West Virginia Clean Water State Revolving Fund



# FY2020 Intended Use Plan

Submitted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region III June xx, 2019



west virginia department of environmental protection

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Glossary1
Preface 2
SECTION I Introduction
SECTION II Funds Identification
SECTION III Goals
SECTION IV Project Priority List
SECTION V Fund Activities7
SECTION VI Assurances
SECTION VII Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds16
SECTION VIII Public Participation
SECTION IX Agreement
Appendices
<ul> <li>A - Project Priority List</li> <li>B - Proposed Binding Commitments – by Quarter</li> <li>C - Projects Budgeted for IUP Available Funds</li> <li>D - Public Hearing Summary</li> <li>E - Median Household Income by County and Magisterial District</li> <li>E1 - Median Household Income by Municipality</li> <li>F - Sources and Uses Chart (for EPA use only)</li> <li>G - Possible Green Technology Projects</li> <li>H - Unemployment Data</li> <li>I - Population Data</li> </ul>

# Glossary

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

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

# Preface

#### **Mission Statements**

#### **Department of Environmental Protection**

To efficiently and effectively carry out the State's environmental laws and regulations that are designed to provide and maintain a healthful environment consistent with the economic benefits derived from strong agricultural, manufacturing, tourism and energy-producing industries.

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

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

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

To provide technical and financial assistance to local governmental entities to improve water quality and

public health conditions.

### Section I Introduction

This document is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund's Intended Use Plan for state fiscal year 2020 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020 (FY2020)). The Division of Water and Waste Management is the primary state agency that administers the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, with financial and support assistance provided by the West Virginia Water Development Authority.

As of July 1, 2019, there have been 31 federal capitalization grants and amendments awarded by the Environmental Protection Agency. The State has provided, where required, the 20% matching funds for each grant and amendment.

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

### SECTION II Funds Identification

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

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

#### WEST VIRGINIA CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

#### Intended Use Plan – Sources and Uses of Funds State FY2020 (July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020)

#### Available funds as of December 31, 2018

	Cash balance in CWSRF account = Federal funds accounts payable (base grants) =	\$121,712,503 <u>\$</u> 0	
<u>New f</u>	unds available during state FY2020:		
	Next Federal EPA Grant Next State Match Est. Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/20) = Est. Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/20) = Est. Investment Earnings (to 6/30/20) =	\$ 24,769,000 \$ 4,953,800 \$ 35,525,670 \$ 2,992,940 \$ 2,221,900	<u>\$ 70,463,310</u>
Less:	Existing project loans payables (12/31/18) = Existing binding commitments (12/31/18) = AgWQLP reserve = OSLP reserve = DEP Administration =	\$ 64,975,912 \$ 71,664,402 \$ 150,000 \$ 300,000 <u>\$ 0</u>	<u>\$137,090,314</u>
Net av	\$ 55,085,499		

Notes:

The match should be received by July 2019.

#### A. Long term goals

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

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

<u>Objective 2</u> – Maximize investment opportunities.

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

<u>Objective 4</u> – Utilize EPA's financial planning model to ascertain the long term effects of different CWSRF policies.

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

#### B. <u>Short term goals</u>

- 1. Continue outreach efforts for potential new loan recipients.
- 2. Maintain a targeted fund utilization rate "pace" goal of at least 95%. Program pace is defined by EPA as the cumulative loan assistance provided divided by the total amount of funds available. Loan assistance is defined as the cumulative assistance provided by executed loan, bond, and funding assistance agreements (does not include preliminary binding commitment letters).
- 3. Provide outreach and requested technical assistance to several communities in the Tygart River Watershed as they consider biological nutrient removal processes in their systems.
- 4. Coordinate and work with WV DEP's Abandoned Mine Lands section on the planning, design, and construction of wastewater treatment facilities that were awarded PILOT Grants in McDowell County.
- 5. Keep the CWSRF flexible to be able to quickly respond to potential project shifts due to the State's economic crisis and rapid regional population adjustments.
- 6. Re-evaluate and potentially restructure the AgWQLP to entice applicants back to the program.

### SECTION IV Project Priority List

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

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

Individual NPS pollution control activities and projects funded by the CWSRF do not have to appear on the annual priority list. However, the funding of these projects is described in Section V(I) and an amount has been reserved to fund these projects. These NPS projects are eligible for funding using state revolving funds in accordance with federal law and are defined under Section 319 of the CWA. Any type of NPS activities funded must be included in the DEP's approved NPS management plan. Appendix C contains a quarterly outlay estimate for all NPS activities expected to be funded this fiscal year.

### SECTION V Fund Activities

#### A. Interest rates on POTW loans

The eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration will be based upon 3,400 gallons of monthly water usage. The DEP will 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: 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: 0.25% interest rate, .25% annual admin fee, 31 - 40-year term* 

The MHI data is derived from the 2015 census data published by the U. S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder. Interest rates will not exceed 2.75% and will not be less than 0.25%. For all public service districts, the MHI to be used will be the lowest of either the county(s) or magisterial district(s) that is most appropriate for the project area. magisterial district and county information can be found in Appendix E. Municipal MHI data is contained in Appendix E1.

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

#### B. Additional subsidization for disadvantaged communities

This year's Clean Water Act Title VI funding allocation for West Virginia is \$24,769,000. The Appropriations Act requires that a portion of each capitalization grant be used for additional loan subsidization and for funding green infrastructure projects. The Act requires a minimum of 10% be set aside for funding green projects. This amount will equal \$2,476,900. The allowable green project categories that will be considered for this funding are described below.

The Act also requires a minimum amount be set aside for providing additional loan subsidization in the form of grants or principal forgiveness. Therefore, DEP will be setting aside 20% of the capitalization grant in the amount of \$4,953,800 to be used as principal forgiveness.

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

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

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

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

<u>Unemployment Data</u> – As published by WorkForce West Virginia, the State's average unemployment rate was 5.2% in 2017. See Appendix H.

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

<u>Population Trends</u> – Based upon the percentage change for the period from 2015 to 2017 (calendar years) by county as published by American Fact Finder. See Appendix I.

Change in Population	Points Points
Greater than +2%	0
0 to +2%	5
Less than 0%	10

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

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

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

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

#### C. Green Projects Reserve

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

Allowable green project categories will be as follows:

#### 1. Energy Efficiency

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

Projects that will <u>not</u> be allowable include but are not limited to:

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

#### 2. <u>Water Efficiency</u>

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

#### 3. <u>Storm Water / Green Infrastructure</u>

Allowable green projects to be funded under this category are:

- a. Publicly sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to treat or eliminate storm water from existing wastewater collection and treatment systems.
- b. MS4 sponsored projects that utilize green technologies to solve storm water issues.

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

#### 4. Environmentally Innovative

Allowable green projects to be funded in this category are:

Decentralized sewer systems

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

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

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

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

Based upon the above guidelines and criteria, a list of potential green projects is included in Appendix G of this document. These projects were submitted in response to a DEP solicitation for green projects that occurred in November and December 2018 simultaneously with the project priority list solicitation. The CWSRF program will further evaluate these projects to determine funding eligibility.

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

Since 1994, an annual administrative fee has been charged on all loans as a means of supporting the administrative costs of operating the CWSRF in perpetuity. These fees are maintained in a separate account outside the CWSRF. The use of these fees is

restricted in accordance with *EPA's Guidance on Fees Charged by States to Recipients of Clean Water State Revolving Program Assistance* as published in the Federal Register on October 20, 2006. Funds have been expended from the account since FY1998.

The annual administrative fee is initially calculated using the outstanding principal amount of the loan over its life but repaid over the term of loan in equal installments as contained in the loan amortization schedule. The chart in Section V (A) will be used to determine the annual administrative fee on each loan. The administrative budget is approximately \$2.2 million. This includes funding the DEP's Project WET position. The amount of the funds available as of December 31, 2018 was \$12,040,689. These funds can also be used to fund the onsite systems program and are being used to match an ARC grant to provide sewer system mapping to several communities in the southern part of the State. The CWSRF is also funding a position with the WV Rural Water Association that provides technical and project support to West Virginia communities. This position also provides asset management support and educates local utilities on energy and water efficiency technologies. It may also be used for additional project funding.

#### E. Maximum allowable loans

In FY2020, there will not be a limit set on the amount of funds available to any single project. This practice will be reviewed annually and may change in future intended use plans.

#### F. <u>BAN leveraging program</u>

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

#### G. Extended Bond Purchase Program

#### 1. <u>30-vear bonds</u>

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

Section 603(d)(2) of the CWA allows local bonds to be purchased by the State at below market interest rates without limiting the term to 20 years as contained in Section 603(d)(1). West Virginia law governing municipalities and public service districts

provides that governing bodies must issue bonds to pay the costs of wastewater projects and sets forth detailed terms regarding interest rates, maturity dates and security provisions and with certain exceptions provides that the term of such bonds shall not exceed 40 years from the date of issuance.

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

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

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

#### 2. <u>40-year bonds</u>

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

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

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

Where there has been a historical decline in population, additional information in the facilities plan will be required concerning the composition of the population base, such as age and income characteristics. Other economic indicators, such as trends in tax base, number of jobs and housing starts, may be requested to determine those communities that pose a high risk to the CWSRF program.

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

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

#### H. Requirements for CWSRF Commitment

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

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

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

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

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

In 2000, the CWSRF began a pilot implementation of its second NPS program titled the Onsite Systems Loan Program. The purpose of this program was to

eliminate existing health hazards and water quality problems due to direct sewage discharges from houses using malfunctioning septic tank systems or direct pipes to a nearby stream. This was a cooperative venture between the DEP and county health departments. After several years of frustration, this program was revived in 2008 and is now fully operational. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund and other nonprofit associations are participating in this program to make it accessible to existing individual homeowners throughout the state.

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

#### 1. <u>Agriculture Water Ouality Loan Program</u>

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

Agricultural producers at the local level work with the SCD, CA and NRCS to develop a conservation plan. A local participating bank then provides a 2% interest loan with terms not to exceed 10 years for construction that will be monitored by these agencies. The CWSRF loans money to local banks at 0% interest as a mechanism for the banks to reduce their interest rate. The DEP expanded this program statewide after securing EPA approval to do so. As of June 30, 2018, more than \$13 million had been loaned under this program for installation of best management practices. Each fiscal year, an additional amount of money is set aside to fund more of these NPS projects. A one-time administrative fee is charged on each loan to cover DEP administrative expenses.

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

#### 2. Onsite Systems Loan Program

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

During the 2007 legislative session, the CWSRF statute was amended to expand the definition of "local entity", which allows CWSRF money to be loaned to other entities who will act as an intermediary lender in the OSLP. The West Virginia Housing Development Fund was the first entity to enter into an agreement with

the CWSRF to provide low interest loans to homeowners to correct failing onsite sewage systems. SAFE Housing and Economic Development, Inc. (SHED) has also entered into an agreement with the CWSRF to provide these loans to homeowners. The CWSRF will provide \$300,000 as a set-aside for this program this fiscal year. Funds from the administrative fee account may also be used to fund this program. As of June 30, 2018, more than \$2.5 million had been loaned under this program.

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

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

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

The WV DEP received an EPA capitalization grant to create a Brownfield Revolving Loan Fund (BRF). The CWSRF program will be working with the BRF to evaluate partnering opportunities for BRF ineligible expenses that may be eligible for the CWSRF. The CWSRF loan terms will mirror those for the BRF.

#### J. <u>Federal requirements</u>

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

The following projects have been selected to comply with federal requirements including, but not limited to, the Single Audit Act, FFATA, etc. These projects total more than the FFY 2019 capitalization grant which is \$24,769,000.

Project Sponsor	Project Description	CWSRF
		Amount
Pea Ridge PSD	WWTP Upgrade/Sewer	\$28,500,000
	Extension	

### Section VI Assurances

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

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

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

#### SECTION VII

# Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds

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

- 1. Analysis of community and financial assistance needed;
- 2. Review of project schedule to determine when the project would be in a state of readiness to proceed to construction;
- 3. Individual contact with potential loan recipient or its representative;
- 4. Allocation of funds among projects;
- 5. Development of an EPA payment schedule which will provide for making timely binding commitments to projects selected for CWSRF financial assistance;

- 6. Development of individual disbursement schedules to timely pay project costs as incurred;
- 7. Analysis of NPS activities and the extent to which reserved funds would be needed for such projects; and
- 8. Estimate of administrative expenditures that will occur during the fiscal year.

### SECTION VIII Public Participation

On June 18, 2019 at 10:30 am, a public hearing will be held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2020. The meeting was legally advertised in newspapers throughout the State. In addition, DEP issued a notice of the meeting by sending a mass mailing directly to consulting engineers, regional councils and other interested parties.

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

#### SECTION IX

### Agreement

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

APPENDIX A

### FISCAL YEAR 2020 PROJECT PRIORITY LIST

2020 Priority List			
Project	SRF #C	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Albright, Town of	544492	66	65.00
Ansted, Town of	544584	24	120.00
Ansted, Town of (Turkey Creek)	544593	13	140.00
Auburn, Town of	547201-02	3	175.00
Barboursville Sanitary Board	544615	67	65.00
Benwood, City of	544613	4	170.00
Bluefield Sanitary Board	544493	25	120.00
Bluewell PSD	544594	60	90.00
Boone County PSD (West Madison)	544494	55	95.00
Bradshaw, Town of	544595	78	30.00
Brooke County PSD (PH. 2 C. St. Johns Rd.)	544006-04	26	120.00
Buffalo Creek PSD	544555	27	120.00
Burnsville Public Utility Board	544578	70	45.00
Camden-on-Gauley, Town of	544083	62	70.00
Canaan Valley PSD	544560	71	45.00
Cedar Grove, Town of	544596	56	95.00
Century Volga PSD	544556-02	1	195.00
Chapmanville, Town of	544483-02	28	120.00
Charleston, City of (Woodward Branch)	544557	49	110.00
Clarksburg Sanitary Board	544549	18	135.00
Clay, Town of	544614	72	45.00
Claywood Park PSD	544498	63	70.00
Colfax PSD	544333	14	140.00
Crab Orchard PSD (MacArthur-Marsh Fork)	544484	8	145.00
Craigsville PSD	544597	79	25.00
Culloden PSD	544360	20	125.00
Delbarton, Town of	544201	29	120.00

Project	SRF #C	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Elizabeth, Town of	544552	30	120.00
Elk Valley PSD	544620	57	95.00
Elkins Sanitary Board	544585	9	145.00
Follansbee, City of	544599	45	115.00
Fort Gay, Town of	544607	46	115.00
Gilbert, Town of	544502	31	120.00
Greater Harrison County PSD	544296	21	125.00
Greater Harrison County PSD (Rt.73 Ph.2)	544451	68	65.00
Greater Paw Paw Sanitary District	544558	32	120.00
Hinton, City of	544550	10	145.00
Huttonsville PSD	544569	50	100.00
Kanawha Falls PSD	544562	51	100.00
Logan County PSD	544619	33	120.00
Logan County PSD (Ph.III B2)	544460-02	34	120.00
Logan County PSD (Ph.III Stollings)	544460-03	35	120.00
Lubeck PSD	544621	80	20.00
Mason County PSD	544616	36	120.00
Matewan, Town of	544482	73	45.00
Matewan, Town of (Red Jacket)	544474	37	120.00
McDowell County PSD (Coalwood Ph.I)	547302	15	140.00
McDowell County PSD (laegar)	544513	2	190.00
McMechen Sewage Disposal System	544553	52	100.00
Mingo County PSD	544312	38	120.00
Monongah, Town of	544565	11	145.00
Morgantown Utility Board	544590	69	50.00
Mount Zion PSD	544521	39	120.00
North Beckley PSD	544522	40	120.00
North Beckley PSD	544617	41	120.00

Project	SRF #C	Ranking	PriorityPoints
Nutter Fort, Town of	544314	42	120.00
Page Kincaid PSD	544508-02	16	140.00
Pea Ridge PSD (Holiday Park)	544609	6	160.00
Pea Ridge PSD (Rt.2 Ph.II)	544576	7	160.00
Pine Grove, Town of	544603	43	120.00
Pocahontas County PSD	544604	22	125.00
Preston County Sewer PSD	544538	19	135.00
Prichard PSD	544298	53	100.00
Ravenswood, City of	544428	77	40.00
Richwood, City of	544579	47	115.00
Ripley Sanitary Board	544575	48	115.00
Ronceverte, City of	544611	74	45.00
Shady Spring PSD (Pluto Road)	544410	23	125.00
Sissonville PSD	544570	75	45.00
Smithers, City of	544583	61	75.00
Sophia Sanitary Board	544085	81	20.00
Southern Jackson PSD	544246	58	95.00
Sun Valley PSD	544587	54	100.00
Terra Alta, Town of	544618	76	45.00
Walton PSD	544166	44	120.00
Webster Springs PSD	544612	59	95.00
Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo)	544334	5	165.00
West Dunbar PSD	544168	64	70.00
West Fork Onsite (CO-OP)	544605	17	140.00
White Sulphur Springs, City of	544606	12	145.00
Williamson, City of	544544	65	70.00

### Wastewater Treatment Needs Categories Definitions

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

Rank / Point	s Project	:	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Century Volga PSD		\$2,770,000 Problem	\$4,150,000
Points 195.00	SRF #C:         544556-02         County:         Barbour         NPDES #WV:         0000000         Binding Date:         9/30/2019	*Needs Categories:	Failing sep collection s discharged the proper Solution The projec of Century WWTP wo approxima	eptic tanks and drain fields along with failing HAUs will be replaced with a gravity system and small package treatment plant. Raw sewage and grey water being ed into the streams and ditches will be eliminated providing a safer environment with er treatment, disinfection and discharge of wastewater collected from the community.
Rank	McDowell County PSD	(laegar)	\$1,500,000	\$6,400,000
2			Problem	
Points 190.00	SRF #C:         544513         County:         McDowell         NPDES #WV:         0000000         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Elimination	tion of a centralized wastewater collection and treatment system

Rank / Point	s Project	SR	SRF Loan Amount Total Costs	
Rank 3	Auburn, Town of		\$2,714,725 \$2,714,725	
Points	SRF #C:         547201-02         County:         Richie         NPDES #WV:         0000000         Binding Date:         12/31/2019	*Needs Categories:	Problem         Raw sewage discharges to roadside ditches and to Bone Creek. Discharges are degra         the water quality of Bone Creek and creating a certified health hazard.         Solution         Installation of 50 individual Orenco AX20 treatment units and appurtenances to serve to Town of Auburn	
J				
Rank 4	Benwood, City of		\$1,538,100 \$1,538,100 Problem	
Points 170.00	SRF #C:         544613         County:         Marshall         NPDES #WV:         0023230         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Large amounts of I&I associated with the combined sewer system overwhelms Lift State         and creates CSO events.         Solution         Installation of a new sanitary sewer system with the existing combined sewer system I         place to serve as a storm drainage system. Includes the removal of 2 CSOs from the second eliminates the CSOs associated with Lift Station D.	eft in

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Webster Springs PSD (	Bergoo)	\$2,692,500 <b>Problem</b>	\$2,692,500
Points	SRF #C:         544334         County:         Webster         NPDES #WV:         0049875         Binding Date:         12/31/2019	*Needs Categories: I,∨	Bergoo is re some of wh the Elk Rive Solution	eportedly being presently served by individual septic tank and absorption fields, ich may be failing. Three discharge pipes are visible in Leatherwood Creek and er.
103.00				
Rank 6	Pea Ridge PSD (Holida	<u>y Park)</u>	\$2,345,000 Problem	\$2,345,000
Points 160.00	SRF #C:         544609         County:         Cabell         NPDES #WV:         0027413         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	The WV DE project. The go through of the propo Holiday Par and the san Solution The propos Holiday Par WWTP in it collection s	P and WV PSC asked the District to take over the system and execute the e sanitary sewer system is not within the District's service area. The District must the Cabell County Commission for a boundary adjustment. With the construction osed project, the District's existing NPDES permit will be modified to include k's sanitary sewer system, causing the current NPDES permit to become inactive itary sewer system would fall under the responsibility of the District. ed project consists of decommissioning and removing the existing 23,000 gpd k WWTP and installing a new 25,000 gpd sequencing batch reactor (SBR) s place. The project also proposes to completely replace the existing gravity ystem with a new gravity collection system. Sanitary sewer flows collected in this are proposed to flow by gravity to the proposed Holiday Park SBR plant for

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 7	Pea Ridge PSD (Rt.2 P	<u>h.ll)</u>	\$18,000,000 Problem	\$29,280,000
Points 160.00	SRF #C:         544576         County:         Cabell         NPDES #WV:         0027431         Binding Date:         3/31/2020	*Needs Categories:	The Kyle In plants. The the design 110 failing : project area and/or Orde <b>Solution</b> This project to eliminate package wa existing A F	dustrial Park and Cox Landing areas are served by individual package treatment District's existing A Plant currently experiences an average daily flow greater than capacity of the plant. The Cabell County Health Department reports approximately septic systems, 43 failing home aeration units, and 48 sewage lagoons in the a. Several of these permit holders have received Notices of Violations (NOVs) ers from the WV DEP in recent history.
Rank	Crab Orchard PSD (Ma	acArthur-Marsh	\$8,600,000	\$15,500,000
8	Fork)		Problem	
Points 145.00	SRF #C:         544484         County:         Raleigh         NPDES #WV:         0082309         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Holly Hills A	site sewage treatment systems are polluting Marsh Fork of the Coal River. Existing WWTP has reached the end of its useful life and has reached capacity.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Elkins Sanitary Board		\$4,264,800	\$4,264,800
9			Problem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		l&I associated with combined sewers. Addressing issues associated with the
	544585	VII	issues dete	cted from previous CCTV of the Buffalo Creek Culvert.
	County:			
	Randolph			
	NPDES #WV:		Solution	
	0020028		Separate s	ewers upstream of existing CSO 016 by installing a new separate storm sewer
	Binding Date:			isting combined sewers will remain as sanitary sewers. Various improvements to ed sewers running adjacent to the Buffalo Creek Culvert.
	6/30/2020			
Points	,			
145.00				
			J.	
Rank	Hinton, City of		\$200,000	\$3,550,000
10		,	Problem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:	Reduction	n the frequency and duration of the discharge from permitted discharge CSO 007.
	544550	VII		
	County:			
	Summers			
	NPDES #WV:		l Solution	
	0024732			nt of existing outdated wastewater collection system and pumping station.
	Binding Date:			
	6/30/2020			
Points				
145.00				
,				

Rank / Point	s Project	:	SRF Loan An	nount	Total Costs
Rank	<u>Monongah, Town of</u>		\$4,100,0	00 Problem	\$4,125,000
Points 145.00	SRF #C:         544565         County:         Marion         NPDES #WV:         0027324         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	S	Portions of th condition and CSO's to ove CSO's to ove CS	he town of Monongah's existing sanitary sewer collection system are in poor d allows I&I into the collection system. The increase in I&I causes the towns erflow on a regular basis. has been completed to identify locations and the severity of the issues. e being designed to repair the issues in the sanitary sewer collection system and frequency of CSO overflows. A portion of the gravity sewer system will be to remove I&I and allow for more efficient operation of the system. Also a new I be placed in order to eliminate a section of line running through the West Fork the largest contributor of I&I into the system.
Rank	White Sulphur Springs	, City of	\$1,100,0	00	\$3,083,000
12 Points 145.00	SRF #C:         544606         County:         Greenbrier         NPDES #WV:         0008400         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	V	wastewater c colution The proposed eliminate cur	a of the proposed project is to construct the necessary facilities to provide collection services for approximately 95 residence in the community of Caldwell.

Rank / Points Project		S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Ansted, Town of (Turke	ey Creek)	\$3,556,300 Problem	\$3,556,300
Points 140.00	SRF #C:         544593         County:         Fayette         NPDES #WV:         0020672         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Homes in T untreated s (within the Solution Install appr stations, 2	Turkey Creek utilize substandard septic tank/soil absorption fields or discharge ewage directly to Turkey Creek, which discharges to the New River at Hawks Nest New River National River).
Rank	Colfax PSD		\$848,685	\$2,460,500
Points	SRF #C: 544333 County: Marion NPDES #WV: 0032131 Binding Date: 9/30/2018	*Needs Categories:	experience into the Tyg of the Towr the Tygart Solution Colfax PSE reduce I&I District to the life and is in is antiquate	<ul> <li>Iic Service District's existing WWTP is in disrepair and their collection system</li> <li>I The combinations of these two items causes overflow events of raw sewage gart Valley River. Colfax PSD's collection system and WWTP are located upstream of Monongah's, and the City of Fairmont's public water treatment plant intakes on Valley River.</li> <li>Is proposing a project to construct sanitary sewer system improvements to and pump their collected sewage to and through Kingmill Valley Public Service the City of Fairmont's WWTP. The existing plant has reached the end of its useful in failure, which has resulted in a NOVs from WVDEP. The electrical control system and parts are no longer made to service the Roto-Phase single phase to 3 verter. Many times there will be power outages due to this system.</li> </ul>

Rank / Point	s Project	:	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	McDowell County PSD	(Coalwood Ph.I)	\$1,250,000 Problem	\$3,250,000
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		site wastewater treatment systems and old orphan mining community sewer
	547302	I,V,VI	collection	systems with no treatment result are health and sanitary hazards which could
	1	ļ., ,		alth risks associated with the possible bacteriological contamination of ground we waters in the area. A letter dated February 24, 2015 from the McDowell County
	County: McDowell			partment is attached.
	NPDES #WV:		Solution	
	0000000			Coalwood Sewer System (Ph1) consisting of 5,000 ft of 8" gravity sewer mains, 700 vity sewer mains, 38 manholes, 7 cleanouts, 72 sewer laterals, 3,200 ft of 4"
	Binding Date:		forcemain	one 80 gpm lift station, one 17,500 gpd package MBBR WWTP, and other
	12/30/2018		related ite	ms to provide public sewer service to 71 dwellings and one business.
Points				
140.00				
			, 	
Rank	Page Kincaid PSD		\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
16			Problem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		in the Robson area of Fayette County are not currently served by a public
	544508-02	XVII		er utility. Households in this area are believed to be served by individual septic These systems are in increasingly poor condition, and are often ineffective in
	County:		treating se	wage due to the inability of the soils to percolate the effluent discharging from the
	Fayette			ks. Residences in the Robson area are in need of a public wastewater collection nent system.
	NPDES #WV:			
	0084425		Solution	ct evaluated two feasible alternatives for extending sanitary sewer service including
	Binding Date:		a gravity s	ystem and a STEP/STEG system for transporting flows to the proposed Robson
	6/30/2020			ne alternatives were presented to the District and it was decided to pursue the G system to transport flows to the proposed Robson WWTP.
Points	0/30/2020			
140.00				

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	West Fork Onsite (CO-	<u>DP)</u>	\$1,683,380 <b>Problem</b>	\$4,018,380
	SRF #C:         544605         County:         Harrison         NPDES #WV:         0000000         Binding Date:	*Needs Categories:	Primary pro environmen waterways. Solution The propose users in and systems to o	blems to be rectified by the proposed project are those acute health and tal consequences of the discharge of raw or partially treated sewage in the local ed project will provide sanitary sewer service to 135 residential and 2 commercial around Arlington. The project will utilize STEP (septic tank effluent pumping) collect and transport the primarily treated "gray" water to the on-site treatment
Points 140.00 Rank	6/30/2020 Clarksburg Sanitary Bo	ard	septic tanks	vill treat the sewage and meet the NPDES discharge permit limits. Individual will be owned and maintained by the Cooperative. The sludge will be transported POTW for further treatment and disposal.
18			Problem	
	SRF #C: 544549 County: Harrison NPDES #WV: 0023302 Binding Date:	*Needs Categories:	unload into passing thro and sanitary WWTP. An Solution Equipment a be installed	ment at the WWTP is at the end of its usable life. Currently, septage haulers a pipe that bypasses the influent screening at the influent lift station. Large solids bugh the pumps can cause issues. The existing sewer system is combined storm w. Wet weather conditions cause CSOs to discharge and bring larger flows to the abandoned ash lagoon has not been filled in at the plant.
Points 135.00	6/30/2020		discharges.	sewer. This will lighten wet weather flows at the plant and reduce CSO Some damaged concrete sewer pipe will also be replaced. The abandoned ash be cleared/grubbed and filled in, allowing the property to be utilized for other uses.

Rank / Point	ts Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Preston County Sewer	PSD	\$5,901,000 Problem	\$9,966,000
Points 135.00	SRF #C:         544538         County:         Preston         NPDES #WV:         0025101         Binding Date:         10/31/2019	*Needs Categories: III,IV	Excessive I The Dosing WWTP is o WWTP's ef closure and <b>Solution</b> The propos new pump approximat the closure 8269. Cont	&I, pump stations out dated equipment, inefficient pumps, and limited storage. Siphon station has operation issues and poses safety hazards to operators. The perating out of date and failing equipment which is affecting the quality of the fluent. The PCPSD is also under Consent Order No. 8269 which stipulates the remediation of the abandoned Valley Point wastewater lagoon. ed project consists of two contracts. Contract #1 includes the construction of three stations, the upgrading of one existing pump station, the installation of ely 1,500 LF of gravity sewer pipe and approximately 2,500 LF of force main, and of the Valley Point wastewater lagoon, in accordance with Consent Order No. ract #2 pertains to the construction of a new 100,000 gpd WWTP which includes a oval process.
Rank	Culloden PSD		\$1,712,148	\$2,462,148
20		I	Problem	
Points 125.00	SRF #C:         544360         County:         Cabell         NPDES #WV:         0027731         Binding Date:         9/30/2019	*Needs Categories:	The CPSD the peaks of Sewer Ove decommiss mosquitoes <b>Solution</b> The project project will	has a high I&I rate (39%) caused by old and deteriorated collection lines. Due to caused by this I&I the system has a consent order for a non permitted Sanitary rflow which will be corrected by this project. Additionally the CPSD has a formerly ioned WWTP which holds water. This water is an ideal breeding ground for and dangerous bacteria. will replace sanitary sewer lines which allow a significant amount of I&I. The also replace a pump station where the sanitary sewer overflow is located to her overflows. The decommissioned WWTP will be demolished in its entirety.

Rank / Point	ts Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Greater Harrison Coun	ty PSD	\$7,694,000	\$8,694,000
Points	SRF #C:         544296         County:         Harrison         NPDES #WV:         0084301         Binding Date:         12/31/2019	*Needs Categories:	on septic sy River. Sam Solution The Greate gravity sew sewer servi	unity of Enterprise is lacking a public sewage collection system. Residences rely ystems or directly discharge into the local streams and tributaries of the West Fork ples taken by the DEP from the river tested positive for fecal matter.
125.00				
Rank 22	Pocahontas County PS	<u>SD</u>	\$3,040,000 Problem	\$3,640,000
Points 125.00	SRF #C:         544604         County:         Pocahontas         NPDES #WV:         0082937         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:  V,VI	Bartow will currently be Solution The project 104 custor	ng a public wastewater collection system to serve the customers in Frank and decrease the amount of raw sewage and inadequately treated wastewater that is eing discharged into the local waterways.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 23	Shady Spring PSD (Plu	Ito Road)	\$7,125,000 Problem	\$7,125,000
,	SRF #C: 544410	*Needs Categories: I,V	Failing septi	c systems are creating health issues and also contributing to the pollution of to of the New River.
	County: Raleigh NPDES #WV:		Solution	
	0080403 Binding Date: 6/30/2019		Pluto/Fire Tr gravity/grind Collected wa	ail Road Sanitary Sewer System Extensions- Construction of a conventional er pump pressure sewer collection system to eliminate failing septic systems. astewater from an estimated 157 customers will be pumped to the existing treatment plant at Glen Morgan, WV.
Points 125.00				
Rank 24	Ansted, Town of		\$3,635,000 Problem	\$3,635,000
	SRF #C: 544584 County: Fayette NPDES #WV:	*Needs Categories:	Gravity sew flows. Pump of maintena	ers currently experiencing excessive I&I that accounts for up to 75% of treated ing equipment needs replaced due to aging and failures. The WWTP is in need nce upgrades and equipment replacement; it has exceeded its useful life, as well dersized for current flow rates.
Points 120.00	NPDES #WV:           0020672           Binding Date:           9/30/2019		diesel pump and two will	e equipment will be purchased for the treatment plant, such as a jetter, a portable , and a new dump truck. Six of the existing pumping stations will be upgraded, be replaced entirely. Design for an upgrade to the treatment plant will also be t of the project. Smoke testing will be done to identify sources of excess I&I in the

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 25	Bluefield Sanitary Boar	<u>'d</u>	\$3,220,000 Problem	\$4,220,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544493         County:         Mercer         NPDES #WV:         0023141         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Area 1 (Mi pump stati developme the overall forcemain <b>Solution</b> Area 1 (Mi Pump Stat	dway): The project is needed to reduce I&I and reduce the inflows into the Midway on. The project is needed to comply with WVDEP administrative orders for the ent and implementation of measures to reduce the number of upsets and spills to system. Area 2 (Thompson Pump Station): The project is needed to eliminate the that is at the end of its useful life and two existing lift stations. dway) The project would replace the Midway sewer system. Area 2 (Thompson ion) The project will replace the forcemain lift station with a gravity sewer system de the existing main pump station.
	Brooke County BSD (B	H 2 C St Johns	¢2,000,000	
Rank 26	<u>Brooke County PSD (P</u> <u>Rd.)</u>		\$3,900,000 Problem	\$4,900,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544006-04         County:         Brooke         NPDES #WV:         0084182         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Currently, project with currently u discharged Solution This Phase	there is no public sewer service available in the areas proposed to be served in this h the exception of a package plant that serves a mobile home park. Residents tilize individual septic tanks and drain fields and in some cases the gray water is d into streams or drainage areas. e IIC project proposes to serve 200 customers along St. John's Road including the from the end of the Phase I project to the intersection of Eldersville Road.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 27	Buffalo Creek PSD		\$13,555,500	\$13,555,500
Points	SRF #C:         544555         County:         Logan         NPDES #WV:         0003851         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	constructed 178 new cus Solution Upgrade of	RBC plant cannot be modified or expanded so a new plant will need to be On-site treatment units will be eliminated by providing service to approximately stomers in the areas of Greenville and Landville.
120.00				
Rank 28	Chapmanville, Town of SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:	\$7,667,669 Problem Pumping sta	\$7,677,669
	544483-02         County:         Logan         NPDES #WV:         0024678         Binding Date:         7/31/2019	I,IV	Branch area Solution Replace 3 p	nent is failing, and capacity of plant has been reached. Sewer mains in the Fowler a are leaking and have no manholes. umping stations and upgrade sewage treatment plant to 400,000 gpd SBR ant and replace sanitary sewers in the Fowler Branch area
Points 120.00				

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 29	Delbarton, Town of		\$2,000,000 Problem	\$5,181,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544201         County:         Mingo         NPDES #WV:         0042374         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Failing on-	n-site wastewater treatment systems
Rank	Elizabeth, Town of		\$2,386,500	\$3,386,500
30 Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544552         County:         Wirt         NPDES #WV:         0041505         Binding Date:         9/30/2019	*Needs Categories: III,IV	during rain collection s completed The smoke sewer syst Solution This project areas of th customer s system. In	en determined that inflow to the WWTP is much greater than anticipated, especially nfall events. The Town has completed an investigation of the existing sanitary sewer system to determine the cause for excess flows at the WWTP. The Town d a comprehensive smoke test to identify sources of I&I within the collection system. et etst also identified areas where storm drains are connected directly to the sanitary stem. ect proposes to rehabilitate the Prunty Street, Franklin Street, and Washington Street he collection system by replacing the existing collection lines, manholes, and service laterals, as well as separating storm infrastructure from the sanitary sewer n addition. the Franklin Street and Little Kanawha lift stations will be upgraded and eous other manholes throughout the sanitary sewer system will receive new

Rank / Point	ts Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 31	Gilbert, Town of	Т	\$4,428,000 Problem	\$4,428,000
Points	SRF #C:         544502         County:         Mingo         NPDES #WV:         0103748         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Failing on-s	ite wastewater treatment systems.
,			1	
Rank 32	Greater Paw Paw Sanit	tary District	\$3,380,000 <b>Problem</b>	\$3,380,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544558         County:         Morgan         NPDES #WV:         0084310         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	The existing in many are reduce the f being in disi and reduce <b>Solution</b> A new gravi new system	g collection system has significant I&I problems. There is no access to the piping as. This phase of the project will significantly reduce I&I into the system and also frequency of accidental discharges that result from the existing collection system repair. This project will also allow access into the proposed lines for maintenance pumping costs for the District. ty collection system, along with replacing a forcemain will be constructed. The will separate the existing system from the proposed collection system. Any d inflow into the collection system will be identified and removed from the ystem.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 33	Logan County PSD		\$5,325,000	\$5,625,000
,	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:	Problem	site wastewater treatment systems
	544619	V,VI		
	County:	1		
	Logan			
	NPDES #WV:			
	0105171		Solution	on of a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site
	Binding Date:			r treatment systems
	6/30/2020			
Points	0/30/2020			
120.00				
120.00				
Rank	Logan County PSD (Pl	n.III B2)	\$4,600,000	\$4,900,000
34		· ·	Problem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		site wastewater treatment systems
	544460-02	V,VI		
	County:	,		
	Logan			
	NPDES #WV:			
	0105171		Solution	on of a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site
	1		wastewater	r treatment systems
	Binding Date: 6/30/2020			
Points	0/30/2020			
120.00				

Rank / Points Project		S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 35	Logan County PSD (Ph	n.III Stollings)	\$4,580,000 Problem	\$4,900,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544460-03         County:         Logan         NPDES #WV:         0105171         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Failing on-s	ite wastewater treatment systems
Rank	Mason County PSD		\$3,600,000	\$11,500,000
36 Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544616         County:         Cabell         NPDES #WV:         0000000         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	<sup>⊪</sup> *Needs Categories: I,V,VI	commercia septic tanks treatment s Solution This project serve new of sanitary set plant, and w	Grove area is in need of reliable public sanitary sewer service for its industrial, , and domestic residents. Many of the domestic residents are currently using s for service while two potential customers are utilizing existing private wastewater systems.

Rank / Point	s Project	SF	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Matewan, Town of (Re	d Jacket)	\$3,000,000 Problem	\$5,380,000
	SRF #C: 544474 County:	*Needs Categories: IV,VI,VII		ailing vacuum collection system and failing on-site wastewater treatment.
	Mingo NPDES #WV: 0024783 Binding Date: 6/30/2020			n of a new centralized gravity collection system to replace the failing vacuum failing on-site wastewater treatment systems
Points 120.00	0/30/2020			
Rank 38	Mingo County PSD		\$2,513,000 <b>Problem</b>	\$2,513,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544312         County:         Mingo         NPDES #WV:         0037699         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories: IV,V,VI	51 residents leaking into system are Solution The 51 resid	a in the eastern end of Chattaroy, WV are using failing septic systems. Sewage is the nearby Buffalo Creek. Several sections of sewer pipe within the existing in a state of near collapse

Rank / Point	s Project	:	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 39	Mount Zion PSD		\$81,000	\$2,310,000
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		reatment plant tankage is severely corroded and the blowers, pumps, control's and
	544521	I,IV	instrumenta	ation are failing. The pumps and controls have reached the end of their useful lives ling. Neither the treatment plant nor the pumping stations have telemetry
	County:			or emergency generators. Spills of raw sewage have occurred because of failures and the PSD has been ordered by the WVDEP (Order No. 8770) to
	Calhoun		remedy the	e situation.
	NPDES #WV:		Solution	
	0101702		Replace th	e existing package plant with new HDPE tankage (MBBR treatment technology)
	Binding Date:		and replace	e existing pumps and controls. Also, install telemetry equipment and emergency
	3/31/2020		ľ	
Points	,			
120.00				
-			,	
Rank	North Beckley PSD		\$4,119,500	\$5,619,500
40			Problem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		discharge of domestic waste and wash water discharge into the small streams
	544522	V,VI	and drains	in the Piney View area of Raleigh County that will eventually enter Piney Creek w River.
	County:			
	Raleigh			
	NPDES #WV:		l Solution	
	0027740		Installation	of a gravity collection system to collect and transport the flow from approximately
	Binding Date:			nces and convey to a lift station that will pump the sewage into the existing system plant for treatment prior to discharge.
	6/30/2020			
Points				
120.00				
			J	

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 41	North Beckley PSD		\$12,410,000 Problem	\$12,910,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544617         County:         Raleigh         NPDES #WV:         0027740         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Reduce I& at the WW at the end Solution Perform an existing Sp sewer over watershed	and sanitary sewer overflows in the wastewater collection system and overflows P. Replace existing WWTP equipment and metal pretreatment building that are f their useful life. Increase sludge dewatering capabilities. I&I study of the wastewater collection system to identify problem areas Upgrade ague Lift Station and forcemain, sewer lines, and manholes to reduce sanitary lows in the wastewater collection system, especially in the Whitestick Creek area Upgrade existing WWTP to increase capacity, provide additional treatment ded flexibility, replace worn out plant equipment, metal pretreatment building, and d work.
Rank	Nutter Fort, Town of		\$3,200,000	\$4,200,000
Points           120.00	SRF #C: 544314 County: Harrison	*Needs Categories:  VII	System is flows from Solution The project installing of replacement sewer flow	sanitary sewer system currently has significant I&I flowing into its system. The so a combined (CSO) system. The purpose of this project is to separate the storm anitary flows and to eliminate a significant amount of I&I.
	NPDES #WV:           0100901           Binding Date:           6/30/2020			includes conducting smoke/dye testing to identify problem areas affect by I&I and rrective measures where issues are located. The corrective measures will include t of existing sanitary sewer lines, installing storm sewer structures to separate the from the stormwater and installing a flow meter between Nutter Fort and the Sanitary Sewer Systems to monitor I&I from the Stonewood Sanitary Sewer

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 43	Pine Grove, Town of		\$1,000,000 Problem	\$3,460,000
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544603         County:         Wetzel         NPDES #WV:         0084433         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	The vacuur up in basen The Town is system. The sewage. The <b>Solution</b> The propos of the vacu balance of collection s	In system is failing in numerous locations. Pits are overflowing, sewage is backing ments and their are numerous releases of sewage in lawns and road side ditches. Is having difficulty containing vacuum leaks and controlling I&I into the vacuum a Town has received numerous NOV's as a result of the uncontrolled releases of e vacuum system has aged beyond its useful life and needs to be replaced. ed project is the third of phase of a three phase project to remove and replace all um system with a traditional gravity collection system with pump stations. The the vacuum system, pits and the vacuum station are to be removed and gravity system installed with three lift stations and their associated force mains. When completed all the vacuum system will have been replaced and removed.
Rank	Walton PSD		\$6,147,660	\$6,147,660
44		l	Problem	
Points 120.00	SRF #C:         544166         County:         Roane         NPDES #WV:         0000000         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	created the quality of th during dry p was listed b Solution This project separate ph will be insta force mains	rge of raw sewage into roadside ditches, area creeks and the Pocatalico River has potential for health hazard conditions within the PSD's service area, and the water e Pocatalico River, Silcott Fork and Biglick Run is being degraded, especially beriods that produce low stream flows, by those discharges. The Pocatalico River by the WV Department of Environmental Protection.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amou	ount Total Costs
Rank 45	Follansbee, City of	]	\$9,269,865	
43				oblem
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		ne downtown collection system has other problems also such as basement and street boding. Through the "Long Term Control Plan" prepared in 2009 the city entered into a
	544599	I,VII		onsent order with WVDEP to reduce its Combined Sewer Overflows.
	County:			
	Brooke			
	NPDES #WV:		Solu	lution
	0020273			otal replacement of North, South, Brooke, Center and Lee Pump Stations are recommended
	Binding Date:		durii	uring the upcoming project. Moderate refurbishment of Archer Heights, Stanley Mott and
	6/30/2020		the	e WWTP. Other major construction during the project will involve separation of Combined
Points	ļ		Sew	ewer System (downtown) involving construction of new storm and sanitary sewer lines.
115.00				
J			I	
Rank	Fort Gay, Town of		\$1,500,000	\$3,400,000
46			Prot	oblem
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:	The	ne system is under an EPA consent order because the Town has failed to properly operate
	544607	I,IV		nd maintain the system. Not all pump stations are operational or only have one pump. The goon is only using half of the needed aerators, the baffle dividers were damaged and
	County:			moved, and there is no screening of the wastewater prior to entering the lagoon.
	Wayne			
	NPDES #WV:		[	lution
	0085359			bgrade and rehabilitate 9 pump stations and 3 grinder pump stations, manholes, and 2,500
	Binding Date:		LFc	of line replacement. Upgrade the WWTP by replacing the flow meter, surface aerators,
	6/30/2019			eaning the lagoon, and installation of 2 floating baffle dividers. Will also install a new immer, security fence, dechlorination drip feed, new headworks, and cleaning the existing
Points	0/30/2019			lorine contact tank. The project will also consist of mapping the collection system.
115.00				

Rank / Point	s Project	\$	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 47	Richwood, City of		\$6,370,000 Proble	\$7,450,000
	SRF #C:         544579         County:         Nicholas         NPDES #WV:         0022004         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	The Cit the Jun repair a extreme are cau the exis <b>Solutio</b> The Cit necess	y of Richwood's wastewater collection and treatment system were terribly damaged by e 2016 flood. Sections of the wastewater collection mains were damaged beyond ind some were completely washed away. Due to the damaged collection mains, ely high levels of I&I are entering into the wastewater system. These high levels of I&I sing the wastewater collection system to continuously overflow from the CSO (s) and thing plant fails to comply with the existing NPDES permit limits.
Points 115.00				
Rank 48	Ripley Sanitary Board		\$11,100,000	\$22,860,000
Points 115.00	SRF #C: 544575 County: Jackson NPDES #WV: 0045543 Binding Date: 6/30/2020	*Needs Categories: II,∨I	Both se facilitie the NP Solutio The pro treat flo pumpe	<ul> <li>wer systems are under Order to upgrade the treatment plants. The existing treatment is are unable to consistently meet the permitted effluent limits resulting in violations of DES permits.</li> <li>n</li> <li>ject consists of constructing a new, centralized wastewater treatment facility that will ws collected from both Ripley and Evans. Sewage from the Evans system will be d to the new facility. The existing ponds in Ripley and Evans will be closed after the isility is placed in service. This will consist of dewatering, and sludge removal and</li> </ul>

Rank / Points Project		S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 49	Charleston, City of (We	oodward Branch)	\$10,876,000 Problem	\$10,876,000
Points 110.00	SRF #C:         544557         County:         Kanawha         NPDES #WV:         0023205         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	The project Plan submithe service life Solution The project existing sev	is part of The Sanitary Board of the City of Charleston CSO Long-Term Control ted to the WVDEP 12/27/2005. The project will improve water quality by reducing as of combined sewer overflows, help reduce excessive I&I, and extend the of the pipes in the impacted areas of the wastewater collection system.
Rank	Huttonsville PSD		\$3,000,000	\$4,000,000
50		ļ	Problem	
Points 100.00	SRF #C:         544569         County:         Randolph         NPDES #WV:         0080535         Binding Date:         6/30/2019	*Needs Categories:	8454 was is in its WV/N temporary s of the hydra customers. Solution A WCS Bio wastewater permitted s placed over and TSS in	&I at the treatment plant far exceeds the permitted capacity. Consent Order No. ssued. The PSD has failed to meet the discharge limitations for Ammonia set forth PDES permit. Order No. 8010 was issued for the PSD to use Outlet No.003 as a sanitary sewer system overflow. This order was issued to provide temporary relief nulic overloading conditions and alleviate potential adverse impacts to the Order No. 8010 expired in Feb 2019. -Shell treatment system is recommended to provide needed treatment of the lagoon facility. These 260 units will be able to ensure the effluent is at the ummer and winter limits. Baffle curtains will be installed and a floating cover will be the cells containing the Bio-Shells to eliminate sunlight which contributes to algae the effluent. The S.S.O covered by Order No. 8010 will be monitored and as part of this project.

Rank / Point	ts Project	Ş	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 51	Kanawha Falls PSD		\$6,463,150	\$7,072,500
	SRF #C: 544562 County: Fayette NPDES #WV: 0034991 Binding Date: 9/30/2019	*Needs Categories:	and wash v and purcha Solution Installation compactors upgrades to	advipment at the WWTP such as the plant lift station, headworks, treatment basins vater system. Also, upgrades to eleven lift stations including pump replacements se of additional needed operation and maintenance equipment.
Points 100.00	,			
Rank 52	McMechen Sewage Dis	sposal System	\$3,750,000 Problem	\$3,750,000
Points 100.00	SRF #C:         544553         County:         Marshall         NPDES #WV:         0020141         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	WWTP and dated and o for 54.09% to enter the as designed their respect Solution Complete r WWTP, rer	d equipment has reached the end of their useful life. Collection system consists of degraded materials and is inaccessible due to multiple HMA overlays. I&I accounts of system flow to the WWTP. Surface storm water inlets are allowing large debris e collection system. Lift Stations at 12th Street and 21st Street are not operating d due to failed pump(s). are experiencing I&I from the discharging waters through ctive CSO's. The City is under Administrative Orders# 6705 & 8243.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 53	Prichard PSD	[	\$2,361,000 Problem	\$2,361,000
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		ervice to residents with failing or non-existent on-site wastewater treatment
	544298	V,VI	systems	
	County:			
	Wayne			
	NPDES #WV:		Solution	
	0105732		Construction	n of a centralized wastewater collection system to replace the failing on-site
	Binding Date:		wastewater	treatment systems in the area of Centerville
	6/30/2020			
Points	,			
100.00				
			, 	
Rank	Sun Valley PSD		\$2,770,000	\$2,770,000
54			Problem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:	The Sun Va	Iley Public Service District is looking to extend its existing system to potential
	544587	IV,V,VI	around the [	The District intends to extend service to approximately 95 customers in four areas District's existing area of operation. The District also has two pump stations in
	County:		need of reha	abilitation or replacement.
	Harrison			
	NPDES #WV:		Solution	
	0104663		The Sun Va	lley Public Service District is proposing to expand its existing system. There are 4
	Binding Date:			eas of construction within the District's service location. Approximately 95 new vill be served with the extension project. The District is also proposing to replace
	6/30/2020			pump stations.
Points	,			
100.00				
			1	

Rank / Points Project		S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 55	Boone County PSD (We	est Madison)	\$4,690,800 <b>Problem</b>	\$4,725,000
Points 95.00	SRF #C:         544494         County:         Boone         NPDES #WV:         0035939         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Certain item Also there is occur. Solution Upgrade co WWTP by r replacing be	Is at the WWTP have outlived their useful life and it is time to replace these units. Is I&I in the West Madison system that causes excessive flows when rain events election system components in/near West Madison and upgrade the Danville eplacing the mechanical bar screen, upgrade the Orbal unit, replacing UV unit, elf filter with fan press and upgrading capacity via addition of third clarifier. nplemented will help the LTCP compliance.
Rank	Cedar Grove, Town of		\$1,625,000	\$1,625,000
56		I	Problem	
Points	SRF #C:         544596         County:         Kanawha         NPDES #WV:         0035637         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	its CSO Lon stations are Mechanical the Kanawh Solution The system identify the s deficiencies to ensure ac with regular	f Cedar Grove is experiencing high levels of I&I. The Town has also not updated g Term Control Plan, which is required by the WV NPDES permit. Existing pump experiencing operational failures and equipment has exceeded its useful life. and electrical failure have resulted in direct discharges of untreated sewage into a River.
95.00			completed.	

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 57	Elk Valley PSD		\$14,500,000 Problem	\$14,500,000
Points 95.00	SRF #C:         544620         County:         Kanawha         NPDES #WV:         0080900         Binding Date:         3/31/2019	*Needs Categories:	Since the c multiple em and corres and deteric Additionally occasional <b>Solution</b> EVPSD pro pipes, upgr also look a as the resu	devastating flood event which occurred in June 2016, Elk Valley PSD has suffered mbankment failures along the Elk River. The flood damaged embankment areas sponding following years of wet weather continue to cause embankment failures orating embankment conditions which endanger the adjacent EVPSD infrastructure. y, EVPSD is suffering from I&I issues in its collection system that are causing I discharges in its collection system during rain events.
	Southern Jackson PSD		¢0.004.400	<b>C</b> 704 400
Rank 58	Southern Jackson PSD	ļ	\$8,204,400	\$9,704,400
Points 95.00	SRF #C:         544246         County:         Jackson         NPDES #WV:         0084468         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	VVVVTP, ti permit. The PSD must parameters Solution An upgrade efficiency ti NPDES pe headwork's growth med	imposition of more stringent discharge limitations for the S. Jackson Co. PSD the facility has been unable to meet the discharge parameters of their NPDES e PSD is currently negotiating a draft consent order with the VVVDEP stating the take all measures needed to initiate compliance with their discharge permit s. e to the PSD's existing treatment plant is proposed that will feature higher treatment equipment allowing the plant to meet the discharge parameters of its ermit. The plant upgrade would consist of screening and grit removal equipment. s shelter. lagoon aeration system and covers, a polishing reactor with attached idia. tertiary membrane ultrafiltration system, membrane building, ultraviolet n unit, and an emergency generator.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	t Total Costs
Rank	Webster Springs PSD	_	\$1,650,000	\$1,650,000
09			Proble	em
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		de of existing WWTP components which have surpassed their useful life as well as
	544612	I,IV		des to wastewater pumping stations throughout the system which have surpassed their life and require modifications for ease of operation.
	County:			
	Webster			
	NPDES #WV:		Solutio	on
	0497875		Rehab	pilitation of the WWTP main pump station, upgrade of the WWTP headworks,
	Binding Date:		replace well as	ement of the treatment systems clarifier's. Upgrade pumps at the pumping stations as s electrical controls and providing a generator for a pump station which currently has no
	6/30/2020		back u	up power supply.
Points	,			
95.00				
,			I	
Rank	Bluewell PSD		\$7,600,000	\$12,500,000
60			Proble	em
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		xisting 400,00 gpd WWTP located at Montcalm, which is 53 years old and is at the end
	544594	I,IV		useful life. Four existing lift stations in the Montcalm area which are 53 years old and are end of their useful life. These existing wet well/underground dry pump pit stations also
	County:		presen	nt safety issues for personnel maintaining the pumping and electrical equipment. ce I&I in the existing gravity sewer collection system to reduce sanitary overflows.
	Mercer			se fai in the existing gravity sewer concertor system to reduce samilary overnows.
	NPDES #WV:		l Solutio	
	0028134		Upgrad	de the existing 400,000 gpd WWTP to a 600,00 gpd WWTP. Replace the existing
	Binding Date:			lift stations in the Montcalm area with wet well type lift stations with submersible s. Replace sections of the existing gravity sewer collection system to reduce I&I to
	6/30/2020			e the flow to the WWTP and to reduce sanitary sewer overflows.
Points	1			
90.00				
,				

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 61	Smithers, City of	[	\$677,549 <b>Problem</b>	\$1,377,549
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		mithers is experiencing higher than normal treatment costs due to the storm
	544583	VII	drains being	g connected to the main collection system and the outdated piping. Both of these issues are causing excessive wastewater flows to Kanawha Falls PSD.
	County:			g
	Fayette			
	NPDES #WV:		Solution	
	0021741		This project	proposes to improve the existing sanitary and stormwater collection system by
	Binding Date:			e sources of I&I entering the system. The reduction of I&I will in turn decrease osts and the amount of sewage overflowing from the three permitted CSO's. The
	6/30/2020			ollection system improvements include replacing portions of the collection system.
Points				
75.00				
r			1	
Rank	Camden-on-Gauley, To	own of	\$1,170,000	\$1,200,000
62		,	Problem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:		n-Gauley is experiencing high volumes of I&I. Based on the results of the smoke
	544083	III	testing conc many areas	ducted in 2015, the Town's existing collection system is in poor shape and has where sewage has the potential to leak directly into the ground water system.
	County:		Residents c	of the area could potentially be exposed to sanitary sewage in the ground water ace water due to the condition of the existing sewer lines and manholes.
	Webster			the water due to the condition of the existing sewer lines and manholes.
	NPDES #WV:		 Solution	
	0024961			ed project consists of the removal and replacement of approximately 2,400 LF of
	Binding Date:			er line with new 8" PVC pipe along Greenbrier Street, Mayer Avenue, Buckhannon Maple Inn Road, approximately 500 LF of 4" PVC service lateral piping as well as
	6/30/2020		the removal	and replacement of 16 manholes. This project also consists of the replacement of
Points	1		various mar	hole lids with watertight frames and covers throughout the sanitary sewer system.
70.00				

Rank / Point	s Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 63	Claywood Park PSD		\$1,824,576	\$4,799,576
Points 70.00	SRF #C:         544498         County:         Wirt         NPDES #WV:         0043991         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	all be e Solutic There Additio already other fi	g excessive inflow, unsanitary conditions, and an imminent failing sewage lagoon will eliminated through this project.
Rank	West Dunbar PSD		\$9,040,000	\$9,039,782
64	<u>West Builder OD</u>	ļ	Proble	
	SRF #C: 544168 County: Kanawha NPDES #WV:	*Needs Categories:	The ex 40 yea	isting sewer system consists mainly of VCP gravity lines that were installed more than rs ago. L/I pump station flooding etc. causes basement flooding and sewage spills in aterways. High infiltration is also causing peak flows at the Dunbar treatment plant.
Points 70.00	0089591 Binding Date: 7/30/2019		All sew relocat power	rage pump stations will be rehabilitated and replaced. Some pump stations will be ed to protect them from occasional flooding. All stations will be equipped with auxiliary and protected against 25 and 100-year flooding. A significant portion of the existing ill be replaced.

Rank / Points Project		SRF Loan Amount		Total Costs	
Rank	Williamson, City of	[	\$4,024,000		\$4,024,000
65		,	Pro	blem	·
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:			lure of wastewater pumping stations, structural issues at WWTP and working
	544544	IV,V,VI	con	mponents, a	and failing on-site treatment for 3 unserved customers.
	County:				
	Mingo				
	NPDES #WV:		Solu	ution	
	0026271		Inst	tallation of	f new pumping stations, structural repairs to facilities and components at the
	Binding Date:				reatment plant, and a small collection system extension to provide service to served customers.
	6/30/2020				
Points					
70.00					
			,		
Rank	<u>Albright, Town of</u>	[	\$1,107,500		\$2,015,000
66			Pro	blem	
	SRF #C:	*Needs Categories:			ection system receives a significant amount of I&I during periods of wet weather
	544492	I,IV	Thr	ree existing	ing WWTP is in need of significant upgrades due to aged, failing equipment. g pump stations are also in need of upgrades with most major equipment items
	County:				placement. Sources in the collection system have been identified as contributing ue. These areas have been targeted for rehabilitation in order to effectively
	Preston				mount of I&I entering the collection system.
	NPDES #WV:		l Soli	ution	
	0103110		The	e project wi	vill consist of collection system rehabilitation to help reduce the amount of I&I
	Binding Date:				system and being conveyed to the WWTP for treatment. The existing WWTP will to replace failing equipment, piping, valves, chlorine contact tank, concrete
	6/30/2020		bas	sin coating,	g, aeration blowers, outlet weir and leveling plates, wastewater drain pump basin,
Points	,				improvements, aerated sludge holding tank upgrades, influent flow splitter tank, and installation of a new WWTP effluent flow meter with chart recorder.
65.00				0 0	
,					

Rank / Point	s Project	:	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 67	Barboursville Sanitary	Board	\$9,216,000	\$9,216,000
	SRF #C:         544615         County:         Cabell         NPDES #WV:         0024481         Binding Date:         3/31/2020	*Needs Categories:	years and it due to the i design stan which are 2 useful lives <b>Solution</b> For this pro decommiss	ject, 6 of the aging pumping stations will be upgraded. The lagoon will be ioned, cleaned and filled. Wastewater will be pumped to the treatment plant at PSD. This will require installing a new pumping station and more than 6,000 lf of
Points 65.00	-			
Rank 68	Greater Harrison Coun	<u>ty PSD (Rt.73 Ph.2)</u>	\$9,878,500 Problem	\$24,036,832
Points 65.00	SRF #C:         544451         County:         Harrison         NPDES #WV:         0084301         Binding Date:         12/31/2019	*Needs Categories:	The Clarkst and current their useful problem, bu will provide Solution	burg Country Club and Laurel Park areas are close proximity to the existing plant ly operate on failing septic systems and violating package plants at the end of lives, and direct stream discharges. The Route 73 area is stricken with the same at is currently not in any proximity to public sewer service or treatment. This project sewer service to 750 customers.

Rank / Points Project		Ş	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 69	Morgantown Utility Boa	ard	\$4,000,000 Problem	\$10,000,000
	SRF #C: 544590 County: Monongalia NPDES #WV:	*Needs Categories:  ∨II	Project will capacity for	upgrade Westover CSO system in order to improve collection and conveyance r improved daily performance and reduced CSO discharges. Additions to the system currently require WVDEP approval.
Points	0024449 Binding Date: 6/30/2020		Installing a Dents Run,	new interceptor along Dents Run, upgrade main pumping station at mouth of which pumps across Monongahela River to Morgantown system, new ela River force main crossing, and other miscellaneous improvements as needed.
Rank	Burnsville Public Utility	/ Board	\$2,839,000	\$2,839,000
70 Points 45.00	SRF #C:         544578         County:         Braxton         NPDES #WV:         0024945         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	Solution	excess I&I from the existing wastewater collection system due to connected drop butdated wastewater collection lines in low lying areas near waterways. The existing wastewater treatment plant and extension of a centralized wastewater ystem in the areas of Greenville and Landville.

Rank / Point	ts Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 71	Canaan Valley PSD		\$2,235,000 Problem	\$2,295,000
Points 45.00	SRF #C:         544560         County:         Tucker         NPDES #WV:         0106011         Binding Date:         3/31/2020	*Needs Categories: V,VI	This project proposed P consists of operate priv wastewater Solution Canaan Va communitie Zone D WV other at the	t is the second phase of a multi-phased regional sewer system in the Valley. The hase II will incorporate the Zone B area into the PSD's system. The Zone B area the communities of Deerfield, Windwood, and Canaan Village, which own and vate sewer systems. Currently, these three systems suffer from deteriorating collection and treatment systems.
		r	<b>*</b> 4 504 000	
Rank	<u>Clay, Town of</u>		\$4,531,000	\$4,531,000
Points 45.00	SRF #C: 544614 County: Clay NPDES #WV: 0022055 Binding Date: 12/31/2019	*Needs Categories: I,IV	caused disc issues relat being used exceeding p Solution The sewage causing the	Town's influent comes from I&I. Some of the pump stations have failed and charges directly into the river. The plant itself has major mechanical and electrical ing to the Zimpro Countercurrent, so much so that only one of the units is currently (and it is failing mechanically). There have been several instances of the plant bermitted capacity and discharge limits.

Rank / Poin	ts Project	S	RF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 73	Matewan, Town of		\$6,160,000 Problem	\$6,160,000
	SRF #C: 544482 County: Mingo NPDES #WV: 0024783 Binding Date: E/20/2020	*Needs Categories:	The existing Enforcement	e existing WWWTP to address more stringent discharge limits and comply with
Points 45.00	6/30/2020			
Rank 74	Ronceverte, City of	I	\$3,700,000 <b>Problem</b>	\$4,700,000
Points 45.00	SRF #C:         544611         County:         Greenbrier         NPDES #WV:         0024236         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	There are s roots. Other replacemen flow from G and has no also not cas Solution There are s issues and and more th	everal areas of the collection system which have broken pipes, offset joints, and issues include I&I in main lines and laterals. Several manholes are in need of t, and some areas have no manholes. Additionally, the interceptor which carries reenbrier PSD No. 1 needs a railroad crossing to be upgraded (it is undersized casing). The crossing has a pipe size smaller than the rest of the line which is ed, which could lead to structural problems regarding the railroad.

Rank / Point	s Project	;	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 75	Sissonville PSD		\$2,950,000 Problem	\$2,950,000
Points 45.00	SRF #C:         544570         County:         Kanawha         NPDES #WV:         0029530         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	The WWTP constructed require reha operation o Lakeland P Shasta Pun <b>Solution</b> The project WWTP imp existing pla improvemen mechanical pump statio	P and most of the wastewater collection system in the Sissonville area was I in the 1980s. Portions of the WWTP have reached the end of their useful life and abilitation, replacement, and/or system improvements to continue successful f the WWTP. Wastewater collection system problems include (1) the pumps at the ump Station are being clogged with excessive rags, and (2) the Middle School and np Station wet wells are in need of rehabilitation. will upgrade the existing WWTP and replace equipment that is past its useful life. rovements include rehabilitation of the clarifiers, disinfection system, replace nt generator, transfer switch, preliminary treatment upgrade, oxidation ditch nts and metal grating replacement. Collection system improvements include a bar screen, preceding the existing Lakeland Pump Station, relocating lines at the on site, and installation of an odor control unit. Cleaning and coating the Middle Shasta Pump Station wet wells.
Rank	Terra Alta, Town of		\$2,720,000	\$3,720,000
76			Problem	
Points 45.00	SRF #C:         544618         County:         Preston         NPDES #WV:         0033804         Binding Date:         6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	equipment i upgrades. T in need of s Additionally Solution The planner a whole by Also, the ex	current WWTP is in need of multiple upgrades as most of the plant and plant is 20 years old. Multiple areas within the plant need new piping and various other The Town's pump stations have reached their life expectancy of 20 years and are ignificant upgrades including new pumps, controls, and electrical upgrades. , there are Town citizens near the stockyard that have requested sewer service. d upgrades will streamline the WWTP and improve the efficiency of the system as replacing the aging equipment with more reliable and energy efficient equipment ( tisting collection system pump stations will be completely upgraded.) This project ses extending sewer service to the stockyard to serve the citizens that have t.

Rank / Point	s Project	S	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank	Ravenswood, City of		\$3,800,000	\$3,800,000
Points	SRF #C:         544428         County:         Jackson         NPDES #WV:         0021989         Binding Date:         3/31/2020	*Needs Categories:	effluent am and contair controls in t replaced. T Solution The pumps emergency construction	s have had recurring problems with meeting the design (and previously permitted) monia limit of 15 mg/l: the 2017 WVNPDES permit lowered the limit to 4.7 mg/l and a compliance schedule that mandates a facility upgrade. The equipment and the 8 sewage pumping stations have exceeded their useful lives and need to be he stations lack telemetry and emergency power generation equipment.
40.00				
Rank 78	Bradshaw, Town of		\$2,208,000 Problem	\$6,208,000
	SRF #C:         544595         County:         McDowell         NPDES #WV:         0103110	*Needs Categories:	The propos throughout resulting in address de Solution The vacuur	ed project will eliminate the problematic vacuum collection system located a large portion of Town, eliminate a significant number of grinder pumping stations a reduction of power consumption and operation and maintenance cost, and ferred operation and maintenance items at the WWTP.
Points 30.00	Binding Date: 6/30/2020			nponents that are at the end of their useful life.

Rank / Point	s Project	Ş	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs
Rank 79	Craigsville PSD		\$4,653,500 Problem	\$5,153,500
Points 25.00	SRF #C:         544597         County:         Nicholas         NPDES #WV:         0045730         Binding Date:         9/30/2019	*Needs Categories: III,IV	The wastev lifespans. C bills for the excess I&I detrimental <b>Solution</b> This projec collection s implementi stations. Th	vater collection system has many sections that are at the end of their useful Craigsville's pumps are operating beyond the optimal range, causing higher power District. According to the Annual Report, the I&I is approximately 37%. This causes the pumps in Craigsville's system to exceed standard run times and has a effect on the useful life of the system. t proposes to improve the energy efficiency of Craigsville's existing sanitary sewer ystem and reduce I&I by replacing damaged sections of sewer line, by ng VFD's in controls of the upgraded pumping stations and eliminate 2 existing lift he improvements include upgrading eight lift stations within Craigsville's collection installing new submersible pumps, controls, and generator hook-ups.
Rank	Lubeck PSD		\$2,312,000	\$2,312,000
80 Points	SRF #C: 544621 County: Wood NPDES #WV: 0032590 Binding Date: 6/30/2020	*Needs Categories:	area of Wo Solution Extending s Service Dis 15,410 ft of	anitary sewer service to two commercial customers in the Washington Bottom od County service to the 2 potential customers by connecting to the existing Lubeck Public strict system with approximately 5,000 ft of 10" and smaller diameter gravity pipe, f 6" and smaller diameter forcemain, 19 manholes, 1 major pumping station, 1 der pumping station, service laterals and other related appurtenances

Rank / Points	s Project	SF	RF Loan An	nount	Total Costs
Rank 81	Sophia Sanitary Board SRF #C: 544085	*Needs Categories:	Ē	Problem	\$17,500,000
	County: Raleigh NPDES #WV:			·	
	0024422 Binding Date:		F		proposes to extend sanitary sewer service to serve the residents of Coal City. also proposes to construct a new WWTP to serve Coal City.
Points 20.00	6/30/2020				

<u>Appendix B</u>

# PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS BY QUARTER

#### Appendix B - Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2019 Grant

				State Fiscal Year 2020 (\$1,000)			)00)
Name	Project Scope	Proj Num	Activity	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr
		C-544	Code	July-Sept	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-June
Pea Ridge PSD	Sewer Ext./WWTP Upgrade	576	D2		\$28,500		
Shady Spring PSD	Sewer Ext./WWTP Upgrade	410	D3	\$7,125			
DEP Administration*	n/a	n/a	n/a		\$0		
Total Projects and Admin				\$7,125	\$28,500	\$0	\$0

Federal Share (0.8333)		\$5,937	\$23,749	\$0	\$0	\$29,686
State Share (0.1667)		\$1,188	\$4,751	\$0	\$0	\$5,939
Total**		\$7,125	\$28,500	\$0	\$0	\$35,625

#### Payment Schedule for the CWSRF Program: CS-540001-19

Federal Quarter	Payment Date	CWSRF Amount	<b>Cumulative Amount</b>
FFY 2019-Quarter 4	7/1/2019	\$24,769,000	\$24,769,000

Activity Codes

P - facilities planning underway

D - design underway

D2 - design under review at DEP

D3 - design approved by DEP/bid process underway

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

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

APPENDIX C

# PROJECTS BUDGETED FOR IUP AVAILABLE FUNDS

				Sta	te Fiscal Yea	ar 2020 (\$1,0	000)
Name	Project Scope	Proj Num	Activity	1st Qtr	2nd Qtr	3rd Qtr	4th Qtr
		C-544	Code	July-Sept	Oct-Dec	Jan-Mar	Apr-June
Auburn	New Decentralized WWTP	7201-02	D2			\$2,411	
Century-Volga PSD	New Decentralized WWTP	4556-02	D3	\$2,770			
Colfax	Connection to neighboring system	4333	D3	\$848			
Culloden PSD	Collection System Upgrade	4360	D3	\$1,712			
Elizabeth	Collection System Upgrade	4552	D3	\$2,386			
Greater Harrison Co. PSD	New WWTP/Sewer Extension	4296	D		\$7,694		
Kanawha Falls PSD	WWTP & Collection System Upgrade	4562	D3		\$6,498		
McDowell Co. PSD (Coalwood)	New WWTP/Sewer Extension	7302	D2		\$600		
North Beckley PSD	WWTP & Collection System Upgrade	4617	Р				\$13,232
Pea Ridge PSD	WWTP Upgrade/Sewer Extension	4576	D3			\$28,500	
Preston Co. PSD	WWTP Upgrade/Sewer Extension	4538	D2	\$4,160			
Shady Spring PSD	WWTP Upgrade/Sewer Extension	4410	D3	\$7,125			
Webster Springs PSD	Decentralized Sewer System	4334	D3		\$2,642		
West Dunbar	CSO Replacement	4168	D3	\$9,040			
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a		\$0		
NPS - Agriculture	various	n/a	n/a	\$25	\$25	\$25	\$25
NPS - Onsite	various	n/a	n/a	\$300			
			Sub-total	\$28,366	\$17,459	\$30,936	\$13,25
						Grand total	\$90,01

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

Activity Codes

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

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC HEARING SUMMARY APPENDIX E

# <u>MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY</u> <u>COUNTY AND MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT</u>

#### WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME 2015 CENSUS

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

#### **COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

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

#### **COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

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

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

#### **COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

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

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

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

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

#### **COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS**

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/guided\_search.xhtml

APPENDIX E1

# MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY MUNICIPALITY

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

MUNICIPALITIESIChapmanville, townCharleston, cityCharles Town, cityChesapeake, townChester, cityClarksburg, cityClay, townClearview, villageClendenin, townCowen, townDDarvis, townDavy, townDelbarton, townDunbar, cityDurbin, townEEast Bank, town	edian HH ncome 34,469 48,442 59,483 40,286 34,508 37,036 24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 	1.50% 43.09 60.55 74.35 50.36 43.14	Bill based o 1.75% 50.27 70.64 86.75 58.75 50.32 54.01 35.11 88.41	2.00% 57.45 80.74 99.14 67.14 57.51 61.73
Chapmanville, townCharleston, cityCharles Town, cityChesapeake, townChester, cityClarksburg, cityClay, townClearview, villageClendenin, townCowen, townDDavis, townDavis, townDavis, townDavis, townDavy, townDurbar, cityDurbin, townEEast Bank, town	34,469 48,442 59,483 40,286 34,508 37,036 24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 	43.09 60.55 74.35 50.36 43.14 46.30 30.09 75.78 53.08	50.27 70.64 86.75 58.75 50.32 54.01 35.11	57.45 80.74 99.14 67.14 57.51 61.73
Charleston, cityCharles Town, cityChesapeake, townChester, cityClarksburg, cityClay, townClearview, villageClendenin, townCowen, townDDanville, townDavis, townDavy, townDelbarton, townDurbar, cityDurbin, townEEast Bank, town	48,442 59,483 40,286 34,508 37,036 24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 	60.55 74.35 50.36 43.14 46.30 30.09 75.78 53.08	70.64 86.75 58.75 50.32 54.01 35.11	80.74 99.14 67.14 57.51 61.73
Charles Town, cityChesapeake, townChester, cityClarksburg, cityClay, townClearview, villageClendenin, townCowen, townDDanville, townDavis, townDavis, townDavy, townDelbarton, townDunbar, cityDurbin, townEEast Bank, town	59,483 40,286 34,508 37,036 24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 26,875	74.35 50.36 43.14 46.30 30.09 75.78 53.08	86.75 58.75 50.32 54.01 35.11	99.14 67.14 57.51 61.73
Chesapeake, townChester, cityClarksburg, cityClay, townClearview, villageClendenin, townCowen, townDDanville, townDavis, townDavy, townDelbarton, townDurbar, cityDurbin, townEEast Bank, town	40,286 34,508 37,036 24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 	50.36 43.14 46.30 30.09 75.78 53.08	58.75 50.32 54.01 35.11	67.14 57.51 61.73
Chester, cityClarksburg, cityClay, townClearview, villageClendenin, townCowen, townDDanville, townDavis, townDavy, townDelbarton, townDunbar, cityDurbin, townEEast Bank, town	34,508 37,036 24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 	43.14 46.30 30.09 75.78 53.08	50.32 54.01 35.11	57.51 61.73
Clarksburg, city Clay, town Clearview, village Clendenin, town Cowen, town Danville, town Davis, town Davy, town Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town	37,036 24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 	46.30 30.09 75.78 53.08	54.01 35.11	61.73
Clay, town Clearview, village Clendenin, town Cowen, town Davis, town Davis, town Davy, town Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town	24,073 60,625 42,461 35,240 	30.09 75.78 53.08	35.11	
Clearview, village Clendenin, town Cowen, town Danville, town Davis, town Davy, town Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town	60,625 42,461 35,240 	75.78 53.08		
Clendenin, town Cowen, town Davis, town Davis, town Davy, town Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town	42,461 35,240  26,875	53.08	88.41	40.12
Cowen, townDDanville, townDavis, townDavy, townDelbarton, townDunbar, cityDurbin, townEEast Bank, town	35,240 26,875			101.04
DIIIIIDanville, townIIIIIDavis, townIIIIIIDavy, townIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	26,875	44.05	61.92	70.77
Danville, town Davis, town Davy, town Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town			51.39	58.73
Davis, town Davy, town Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town				
Davy, town Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town		33.59	39.19	44.79
Delbarton, town Dunbar, city Durbin, town <u>E</u> East Bank, town	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42
Dunbar, city Durbin, town E East Bank, town	23,667	29.58	34.51	39.45
Durbin, town E East Bank, town	30,833	38.54	44.96	51.39
E EEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEEE	41,287	51.61	60.21	68.81
East Bank, town	31,477	39.35	45.90	52.46
	52,083	65.10	75.95	86.81
Eleanor, town	51,414	64.27	74.98	85.69
Elizabeth, town	31,691	39.61	46.22	52.82
Elk Garden, town	17,813	22.27	25.98	29.69
Elkins, city	38,214	47.77	55.73	63.69
Ellenboro, town	35,694	44.62	52.05	59.49
F				
Fairmont, city	36,086	45.11	52.63	60.14
Fairview, town	34,583	43.23	50.43	57.64
Falling Spring, town	55,000		80.21	91.67
Farmington, town	46,518		67.84	77.53
Fayetteville, town	, 36,429		53.13	60.72
Flatwoods, town	, 30,625	38.28	44.66	51.04
Flemington, town	30,417	38.02	44.36	50.70
Follansbee, city	51,144	63.93	74.59	85.24
Fort Gay, town	12,454	15.57	18.16	20.76
Franklin, town	42,361	52.95	61.78	70.60
Friendly, town	23,929	29.91	34.90	39.88
G				
Gary, city	31,667	39.58	46.18	52.78
Gassaway, town	34,375	42.97	50.13	57.29
Gauley Bridge, town	37,344	46.68	54.46	62.24
Gilbert, town	-			
Glasgow, town	43.333	54.17		
Glen Dale, city	43,333 41,648	54.17 52.06	63.19 60.74	72.22

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

IVIUNICIPALITIES						
				Bill based on % MHI		
MUNICIPALITIES	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%		
McMechen, city	41,000		59.79	68.33		
Madison, city	46,559		67.90	77.60		
Man, town	55,250	69.06	80.57	92.08		
Mannington, city	43,750		63.80	72.92		
Marlinton, town	28,633	35.79	41.76	47.72		
Marmet, city	36,382	45.48	53.06	60.64		
Martinsburg, city	37,843	47.30	55.19	63.07		
Mason, town	33,859	42.32	49.38	56.43		
Masontown, town	46,488	58.11	67.80	77.48		
Matewan, town	14,135	17.67	20.61	23.56		
Matoaka, town	26,875	33.59	39.19	44.79		
Meadow Bridge, town	35,192	43.99	51.32	58.65		
Middlebourne, town	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08		
Mill Creek, town	29,702	37.13	43.32	49.50		
Milton, town	35,500	44.38	51.77	59.17		
Mitchell Heights, town	64,583	80.73	94.18	107.64		
Monongah, town	36,739	45.92	53.58	61.23		
Montgomery, city	24,716	30.90	36.04	41.19		
Montrose, town	58,125	72.66	84.77	96.88		
Moorefield, town	32,775	40.97	47.80	54.63		
Morgantown, city	34,090	42.61	49.71	56.82		
Moundsville, city	34,628	43.29	50.50	57.71		
Mount Hope, city	21,218	26.52	30.94	35.36		
Mullens, city	43,942	54.93	64.08	73.24		
N						
Newburg, town	46,875	58.59	68.36	78.13		
New Cumberland, city	25,045	31.31	36.52	41.74		
New Haven, town	36,750	45.94	53.59	61.25		
New Martinsville, city	40,039	50.05	58.39	66.73		
Nitro, city	43,434	54.29	63.34	72.39		
Northfork, town	31,786	39.73	46.35	52.98		
North Hills, town	92,344	115.43	134.67	153.91		
Nutter Fort, town	39,583	49.48	57.73	65.97		
0						
Oak Hill, city	39,316	49.15	57.34	65.53		
Oakvale, town (2014)	25,625	32.03	37.37	42.71		
Oceana, town	29,125	36.41	42.47	48.54		
Р						
Paden City, city	35,898	44.87	52.35	59.83		
Parkersburg, city	31,876		46.49	53.13		
Parsons, city	35,450		51.70	59.08		
Paw Paw, town	29,821	37.28	43.49	49.70		
Pax, town	33,625		49.04	56.04		

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

	Median HH Average Bill based on % MH				
MUNICIPALITIES	Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%	
Star City, town	40,833	51.04	59.55 65.63	68.06	
Stonewood, city	45,000	56.25		75.00	
Summersville, town (2012)	34,924	43.66	50.93	58.21	
Sutton, town	35,938		52.41	59.90	
Sylvester, town	52,500	65.63	76.56	87.50	
T	20 542	45.04	<b>FD DF</b>		
Terra Alta, town	36,513	45.64	53.25	60.86	
Thomas, city	33,000	41.25	48.13	55.00	
Thurmond, town (2000 again)	23,750	29.69	34.64	39.58	
Triadelphia, town	29,063	36.33	42.38	48.44	
Tunnelton, town	46,042	57.55	67.14	76.74	
U					
Union, town	28,409	35.51	41.43	47.35	
V					
Valley Grove, village	35,357	44.20	51.56	58.93	
Vienna, city	46,968	58.71	68.50	78.28	
W					
War, city	20,625	25.78	30.08	34.38	
Wardensville, town	35,000	43.75	51.04	58.33	
Wayne, town	17,559	21.95	25.61	29.27	
Weirton, city	39,832	49.79	58.09	66.39	
Welch, city	28,112	35.14	41.00	46.85	
Wellsburg, city	31,288	39.11	45.63	52.15	
West Hamilin, town	16,094	20.12	23.47	26.82	
West Liberty, town (2014)	21,250	26.56	30.99	35.42	
West Logan, town	40,750	50.94	59.43	67.92	
West Milford, town	48,125	60.16	70.18	80.21	
Weston, city	31,776	39.72	46.34	52.96	
Westover, city	35,792	44.74	52.20	59.65	
West Union, town	30,583	38.23	44.60	50.97	
Wheeling, city	36,989	46.24	53.94	61.65	
White Hall, town	63,333	79.17	92.36	105.56	
White Sulphur Springs, city	30,363	37.95	44.28	50.61	
Whitesville, town	24,375	30.47	35.55	40.63	
Williamson, city	33,872	42.34	49.40	56.45	
Williamstown, city	49,890	62.36	72.76	83.15	
Windsor Heights, village	41,607	52.01	60.68	69.35	
Winfield, town	56,300	70.38	82.10	93.83	
Womelsdorf (Coalton), town	47,222	59.03	68.87	78.70	
Worthington, town	26,875	33.59	39.19	44.79	

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder

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

APPENDIX F

# <u>Sources and Uses Chart</u> <u>(for EPA use only)</u>

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

#### Cumulative Sources as of December 31, 2018

Capitalization Grants (31)	\$ 705,204,586		
State Matches (actual)	\$ 128,846,073		
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319)	\$ 479,691,733		
Investment Earnings	\$ 31,870,598		
Sources sub-total (a)		<u>\$</u> 1	,345,612,990
Cumulative Uses as of December 31, 2018			
Loan Assistance (212+319)	\$ 1,269,152,322		
DEP Administration (4%)	\$ 14,143,540		
Uses sub-total (b)		<u>\$</u> 1	,283,295,862
FY2020 Sources of Funds			
Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	\$ 62,317,128		
Capitalization Grant #32 (FFY2019 Funds)	\$ 24,769,000		
State Match (estimate)	\$ 4,953,800		
Earnings (estimate)	\$ 2,221,900		
Repayments (estimate)	\$ 35,518,610		
Sources of Funds ( c )		\$	129,780,438
Less			
Appendix C Projects	\$ 90,018,000		
Loan Closings Between 12/31/2018 - 6/30/19	\$ 24,220,456		
AgWQLP Reserves	\$ 150,000		
OSLP Reserve	\$ 300,000		
Total		\$	114,688,456

<u>Appendix G</u>

# POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

#### CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

### "Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2020 IUP

Project	Category	Description	Total Project Cost Estimate
Ansted, Town of (Turkey Creek)	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized grinder system	\$3,556,300
Auburn, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized individual treatment units	\$2,714,725
Bradshaw, Town of	energy efficiency	Replacement of Vacuum Sewer system with Gravity system	\$6,208,000
Cairo, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	\$3,255,000
Century Volga PSD	decentralized sewer system	sand filter with subsurface discharge	\$2,870,000
Fort Gay, Town of	energy efficiency	Treatment plant rehabilitation	\$3,400,000
McDowell Co. PSD - Coalwood	decentralized sewer system	Packaged MBBR plant and collection system	\$3,250,000
McDowell Co. PSD - laeger	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized system for unsewered area	\$6,400,000
Mount Zion PSD	decentralized sewer system	Treatment plant replacement	\$2,310,000
Page Kincaid PSD	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized system for unsewered area	\$3,000,000
Pea Ridge PSD (Holiday Park)	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized Wastewater Treatment Plant	\$2,345,000
Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo)	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$2,692,500
West Fork Cooperative	decentralized sewer system	STEG/STEP system	\$4,018,380
		TOTAL	\$46,019,905

<u>Appendix H</u>

**UNEMPLOYMENT DATA** 

# Labor Force Data by County 2017

County	Percentage
Barbour	5.8
Berkeley	3.7
Boone	6.3
Braxton	7.4
Brooke	6.1
Cabell	4.5
Calhoun	10.5
Clay	8.6
Doddridge	4.2
Fayette	6.4
Gilmer	7.1
Grant	5.6
Greenbrier	4.8
Hampshire	3.9
Hancock	6.1
Hardy	5.0
Harrison	4.8
Jackson	5.7
Jefferson	3.1
Kanawha	5.0
Lewis	6.6
Lincoln	6.8
Logan	7.5
McDowell	8.5
Marion	5.2
Marshall	6.0
Mason	6.7
Mercer	5.8
Mineral	5.4
Mingo	8.6
Monongalia	3.7
Monroe	4.3
Morgan	4.0
Nicholas	7.1
Ohio	4.8
Pendleton	3.6
Pleasants	7.0
Pocahontas	6.0
Preston	5.0
Putnam	4.7
Raleigh	5.4
Randolph	5.4
Ritchie	5.5
Roane	8.5
Summers	5.6
Taylor	4.9
Tucker	4.9 5.1
Tyler	7.2
Upshur	6.0
Wayne	5.8
Webster	5.8 6.2
	6.2 7.2
Wetzel Wirt	7.2 7.9
Wood	7.9 5.5
Wyoming	7.0 5.2
WV Source: from www.workforcev	

Source: from www.workforcewv.org

<u>Appendix I</u>

## **POPULATION DATA**

#### **Population Data**

	2015	2017		% Change
County	Estimate		delta	*red reflects negative
Barbour	16731	16790	59	0.35
Berkeley	108724	111610	2886	2.65
Boone	24000	23236	764	3.18
Braxton	14466	14345	121	0.84
Brooke	23665	23067	598	2.53
Cabell	96824	96100	724	0.75
Calhoun	7557	7450	107	1.42
Clay	9141	8901	240	2.63
Doddridge	8201	8570	369	4.50
Fayette	45534	44602	932	2.05
Gilmer	8644	8305	339	3.92
Grant	11815	11673	142	1.20
Greenbrier	35666	35523	143	0.40
Hampshire	23542	23412	130	0.55
Hancock	30201	29921	280	0.93
Hardy	13936	13812	124	0.89
Harrison	68998	68438	560	0.81
Jackson	29256	29123	133	0.45
Jefferson	55214	55673	459	0.83
Kanawha	190781	187827	2954	1.55
Lewis	16434	16371	63	0.38
Lincoln	21560	21241	319	1.48
Logan	35760	34428	1332	3.72
McDowell	20802	19707	1095	5.26
Marion	56790	56575	215	0.38
Marshall	32480	32006	474	1.46
Mason	27177	27000	177	0.65
Mason Mercer	61891	60963	928	1.50
Mineral	27755	27421	334	1.20
Mingo	25931	25150		
Monongalia	101668	103715	781 2047	3.01 2.01
Monroe	13525	13517	2047	0.06
	17475	17510	35	0.20
Morgan Nicholas	25930	25496	434	1.67
Ohio	43637	42906	731	1.68
Pendleton	7402	7138	264	3.57
Pleasants				
	7636	7527	109	1.43 1.41
Pocahontas	8697	8574	123	
Preston Putnam	33809	33760	<mark>49</mark> 48	0.14
	56596	56644		0.08
Raleigh	78493	77097	1396	
Randolph	29365	29152	213	0.73
Ritchie	10140	10005	135	1.33
Roane	14636	14348	288	1.97
Summers	13544	13210	334	2.47
Taylor	16977	16977	0	0.00
Tucker	6972	7035	63	0.90
Tyler	9033	8949	84	0.93
Upshur	24560	24604	44	0.18
Wayne	41499	41063	436	1.05
Webster	8927	8637	290	3.25
Wetzel	16157	15793	364	2.25
Wirt	5841	5800	41	0.70
Wood	86559	86016	543	0.63
Wyoming	22866	22130	736	3.22

Source:https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS\_17\_5YR\_B0100 3&prodType=table