85th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting Minutes
February 22, 2002 – 8:00 a.m.
Nathanael Greene Lodge
6394 Wesselman Road
Cincinnati, OH 45248

Mr. Brayshaw, Chairman of the Integrating Committee, called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

Board Members Present: Chairman - William Brayshaw, Mayor Dan Brooks, Mr. Tom Bryan, Mr. Dick Huddleston, Mr. Tim Riordan, Mayor Dave Savage, and Mr. Joe Sykes

Excused Absence: Mr. Pete Heile, and John Deatrick

Alternate Members Present: Mr. Prem Garg – City of Cincinnati *(Voting Alternate for Mr. John Deatrick)*; and Mr. Dan Schlueter *(Voting Alternate for Mr. Pete Heile)*

Support Staff & Guest Present: Hamilton County – Mr. Jon Brady and Mr. Joe Cottrill; City of Cincinnati – Ms. Bonnie Phillips; Village of Lockland – Ms. Evonne Kovach; Hamilton County Development Company – Mr. David Main; Port of Greater Cincinnati Development Authority – Mr. Tim Sharp; KMK Consulting – Mr. Jim Benedict

Approval of Minutes...

Mayor Savage moved approval of the minutes from the 84th Integrating Committee Board Meeting dated January 18, 2002; seconded by Mr. Huddleston and the motion carried.

It was also requested by Cathy Listermann to amend the minutes from the 82nd Integrating Committee Board Meeting dated October 11, 2001. She noted that Commissioner John Dowlin had brought this correction to her attention. The proposed amendment (noted on page two under "Nominations for NRAC" - Nominations #5 & #6 - Group #2 - 1st Paragraph) stated "Eric Russo who was nominated by the Hillside Trust and by the Hamilton County Commissioners" should be amended to read "Eric Russo who was nominated by the Hillside Trust".

Mr. Bryan moved approval to amend the minutes as noted above for the 82nd Integrating Committee Board Meeting dated October 11, 2001; seconded by Mr. Riordan and the motion carried.

<u>NRAC Update</u>

◊ Jon Brady, Director of the Hamilton County Park District and Vice Chairman of the NRAC provided a progress report to the Integrating Committee. A copy of this report was distributed to everyone and a brief summation was provided.

Mayor Savage inquired as to what kinds of issues the NRAC is currently trying to work their way through. Jon Brady indicated the primary purpose of the legislator's intent was to provide open space and green space. They currently have a lot of park and recreation agencies that interpret that a little differently. For example with the Hamilton County Park District, when they talk about open space with green space, they have a land management policy where 80% of it must remain natural. Some of the questions they are receiving are: "Can we build soccer fields on it?" "Can we build a bike trail on it?" "If we acquire ten acres can we then pave a bike trail over this, not with NRAC money, but at a later date?"

Another issue that came up during the first training session was when Rob White indicated that on top of the acquisition of land, there was going to be conservation easements required. The state is going to require a conservation easement, which would restrict almost any type of minor development. The state seems to be in agreement with soccer fields, but they don't want a tennis court or community center.

The legislation talks about NRAC money being used for access, which makes it easier and accessible. What exactly is that? Is that a paved driveway, a paved parking lot, or a gravel lot? Does that mean that people will be restricted from going in and out of the area? For example, they want to make our streams and corridors accessible. If there is green space or land that is available for purchase a quarter a mile away from the river corridor, the legislation says that if you provide access does that mean that we would be able to pave a quarter mile of a road. They are trying to determine what the legislative intent was, and what OPWC is going to be comfortable with.

The other difficult section of this is the fact that when the legislation was passed it was to be available for non-profits. He used the example of Little Miami Inc. or the Hillside Trust, which are very strong green space advocacy groups. If the idea was to get them to apply for these funds as well, the problem is that if they acquire the green space and it is somewhat of a temporary or transient group, they might wind up having title to it and there are disputes on whether or not the title has to go back to State of Ohio or could the Hillside Trust have the title. They are looking at all types of issues like that and it is not as clean cut as perhaps it might have initially sounded.

There is also a "Corrections Bill", which was passed. When the bill was first passed the process was extremely cumbersome for park agencies. He used the example of the Hamilton County Park District. The first draft of the bill would require them to notify and get the approval of the township trustees wherever the project may occur. The "Corrections Bill" has changed that. Now it states that we have to consult with them.

Tom Bryan stated since these are public monies we are spending, it ought to be clear to everyone that the result is something that is available for public use rather than building a fence around it so that the public can not use it. Jon Brady shared that one of the requirements is that it is accessible to the public. Another scenario would be Green Township going along I-74, buying conservation easements, preserving the hillside, and preserving green space, while a lot of those conservation easements may be on private property. What is the accessibility issue there, now can people traipse through someone's yard for the green space? The intent is that it's available for everyone. In fact, there are more points if it is available for public use for seven days a week, during lighted hours. Also, the whole intent is to provide green space and there are some hillsides in some inaccessible areas where they are valuable to preserve, but you also don't want a lot of human activity in there as well.

Tom Bryan stated that a lot of them would be preserved naturally because of the difficulty in development. They might be used by a normal landowner from the standpoint of hunting or preserving around their own other properties. Spending public dollars to secure something that will probably never be developed seems rather fruitless. Jon Brady noted the engineering as such, that over the past twenty years they have developed so many ways to develop hillsides. The hillside issues with flooding and drainage are more critical for Hamilton County, rather than other areas of the state. One of the things locally that should be a priority in District #2 is to preserve the hillsides. NRAC made this one of their priorities. It also brought up the issues of accessibility. You want to make sure they are accessible for view as you go along the highway or to preserve the natural area. They don't lend themselves well for a lot of public use.

Chairman Brayshaw noted this shows how big the problem is in getting the first round of projects rated and accepted. He shared they went through this same process seventeen years ago when the Integrating Committee first started. After the first round each round was then fine tuned with improvements.

Chairman Brayshaw thanked Jon Brady for the informative update.

Brownfield Support Staff Update

◊ David Main, Director of the Hamilton County Development Company and spokesperson for the Brownfield Support Staff, provided a summary report to the Integrating Committee. A copy of this report was distributed to everyone.

◊ David Main noted that Bonnie Phillips, Evonne Kovach and himself attended a training session for applicant processing at the Ohio Department of Development this past week. He explained that successful applicants are required to have Phase I and Phase II environmental assessments that are "Certified" through the Voluntary Action Plan (VAP).

◊ Application Timeline - During the week of March 18, 2002 the applicants must file a preliminary application in a local library and post on the proposed site a (4' X 4') sign. This timeframe starts the forty-five (45) day notice period. A notice in a newspaper of general circulation must also be posted. A public meeting is then required; this should take place prior to the submission of the application to the Integrating Committee (Brownfield Support Staff), as the completed applications are due on May 10, 2002. The approximate date for the public meeting would be around March 25-26, 2002.

Meanwhile, the state is also requesting that they submit an application at the same time when they do the public library filing. This is so the Ohio Department of Development can review those applications for completeness. They will not review for quality or how good they are, they will go through to check for completeness and give the applicants a chance to make corrections if necessary.

After the final review and ratings from the Brownfield Support Staff have been conducted, the final vote from the Integrating Committee will be held on May 31, 2002. After that meeting the completed applications (electronic copy and hard copy) are to be submitted by the Integrating Committee to the Clean Ohio Council no later than 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 4, 2002.

◊ Selection Methodology – The base criteria consists of (102) points. They are broken down into the following seven categories:

1.) Economic benefit (30)
2.) Environmental improvement (30)
3.) Match (10)
4.) Benefit to low-income community (10)
5.) Project viability (15)
6.) Combination of uses (5)
7.) Loans (2)

- Bonds have been set up in order to loan up to $7.5 million dollars a round; there is roughly $40 million in this round. They can make a low interest loan, 1% for ten years. Two points are given if they want a loan.
- The next section discussed was "Discretionary Points" and "Priority Points". The reason the (15) points become crucial is because it could change the ranking of projects.

1.) The highest-ranking project would receive (40) additional points.
2.) The second would get (25) additional points.
3.) The third would get (15) additional points.
4.) The fourth would get (10) additional points.
5.) The fifth would get (5) additional points.
6.) The sixth project would not receive any other priority points.

- The Brownfield Support Staff is currently working on how to allocate those (15) points:

1.) "Essay" – Why applicants should be awarded points.
2.) Categorical distribution to assign points.

- The State of Ohio has indicated that sometime in mid to late March 2002 there will be training opportunities for both the Integrating Committees and Support Staff. This will be done on a regional basis.
- Chairman Brayshaw noted the "Discretionary Points" are stripped off after they are submitted to the Clean Ohio Council in Columbus, Ohio. The Clean Ohio Council doesn't look at the "Discretionary Points" as part of the score.

  David Main confirmed that after the state receives them they take the points off and then add the additional (25) points. They would take off the (15) points and the "Priority Points" remain. Then as noted the Clean Ohio Council has the option to add another (25) points.

  Mayor Savage stated the "Discretionary Points" end up affecting the ranking, because the ranking points stick. If there is no rationale for the awarding of "Discretionary Points", then you will have problems. People are vying to get the ranking points.

  Chairman Brayshaw indicated that the Integrating Committee should focus on what has the best chance of getting state funding. Ultimately the state will determine which projects get funded. With the (25) "Discretionary Points", the state will have quite a bit of power to make that decision.
- After further discussion, David Main indicated the Brownfield Support Staff's next meeting to be held on April 8, 2002. After that meeting their staff will be able to make recommendations to the Integrating Committee. Then the Integrating Committee needs to make the decision whether they want to award "Discretionary Points" or not.
- David Main noted the following possible candidates for applications:

  1.) Green Industries Site – Kemper Road in Sharonville
  2.) The American Tissue Site – Lockland
  3.) The GM Globe Site – Norwood
  4.) Center Hill Landfill Project – City of Cincinnati
  5.) City of North College Hill
- After further discussion, it was decided the next Integrating Committee Meeting should be held on Friday, April 12, 2002 at the Nathanael Greene Lodge at 8:00 a.m. This will allow the committee to discuss their options in the awarding of the discretionary points, the tiebreakers and readiness to proceed prior to the final vote on May 31, 2002 Integrating Committee Meeting.

  It was also requested by Tim Riordan for the Brownfield Support Staff to communicate to the applicants the outcome of the meeting on April 12th. This will allow the applicants to make the necessary adjustments or address whatever those criteria may be in their application.

  Chairman Brayshaw requested Joe Cottrill to post the upcoming Integrating Committee meetings, along with the upcoming training session in April on the Hamilton County Engineer's website.
- David Main noted the Clean Ohio Council intentions are to have projects awarded and grants signed in August 2002; then another round will start in September 2002.

Old Business…

◊ Tom Bryan made an apology to the Integrating Committee for not attending the last two meetings and further explained that he had business constraints.

*New Business…*Nothing to report.

Next Meeting Date & Time…

◊ The next Integrating Committee Meeting will be held on Friday, April 12, 2002 at the Nathanael Greene Lodge, in Green Township at 8:00 a.m. The agenda will consist of the following: Round 17 SCIP/LTIP projects, Brownfield Support Staff update and NRAC update.

At a later date the Brownfield Support Staff was contacted regarding "Brownfield Training". This training is scheduled for April 16, 2002 at the Blacklick Woods Metro Park located in Reynoldburg, OH. Chairman Brayshaw, David Main, Evonne Kovach, Bonnie Phillips and Ron Ebelhar will represent District #2.

Therefore, the next Integrating Committee Meeting was rescheduled for Thursday, April 18, 2002 at the Nathanael Greene Lodge, in Green Township at 8:00 a.m. The agenda will consist of the following: Round 17 SCIP/LTIP projects, Brownfield Support Staff update and NRAC update.

The next proposed meeting will be conducted on Friday, May 31, 2002 at the Nathanael Greene Lodge, in Green Township at 8:00 a.m. The agenda will consist of the following: Final vote for Round 17 SCIP/LTIP projects, final prioritization and vote for Brownfield projects and NRAC update.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mayor Savage; seconded by Dan Schlueter and the meeting adjourned at 9:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathy Listermann

Cathy Listermann
Recording Secretary

SCIP/LTIP PROGRAM
ROUND ~~16~~17 - PROGRAM YEAR ~~2002~~2003
PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA
JULY 1, ~~2002~~2003 TO JUNE 30, ~~2003~~2004

NAME OF APPLICANT: _____

NAME OF PROJECT: _____

RATING TEAM: _____

NOTE: *See the attached "Addendum To The Rating System" for definitions, explanations and clarifications to each of the criterion points of this rating system.*

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE RATING

1) What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired?

25 - Failed
23 - Critical
20 - Very Poor
17 - Poor
15 - Moderately Poor
10 - Moderately Fair
5 - Fair Condition
0 - Good or Better

Appeal Score _____

2) How important is the project to the *safety* of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

25 - Highly significant importance
20 - Considerably significant importance
15 - Moderate importance
10 - Minimal importance
0 - No measurable impact

Appeal Score _____

3) How important is the project to the *health* of the Public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

25 - Highly significant importance
20 - Considerably significant importance
15 - Moderate importance
10 - Minimal importance
0 - No measurable impact

Appeal Score _____

4) Does the project help meet the infrastructure repair and replacement needs of the applying jurisdiction?
Note: Jurisdiction's priority listing (part of the Additional Support Information) must be filed with application(s).

25 - First priority project
20 - Second priority project
15 Third priority project
10 - Fourth priority project
5 - Fifth priority project or lower

Appeal Score _____

5) Will the completed project generate user fees or assessments?

10 – No
0 – Yes

Appeal Score _____

6) Economic Growth – How the completed project will enhance economic growth (See definitions).

10 – The project will directly secure significant new employment
7 - The project will directly secure new employment
5 – The project will secure new employment
3 – The project will permit more development
0 – The project will not impact development

Appeal Score

_____

7) Matching Funds - LOCAL

10 - This project is a loan or credit enhancement
10 – 50% or higher
8 – 40% to 49.99%
6 – 30% to 39.99%
4 – 20% to 29.99%
2 – 10% to 19.99%
0 – Less than 10%

8) Matching Funds - OTHER

10 – 50% or higher
8 – 40% to 49.99%
6 – 30% to 39.99%
4 – 20% to 29.99%
2 – 10% to 19.99%
1 – 1% to 9.99%
0 – Less than 1%

9) Will the project alleviate serious traffic problems or hazards or respond to the future level of service needs of the district? (See Addendum for definitions)

10 - Project design is for future demand.
8 - Project design is for partial future demand.
6 - Project design is for current demand.
4 - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity.
2 - Project design is for no increase in capacity.

Appeal Score

_____

10) Ability to Proceed - If SCIP/LTIP funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded? (See Addendum concerning delinquent projects)

5 - Will be under contract by December 31, 2002 and no delinquent projects in Rounds 13 & 14
3 - Will be under contract by March 31, 2003 and/or one delinquent project in Rounds 13 & 14
0 - Will not be under contract by March 31, 2003 and/or more than one delinquent project in Rounds 13 & 14

11) Does the infrastructure have regional impact? Consider origination and destination of traffic, functional classifications, size of service area, and number of jurisdictions served, etc. (See Addendum for definitions)

10 - Major impact
8 -
6 - Moderate impact
4 -
2 - Minimal or no impact

Appeal Score

_____

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

10 Points
8 Points
6 Points
4 Points
2 Points

13) 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?

10 - Complete ban, facility closed
8 – 80% reduction in legal load or 4-wheeled vehicles only
7 – Moratorium on future development, *not* functioning for current demand
6 – 60% reduction in legal load
5 - Moratorium on future development, functioning for current demand
4 – 40% reduction in legal load
2 – 20% reduction in legal load
0 – Less than 20% reduction in legal load

Appeal Score

_____

14) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project?

10 - 16,000 or more
8 - 12,000 to 15,999
6 - 8,000 to 11,999
4 - 4,000 to 7,999
2 - 3,999 and under

Appeal Score

_____

15) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional $5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure? (Provide documentation of which fees have been enacted.)

5 - Two or more of the above
3 - One of the above
0 - None of the above

Appeal Score

_____

ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM

General Statement for Rating Criteria

Points awarded for all items will be based on engineering experience, field verification, application information and other information supplied by the applicant, which is deemed to be relevant by the Support Staff. The examples listed in this addendum are not a complete list, but only a small sampling of situations that may be relevant to a given project.

Criterion 1 - Condition

Condition is based on the amount of deterioration that is field verified or documented exclusive of capacity, serviceability, health and/or safety issues. Condition is rated only on the facility being repaired or abandoned. (Documentation may include: ODOT BR86 reports, pavement management condition reports, televised underground system reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included in the original application.)

Definitions:

Failed Condition - 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.)

Critical Condition - 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.)

Very Poor Condition - 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.)

Poor Condition - 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.)

Moderately Poor Condition - 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 to no maintenance required to maintain integrity.

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

Criterion 2 – Safety

The ~~design of the project is intended to reduce existing accident rate, promote safer conditions, and reduce the danger of risk, liability or injury. (e.g. widening existing roadway lanes to standard widths, adding lanes to a roadway or bridge to increase capacity or alleviate congestion, replacing non-functioning hydrants, increasing capacity to a water system, etc. Documentation is required.)~~jurisdiction shall include in its application the type of safety problem that currently exists and how the intended project would improve the situation. For example, have there been vehicular accidents attributable to the problems cited? Have they involved injuries or fatalities? In the case of water systems, are existing hydrants non-functional? In the case of water lines, is the present capacity inadequate to provide volumes or pressure for adequate fire protection? **In all cases, specific documentation is required.**

Note: **Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply.~~The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.~~** Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.

Criterion 3 – Health

The ~~design of the project will improve the overall condition of the facility so as to reduce or eliminate potential for disease, or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area (e.g. Improving or adding storm drainage or sanitary facilities, replacing lead jointed water lines, etc.)~~jurisdiction shall include in its application the type and seriousness of the health problem that would be eliminated or reduced by the intended project. For example, can the problem be eliminated only by the project, or would routine maintenance be satisfactory? If basement flooding has occurred, was it storm water or sanitary flow? What complaints, if any are recorded? In the case of underground improvements, how will they improve health if they are storm sewers? How would improved sanitary sewers improve health or reduce health risk? Are leaded joints involved in existing water line replacements? **In all cases, specific documentation is required.**

Note: **Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply.** ~~The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems and the method of correction.~~ Examples given above are NOT intended to be exclusive.

Criterion 4 – Jurisdiction's Priority Listing

The jurisdiction **must** submit a listing in priority order of the projects for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of most to least importance. The form is included in the Additional Support Information.

Criterion 5 – Generate Fees

Will the local jurisdiction assess fees or project costs for the usage of the facility or its products once the project is completed (example: rates for water or sewer, frontage assessments, etc.). The applying jurisdiction must submit documentation.

Criterion 6 – Economic Growth

Will the completed project enhance economic growth and/or development in the service area?

Definitions:

Directly secure significant new employment: The project is specifically designed to secure a particular development/employer(s), which will add at least 100 or more new employees. The applicant agency must supply specific details of the development, the employer(s), and number of new permanent employees.

Directly secure new employment: The project is specifically designed to secure development/employers, which will add at least 50 new permanent employees. The applying agency must supply details of the development and the type and number of new permanent employees.

Secure new employment: The project is specifically designed to secure development/employers, which will add 10 or more new permanent employees. The applying agency must submit details.

Permit more development: The project is designed to permit additional business development. The applicant must supply details.

The project will not impact development: The project will have no impact on business development.

Note: **Each project is looked at on an individual basis to determine if any aspects of this category apply.**

Criterion 7 – Matching Funds - Local

The percentage of matching funds which come directly from the budget of the applying local government.

Criterion 8 – Matching Funds - Other

The percentage of matching funds that come from funding sources other than those mentioned in Criterion 7.

Criterion 9 – Alleviate Traffic Problems

The jurisdiction shall provide a narrative, along with pertinent support documentation, which describe the existing deficiencies and showing how congestion or hazards will be reduced or eliminated and how service will be improved to meet the needs of any expected growth or development. A formal capacity analysis accompanying the application would be beneficial. Projected traffic or demand should be calculated as follows:

Formula:

Existing users x design year factor = projected users

Design Year	Design year factor		
	Urban	Suburban	Rural
20	1.40	1.70	1.60
10	1.20	1.35	1.30

Definitions:

Future demand – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for twenty-year projected demand or fully developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.

Partial future demand – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service for ten-year projected demand or partially developed area conditions. Justification must be supplied if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.

Current demand – Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide sufficient capacity or service only for existing demand and conditions.

Minimal increase – Project will reduce but not eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies and will provide a minimal but less than sufficient increase in existing capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

No increase – Project will have no effect on existing congestion or deficiencies and provide no increase in capacity or service for

existing demand and conditions.

Criterion 10 - 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 [illegible]ed by the OPWC. A jurisdiction receiving approval for a project and subsequently canceling the same after the bid date on the application may be considered as having a delinquent project.

Criterion 11 - Regional Impact

The regional significance of the infrastructure that is being repaired or replaced.

Definitions:

Major Impact - Roads: major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed route to an Interstate, Federal Aid Primary routes.
Moderate Impact - Roads: principal thoroughfares, Federal Aid Urban routes
Minimal / No Impact - Roads: cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets

Criterion 12 – Economic Health

The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the jurisdiction's economic health. The economic health of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when census and other budgetary data are updated.

Criterion 13 - Ban

The jurisdiction shall provide documentation to show that a facility ban or moratorium has been formally placed. The ban or moratorium must have been caused by a structural or operational problem. Points will only be awarded if the end result of the project will cause the ban to be lifted.

Criterion 14 - Users

The applying jurisdiction shall provide documentation. A registered professional engineer or the applying jurisdictions' C.E.O must certify the appropriate documentation. Documentation may 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.

[illegible]terion 15 – Fees, Levies, Etc.

The applying jurisdiction shall document (in the "Additional Support Information" form) which type of fees, levies or taxes they have dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for.

Cathy 3/20/02

City of Cincinnati

Timothy H. Riordan
City Manager (Acting)

Room 152, City Hall
801 Plum Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202-5706
Phone (513) 352-5200
Fax (513) 352-6284

March 14, 2002

Mr. William Brayshaw
Hamilton County Engineer
County Administration Building
138 E. Court Street, Room 700
Cincinnati, OH 45202

Dear Mr. Brayshaw:

This is to inform you that with the retirement of Mr.John Deatrick, Mr. William Moller, Acting City Finance Director, will serve as a member of the Issue 2 Integrating Committee. Mr. Brian Ashford, the City's Budget Manager, will serve as his alternate.

Mr. Prem Garg will serve as the alternate to Mr. Timothy Riordan.

Sincerely,

Timothy H. Riordan
Acting City Manager

WWB 4-3-02
Cathy

City of Cincinnati

Department of Transportation and Engineering

Room 450, City Hall
801 Plum Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Phone: (513) 352-2366
Fax: (513) 352-6246

John F. Deatrick, P.E., AICP
Director

April 1, 2002

William W. Brayshaw
Chairman
District #2 Integrating Committee
10480 Burlington Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45231

Dear Mr. Brayshaw:

As you may be aware, I am retiring from the City of Cincinnati in the near future and find it necessary to respectively submit my resignation as a member of the District #2 Integrating Committee.

It has been a very rewarding experience working with the exceptional individuals on the Committee. I am sure that my replacement, Mr. Bill Moller will provide assistance to continue the momentum on the important initiatives being championed by the Committee.

Sincerely,

John F. Deatrick, P.E., AICP
Director

cc: B. Moller, Finance

85th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting
Green Township
Nathanael Greene Lodge
6394 Wesselman Road
Cincinnati, OH 45248

February 22, 2002

BOARD ATTENDANCE LIST

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE
Tom Bryan	Springfield TWP	522-8532
Joe Sykes	Miami Twp	941 3393
Dan Schlueter	CINCINNATI	~~[illegible]~~ 591-6501
Prem garg	city of Cincinnati	352-3720
DAVE SAVAGE	HCML (Wyoming)	821-7600
Bill Brayshaw	Ham. Co. Engr.	946-8902
Tim Riordan	City of Cincy	352-3241
Dick [illegible]	[illegible]	583-4747 ~~[illegible]~~
Dan Barnett	HCML (N.C.H)	521-7413

85th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting
Green Township
Nathanael Greene Lodge
6394 Wesselman Road
Cincinnati, OH 45248

February 22, 2002

VISITOR LIST

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE
Joe Cottrill	HAMCO ENGR'S.	946-8906
Jim Brady	H.C.P.D	521-7275
David Mann	HCDC	631-8292
Bonnie Pulley	City - OEM	352-5310
Eronni Konack	Lockland	761-1124
Jim BENEDICT	KMK CONSULTING	639-3963
TIM SHARP	PORT OF GREATER CINTI. DEV. AUTHORITY	621-3000

85th District #2 Integrating Committee Meeting

Nathanael Greene Lodge
(First Floor Conference Room)
6394 Wesselman Road
Cincinnati, OH 45248

February 22, 2002 - 8:00 a.m.

AGENDA

1.) Meeting Called to Order

2.) Approval of 84th Meeting Minutes of January 18, 2002

3.) NRAC Committee Update – Presented by Jon Brady, Director of the Hamilton County Park District.

4.) Brownfield Support Staff Update – Presented by David Main, Director of the Hamilton County Development Company.

   a) Application Timeline
   b) Selection Methodology
   c) Training for Integrating Committee & Support Staff
   d) Discretionary Points (15) – How to Allocate
   e) Next Support Staff Meeting – Monday, April 8, 2002 @ 8:00 a.m.

5.) Old Business

6.) New Business

7.) Next Meeting Date: Friday, May 31, 2002 at 8:00 a.m.

8.) Adjournment

Website Address for District #2 "SCIP/LTIP" page:
www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/SCIP/ltip.htm

Website Address for Clean Ohio "Brownfield" page:
www.pwc.state.oh.us/clean_ohio.htm

Website Address for Hamilton County Engineer "NRAC" page:
www.hamilton-co.org/engineer/nrac.htm