# OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

65 East State Street, Suite 312
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 466-0880

## APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Revised 6/90

**IMPORTANT:** Applicant should consult the "Instructions for Completion of Project Application for assistance in the proper completion of this form.

CBD05

**APPLICANT NAME** Delhi Township Board of Trustees
**STREET** 934 Neeb Road

**CITY/ZIP** Cincinnati, Ohio 45233

**PROJECT NAME** Duebber's Subdivision Reconstruction
**PROJECT TYPE** Reconstruction
**TOTAL COST** $ 565,921.00

**DISTRICT NUMBER** 2
**COUNTY** Hamilton

**PROJECT LOCATION ZIP CODE** 45233

### DISTRICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION
To be completed by the District Committee ONLY

**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT OF FUNDING:** $ 509,329.00

**FUNDING SOURCE (Check Only One):**

State Issue 2 District Allocation
_____ Grant
_____ Loan
_____ Loan Assistance

_____ State Issue 2 Small Government Fund
_____ State Issue 2 Emergency Funds
X Local Transportation Improvement Fund

**FOR OPWC USE ONLY**

OPWC PROJECT NUMBER: _____ OPWC FUNDING AMOUNT: $_____

# 1.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER | Hal L. Franke |
| | TITLE | Board President |
| | STREET | 934 Neeb Road |
| | CITY/ZIP | Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 |
| | PHONE | ( 513 ) 922 - 3111 |
| | FAX | ( 513 ) 922 - 9315 |
| 1.2 | CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER | Robert A. Bedinghaus |
| | TITLE | Township Clerk |
| | STREET | 934 Neeb Road |
| | CITY/ZIP | Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 |
| | PHONE | ( 513 ) 922 - 3111 |
| | FAX | ( 513 ) 922 - 9315 |
| 1.3 | PROJECT MGR | Robert W. Bass |
| | TITLE | Highway Superintendent |
| | STREET | 665 Neeb Road |
| | CITY/ZIP | Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 |
| | PHONE | ( 513 ) 922 - 8609 |
| | FAX | ( 513 ) 922 - 8635 |
| 1.4 | PROJECT CONTACT | Robert W. Bass |
| | TITLE | Project Manager |
| | STREET | 665 Neeb Road |
| | CITY/ZIP | Cincinnati, Ohio 45233 |
| | PHONE | ( 513 ) 922 - 8609 |
| | FAX | ( 513 ) 922 - 8635 |
| 1.5 | DISTRICT LIAISON | William Brayshaw, P.E., P.S. |
| | TITLE | Chief Deputy Engineer |
| | STREET | 138 E. Court Street, Room 700 |
| | CITY/ZIP | Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 |
| | PHONE | ( 513 ) 632 - 8691 |
| | FAX | ( 513 ) 723 - 9748 |

# 2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

**IMPORTANT:** If project is multi-jurisdictional in nature, information must be consolidated for completion of this section.

2.1 **PROJECT NAME:** Duebber's Subdivision Reconstruction

2.2 **BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION - (Sections A through D):**

A. **SPECIFIC LOCATION:**

Duebber's Subdivision Reconstruction is located in south central Delhi Township and is a connecter subdivision to one county artery (Delhi Pike) and two sccondary roads (Mt. Alverno and Greenwell Roads). ADT=580 (see attached pavement management section survey).

B. **PROJECT COMPONENTS:**

Full depth removal of existing pavement. Subgrade stabilization and curb underdrains. New concrete curbs with full depth pavement replacement at 8 inch depth. Rehabilitation of current drainage system and replacement of deteriorated sidewalk.

C. **PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS/CHARACTERISTICS:**

Streets are approximately 45 years old. Pavements are in poor condition with standing water in roadway. Current overlays only mask severe subgrade problems. Full and partial depth repairs were not made as a matter of current overlays.

D. **DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY:**

**IMPORTANT:** Detail shall be included regarding current service capacity vs proposed service level. If road or bridge project, include ADT. If water or wastewater project include current residential rates based on monthly usage of 7,756 gallons pe household.

Design is for maximum service due to the extensive work being done on the subgrade, the drainage system, the new curb and gutter, and the new pavement.

2.3 **REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

(Photographs/Additional Description; Capital Improvements Report; Priority Lisi 5-year Plan; 2-year Maintenance of Effort report, etc.) Also discuss the numbe of temporary and/or fulltime jobs which are likely to be created as a result o this project. Attach Pages. Refer to accompanying instructions for furthe detail.

# 3.0 PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

## 3.1 PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS (Round to Nearest Dollar):

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| a) | Project Engineering Costs: | |
| | 1. Preliminary Engineering | $ N/A |
| | 2. Final Design | $ N/A |
| | 3. Construction Supervision | $ N/A |
| b) | Acquisition Expenses | |
| | 1. Land | $ N/A |
| | 2. Right-of-Way | $ N/A |
| c) | Construction Costs | $ 560,638.50 |
| d) | Equipment Costs | $ 0 |
| e) | Other Direct Expenses | $ 0 |
| f) | Contingencies | $ 5,282.50 |
| g) | **TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS** | $ 565,921.00 |

## 3.2 PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES (Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

| | | Dollars | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) | Local In-Kind Contributions* | $ 0 | - |
| b) | Local Public Revenues | $ 56,592.10 | 10 |
| c) | Local Private Revenues | $ 0 | - |
| d) | Other Public Revenues | | |
| | 1. ODOT | $ 0 | - |
| | 2. FMHA | $ 0 | - |
| | 3. OEPA | $ 0 | - |
| | 4. OWDA | $ 0 | - |
| | 5. CDBG | $ 0 | - |
| | 6. Other _____ | $ 0 | - |
| e) | OPWC Funds | | |
| | 1. Grant | $ 509,328.90 | 90 |
| | 2. Loan | $ 0 | - |
| | 3. Loan Assistance | $ 0 | - |
| f) | **TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES** | $ 565,921.00 | 100 |

* If the required local match is to be 100% In-Kind Contributions, list source of funds to be used for retainage purposes:

## 3.3 AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS

**Indicate the status of <u>all</u> local share funding sources listed in section 3.2(a) through 3.4(c). In addition, if funds are coming from sources listed in section <u>3.2(d)</u>, the following information <u>must be attached to this project application</u>:**

1) The date funds are available;
2) Verification of funds in the form of an agency approval letter or agency project number. Please include the name and number of the agency contact person.

## 3.4 PREPAID ITEMS

**Definitions:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Cost -** | Total Cost of the Prepaid Item. |
| **Cost Item -** | Non-construction costs, including preliminary engineering, final design, acquisition expenses (land or right-of-way). |
| **Prepaid -** | Cost items (non-construction costs directly related to the project), paid prior to receipt of fully executed Project Agreement from OPWC. |
| **Resource Category -** | Source of funds (see section 3.2). |
| **Verification -** | Invoice(s) and copies of warrant(s) used to for prepaid costs, accompanied by Project Manager's Certification (see section 1.4). |

**IMPORTANT: Verification of all prepaid items shall be attached to this project application.**

| | COST ITEM | RESOURCE CATEGORY | COST |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1) | _____ | _____ | $_____ |
| 2) | _____ | _____ | $_____ |
| 3) | _____ | _____ | $_____ |

TOTAL OF PREPAID ITEMS $_____

## 3.5 REPAIR/REPLACEMENT or NEW/EXPANSION

**This section need only be completed if the Project is to be funded by SI2 funds:**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT** | $_____ | _____% |
| **State Issue 2 Funds for Repair/Replacement (Not to Exceed 90%)** | $_____ | _____ |
| **TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION** | $_____ | _____% |
| **State Issue 2 Funds for New/Expansion (Not to Exceed 50%)** | $_____ | _____ |

# 4.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

For schedule purposes only. See project application for all additional information.

| | | ESTIMATED START DATE | ESTIMATED COMPLETE DATE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.1 | ENGR. DESIGN | 05 / 01 / 92 | 08 / 01 / 92 |
| 4.2 | BID PROCESS | 08 / 12 / 92 | 08 / 26 / 92 |
| 4.3 | CONSTRUCTION | 09 / 15 / 92 | 06 / 30 / 93 |

# 5.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

The Applicant Certifies That:

As the official representative of the Applicant, the undersigned certifies that: (1) he/she is legally empowered to represent the applicant in both requesting and accepting financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code and 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; (2) that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are a part of this application are true and correct; (3) that all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are a part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the Applicant; (4) and, should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the Applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio law, including those involving minority business utilization, Buy Ohio, and prevailing wages.

**IMPORTANT:** Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in this application has not begun, and will not begin, until a Project Agreement on this project has been issued by the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary is evidence that OPWC funds are not necessary to complete this project.

**IMPORTANT:** In the event of a project cost underrun, applicant understands that the identified local match share (sections 3.2(a) through 3.2(c) will be paid in full toward completion of this project. Unneeded OPWC funds will be returned to the funding source from which the project was financed.

HAL L. FRANKE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

Hal L. Franke 12-30-91
Signature/Date Signed

Applicant shall check each of the statements below, confirming that all required information is included in this application:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | | A five-year Capital Improvements Report as required in 164-1-31 of the Ohio Administrative Code and a two-year Maintenance of Local Effort Report as required in 164-1-12 of the Ohio Administrative Code. |
| X | | A registered professional engineer's estimate of useful life as required in 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's original seal and signature. |
| X | | A registered professional engineer's estimate of cost as required in 164-1-14 and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's original seal and signature. |
| X | | A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to submit this application and to execute contracts. |
| | YES | A copy of the cooperation agreement(s) (for projects involving more than one subdivision or district). |
| X | N/A | |
| | YES | Copies of all invoices and warrants for those items identified as "pre-paid" in section 4.4 of this application. |
| X | N/A | |

# 6.0 DISTRICT COMMITTEE CERTIFICATION

The District Integrating Committee for District Number 2 Certifies That:

As the official representative of the District Public Works Integrating Committee, the undersigned hereby certifies: that this application for financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code has been duly selected by the appropriate body of the District Public Works Integrating Committee; that the project's selection was based entirely on an objective, District-oriented set of project evaluation criteria and selection methodology that are fully reflective of and in conformance with Ohio Revised Code Sections 164.05, 164.06, and 164.14, and Chapter 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; and that the amount of financial assistance hereby recommended has been prudently derived in consideration of all other financial resources available to the project. As evidence of the District's due consideration of required project evaluation criteria, the results of this project's ratings under such criteria are attached to this application.

William W. Brayshaw, Chairman, District 2 Integrating Committee
Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

William W. Brayshaw 4-20-92
Signature/Date Signed

*FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR USE OF*
*OHIO INFRASTRUCTURE BOND MONIES*

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to establish a plan for monies obtained through Ohio's Infrastructure Bond sale and to address needs, costs, completion time frames and income streams. It is also designed to establish a priority listing of infrastructure needs and projects.

## INVENTORY

Delhi Township has a road network which includes forty nine and eighty three hundreths (49.83) miles of road surface and the ensuing right of way. It also maintains an administration and a police building, two (2) maintenance garages, two (2) fire stations, a senior citizens center, a historical landmark and a cemetery. Additionally, it maintains thirteen hundred and fifty plus (1350+) catch basins and many miles of storm sewer pipes, as well as seven (7) storm water culverts.

## CURRENT CONDITION

The Township is utilizing a 1.5 mill Road and Bridge levy since 1985 to repair and maintain its' road network. This levy translates into approximately $330,000.00 per year. This levy expires after 1994. The Township has had levy money with which to repair its' road network since 1985. The levy money has been used to repair as many roads as possible but has not had the opportunity to deal with total "reconstruction" projects. Issue 2 funding could help greatly with these reconstruction costs.

Furthermore, in 1987, the Hamilton County Public Works Department changed their regulations to make townships within the county responsible for certain aspects of storm water drainage. This is a new experience for the Township and consequently many new problems exist as a result of this change. Currently, the Township does not have the equipment, manpower or funds to maintain these storm sewer systems. Furthermore, the County does not have a master plan showing the location or depths of these systems.

## PRIORITIES

The first priority for this funding would be for road reconstruction on all streets within the Township, which, due to the extensive nature of the work needed, the Township has not

been able to accomplish. These roads are in need of complete reconstruction including new drainage systems. They are listed below with an approximate amount of cost.

| STREET | APPROXIMATE COST |
|---|---|
| 1) Chantilly Woods Subdivision | $ 1,480,859.00 |
| 2) Briarhill Lane/Anders Court | $ 320,496.50 |
| 3) Ihle Drive | $ 207,053.50 |
| 4) Ivyhill Subdivision | $ 354,360.00 |
| 5) Bob/Don Subdivision | $ 565,921.00 |
| 6) Mapleton/Groton Drive | $ 224,510.00 |
| 7) Victory Drive | $ 150,000.00 |
| 8) Virgil Drive | $ 50,000.00 |
| 9) South Delridge Drive | $ 50,000.00 |
| 10) Felicia Drive | $ 75,000.00 |
| 11) Muirwood Drive | $ 112,000.00 |
| **Grand Total** | **$ 3,590,199.00** |

Additionally, this type of funding could be used to reconstruct damaged storm sewer systems which are now the responsibility of Delhi Township to maintain. Due to the lack of records available, lack of visibility of these systems and the Township's lack of experience in this type of repair, it is virtually impossible to estimate a cost factor at this time.

However, there are many areas where the original developer was allowed to run street storm water drainage via storm drainage pipes to the rear yards of the development consequently causing erosion problems throughout the township. Listed below are some of those areas and the approximate cost to enclose these systems.

| SUBDIVISION | LOTS | COST |
|---|---|---|
| FOLEY FOREST | 43-45-46-58-59 | 5,200.00 |
| EILEEN GARDENS | 21-22-23-24-16-17-27-28 | 7,520.00 |
| AREA SERVICE(#2) | 20-21 | 2,170.00 |
| MT. ALVERNO | 218-219-220 | 3,500.00 |
| | 245-246-247 | 5,420.00 |
| CANDLERIDGE | 22-23 | 1,870.00 |
| DELHIVIEW | 19-20 | 2,030.00 |
| **GRAND TOTAL** | | 27,710.00 |

**DEPARTMENTAL OVERVIEW**

The Township will continue to repair and rehabilitate as well as handling routine maintenance(crack sealing, surface treatment, etc.) on it's road network through in-house personnel and outside contracts through approved levies and other road

funds. Issue 2 funding, as stated previously, is intended to be used first for reconstruction contracts and secondly for storm drainage erosion restitution.

*TWO YEAR MAINTENANCE EFFORT*
*LOCAL FUNDING 1990 & 1991*

PROJECTS-REHABILITATION & REPAIR

**1990 STREETS REHABILITATED**
Andy Court--Betty Drive--Centerview Court--Glenoaks Drive--Hollowview Lane--Montview Drive--Mystical Rose Lane--Patron Court--Pinallas Court--Wilderness Trail--Willnet Drive
**TOTAL PROJECT COST - $144,652.00**

**1990 STREETS RECONSTRUCTED**
Allenford Court--Covedale Avenue
**TOTAL PROJECT COST - $298,600.00**

**1991 STREETS REHABILITATED**
Beechmeadow Lane--Coachman Court--Courier Court--Debonhill Drive- Eaglepoint Drive--Fairdale Drive--Hickok Drive--Kitty Lane--Picuda Court--Redstar Drive--Riverama Drive--Starcrest Drive--Viscount Drive
**TOTAL PROJECT COST - $179,600.00**

**1991 STREETS RECONSTRUCTED**
Faysel Drive--Viewland Drive--Burhen Drive--Samoht Ridge--Leath Road--Orchardview Lane--Elm Street--Plum Street
**TOTAL PROJECT COST - $1,199,000.00**

**FUNDING SOURCE**

Funding for the 1990 rehabilitation projects were provided by the Township's Road and Bridge Fund which was supported by a 1.9 mill tax levy. In November of 1989 this levy was renewed at a lower rate of 1.5 mills. This 1.5 mill money will be used in the upcoming five years for additional rehabilitation projects. In addition to the money spent in 1990 and 1991 for reconstruction, the money spent for reconstruction came from Community Development Block Grant Funding, State of Ohio Issue Two Funds and the Townships' Road and Bridge Fund.

THOMAS E. FERGUSON

AUD-4254A (Revised 12/89)

Auditor of State

# FINANCIAL REPORT OF TOWNSHIPS

For Fiscal Year Ending December 31, 19 90

DELHI Township, County of HAMILTON

"This is an unaudited Financial Report"

## SUMMARY OF CASH BALANCES, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

| Line No. | SOURCE DESCRIPTION | GOVERNMENTAL FUNDS | TOTAL EXPENDABLE TRUST AND AGENCY FUNDS | | NON-EXPENDABLE TRUST FUNDS | TOTALS & FUND BALANCE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | RECEIPTS: | REVENUE | RECEIPTS | | OPERATING | |
| 02 | Taxes | 2,903,892.08 | | | RECEIPTS | 2,903,892.08 |
| 03 | Charges for Services | | | | | |
| 04 | Licenses, Permits and Fees | 15,425.00 | | | | 15,425.00 |
| 05 | Fines and Forfeitures | 32,937.57 | | | | 32,937.57 |
| 06 | Intergovernmental Receipts | 1,273,188.24 | | | | 1,273,188.24 |
| 07 | Special Assessments | 10,775.79 | | | | 10,775.79 |
| 08 | Interest | 292,497.16 | | 04 | | 292,497.16 |
| | Gifts | | | 05 | | |
| 09 | All Other Revenue | 128,887.87 | | 06 | | 128,997.87 |
| 10 | TOTAL RECEIPTS | 4,657,603.71 | | 08 | | 4,657,603.71 |
| | DISBURSEMENTS | EXPENDITURE | DISBURSEMENTS | | OPERATING | |
| 13 | General Government | 778,870.61 | | | DISBURSEMENTS | 778,870.61 |
| 14 | Public Safety | 2,241,065.75 | | | | 2,241,065.75 |
| 15 | Public Works | 844,614.80 | | | | 844,614.80 |
| 16 | Health | 21,586.36 | | | | 21,586.36 |
| 17 | Human Services | | | | | |
| 18 | Conservation-Recreation | | | | | |
| 19 | Miscellaneous | | | | | |
| 20 | Capital Outlay | 280,230.98 | | 13 | | 280,230.98 |
| 21 | Debt Service | | | | | |
| 22 | Bond Principal Payment | | | | | |
| 23 | Note Principal Payment | | | | | |
| 24 | Interest and Fiscal Charges | | | | | |
| | Personal Services | | | 10 | | |
| | Contract Services | | | 11 | | |
| | Supplies and Materials | | | 12 | | |
| | TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS | 4,166,368.50 | | | | 4,166,368.50 |
| | | | | | | |
| 27 | Total Receipts Over/(Under)Disb | 491,235.21 | | 17 | | 491,235.21 |
| | | OTHER FINANCING | SOURCES (USES) | | NON-OPERATING | |
| 29 | Proceeds of Bonds | | | | RECEIPTS (USES) | |
| 30 | Proceeds of Notes | | | | | |
| 31 | Operating Transfers-In | 112,935.48 | | 35 | | 112,935.48 |
| 32 | Operating Transfers-Out | (112,935.48) | | 36 | | (112,935.48) |
| 33 | Advances-In | 10,520.00 | | | | 10,520.00 |
| 34 | Advances-Out | (10,520.00) | | | | (10,520.00) |
| 35 | Other Sources/Receipts | 2,130.95 | | 39 | | 2,130.95 |
| 36 | Other Uses/Disbursements | | | 30 | | |
| 38 | TOTAL OTHER FINANCING SOURCES(USES) | 2,130.95 | | * | | 2,130.95 |
| 39 | Total of Rec. & Other Sources Over (Under) | | | | | |
| 40 | Disb & Other Uses | 493,366.16 | | 40 | | 493,366.16 |
| 41 | Fund Cash Balance, January 1, | 2,858,956.15 | | 41 | | 2,858,956.15 |
| 42 | Fund Cash Balance, December 31, 1990 | 3,352,322.31 | | 42 | | 3,352,322.31 |
| 43 | Reserve for Encumbrances, Dec 31, 1990 | 704,724.14 | | 43 | | 704,724.14 |

| SUMMARY OF INDEBTEDNESS | OUTSTANDING Jan. 1, 19 | NEW ISSUES | RETIRED | OUTSTANDING Dec. 31, 19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Fund Cash Balance | |
|---|---|
| Depository Balance | 1,015,878.59 |
| Investments | 2,500,000.00 |
| Cash on Hand | 0.00 |
| Total Treasury Balance | 3,515,878.59 |
| Less Outstanding Checks | (163,556.28) |
| TOTAL BALANCE | 3,352,322.31 |

I certify the following report to be correct and true, to the best of my knowledge.

DELHI TOWNSHIP CLERK
(Chief Fiscal Officer Title)

3/21/91
(Date)

934 NEEB ROAD
(Street Address)

(Chief Fiscal Officer Sign Above)

ROBERT A. BEDINGHAUS (513) 922-3111
(Type or Print Name) (Telephone)

CINCINNATI Ohio 45233
(City or Village) (Zip)

SI2P-ROUND 5

04-DEC-1991

| | ITEM | 202 PAVEMENT REMOVAL | 203 UNDER CUT | 301 BIT. AGG. BASE | 304 #2 STONE | 304 LIME STONE | 403 AC. SCR. COURSE | 404 AC. SUR. COURSE | 452 PPC CONCRETE PAVEMENT(7") | 603 12" PIPE | 604 C.B. RECON | 604 SAN. M.H. RECON | 604 STM. M.H. RECON | 604 W.V. RECON | 608 5" CON. WALK |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MEASURE | S.Y. | C.Y. | C.Y. | C.Y. | C.Y. | C.Y. | C.Y. | S.Y. | L.F. | EA. | EA. | EA. | EA. | S.F. |
| | COST | 5.00 | 10.00 | 65.00 | 30.00 | 30.00 | 55.00 | 55.00 | 90.00 | 25.00 | 700.00 | 250.00 | 300.00 | 300.00 | 3.00 |
| UMBER | STREET | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | BOB | 4520.00 | 1505.00 | 619.00 | 1130.00 | 377.00 | 103.00 | 103.00 | 265.00 | 300.00 | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6500.00 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 22600.00 | 15050.00 | 40235.00 | 33900.00 | 11310.00 | 5665.00 | 5665.00 | 23850.00 | 7500.00 | 2800.00 | 250.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 19500.00 |
| 2 | DON | 4141.00 | 1370.00 | 552.00 | 1035.00 | 345.00 | 92.00 | 92.00 | 265.00 | 300.00 | 5.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 5980.00 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 20705.00 | 13700.00 | 35880.00 | 31050.00 | 10350.00 | 5060.00 | 5060.00 | 23850.00 | 7500.00 | 3500.00 | 250.00 | 300.00 | 0.00 | 17940.00 |
| 3 | MARGE | 1155.00 | 386.00 | 155.00 | 289.00 | 93.00 | 26.00 | 26.00 | 32.00 | 50.00 | 2.00 | 5.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 5775.00 | 3860.00 | 10075.00 | 8670.00 | 2790.00 | 1430.00 | 1430.00 | 2880.00 | 1250.00 | 1400.00 | 1250.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | LUMP SUM | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | CONTINGENCIES | 0.00 | 50.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 | 50.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | SUBTOTAL | 0.00 | 500.00 | 0.00 | 3000.00 | 1500.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| | TOTAL QUANTITY | 9816.00 | 3311.00 | 1326.00 | 2554.00 | 865.00 | 221.00 | 221.00 | 562.00 | 650.00 | 11.00 | 7.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 12480.00 |
| | TOTAL COST | 49080.00 | 33110.00 | 86190.00 | 76620.00 | 25950.00 | 12155.00 | 12155.00 | 50580.00 | 16250.00 | 7700.00 | 1750.00 | 300.00 | 0.00 | 37440.00 |

USEFUL LIFE: THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT UPON SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF THIS WORK, THE USEFUL LIFE OF THE STREETS ON THIS PROJECT WILL BE AT LEAST 20 YEARS.

SIGNED: Donald C. Schramm P.E.

SI2P-ROUND 5

04-DEC-1991

| | ITEM | 609 CURB & GUTTER | 614 MAINTAIN TRAFFIC | 619 FIELD OFFICE | SPL DOWN SPOUTS | SPL ROAD FABRIC | SPL UNDER DRAINS | TOTALS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | MEASURE | L.F. | L.S. | L.S. | L.F. | S.Y. | L.F. | |
| | COST | 8.50 | 7000.00 | 7000.00 | 7.00 | 1.50 | 10.00 | |
| UMBER | STREET | | | | | | | |
| 1 | BOB | 3255.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 250.00 | 4520.00 | 3255.00 | |
| | SUBTOTAL | 27667.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1750.00 | 6780.00 | 32550.00 | 257072.50 |
| 2 | DON | 2990.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 250.00 | 4141.00 | 2290.00 | |
| | SUBTOTAL | 25415.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1750.00 | 6211.50 | 22900.00 | 231421.50 |
| 3 | MARGE | 832.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 30.00 | 1155.00 | 832.00 | |
| | SUBTOTAL | 7072.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 210.00 | 1732.50 | 8320.00 | 58144.50 |
| | LUMP SUM | 0.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| | SUBTOTAL | 0.00 | 7000.00 | 7000.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14000.00 |
| | CONTINGENCIES | 25.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| | SUBTOTAL | 212.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 70.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 5282.50 |
| | TOTAL QUANTITY | 7102.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 540.00 | 9816.00 | 6377.00 | 565921.00 |
| | TOTAL COST | 60367.00 | 7000.00 | 7000.00 | 3780.00 | 14724.00 | 63770.00 | 565921.00 |

STATUS OF FUNDS

This is to certify that Delhi Township's portion of the funding for this project will become available on January 1, 1992.

Robert A. Bedinghaus
Township Clerk & Chief Fiscal Officer

# DELHI TOWNSHIP, OHIO

ROAD MAINTENANCE
665 NEEB ROAD
DELHI TOWNSHIP
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45233

| | |
|---|---|
| ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES | 513/922-3111 |
| FIRE DEPARTMENT | 513/922-2011 |
| POLICE DEPARTMENT | 513/922-0060 |
| ROAD DEPARTMENT | 513/922-8609 |
| DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES | 513/922-3111 |

Resolution 92-

Trustee Espelage moved and Trustee LaScalea seconded to apply to the Issue 2 District Integrating Committee for the below mentioned projects and to appoint Hal L. Franke as Chief Executive Officer, Robert A. Bedinghaus as Chief Fiscal Officer, and Robert W. Bass as Project Manager.

Streets being requested for Issue 2 Infrastructure Bond Applications for 1992:

1. Chantilly Woods Subdivision Reconstruction

   - Cost $1,480,859.00

2. Briarhill Lane/Anders Court Reconstruction
   - Cost $320,496.50

3. Duebbers Subdivision Reconstruction

   - Cost $565,921.00

4. Ihle Drive Reconstruction

   - Cost $207053.50

The total request to the Issue 2 Integrating Committee is $2,574,330.00

Trustees Espelage, LaScalea and Franke voted aye at roll call. Motion carried.

Certificate of Clerk

It is hereby certified that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Delhi Township Board of Trustees in session on January 8, 1992.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of January, 1992.

Robert A. Bedinghaus, Township Clerk

# URBAN INVENTORY FORM
## SECTION IDENTIFICATION

SECTION NO: (0 TO QUIT) 337.1 DATE: 02/23/90 COMPLETED BY: MEB

STATE RT #: 4 NAME: BOB DRIVE LENGTH (FT): 1116.2

FROM: DON LANE TO: #323 BOB DRIVE

FUNCTIONAL CLASS: C R.O.W. WIDTH: 50.0 SUBDIVISION : DUEBBER 1

## PAVEMENT INFORMATION

PAVEMENT TYPE: 3 WIDTH: 25.0 # TRAVEL LANES: 2 # PARKING LANES: 1

## SHOULDER INFORMATION

LEFT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0 RIGHT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0

## DRAINAGE INFORMATION

L CURB HT(''): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 R CURB HT(''): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0

LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0

## TRAFFIC INFORMATION

CURRENT ADT: 172 % TRUCKS: 1.0 YEAR: 1990 ESTIMATED: 1

PROJECTED ADT: 0 % TRUCKS: 0.0 YEAR: 0 TRANSIT/BUS ROUTE: 0

## UTILITIES INFORMATION

# MANHOLES: 2 # UTILITY BOX COVERS: 0 ELECTRICAL: 0 TELEPHONE: 0

ELECTRIC OWNER: C.G.&E. GAS OWNER: C.G.&E.

TELEPHONE OWNER: Cinti. Bell OWNER WATER: Cinti Water Works

LIGHTING OWNER: C.G.&E. SEWER OWNER: M.S.D.

CABLE TV OWNER: United Video STORM OWNER:

## STRUCTURE INFORMATION

| STRUCTURE | PAVEMENT | TYPE | THICKNESS | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |

# URBAN INVENTORY FORM
## SECTION IDENTIFICATION

SECTION NO: (0 TO QUIT) 337.0 DATE: 02/23/90 COMPLETED BY: MEB

STATE RT #: 4 NAME: BOB DRIVE LENGTH (FT): 510.0

FROM: MT.ALVERNO TO: #323 BOB DRIVE

FUNCTIONAL CLASS: C R.O.W. WIDTH: 50.0 SUBDIVISION : DUEBBER 1

## PAVEMENT INFORMATION

PAVEMENT TYPE: 2 WIDTH: 25.0 # TRAVEL LANES: 2 # PARKING LANES: 1

## SHOULDER INFORMATION

LEFT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0 RIGHT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0

## DRAINAGE INFORMATION

L CURB HT(''): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 R CURB HT(''): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0

LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0

## TRAFFIC INFORMATION

CURRENT ADT: 172 % TRUCKS: 1.0 YEAR: 1990 ESTIMATED: 1

PROJECTED ADT: 0 % TRUCKS: 0.0 YEAR: 0 TRANSIT/BUS ROUTE: 0

## UTILITIES INFORMATION

# MANHOLES: 0 # UTILITY BOX COVERS: 0 ELECTRICAL: 0 TELEPHONE: 0

ELECTRIC OWNER: C.G.&E. GAS OWNER: C.G.&E.

TELEPHONE OWNER: Cinti. Bell OWNER WATER: Cinti Water Works

LIGHTING OWNER: C.G.&E. SEWER OWNER: M.S.D.

CABLE TV OWNER: United Video STORM OWNER:

## STRUCTURE INFORMATION

| STRUCTURE | PAVEMENT | TYPE | THICKNESS | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |

URBAN DISTRESS DATA FORM RIGID PAVEMENT

STREET: BOB DRIVE
FROM: MT.ALVERNO
TO: #323 BOB DRIVE
DATE SURVEYED (MM/YY): 11/91

SECTION NO: 337.0
INPUT MAINTENANCE FACTOR: 5
% CURB DETERIORATION: 10
ROUGHNESS INDEX: 0.0

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | PERCENTAGE OF AREA |
|---|---|---|
| DURABILITY "D" CRACKING | 2 | 1 |
| SPALLING | 0 | 0 |
| CRAZING OR MAP CRACKING | 0 | 0 |
| LONGITUDINAL AND TRANSVERSE CRACKING | 0 | 0 |
| PUMPING | 0 | 0 |
| FAULTING | 2 | 2 |

AREA KEY
0 = 0%
1 = 1-5%
2 = 6-25%
3 = 26-50%
4 = 51-100%

SEVERITY KEY 0 = NONE ; 1 = LOW ; 2 = MODERATE ; 3 = HIGH

PCI = 85.0

PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE...

URBAN DISTRESS DATA FORM COMPOSITE PAVEMENT

STREET: BOB DRIVE
FROM: DON LANE
TO: #323 BOB DRIVE
DATE SURVEYED (MM/YY): 11/91

SECTION NO: 337.1
INPUT MAINTENANCE FACTOR: 5
% CURB DETERIORATION: 65
ROUGHNESS INDEX: 0.0

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | PERCENTAGE OF AREA |
|---|---|---|
| SWELL | 3 | 3 |
| BOND LOSS | 2 | 2 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | 3 | 4 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | 0 | 0 |
| WEATHERING AND RAVELLING | 3 | 4 |

AREA KEY
0 = 0%
1 = 1-5%
2 = 6-25%
3 = 26-50%
4 = 51-100%

SEVERITY KEY 0 = NONE ; 1 = LOW ; 2 = MODERATE ; 3 = HIGH

PCI = 1.0

PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE...

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

# RIGID PAVEMENT DISTRESS DATA FORM

DATE _____ SECTION NO. _____

STREET NAME Bob _____ INSPECTED BY _____

FROM _____ MAINTENANCE FACTOR _____

TO _____ % CURB DETERIORATION _____

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | | PERCENTAGE OF AREA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1–5% | 6–25% | 26–50% | 51–100% |
| DURABILITY "D" CRACKING | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 40 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 50 |
| SPALLING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| | MODERATE | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 15 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 25 |
| CRAZING OR MAP CRACKING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| | MODERATE | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | HIGH | 1 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| LONGITUDINAL & TRANSVERSE CRACKING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 15 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 30 |
| PUMPING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| | MODERATE | 1 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| | HIGH | 1 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| FAULTING | LOW | 2 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 5 | 10 | 25 | 35 |
| | | | | | | |

1– PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE RELATED

2– STRUCTURAL RELATED

PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

# COMPOSITE PAVEMENT DISTRESS DATA FORM

DATE _____

STREET NAME Bob

FROM _____

TO Don

SECTION NO. _____

INSPECTED BY _____

MAINTENANCE FACTOR _____

% CURB DETERIORATION _____

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | | PERCENTAGE OF AREA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1–5% | 6–25% | 26–50% | 51–100% |
| SWELL | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 40 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 50 |
| BOND LOSS | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 25 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 45 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 10 | 30 | 35 | 40 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | LOW | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 35 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 15 | 35 | 40 | 45 |
| WEATHERING & RAVELING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 1 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | HIGH | 1 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

1– PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE RELATED

PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD PROJECT
COST ESTIMATE

Section # 337 & 337.1

NAME: Bob

| REPAIR | QUANTITY | PRICE /PER | COST |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.CURB | | | |
| 2.DOWNSPUT | | | |
| 3.STM.M.H adj. | | | |
| 4.SAN.M.H adj. | | | |
| 5.JOINT MEMBRANE | | | |
| 6.~~PARTIAL DEPTH~~ | 3255 L.F | | |
| 7.RIGID REMOVAL | 4520 YD$^2$ | | |
| 8.301 | 378 YD$^3$ | | |
| 9.403 | 126 YD$^3$ | | |
| 10.404 | 126 YD$^3$ | | |
| 11.~~CB adj.~~ 12" R.C.P. | 300 L.F. | | |
| 12.CB rec. | 6 | | |
| 13.EXCAVATION/12" CUT | 1505 YD$^3$ | | |
| 14.EMBANKMENT #2 | 1130 YD$^3$ | | |
| 15.ROAD FABRIC | 4520 YD$^2$ | | |
| 16.EXC.w/emb | | | |
| 17.EXC.w/301 B-19 | 377 YD$^3$ | | |

SKETCH:

SIDEWALK: 6500 FT$^2$

DRIVEWAY: 265 YD$^2$

SOD/SOIL: 723 YD$^2$

# URBAN INVENTORY FORM
## SECTION IDENTIFICATION

SECTION NO: (0 TO QUIT) 335.0 DATE: 02/24/90 COMPLETED BY: MEB

STATE RT #: 3 NAME: DON LANE LENGTH (FT): 311.4

FROM: DELHI PIKE TO: BOB DRIVE

FUNCTIONAL CLASS: C R.O.W. WIDTH: 50.0 SUBDIVISION : DUEBBER RE

## PAVEMENT INFORMATION

PAVEMENT TYPE: 3 WIDTH: 25.2 # TRAVEL LANES: 2 # PARKING LANES: 1

## SHOULDER INFORMATION

LEFT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0 RIGHT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0

## DRAINAGE INFORMATION

L CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 R CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0

LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0

## TRAFFIC INFORMATION

CURRENT ADT: 316 % TRUCKS: 1.0 YEAR: 1990 ESTIMATED: 1

PROJECTED ADT: 0 % TRUCKS: 0.0 YEAR: 0 TRANSIT/BUS ROUTE: 0

## UTILITIES INFORMATION

# MANHOLES: 1 # UTILITY BOX COVERS: 0 ELECTRICAL: 0 TELEPHONE: 0

ELECTRIC OWNER: C.G.&E. GAS OWNER: C.G.&E.

TELEPHONE OWNER: Cinti. Bell OWNER WATER: Cinti Water Works

LIGHTING OWNER: C.G.&E. SEWER OWNER: M.S.D.

CABLE TV OWNER: United Video STORM OWNER:

## STRUCTURE INFORMATION

| STRUCTURE | PAVEMENT | TYPE | THICKNESS | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |

# URBAN INVENTORY FORM
## SECTION IDENTIFICATION

SECTION NO: (0 TO QUIT) 336.0 DATE: 02/24/90 COMPLETED BY: MEB

STATE RT #: 3 NAME: DON LANE LENGTH (FT): 1180.0

FROM: BOB DRIVE TO: END (SOUTH)

FUNCTIONAL CLASS: L R.O.W. WIDTH: 50.0 SUBDIVISION : DUEBBER RE

## PAVEMENT INFORMATION

PAVEMENT TYPE: 3 WIDTH: 25.2 # TRAVEL LANES: 2 # PARKING LANES: 1

## SHOULDER INFORMATION

LEFT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0 RIGHT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0

## DRAINAGE INFORMATION

L CURB HT(''): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 R CURB HT(''): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0

LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0

## TRAFFIC INFORMATION

CURRENT ADT: 82 % TRUCKS: 1.0 YEAR: 1990 ESTIMATED: 1

PROJECTED ADT: 0 % TRUCKS: 0.0 YEAR: 0 TRANSIT/BUS ROUTE: 0

## UTILITIES INFORMATION

# MANHOLES: 2 # UTILITY BOX COVERS: 0 ELECTRICAL: 0 TELEPHONE: 0

ELECTRIC OWNER: C.G.&E. GAS OWNER: C.G.&E.

TELEPHONE OWNER: Cinti. Bell OWNER WATER: Cinti Water Works

LIGHTING OWNER: C.G.&E. SEWER OWNER: M.S.D.

CABLE TV OWNER: United Video STORM OWNER:

## STRUCTURE INFORMATION

| STRUCTURE | PAVEMENT | TYPE | THICKNESS | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | | 0.00 | 0 |

URBAN DISTRESS DATA FORM  COMPOSITE PAVEMENT

STREET: DON LANE
FROM: DELHI PIKE
TO: BOB DRIVE
DATE SURVEYED (MM/YY): 10/90

SECTION NO: 335.0
INPUT MAINTENANCE FACTOR: 5
% CURB DETERIORATION: 80
ROUGHNESS INDEX: 0.0

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | PERCENTAGE OF AREA |
|---|---|---|
| SWELL | 1 | 4 |
| BOND LOSS | 3 | 3 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | 3 | 4 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | 0 | 0 |
| WEATHERING AND RAVELLING | 2 | 4 |

AREA KEY
0 = 0%
1 = 1-5%
2 = 6-25%
3 = 26-50%
4 = 51-100%

SEVERITY KEY  0 = NONE ; 1 = LOW ; 2 = MODERATE ; 3 = HIGH

PCI = 1.0

PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE...

URBAN DISTRESS DATA FORM  COMPOSITE PAVEMENT

STREET: DON LANE
FROM: BOB DRIVE
TO: END (SOUTH)
DATE SURVEYED (MM/YY): 11/91

SECTION NO: 336.0
INPUT MAINTENANCE FACTOR: 5
% CURB DETERIORATION: 60
ROUGHNESS INDEX: 0.0

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | PERCENTAGE OF AREA |
|---|---|---|
| SWELL | 2 | 4 |
| BOND LOSS | 2 | 2 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | 3 | 4 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | 0 | 0 |
| WEATHERING AND RAVELLING | 2 | 4 |

AREA KEY
0 = 0%
1 = 1-5%
2 = 6-25%
3 = 26-50%
4 = 51-100%

SEVERITY KEY  0 = NONE ; 1 = LOW ; 2 = MODERATE ; 3 = HIGH

PCI = 1.0

PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE...

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

# COMPOSITE PAVEMENT DISTRESS DATA FORM

DATE 11-19-91

STREET NAME Don

FROM Delhi

TO Bob

SECTION NO. _____

INSPECTED BY _____

MAINTENANCE FACTOR _____

% CURB DETERIORATION 100

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | | PERCENTAGE OF AREA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1–5% | 6–25% | 26–50% | 51–100% |
| SWELL | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 40 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 50 |
| BOND LOSS | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 25 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 45 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 10 | 30 | 35 | 40 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | LOW | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 35 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 15 | 35 | 40 | 45 |
| WEATHERING & RAVELING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 1 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | HIGH | 1 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

1– PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE RELATED

PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

# COMPOSITE PAVEMENT DISTRESS DATA FORM

DATE 11-19-91

STREET NAME Dan

FROM Rob

TO End

SECTION NO. _____

INSPECTED BY _____

MAINTENANCE FACTOR _____

% CURB DETERIORATION 100

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | | PERCENTAGE OF AREA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1–5% | 6–25% | 26–50% | 51–100% |
| SWELL | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 40 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 50 |
| BOND LOSS | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 25 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 45 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 10 | 30 | 35 | 40 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | LOW | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 35 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 15 | 35 | 40 | 45 |
| WEATHERING & RAVELING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 1 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | HIGH | 1 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

1– PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE RELATED

PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD PROJECT
COST ESTIMATE

Section # 335 & 336

NAME: Don

| REPAIR | QUANTITY | PRICE /PER | COST |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.CURB | 2990 L.F. | | |
| 2.DOWNSPUT | 250 L.F. | | |
| 3.STM.M.H adj. | 2 | | |
| 4.SAN.M.H adj. | 1 | | |
| 5.JOINT MEMBRANE | | | |
| 6.~~PARTIAL DEPTH~~ UNDERDRAIN | 2990 | | |
| 7.RIGID REMOVAL | 4141 YD² | | |
| 8.301 | 346 YD³ | | |
| 9.403 | 115 YD³ | | |
| 10.404 | 115 YD³ | | |
| 11.CB adj. 12" R.C.P. | 300 L.F. | | |
| 12.CB rec. | 6 | | |
| 13.EXCAVATION | | | |
| 14.EMBANKMENT # 2 | 1035 YD³ | | |
| 15.ROAD FABRIC | 4141 YD² | | |
| 16.EXC.w/emb | | | |
| 17.EXC.w/301 B-19 | 345 YD³ | | |

SKETCH:

SIDEWALK: 5980 FT²

DRIVEWAYS: 265 YD²

SOD/SOIL: 662 YD²

# URBAN INVENTORY FORM
## SECTION IDENTIFICATION

SECTION NO: (0 TO QUIT) 338.0 DATE: 02/26/90 COMPLETED BY: MEB

STATE RT #: 26 NAME: MARGE PLACE LENGTH (FT): 416.9

FROM: DON LANE TO: GREENWELL AVENUE

FUNCTIONAL CLASS: C R.O.W. WIDTH: 50.0 SUBDIVISION : DUEBBER RE

## PAVEMENT INFORMATION

PAVEMENT TYPE: 3 WIDTH: 25.0 # TRAVEL LANES: 1 # PARKING LANES: 1

## SHOULDER INFORMATION

LEFT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0 RIGHT SHOULDER TYPE: 4 WIDTH: 12.0

## DRAINAGE INFORMATION

L CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0 R CURB HT("): 3.0 # INLETS: 0 0 0

LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0 LENGTH: TYPE: 0 0 0

## TRAFFIC INFORMATION

CURRENT ADT: 154 % TRUCKS: 1.0 YEAR: 1990 ESTIMATED: 1

PROJECTED ADT: 0 % TRUCKS: 0.0 YEAR: 0 TRANSIT/BUS ROUTE: 0

## UTILITIES INFORMATION

# MANHOLES: 2 # UTILITY BOX COVERS: 0 ELECTRICAL: 0 TELEPHONE: 0

ELECTRIC OWNER: C.G.&E. GAS OWNER: C.G.&E.

TELEPHONE OWNER: Cinti. Bell OWNER WATER: Cinti Water Works

LIGHTING OWNER: C.G.&E. SEWER OWNER: M.S.D.

CABLE TV OWNER: United Video STORM OWNER:

## STRUCTURE INFORMATION

| STRUCTURE PAVEMENT | TYPE | THICKNESS | DATE |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | 0.00 | 0 |
| | | 0.00 | 0 |

URBAN DISTRESS DATA FORM  COMPOSITE PAVEMENT

STREET: MARGE PLACE
FROM: DON LANE
TO: GREENWELL AVENUE
DATE SURVEYED (MM/YY): 11/91

SECTION NO: 338.0
INPUT MAINTENANCE FACTOR: 5
% CURB DETERIORATION: 50
ROUGHNESS INDEX: 0.0

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | PERCENTAGE OF AREA |
|---|---|---|
| SWELL | 1 | 4 |
| BOND LOSS | 0 | 0 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | 3 | 4 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | 0 | 0 |
| WEATHERING AND RAVELLING | 2 | 4 |

AREA KEY
0 = 0%
1 = 1-5%
2 = 6-25%
3 = 26-50%
4 = 51-100%

SEVERITY KEY  0 = NONE ; 1 = LOW ; 2 = MODERATE ; 3 = HIGH

PCI = 20.0

PRESS ANY KEY TO CONTINUE...

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT

# COMPOSITE PAVEMENT DISTRESS DATA FORM

DATE 11-19-91

STREET NAME MARGE

FROM GREENWELL

TO [illegible]

SECTION NO. _____

INSPECTED BY _____

MAINTENANCE FACTOR _____

% CURB DETERIORATION 50

| DISTRESS TYPE | SEVERITY | | PERCENTAGE OF AREA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1–5% | 6–25% | 26–50% | 51–100% |
| SWELL | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 40 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 50 |
| BOND LOSS | LOW | 2 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 25 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 45 |
| REFLECTIVE CRACKING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 10 | 30 | 35 | 40 |
| SLIPPAGE CRACKING | LOW | 2 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 25 |
| | MODERATE | 2 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 35 |
| | HIGH | 2 | 15 | 35 | 40 | 45 |
| WEATHERING & RAVELING | LOW | 1 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| | MODERATE | 1 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 |
| | HIGH | 1 | 15 | 20 | 25 | 30 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

1– PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE RELATED

PAVEMENT CONDITION INDEX

DELHI TOWNSHIP
ROAD PROJECT
COST ESTIMATE

Section # 338

NAME: Marge

| REPAIR | QUANTITY | PRICE /PER | COST |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1.CURB | 832 L.F. | | |
| 2.DOWNSPUT | 30 L.F | | |
| 3.STM.M.H adj. | 1 EA | | |
| 4.SAN.M.H adj. | 1 EA | | |
| 5.JOINT MEMBRANE | | | |
| 6.~~PARTIAL DEPTH~~ UNDERDRAINS | 832 L.F. | | |
| 7.RIGID REMOVAL | 1155 YD² | | |
| 8.301 | 95 YD³ | | |
| 9.403 | [illegible] | | |
| 10.404 | 32 YD³ | | |
| 11.~~CB adj.~~ 12" R.C.P. | 50 L.F. | | |
| 12.CB rec. | 2 EA | | |
| 13.~~EXCAVATION~~/UNDERCUT | 386 YD³ | | |
| 14.~~EMBANKMENT~~ # 2's | 289 YD³ | | |
| 15.ROAD FABRIC | 1155 YD² | | |
| 16.EXC.w/emb | | | |
| 17.EXC.w/301 B-19 | 93 YD³ | | |

SKETCH:

DRIVEWAYS: 32 YD²

SOD INC SOIL: 185 YD²

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ANDERS COURT | Poor | |
| BANDANNA DRIVE | Poor | 0.06 |
| BANDANNA DRIVE | Poor | 0.10 |
| BEECHMEADOW DRIVE | Poor | 0.13 |
| BEECHMEADOW DRIVE | Poor | 0.15 |
| BETLIN COURT | Poor | 0.04 |
| BOB DRIVE | Poor | 0.21 |
| BOUTIQUE DRIVE | Poor | 0.11 |
| BRIARHILL DRIVE | Poor | 0.20 |
| BROSS COURT | Poor | 0.06 |
| BURHEN DRIVE | Poor | 0.14 |
| CANNAS DRIVE | Poor | 0.11 |
| CANNAS DRIVE | Poor | 0.15 |
| CASUAL COURT | Poor | 0.14 |
| CHAMPDALE LANE | Poor | 0.11 |
| CHAPELACRES DRIVE | Poor | 0.07 |
| CHAPELHILL DRIVE | Poor | 0.17 |
| CHAPELVIEW DRIVE | Poor | 0.06 |
| CIMMARON TRAIL | Poor | 0.07 |
| CIMMARON TRAIL | Poor | 0.12 |
| CLAYMORE TERRACE | Poor | 0.10 |
| CLEANDER DRIVE | Poor | 0.19 |
| CLEANDER DRIVE | Poor | 0.11 |
| COACHMAN COURT | Poor | 0.09 |
| COURIER COURT | Poor | 0.08 |
| DEBONHILL COURT | Poor | 0.10 |
| DON LANE | Poor | 0.06 |
| DON LANE | Poor | 0.22 |
| DRESDEN COURT | Poor | 0.04 |
| DRYHORSE COURT | Poor | 0.05 |
| DUNDAS DRIVE | Poor | 0.08 |
| EDFEL WAY | Poor | 0.06 |
| ELM STREET | Poor | 0.10 |
| FAYSEL DRIVE | Poor | 0.17 |
| FELICIA DRIVE | Poor | 0.04 |
| GENENBIL DRIVE | Poor | 0.14 |
| GILES COURT | Poor | 0.11 |
| GLENOAKS DRIVE | Poor | 0.17 |
| GLENOAKS DRIVE | Poor | 0.12 |
| GLENROY AVENUE | Poor | 0.11 |
| GREENWELL ROAD | Poor | 0.14 |
| GROTON COURT | Poor | 0.06 |
| HALIDONHILL DRIVE | Poor | 0.18 |
| HALIDONHILL DRIVE | Poor | 0.19 |
| HAPPY DRIVE | Poor | 0.19 |
| HAPPY DRIVE | Poor | 0.06 |
| HICKOK LANE | Poor | 0.15 |
| HICKOK LANE | Poor | 0.12 |
| HICKORYKNOLL DRIVE | Poor | 0.09 |
| HICKORYKNOLL DRIVE | Poor | 0.08 |
| HILLIARD DRIVE | Poor | 0.15 |
| IHLE ROAD | Poor | 0.27 |
| JUDY LANE | Poor | 0.11 |
| LEATH ROAD | Poor | 0.24 |
| LINNEMAN DRIVE | Poor | 0.18 |
| TOTALS | | 6.73 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| LOBOB COURT | Poor | 0.04 |
| MAPLETON AVENUE | Poor | 0.06 |
| MARGE PLACE | Poor | 0.08 |
| ORCHARDVIEW LANE | Poor | 0.16 |
| PLUM STREET | Poor | 0.09 |
| REVMAL LANE | Poor | 0.03 |
| RIVERAMA DRIVE | Poor | 0.20 |
| ROCKWELL ROAD | Poor | 0.08 |
| SAMOHT RIDGE | Poor | 0.16 |
| SAMOHT RIDGE | Poor | 0.12 |
| SEBASTIAN COURT | Poor | 0.08 |
| SEBASTIAN COURT | Poor | 0.13 |
| STYLE LANE | Poor | 0.22 |
| SULTANA DRIVE | Poor | 0.19 |
| SUNDANCE DRIVE | Poor | 0.10 |
| TAHOE TERRACE | Poor | 0.12 |
| THUNDERHILL LANE | Poor | 0.07 |
| THUNDERHILL LANE | Poor | 0.29 |
| TIMBERDALE COURT | Poor | 0.10 |
| TIMELY TERRACE | Poor | 0.10 |
| TIMELY TERRACE | Poor | 0.07 |
| TIMELY TERRACE | Poor | 0.02 |
| TROUBADOR COURT | Poor | 0.10 |
| TROUBADOR COURT | Poor | 0.12 |
| TURTLEDOVE DRIVE | Poor | 0.09 |
| VICTORY DRIVE | Poor | 0.19 |
| VIEWLAND DRIVE | Poor | 0.09 |
| VIRGIL ROAD | Poor | 0.04 |
| VISCOUNT DRIVE | Poor | 0.15 |
| VISCOUNT DRIVE | Poor | 0.12 |
| WOODCREEK COURT | Poor | 0.04 |

TOTALS 10.18

# ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For Fiscal Year 1993, jurisdictions shall complete the State application form for Issue 2, Small Government, or Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) funding. In addition, the District 2 Integrating Committee requests the following information to determine which projects are funded. Information provided on both forms should be accurate, based on reliable engineering principles. Do NOT request a specific type of funding desired, as this is decided by the District Integrating Committee.

1. Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what percentage can be classified as being in poor condition, adequacy and/or serviceability? Accurate support information, such as pavement management inventories or bridge condition summaries, must be provided to substantiate the stated percentage.

   Typical examples are:

   Road percentage= $\frac{\text{Miles of road that are in poor condition}}{\text{Total miles of road within jurisdiction}}$

   Storm percentage= $\frac{\text{Miles of storm sewers that are in poor condition}}{\text{Total miles of storm sewers within jurisdiction}}$

   Bridge percentage= $\frac{\text{Number of bridges that are in poor condition}}{\text{Number of bridges within jurisdiction}}$

   20.4% of roadway in poor condition

2. What is the condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded? For bridges, submit a copy of the latest general appraisal and condition rating.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Closed | ____ | Poor | X |
| Fair | ____ | Good | ____ |

Give a brief statement of the nature of the deficiency of the present facility such as: inadequate load capacity (bridge); surface type and width; number of lanes; structural condition; substandard design elements such as berm width, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, or inadequate service capacity. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

See 2.2 C

3. If State Issue 2 funds are awarded, how soon (in weeks or months) after completion of the agreement with OPWC would the opening of bids occur? The Integrating Committee will be reviewing schedules submitted for previous projects to help judge the accuracy of a particular jurisdiction's anticipated schedule.

4 to 5 months

Please indicate the current status of the project development by circling the appropriate answers below. PROVIDE ACCURATE ESTIMATE.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| a) Has the Consultant been selected?..... | Yes | No | N/A |
| b) Preliminary development or engineering completed? | Yes | No | N/A |
| c) Detailed construction plans completed?..... | Yes | No | N/A |
| d) All right-of-way and easements acquired?..... | Yes | No | N/A |
| e) Utility coordination completed?..... | Yes | No | N/A |

Give estimate of time, in weeks or months, to complete any item above not yet completed.

c) 4 to 5 months

4. How will the proposed infrastructure activity impact the general health, welfare, and safety of the service area? (Typical examples include the effects of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, health hazards, user benefits, and commerce.)

Upgrading road surfaces will help to remove a blighting influence on the area and improve the safety and drainage. Sidewalk replacement will cure pedestrian saftey hazard.

5. For any project involving GRANTS, the local jurisdiction must provide a MINIMUM OF 10% of the anticipated construction cost. Additionally, the local jurisdiction must pay 100% of the costs of preliminary engineering, inspection, and right-of-way. If a project is to be funded under Issue 2 or Small Government, the costs of any betterment/expansion are 100% local. Local matching funds must either be currently on deposit with the jurisdiction, or certified as having been approved or encumbered by an outside agency (MRF, CDBG, etc.) Proposed funding must be shown on the Project Application under Section 3.2, "Project Financial Resources". For a project involving LOANS or CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS, 100% of construction costs are eligible for funding, with no local match required.

What matching funds are to be used for this project? (i.e. Federal State, MRF, Local, etc.)

Delhi Township Road and Bridge Funds

To what extent are matching funds to be utilized, expressed as percentage of anticipated CONSTRUCTION costs?

100% Engineering and 10% Construction

6. Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a complete ban or partial ban of the use or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? (Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of new building permits.) **THE BAN MUST HAVE AN ENGINEERING JUSTIFICATION TO BE CONSIDERED VALID.** Attach a copy of the document (ordinance, resolution, etc.) which imposes the ban.

COMPLETE BAN ____ PARTIAL BAN ____ NO BAN X

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed? YES____ NO____

7. What is the total number of existing users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Use specific criteria such as households, traffic counts, ridership figures for public transit, daily users, etc., and equate to an equal measurement of users:

ADT = 580 users

For roads and bridges, multiply current documented Average Daily Traffic by 1.2 occupants per car (I.T.E. estimated conversion factor) to determine users per day. Ridership figures for public transit must be documented. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by four (4) to determine the approximate number of users per day.

8. The Ohio Public Works Commission requires that all jurisdictions applying for project funding develop a five year overall Capital Improvement Plan that shall be updated annually. The Plan is to include an inventory and condition survey of existing capital improvements, and a list detailing a schedule for capital improvements and/or maintenance. Both Five-Year Overall and Five-Year Issue 2 Capital Improvement Plans are required.

**Copies of these Plans are to be submitted to the District Integrating Committee at the same time the Project Application is submitted.**

9. Is the infrastructure to be improved part of a facility that has regional significance? (Consider the number of jurisdictions served, size of service area, trip lengths, functional classification, and length of route.) **Provide supporting information.**

Subdivision connects a primary county roadway (Delhi Pike) to two secondary county roadways (Mt. Alverno and Greenwell Roads)

**OHIO INFRASTRUCTURE BOND PROGRAM (ISSUE 2) - ROUND 5**

**LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (LTIP) - ROUND 4**

**FY 1993 PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA - 7/1/92 TO 6/30/93**

ADOPTED BY DISTRICT 2 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE, 2/21/92

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: DELHI TWP

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION:

DUEBBER'S SUB.

PROPOSED FUNDING:

ELIGIBLE CATEGORY:

POINTS — TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROJECT - 57

10 1) Type of project

10 Points - Bridge, road, stormwater
5 Points - All other projects

10 2) If Issue 2/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded? (Even though the jurisdictions will be asked this question, the Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience.)

10 Points - Will definitely be awarded by end of 1992
5 Points - Some doubt as to whether it can be awarded by end of 1992
0 Points - No way it can be awarded in 1992

15 3) What is the condition of the infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.

15 Points - Poor condition
12 Points -
9 Points - Fair to Poor condition
6 Points -
3 Points - Fair condition

**NOTE: If infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will NOT be considered for Issue 2/LTIP funding, unless it is a betterment project that will improve serviceability.**

2 4) If the project is built, what will be its effect on the facility's serviceability?

10 Points - Significantly effect on serviceability (e.g., widen to add lanes along entire project)
8 Points - Moderate to significant effect on serviceability
6 Points - Moderately effect on serviceability (e.g., widen existing lanes)
4 Points - Little to no effect on serviceability
2 Point - Little or no effect on serviceability (e.g., street or bridge deck rehab)

1 5) Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what portion can be classified as being in poor or worse condition, and/or inadequate in service?

3 Points - 50% and over
2 Points - 30% to 49.9%
1 Point - 10% to 29.9%
0 Points - Less than 10%

4 6) How important is the project to the HEALTH, SAFETY, and WELFARE of the public and the citizens of the District and/or the service area?

10 Points - Highly significant importance, with substantial impact on all 3 factors

8 Points - Considerably significant importance, with substantial impact on 2 factors OR noticeable impact on all 3 factors

6 Points - Moderate importance, with substantial impact on 1 factor or noticeable impact on 2 factors

4 Points - Minimal importance, with noticeable impact on 1 factor

2 Points - No measurable impact

10 7) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

10 Points - Poor
8 Points -
6 Points - Fair
4 Points -
2 Points - Excellent

1 8) What matching funds are being committed to the project, expressed as a percentage of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST? Matching funds may be local, federal, ODOT, MRF, etc. or a combination of funds. Loan and credit enhancement projects automatically receive 5 points. **MINIMUM 10% MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED FOR GRANT-FUNDED PROJECTS**

5 Points - More than 50%
4 Points - 40% to 49.9%
3 Points - 30% to 39.9%
2 Points - 20% to 29.9%
1 Point - 10% to 19.9%

0 9) Has any formal action or orders by a federal, state, or local governmental agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? Examples include weight limits on structures, EPA orders to replace or repair sewerage, and moratoriums on building permits in a particular area due to local flooding downstream. **POINTS CAN BE AWARDED ONLY IF CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROJECT BEING RATED WILL CAUSE THE BAN TO BE REMOVED.**

10 Points - Complete ban
5 Points - Partial ban
0 Points - No ban

2 10) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Appropriate criteria include traffic counts & households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

10 Points - 10,000 and Over
8 Points - 7,500 to 9,999
6 Points - 5,000 to 7,499
4 Points - 2,500 to 4,999
2 Points - 2,499 and Under

2 11) Does the infrastructure have REGIONAL impact? Consider originations & destinations of traffic, functional classification,size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, etc. (Functional classifications to be revised in the future to conform to new Surface Transportation Act.)

5 Points - Major impact (e.g., major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed route to an Interstate, Federal-Aid Primary routes)
4 Points -
3 Points - Moderate impact (e.g., principal thoroughfares, Federal-Aid Urban routes)
2 Points -
1 Point - Minimal or no impact (e.g., cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets)

**TOTAL AVAILABLE POINTS: 98**