West Virginia
Clean Water State Revolving Fund

FY2014
Intended Use Plan

Submitted to the
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
July 1, 2013

dep

west virginia department of environmental protection

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Glossary 1

Preface 2

SECTION I

Introduction 3

SECTION II

Funds Identification 3

SECTION III

Goals 5

SECTION IV

Project Priority List 6

SECTION V

Fund Activities 7

SECTION VI

Assurances 15

SECTION VII

Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds 16

SECTION VIII

Public Participation 16

SECTION IX

Agreement 17

Appendices

A - FY 2014 Project Priority List
B - Proposed Binding Commitments – by Quarter
C - Projects Budgeted for IUP Available Funds
D - Public Hearing Summary
E - Median Household Income by Magisterial District
E1 - Median Household Income by Municipality and County
E2 - Proposed 2010 MHI data
F - Sources and Uses Chart (for EPA use only)
G - Possible Green Technology Projects

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

BAN – Bond Anticipation Note

CA – West Virginia Conservation Agency

CWA – Federal Clean Water Act

CWSRF – Clean Water State Revolving Fund

DEP – West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

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

USDA– United States Department of Agriculture

SCD – Soil Conservation District

WDA – West Virginia Water Development Authority

Preface

Mission Statements

Department of Environmental Protection

To promote a healthy environment.

Division of Water and Waste Management

To protect, preserve and enhance West Virginia's land

and watersheds for the safety

and benefit of all.

Clean Water State Revolving Fund

To provide technical and financial assistance to local governmental

entities to improve water quality and

public health conditions.

SECTION I

Introduction

This document is the Clean Water State Revolving Fund's Intended Use Plan for state fiscal year 2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014). The Department of Environmental Protection, 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, 2013, there have been 24 federal capitalization grants and amendments awarded by the Environmental Protection Agency. The state has provided, where necessary, the required 20% matching funds for each grant and amendment.

Repayments of prior loans, bonds and investment earnings are also available within the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to fund additional wastewater and nonpoint source projects. A calculation of available funds during FY2014 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 during FY2014.

A similar chart can be found in Appendix F, which is used by EPA for their purpose only. This chart summarizes the federal capitalization grants, state matches, repayments, earnings, etc. since the program began. It also estimates the FY2014 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 FY2014 (July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014)

Available funds as of March 31, 2013

Cash balance in CWSRF account =	$104,531,975	
Federal funds accounts payable (Base grants) =	$ 0	
		$ 104,531,975

New funds available during state FY2014:

Next Federal EPA Grant =	$20,813,000	
Next State Match	$ 4,162,600*	
Repayments (principal) (to 6/30/14) =	$28,989,015	
Repayments (interest) (to 6/30/14) =	$ 2,971,427	
Investment earnings (to 6/30/14) =	$ 152,060	
		$ 57,088,102

Less:

Existing project loans payables (3/31/13) =	$57,042,409	
Existing binding commitments (3/31/13) =	$19,064,167	
AgWQLP reserve =	$ 150,000	
OSLP reserve =	$ 500,000	
DEP Administration =	$ 0	
		$ 76,756,576

Net available funds during FY2014 = $ 85,863,501

Notes:

1. $7,041,018 remains to be committed for loan forgiveness in all categories combined to meet the 2010-2013 grant conditions.

2. There is $3,930,419 that must still be allocated to green projects to meet the 2010-2013 grant conditions.

* State Match is provided by the IJDC and should be received in July 2013

SECTION III

Goals

A. Long term goals

1. Expand the CWSRF accessibility by creating new financial assistance programs to address NPS pollution control problems.

2. Ensure the CWSRF program operates in perpetuity at its maximum level to provide financial assistance to local entities.

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

   Objective 2 – Maximize investment opportunities.

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

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

3. Integrate the CWSRF program into DEP's Watershed Management Framework to increase program effectiveness by targeting the CWSRF funds toward higher priority watersheds.

4. Market the CWSRF program throughout the state to increase commitment 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 sewer projects and coordinating and recommending the most feasible funding sources.

6. Incorporate EPA's strategic plan program activity measures into the CWSRF program by working to achieve a targeted fund utilization rate of 100% (cumulative dollar amount of loan agreements divided by cumulative amount available for projects).

7. Develop effective wastewater management in rural, low income West Virginia communities. This includes investigating new funding opportunities and participating in groups to develop wastewater management ideas and programs.

B. Short term goals for FY2014

1. Continue outreach efforts on potential new loan recipients.

2. Achieve a targeted fund utilization rate "pace" goal of 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 and bond agreements (does not include preliminary binding commitment letters).

3. Update the Project Priority List application and Ranking System.

4. Complete the Environmental Benefits for each CWSRF project in EPA's CBR system.

5. Work with other funding agencies to fund the required nutrient reduction projects of WV's Chesapeake Bay communities.

SECTION IV

Project Priority List

The FY2014 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 the 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 generally takes 60 days.

The CWSRF will continue to commit funds to projects on a first-come first-served basis regardless of their position on the priority list, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met and the project is within six months of construction. Further, 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.

Individual NPS pollution control activities and projects funded by the CWSRF do not have to appear on the annual priority list. However, the funding of these projects is described in Section V(I) and an amount has been reserved to fund these projects. These NPS projects are allowable for funding using state revolving funds in accordance with federal law and are defined under Section 319 of the CWA. Any type of NPS activities funded must be included in the DEP's approved NPS management plan. Appendix C contains a quarterly outlay estimate for all NPS activities expected to be funded in FY2014.

SECTION V

Fund Activities

A. Interest rates on POTW loans

The eligibility criterion for low interest loan consideration is still based upon 4,000 gallons of water usage and the average monthly user rate must be at or above 1.5% of the median household income in order for a community to qualify for a ½% interest rate on its loan.

The DEP will be using this criterion to determine its interest rate on loans. However, 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% interest rate, 1% annual admin fee, 20 year term*

1.5% to 1.74% MHI: *½ % interest rate, ½ % annual admin fee, 21 - 30 year term*

1.75% MHI and higher: *0% interest rate, ½% annual admin fee, 31 - 40 year term*

The MHI data that will be used will be the 2000 census data published by the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census until a determination is made by the CWSRF, DWTRF, and IJDC concerning the data to be used and implemented. Only projects that have a valid binding commitment letter and have filed for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity with the PSC by April 1, 2014 or the effective date of the legislation approving the IJDC Legislative Rule amendment will proceed to project closing with the 2000 MHI data. All others will have their terms reevaluated using the latest MHI data. Interest rates will not exceed 2% and will not be less than 0%. For all public service districts, the MHI to be used will be the lowest of either the county or magisterial district that is most appropriate for the project area. Magisterial District information can be found in Appendix E. Municipalities and County specific MHI data that will be used is contained in Appendix E1. The proposed 2010 MHI data is included in Appendix E2.

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 $20,813,000. 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 is estimated to equal $2,081,300. 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 to qualifying communities.

This minimum amount is expected to be $980,381. The Act also allows for a maximum amount to be set aside, which may be equal to $1,470,572. In accordance with the CWSRF state statute, which says in part, "...moneys in the fund shall be used to make grants for projects to the extent allowed or authorized by federal law", the DEP will be setting aside the maximum amount which will be used for providing additional loan subsidies for disadvantaged communities.

Principal forgiveness of all or part of a loan will be the mechanism that will be used to supply the additional subsidization. The criteria for projects to be eligible for additional subsidization are as follows:

1. 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.).

2. The proposed average sewer rate based upon 4,000 gallons of water usage after project completion must be equal to or greater than 1.75% of the median household income based upon the census data as described in Section V(A). The additional loan subsidization provided will be the lesser of 50% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or $1,000,000.

3. If the proposed average rate is equal to or greater than 2.0% MHI, then the additional loan subsidization amount will be the lesser of 100% of the total eligible CWSRF project costs or $2,000,000.

Readiness to proceed to construction will be 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, it will rollover to pay the amount of any deferred loan.

Loan recipients eligible for additional subsidization must appear on the current FY2014 priority list prior to loan closing.

C. Green Projects Reserve

In accordance with federal law, 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 use 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 will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or $500,000.

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

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

2. Water Efficiency

Water efficiency type projects will not be allowable for additional loan subsidization or green technology funding, except for water reuse type projects. Proposed green projects in the water reuse category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 20% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs or $500,000.

3. Storm Water / Green Infrastructure

Allowable green projects to be funded under this category are:

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

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

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive additional loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, to the lesser of 20% 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

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 CWSRF funding.

Proposed green projects in this category will be eligible to receive loan subsidization, in the form of debt forgiveness, of 100% of the total eligible green CWSRF costs. During FY 2014, 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 debt forgiveness funds. The program will fund the pre-bid costs for these systems from the available green debt forgiveness funds. In order 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 WV Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council;
2. An engineering agreement approved by the CWSRF program;
3. A facility 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;
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 January and February 2013 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 calculated annually using the outstanding principle 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 for state FY2014 is $2,644,172. This includes funding the DEP's Project WET position. The amount of the funds available on March 31, 2013 was $6,112,926.

E. Maximum allowable loans

In FY2014, there will not be a limit set on the amount of funds available to any single project. This practice will be reviewed annually and may change in future intended use plans.

F. BAN leveraging program

DEP is continuing the following option for multimillion dollar projects that cannot reduce their scope to reflect a reasonable cost. A specific dollar amount will be issued by the entity using a BAN for the length of the construction period. The CWSRF will commit out of its second round funds 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 interim financing. This proposed closing date will also be reflected in the BAN documents. Repayment of the CWSRF loan will begin immediately using the first full Municipal Bond Commission quarter following loan closing if the rates are in effect or the quarter following the date which the rates go into effect.

G. Extended Bond Purchase Program

1. 30-year bonds

The EPA approval of the 30-year extended bond purchase program on April 13, 1999, allowed many disadvantaged communities in West Virginia to be funded under the CWSRF, resulting in additional water quality improvement projects and providing rate relief to local governmental entities. The more advantageous bond terms have increased the number of sewer construction projects in the state and have allowed better leveraging of other state and federal funds available for sewer 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. In performing the analysis, an interest rate of ½% and an annual administrative fee of ½% shall be assumed.

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 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.

Facility 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 facility units / components, including equipment.

Where there has been a historical decline in population, additional information in the facility 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 facility plan. This requirement will apply during the entire preconstruction phase of the project, including the Public Service Commission certificate case. A copy of the Rule 42 exhibit shall be submitted to the DEP for compliance review 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 reviewed for the purposes of conducting a final financial review.

H. Requirements for CWSRF Commitment

Preliminary Commitments – when IJDC or another funding agency commits funds to a project that includes CWSRF as a funding partner, the DEP may also commit its funding to the project at that time, conditioned upon program requirements being met in the future as the project proceeds.

Formal Commitments – once it has been determined that a project can realistically proceed to construction within six months, a formal commitment of CWSRF funding will be made that may include such terms and conditions as deemed necessary. 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 WV Conservation Agency. The purpose of the AgWQL program is to provide a source of low-interest financing match funds to implement best management 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 individual homeowners throughout the state.

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

1. **Agriculture Water Quality Loan Program**

With the initiation of the FY1998 pilot program in five counties (Grant, Mineral, Pendleton, Hardy, and Hampshire), DEP addressed nonpoint sources of pollution by the installation of best management practices. The pilot program was a cooperative effort among the DEP, WV 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 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. 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 in FY2014 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 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 $500,000 as a set-aside for this program in FY2014.

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

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

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

J. Federal requirements

To streamline the program and reduce project costs, all new binding commitments made to POTW projects in FY2014 will not have to meet many federal requirements. As a recipient of federal CWSRF funds, the DEP has to apply these federal requirements to loans equal to the cumulative amounts of all the federal capitalization grants. The DEP has consistently applied these federal requirements to all loans since the beginning of the program in 1991and has exceeded this requirement. Therefore, many federal requirements will not be imposed on projects in FY2014, such as minority/woman-owned business enterprise goals, presidential executive orders, just to name a few. 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.

In order to minimize the burden on borrowers with compliance with the Single Audit Act (OMB A-133), the following project has been selected to comply with these requirements. This borrower will submit single audit reports in all years when the receipt of federal funds (both CWSRF and non-CWSRF federal funds) is greater than $500,000.

Project Sponsor	Project Description	CWSRF amount
City of Martinsburg	Chesapeake Bay WWTP Upgrade	$31,290,279

This project's total is more than the FFY 2013 capitalization grant which is estimated to be $20,813,000.

SECTION VI

Assurances

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

602(a) - Environmental Reviews – the DEP will conduct the reviews in accordance with state regulations.

602(b)(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. The OA underwent revisions this past year and has been accepted by the WV DEP and the U.S. EPA.

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 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 11, 2013 a public hearing will be held to receive comments on the CWSRF IUP for FY2014. 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 potential 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 sheets for all loans closed during FY2014. This documentation is being requested by EPA to better ascertain the environmental results of projects funded under the CWSRF program.

APPENDIX A

FISCAL YEAR 2014 PRIORITY LIST

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND AMENDED 2014 PRIORITY LIST

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 1	**McDowell County PSD (Crumpler)**	$840,000	$2,337,499	**Problem:** Community where most homes directly discharge wastewater to the nearest stream **Solution:** Construct a septic tank effluent collection system & a 25,000 gpd recirculation packaged filter treatment system to serve 114 homes, 3 churches, & 1 one convenience store
Rank 2	**Weston, City of**	$7,094,000	$7,494,000	**Problem:** Unserved areas & package plant that is unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements. (Turnertown area) **Solution:** New collection system to unserved areas & eliminate the package plant and send all flow to the Weston WWTP

McDowell County PSD (Crumpler)

- SRF #C: 547303
- County: McDowell
- NPDES #WV: 0115011
- Binding Date: 6/30/2014
- Needs Category: XII
- Points: 160.00

Weston, City of

- SRF #C: 544471
- County: Lewis
- NPDES #WV: 0028068
- Binding Date: 6/30/2014
- Needs Category: IVA,IVB
- Points: 160.00

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 3	**Cottageville PSD**	$600,000	$2,700,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems and direct discharges
	SRF #C: 544499			
	County: Jackson			
	NPDES #WV: 0044466			**Solution**: Construct new collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 155.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 4	**Elk Valley PSD (Phase II)**	$14,970,000	$15,000,000	**Problem**: Direct discharge, unserved areas
	SRF #C: 544400-02			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0080900			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to Brookhill Dr., Young's Bottom, Rt. 119/Reamer & Kelly Hill
	Binding Date: 3/31/2014			
Points 155.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 5	**Morgantown, City of (Sunshine Estates)**	$547,850	$1,279,000	**Problem**: Failing package plant
	SRF #C: 544518			
	County: Monongalia			
	NPDES #WV: 0083071			**Solution**: Extension to eliminate the package plant and upgrade collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 155.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 6	**New Haven PSD (Winona)**	$2,769,160	$3,095,000	**Problem**: Failing septic system & direct discharges to Keeney Creek or the New River
	SRF #C: 547850			
	County: Fayette			
	NPDES #WV: 0032531			**Solution**: Construct a new septic tank effluent collection system, recirculating media filter, disinfection, constructed wetlands with a discharge to Keeney Creek to serve 99 customers in the community of Winona
	Binding Date: 3/31/2014			
Points 155.00	Needs Category: XII			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 7	**Center PSD (Phase II Rockview)**	$1,500,000	$9,790,000	**Problem:** Failing septic systems, lots too small
	SRF #C: 544268-02			
	County: Wyoming			
	NPDES #WV: 0027138			**Solution:** Construct new collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 145.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 8	**Greater Harrison County PSD (Phase II/Rt. 73)**	$15,500,000	$15,664,000	**Problem:** Failing package plant and severe I/I issues
	SRF #C: 544451			
	County: Harrison			
	NPDES #WV: 0084301			**Solution:** Construct new WWTP and collection system
	Binding Date: 12/31/2013			
Points 145.00	Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 9	**Webster Springs PSD (Bergoo)** SRF #C: 547651 County: Webster NPDES #WV: 0049875 Binding Date: 3/31/2014 Needs Category: XII Points 145.00	$2,437,129	$2,437,129	**Problem** Failing septic system and community direct discharges in the community of Bergoo **Solution** Construct a gravity collection system that will flow to a large community septic tank with treatment provided by an alternative treatment system. Discharge will either be surface or subsurface. Serving 50 residences & 1 store
Rank 10	**Claywood Park PSD (Phase I Newark)** SRF #C: 544419 County: Wood NPDES #WV: 0043991 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: IVA,IVB Points 142.00	$3,792,000	$5,572,000	**Problem** Direct discharge, failing septic systems **Solution** Extend sewer service to unserved areas

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 11	**Buckhannon, City of (Lorentz)**	$6,100,895	$6,129,675	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544207			
	County: Upshur			
	NPDES #WV: 0032336			**Solution**: Construct new collection system in Lorentz area
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 140.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 12	**Pea Ridge PSD (Green Bottom)**	$9,926,000	$10,426,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544442			
	County: Cabell			
	NPDES #WV: 0027413			**Solution**: New WWTP, collection and pump stations
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 140.00	Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 13	**Westover, City of**	$2,364,000	$2,872,500	**Problem**: Failing septic systems and working toward CSO compliance
	SRF #C: 544435			
	County: Monongalia			
	NPDES #WV: 0024449			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas and development of a CSO Long-Term Control Plan and system mapping
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 140.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB,V			
Rank 14	**Hancock County PSD (Route 30)**	$7,900,000	$8,200,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544431			
	County: Hancock			
	NPDES #WV: 0010584			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to approximately 210 new customers
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 137.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 15	**Chapmanville, Town of (Hidden Valley/Sunset Court)**	$5,835,000	$5,865,000	**Problem**: Direct discharges
	SRF #C: 544147			
	County: Logan			
	NPDES #WV: 0024678			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 135.00	Needs Category: IVA, IVB			
Rank 16	**Charleston, City of (Sherwood Forest)**	$3,238,000	$3,270,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544482			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0023205			**Solution**: Replace/rehab areas of the collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 135.00	Needs Category: IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 17	**Nitro, City of (Blake's Creek)**	$8,690,000	$8,700,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems, excessive I/I and sludge handling difficulties at the WWTP
	SRF #C: 544273			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0023299			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas, sanitary/storm sewer separation, replace belt filter press at the WWTP
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 135.00	Needs Category: I,IIIB,IVA,IVB,V			
Rank 18	**Shinnston, City of (Rt. 19/Rt. 20)**	$3,821,785	$3,841,785	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544109			
	County: Harrison			
	NPDES #WV: 0054500			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to approximately 170 new customers
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 135.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 19	**Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Marsh Fork)**	$22,540,000	$22,590,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems and direct discharges
	SRF #C: 544484			
	County: Raleigh			
	NPDES #WV: 0082309			**Solution**: Construct WWTP and collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 130.00	Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			
Rank 20	**Greenbrier PSD #1**	$4,048,917	$5,296,145	**Problem**: Failing septic systems & a failing system that is under DEP order in the Meadowbrook Estates subdivision
	SRF #C: 544449G			
	County: Greenbrier			
	NPDES #WV: 0089010			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas. Replace failing package plant (Meadowbrook Estates)
	Binding Date: 3/31/2014			
Points 130.00	Needs Category: I,IIIB,IVA,IVB,XII			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 21	**Kanawha PSD (Lens & Upper Witcher Creeks)**	$3,000,000	$11,900,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544222-03			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0038776			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 130.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 22	**Marshall County SD (Mozart)**	$3,160,000	$4,960,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544473			
	County: Marshall			
	NPDES #WV: 0081612			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 130.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 23	**McDowell County PSD (Coalwood)**	$2,000,000	$4,372,500	**Problem**: Collection system with a direct discharge & residents are having issues of raw sewage backing up in yards & homes
	SRF #C: 547302			
	County: Mingo			
	NPDES #WV: 0115011			**Solution**: New collection system & decentralized WWTP to serve 199 customers
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 130.00	Needs Category: XII			
Rank 24	**McDowell County PSD (Iaeger-Phase I)**	$5,710,000	$6,400,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544513			
	County: Mingo			
	NPDES #WV: 0115011			**Solution**: New collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 130.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 25	**Preston County Sewer PSD (Valley Point)**	$1,751,000	$1,875,000	**Problem**: 26 homes in the Glade Meadows subdivision send wastewater to a pond that is not adequate for wastewater treatment **Solution**: Construct a decentralized gravity sewer collection system and a 10,000 gpd extended aeration WWTP
Points 125.00	SRF #C: 547551 County: Preston NPDES #WV: 0025101 Binding Date: 9/30/2013 Needs Category: XII			
Rank 26	**Frankfort PSD (Phase II)**	$15,470,000	$18,338,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems and 4 package plants/lagoons that need eliminated **Solution**: Extend 30 mile gravity collection system to these customers & send flow to the upgraded, Chesapeake Bay compliant WWTP.
Points 120.00	SRF #C: 544411-02 County: Mineral NPDES #WV: 0010598 Binding Date: 12/31/2013 Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 27	**Greater Paw Paw PSD (Crown)** SRF #C: 547750 County: Marion NPDES #WV: 0084310 Binding Date: 9/30/2013 Needs Category: XII Points 120.00	$1,562,255	$1,572,255	**Problem** Failing septic systems & direct discharges to the ditch line **Solution** Construct decentralized treatment system using a STEP system and a collection system to serve the community
Rank 28	**Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD (Rhodell)** SRF #C: 547151 County: Raleigh NPDES #WV: 0082309 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: XII Points 115.00	$760,200	$4,510,200	**Problem** Failing septic systems and direct discharges to Stonecoal & Tommy Creeks **Solution** Construct decentralized WWTP and collection system with 11,000 LF of 6" & 8" sewers & 6,000 LF of 2" FM, 25,000 gpd package plant with a subsurface or surface discharge

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 29	**Hurricane, City of (Tackett's Branch)**	$789,100	$804,100	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 547501			
	County: Putnam			
	NPDES #WV: 0028151			**Solution**: Construct decentralized system, either STEP or STEG system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 115.00	Needs Category: XII			
Rank 30	**Shady Spring PSD (Phase II Cool Ridge/Flat Top)**	$8,600,858	$8,605,858	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544300-02			
	County: Raleigh			
	NPDES #WV: 0010575			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 115.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 31	**McDowell County PSD (McDowell)**	$1,198,500	$1,203,500	**Problem**: Direct discharge to area streams
	SRF #C: 547301			
	County: Mingo			
	NPDES #WV: 0115011			**Solution**: Construct a STEP collection system and a recirculating packaged filter treatment system with a subsurface discharge
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 110.00	Needs Category: XII			
Rank 32	**Albright, Town of**	$494,450	$1,994,450	**Problem**: Excessive I/I, unserved area
	SRF #C: 544445			
	County: Preston			
	NPDES #WV: 0024759			**Solution**: Upgrade existing collection system, new gravity sewer lines to provide service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 105.00	Needs Category: IIIA,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 33	**Beckley, City of (Phase III Red Brush)**	$4,802,330	$4,832,330	**Problem**: Failing septic systems & CSO rehabilitation for compliance
	SRF #C: 544439-03			
	County: Raleigh			
	NPDES #WV: 0023183			**Solution**: Improvements include replacing existing sewer & extending sewer to provide service to an unserved area
	Binding Date: 3/31/2014			
Points 105.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB,V			
Rank 34	**Brooke County PSD (Phase III Eldersville Rd)**	$700,000	$2,200,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544006-03			
	County: Brooke			
	NPDES #WV: 0084182			**Solution**: New gravity system to serve 89 customers in the areas of St. Johns Rd & Eldersville Rd
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 105.00	Needs Category: IVA, IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 35	**Gary, City of**	$1,500,000	$3,458,000	**Problem**: Severe I/I & deteriorated system, under WV DEP consent order
	SRF #C: 544501			
	County: McDowell			
	NPDES #WV: 0020044			**Solution**: Upgrade WWTP to improve operation & maintenance & replace areas of the collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 105.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA			
Rank 36	**Logan County PSD (Phase III B1)**	$4,340,000	$4,570,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544460-01			
	County: Logan			
	NPDES #WV: 0033821			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 105.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 37	**Logan, City of (Phase III Stollings)**	$11,006,960	$12,006,960	**Problem**: Failing septic system and direct discharges
	SRF #C: 544364-03			
	County: Logan			
	NPDES #WV: 0033821			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 105.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 38	**Ellenboro Lamberton PSD (Pullman)**	$2,000,000	$2,200,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems/direct discharges
	SRF #C: 547601			
	County: Ritchie			
	NPDES #WV: 0000000			**Solution**: Construct decentralized peat bio filter treatment system with subsurface discharge to serve approx. 70 customers in town
	Binding Date: 12/31/2013			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: XII			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 39	**Gilbert, Town of (Justice)**	$4,398,000	$4,428,000	**Problem**: Failing septic system
	SRF #C: 544502			
	County: Mingo			
	NPDES #WV: 0071820			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved area
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 40	**Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IIIC Tackett's Creek)**	$4,263,050	$9,263,050	**Problem**: Failing septic systems and direct discharges
	SRF #C: 544406-03			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0035068			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 3/31/2004			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 41	**Greater St. Albans PSD (Phase IV Thomas Hollow Rd)**	$3,445,000	$3,445,000	**Problem**: Direct discharge & failing septic systems along Thomas Hollow near Tornado
	SRF #C: 547251			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0035068			**Solution**: Construct a decentralized treatment system with a recirculating sand filter with subsurface discharge & a new gravity collection system.
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: XII			
Rank 42	**Logan County PSD (Phase III B2)**	$4,600,000	$4,900,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544460-02			
	County: Logan			
	NPDES #WV: 0033821			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 43	**Logan County PSD (Phase III B3)**	$4,580,000	$4,780,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544460-03			
	County: Logan			
	NPDES #WV: 0033821			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 44	**New Creek PSD**	$6,716,000	$6,716,000	**Problem**: Failing septic system
	SRF #C: 544527			
	County: Mineral			
	NPDES #WV: 0085456			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 45	**North Beckley PSD (Phase IIIB Piney View)**	$3,286,250	$4,786,250	**Problem**: Failing septic system
	SRF #C: 544522			
	County: Raleigh			
	NPDES #WV: 0027740			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 46	**Pocahontas PSD (Snowshoe/Linwood Area)**	$21,750,712	$21,895,712	**Problem**: Order to upgrade existing facilities and provide a regional facility
	SRF #C: 544415			
	County: Pocahontas			
	NPDES #WV: 0023311			**Solution**: Provide regional system in the Valley & extend service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 100.00	Needs Category: I,II,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 47	**Auburn, Town of**	$2,769,000	$2,769,000	**Problem**: Direct discharge, no NPDES permitted system
	SRF #C: 547201			
	County: Ritchie			
	NPDES #WV: 0000000			**Solution**: New decentralized sewer system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 90.00	Needs Category: XII			
Rank 48	**Flemington, Town of**	$2,075,000	$4,700,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544234-02			
	County: Taylor			
	NPDES #WV: 0001054			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas, expand WWTP capacity to accommodate additional customers
	Binding Date: 9/30/2013			
Points 88.00	Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 49	**Mount Zion PSD**	$1,035,000	$1,035,000	**Problem**: Antiquated WWTP and pump stations
	SRF #C: 544521			
	County: Calhoun			
	NPDES #WV: 0101702			**Solution**: Construct new WWTP, rehabilitate pump stations and upgrade portion of collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 85.00	Needs Category: I,IIIB			
Rank 50	**Weirton, City of (5th Street)**	$5,864,000	$5,904,000	**Problem**: Direct discharge, WVDEP Administrative Order
	SRF #C: 544528			
	County: Hancock			
	NPDES #WV: 0023108			**Solution**: Upgrade existing system to eliminate the discharge
	Binding Date: 9/30/2013			
Points 85.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 51	**Berkeley County PSSD (WWTP Upgrades)**	$25,411,000	$42,351,000	**Problem**: Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient discharge requirements **Solution**: Upgrade (4) WWTPs to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient discharge requirements
Points 80.00	SRF #C: 544492 County: Berkeley NPDES #WV: 0082759 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: II			
Rank 52	**Green Valley Glenwood PSD**	$1,100,000	$1,100,000	**Problem**: DEP order to eliminate SSO **Solution**: Construct pump station & force main to send flow to UV disinfection
Points 80.00	SRF #C: 544017 County: Mercer NPDES #WV: 0083186 Binding Date: 3/31/2014 Needs Category: VI			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 53	**Point Pleasant, City of**	$4,444,700	$4,454,700	**Problem**: Inability to comply with CSO requirements because of the storm flow in their system
	SRF #C: 544082			
	County: Mason			
	NPDES #WV: 0022039			**Solution**: Construction an earthen channel to treat and infiltrate storm water and remove it from the combined system
	Binding Date: 9/30/2013			
Points 80.00	Needs Category: V			
Rank 54	**White Sulphur Springs, City of**	$1,878,240	$2,889,600	**Problem**: Unable to meet Permit requirements
	SRF #C: 544542			
	County: Greenbrier			
	NPDES #WV: 0084000			**Solution**: Add phosphorus removal process to WWTP
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 80.00	Needs Category: I,II			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 55	**Alderson, Town of**	$2,545,000	$3,945,000	**Problem**: Not able to meet Permit requirements
	SRF #C: 544034			
	County: Greenbrier			
	NPDES #WV: 0024881			**Solution**: Replace WWTP and upgrade pump stations
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 75.00	Needs Category: I,II,IIIB			
Rank 56	**Dunbar, City of**	$13,010,458	$13,020,458	**Problem**: Failing septic system, excessive I/I, need to reduce energy consumption at the WWTP
	SRF #C: 544508G			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0028118			**Solution**: Rehabilitate existing sewer collection system for I/I reduction. WWTP energy upgrade includes replacement of lighting fixtures, VFD's for aerators & blowers & digester mixers.
	Binding Date: 9/30/2013			
Points 75.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB,V			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 57	**Morgantown, City of (Star City TP/Poponoe Run Upgrades)**	$47,000,000	$52,000,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I and antiquated equipment, insufficient digester capacity in Pocono Run
	SRF #C: 544520			
	County: Monongalia			
	NPDES #WV: 0023124			**Solution**: Replace RBC's with activated sludge and clarifiers, upgrade and expand digesters, upgrade Pocono Run interceptor and provide storage for CSO discharges
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 75.00	Needs Category: I,IVB			
Rank 58	**Oceana, Town of**	$5,180,000	$5,180,000	**Problem**: Inadequate capacity to treat peak flows
	SRF #C: 544525			
	County: McDowell			
	NPDES #WV: 0024431			**Solution**: Upgrade WWTP to increase the capacity
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 75.00	Needs Category: I			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 59	**Warm Springs PSD** SRF #C: 547900 County: Morgan NPDES #WV: 0027707 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I Points 75.00	$836,000	$836,000	**Problem** Large amount of electricity consumption at WWTP **Solution** Install solar panels to reduce energy consumption
Rank 60	**Charleston, City of (Porter Hollow)** SRF #C: 544270 County: Kanawha NPDES #WV: 0023205 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: IIIB Points 70.00	$6,782,000	$6,814,000	**Problem** Excessive I/I **Solution** Replace/rehab areas of the collection system

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 61	**Matewan, Town of (WWTP replacement)**	$6,130,000	$6,160,000	**Problem**: DEP Enforcement Action; unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements
	SRF #C: 544534			
	County: Mingo			
	NPDES #WV: 0024783			**Solution**: Upgrade WWTP
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 70.00	Needs Category: I			
Rank 62	**Northern Wayne County PSD (CS Rehab)**	$1,034,080	$1,034,080	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544523			
	County: Wayne			
	NPDES #WV: 0089621			**Solution**: Replace collection lines
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 70.00	Needs Category: IIIA			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 63	**Oakvale Road PSD (Green Acres)**	$1,500,000	$4,484,000	**Problem**: Unserved areas
	SRF #C: 544524			
	County: Mercer			
	NPDES #WV: 0080489			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 70.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 64	**Ripley, City of**	$12,000,000	$13,415,000	**Problem**: Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544526			
	County: Jackson			
	NPDES #WV: 0027791			**Solution**: I/I study, interim measures to meet limits; replace a portion of the collection system & pump stations. Select site for regional WWTP
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 70.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 65	**Ronceverte, City of**	$16,898,000	$21,198,000	**Problem**: Need to comply with Greenbrier river phosphorus limits **Solution**: Upgrade WWTP
Points 70.00	SRF #C: 544267 County: Greenbrier NPDES #WV: 0023246 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I,II			
Rank 66	**Boone County PSD (West Madison/Danville)**	$3,900,000	$4,370,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I, antiquated equipment at WWTP **Solution**: Replace/rehab areas of the existing collection system; replace mechanical bar screen, uv unit, belt filter press; upgrade capital orbal unit and clarifier capacity
Points 65.00	SRF #C: 544494 County: Boone NPDES #WV: 0035939 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I,IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 67	**Clarksburg, City of**	$11,500,000	$11,500,000	**Problem**: Working toward CSO compliance **Solution**: Upgrading the Clarksburg WWTP to handle flows up to 18 MGD. Add SCADA system.
	SRF #C: 544060-02 County: Harrison NPDES #WV: 0023302 Binding Date: 12/31/2013 Needs Category: IIIB,V			
Points 65.00				
Rank 68	**Malden PSD**	$20,070,238	$20,107,000	**Problem**: Inadequate capacity to treat peak flows, excessive I/I, deteriorated force mains. Under Consent Order. **Solution**: Construct a new WWTP, install new force mains, & line existing gravity sewers to eliminate I/I
	SRF #C: 544480 County: Kanawha NPDES #WV: 0050610 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB			
Points 65.00				

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 69	**Martinsburg, City of**	$47,738,381	$47,738,381	**Problem**: Existing system unable to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria
	SRF #C: 544197			**Solution**: Upgrade existing WWTP
	County: Berkeley			
	NPDES #WV: 0023167			
	Binding Date: 9/30/2013			
Points 65.00	Needs Category: I,II			
Rank 70	**Masontown, Town of**	$7,680,000	$9,280,000	**Problem**: Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements
	SRF #C: 544124			**Solution**: Upgrade existing WWTP
	County: Preston			
	NPDES #WV: 0015627			
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 65.00	Needs Category: I,II			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 71	**Pratt, Town of**	$1,196,000	$1,196,000	**Problem**: Pump stations are unreliable, need to reduce I/I from their system and make improvements at the WWTP to comply with order # 6464
	SRF #C: 544464			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0021784			**Solution**: Rehab/abandoned pump stations and manholes and install necessary equipment at the WWTP
	Binding Date: 12/31/2013			
Points 65.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA,IIIB			
Rank 72	**St. Albans, City of**	$2,990,480	$3,010,480	**Problem**: Increase energy efficiency of the WWTP & pump stations have deteriorated
	SRF #C: 544489G			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0023175			**Solution**: Replace UV disinfection system with a lower power cost system, install a DO control system on the blowers, & replace the 5 lift stations that are beyond their useful life
	Binding Date: 3/31/2014			
Points 65.00	Needs Category: I,IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 73	**Barrackville, Town of (Phase II Coal Camp)**	$250,000	$1,050,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I **Solution**: Separation of storm and sanitary sewers
	SRF #C: 544438-02 County: Marion NPDES #WV: 0081434 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: V			
Points 60.00				
Rank 74	**Benwood, City of (Phase I)**	$3,452,555	$3,499,555	**Problem**: Excessive I/I **Solution**: Separation of storm and sanitary sewers
	SRF #C: 544531 County: Marshall NPDES #WV: 0020648 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: V			
Points 60.00				

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 75	**Bluefield, City of (WWTP Upgrades & PS replacement)**	$2,426,750	$2,962,750	**Problem**: Failing pump stations, WWTP facility requires intensive maintenance **Solution**: Upgrade WWTP (with energy efficient options) & replace pumps. Upgrade includes 8 new blowers with VFD's, fine bubble diffusers, replace roof, generator, pumps, clarifier rakes & scrapers & install telemetry
Points 60.00	SRF #C: 544493G County: Mercer NPDES #WV: 0023141 Binding Date: 9/30/2013 Needs Category: I			
Rank 76	**Cedar Grove, Town of**	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	**Problem**: Severe I/I, working towards CSO compliance **Solution**: Line existing clay sewer lines, smoke test existing sewers & prepare CSO Long-Term Control Plan
Points 60.00	SRF #C: 544280-02 County: Kanawha NPDES #WV: 0035637 Binding Date: 9/30/2013 Needs Category: IIIA,V			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 77	**Central Boaz PSD**	$1,500,000	$1,875,000	**Problem**: Unserved area and existing WWTP aeration & decanting systems aren't functioning properly & UV disinfection has reached the end of its useful life.
	SRF #C: 544059			**Solution**: New pressure sewer system and upgrade WWTP
	County: Wood			
	NPDES #WV: 0084221			
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			
Rank 78	**Kenova, City of**	$855,662	$1,711,324	**Problem**: Sanitary sewer overflows
	SRF #C: 544095-02			**Solution**: Sanitary/Storm sewer separation
	County: Wayne			
	NPDES #WV: 0035912			
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: V			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 79	**Matewan, Town of (Red Jacket)**	$3,000,000	$5,380,000	**Problem**: Failing vacuum collection and on-site systems
	SRF #C: 544474			
	County: Mingo			
	NPDES #WV: 0024783			**Solution**: New Gravity system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 80	**Mingo County PSD (Chattaroy)**	$1,013,000	$2,513,000	**Problem**: Failing septic systems & sections of existing collection system are near collapse
	SRF #C: 544312			
	County: Mingo			
	NPDES #WV: 0037699			**Solution**: Extend sewer service to approximately 51 customers & replace sections of existing system.
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: IIIB,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 81	**Montgomery, City of (6th St.)**	$809,700	$844,700	**Problem**: Damaged pump station difficult to safely operate and maintain
	SRF #C: 544517G			
	County: Fayette			
	NPDES #WV: 0020621			**Solution**: Relocate the pump station & provide fencing & emergency generator. The new pump station is expected to save more than 20% in energy costs.
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: IIIB			
Rank 82	**Montgomery, City of (CS Rehab)**	$2,020,500	$2,020,500	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544515			
	County: Fayette			
	NPDES #WV: 0020621			**Solution**: Rehabilitate existing system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: IIIA			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 83	**Montgomery, City of (WWTP Improvements)**	$2,695,000	$2,775,000	**Problem**: WWTP is unable to handle peak flows
	SRF #C: 544516			
	County: Fayette			
	NPDES #WV: 0020621			**Solution**: Construction two new clarifiers & upgrade the disinfection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: I			
Rank 84	**Parkersburg, City of (19th Street)**	$12,100,000	$12,100,000	**Problem**: Failing RBC's & primary sludge pumps are causing the WWTP to be inadequate to treat peak flows
	SRF #C: 544354-02G			
	County: Wood			
	NPDES #WV: 0023213			**Solution**: Upgrade WWTP. Anticipated energy savings are associated with the project.
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: I			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 85	**Philippi, City of**	$5,102,000	$5,102,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I in combined sewers
	SRF #C: 544355			
	County: Barbour			
	NPDES #WV: 0021857			**Solution**: Separate portion of collection system in northern section of city and replace North lift station force main
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: V			
Rank 86	**West Dunbar PSD**	$6,000,000	$7,500,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544168			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0089591			**Solution**: Rehabilitate all existing pump stations & replace/rehab all VCP lines
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 60.00	Needs Category: IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 87	**Winfield, Town of**	$1,895,000	$1,900,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544440-02 County: Putnam NPDES #WV: 0024503 Binding Date: 6/30/2014			**Solution**: Replace manholes, rehabilitate and or replace collection system
Points 60.00	Needs Category: IIIA,IIIB			
Rank 88	**Cairo, Town of**	$1,035,000	$1,035,000	**Problem**: Components of the collection & treatment system are failing
	SRF #C: 547101 County: Ritchie NPDES #WV: 0084212 Binding Date: 6/30/2014			**Solution**: Rehab manholes, pump stations and construct new WWTP
Points 55.00	Needs Category: I,IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 89	**Charles Town, City of**	$4,951,600	$4,951,600	**Problem**: Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient discharge requirements **Solution**: Upgrade Samuel's St./Patrick Henry/Walmart pump stations, construction new pump station Willow Spring TP, construct force main upgrade and Phase I improvements to Charles Town WWTP
Points 55.00	SRF #C: 544164 County: Jefferson NPDES #WV: 0022349 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: II,IIIB,IVA,IVB			
Rank 90	**Elkins, City of**	$2,458,300	$2,468,300	**Problem**: Excessive I/I **Solution**: Rehabilitate collection system and separate combined sewers
Points 55.00	SRF #C: 544067 County: Randolph NPDES #WV: 0020028 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: V			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 91	**Huntington, City of (13th St)**	$11,533,640	$11,533,640	**Problem**: 13th St pump station is 50 years old and is suffering pipe failures, the 54 inch mainline and magnetic meter which carries the entire flow is failing due to hydrogen sulfide, the WWTP effluent line has buckled & existing fly ash lagoon is being closed out **Solution**: Rehabilitate the 13 St pump station, replace 230' of 54" in force main and the magnetic meter, replace the WWTP outfall/diffuser & construct bio-retention basin to replace the fly ash lagoon.
Points 55.00	SRF #C: 544443 County: Cabell NPDES #WV: 0023159 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I,IIIB,VI			
Rank 92	**Preston County Sewer PSD (Bruceton Mills)**	$2,867,500	$2,872,500	**Problem**: Antiquated equipment at both TP and Brandonville pump station **Solution**: Upgrade WWTP and pump station
Points 55.00	SRF #C: 544538 County: Preston NPDES #WV: 0025101 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I,IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 93	**Romney, City of**	$5,600,000	$16,172,768	**Problem**: Sanitary sewer overflows and comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient criteria
	SRF #C: 544031			
	County: Hampshire			
	NPDES #WV: 0020699			**Solution**: Construct new WWTP with increased capacity and comply with nutrient requirements
	Binding Date: 9/30/2013			
Points 55.00	Needs Category: I,II,IIIB			
Rank 94	**West Union, Town of (Wabash Area)**	$1,023,000	$2,523,000	**Problem**: Working toward CSO compliance
	SRF #C: 544441			
	County: Doddridge			
	NPDES #WV: 0020109			**Solution**: Construction of new sanitary sewer system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 55.00	Needs Category: V			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 95	**West Union, Town of (WWTP upgrade)**	$5,450,000	$5,450,000	**Problem**: Not meeting Permit requirements, hydraulically overloaded
	SRF #C: 544171			
	County: Doddridge			
	NPDES #WV: 0020109			**Solution**: Increase capacity
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 55.00	Needs Category: I			
Rank 96	**Belle, Town of (Phase III)**	$2,599,500	$4,599,500	**Problem**: Antiquated WWTP not meeting permit requirements
	SRF #C: 544177-04			
	County: Kanawha			
	NPDES #WV: 0021946			**Solution**: Replace WWTP with package plant, repair existing tanks to serve as equalization basins and clarifier
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 50.00	Needs Category: I			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 97	**Claywood Park PSD (Phase II Spring Valley)**	$2,211,000	$2,211,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I, existing collection system undersized **Solution**: Construct new collection system
Points 50.00	SRF #C: 544498 County: Wood NPDES #WV: 0043991 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 98	**Elizabeth, Town of**	$2,862,100	$2,862,100	**Problem**: Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES Permit requirements, need to comply with DEP order **Solution**: Construct new .15 MGD WWTP
Points 50.00	SRF #C: 544143-02 County: Wirt NPDES #WV: 0041505 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I,II			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 99	**Greater Paw Paw PSD (Phase II)**	$2,000,000	$2,930,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I, & construct Phase II of the LTCP to reduce CSO outfalls
	SRF #C: 544509			
	County: Marion			
	NPDES #WV: 0084310			**Solution**: Replace portions of collection system in Fairview Area and Orchard Hill Area
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 50.00	Needs Category: V			
Rank 100	**Mannington, City of**	$5,471,895	$5,621,895	**Problem**: Inadequate capacity, failing septic systems, package plant not meeting permit requirements
	SRF #C: 544511			
	County: Marion			
	NPDES #WV: 0024953			**Solution**: Upgrade TP to handle additional flows, extend service to unserved areas
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 50.00	Needs Category: I,II,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 101	**Morgantown, City of (Bakers Ridge)**	$3,871,000	$4,750,000	**Problem**: Package plants not meeting permit limits **Solution**: Extend collection system to eliminate the package plants
Points 50.00	SRF #C: 544512 County: Monongalia NPDES #WV: 0023124 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 102	**Vienna, City of**	$1,788,000	$1,788,000	**Problem**: Main pump station has exceeded useful life **Solution**: Upgrade 12th St. pump station
Points 50.00	SRF #C: 544211 County: Wood NPDES #WV: 0023221 Binding Date: 12/31/2013 Needs Category: IIIB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 103	**Wellsburg, City of** SRF #C: 5444362-02 County: Brooke NPDES #WV: 0026832 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: V	$4,000,000	$4,000,000	**Problem** Excessive I/I - CSO **Solution** Separation of storm and sanitary sewers
Points 50.00				
Rank 104	**Williamstown (CS) Sewer Line Replacement** SRF #C: 544386 County: Wood NPDES #WV: 0022071 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: IIIB	$300,000	$300,000	**Problem** Deteriorated sewer line **Solution** Replace existing gravity sewer lines, four manholes, and the relocation of 200 l.f. water line
Points 50.00				

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 105	**Flatwoods-Canoe Run PSD**	$8,000,000	$13,000,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I - CSO
	SRF #C: 544316-02			
	County: Braxton			
	NPDES #WV: 0084042			**Solution**: Rehabilitation of existing sewer system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 45.00	Needs Category: IIIB,V			
Rank 106	**Meadow Creek PSD**	$570,000	$2,348,112	**Problem**: Deteriorated and failing package plant and failing septic systems
	SRF #C: 544514			
	County: Summers			
	NPDES #WV: 0550745			**Solution**: New WWTP, extend collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 40.00	Needs Category: I,IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 107	**North Beckley PSD (Phase II Stanaford Acres)**	$2,680,200	$2,685,200	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544157-04			
	County: Raleigh			
	NPDES #WV: 0027740			**Solution**: Rehabilitate and/or replace collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 40.00	Needs Category: IIIB			
Rank 108	**Northern Wayne County PSD (Dock's Creek)**	$2,583,080	$3,583,080	**Problem**: Under sized/high maintenance grinder system & failing septic systems.
	SRF #C: 544402			
	County: Wayne			
	NPDES #WV: 0089621			**Solution**: Replace system with gravity collection & pick up 256 new customers
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 40.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 109	**Petersburg, City of**	$6,060,932	$8,658,475	**Problem**: Existing WWTP unable to meet NPDES permit requirements, need to comply with Chesapeake Bay nutrient discharge requirements
	SRF #C: 544536			
	County: Grant			
	NPDES #WV: 0021792			**Solution**: Retrofit existing oxidation ditches and adding a 4th oxidation ditch & filters
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 40.00	Needs Category: II			
Rank 110	**Keyser, City of**	$5,180,000	$26,000,000	**Problem**: Working towards Chesapeake Bay compliance
	SRF #C: 544023-03			
	County: Mineral			
	NPDES #WV: 0084042			**Solution**: Construction new WWTP that will meet nutrient criteria
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 35.00	Needs Category: I,II			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 111	**Oak Hill, City of**	$13,600,000	$14,000,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544535			
	County: Fayette			
	NPDES #WV: 0022028			**Solution**: Upgrade both WWTP's and repair and/or replace collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 35.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA			
Rank 112	**Pennsboro, City of**	$4,973,900	$4,973,900	**Problem**: Unable to meet permit limits
	SRF #C: 544409-03			
	County: Ritchie			
	NPDES #WV: 0025739			**Solution**: Install SBR and conversion of existing units to sludge holding tanks
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 35.00	Needs Category: I			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 113	**Buffalo Creek PSD**	$5,136,700	$5,487,900	**Problem**: WWTP is experiencing difficulties & upgrades are needed to comply with state regs.
	SRF #C: 544092-03			
	County: Boone			
	NPDES #WV: 0038351			**Solution**: Upgrade equipment to comply with State requirements
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 30.00	Needs Category: I			
Rank 114	**Center PSD (Phase I)**	$1,500,000	$2,309,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I & aging WWTP equipment
	SRF #C: 544268-01			
	County: Wyoming			
	NPDES #WV: 0027138			**Solution**: Rehabilitate and upgrade WWTP & replace areas of the collection system & manholes
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 30.00	Needs Category: I,IIIA,IVA,VI			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 115	**Chapmanville, Town of (TP Upgrade)**	$6,550,000	$6,580,350	**Problem**: Failing WWTP, needs upgraded
	SRF #C: 544483			
	County: Logan			
	NPDES #WV: 0024678			**Solution**: Rehabilitate and upgrade WWTP
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 30.00	Needs Category: I,IIIB			
Rank 116	**Deckers Creek PSD**	$2,145,000	$2,145,000	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544252			
	County: Monongalia			
	NPDES #WV: 0040517			**Solution**: Rehab/Replace areas of the collection system
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 30.00	Needs Category: IIIA			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 117	**Grafton, City of**	$2,969,820	$4,469,820	**Problem**: Working toward CSO compliance **Solution**: Rehabilitation of existing sewer system, separation of storm and sanitary sewers
Points 30.00	SRF #C: 544477 County: Taylor NPDES #WV: 0021822 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: V			
Rank 118	**Harpers Ferry-Bolivar PSD**	$1,943,103	$1,943,103	**Problem**: Replace aging critical assets identified in the Asset Management Plan **Solution**: Upgrade existing system, (i.e. blowers, diffusers, disinfection, & electrical control's)
Points 30.00	SRF #C: 544504 County: Jefferson NPDES #WV: 0039136 Binding Date: 6/30/2014 Needs Category: I			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

Rank/Points	Project	SRF Loan Amount	Total Costs	Problem / Solution
Rank 119	**Jefferson County PSD**	$9,866,461	$10,037,082	**Problem**: Collection system is near design capacity
	SRF #C: 544505			
	County: Jefferson			
	NPDES #WV: 0084361			**Solution**: Construct new gravity interceptor, pump station & force main & eliminate several existing pump stations
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 30.00	Needs Category: IVA,IVB			
Rank 120	**Beckley, City of (Phase IIIB Mool & Koch Ave)**	$3,602,600	$3,602,600	**Problem**: Excessive I/I
	SRF #C: 544491			
	County: Raleigh			
	NPDES #WV: 0023183			**Solution**: New sanitary sewers, rehab existing sewers
	Binding Date: 6/30/2014			
Points 20.00	Needs Category: IIIA			

Needs Category Definitions: I. Secondary Treatment - II. Advance Treatment - IIIA. I/I Correction - IIIB. Major Sewer Rehab - IVA. New Collector Sewer - IVB. New Interceptor Sewer - V. CSO Correction - VI. Storm Water Controls - XII. - Decentralized

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED BINDING COMMITMENTS BY QUARTER

Appendix B - Binding Commitments and Cash Draw Proportionality
Projects Budgeted for the Federal FY 2013 Grant

Name	Equiv.	Project Scope	Proj Num C-544___	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2012 ($1,000)			
					1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June
Martinsburg	N	Ch. Bay Upgrade	147	D2		31,290		
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		0		
Total Projects and Admin					0	31,290	0	0

Federal Share (0.8333)					$0.00	26,074	0	0	26,074
State Share (0.1667)					$0.00	5,216	0	0	5,216
Total**					$0.00	31,290	0	0	31,290

Payment Schedule for the CWSRF Program: CS-540001-13

Federal Quarter	Payment Date	CWSRF Amount	Cumulative Amount
		$20,813,000	$20,813,000

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

Appendix C - Projects Budgeted for FY 2014 Intended Use Plan

Name	Equiv.	Project Scope	Proj Num C-54	Activity Code	State Fiscal Year 2014 ($1,000) 1st Qtr July-Sept	2nd Qtr Oct-Dec	3rd Qtr Jan-Mar	4th Qtr Apr-June	PPL Ranking
Clarksburg	N	CSO work	060-02	D2		11,500			67
Dunbar	N	CS rehab/ext.	508	D2		12,560			56
Ellensboro Lamberton PSD (gree	N	Dec. WWTP	7601	D2			2,420		38
Flemington	Y	WWTP Upgrade/cs ext	234-02	D3		3,575			48
Greater Paw Paw PSD (green)	N	Dec. WWTP	069-01	D2	1,562				27
Kenova	N	CSO work	506	D2		1,017			78
Lincoln Co. Ph. V (green)	N	Dec. WWTP	7-801	D2		676			N/A
Martinsburg	N	C. Bay WWTP	147	D2		31,290			69
Pea Ridge	N	WWTP Upgrade/cs ext	442	D2				9,926	12
Preston County PSD (green)	N	Dec. WWTP	487	D3	1,751				25
Romney	Y	C. Bay WWTP	031	D2		5,600			93
Weirton	N	CS ext.	528	D3			5,904		50
DEP Administration	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a		0			
NPS - Agriculture	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	25	25	25		
NPS - Onsite	BMP	various	N/A	N/A	300				
				sub-total	3,638	66,243	8,349	9,926	
							grand total	88,156	

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 one year 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

"NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING"

The West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection has scheduled a public hearing on June 11, 2013, at 1:30 pm to discuss the ***Draft Fiscal Year 2014 Intended Use Plan*** for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund Program (CWSRF). A part of the Intended Use Plan is the Fiscal Year 2014 Priority List. The hearing will take place at the DEP headquarters in Charleston in the New River Conference Room (Room #2129). A copy of the draft Fiscal Year 2014 Intended Use Plan is available, and may be requested by calling, writing or sending an email request to the address below. The plan can also be viewed on DEP's web site.

Contact

Katheryn Emery
WV Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Water & Waste Management
Clean Water State Revolving Fund
601 57th Street, SE
Charleston, WV 25304
(304) 926-0499 Ext. 1596
Katheryn.D.Emery@wv.gov

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

FY 2014 INTENDED USE PLAN PUBLIC HEARING

JUNE 11, 2013 – 1:30PM

ATTENDANCE SHEET

NAME	COMPANY
ROSE BRODERSEN	WV DEP
Elbert Morton	WV DEP
CARRIE GRIMM	WVDEP
Don Wang	WVDEP
Heddy Clair King	Public ø@suddenlink.net
Henry Theodore	private man
Representing public: by Richard Sweeler	Private citizen
RICHARD D. BERTOLOTTI	WV DEP
Jefferson E. Brady	WV DEP
Samme L. Gee	Jackson Kelly PLLC
Kathy Emery	WVDEP
Suzi Adkins	WVDEP

CWSRF FY2014 Intended Use Plan

Public Hearing

June 11, 2013

Kathy Emery

This is the public hearing for the 2014 Intended Use Plan for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. I'm going to be covering this document, and if you have any questions on this document, we will try to answer them.

The 2014 Intended Use Plan covers July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014. I will just be skimming through the document. I will be covering any major points and any changes from last year.

The Sources and Use Chart – Page 4 covers the funds in the program as of March 31, 2013, new funds available during FY2014, less existing project loans, binding commitments, as of March 31, 2013 and the (2) Nonpoint Source Programs, plus DEP Administration, which leaves net available fund of $82,359,269.

Richard Swecker

I do see $82,359,269 for FY2014. But when I look at the actual projects to be funded, it looks like grants and loans are ten times what your net funds are. So I wonder if you have $80,000,000, how you grant and loan $800,000,000?

Kathy Emery

This is an annual Priority List that is a requirement of EPA in order to get funded. We fund on a first come first serve basis. Not every single community will be receiving money this year. We receive their applications, we do not deny anyone the ability to be on the priority list, and it is up to them how quickly they move their project thru and if they get it thru while we have funds this upcoming year. We do not outlay and say these people are getting the money. It's up to each community to get their project thru and to get it funded. There is a lot more needs than funds in this state. And that consists of all funding agencies. I have two notes that are at the bottom of the page as of March 31, 2013, $7,041,018 remains to be committed for loan forgiveness and $3,930,419 remains to be allocated to green projects as dictated by EPA.

Heddy Clair King

How do you get loan forgiveness?

Kathy Emery

I'll cover that under the terms for that.

Goals have been consistent over the years for the program. We did make one change to the Short Term goals for 2014 and that is #5. Working with other funding agencies to fund the required nutrient reduction projects of the WV's Chesapeake Bay communities. Those communities are required to be meeting nutrient effluent criteria by the end of 2015 in accordance with their permit. If you will note on the project priority list section which is something you're asking for it states in paragraph two we will continue to fund projects on a first-come first-served basis regardless of their position on the priority list, as long as all applicable program requirements have been met and the project is within six months of construction. And in order also to reach that point they must have received recommendation from the WV IJDC before we can fund that project.

Henry Theodore

Your comment about six months is when you give them your money you want to see them under construction within six month?

Kathy Emery

Yes.

Section 5 on page 7 covers the terms on our loans. Based upon the median household income of the area that has the project. If the proposed wastewater bill is less than 1.5% MHI: 2% interest rate, 1% annual admin fee, 20 year term, 1.5% to 1.74% MHI: ½% interest rate, ½% annual admin fee, 21-30 year term, 1.75% MHI or higher: 0% interest rate, ½% annual admin fee, 31-40 year term.

One of the other changes that is coming this FY with our program, the DWSRF program, the WVIJDC is we are moving to the 2010 census data set. WVIJDC is filing their legislation that will be up at the next session in February. Once that legislation is approved, we will be updating the MHI data scores from the 2000 to the 2010 data set. Only projects that have a valid binding commitment letter and have filed for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity with the PSC by April 1, 2014 or the effective date of the legislation approving the IJDC legislative rule amendment will proceed to project closing with the 2000 MHI data.

Richard Swecker

Can I ask a question about the 40 year loans?

40 years is a long time to fund anything. An automobile, a sewer project, or a water project. So in forty years it is most likely to be obsolete. But if its forty year bonds and 20 years from now the system in whole or in part must be replaced, that bond is still on the books so how do you

handle those old bonds when the new project must be instituted to replace or correct what is now in place.

Kathy Emery

40 years bonds are an option for the community to choose. No one is going to mandate that they do a 40 years bond term. It is an option that EPA laid out for us to finance projects to lessen the rate impact on the individual customers. If they do need another project within the 40 years terms they will have to finance or pursue grant funding to funding the additional project.

Henry Theodore

I'm confused. You are basically saying this is grant money?

Kathy Emery

No sir. This is loan money. We do have a certain pot of money called debt forgiveness that EPA mandates a certain amount of the grant that they give us we have to give out in the form of grants. However, this program is predominately loan. You asked about the additional subsidization - EPA mandates us to set aside 10% for green projects. The amount for FY2014 is $2,081,300 in green projects. On page 8 it talks about the debt forgiveness that we have to give out to the communities on a first-come first-serve basis. And the minimum amount for the grant this year is $983,155 with the maximum for $1,474,732. In accordance with the CWSRF state statute that says in part "moneys in the fund shall be used to make grants for projects to the extent allowed or authorized by federal law" we are setting aside the maximum amount to provide additional loan subsidies to communities for their projects. There are a couple of rules on there, if you look on page 8 at 1, 2 & 3 if tells how you qualify for this money. Again readiness to proceed to construction is the primary criteria. This money is also first-come first-serve. So when we run out of money we run out of money.

Heddy Clair King

So the $2,000,000 for green projects is state wide?

Kathy Emery

Yes. We are state wide.

Heddy Clair King

Then why is drinking water related projects prohibited for qualifying for this money?

Kathy Emery

We are a clean water state revolving fund loan program. If you have a drinking water related project, there is a drinking water loan program that also has to do green. You should be pursuing those from public health that runs that program.

As mentioned before, the green project reserve in accordance with EPA there are 4 different categories. Energy efficiency, water efficiency, storm water/green infrastructure, and environmentally innovative. These categories have not changed since the last IUP. The subsizidation amount has not changed since the last IUP.

Energy efficiency and the environmentally innovative, the decentralized sewer system projects, are the type of green projects we have funded.

Page 10, the annual administrative fee, previously there is an admin fee on every single loan issued. The amount budgeted for the administrative project costs for the CWSRF program for FY2014 is $2,644,172.

There is not a limit on page 11 set on the maximum amount of funds available to any single project. We are still continuing the bond anticipating note leveraging program if a community would like to pursue that with us.

The bond terms: there are 30-year and 40-year bond terms available as approved by EPA to allow us to do that. It gives us an opportunity to help offset the rate to the individual customer if the community qualifies for either of those programs.

In Section H on page 13, the formal commitment and the binding commitment is where we lock in the loan to the community. Once the binding commitment letter is issued it is good for six months. We hold that money back to fund that project. Once determined that that project can realistically proceed to construction within six months, a formal commitment of funding will be made to that project. You have to be on the current year's priority list in order to receive funds, which is why we have so many communities on our priority list.

Richard Swecker

Ms. Emery are you saying that there is competition among communities to get the funds ahead of the next guy since there is a limited amount of funds. So you have two projects, A & B, and B says we have to hurry up and get ours done or A is going to get our money. Does that come in to play?

Kathy Emery

I would have to say yes that probably would come into play within communities. They understand that that is the way it is. And it is like that with every funding agency. If you were to

attend the WVIJDC meetings where all funding agencies are present, there is always more needs than money in the state to fund projects.

Communities do their best to try to get their project funded and if it doesn't happen this year they can try again next year. It was that way when we were a grant program and it is that way as a loan program.

Richard Swecker

When did you become a loan program?

Kathy Emery

I believe it was 1990, 1992 was the first loan.

We have 2 Nonpoint Source programs. We have the Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program. The set aside reserve, due to demand last year, we increased it to $150,000 to provide the match to the Agricultural Grants for those who qualify. We also have the Onsite Assistance Loan Program, which we are setting aside $300,000 as mentioned previously for 2014 for those communities.

Federal requirements: all the communities this year are still non equivalency projects. We have already meet the disadvantage business enterprise, so projects coming this year we will not have to do that. In addition to the requirement for compliance with the Single Audit Act, The City of Martinsburg, which should be funded this year, will be the only community required to comply with the Single Audit Act, which is laid out by the OMB.

Richard Swecker

The question that I would like to put forth if I may is Sustainable Development. And I understand that the DEP is coming up with Sustainable Workshops. And where I live in the country side, you see this like a flood coming into the local community. I would like for you to give us your vision that you have regarding your implementation of sustainable development as it has its effect on the people in Preston County where I come from.

Kathy Emery

I'm not sure I can answer that question in regards to Preston County. We do not have specific sustainability development criteria for projects that we issue loan funds to. Now one thing that EPA has worked with us on that we are doing under sustainability in the communities we are loaning funds to are required as program bond conditions to do an asset management plan. So that they can take stock of their assets, make sure they are properly managed, determine the longevity of all of their equipment, the location, so that they can properly manage their assets in regards to their wastewater treatment facility. But as to sustainable development that is up to your zoning, county and community to deal with that.

Richard Swecker

I believe that Randolph County has become one of the sustainability development counties. I don't believe Preston County has been so designated but doesn't that bring into play transportation, water and wastewater, housing? For instance we are seeing the United Nation Smart Communities spring up all over the country and I suppose all over the state. And I believe if you have water or a wastewater project, those future housing developments would be part of the project. Do you understand the question?

Kathy Emery

Our funds go to serving and clearing up an actual water quality impact to the community. We are building wastewater treatment plants; we are extending sewer service to unserved areas that have straight pipes, failing septic systems. We are looking to have a water quality benefit for our fund. When you are looking at smart growth and smart development that is really up to your community as to determine how that is implemented. This is for the 2014 Intended Use Plan and we do not enforce those criteria on communities.

Richard Swecker

I think I only have one more question, and I want to say thank you for hearing the questions that I have. It would be really great I think, if we had someone like you, who could actually visit the community where I am from to let them know things that you're about, what your goals are just like you are doing here. I mean we only have 3 people here today from the public, but there are millions of us out there. Instead of having Mohammed come to the mountain how about considering having the mountain come to Mohammed. Because if we have to live in this new environment that's coming we would like to know more about it and how it will affect us and how much we are going to have to pay. It would be nice if that could be arranged or considered.

Kathy Emery

I'm not sure how we would go about that or be arranged but we will take that under consideration.

Richard Swecker

Can that become part of the minutes of the meeting?

Kathy Emery

It's being recorded are we speak.

Richard Swecker

God bless you. You are doing a good job by the way.

Kathy Emery

Thank you.

Henry Theodore

Is the amount of money this $80,000,000 is this similar to last year? Or is it significally different?

Kathy Emery

The actual grants we have coming from EPA actually got smaller this year, and I anticipate them being smaller next year. The actual total dollar amount that is going to vary by how many binding commitments we had and what the pace of our program was, how much demand we had last year. I don't remember what that number was. I think this number may be a little bit higher, because the demand was less last year but I will tell you the EPA Capitalization Grant is slightly smaller, it is about $2,000,000 less. It is still more than what I anticipated getting. And with the recession and everything we've seen this year I anticipated it being less next year.

Henry Theodore

So there was committed $85,063,000 last year?

Kathy Emery

That's the money that was available to commit.

Henry Theodore

I was wondering what might have happened last year. Just a ball park number $10,000,000, $100,000,000?

Kathy Emery

I'm working on our Annual Report at the end of June 30th and I will be able to tell you. I haven't tallied that up right off the top of my head. Actually I will tell you our pace is going to be increasing because of the size of the Chesapeake Bay projects coming thru the program. So we will be issuing binding commitment letters in a higher amount than we did last year. Because of the demand at this point.

Henry Theodore

I can see that you have the $82,000,000 available, but I was just wondering what actually happened.

Richard Swecker

Is that something that you will include in your report of this meeting?

Kathy Emery

You want me to include in the minutes of how much money we issued in loans this past fiscal year?

Richard Swecker

Yes and then lay out what you are planning in the future. We would like to know that.

Kathy Emery

Yes I can get that to you. Planning in the future depends on the communities and then the demand. I can tell you I can add that up and tell you exactly how much we loaned this past fiscal year.

Richard Swecker

Loans and Grants.

Heddy Clair King

And the grants come from the Federal government?

Kathy Emery

It comes from this money that they have given to us. It is part of Capitalization Grant agreement. They tell us how much we have to give out.

Henry Theodore

So the fees alone are the repayment of the loans, whether it's 10 years or 40 years?

Kathy Emery

The sewer rates pay back the loans. It repays the loans and O&M Cost (Operation and Maintenance) to run your sewer system. That makes up your fees.

Richard Swecker

The loans themselves whatever they are like a 40 year loan, if it's to provide a sewer project for a City, the loan is not something against the City's credit? The loans actually go against the customers of the service. So the loan is not to the City

Kathy Emery

The loan is to the City.

Richard Swecker

The bonds state that the loans belong to the customers.

Kathy Emery

Let's let our Bond Attorney answer this.

Samme Gee

The type of bonds that are issued with respect to wastewater systems, the state statue, which by the way authorizes you to issue bonds up to 40 years specifically, provide that the bonds can only be paid by the revenues generated from the services of the system. I think your question is whether it's a debt of the community in a sense of against its general fund, the answer is no. These bonds are secured solely by the repayment stream coming from the customers who use the facility or the enterprise.

Richard Swecker

That's a pretty good deal if you think about it because the bonds are paid for by increased rates of the sewer. So the community at large puts up the money for the increased sewer rates which they invest in a municipal corporations system. The public does not own that sewer system, it is owned by the corporation correct?

Samme Gee

The system is owned by the municipality. The City which is comprised of all its citizens owns the system or the Public Service District.

Richard Swecker

The municipality calls itself a corporation.

Samme Gee

We've got state laws, and all these things tie back to our constitution. They are municipal corporations, which means that they have certain parameters that the state has given them under which they can operate. But one of the specific things with respect to water and sewer service is that they have to be enterprises. They have to be self-liquidating. They are supposed to generate enough revenues to pay their Operation & Maintenance debts, and to pay their debt service on the bonds that are issued to build that enterprise.

Richard Swecker

But you realize I am here on behalf of the regular people, flesh and blood people. And if you take the communities where I come from, for instance Kingwood. In Kingwood the city is falling to the ground. The store fronts are empty. People, old people there are dying off. Young families have to move away to find work. Business is moving out of the city, so what I am trying to say here is our communities our dying. And these big sewer projects cost money. If you look at Kingwood that infrastructure was put in place in the 1920's, Thrasher Engineering, but they came off with a $19,000,000 sewer project, and never touched the down town sewer, saying it would cost another $100,000,000 but we cannot afford it. The public can't afford it; maybe the corporation can, but not individuals?

Heddy Clair King

Can they not apply for grants or debt forgiveness to update the sewer?

Richard Swecker

Well they got a debt forgiveness which turned out to be a 2012B bonds so I don't know if debt forgiveness equates to a new bond. Whatever debt forgiveness is? We don't know what it is.

Kathy Emery

Let me go ahead and give it to you. If it was debt forgiveness it is listed as one of the bonds but it is forgiven. Kingwood will not have to repay that bond. It's on the books that it was from the program but its forgiveness.

Samme Gee

Kingwood had a $300,000 sewer revenue bond series B I believe that is the one that you are referring to. Kingwood will not be repaying that $300,000. It specifically says that in the bond.

Henry Theodore

And who does pay that. So where is the money that pays for what they don't pay for?

Kathy Emery

Nobody pays that. We are calling that debt forgiveness and that's what it is. We are forgiving that debt.

Henry Theodore

Federal money or State money?

Kathy Emery

It's a combination of all of it. That's one of the agreements that we agree to, when we accept the grant from EPA, that a certain dollar amount will be set aside and it will be forgiven. We will loan it out and then we will forget the debt.

Are there any other questions on our Intended Use Plan?

Samme Gee

On page 7 with respect to when the new MHI numbers become available. You have a specific provision with respect to public service districts, but if you have a municipality that serves outside of its boundaries is it City MHI only or if there are areas that it serves outside its boundaries that have a lower MHI do you do a combination?

Kathy Emery

You are talking about the County or Magisterial District which is most appropriate? If it is in a magisterial district we will look at that magisterial district to see if it is lower than the county MHI. City is still just what is in the City.

Samme Gee

If it is serving an area outside the City, with a much lower MHI does it blend that or still use the City?

Kathy Emery

It's still going to be the City. We haven't made any distinctions for that.

Samme Gee

That is a growing issue now where the cities are serving the low income areas.

Henry Theodore

I would like to ask one more question, so you don't know the actual amount of money loaned last year, but you will get that information to us somehow, the amount of money loaned last year, the total of project loans and we will also have a figure on what was the available funds and you think those numbers will be close to each other?

Kathy Emery

No. It not going to be the same number because the fund is constantly revolving. We have the funds from the previous year that is still available, plus the new money coming in this past year

all blended together, plus the additional repayments coming in. I can give you the total amount of the project we loaned last year.

Henry Theodore

So the net available is this number for 2014 is not all the money that is available.

Kathy Emery

Yes, right now for 2014, that is the money that is anticipated to be available. These are March 31 figures. The money you see there it has the cash balance that we have in our fund at this point and time. It has the new funds that are coming in with the grant, state match, repayments that our accountant calculated plus interest, plus anticipated investment earnings. Add those two numbers together you are then going to subtract the payables, that our existing projects that we have loaned money to, we are going to continue to pay their construction as they progress, existing binding commitments that we have given to communities, also subtract the money that we are holding for the Agricultural Water Quality Loan Program and Onsite Systems Loan Program minus also the administration of the program. That is how you calculate that number. We may not spend all of that. It depends on the pace of the program.

Henry Theodore

The funding available is carrying remnants of other years. And also interest. What I am interested in is just a ball park number of funds available last year compared to actually how much money was loaned last year.

Kathy Emery

I can give you those numbers from the Intended Use Plan. And I can give you the actual amount of money we spent last year.

Henry Theodore

Because last year is a fixed thing, it cannot change. We can see hard numbers. I would like to see that.

Kathy Emery

Please provide us with your addresses and we will be happy to provide you with the information you are requesting.

Are there any other comments or questions, if not then this public hearing is adjourned.

APPENDIX E

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS
(2000 Census Data Used)

Magisterial Districts	Median Household Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
B				
Barbour				
North district	24,263	40.44	35.38	30.33
South district	24,669	41.12	35.98	30.84
West district	25,958	43.26	37.86	32.45
Berkeley				
Adam Stephens district	29,702	49.50	43.32	37.13
Norborne district	48,396	80.66	70.58	60.50
Potomac district	40,546	67.58	59.13	50.68
Shenandoah district	43,481	72.47	63.41	54.35
Tuscarora district	38,848	64.75	56.65	48.56
Valley district	41,896	69.83	61.10	52.37
Boone				
District 1	23,065	38.44	33.64	28.83
District 2	25,085	41.81	36.58	31.36
District 3	28,273	47.12	41.23	35.34
Braxton				
Eastern district	26,105	43.51	38.07	32.63
Northern district	26,265	43.78	38.30	32.83
Southern district	21,348	35.58	31.13	26.69
Western district	23,904	39.84	34.86	29.88
Brooke				
Buffalo district	39,964	66.61	58.28	49.96
Cross Creek district	36,435	60.73	53.13	45.54
Follansbee district	32,056	53.43	46.75	40.07
Weirton district	35,214	58.69	51.35	44.02
Wellsburg district	29,430	49.05	42.92	36.79
C				
Cabell				
District 1	29,681	49.47	43.28	37.10
District 2	18,016	30.03	26.27	22.52
District 3	23,735	39.56	34.61	29.67
District 4	36,056	60.09	52.58	45.07
District 5	33,808	56.35	49.30	42.26
Calhoun				
District 1	20,125	33.54	29.35	25.16
District 2	22,819	38.03	33.28	28.52
District 3	25,313	42.19	36.91	31.64
District 4	23,790	39.65	34.69	29.74
District 5	17,847	29.75	26.03	22.31
Clay				
District A	21,747	36.25	31.71	27.18
District B	17,857	29.76	26.04	22.32
District C	27,196	45.33	39.66	34.00
D				
Doddridge				
Beech district	26,800	44.67	39.08	33.50
Maple district	25,870	43.12	37.73	32.34
Oak district	31,047	51.75	45.28	38.81
Pine district	25,204	42.01	36.76	31.51

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS
(2000 Census Data Used)

Magisterial Districts	Median Household Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
F				
Fayette				
New Haven district	26,075	43.46	38.03	32.59
Plateau district	23,697	39.50	34.56	29.62
Valley district	24,328	40.55	35.48	30.41
G				
Gilmer				
Center district	21,635	36.06	31.55	27.04
City district	20,243	33.74	29.52	25.30
De Kalb-Troy district	26,336	43.89	38.41	32.92
Glenville district	21,583	35.97	31.48	26.98
Grant				
Grant district	31,447	52.41	45.86	39.31
Milroy district	25,813	43.02	37.64	32.27
Union district	29,161	48.60	42.53	36.45
Greenbrier				
Central district	28,452	47.42	41.49	35.57
Eastern district	27,344	45.57	39.88	34.18
Western district	24,602	41.00	35.88	30.75
H				
Hampshire				
Bloomery district	35,765	59.61	52.16	44.71
Capon district	40,161	66.94	58.57	50.20
Gore district	30,128	50.21	43.94	37.66
Mill Creek district	33,086	55.14	48.25	41.36
Romney district	26,489	44.15	38.63	33.11
Sherman district	30,938	51.56	45.12	38.67
Springfield district	30,000	50.00	43.75	37.50
Hancock				
Butler district	36,667	61.11	53.47	45.83
Clay district	34,323	57.21	50.05	42.90
Grant district	31,225	52.04	45.54	39.03
Hardy				
Capon district	33,676	56.13	49.11	42.10
Lost River district	35,123	58.54	51.22	43.90
Moorefield district	27,904	46.51	40.69	34.88
Old Fields district	29,509	49.18	43.03	36.89
South Fork district	34,028	56.71	49.62	42.54
Harrison				
Eastern district	39,027	65.05	56.91	48.78
Northern district	28,113	46.86	41.00	35.14
North Urban district	24,834	41.39	36.22	31.04
Southern district	31,204	52.01	45.51	39.01
South Urban district	30,197	50.33	44.04	37.75
Southwest district	29,608	49.35	43.18	37.01
J				
Jackson				
Eastern district	30,111	50.19	43.91	37.64
Northern district	32,318	53.86	47.13	40.40
Western district	35,621	59.37	51.95	44.53

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS
(2000 Census Data Used)

Magisterial Districts	Median Household Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Jefferson				
Charles Town district	30,461	50.77	44.42	38.08
Harpers Ferry district	42,716	71.19	62.29	53.40
Kabletown district	53,571	89.29	78.12	66.96
Middleway district	42,372	70.62	61.79	52.97
Shepherdstown district	52,197	87.00	76.12	65.25
K				
Kanawha				
District 1	27,850	46.42	40.61	34.81
District 2	40,224	67.04	58.66	50.28
District 3	36,931	61.55	53.86	46.16
District 4	31,154	51.92	45.43	38.94
L				
Lewis				
Courthouse-Collins Settlement district	22,783	37.97	33.23	28.48
Freemans Creek district	26,100	43.50	38.06	32.63
Hackers Creek-Skin Creek district	30,878	51.46	45.03	38.60
Lincoln				
Carroll district	25,825	43.04	37.66	32.28
Duval district	20,794	34.66	30.32	25.99
Harts Creek district	21,129	35.22	30.81	26.41
Jefferson district	16,229	27.05	23.67	20.29
Laurel Hill district	16,875	28.13	24.61	21.09
Sheridan district	23,800	39.67	34.71	29.75
Union district	18,000	30.00	26.25	22.50
Washington district	35,580	59.30	51.89	44.48
Logan				
Central district	24,286	40.48	35.42	30.36
Eastern district	24,984	41.64	36.44	31.23
Western district	24,540	40.90	35.79	30.68
M				
Marion				
Middletown district	25,545	42.58	37.25	31.93
Palatine district	33,001	55.00	48.13	41.25
West Augusta district	27,287	45.48	39.79	34.11
Marshall				
District 1	33,150	55.25	48.34	41.44
District 2	23,107	38.51	33.70	28.88
District 3	36,000	60.00	52.50	45.00
Mason				
Arbuckle district	20,500	34.17	29.90	25.63
Clendenin district	26,451	44.09	38.57	33.06
Cologne district	25,700	42.83	37.48	32.13
Cooper district	25,161	41.94	36.69	31.45
Graham district	26,366	43.94	38.45	32.96
Hannan district	28,689	47.82	41.84	35.86
Lewis district	26,565	44.28	38.74	33.21
Robinson district	38,137	63.56	55.62	47.67
Union district	24,570	40.95	35.83	30.71
Waggener district	27,977	46.63	40.80	34.97

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS
(2000 Census Data Used)

Magisterial Districts	Median Household Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
McDowell				
Big Creek district	16,749	27.92	24.43	20.94
Browns Creek district	18,701	31.17	27.27	23.38
North Elkin district	17,204	28.67	25.09	21.51
Sandy River district	15,163	25.27	22.11	18.95
Mercer				
District I	25,980	43.30	37.89	32.48
District II	26,522	44.20	38.68	33.15
District III	27,292	45.49	39.80	34.12
Mineral				
District 1	32,599	54.33	47.54	40.75
District 2	24,937	41.56	36.37	31.17
District 3	33,298	55.50	48.56	41.62
Mingo				
Hardee district	26,838	44.73	39.14	33.55
Harvey district	17,096	28.49	24.93	21.37
Kermit district	17,308	28.85	25.24	21.64
Lee district	23,504	39.17	34.28	29.38
Magnolia district	20,648	34.41	30.11	25.81
Stafford district	20,938	34.90	30.53	26.17
Tug River district	25,000	41.67	36.46	31.25
Williamson district	19,635	32.73	28.63	24.54
Monongalia				
Central district	20,493	34.16	29.89	25.62
Eastern district	33,586	55.98	48.98	41.98
Western district	31,467	52.45	45.89	39.33
Monroe				
Central district	26,641	44.40	38.85	33.30
Eastern district	29,716	49.53	43.34	37.15
Western district	27,274	45.46	39.77	34.09
Morgan				
District 1	30,357	50.60	44.27	37.95
District 2	35,688	59.48	52.05	44.61
District 3	40,240	67.07	58.68	50.30
District 4	33,587	55.98	48.98	41.98
N				
Nicholas				
Beaver district	23,868	39.78	34.81	29.84
Grant district	30,441	50.74	44.39	38.05
Hamilton district	27,417	45.70	39.98	34.27
Jefferson district	23,958	39.93	34.94	29.95
Kentucky district	26,984	44.97	39.35	33.73
Summersville district	30,383	50.64	44.31	37.98
Wilderness district	30,135	50.23	43.95	37.67
O				
Ohio				
District 1	35,424	59.04	51.66	44.28
District 2	23,604	39.34	34.42	29.51
District 3	32,760	54.60	47.78	40.95
P				

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS
(2000 Census Data Used)

Magisterial Districts	Median Household Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Pendleton				
Central district	31,349	52.25	45.72	39.19
Eastern district	31,494	52.49	45.93	39.37
Western district	26,737	44.56	38.99	33.42
Pleasants				
District A	34,574	57.62	50.42	43.22
District B	30,043	50.07	43.81	37.55
District C	30,190	50.32	44.03	37.74
District D	39,286	65.48	57.29	49.11
Pocahontas				
Edray district	24,437	40.73	35.64	30.55
Greenbank district	26,888	44.81	39.21	33.61
Huntersville district	27,266	45.44	39.76	34.08
Little Levels district	30,444	50.74	44.40	38.06
Preston				
Fifth district	24,433	40.72	35.63	30.54
First district	31,389	52.32	45.78	39.24
Fourth district	25,176	41.96	36.72	31.47
Second district	30,802	51.34	44.92	38.50
Third district	28,500	47.50	41.56	35.63
Putnam				
Buffalo-Union district	33,514	55.86	48.87	41.89
Curry district	40,109	66.85	58.49	50.14
Pocatalico district	36,175	60.29	52.76	45.22
Scott district	46,708	77.85	68.12	58.39
Teays district	53,444	89.07	77.94	66.81
R				
Raleigh				
District 1	28,802	48.00	42.00	36.00
District 2	27,295	45.49	39.81	34.12
District 3	28,675	47.79	41.82	35.84
Randolph				
Beverly district	30,991	51.65	45.20	38.74
Dry Fork district	26,875	44.79	39.19	33.59
Huttonsville district	24,750	41.25	36.09	30.94
Leadsville district	28,311	47.19	41.29	35.39
Middle Fork district	23,571	39.29	34.37	29.46
Mingo district	21,299	35.50	31.06	26.62
New Interest district	28,786	47.98	41.98	35.98
Roaring Creek district	23,989	39.98	34.98	29.99
Valley Bend district	29,750	49.58	43.39	37.19
Ritchie				
Clay district	30,938	51.56	45.12	38.67
Grant district	29,440	49.07	42.93	36.80
Murphy district	22,368	37.28	32.62	27.96
Union district	26,158	43.60	38.15	32.70
Roane				
Eastern district	22,534	37.56	32.86	28.17
Northern district	22,088	36.81	32.21	27.61
Southern district	26,274	43.79	38.32	32.84

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS
(2000 Census Data Used)

Magisterial Districts	Median Household Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Western district	28,382	47.30	41.39	35.48
S				
Summers				
Bluestone River district	24,275	40.46	35.40	30.34
Greenbrier River district	20,996	34.99	30.62	26.25
New River district	18,285	30.48	26.67	22.86
T				
Taylor				
Eastern district	25,506	42.51	37.20	31.88
Tygart district	23,848	39.75	34.78	29.81
Western district	32,488	54.15	47.38	40.61
Tucker				
Black Fork district	26,974	44.96	39.34	33.72
Clover district	24,671	41.12	35.98	30.84
Davis district	22,841	38.07	33.31	28.55
Dry Fork district	38,750	64.58	56.51	48.44
Fairfax district	21,164	35.27	30.86	26.46
Licking district	12,014	20.02	17.52	15.02
St. George district	33,194	55.32	48.41	41.49
Tyler				
Central district	28,289	47.15	41.25	35.36
North district	33,781	56.30	49.26	42.23
South district	27,188	45.31	39.65	33.99
West district	28,864	48.11	42.09	36.08
U				
Upshur				
First district	26,647	44.41	38.86	33.31
Second district	26,646	44.41	38.86	33.31
Third district	27,948	46.58	40.76	34.94
W				
Wayne				
Butler district	29,170	48.62	42.54	36.46
Ceredo district	28,071	46.79	40.94	35.09
Stonewall district	19,510	32.52	28.45	24.39
Union district	29,549	49.25	43.09	36.94
Westmoreland district	30,581	50.97	44.60	38.23
Webster				
Central district	20,175	33.63	29.42	25.22
Northern district	21,069	35.12	30.73	26.34
Southern district	21,555	35.93	31.43	26.94
Wetzel				
District 1	26,374	43.96	38.46	32.97
District 2	34,096	56.83	49.72	42.62
District 3	33,750	56.25	49.22	42.19
Wirt				
Central district	29,138	48.56	42.49	36.42
Northeast district	32,703	54.51	47.69	40.88
Southwest district	29,912	49.85	43.62	37.39
Wood				
Clay district	35,891	59.82	52.34	44.86

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND AVERAGE BILLS
(2000 Census Data Used)

Magisterial Districts	Median Household Income	Average Bill Based on		
		2.00%	1.75%	1.50%
Harris district	33,382	55.64	48.68	41.73
Lubeck district	41,218	68.70	60.11	51.52
Parkersburg district	28,630	47.72	41.75	35.79
Slate district	37,609	62.68	54.85	47.01
Steele district	29,313	48.86	42.75	36.64
Tygart district	30,172	50.29	44.00	37.72
Union district	40,701	67.84	59.36	50.88
Walker district	27,372	45.62	39.92	34.22
Williams district	41,129	68.55	59.98	51.41
Wyoming				
District 1	24,152	40.25	35.22	30.19
District 2	23,009	38.35	33.55	28.76
District 3	24,973	41.62	36.42	31.22

APPENDIX E1

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY MUNICIPALITY AND COUNTY

Municipality	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Addison (Webster Springs) town	20,592	21.45	25.74	30.03
Albright town	21,389	22.28	26.74	31.19
Alderson town	23,043	24.00	28.80	33.60
Alum Creek CDP	40,714	42.41	50.89	59.37
Amherstdale-Robinette CDP	28,512	29.70	35.64	41.58
Anawalt town	13,333	13.89	16.67	19.44
Anmoore town	25,000	26.04	31.25	36.46
Ansted town	25,028	26.07	31.29	36.50
Athens town	27,260	28.40	34.08	39.75
Auburn town	19,063	19.86	23.83	27.80
Bancroft town	28,833	30.03	36.04	42.05
Barboursville village	35,139	36.60	43.92	51.24
Barrackville town	31,587	32.90	39.48	46.06
Bath (Berkeley Springs) town	24,934	25.97	31.17	36.36
Bayard town	25,156	26.20	31.45	36.69
Beaver CDP	25,836	26.91	32.30	37.68
Beckley city	28,122	29.29	35.15	41.01
Beech Bottom village	33,393	34.78	41.74	48.70
Belington town	22,154	23.08	27.69	32.31
Belle town	34,118	35.54	42.65	49.76
Belmont city	27,375	28.52	34.22	39.92
Benwood city	20,478	21.33	25.60	29.86
Bethany town	36,375	37.89	45.47	53.05
Bethlehem village	43,802	45.63	54.75	63.88
Beverly town	21,875	22.79	27.34	31.90
Blacksville town	31,250	32.55	39.06	45.57
Blennerhassett CDP	51,250	53.39	64.06	74.74
Bluefield city	27,672	28.83	34.59	40.36
Boaz CDP	39,250	40.89	49.06	57.24
Bolivar town	42,375	44.14	52.97	61.80
Bradley CDP	28,844	30.05	36.06	42.06
Bradshaw town	12083	12.59	15.10	17.62
Bramwell town	21,979	22.89	27.47	32.05
Brandonville town	28,125	29.30	35.16	41.02
Bridgeport city	49,310	51.36	61.64	71.91
Brookhaven CDP	32,206	33.55	40.26	46.97
Bruceton Mills town	25,625	26.69	32.03	37.37
Buckhannon city	23,421	24.40	29.28	34.16
Buffalo town	26,481	27.58	33.10	38.62
Burnsville town	24,167	25.17	30.21	35.24
Cairo town	24,688	25.72	30.86	36.00
Camden-on-Gauley town	15,417	16.06	19.27	22.48
Cameron city	25,119	26.17	31.40	36.63
Capon Bridge town	30,750	32.03	38.44	44.84
Carpendale town	35,404	36.88	44.26	51.63
Cassville CDP	25,799	26.87	32.25	37.62
Cedar Grove town	23,250	24.22	29.06	33.91
Ceredo city	24,323	25.34	30.40	35.47
Chapmanville town	23,077	24.04	28.85	33.65
Charles Town city	32,538	33.89	40.67	47.45

Municipality	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Charleston city	34,009	35.43	42.51	49.60
Chattaroy CDP	31,563	32.88	39.45	46.03
Cheat Lake CDP	48,594	50.62	60.74	70.87
Chesapeake town	29,526	30.76	36.91	43.06
Chester city	28,550	29.74	35.69	41.64
Clarksburg city	27,722	28.88	34.65	40.43
Clay town	14,712	15.33	18.39	21.46
Clearview village	41,250	42.97	51.56	60.16
Clendenin town	32,000	33.33	40.00	46.67
Coal City CDP	28,049	29.22	35.06	40.90
Coal Fork CDP	26,250	27.34	32.81	38.28
Corporation of Ranson town	24,485	25.51	30.61	35.71
Cowen town	21,250	22.14	26.56	30.99
Crab Orchard CDP	29,932	31.18	37.42	43.65
Craigsville CDP	24,631	25.66	30.79	35.92
Cross Lanes CDP	45,334	47.22	56.67	66.11
Culloden CDP	39,135	40.77	48.92	57.07
Daniels CDP	27,955	29.12	34.94	40.77
Danville town	21,369	22.26	26.71	31.16
Davis town	25,221	26.27	31.53	36.78
Davy town	16,250	16.93	20.31	23.70
Delbarton town	21,875	22.79	27.34	31.90
Despard CDP	19,740	20.56	24.68	28.79
Dunbar city	35,117	36.58	43.90	51.21
Durbin town	23,462	24.44	29.33	34.22
East Bank town	35,341	36.81	44.18	51.54
Eleanor town	35,284	36.75	44.11	51.46
Elizabeth town	25,114	26.16	31.39	36.62
Elk Garden town	24,375	25.39	30.47	35.55
Elkins city	26,906	28.03	33.63	39.24
Elkview CDP	35,033	36.49	43.79	51.09
Ellenboro town	22,500	23.44	28.13	32.81
Enterprise CDP	29,583	30.82	36.98	43.14
Fairlea CDP	20,664	21.53	25.83	30.14
Fairmont city	25,628	26.70	32.04	37.37
Fairview town	24,896	25.93	31.12	36.31
Falling Spring town	25,469	26.53	31.84	37.14
Farmington town	29,375	30.60	36.72	42.84
Fayetteville town	35,043	36.50	43.80	51.10
Flatwoods town	29,500	30.73	36.88	43.02
Flemington town	27,917	29.08	34.90	40.71
Follansbee city	30,818	32.10	38.52	44.94
Fort Ashby CDP	32,375	33.72	40.47	47.21
Fort Gay town	14,565	15.17	18.21	21.24
Franklin town	32,125	33.46	40.16	46.85
Friendly town	33,571	34.97	41.96	48.96
Gary city	22,857	23.81	28.57	33.33
Gassaway town	23,009	23.97	28.76	33.55
Gauley Bridge town	22,500	23.44	28.13	32.81
Gilbert Creek CDP	16,625	17.32	20.78	24.24

Municipality	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Gilbert town	29,219	30.44	36.52	42.61
Glasgow town	35,526	37.01	44.41	51.81
Glen Dale city	40,000	41.67	50.00	58.33
Glenville town	20,243	21.09	25.30	29.52
Grafton city	21,981	22.90	27.48	32.06
Grant Town town	24,722	25.75	30.90	36.05
Grantsville town	26,111	27.20	32.64	38.08
Granville town	22,583	23.52	28.23	32.93
Hambleton town	23,625	24.61	29.53	34.45
Hamlin town	22,143	23.07	27.68	32.29
Handley town	21,429	22.32	26.79	31.25
Harman town	21,136	22.02	26.42	30.82
Harpers Ferry town	52,344	54.53	65.43	76.34
Harrisville town	28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93
Hartford City town	24,219	25.23	30.27	35.32
Harts CDP	21,703	22.61	27.13	31.65
Hedgesville town	49,375	51.43	61.72	72.01
Henderson town	15,865	16.53	19.83	23.14
Hendricks town	26,705	27.82	33.38	38.94
Hillsboro town	29,583	30.82	36.98	43.14
Hinton city	20,323	21.17	25.40	29.64
Holden CDP	23,510	24.49	29.39	34.29
Hooverson Heights CDP	37,101	38.65	46.38	54.11
Hundred town	25,192	26.24	31.49	36.74
Huntington city	23,234	24.20	29.04	33.88
Hurricane city	39,591	41.24	49.49	57.74
Huttonsville town	22,321	23.25	27.90	32.55
Iaeger town	14,886	15.51	18.61	21.71
Inwood CDP	41,033	42.74	51.29	59.84
Jane Lew town	23,571	24.55	29.46	34.37
Jefferson town	16,384	17.07	20.48	23.89
Junior town	20,536	21.39	25.67	29.95
Kenova city	23,342	24.31	29.18	34.04
Kermit town	31,500	32.81	39.38	45.94
Keyser city	23,718	24.71	29.65	34.59
Keystone city	10,417	10.85	13.02	15.19
Kimball town	17,333	18.06	21.67	25.28
Kingwood city	29,155	30.37	36.44	42.52
Leon town	21,429	22.32	26.79	31.25
Lester town	24,375	25.39	30.47	35.55
Lewisburg city	27,857	29.02	34.82	40.62
Littleton town	15,714	16.37	19.64	22.92
Logan city	22,623	23.57	28.28	32.99
Lost Creek town	26,563	27.67	33.20	38.74
Lubeck CDP	42,614	44.39	53.27	62.15
Lumberport town	33,750	35.16	42.19	49.22
Mabscott town	28,021	29.19	35.03	40.86
MacArthur CDP	29,607	30.84	37.01	43.18
Madison city	29,911	31.16	37.39	43.62
Mallory CDP	24,458	25.48	30.57	35.67

Municipality	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Man town	40,179	41.85	50.22	58.59
Mannington city	26,806	27.92	33.51	39.09
Marlinton town	21,293	22.18	26.62	31.05
Marmet city	29,779	31.02	37.22	43.43
Martinsburg city	29,495	30.72	36.87	43.01
Mason town	24,621	25.65	30.78	35.91
Masontown town	22,750	23.70	28.44	33.18
Matewan town	13,529	14.09	16.91	19.73
Matoaka town	17,159	17.87	21.45	25.02
McMechen city	27,179	28.31	33.97	39.64
Meadow Bridge town	23,194	24.16	28.99	33.82
Middlebourne town	28,704	29.90	35.88	41.86
Mill Creek town	24,886	25.92	31.11	36.29
Milton town	29,348	30.57	36.69	42.80
Mineralwells CDP	42,083	43.84	52.60	61.37
Mitchell Heights town	52,500	54.69	65.63	76.56
Monongah town	25,750	26.82	32.19	37.55
Montcalm CDP	20,435	21.29	25.54	29.80
Montgomery city	20,606	21.46	25.76	30.05
Montrose town	33,571	34.97	41.96	48.96
Moorefield town	24,178	25.19	30.22	35.26
Morgantown city	20,649	21.51	25.81	30.11
Moundsville city	23,107	24.07	28.88	33.70
Mount Gay-Shamrock CDP	18,975	19.77	23.72	27.67
Mount Hope city	18,375	19.14	22.97	26.80
Mullens city	27,742	28.90	34.68	40.46
New Cumberland city	28,529	29.72	35.66	41.60
New Haven town	27,008	28.13	33.76	39.39
New Martinsville city	33,750	35.16	42.19	49.22
Newburg town	24,063	25.07	30.08	35.09
Newell CDP	31,343	32.65	39.18	45.71
Nitro city	32,389	33.74	40.49	47.23
North Hills town	83,659	87.14	104.57	122.00
Northford town	16,544	17.23	20.68	24.13
Nutter Fort town	30,163	31.42	37.70	43.99
Oak Hill city	24,792	25.83	30.99	36.16
Oakvale town	22,500	23.44	28.13	32.81
Oceana town	19,273	20.08	24.09	28.11
Osage town		0.00	0.00	0.00
Paden City city	32,940	34.31	41.18	48.04
Parkersburg city	26,990	28.11	33.74	39.36
Parsons city	26,424	27.53	33.03	38.54
Paw Paw town	25,625	26.69	32.03	37.37
Pax town	21,875	22.79	27.34	31.90
Pea Ridge CDP	41,739	43.48	52.17	60.87
Pennsboro city	24,120	25.13	30.15	35.18
Petersburg city	24,867	25.90	31.08	36.26
Peterstown town	23,036	24.00	28.80	33.59
Philippi city	21,528	22.43	26.91	31.40
Piedmont town	21,190	22.07	26.49	30.90

Municipality	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Pinch CDP	46,516	48.45	58.15	67.84
Pine Grove town	25,769	26.84	32.21	37.58
Pineville town	31,008	32.30	38.76	45.22
Piney View CDP	26,324	27.42	32.91	38.39
Pleasant Valley city	33,686	35.09	42.11	49.13
Poca town	42,273	44.03	52.84	61.65
Point Pleasant city	27,022	28.15	33.78	39.41
Powellton CDP	23,224	24.19	29.03	33.87
Pratt town	37,500	39.06	46.88	54.69
Princeton city	21,736	22.64	27.17	31.70
Prosperity CDP	31,632	32.95	39.54	46.13
Pullman town	19,821	20.65	24.78	28.91
Quinwood town	21,705	22.61	27.13	31.65
Rainelle town	19,491	20.30	24.36	28.42
Ravenswood city	30,308	31.57	37.89	44.20
Red Jacket CDP	21,364	22.25	26.71	31.16
Reedsville town	32,273	33.62	40.34	47.06
Reedy town	17,000	17.71	21.25	24.79
Rhodell town	17,143	17.86	21.43	25.00
Richwood city	21,620	22.52	27.03	31.53
Ridgeley town	26,016	27.10	32.52	37.94
Ripley city	25,861	26.94	32.33	37.71
Rivesville town	25,700	26.77	32.13	37.48
Romney city	22,261	23.19	27.83	32.46
Ronceverte city	24,400	25.42	30.50	35.58
Rowlesburg town	28,125	29.30	35.16	41.02
Rupert town	20,250	21.09	25.31	29.53
Salem city	16,577	17.27	20.72	24.17
Sand Fork town	30,179	31.44	37.72	44.01
Shady Spring CDP	29,464	30.69	36.83	42.97
Shepherdstown town	40,750	42.45	50.94	59.43
Shinnston city	26,786	27.90	33.48	39.06
Sissonville CDP	36,725	38.26	45.91	53.56
Sistersville city	26,799	27.92	33.50	39.08
Smithers city	20,417	21.27	25.52	29.77
Smithfield town	18,500	19.27	23.13	26.98
Sophia town	26,008	27.09	32.51	37.93
South Charleston city	37,905	39.48	47.38	55.28
Spencer city	19,773	20.60	24.72	28.84
St Albans city	37,130	38.68	46.41	54.15
Stanaford CDP	30,640	31.92	38.30	44.68
Star City town	26,771	27.89	33.46	39.04
Stonewood city	28,000	29.17	35.00	40.83
St. Marys city	30,755	32.04	38.44	44.85
Summersville town	29,783	31.02	37.23	43.43
Sutton town	25,134	26.18	31.42	36.65
Switzer CDP	21,806	22.71	27.26	31.80
Sylvester town	35,625	37.11	44.53	51.95
Teays Valley CDP	53,053	55.26	66.32	77.37
Terra Alta town	25,388	26.45	31.74	37.02

Municipality	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Thomas city	22,443	23.38	28.05	32.73
Thurmond town	23,750	24.74	29.69	34.64
Tornado CDP	50,000	52.08	62.50	72.92
Triadelphia town	26,169	27.26	32.71	38.16
Tunnelton town	18,125	18.88	22.66	26.43
Union town	21,797	22.71	27.25	31.79
Valley Grove village	27,813	28.97	34.77	40.56
Vienna city	39,220	40.85	49.03	57.20
War city	16,012	16.68	20.02	23.35
Wardensville town	28,864	30.07	36.08	42.09
Washington CDP	54,483	56.75	68.10	79.45
Wayne town	20,242	21.09	25.30	29.52
Weirton city	35,212	36.68	44.02	51.35
Welch city	19,795	20.62	24.74	28.87
Wellsburg city	27,298	28.44	34.12	39.81
West Hamlin town	19,250	20.05	24.06	28.07
West Liberty town	28,393	29.58	35.49	41.41
West Logan town	23,500	24.48	29.38	34.27
West Milford town	32,250	33.59	40.31	47.03
West Union town	18,300	19.06	22.88	26.69
Weston city	26,690	27.80	33.36	38.92
Westover city	28,659	29.85	35.82	41.79
Wheeling city	27,388	28.53	34.24	39.94
White Sulphur Springs city	26,694	27.81	33.37	38.93
Whitehall town	42,813	44.60	53.52	62.44
Whitesville town	19,250	20.05	24.06	28.07
Wiley Ford CDP	32,017	33.35	40.02	46.69
Williamson city	19,635	20.45	24.54	28.63
Williamstown city	36,344	37.86	45.43	53.00
Windsor Heights village	28,523	29.71	35.65	41.60
Winfield town	51,023	53.15	63.78	74.41
Womelsdorf (Coalton) town	28,462	29.65	35.58	41.51
Worthington town	28,750	29.95	35.94	41.93

County	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Barbour	24,885	25.92	31.11	36.29
Berkeley	38,187	39.78	47.73	55.69
Boone	26,912	28.03	33.64	39.25
Braxton	24,746	25.78	30.93	36.09
Brooke	32,414	33.76	40.52	47.27
Cabell	29,088	30.30	36.36	42.42
Calhoun	22,717	23.66	28.40	33.13
Clay	23,025	23.98	28.78	33.58
Doddridge	27,400	28.54	34.25	39.96
Fayette	24,691	25.72	30.86	36.01
Gilmer	23,312	24.28	29.14	34.00
Grant	28,940	30.15	36.18	42.20
Greenbrier	27,445	28.59	34.31	40.02
Hampshire	31,358	32.66	39.20	45.73

County	2000 Census Median HH Income	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.25%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.5%	Avg Monthly Bill Based on 1.75%
Hancock	33,296	34.68	41.62	48.56
Hardy	31,647	32.97	39.56	46.15
Harrison	30,755	32.04	38.44	44.85
Jackson	32,213	33.56	40.27	46.98
Jefferson	43,024	44.82	53.78	62.74
Kanawha	33,626	35.03	42.03	49.04
Lewis	26,911	28.03	33.64	39.25
Lincoln	23,553	24.53	29.44	34.35
Logan	24,396	25.41	30.50	35.58
Marion	28,905	30.11	36.13	42.15
Marshall	30,803	32.09	38.50	44.92
Mason	28,123	29.29	35.15	41.01
McDowell	17,981	18.73	22.48	26.22
Mercer	26,719	27.83	33.40	38.97
Mineral	31,103	32.40	38.88	45.36
Mingo	22,949	23.91	28.69	33.47
Monongalia	30,374	31.64	37.97	44.30
Monroe	27,646	28.80	34.56	40.32
Morgan	33,687	35.09	42.11	49.13
Nicholas	26,591	27.70	33.24	38.78
Ohio	31,559	32.87	39.45	46.02
Pendleton	29,632	30.87	37.04	43.21
Pleasants	31,942	33.27	39.93	46.58
Pocahontas	26,180	27.27	32.73	38.18
Preston	27,792	28.95	34.74	40.53
Putnam	42,180	43.94	52.73	61.51
Raleigh	28,020	29.19	35.03	40.86
Randolph	27,108	28.24	33.89	39.53
Ritchie	27,509	28.66	34.39	40.12
Roane	24,864	25.90	31.08	36.26
Summers	21,672	22.58	27.09	31.61
Taylor	26,836	27.95	33.55	39.14
Tucker	26,536	27.64	33.17	38.70
Tyler	29,764	31.00	37.21	43.41
Upshur	27,418	28.56	34.27	39.98
Wayne	28,459	29.64	35.57	41.50
Webster	21,297	22.18	26.62	31.06
Wetzel	30,972	32.26	38.72	45.17
Wirt	29,415	30.64	36.77	42.90
Wood	33,212	34.60	41.52	48.43
Wyoming	23,959	24.96	29.95	34.94
West Virginia	30,108	31.36	37.64	43.91

APPENDIX E2

PROPOSED MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS & MUNICIPALITIES

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
COUNTY & MAGISTERIAL DISTRICTS

County/Magisterial District	Median HH Income	1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Barbour	31,212	39.02	45.52	52.02
North district	32,009	40.01	46.68	53.35
South district	31,628	39.54	46.12	52.71
West district	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92
Berkeley	52,857	66.07	77.08	88.10
Adam Stephens district	31,280	39.10	45.62	52.13
Norborne district	76,826	96.03	112.04	128.04
Potomac district	54,637	68.30	79.68	91.06
Shenandoah district	58,956	73.70	85.98	98.26
Tuscarora district	52,756	65.95	76.94	87.93
Valley district	59,740	74.68	87.12	99.57
Boone	38,783	48.48	56.56	64.64
District 1	43,910	54.89	64.04	73.18
District 2	37,721	47.15	55.01	62.87
District 3	40,033	50.04	58.38	66.72
Braxton	32,158	40.20	46.90	53.60
Eastern district	38,803	48.50	56.59	64.67
Northern district	35,273	44.09	51.44	58.79
Southern district	26,131	32.66	38.11	43.55
Western district	28,681	35.85	41.83	47.80
Brooke	39,475	49.34	57.57	65.79
Follansbee district	40,775	50.97	59.46	67.96
Weirton district	36,615	45.77	53.40	61.03
Wellsburg district	41,674	52.09	60.77	69.46
Cabell	34,492	43.12	50.30	57.49
District 1	35,245	44.06	51.40	58.74
District 2	23,279	29.10	33.95	38.80
District 3	28,683	35.85	41.83	47.81
District 4	46,647	58.31	68.03	77.75
District 5	43,378	54.22	63.26	72.30
Calhoun	26,922	33.65	39.26	44.87
District 1	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08
District 2	29,601	37.00	43.17	49.34
District 3	27,134	33.92	39.57	45.22
District 4	24,745	30.93	36.09	41.24
District 5	23,345	29.18	34.04	38.91
Clay	30,789	38.49	44.90	51.32
District A	25,764	32.21	37.57	42.94
District B	28,594	35.74	41.70	47.66
District C	40,651	50.81	59.28	67.75
Doddridge	30,019	37.52	43.78	50.03

Beech district	33,207	41.51	48.43	55.35
Maple district	27,250	34.06	39.74	45.42
Oak district	37,115	46.39	54.13	61.86
Pine district	25,891	32.36	37.76	43.15
Fayette	31,912	39.89	46.54	53.19
New Haven district	35,399	44.25	51.62	59.00
Plateau district	28,757	35.95	41.94	47.93
Valley district	31,392	39.24	45.78	52.32
Gilmer	29,706	37.13	43.32	49.51
Center district	25,482	31.85	37.16	42.47
City district	30,951	38.69	45.14	51.59
De Kalb - Troy district	32,552	40.69	47.47	54.25
Glenville district	29,375	36.72	42.84	48.96
Grant	35,593	44.49	51.91	59.32
Grant district	34,750	43.44	50.68	57.92
Milroy district	34,260	42.83	49.96	57.10
Union district	41,204	51.51	60.09	68.67
Greenbrier	33,732	42.17	49.19	56.22
Central district	39,284	49.11	57.29	65.47
Eastern district	31,720	39.65	46.26	52.87
Western district	29,478	36.85	42.99	49.13
Hampshire	31,792	39.74	46.36	52.99
Bloomery district	40,192	50.24	58.61	66.99
Capon district	27,148	33.94	39.59	45.25
Gore district	32,254	40.32	47.04	53.76
Mill Creek district	35,759	44.70	52.15	59.60
Romney district	22,923	28.65	33.43	38.21
Sherman district	34,321	42.90	50.05	57.20
Springfield district	35,884	44.86	52.33	59.81
Hancock	38,565	48.21	56.24	64.28
Butler district	42,197	52.75	61.54	70.33
Clay district	38,300	47.88	55.85	63.83
Grant district	32,378	40.47	47.22	53.96
Hardy	31,347	39.18	45.71	52.25
Capon district	33,207	41.51	48.43	55.35
Lost River district	26,889	33.61	39.21	44.82
Moorefield district	25,131	31.41	36.65	41.89
Old Fields district	37,064	46.33	54.05	61.77
South Fork district	40,969	51.21	59.75	68.28
Harrison	39,191	48.99	57.15	65.32
Eastern district	55,881	69.85	81.49	93.14
Northern district	34,730	43.41	50.65	57.88
North Urban district	26,415	33.02	38.52	44.03
Southern district	42,144	52.68	61.46	70.24
South Urban district	37,945	47.43	55.34	63.24
Southeast district	39,241	49.05	57.23	65.40
Jackson	41,406	51.76	60.38	69.01

Eastern district	43,823	54.78	63.91	73.04
Northern district	36,288	45.36	52.92	60.48
Western district	45,315	56.64	66.08	75.53
Jefferson	65,603	82.00	95.67	109.34
Charles Town district	48,734	60.92	71.07	81.22
Harpers Ferry district	72,779	90.97	106.14	121.30
Kabletown district	75,167	93.96	109.62	125.28
Middleway district	55,957	69.95	81.60	93.26
Shepherdstown district	85,289	106.61	124.38	142.15
Kanawha	42,669	53.34	62.23	71.12
District 1	36,969	46.21	53.91	61.62
District 2	46,625	58.28	67.99	77.71
District 3	43,952	54.94	64.10	73.25
District 4	41,904	52.38	61.11	69.84
Lewis	33,293	41.62	48.55	55.49
Courthouse - Collins Settlement district	28,196	35.25	41.12	46.99
Freemans Creek district	36,753	45.94	53.60	61.26
Hackers Creek - Skin Creek district	33,431	41.79	48.75	55.72
Lincoln	30,868	38.59	45.02	51.45
Carroll district	30,764	38.46	44.86	51.27
Duval district	39,592	49.49	57.74	65.99
Harts district	32,543	40.68	47.46	54.24
Jefferson district	24,714	30.89	36.04	41.19
Laurel Hill district	29,329	36.66	42.77	48.88
Sheridan district	26,800	33.50	39.08	44.67
Union district	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08
Washington district	29,485	36.86	43.00	49.14
Logan	35,465	44.33	51.72	59.11
Central district	33,298	41.62	48.56	55.50
Eastern district	35,511	44.39	51.79	59.19
Western district	38,145	47.68	55.63	63.58
Marion	38,115	47.64	55.58	63.53
Middletown district	32,983	41.23	48.10	54.97
Palatine district	42,667	53.33	62.22	71.11
West Augusta district	37,506	46.88	54.70	62.51
Marshall	34,419	43.02	50.19	57.37
District 1	37,141	46.43	54.16	61.90
District 2	29,383	36.73	42.85	48.97
District 3	36,174	45.22	52.75	60.29
Mason	36,027	45.03	52.54	60.05
Arbuckle district	39,885	49.86	58.17	66.48
Clendenin district	32,445	40.56	47.32	54.08
Cologne district	33,042	41.30	48.19	55.07
Cooper district	40,000	50.00	58.33	66.67
Graham district	32,104	40.13	46.82	53.51
Hannan district	34,761	43.45	50.69	57.94
Lewis district	42,410	53.01	61.85	70.68

Robinson district	28,875	36.09	42.11	48.13
Union district	31,190	38.99	45.49	51.98
Waggener district	35,609	44.51	51.93	59.35
McDowell	22,154	27.69	32.31	36.92
Big Creek district	19,494	24.37	28.43	32.49
Browns Creek district	25,486	31.86	37.17	42.48
North Elkin district	23,273	29.09	33.94	38.79
Sandy River district	22,137	27.67	32.28	36.90
Mercer	32,131	40.16	46.86	53.55
District I	30,510	38.14	44.49	50.85
District II	32,496	40.62	47.39	54.16
District III	33,617	42.02	49.02	56.03
Mineral	36,571	45.71	53.33	60.95
District 1	38,969	48.71	56.83	64.95
District 2	27,951	34.94	40.76	46.59
District 3	43,517	54.40	63.46	72.53
Mingo	32,902	41.13	47.98	54.84
Beech Ben Mate district	32,796	41.00	47.83	54.66
Kermit Harvey district	24,899	31.12	36.31	41.50
Lee district	38,553	48.19	56.22	64.26
Magnolia district	33,142	41.43	48.33	55.24
Stafford district	32,940	41.18	48.04	54.90
Tug Hardee district	41,042	51.30	59.85	68.40
Williamson district	28,829	36.04	42.04	48.05
Monongalia	39,167	48.96	57.12	65.28
Central district	26,069	32.59	38.02	43.45
Eastern district	45,192	56.49	65.91	75.32
Western district	44,689	55.86	65.17	74.48
Monroe	39,574	49.47	57.71	65.96
Central district	38,342	47.93	55.92	63.90
Eastern district	43,874	54.84	63.98	73.12
Western district	35,943	44.93	52.42	59.91
Morgan	37,281	46.60	54.37	62.14
District 1	25,271	31.59	36.85	42.12
District 2	36,315	45.39	52.96	60.53
District 3	44,375	55.47	64.71	73.96
Nicholas	38,457	48.07	56.08	64.10
Beaver district	26,623	33.28	38.83	44.37
Grant district	41,488	51.86	60.50	69.15
Hamilton district	44,718	55.90	65.21	74.53
Jefferson district	37,420	46.78	54.57	62.37
Kentucky district	43,425	54.28	63.33	72.38
Summersville district	43,114	53.89	62.87	71.86
Wilderness district	45,163	56.45	65.86	75.27
Ohio	39,669	49.59	57.85	66.12
District 1	48,107	60.13	70.16	80.18
District 2	28,470	35.59	41.52	47.45

District 3	41,625	52.03	60.70	69.38
Pendleton	33,323	41.65	48.60	55.54
Central district	40,000	50.00	58.33	66.67
Eastern district	31,607	39.51	46.09	52.68
Western district	30,742	38.43	44.83	51.24
Pleasants	38,882	48.60	56.70	64.80
District A	51,893	64.87	75.68	86.49
District B	26,851	33.56	39.16	44.75
District C	40,446	50.56	58.98	67.41
District D	48,750	60.94	71.09	81.25
Pocahontas	32,161	40.20	46.90	53.60
Edray district	31,923	39.90	46.55	53.21
Greenbank district	37,188	46.49	54.23	61.98
Huntersville district	31,161	38.95	45.44	51.94
Little Levels district	30,755	38.44	44.85	51.26
Preston	40,753	50.94	59.43	67.92
Fifth district	37,666	47.08	54.93	62.78
First district	45,297	56.62	66.06	75.50
Fourth district	34,673	43.34	50.56	57.79
Second district	44,432	55.54	64.80	74.05
Third district	42,798	53.50	62.41	71.33
Putnam	52,618	65.77	76.73	87.70
Buffalo - Union district	44,398	55.50	64.75	74.00
Curry district	45,387	56.73	66.19	75.65
Pocatalico district	41,023	51.28	59.83	68.37
Scott district	67,500	84.38	98.44	112.50
Teays district	75,385	94.23	109.94	125.64
Raleigh	38,036	47.55	55.47	63.39
District 1	41,325	51.66	60.27	68.88
District 2	33,871	42.34	49.40	56.45
District 3	37,058	46.32	54.04	61.76
Randolph	36,176	45.22	52.76	60.29
Beverly district	37,020	46.28	53.99	61.70
Dry Fork district	35,634	44.54	51.97	59.39
Huttonsville district	27,117	33.90	39.55	45.20
Leadsville district	37,736	47.17	55.03	62.89
Middle Fork district	35,469	44.34	51.73	59.12
Mingo district	30,972	38.72	45.17	51.62
New Interest district	46,042	57.55	67.14	76.74
Roaring Creek district	32,561	40.70	47.48	54.27
Valley Bend district	41,786	52.23	60.94	69.64
Ritchie	32,619	40.77	47.57	54.37
Clay district	34,702	43.38	50.61	57.84
Grant district	34,948	43.69	50.97	58.25
Murphy district	25,602	32.00	37.34	42.67
Union district	30,972	38.72	45.17	51.62
Roane	27,428	34.29	40.00	45.71

District 1	31,866	39.83	46.47	53.11
District 2	22,823	28.53	33.28	38.04
District 3	28,614	35.77	41.73	47.69
Summers	27,720	34.65	40.43	46.20
Bluestone River district	27,857	34.82	40.62	46.43
Greenbrier River district	29,984	37.48	43.73	49.97
New River district	26,483	33.10	38.62	44.14
Taylor	36,956	46.20	53.89	61.59
Eastern district	32,669	40.84	47.64	54.45
Tygart district	30,592	38.24	44.61	50.99
Western district	46,278	57.85	67.49	77.13
Tucker	32,712	40.89	47.71	54.52
Black Fork district	35,813	44.77	52.23	59.69
Clover district	30,234	37.79	44.09	50.39
Davis district	17,961	22.45	26.19	29.94
Dry Fork district	50,052	62.57	72.99	83.42
Fairfax district	31,417	39.27	45.82	52.36
Licking district	9,333	11.67	13.61	15.56
St. George district	39,688	49.61	57.88	66.15
Tyler	33,496	41.87	48.85	55.83
Central district	29,138	36.42	42.49	48.56
North district	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42
South district	32,440	40.55	47.31	54.07
West district	31,944	39.93	46.59	53.24
Upshur	36,114	45.14	52.67	60.19
First district	35,595	44.49	51.91	59.33
Second district	33,974	42.47	49.55	56.62
Third district	38,009	47.51	55.43	63.35
Wayne	35,079	43.85	51.16	58.47
Butler district	35,114	43.89	51.21	58.52
Ceredo district	38,555	48.19	56.23	64.26
Stonewall district	28,994	36.24	42.28	48.32
Union district	39,031	48.79	56.92	65.05
Westmoreland district	36,239	45.30	52.85	60.40
Webster	28,025	35.03	40.87	46.71
Central district	26,198	32.75	38.21	43.66
Northern district	23,686	29.61	34.54	39.48
Southern district	32,089	40.11	46.80	53.48
Wetzel	36,636	45.80	53.43	61.06
District 1	36,370	45.46	53.04	60.62
District 2	37,556	46.95	54.77	62.59
District 3	36,282	45.35	52.91	60.47
Wirt	36,705	45.88	53.53	61.18
Central district	42,712	53.39	62.29	71.19
Northeast district	34,821	43.53	50.78	58.04
Southwest district	31,643	39.55	46.15	52.74
Wood	42,146	52.68	61.46	70.24

Clay district	45,625	57.03	66.54	76.04
Harris district	38,229	47.79	55.75	63.72
Lubeck district	48,184	60.23	70.27	80.31
Parkersburg district	34,208	42.76	49.89	57.01
Slate district	53,295	66.62	77.72	88.83
Steele district	47,000	58.75	68.54	78.33
Tygart district	35,710	44.64	52.08	59.52
Union district	55,192	68.99	80.49	91.99
Walker district	56,458	70.57	82.33	94.10
Williams district	53,094	66.37	77.43	88.49
Wyoming	36,343	45.43	53.00	60.57
District 1	35,580	44.48	51.89	59.30
District 2	36,975	46.22	53.92	61.63
District 3	35,440	44.30	51.68	59.07

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/guided_search.xhtml

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
A				
Addison (Webster Springs), town	22,283	27.85	32.50	37.14
Albright, town	33,036	41.30	48.18	55.06
Alderson , town	25,469	31.84	37.14	42.45
Anawalt, town	41,750	52.19	60.89	69.58
Anmoore, town	22,756	28.45	33.19	37.93
Ansted, town	27,885	34.86	40.67	46.48
Athens, town	46,944	58.68	68.46	78.24
Auburn, town	10,625	13.28	15.49	17.71
B				
Bancroft, town	30,288	37.86	44.17	50.48
Barboursville, village	51,574	64.47	75.21	85.96
Barrackville, town	44,427	55.53	64.79	74.05
Bath (Berkeley Springs), town	36,350	45.44	53.01	60.58
Bayard, town	30,156	37.70	43.98	50.26
Beckley, city	31,480	39.35	45.91	52.47
Beech Bottom, village	30,667	38.33	44.72	51.11
Belington, town	29,803	37.25	43.46	49.67
Belle, town	33,824	42.28	49.33	56.37
Belmont, city	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92
Benwood, city	29,955	37.44	43.68	49.93
Bethany, town	45,938	57.42	66.99	76.56
Bethlehem, village	60,896	76.12	88.81	101.49
Beverly, town	25,481	31.85	37.16	42.47
Blacksville, town	31,250	39.06	45.57	52.08
Bluefield, city	31,371	39.21	45.75	52.29
Bolivar, town	52,045	65.06	75.90	86.74
Bradshaw, town	17,292	21.62	25.22	28.82
Bramwell, town	26,563	33.20	38.74	44.27
Brandonville, town	19,375	24.22	28.26	32.29
Bridgeport, city	66,318	82.90	96.71	110.53
Bruceton Mills, town	64,583	80.73	94.18	107.64
Buckhannon, city	34,425	43.03	50.20	57.38
Buffalo, town	39,286	49.11	57.29	65.48
Burnsville, town	27,031	33.79	39.42	45.05
C				
Cairo, town	24,688	30.86	36.00	41.15
Camden-on-Gauley, town	21,875	27.34	31.90	36.46
Cameron, city	22,500	28.13	32.81	37.50
Capon Bridge, town	30,690	38.36	44.76	51.15
Carpendale, town	37,946	47.43	55.34	63.24
Cedar Grove, town	30,370	37.96	44.29	50.62
Ceredo, city	23,244	29.06	33.90	38.74

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Chapmanville, town	41,471	51.84	60.48	69.12
Charleston, city	42,133	52.67	61.44	70.22
Charles Town, city	56,926	71.16	83.02	94.88
Chesapeake, town	36,958	46.20	53.90	61.60
Chester, city	38,795	48.49	56.58	64.66
Clarksburg, city	32,078	40.10	46.78	53.46
Clay, town	16,750	20.94	24.43	27.92
Clearview, village	52,083	65.10	75.95	86.81
Clendenin, town	32,045	40.06	46.73	53.41
Cowen, town	30,652	38.32	44.70	51.09
D				
Danville, town	28,000	35.00	40.83	46.67
Davis, town	18,947	23.68	27.63	31.58
Davy, town	23,594	29.49	34.41	39.32
Delbarton, town	24,074	30.09	35.11	40.12
Dunbar, city	43,217	54.02	63.02	72.03
Durbin, town	27,273	34.09	39.77	45.46
E				
East Bank, town	45,938	57.42	66.99	76.56
Eleanor, town	30,150	37.69	43.97	50.25
Elizabeth, town	25,417	31.77	37.07	42.36
Elk Garden, town	30,690	38.36	44.76	51.15
Elkins, city	34,705	43.38	50.61	57.84
Ellenboro, town	34,375	42.97	50.13	57.29
F				
Fairmont, city	33,110	41.39	48.29	55.18
Fairview, town	32,500	40.63	47.40	54.17
Falling Spring, town	33,438	41.80	48.76	55.73
Farmington, town	33,250	41.56	48.49	55.42
Fayetteville, town	42,667	53.33	62.22	71.11
Flatwoods, town	22,153	27.69	32.31	36.92
Flemington, town	39,792	49.74	58.03	66.32
Follansbee, city	40,625	50.78	59.24	67.71
Fort Gay, town	17,727	22.16	25.85	29.55
Franklin, town	32,784	40.98	47.81	54.64
Friendly, town	25,833	32.29	37.67	43.06
G				
Gary, city	23,594	29.49	34.41	39.32
Gassaway, town	31,667	39.58	46.18	52.78
Gauley Bridge, town	20,750	25.94	30.26	34.58
Gilbert, town	26,250	32.81	38.28	43.75
Glasgow, town	31,458	39.32	45.88	52.43
Glen Dale, city	48,869	61.09	71.27	81.45

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Glenville, town	29,333	36.67	42.78	48.89
Grafton, city	26,494	33.12	38.64	44.16
Grantsville, town	28,173	35.22	41.09	46.96
Grant Town, town	27,115	33.89	39.54	45.19
Granville, town	29,375	36.72	42.84	48.96
H				
Hambleton, town	35,417	44.27	51.65	59.03
Hamlin, town	26,343	32.93	38.42	43.91
Handley, town	23,000	28.75	33.54	38.33
Harman, town	18,000	22.50	26.25	30.00
Harpers Ferry, town	69,167	86.46	100.87	115.28
Harrisville, town	34,545	43.18	50.38	57.58
Hartford City, town	32,697	40.87	47.68	54.50
Hedgesville, town	41,458	51.82	60.46	69.10
Henderson, town	16,771	20.96	24.46	27.95
Hendricks, town	45,833	57.29	66.84	76.39
Hillsboro, town	20,625	25.78	30.08	34.38
Hinton, city	18,750	23.44	27.34	31.25
Hundred, town	22,292	27.87	32.51	37.15
Huntington, city	27,858	34.82	40.63	46.43
Hurricane, city	54,770	68.46	79.87	91.28
Huttonsville, town	17,917	22.40	26.13	29.86
I				
Iaeger, town	21,500	26.88	31.35	35.83
J				
Jane Lew, town	29,130	36.41	42.48	48.55
Junior, town	16,667	20.83	24.31	27.78
K				
Kenova, city	31,406	39.26	45.80	52.34
Kermit, town	37,862	47.33	55.22	63.10
Keyser, city	28,321	35.40	41.30	47.20
Keystone, city	26,563	33.20	38.74	44.27
Kimball, town	34,688	43.36	50.59	57.81
Kingwood, city	33,914	42.39	49.46	56.52
L				
Leon, town	41,875	52.34	61.07	69.79
Lester, town	28,500	35.63	41.56	47.50
Lewisburg, city	39,207	49.01	57.18	65.35
Logan, city	26,651	33.31	38.87	44.42
Lost Creek, town	43,929	54.91	64.06	73.22
Lumberport, town	38,625	48.28	56.33	64.38
M				
Mabscott, town	46,813	58.52	68.27	78.02

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
McMechen, city	27,450	34.31	40.03	45.75
Madison, city	43,894	54.87	64.01	73.16
Man, town	36,696	45.87	53.52	61.16
Mannington, city	37,727	47.16	55.02	62.88
Marlinton, town	24,415	30.52	35.61	40.69
Marmet, city	33,490	41.86	48.84	55.82
Martinsburg, city	34,799	43.50	50.75	58.00
Mason, town	27,083	33.85	39.50	45.14
Masontown, town	33,063	41.33	48.22	55.11
Matewan, town	16,522	20.65	24.09	27.54
Matoaka, town	11,917	14.90	17.38	19.86
Meadow Bridge, town	22,917	28.65	33.42	38.20
Middlebourne, town	29,196	36.50	42.58	48.66
Mill Creek, town	23,600	29.50	34.42	39.33
Milton, town	34,141	42.68	49.79	56.90
Mitchell Heights, town	58,472	73.09	85.27	97.45
Monongah, town	38,917	48.65	56.75	64.86
Montgomery, city	21,914	27.39	31.96	36.52
Montrose, town	20,000	25.00	29.17	33.33
Moorefield, town	24,886	31.11	36.29	41.48
Morgantown, city	25,495	31.87	37.18	42.49
Moundsville, city	28,496	35.62	41.56	47.49
Mount Hope, city	19,746	24.68	28.80	32.91
Mullens, city	32,667	40.83	47.64	54.45
N				
Newburg, town	39,306	49.13	57.32	65.51
New Cumberland, city	24,760	30.95	36.11	41.27
New Haven, town	29,527	36.91	43.06	49.21
New Martinsville, city	36,282	45.35	52.91	60.47
Nitro, city	40,322	50.40	58.80	67.20
Northfork, town	16,250	20.31	23.70	27.08
North Hills, town	90,000	112.50	131.25	150.00
Nutter Fort, town	31,790	39.74	46.36	52.98
O				
Oak Hill, city	31,835	39.79	46.43	53.06
Oakvale, town	24,821	31.03	36.20	41.37
Oceana, town	30,032	37.54	43.80	50.05
P				
Paden City, city	35,026	43.78	51.08	58.38
Parkersburg, city	33,916	42.40	49.46	56.53
Parsons, city	31,682	39.60	46.20	52.80
Paw Paw, town	16,190	20.24	23.61	26.98
Pax, town	12,308	15.39	17.95	20.51

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Pennsboro, city	26,848	33.56	39.15	44.75
Petersburg, city	32,383	40.48	47.23	53.97
Peterstown, town	31,563	39.45	46.03	52.61
Philippi, city	31,974	39.97	46.63	53.29
Piedmont, town	23,125	28.91	33.72	38.54
Pine Grove, town	30,625	38.28	44.66	51.04
Pineville, town	43,150	53.94	62.93	71.92
Pleasant Valley, city	37,931	47.41	55.32	63.22
Poca, town	54,934	68.67	80.11	91.56
Point Pleasant, city	41,915	52.39	61.13	69.86
Pratt, town	51,111	63.89	74.54	85.19
Princeton, city	26,705	33.38	38.94	44.51
Pullman, town	47,813	59.77	69.73	79.69
Q				
Quinwood, town	27,794	34.74	40.53	46.32
R				
Rainelle, town	28,017	35.02	40.86	46.70
Ranson Town, corporation of	39,596	49.50	57.74	65.99
Ravenswood, city	32,242	40.30	47.02	53.74
Reedsville, town	55,313	69.14	80.66	92.19
Reedy, town	24,844	31.06	36.23	41.41
Rhodell, town	28,125	35.16	41.02	46.88
Richwood, city	24,149	30.19	35.22	40.25
Ridgeley, town	33,618	42.02	49.03	56.03
Ripley, city	34,625	43.28	50.49	57.71
Rivesville, town	38,317	47.90	55.88	63.86
Romney, city	24,875	31.09	36.28	41.46
Ronceverte, city	35,931	44.91	52.40	59.89
Rowlesburg, town	44,750	55.94	65.26	74.58
Rupert, town	25,549	31.94	37.26	42.58
S				
St. Albans, city	41,956	52.45	61.19	69.93
St. Marys, city	41,063	51.33	59.88	68.44
Salem, city	25,481	31.85	37.16	42.47
Sand Fork, town	24,250	30.31	35.36	40.42
Shepherdstown, town	62,917	78.65	91.75	104.86
Shinnston, city	33,468	41.84	48.81	55.78
Sistersville, city	31,786	39.73	46.35	52.98
Smithers, city	21,019	26.27	30.65	35.03
Smithfield, town	8,375	10.47	12.21	13.96
Sophia, town	32,083	40.10	46.79	53.47
South Charleston, city	42,034	52.54	61.30	70.06
Spencer, city	19,206	24.01	28.01	32.01

WEST VIRGINIA MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME
2010 CENSUS
MUNICIPALITIES

MUNICIPALITIES	Median HH Income	Average Bill based on % MHI		
		1.50%	1.75%	2.00%
Star City, town	33,684	42.11	49.12	56.14
Stonewood, city	33,105	41.38	48.28	55.18
Summersville, town	47,083	58.85	68.66	78.47
Sutton, town	25,625	32.03	37.37	42.71
Sylvester, town	58,125	72.66	84.77	96.88
T				
Terra Alta, town	32,500	40.63	47.40	54.17
Thomas, city	31,750	39.69	46.30	52.92
Thurmond, town	23,750	29.69	34.64	39.58
Triadelphia, town	38,077	47.60	55.53	63.46
Tunnelton, town	23,125	28.91	33.72	38.54
U				
Union, town	41,490	51.86	60.51	69.15
V				
Valley Grove, village	43,047	53.81	62.78	71.75
Vienna, city	42,616	53.27	62.15	71.03
W				
War, city	21,923	27.40	31.97	36.54
Wardensville, town	33,333	41.67	48.61	55.56
Wayne, town	24,194	30.24	35.28	40.32
Weirton, city	39,699	49.62	57.89	66.17
Welch, city	25,125	31.41	36.64	41.88
Wellsburg, city	33,089	41.36	48.25	55.15
West Hamilin, town	19,417	24.27	28.32	32.36
West Liberty, town	35,673	44.59	52.02	59.46
West Logan, town	35,625	44.53	51.95	59.38
West Milford, town	45,526	56.91	66.39	75.88
Weston, city	27,066	33.83	39.47	45.11
Westover, city	42,900	53.63	62.56	71.50
West Union, town	26,324	32.91	38.39	43.87
Wheeling, city	32,779	40.97	47.80	54.63
White Hall, town	54,091	67.61	78.88	90.15
White Sulphur Springs, city	33,843	42.30	49.35	56.41
Whitesville, town	39,306	49.13	57.32	65.51
Williamson, city	28,750	35.94	41.93	47.92
Williamstown, city	54,818	68.52	79.94	91.36
Windsor Heights, village	43,750	54.69	63.80	72.92
Winfield, town	65,368	81.71	95.33	108.95
Womelsdorf (Coalton), town	26,563	33.20	38.74	44.27
Worthington, town	36,250	45.31	52.86	60.42

Source: US Census Bureau American Fact Finder
http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t

APPENDIX F

SOURCES AND USES CHART (FOR EPA USE ONLY)

West Virginia Clean Water State Revolving Fund
Intended Use Plan - Sources and Uses of Funds
FY2014
(for EPA use only)

Cumulative Sources as of March 31, 2013

Capitalization Grants (24)	553,605,586	
State Matches (actual)	98,502,695	
Repayments (P + I; 212 + 319)	286,334,618	
Investment Earnings	29,178,346	
Sources sub-total (a)		967,621,245

Cumulative Uses as of March 31, 2013

Loan Assistance (212+319)	910,127,547	
DEP Administration (4%)	14,143,540	
Uses sub-total (b)		924,271,087

FY2014 Sources of Funds

Available funds from prior IUPs (a - b)	43,350,158	
Capitalization Grant #22 (FY2013 Funds)	20,813,000	
State Match	4,162,600	
Earnings	152,060	
Repayments	31,960,442	
FY2014 Sources of Funds (c)		100,438,260

Less

Appendix C Projects	85,863,501	
AgWQLP Reserves	150,000	
OSLP Reserve	500,000	
PPL Projects on a first come basis	13,924,759	
Total		100,438,260

APPENDIX G

POSSIBLE GREEN TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

"Green" Infrastructure Project Solicitation for FY2014 IUP

Project	Category	Description	Cost Estimate
Auburn, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Decentralized package plant w/subsurf discharge	$2,769,000
Bluefield Sanitary Bd	energy efficiency/savings	PS rehab / construction	$500,000
Cairo, Town of	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	$1,035,000
Crab Orchard-MacArthur PSD - Rhodell	decentralized sewer system	Packaged Ext. Aer. Plant	$4,510,200
Dunbar Sanitary Board	energy efficiency/savings & storm water	Light Fixture replacement / sewer separation	$460,000
Ellenboro Lamberton PSD (Pullman)	decentralized sewer system	Peat system w/subsurface discharge for 70 cust.	$2,200,000
Greater Paw Paw PSD	decentralized sewer system	Crown Community STEP proj.	$1,572,255
Greater St. Albans PSD	decentralized sewer system	Ph. IV - low pressure sys in Thomas Hollow	$3,445,000
Greenbrier PSD #1	decentralized sewer system	Meadowbrook plant / system ext	$5,296,145
Hurricane, City of	decentralized sewer system	Tackett's Branch 27 home decentralized system	$804,100
McDowell PSD	decentralized sewer system	McDowell 29 home septic collect. w/comm. Filter & subsurface dis.	$1,203,500
McDowell PSD	decentralized sewer system	Crumpler 114 home septic collect. w/comm. Filter & subsurface dis.	$2,337,499
McDowell PSD	decentralized sewer system	Coalwood 199 new customers	$4,372,500
Montgomery, City of	energy efficiency	PS rehab / construction	$844,700
New Haven PSD	decentralized sewer system	Winona STEP/STEG system	$3,095,000
Preston County PSD	decentralized sewer system	Valley PT. 46 customer decentralized system	$1,875,000
St. Albans MUC	energy efficiency/savings	UV replacement & Blower Controls	$3,010,480
Warm Springs PSD	energy efficiency/savings	Solar power	$836,000
Webster Springs PSD	decentralized sewer system	Bergoo comm. septic for 50 customers	$2,437,129
		TOTAL	$39,834,508