County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1232

PHONE (513) 632-8523 FAX (513) 723-9748

61st District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes
May 24, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room
Room 603, County Administration Building
Cincinnati, OH 45202

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brayshaw at 8:15 a.m. Mr. Hamner was the only Committee Member not present.

Support Staff present: Messrs. Cottrill, Cline, Bass, Pettit, Vogel, Beck and Riddiough. Also present from the City of Cincinnati was Prem Garg and his intern Chris Nyberg, in addition to Cathy Concilla from OPWC.

Mr. Seitz moved approval of the April 18, 1996 minutes; seconded by Mayor Savage and passed unanimously.

Round 10 Funding - The latest status report from OPWC indicated that we have $284,000 available under SCIP for distribution. The next project on the list, from North College Hill, needed $741,000; consequently, North College Hill passed. The next project on the list, from Elmwood Place, was originally submitted with a $475,000 request, but can proceed with the available funding. A small balance is available under LTIP, but not enough to generate any interest from the next group of jurisdictions on the list.

Revolving Loan Program (RLP) - More information on this program was provided by OPWC at a recent District Leadership Conference attended by the Chairman and three Support Staff Members. The RLP will begin with Round 12, and is intended to fund loan projects after SCIP loan funding has already been exhausted. Also, OPWC stated the allocation may be accumulated at the discretion of the Committee. (A Policy/Implementation report was distributed to the Committee for their information.)

Senate Bill 257 - The implementation legislation for Rounds 11 through 20 of State Issue 2 has become law. Some amendments were added to the original bill as it progressed through the General Assembly, but nothing that will drastically affect our District. One change that should simplify matters for Districts changes the current minimum requirement for 22% loans and 8% credit enhancements. The new guidelines stipulate a minimum of only 20% for loans and credit enhancements combined.

Round 11 Allocations - Preliminary figures indicate that we can expect to receive $8,300,000 under SCIP and $4,307,000 under LTIP, which are the same amounts as last year.

61st District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes May 24, 1996

Unfinished Support Staff Business from Last Month:

Rating System for Round 11 - Upon reviewing the draft Rating System presented for consideration last month, the Support Staff suggested some minor clarifications. In addition the Integrating Committee considered the issues presented by Messrs. Seitz, Savage Sykes and Brooks and decided to endorse the group's recommendation of raising the maximum number of "Condition" points to 25 from 20. In light of that recommendation, Mr. Seitz moved to adopt the Round 11 Rating System as revised/clarified by the Support Staff, including the adjustment of the available "Condition" points. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sykes, then was passed unanimously.

Schedule for District Activities involving Round 11 - The Support Staff presented a recommended schedule which was ratified by a unanimous vote, subsequent to an adoption motion by Mr. Savage and a second by Mr. Huddleston.

Small Governments Subcommittee report - Mr. Sykes reported that the Village of Lincoln Heights, Village of Woodlawn, Columbia Township and Village of Terrace Park all were approved for a total of $988,210, and the Villages of Greenhills and Newtown were put on the contingency list. Chairman Brayshaw commented that Mr. Sykes has done an excellent job in representing the Small Governments and the Committee gave him a hearty round of applause. Mr. Sykes, in turn, thanked everyone.

Old Business - None

New Business - Mr. Cottrill reminded the Committee of the Press Conference being held on June 28, 1996 during which time Mr. Larry Bicking will present the Round 10 approved Project Agreements including the Small Government approved Project Agreements.

Mayor Brooks asked Chairman Brayshaw if he could perceive seeing the Anderson Township situation (landslides) coming before Issue 2 on an emergency basis. Chairman Brayshaw proceeded to give an update on where the situation stands. Mr. Cline reiterated that the Emergency OPWC Applications need not go through the District Integrating Committee. This was confirmed by our Program Representative, Cathy Concilla.

Mr. Cottrill stated that unless something comes up that he would feel the Committee needs to convene, additional summer meetings would be superfluous and we can likely cancel the entire summer meeting schedule.

Mayor Savage moved adjournment; seconded by Mr. Heile and passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned 8:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Cornelius

Joan Cornelius
Recording Secretary

cc: Support Staff

REVOLVING LOAN PROGRAM (RLP)
POLICY/IMPLEMENTATION
(May 15th, 1996)

I). Program Policy

A). Loan Repayments (principal and interest) allocated back to originating District Integrating Committee (S.B. 257)

B). Loan allocations will be provided each Program Year based on the actual cash received from loan recipients within each district. (S.B. 257)

C). Districts must first use loan allocations provided under State Capital Improvements Program (SCIP), then may draw funds from RLP. Districts with significant loan balances under the SCIP or RLP will be requested to submit additional applications.

D). Loans approved under the RLP are <u>not</u> subject to the 20% new and expansion limitations for each Program Year and may fund up to 100% of total project costs. (S.B. 257)

E). Grant/Loan combinations for the same project - a SCIP grant with an RLP loan will be allowed. <u>No</u> Grant/Loan/Loan combinations - a SCIP grant, a SCIP loan and an RLP loan for the same project.

F). Using RLP funds as match for projects approved under Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) - not allowed.

G). Districts will continue to recommend interest rates for loans. Allowable rates will range from 0% to 3% (annual). Allowable terms will range from five to twenty years based on the useful life of the project.

II). Program Implementation

A). First allocation of RLP funds to be in Program Year 12 - appropriation authority coincides with state Capital Biennium. Preliminary allocations provided in May, 1997 as part of the Program Year 12 guidance memo.

B). Districts will select and submit RLP projects as part of their normal Program Year process. Approved projects subject to standard operating guidelines concerning Minority Business Enterprise requirements and minimum useful life.

C). For projects approved with RLP funds, use existing OPWC Application. Within the "District Recommendation" section of the application, note "RLP" near the recommended loan dollar amount.

D). Loan allocations provided under the RLP will be inconsistent from Program Year to Program Year.

Am. Sub Senate Bill 257

Modifies the Ohio Public Works Commission Law to reflect the adoption of Section 2m of Article VIII of the Ohio Constitution to finance or assist financing local government public infrastructure capital improvements.

* Combines the 22 percent loan and 8 percent credit enhancement minimums into a reduced and combined 20 percent. This gives local District Public Works Integrating Committees more flexibility in awarding loan and/or credit enhancement and increases the amount of grant funds available from 70 to 80 percent.

* Gives the Ohio Public Works Commission the ability to allocate funds deposited in the State Capital Improvements Revolving Loan Fund back to each local District Public Works Integrating Committee. The Ohio Public Works Commission estimates that approximately $12 million will be available in this fund at the end of calendar year 1996, growing to over $19 million by the end of calendar year 1997.

* Creates the Small Counties Capital Improvements Program which will assist county government with populations of 85,000 or below. This program will be administered much like the Small Government Capital Improvements Program and will be funded in program years 12 and 14 at a $2 million dollar level each year.

* Freezes the percent of funding which local District Public Works Integrating Committees can use for new and expansion at it's current 20 percent.

* Expands the membership on the Public Works Integrating Executive Committees in District 15 and 18 to allow each county in these districts to be represented.

* Requires the Ohio Public Works Commission to evaluate the programs it administers and to submit a report of its finding and recommendations to legislative leadership by December 31, 1996.

* Makes capital appropriations to the Commission for Program Year 10 to be released July 1 of this year and for Program Year 11 to be released July 1 of 1997 as the first appropriation under Section 2m Article VIII of the Ohio Constitution.

####

MAY, 1996

OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
PROGRAM YEAR ELEVEN (1997) ALLOCATIONS *

DISTRICT	TOTAL ALLOCATION	LTIP ALLOCATION	SCIP ALLOCATION	MINIMUM SCIP LOANS OR CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS (20%)	MAXIMUM SCIP GRANTS (80%)
1	$20,470,000	$6,993,000	$13,477,000	$2,695,400	$10,781,600
2	12,607,000	4,307,000	8,300,000	1,660,000	6,640,000
3	14,035,000	4,795,000	9,240,000	1,848,000	7,392,000
4	8,311,000	2,839,000	5,472,000	1,094,400	4,377,600
5	6,786,000	2,246,000	4,540,000	908,000	3,632,000
6	7,133,000	2,437,000	4,696,000	939,200	3,756,800
7	7,795,000	2,663,000	5,132,000	1,026,400	4,105,600
8	7,479,000	2,555,000	4,924,000	984,800	3,939,200
9	6,414,000	2,227,000	4,187,000	837,400	3,349,600
10	8,516,000	2,909,000	5,607,000	1,121,400	4,485,600
11	8,354,000	2,854,000	5,500,000	1,100,000	4,400,000
12	6,698,000	2,288,000	4,410,000	882,000	3,528,000
13	5,949,000	2,019,000	3,930,000	786,000	3,144,000
14	6,319,000	2,084,000	4,235,000	847,000	3,388,000
15	6,613,000	2,136,000	4,477,000	895,400	3,581,600
16	7,427,000	2,507,000	4,920,000	984,000	3,936,000
17	6,057,000	2,057,000	4,000,000	800,000	3,200,000
18	6,377,000	1,958,000	4,419,000	883,800	3,535,200
19	5,364,000	1,832,000	3,532,000	706,400	2,825,600
TOTALS	$158,704,000	$53,706,000	$104,998,000	$20,999,600	$83,998,400

*** PRELIMINARY - FINAL ALLOCATIONS DETERMINED ON JULY 1ST, 1997**
DISTRICTS MUST SUBMIT PROJECTS TO CONSUME A MINIMUM OF 115% OF THEIR ALLOCATION

SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM
ROUND 11 - PROGRAM YEAR 1997
PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA
JULY 1, 1997 TO JUNE 30, 1998

ADOPTED BY THE INTEGRATING COMMITTEE

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: _____

NAME OF PROJECT: _____

TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROJECT: _____ RATING TEAM: _____

POINTS

1) If SCIP/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded? _____

10 Points - Will be under contract by end of 1997 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 8 & 9.

5 Points - Will be under contract by March 30, 1998 and/or jurisdiction has had one delinquent project in Rounds 8 & 9.

0 Points - Will not be under contract by March 30, 1998 and/or jurisdiction has had more than one delinquent project in Rounds 8 & 9.

2) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? _____

20 Points - Failed
18 Points - Critical
16 Points - Very Poor
14 Points - Poor
12 Points - Moderately Poor
8 Points - Moderately Fair
4 Points - Fair Condition
0 Points - Good or Better

NOTE: If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition, it will <u>NOT</u> be considered for SCIP/LTIP funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

If the project is built, what will be its effect on the facility's serviceability? Documentation is required.

5 Points - Project design is for future demand. _____
4 Points - Project design is for partial future demand.
3 Points - Project design is for current demand.
2 Points - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity.
1 Point - Project design is for no increase in capacity.

4) How important is the project to HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE of the public and the citizens of the District and/or 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

5) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

10 Points _____
8 Points
6 Points
4 Points
2 Points

6) What matching funds are being committed to the project, expressed as as a percentage of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST? Loan and Credit Enhancement projects automatically receive 5 points, and no match is required. All grant funded projects require a minimum of 10% matching funds.

5 Points - 50% or more _____
4 Points - 40% to 49.99%
3 Points - 30% to 39.99%
2 Points - 20% to 29.99%
1 Point - 10% to 19.99%

Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? POINTS MAY ONLY BE AWARDED IF THE END RESULT OF THE PROJECT WILL CAUSE THE BAN TO BE LIFTED.

5 Points - Complete ban
3 Points - Partial ban
0 Points - No ban of any kind

_____

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

5 Points - 16,000 or more
4 Points - 12,000 to 15,999
3 Points - 8,000 to 11,999
2 Points - 4,000 to 7,999
1 Point - 3,999 and under

_____

9) Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider originations and destinations of traffic, functional classifications, size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, etc.

5 Points - Major impact
4 Points -
3 Points - Moderate impact
2 Points -
1 Point - Minimal or no impact

_____

10) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional $5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or a dedicated tax for infrastructure and provided certification of which fees have been enacted?

5 Points - Two of the above
3 Points - One of the above
0 Points - None of the above

_____

ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM DEFINITIONS/CLARIFICATIONS

Criterion 1 - *ABILITY TO PROCEED*

The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience and OPWC defined delinquent projects. A project is considered delinquent when it has not received a notice to proceed within the time stated on the original application and no time extension has been granted by the OPWC. A jurisdiction receiving approval for a project and subsequently cancelling the same after the bid date on the application may be considered as having a delinquent project.

Criterion 2 - *CONDITION*

Condition is based on the amount of deterioration that is field verified or documented exclusive of capacity, serviceability, or health, safety and welfare issues. Condition is rated only on the existing facility being repaired or abandoned. If the existing facility is not being abandoned or repaired, but a new facility is being built, it shall be considered as an expansion project. (Documentation may include ODOT BR-86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included with the original application.)

Definitions:

<u>FAILED CONDITION</u> - Requires complete reconstruction where no part of the existing facility is salvageable. (e.g. Roads: complete reconstruction of roadway, curbs and base; Bridges: complete removal and replacement of bridge; Underground: removal and replacement of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: completely non-functioning and replacement parts are unavailable.)

<u>CRITICAL CONDITION</u> - Requires moderate or partial reconstruction to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: reconstruction of roadway, curbs can be saved; Bridges: removal and replacement of bridge with abutment modification; Underground: removal and replacement of part of an underground drainage or water system; Hydrants: some non-functioning, others obsolete and replacement parts are unavailable.)

<u>VERY POOR CONDITION</u> - Requires extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: extensive full depth, partial depth and curb repair of a roadway with a structural overlay; Bridges: superstructure replacement; Underground: repair of joints and/or minor replacement of pipe sections; Hydrants: non-functioning and replacement parts are available.)

<u>POOR CONDITION</u> - Requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: moderate full depth, partial depth and curb repair to a roadway with no structural overlay needed or structural overlay with minor repairs to a roadway needed; Bridges: extensive patching of substructure and replacement of deck; Underground: insituform or other in ground repairs; Hydrants: functional, but leaking and replacement parts are unavailable.)

<u>MODERATELY POOR CONDITION</u> - Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: minor full depth, partial depth or curb repairs to a roadway with either a thin overlay or no overlay needed; Bridges: major structural patching and/or major deck repair; Hydrants: functional and replacement parts are available.)

MODERATELY FAIR CONDITION - Requires extensive maintenance to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: thin or no overlay with extensive crack sealing, minor partial depth and/or slurry or rejuvenation; Bridges: minor structural patching, deck repair, erosion control.)

FAIR CONDITION - Requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity. (e.g. Roads: slurry seal, rejuvenation or routine crack sealing to the roadway; Bridges: minor structural patching.)

GOOD OR BETTER CONDITION - Little or no maintenance required to maintain integrity.

Criterion 4 - *HEALTH, SAFETY & WELFARE*

Definitions:

SAFETY - The design of the project will prevent accidents, promote safer conditions, and eliminate or reduce the danger of risk, liability, or injury.

EXAMPLES: Widening existing roadway lanes to standard lane widths; Adding lanes to a roadway or bridge to increase capacity or alleviate congestion; replacing old or non-functioning hydrants; increasing capacity to a water system, etc.

HEALTH - The design of the project will improve the overall condition of the facility so as to reduce or eliminate disease; or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area.

EXAMPLES: Improving or adding storm drainage or sanitary facilities; replacing lead joints in water lines;

WELFARE - The design of the project will promote economic well-being and prosperity.

EXAMPLES: Project has the potential to improve business expansions or opportunities in the area; project will improve the quality of life in the area;

PLEASE NOTE: The examples listed above are NOT a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to any given project. Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this rating category apply.

Criterion 9 - *REGIONAL IMPACT*

Definitions:

MAJOR IMPACT - Roads: major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed to an interstate, Federal Aid Primary routes; Underground: primary water or sewer main serving and entire system; Hydrants: multi-jurisdictional.

MODERATE IMPACT - Roads: principal thoroughfares, Federal Aid Urban routes; Underground: primary water or sewer main serving only part of a system; Hydrants: all hydrants in a local system serving only one jurisdiction.

MINIMAL/NO IMPACT - Roads: cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets; Underground: individual water or sewer main not part of a large system; Hydrants: only some hydrants in a local system serving only one jurisdiction.

Round 11 Schedule

Applications will be mailed to all subdivisions in July 1996. The due date for the applications will be Friday, September 27, 1996.

Field Checks by Support Staff and Preliminary Ratings

Monday, September 30, 1996 through Friday, October 25, 1996

Appeal Period by Jurisdictions

Monday, October 28, 1996 through Monday, November 4, 1996

Appeals Field Checks & Hearings

Wednesday, November 6, 1996 through Wednesday, November 13, 1996

Final Priority Listing of Project Applications & Results of Appeals Available

Friday, November 22, 1996

Vote on Round 11 Priority Listing of Projects

Friday, December 6, 1996

Round 11 Priority Listing Filed With OPWC

As soon as possible after December 6, 1996.

RC 164.04
Duties of Administrator of Small Government Capital Improvements Commission, RC 164.051
Duties of District Public Works Integrating Committee, RC 164.06

164.051 Duties of Administrator of Small Government Capital Improvements Commission.

(A) The Administrator of the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission shall review projects submitted to him by subcommittees of District Public Works Integrating Committees in accordance with Section 164.06 of the Revised Code. If he determines that a project satisfies the criteria of division (B) of that section, while taking into consideration the special needs of villages and townships, the Administrator shall recommend to the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission that the project be approved. If he determines that a project should not be approved or that a decision on the project should be delayed, such determinations and an explanation should also be sent to the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission for final resolution.

(B) With respect to projects which the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission approves, the Administrator is authorized to:

(1) Enter into agreements to provide financial assistance in the form of loans, grants, or local debt support and credit enhancements to villages or townships with populations in the unincorporated areas of the township of less than five thousand (5000);

(2) Authorize payments to such villages or townships or their contractors for the costs incurred for capital improvements projects which have been approved in accordance with this chapter. All requests for payments shall be submitted to the Administrator on forms and in accordance with procedures specified in rules adopted pursuant to Division (A) (4) of Section 164.05 of the Revised Code;

(3) Notify the Director of Budget and Management of all approved projects, and supply all information necessary to track the approved projects through the state accounting system; and

(4) Do all other acts and enter into contracts and execute all instruments necessary or appropriate to carry out this section.

(C) Fees, charges, rates of interest, times of payment of interest and principal, and other terms, conditions, and provision of and security for financial assistance provided pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be such as the Administrator determines to be appropriate. If any payments required by a loan agreement entered into pursuant to this section are not paid, the funds which would otherwise be allocated to the local subdivision from the County Undivided Local Government Fund, pursuant to Sections 5747.51 to 5747.53 of the Revised Code, may, at the direction of the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission, be reduced by the amount payable. The county treasurer shall, at the direction of the commission, pay the amount of such reductions to the State Capital Improvements Revolving Loan Fund. Subject to the approval of the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission, the Administrator may renegotiate a loan repayment schedule with a local subdivision whose payments from the County Undivided Local Government Fund could be reduced pursuant to this division, but such a renegotiation may occur only one time with respect to any particular loan agreement.

HISTORY: 142 v H 704, EFF 3-29-88; 142 v H 867, EFF 6-14-88

Cross-References to Related Sections:
Annual allocation to certain funds, RC 164.08
Definitions, RC 164.01

164.06 Duties of District Public Works Integrating Committee; Study and Report by Subdivision.

(A) Each District Public Works Integrating Committee shall evaluate materials submitted to it by the local subdivision located in the district concerning capital improvements for which assistance is sought from the State Capital Improvements Fund and shall, pursuant to division (B) of this section, select the requests for financial assistance that will be formally submitted by the district to the Director of the Ohio Public Works Commission. In order to provide for the efficient use of the district's State Capital Improvements Fund allocation each year, a district committee shall assist its subdivision in the preparation and coordination of project plans.

(B) In selecting the requests for assistance for capital improvements projects which will be submitted to the Director, and in determining the nature, amount, and terms of the assistance that will be requested, a District Public Works Integrating Committee shall give priority to capital improvement projects for the repair or replacement of existing infrastructure and which would be unlikely to be undertaken without assistance under this chapter, and shall specifically consider all of the following factors:

(1) The infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the district;

(2) The age and condition of the system to be repaired or replaced;

(3) Whether the project would generate revenue in the form of user fees or assessments;

(4) The importance of the project to the health and safety of the citizens of the district;

(5) The cost of the project and whether it is consistent with Division (G) of Section 164.05 of the Revised Code and the district's allocation for grants, loans, and local debt support and credit enhancements for that year;

(6) The effort and ability of the benefitted local subdivisions to assist in financing the project;

(7) The availability of federal or other funds for the project;

(8) The overall economic health of the particular local subdivision;

(9) The adequacy of the planning for the project and the readiness of the applicant to proceed should the project be approved;

(10) Any other factors relevant to a particular project.

(C) Prior to filing an application with its District Public Works Integrating Committee for assistance in financing a capital improvement project under this section, a local subdivision shall conduct a study of its existing capital improvements, the condition of those improvements, and the projected capital improvement needs of the subdivision in the ensuing five (5) year period.

After completing this study, the subdivision shall compile a report that includes an inventory of its existing capital improvements, a plan detailing the capital improvement needs of the subdivision in the ensuing five (5) year period, and a list of the subdivision's priorities with respect to addressing those needs. Each year, the report shall be reviewed and updated by the subdivision to reflect capital improvement projects undertaken or completed in the past year and any changes in the subdivision's plan or priorities. The report and annual updates shall be made available upon request to the Ohio Public Works Commission, the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission, and the District Public Works Integrating Committee of the district of which the subdivision is a part.

(D) In addition to reviewing and selecting the projects for which approval will be sought from the Director of the Ohio Public Works Commission for financial assistance from the State Capital Improvements Fund, each District Public Works Integrating Committee shall appoint a subcommittee of its members that will represent the interest of villages and townships and that will review and select the capital improvement projects which will be submitted by the subcommittee to the Administrator of the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission for consideration of assistance from the portion of the net proceeds of obligations issued and sold by the Treasurer of State which is allocated pursuant to Division (B) (1) of Section 164.08 of the Revised Code. In reviewing and approving the projects selected by its subcommittee, the Administrator, and the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission shall be guided by the provisions of division (B) of this section, and shall also take into account the fact that villages and townships may have different public infrastructure needs than larger subdivisions.

HISTORY: **142 v H 704, EFF 3-29-89; 142 v H 867, EFF 6-14-89**

Cross-References to Related Sections:

Annual allocation to certain funds, RC 164.08
Definitions, 164.01
Duties of Administrator of Small Government Capital Improvements Commission, RC 164.051
Duties of Director of Public Works Commission, RC 164.05

164.07 Minority Business Enterprise Provisions; Prevailing Wage Law.

(A) In awarding contracts for capital improvement projects to be financed in whole or in part under this chapter, a local subdivision shall comply with the percentage requirements of Division (C)(1) of Section 123.151 and of section 125.081 of the Revised Code. The subdivision shall also require compliance by its contractors with the requirements of Division (C)(2) of Section 123.151 of the Revised Code in awarding contracts and purchasing services and materials under those contracts. If, after making a good faith effort, a contractor is unable to comply with the requirements of Division (C)(2) of Section 123.151 of the Revised Code because it is unable to locate minority business enterprises available to accept

APPROVED TENTH ROUND SMALL GOVERNMENT AWARDS

	AMOUNT AWARDED
DISTRICT 1	
Woodmere, Village of	$192,154
Oakwood, Village of	249,999
DISTRICT 2	
Lincoln Heights, Village of	87,360
Woodlawn, Village	449,800
Columbia Township	307,050
Terrace Park, Village of	144,000
DISTRICT 3	
Canal Winchester, Village of	550,000
Brice, Village of	84,600*
Sharon Township	243,930
DISTRICT 5	
Genoa, Village of	237,099
Chesterfield Township	196,690
Townsend Township	55,000
Green Creek Township	40,000
York Township	37,050
DISTRICT 6	
Sebring, Village of	303,174
Braceville Township	141,807
Goshen Township	155,728
Newton Falls, Village of	157,197
DISTRICT 7	
Hiram, Village of	308,000
Fairport Harbor, Village of	58,460

DISTRICT 8

Richfield Township	368,551
Boston Township	335,846

DISTRICT 9

Wakeman Township	173,700
New London Township	246,530
Brighton Township	138,840

DISTRICT 10

Amelia, Village of	79,920
Batavia, Village of	290,245
Liberty Township	101,271

DISTRICT 11

Gratis, Village of	233,550
Magnetic Springs, Village of	65,910

DISTRICT 12

Ottawa Hills, Village of	175,572*

DISTRICT 13

Russells Point, Village of	426,000
Jefferson Township	45,000
Willshire, Village of	550,000*
Anna, Village of	229,600

DISTRICT 14

Malvern, Village of	250,000*
Washingtonville, Village of	250,000*
Newcomerstown, Village of	119,413*

DISTRICT 15

Coal Grove, Village of	49,375
Winchester, Village of	114,454
Russellville, Village of	450,000*
Mt. Orab, Village of	344,213*
Scott Township	66,800

DISTRICT 16

Cessna Township	324,434
Springfield Township	116,090
Ada, Village of	449,999

DISTRICT 17

Richland Township	63,202
Newton Township	123,301

DISTRICT 18

New Straitsville, Village of	440,000
Somerset, Village of	400,000*
Malta, Village of	100,000
Trimble, Village of	76,342

DISTRICT 19

Wilmot, Village of	305,620

SMALL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS
ROUNDS 1 THROUGH 10

DISTRICT	AWARDS	% OF ALL FUNDS
14	$14,918,248	11.384%
15	$10,922,508	8.335%
18	$9,629,750	7.348%
2	$8,636,808	6.591%
17	$7,648,792	5.837%
6	$7,555,816	5.766%
16	$7,547,731	5.760%
11	$7,474,549	5.704%
3	$7,223,127	5.512%
1	$7,088,439	5.409%
9	$6,423,783	4.902%
7	$6,244,919	4.765%
13	$5,626,211	4.293%
5	$4,987,671	3.806%
12	$4,899,306	3.739%
8	$4,180,362	3.190%
10	$3,611,329	2.756%
19	$3,572,308	2.726%
4	$2,853,414	2.177%
	$131,045,071	100%

County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1232

PHONE (513) 632-8523 FAX (513) 723-9748

June 20, 1996

TO: District #2 Integrating Committee Members

The change in the increase in points for Criterion #10 in the Rating System was inadvertently omitted from the May 24, 1996 District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes. This was picked up and pointed out to me by one of our observant Support Staff Members (Bob Bass).

Will you please replace the previously sent May 24, 1996 minutes with the enclosed amended ones. I hope this has not caused you too much inconvenience.

Hope you are enjoying your summer!

Sincerely,

Joan Cornelius

Joan Cornelius
Recording Secretary

Enclosure
cc: Support Staff

County of Hamilton

WILLIAM W. BRAYSHAW, P.E.-P.S. COUNTY ENGINEER

700 COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

138 EAST COURT STREET

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-1232

PHONE (513) 632-8523 FAX (513) 723-9748

61st District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes (Amended)
May 24, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room
Room 603, County Administration Building
Cincinnati, OH 45202

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brayshaw at 8:15 a.m. Mr. Hamner was the only Committee Member not present.

Support Staff present: Messrs. Cottrill, Cline, Bass, Pettit, Vogel, Beck and Riddiough. Also present from the City of Cincinnati was Prem Garg and his intern Chris Nyberg, in addition to Cathy Concilla from OPWC.

Mr. Seitz moved approval of the April 18, 1996 minutes; seconded by Mayor Savage and passed unanimously.

Round 10 Funding - The latest status report from OPWC indicated that we have $284,000 available under SCIP for distribution. The next project on the list, from North College Hill, needed $741,000; consequently, North College Hill passed. The next project on the list, from Elmwood Place, was originally submitted with a $475,000 request, but can proceed with the available funding. A small balance is available under LTIP, but not enough to generate any interest from the next group of jurisdictions on the list.

Revolving Loan Program (RLP) - More information on this program was provided by OPWC at a recent District Leadership Conference attended by the Chairman and three Support Staff Members. The RLP will begin with Round 12, and is intended to fund loan projects after SCIP loan funding has already been exhausted. Also, OPWC stated the allocation may be accumulated at the discretion of the Committee. (A Policy/Implementation report was distributed to the Committee for their information.)

Senate Bill 257 - The implementation legislation for Rounds 11 through 20 of State Issue 2 has become law. Some amendments were added to the original bill as it progressed through he General Assembly, but nothing that will drastically affect our District. One change that should simplify matters for Districts changes the current minimum requirement for 22% loans and 8% credit enhancements. The new guidelines stipulate a minimum of only 20% for loans and credit enhancements combined.

Round 11 Allocations - Preliminary figures indicate that we can expect to receive $8,300,000 under SCIP and $4,307,000 under LTIP, which are the same amounts as last year.

61st District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes (Amended) May 24, 1996

Unfinished Support Staff Business from Last Month:

Rating System for Round 11 - The Committee reviewed the draft Rating System presented for consideration last month. At that meeting, the Committee had reviewed and approved in concept the suggested change in Criterion #10, which awards points to a jurisdiction for enacting an infrastructure levy, the optional $5 license plate fee, user fees, and/or a dedicated tax for infrastructure. The suggested change would award five points if two or more of these measures were adopted, three points if one measure was adopted, and zero points if no measures were adopted. In addition, the Integrating Committee considered the issues presented by Messrs. Seitz, Savage Sykes and Brooks and decided to endorse the group's recommendation of raising the maximum number of "Condition" points to 25 from 20. In light of today's recommendation to raise the maximum number of "Condition" points, and last month's recommendation to raise the available points under Criterion #10, Mr. Seitz moved to adopt the Round 11 Rating System as revised/clarified by the Support Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sykes, then was passed unanimously.

Schedule for District Activities Involving Round 11 - The Support Staff presented a recommended schedule, which was ratified by a unanimous vote, subsequent to an adoption motion by Mr. Savage and a second by Mr. Huddleston.

Small Governments Subcommittee report - Mr. Sykes reported that the Village of Lincoln Heights, Village of Woodlawn, Columbia Township and Village of Terrace Park all were approved for a total of $988,210, and the Villages of Greenhills and Newtown were put on the contingency list. Chairman Brayshaw commented that Mr. Sykes has done an excellent job in representing the Small Governments and the Committee gave him a hearty round of applause. Mr. Sykes, in turn, thanked everyone.

Old Business - None

New Business - Mr. Cottrill reminded the Committee of the Press Conference being held on June 28, 1996 during which time Mr. Larry Bicking will present the Round 10 approved Project Agreements including the Small Government approved Project Agreements.

Mayor Brooks asked Chairman Brayshaw if he could perceive seeing the Anderson Township situation (landslides) coming before Issue 2 on an emergency basis. Chairman Brayshaw proceeded to give an update on where the situation stands. Mr. Cline reiterated that the Emergency OPWC Applications need not go through the District Integrating Committee. This was confirmed by our Program Representative, Cathy Concilla.

Mr. Cottrill stated that unless something comes up that he would feel the Committee needs to convene, additional summer meetings would be superfluous and we can likely cancel the entire summer meeting schedule.

Mayor Savage moved adjournment; seconded by Mr. Heile and passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned 8:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Cornelius

Joan Cornelius
Recording Secretary

cc: Support Staff

County Commissioner's Conference Room
County Administration Building
Room 603
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
May 24, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

AGENDA

1.) Approval of previous meeting's minutes

2.) Report by District Liaison on status of Round 10 projects.

3.) Handouts from District Leadership Conference held on May 15.

A. Revolving Loan Program
B. Amended Bill 257
C. Round 11 Allocation figures

4.) Support Staff items:

(A) Presentation of Round 11 Rating System. (Vote required for adoption. NOTE: Rating System must be approved and received by OPWC no later than June 28, 1996)

(B) Round 11 Schedule (Vote required; also required by OPWC, but may be amended later if need be.)

5.) Small Governments Subcommittee report.

Please see the handout for the Small Government Awards.

6.) Old business.

7.) New business.

REMINDER!

Round 10 Project Agreements will be presented at a Press Conference on Friday, June 28, 1996 at 10:30 a.m. by Mr. Larry Bicking, Director of OPWC. The Press Conference will be held in the Commissioners large assembly room. All committee members and staff members are invited to attend.

8.) Next meeting date is Friday, June 21, 1996, if needed.

9.) Adjournment

HAVE A HAPPY SUMMER!

61st District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting
Board of County Commissioners' Conference Room
Room 603, County Administration Building
Cincinnati, OH 45202

May 24, 1996 - 8:00 a.m.

ATTENDANCE LIST

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NO.
Richard MENDES	City of Cincinnati	352-2457
Peter Heile	City of Cincinnati	352-3337
Bill Seitz	~~City of~~ Green Township	357-9332
Joe Sylvester	Miami Twp	941 2466
DAVE SAVAGE	City of Wyoming	821-7266
[illegible]	Hamilton County Comm.	771-0900
William W Braphe	Ham. County	632-8630
Don Brooks	City of North College Hill	521-7413