for iron and manganese control and GAC for PFAS treatment.	\$9,500,000	\$9,500,000
Union Williams Public Service District	Upgrade the existing Union Williams WTP with a new pretreatment system utilizing ion exchange to remove PFAS from the groundwater supply.	\$5,000,000	\$1,000,000
Walton Public Service District	Implement GAC filtration to remove PFA's and refurbish or replace existing filter media and controls, electrical service, pumps, backwash basins, presedimentation basin and the filter building.	\$5,450,000	\$5,450,000
Williamstown, City of	Greensand filters for iron and manganese control and GAC for PFAS treatment.	\$5,210,000	\$5,210,000
	TOTAL	\$93,695,100	\$79,445,100

APPENDIX I

SOURCES AND USES CHART (FOR EPA USE ONLY)

West Virginia Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Fund Intended Use Plan - Sources and Uses of Funds (For EPA use only)

Cumulative Sources as of December 31, 2024

	^	0.00.000.000			
Capitalization Grants (36)	\$	267,276,782			
State Match	\$	49,541,757			
BIL Capitalization Grants (3)	\$	62,032,000			
BIL State Match	\$	8,501,700			
Emerging Contaminants Grants (3)	\$	22,885,000			
Lead Service Line Grants (3)	\$	87,845,000			
10% Set-Aside State Match	\$	16,063,435			
Repayments $(P + I)$	\$	117,774,009			
Investment Earnings	\$	10,668,495	_		
Sources sub-total (a)			\$	642,588,178	
Cumulative Uses as of December 31, 2024					
Project Loan Assistance	\$	538,312,047			
Technical Assistance (2%)	\$ \$	5,347,031			
Program Administration (4%)	\$ \$	7,351,571			
Program Management (State & Federal 10%)		22,813,210			
	\$ \$				
Local Assistance (15%)	Ф	34,034,240	ø	607 959 000	
Uses sub-total (b)				607,858,099	
FY2026 Sources of Funds					
Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	\$	34,730,079			
Base Capitalization Grant (FFY2025 Funds)	\$	10,935,000			
Base State Match	\$	2,187,000			
BIL Capitalization Grant #4 (FFY 2025 Funds)	\$	24,898,000			
BIL State Match	\$	4,979,000			
Emerging Contaminants Grant	\$	7,857,000			
Lead Service Line Replacement Grant*	\$	28,650,000			
Earnings (estimate)	\$	1,891,972			
Repayments (estimate)	\$	11,733,787			
Transfer of funds from the CWSRF*	\$ \$	65,000,000			
Sources of Funds (c)	Ψ	03,000,000	- \$	192,861,838	
Sources of Funds (C)			Φ	172,001,030	
<u>Less</u>					
Appendix B Projects	\$	91,999,118			
Loan Closings Between 12/31/2024 - 6/30/25	\$	-			
Technical Assistance (2%)	\$	500,000			
DWTRF Administrative Expenses (4%)	\$	-			
Program Management (State & Federal 10%)	\$	1,493,149			
Local Assistance (15%)	\$	4,823,824			
Total	<u> </u>	.,020,021	- \$	98,816.091	(Still working or
			—	,,	(