



Hamilton County, Ohio



Ohio Public Works Commission District 2 Integrating Committee

Applicant Manual Fiscal Year 2025 Rules & Regulations

Adopted May 12th, 2023

Table of Contents

Revisions of Note	3
Schedule	4
Program Administration	5-6
□ Integrating Committee	5
□ Support Staff	6
Eligibility & Funding	7-8
□ Eligible Infrastructure	7
□ Standalone Infrastructure	7
□ Eligible Costs	7
□ Ineligible Costs	8
□ Project Cost Overruns & OPWC Advisory	8
State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP)	9-10
□ SCIP Grant Program	9
□ SCIP Loan Program	9-10
□ Loan Assistance Program	10
□ Credit Enhancement Program	10
Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP)	10
Revolving Loan Program	11
Small Government Program	12
Pre-Application Policy & Procedure	13
Rules for Application	14-20
□ Filing Instructions	14
□ General Submittal Rules & Guidelines	14-16
† Required Documentation	14
† Recommended Additional Support Documentation	15
† Errors & Omissions	15-16
□ Specific Submittal Rules & Guidelines	17-20
† OPWC Application for Financial Assistance	17
† Additional Support Information	17-18
† Detailed Cost Estimate	18
† Useful Life Statement	18
† Certification of Funds / Loan Repayment Letter	18
† Authorizing Legislation	18
† Certification of Traffic	19
† Public Infrastructure / Right-of-Way	19
† Cooperative Agreement	19
† Certification of Fees, Levies & Taxes	19
† Project Photos / Video	19
† Project Vicinity Map	19
† Submission Checklist	20

Project Rating	20-22
□ Submittal Review	20
□ Rating Teams	21
□ Project Distribution	21
□ Rating of Projects	21-22
□ Initial Rating Work Session	22
Rules for Appeal	23
□ Overview	
□ Rating of Projects	
□ Appealed Rating Work Session	
Project Funding	23-26
□ Rules for Award	23
□ LTIP Minimum	23
□ Small Government	24
□ Useful Life Requirement	24
□ Ranking the Projects	24-25
□ Recommended Funding Package	25
□ Project Approval	25-26
Residual Project Funding	26
Annual Program Review	26-27
Roster of District Officials	28-29
Subdivision Codes	30
Additional Support Information	31-35
Applicant Submission Checklist	36-37
Pre-Application Form	38-39
Appendices	40-45
□ Appendix A Detailed Engineer's Estimate/Useful Life Statement	41
□ Appendix B Certification of Local Funds/Loan Repayment Letter	42
□ Appendix C Authorizing Legislation	43
□ Appendix D Traffic Certification Statement	44
□ Appendix E Cooperative Agreement	45

Revisions of Note

Applicant Guidelines

Section	Page
General Submittal Rules & Guidelines	
▫ Errors & Omissions	15-16
Specific Submittal Rules & Guidelines	
▫ Certification of Local Matching Funds	18
Rating of Projects	
▫ New / Expansion Projects	22
▫ Roadway Expansion / Relocation Projects	22

August

Thursday 17th

Applicant Assistance Session

Friday 25th

Pre-application deadline 2:00 p.m.

September

Friday 29th

Application submittal deadline 2:00 p.m.

Friday 29th

Residual funds disbursement deadline

October

Monday 2nd thru Friday 6th

Submittal Review & Data Entry

Monday 9th thru Friday 20th

Field rating of projects

Tuesday 24th thru Wednesday 25th

Support Staff rating review meetings

Friday 27th

Preliminary ratings emailed to applicants

November

Friday 3rd

Appealed project filing deadline 2:00 p.m.

Monday 6th thru Thursday 9th

Field rating of appealed projects

Tuesday 14th

Support Staff appeal rating review

Wednesday 15th

Appeal results emailed to applicants

December

Friday 1st

Integrating Committee District priority approval

January

Wednesday 31st

Fully executed Legislation & Cooperative Agreement submittal deadline 2:00 p.m.

**Program Administration
Integrating Committee**

Structure (as per the Ohio Revised Code 164.04)

The District Integrating Committee shall consist of nine (9) members appointed as follows:

- Two (2) members appointed by the Board of County Commissioners
 - † One (1) shall have experience in infrastructure planning & economic development
 - † One (1) shall be either a county commissioner or county engineer of the District
- Three (3) members appointed by the chief executive officer of the most populous municipal corporation in the district
- Two (2) members appointed by a majority of the other chief executive officers of municipal corporations in the district
- Two (2) members appointed by a majority of the boards of township trustees in the district

Appointments

- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| □ City of Cincinnati | Three (3) members |
| □ Hamilton County | Two (2) members |
| □ Hamilton County Municipal League | Two (2) members |
| □ Hamilton County Township Association | Two (2) members |

Duties & Responsibilities (as per the Ohio Revised Code 164.06)

Each District Integrating Committee shall evaluate materials submitted to it by the local subdivisions located in the District concerning capital improvements for which assistance is sought from the State Capital Improvements Fund and shall prioritize the requests for financial assistance that will be formally submitted by the district to the director of the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC).

In order to provide for the efficient use of the District's OPWC funding allocations each year, the District Committee shall assist its subdivisions in the preparation and coordination of project plans.

The Integrating Committee shall appoint a subcommittee of its members that will represent the interests of villages and townships and that will review and prioritize the capital improvement projects which will be submitted by the subcommittee to the administrator of the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvements Commission.

The affirmative vote of at least seven (7) members of the Committee or their alternates is required for any action taken by a vote of the Committee.

Program Administration Support Staff

Structure

Eleven (11) appointed members:

- One (1) serves as the Liaison Officer for the District 2 Integrating Committee & OPWC.
 - † The Liaison Officer does not participate in the rating of projects
- Two (2) serve as Technical Assistants to the Liaison Officer
- Five (5) rating teams / Two (2) members per team

Appointments

- City of Cincinnati Four (4) members
- Hamilton County Four (4) members (includes Liaison Officer)
- Hamilton County Municipal League One (1) member
- Hamilton County Township Association Two (2) members

Duties & Responsibilities

At the direction of the District 2 Integrating Committee, the Support Staff assists in developing and implementing the District's rating methodology, including:

- Perform annual review of current methodology, policies & procedures.
- Recommend revisions to the methodology for consideration & approval of the Integrating Committee.
- Assist communities in interpreting the methodology, policies & procedures and preparing applications.
- Review project applications for completeness.
- Project rating- part of a two (2) person Rating Team, and work sessions with full Support Staff.
- Develop the Project Priority Listings and Recommended Funding Package for the Integrating Committee's consideration and approval.
- Build consensus in all areas of the District's Program.
 - † If consensus cannot be reached, the discordant parties will each file a report with the Integrating Committee for their consideration and resolution of the matter.

Eligibility & Funding

Eligible Infrastructure

Roads

- Only **publicly maintained thoroughfares** within the right-of-way dedicated for public road purposes.
- If applying for **multiple streets in a single application**, such as in a subdivision, **all streets must be contiguous or immediately adjacent**. If not, the project **will not** be rated by the Support Staff or considered for funding by the Integrating Committee.

Bridges

Storm and sanitary water collection & storage facilities

Storm & sanitary water treatment facilities

Water supply systems

Solid waste disposal facilities

Standalone Eligibility

Permit the application for **loan funding only** for the following:

- ADA curb ramps
- Signalization
- Railroad crossing grade
- Fire hydrants
- Signage
- Guardrail
- Security for drinking water facilities

Eligible Costs

Only the total project cost (construction and construction contingency) is **eligible for grant funding**.

Design/engineering and costs for right-of-way/property acquisition are eligible for **loan funding only**.

Construction contingency costs **cannot exceed 10%** of construction costs.

Ineligible Costs

Construction administration

Costs for landscaping activities and improvements pertaining to infrastructure that go beyond basic requirements of post-construction repair, stabilization, and reseeding of land surfaces **are ineligible, except** for roundabouts for the purpose of serving as visual cues, and for green stormwater management options. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Sodding
- Trees
- Ornamental plants or structures
- Landscaped islands
- Decorative signs and other decorative items

Project Cost Overruns

All cost overruns associated with a funded project, whether for work covered by the approved application or otherwise, **shall be the sole responsibility of the project applicant**, or such other subdivisions or persons as may be specified in the application.

OPWC Advisory (April 27th, 2022)

Inflated Project Costs

Over the course of the program's history, due to the economic climate, we have seen trends in which bids exceed the engineer's estimates. This is one of those times. Not only has the cost of certain raw materials increased, but also the cost of labor. Recipients have the following choices:

- Withdraw and reapply in the next funding round
- Find a supplemental funding source
- Check with the District for any leftover loan funds
- Reduce the project scope

The last two options require District approval.

We cannot accept an application in a following round to supplement the gap since a project cannot be funded more than once within its projected useful life.

State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP)

SCIP Grant Program

Grant funds provided for rehabilitation, repair, and reconstruction projects.

Expansion projects **are not eligible** for SCIP Grant funding **unless** the expansion component is to be funded by the local jurisdiction.

The amount of SCIP grant funding awarded cannot be greater than **90%** of the total District SCIP allocation.

Grant funds for individual projects cannot exceed **90%** of the total construction cost of the project.

- The local jurisdiction must contribute a minimum of **10%** of the total construction cost.
- Loan requests of **10% or more** of the total project cost **will be credited** as the jurisdiction's local match.

Applications seeking funding by means of a **grant/loan combination are eligible**.

SCIP Loan Program

SCIP Loan/Loan Assistance awards must comprise at least **10%** of the total District 2 SCIP allocation.

Any project primarily involving repair, reconstruction, or construction of facilities **which are part of a system collecting fees from its users, such as water and sewer systems, are eligible only for loan or loan assistance funding**.

Loan funds can be used for rehabilitation, repair, reconstruction, design/engineering (including standalone infrastructure) and right-of-way (R/W) acquisition costs.

- The OPWC no longer permits funding requests for projects seeking loan funding for design/engineering services only.
 - † Requests for these services must be accompanied by a request for construction funding.

For projects involving the acquisition of R/W:

- R/W acquired **must result** in functioning infrastructure constructed within it.
 - † OPWC loan funds **cannot** be used to purchase property not used in the construction of the infrastructure (i.e., ten acres acquired; improvements realized on only four acres).
- Eligible R/W acquisition costs include:
 - † Acquisition of easements or land for project construction.
 - † Appraisals, appraisal reviews and title searches of property to be acquired.
- In the event the amount of loan funding requested exceeds the District's loan program balances, the Integrating Committee will consider capping R/W acquisition requests to ensure that as many loan projects can be funded as possible.

No minimum local share is required for loan projects.

- **100%** of the total project cost is fundable unless **the project involves expansion**.

SCIP loans:

- **Do not count** against the local jurisdiction's State of Ohio mandated 10-mil debt limitation, **nor affect** a jurisdiction's credit rating.
- May be paid off early, without penalty.

The applicant determines the **loan term**; between **1 and 30 years**.

- The term **cannot exceed the infrastructure's projected useful life** as noted in the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance (Page 3- Section 4.1).

The **interest rate** for SCIP loans is to be **0%**.

Loan Assistance Program (LAP)

Loan Assistance is a grant that pays for the interest on a public or private loans during the construction period. **Construction must have commenced within three years prior to the date of the project agreement.**

The LAP offers grant funding that pays for the interest on loans for OPWC eligible construction projects. LAP grant funds will pay for accrued interest during the construction period plus one year thereafter, and going back up to one year prior to the date of the Project Agreement.

LAP grant funds may be applied for as part of a project which is also seeking OPWC grant, loan or grant/loan combination funding, but needs to be a separate application for administrative purposes.

LAP grant funds **do not have to be repaid to the OPWC.**

Credit Enhancement Program (CEP)

The CEP offers a one-time infusion of funds to enhance an applicant's ability to secure affordable debt. The OPWC may pay the premium for a bond insurance policy which would improve the applicant's credit or bond rating.

CEP grant funds **do not have to be repaid to the OPWC.**

CEP funds may be applied for as part of a project which is also seeking OPWC grant, loan or grant/loan combination funding, but needs to be a separate application for administrative purposes.

Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP)

LTIP funds can be used for the rehabilitation, repair, construction, reconstruction and expansion of **roads and bridges only.**

Projects in which **greater than 50%** of costs are for drainage items **are not eligible** for LTIP funding.

LTIP Program awards **grant funding only.**

LTIP grants fund a **maximum of 90%** of the total construction cost.

Revolving Loan Program (RLP)

Any project primarily involving repair, reconstruction, or construction of facilities **which are part of a system collecting fees from its users, such as water and sewer systems, may only apply for a loan or loan assistance funding for such projects.**

Loan funds can be used for rehabilitation, repair, reconstruction, design/engineering (including standalone infrastructure), and right-of-way (R/W) acquisition costs.

- The OPWC no longer permits funding requests for projects seeking loan funding for design/engineering services only.
 - † Requests for these services must be accompanied by a request for construction funding.

For projects involving the acquisition of R/W:

- R/W acquired **must result** in functioning infrastructure constructed on the property.
 - † OPWC loan funds **cannot be used** to purchase property not used in the construction of the infrastructure (i.e., ten (10) acres acquired; improvements realized on only four acres).
- **Eligible R/W acquisition costs include:**
 - † Acquisition of easements or land for project construction.
 - † Appraisals, appraisal reviews and title searches of property to be acquired.

In the event the amount of loan funding requested exceeds the District's loan program balances, the Integrating Committee will consider capping R/W acquisition loan requests to ensure that as many loan projects can be funded as possible.

RLP funds **are not** subject to the **20%** new and expansion limitations.

No minimum local share is required.

- **100%** of the total project cost is fundable.

RLP loans **do not count against** the local jurisdiction's State of Ohio mandated 10-mil debt limitation, nor affect a jurisdiction's credit rating.

Loans may be paid off early, without penalty.

The interest rate for RLP loans is to be **0%**.

Small Government Program (SGP)

The Small Government Commission (SGC) awards grants, loans, and loan assistance to local jurisdictions with a **population base of less than 5,000**. Only infrastructure that is village or township owned is eligible for assistance.

The District 2 Integrating Committee **does not** determine which projects will be funded. **The SGC makes all funding decisions.**

All projects **must be submitted and rated as District 2 SCIP/LTIP projects prior to submittal to the SGC** to determine if the project can first be funded with SCIP/LTIP allocated funds.

SGP eligible projects which did not qualify for District 2 SCIP/LTIP funds are reviewed by the Liaison Officer and District 2 Integrating Committee Small Government Subcommittee to determine the potential competitiveness of the projects, utilizing criteria two (2) thru eleven (11) of the SGC's rating methodology.

The **seven (7) highest rated projects** are recommended for approval by the Integrating Committee as the District's SGC priorities and are then submitted to the OPWC for further consideration.

- **Only the top five** are awarded district ranking points by the Small Government Administrator.

The SGC will notify applicants of the opportunity to revise their application to better conform to the SGC's project rating methodology.

- Applicants will have 30 days to make revisions and resubmit to the SGC.

Pre-application Policy & Procedure

The pre-application process provides applicants the opportunity to have the **physical condition of roads & bridges** pre-rated, permitting the performance of maintenance & repair to the infrastructure without severely affecting the infrastructure condition score when applying for SCIP/LTIP funds.

Only road and bridge projects are eligible to apply for a pre-rating score.

Pre-applications must include the date maintenance activity is to be performed to ensure the Support Staff can field rate the project site before work is started.

Applications for pre-rating will be accepted **only for projects that will be applied for in the upcoming funding round (FY25)**.

The pre-rating score will be valid **only for the current funding round**.

Failure to meet the terms, limits, and scope of work as detailed in the Pre-Application **could result in disqualification** of the OPWC application.

The Support Staff will pre-rate only the physical condition of the infrastructure. **The score will be kept in confidence until all projects are rated.**

The pre-rating score will be factored as **75% of the final score**.

The infrastructure's condition as noted by the Support Staff rating team in October will be factored as **25% of the final score**.

The deadline for submittal of pre-applications is **Friday, August 25th, 2023**

Rules for Application

Application Deadline - **Friday, September 29th, 2023 (2:00 p.m.)**
Applications filed after the deadline will not be accepted.

Filing Instructions

Applicants are required to submit applications via the OPWC WorksWise Portal. Visit <https://pwc.ohio.gov/WorksWise-Training> for details on how to request access, as well as training videos on how to use the system. Paper applications can still be used, but the applications must still be put into the WorksWise portal in order to be eligible for scoring. Submission of a paper and pdf disc or thumb drive copy of the project application and required documentation to the District 2 Liaison Officer is **no longer required**. Contact your Program Representative or District Liaison for questions.

General Submittal Rules & Guidelines

All documents must be filled out completely and signed where applicable!
The applicant is solely responsible for filing the application and its content!

Documents which must be submitted for a submittal to be considered complete & eligible for funding are:
OPWC

- Application for Financial Assistance
- Detailed Cost Estimate (signed and sealed by professional engineer)
- Useful Life Statement (signed and sealed by professional engineer)
- Certification of Funds / Loan Repayment Letter (signed by fiduciary officer)
- Authorizing Legislation (must be submitted by **Wednesday January 31st, 2024**)
- Cooperative Agreement (if applicable - must be submitted by **Wednesday January 31st, 2024**)

District 2

- District 2 Additional Support Information (ASI)
- Certification of Fees, Levies and/or Taxes
- Certification of Users / Traffic (signed by a registered professional engineer)
 - † Projects involving less than 3,000 users are not required to submit certification documents
- Public Infrastructure / Right of Way documentation
- Ban/Moratorium Documentation (a copy of legislation passed by the jurisdiction is required)
- Project Vicinity Map
- Project Photos / Video
- Submission Checklist (signed)
-

Documents required to be submitted for an application to be competitive:

- Infrastructure condition data

- Infrastructure safety data
- Infrastructure health data
- Economic growth data
- Alleviate traffic hazard / level of service data
- Relevant traffic accident reports - to include summaries, analysis, and accident rates

The applicant should provide as much information as possible to assist the Integrating Committee & Support Staff in understanding the limits, needs, costs, and other factors relevant to the project.

- The District has determined that if an application does not offer a sufficient amount of information with which to truly understand the project, **the lowest possible rating value will be awarded.**

A facility may be applied for **only once** in a given round. For instance, a single street may be applied for either in a stand-alone application, or with a group of streets, but not both.

Errors & Omissions

The District's policy regarding errors & omissions has been significantly revised for FY25, most notably as it applies to penalties for errors found in the documents noted on the previous page, or omission of these documents or required information to be provided in them.

Information the applicant provides in the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance **will be the sole source utilized for the rating of projects for the following rating criteria:**

- Project Type (page 1)
- Project Financial Information, **including Total Estimated Cost** (page 2)
- Repair / Replacement or New / Expansion (page 3)
- Project Schedule (page 3)
- Useful Life / Age of Infrastructure (page 3)
- Users (page 3)

The information provided in two (2) of the above noted sections of the OPWC Application directly impacts the Support Staff's ability to determine ratings for rating criteria found in the Additional Support Information (ASI) document. These are:

- Project Financial Information
- Project Schedule

If this information is **omitted**, the project cannot be rated, which will result in the **disqualification** of the project for FY25.

If **errors** are found in other documents, such as the ASI or Certification of Matching Funds, in which information contained in the OPWC Application is also to be recorded, the rating awarded will be **zero (0)**. Examples for each of these is as follows:

- Project Financial Information- The amount noted in the Certification of Local Matching Funds document or Loan Repayment letter **is lower** than that noted in the OPWC Application.
 - † If the amount of local matching funds noted in the Certification of Local Matching Funds document is greater than that noted in the OPWC Application, and the source of matching funds is consistent with that stated in the OPWC Application the submittal will receive a rating commensurate with the amount noted in the OPWC Application.

- The number of users noted in the User's Certification document (if applicable) differs from that noted in the OPWC Application.
-

If the following documents are **omitted**, the project submittal will be subject to disqualification:

- OPWC:
 - † OPWC Application
 - † Registered professional engineer's detailed cost estimate, as required in 164-1-13, 164-1-14, and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code.
 - § Estimates shall contain an engineer's seal or stamp and signature.
 - District 2
 - † District 2 Additional Support Information document
 - † Public Infrastructure / Right of Way documentation (if applicable)
-

The means of addressing errors and/or omissions found in the remaining OPWC documents included on page **14**, will be the sole responsibility of the OPWC to determine. These are:

- Useful Life Statement
 - Authorizing Legislation
 - Cooperative Agreement (if applicable)
-

Errors and/or omissions found in the following District 2 documents included on page **14** will result in a rating of **zero (0)**:

- Certification of Fees, Levies & Taxes
- Certification of Users (if applicable)
- Ban/moratorium documentation

Omission of the Project Vicinity Map and/or Project Photos/Video will not result in a penalty being imposed but could negatively impact ratings awarded for various rating criterion due to lack of this information.

In all cases, the applicant will be notified via email of the errors and/or omissions found in their submittals and be given **two (2) business days** to make correction(s) or provide the omitted documents/information.

Note: Field rating of a project does not imply that the project will be determined eligible until approved by the Integrating Committee.

Specific Submittal Rules & Guidelines

OPWC Application for Financial Assistance

Section 1 - Project Financial Information

Grant requests require a **minimum local share of at least 10%** of the project's total cost.

Loan requests **require no local share** but will be awarded a rating if a local match is offered.

- Project engineering & R/W acquisition **costs are eligible for loan funding only.**

Costs for **project administration are not eligible** for OPWC funding in District 2.

Section 2 - Project Schedule

True and realistic dates are required.

As per OPWC rules & regulations for projects applying for OPWC FY25 funding, construction must be underway no later than **June 30th, 2025.**

- Failure to meet past project schedules **may result in termination of the project by the OPWC.**
- Information provided in the OPWC application pertaining to the project's schedule (Section 3.0 - Project Schedule - Page 3) **will be the sole source for determining the submittal's eligibility in this regard.**

Section 3 - Project Information

Details assist the Support Staff in accurately & thoroughly evaluating the project.

Documentation **detailing how the issues identified are to be corrected is required** to substantiate the individual items noted in the submittal.

The applicant is strongly encouraged to use the **District 2 Applicant Guidelines** and **Project Selection Criteria** as a guide.

Section 4 - Applicant Certification

Requires the signature of the applying jurisdiction's Chief Executive Officer, as noted on page 5 of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance, and the date signed.

Additional Support Information (ASI)

To maximize the scoring potential of the application, be descriptive and detailed in the information you provide. The Support Staff relies heavily on the ASI when rating projects. Before completing the ASI form, thoroughly review all District 2 rating methodology documents to fully understand how projects are reviewed and rated by the Support Staff. It is highly recommended that detailed information, preferably supported by documentation, be included for all applicable rating criteria, whether noted as required or not. Applicants can contact the District Liaison Officer or a Support Staff member with questions. **Take time to review your completed ASI to ensure that your responses provide all of the information requested for each category and are consistent with information provided in the OPWC Application.**

All questions must be answered; leave no section blank. The District has added **Yes - No** choices for each rating criterion to assist in ensuring that all questions have been answered. **Checking one of these options satisfies this requirement.**

Information the applicant provides in the **OPWC Application will be the sole source utilized** for the rating of projects for the following rating criteria:

- Project Type (page 1)

- Project Financial Information **including Total Estimated Cost** (page 2)
- Repair / Replacement or New / Expansion (page 3)
- Project Schedule (page 3)
- Useful Life / Age of Infrastructure (page 3)
- User Information (page 3)

Detailed Cost Estimate- 164.06(B) (5) (please see Appendix A for a template excerpted from the OPWC's Instructions for Financial Assistance)

Provide an **itemized cost estimate** that accurately reflects the project cost.

All items noted as a component of the project **must be included in the estimate**.

- If the applicant has or is to hire a consultant to formulate the actual construction estimate but is not seeking loan funding for these services in its funding request, **do not include the cost of the consultant!**

Estimate **must be signed & sealed by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Ohio**.

Useful Life Statement (please see Appendix A for a template excerpted from the OPWC's Instructions for Financial Assistance)

- **Must be signed & sealed by a Professional Engineer registered in the State of Ohio.**
 - † The minimum useful life for any project is **seven (7) years**.

Certification of Funds/Loan Repayment Letter (please see Appendix B for a template excerpted from the OPWC's Instructions for Financial Assistance)

- **Must be on jurisdiction letterhead and signed by the Chief Fiscal Officer.**
- **Must be included for each funding source listed in the application.**
- **Must include:**
 - † CFO name
 - † CFO Title
 - † Name of the political subdivision
 - † Amount of local funds
 - † Name of account/fund from which match will be allocated
 - † Name of the project

Authorizing Legislation (please see Appendix C for a template excerpted from the OPWC's Instructions for Financial Assistance)

- Names a jurisdiction's **Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Chief Fiscal Officer (CFO), & Project Manager**.
- Authorizes the **CEO** to apply for OPWC funding and enter into contract with the OPWC.
- **Must be signed by either the jurisdiction's CFO or Clerk/Fiscal Officer.**
- **Must be submitted by January 31st, 2024**
- Applicants **must submit new enabling legislation each funding round**.

Certified Traffic Count (please see Appendix D for a template excerpted from the OPWC's Instructions for Financial Assistance)

Signed by a **registered professional engineer in the State of Ohio and must include:**

- Name of the street or street(s) / facility
- Name of the political subdivision
- The number of users being certified
- The source of the count

Public Infrastructure / Right-of-Way

For submittals that include infrastructure that lies outside commonly or traditionally recognized limits (right of way) of a public road or other public facility the applicant shall include documentation which demonstrates that the infrastructure in question is **owned & maintained by the local subdivision**. Failure to include such documentation **will result in the project being recommended as ineligible**. Examples of acceptable documentation include but are not limited to **Deed of Acceptance or Easement or Right of Way acquisition documentation**.

Cooperative Agreement (please see Appendix E for a template excerpted from the OPWC’s Instructions for Financial Assistance)

Required only if project involves more than one subdivision. **Must be submitted by January 31st, 2024**

Certification of Fees, Levies & Taxes (FLT)

Documentation must be provided; examples include but are not limited to:

- **Resolution or ordinance** establishing a fee, levy or tax for the infrastructure applied for.
 - † In the event that a copy of the enabling legislation is not available for inclusion in the submittal, **a letter from the jurisdiction’s CFO or Clerk/Fiscal Officer** certifying that the fee, levy, or tax being cited has been levied will be accepted.
 - § **Must definitively state** that the infrastructure being applied for is earmarked for funding from the FLT noted.
- **TIF or JED Districts:**
 - † A **copy of a resolution or ordinance** establishing a fee, levy, or tax dedicated for the infrastructure applied for, demonstrating that all, or a portion, of the revenue collected is designated for the maintenance and repair of OPWC eligible infrastructure.
 - § The infrastructure applied for **must lie within** that district cited in the resolution establishing this type of FLT.

Project Photos / Video

Should accurately reflect the condition of the infrastructure cited in the application. Whenever possible, photos should be of expansive areas of the infrastructure; for example, for road or drainage improvement to address flooding problems, a photo(s) or video shot during, or immediately after, a rain event.

- Photos exhibiting a single pothole or other isolated deficiencies will not suffice.

Project Vicinity Map

The applicant should consider including a **broad location map and a more detailed map** to identify the project and any surrounding features that will support the application.

- A copy of a page from the **Auditor’s Plat Book, or other such source**, which does not sufficiently demonstrate the location of the project, **is not acceptable**.

Submission Checklist

Must be signed by an official of the applying agency.

- With the signature of the applicant's representative, the applicant acknowledges they have read and understand the most current edition of the District 2 Applicant Guidelines and that omission of any required information will impact the rating of the project and **may also result in the application being considered ineligible**.

Project Rating

Submittal Review

Following the project submittal deadline, the Liaison Officer will review each submittal to ensure that all documents or items required to be submitted by either the OPWC or the District are present. This is to include all documents & items noted in both the OPWC & District 2 Applicant Checklists or requiring signatures or engineer's seal. Please refer to the OPWC & District 2 Applicant Checklists, and pages 14-17 of this document for a complete list of these documents & items.

Omission of any document or item required to be submitted by either the OPWC or the District, **as noted on page 15 & 16**, will result in the disqualification of the project for consideration in OPWC FY25.

- If it is found that a document(s) or item(s) required to be submitted by either the OPWC or the District has been omitted, the Liaison Officer will contact via email that person noted as the Project Contact on page 1 of the OPWC Application to inform them of the disqualification of the project for FY25.
- If during the course of their rating of projects a Support Staff Rating Team finds that a document or item required to be submitted by either the OPWC or the District has been omitted, they will contact the Liaison Officer, who then in turn informs the applicant of the disqualification of the project for FY25 as noted in the preceding paragraph.

Rating Teams

The rating teams field check applicable rating criteria and verify all other criteria in the ASI and assign the appropriate rating.

The District's ten (10) Support Staff members are assigned to one (1) of five (5) rating teams whose responsibility it is to verify that all information relevant to the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance and the District 2 Additional Support Information documents is accurate.

The Liaison Officer and Technical Assistants determine the makeup of the rating teams. Careful consideration is given when determining the makeup of each team. Factors considered in making the assignments include:

- Rating team assignments change from one funding round to the next.
- A Support Staff member with considerable project rating experience will be teamed with a less experienced member.
- Expertise of rating team members (traffic, structures, drainage for example).
- When possible, members representing the same jurisdiction are not assigned to the same team.

The following policies & procedures have been established to ensure that project rating is conducted accurately, thoroughly, and objectively:

- Prior to the field checking of assigned projects, rating teams review all applications to ensure all required documents and necessary supporting information are included in the submittal.

- A Support Staff member may not be involved in the rating of a project(s) submitted by the jurisdiction they are employed by.
 - † The member may be in attendance, but not involved in the field rating process.
- A rating team may call upon another team's expertise as required.

Project Distribution

Projects are sorted for distribution to rating teams based on the following (in order of importance):

- Expertise of rating team
- Project type (roadway rehabilitation, roadway expansion, structural, drainage, etc.)
- Balanced number of projects assigned per rating team
- Geographical considerations:
 - † Considerable effort is made to assign projects based on their location within the District.
 - † Team members are assigned a different geographic area than in the previous funding round.

Technically difficult or potentially problematic applications will be reviewed by a rating team consisting of four or more Support Staff members. If the rating(s) for such a project is appealed, the remaining six (6) Support Staff members not assigned to initially rate the project will review the appeal.

In most cases, a rating team will not be assigned a project which was resubmitted from the previous funding round, and which one of the members of the team was assigned in the previous funding round.

Rating of Projects

Infrastructure Costs Considerations

Infrastructure included in the project's Engineer's Estimate, which represents **10% or less** of the total project cost are considered incidental and **will not be** factored into the project's Condition rating.

Infrastructure included in the project's Engineer's Estimate, which represents **greater than 10%** of the total project cost (TPC) as indicated in the Engineer's Estimate **will be** included in the rating of the Condition criterion. In such cases, the final Physical Condition rating will be determined by calculating the percentage each component represents in terms of the TPC as indicated on the first page of the OPWC Application. For example:

On page 1 of the OPWC Application the applicant has designated the Project Type as Storm Water. Included in the project's scope is the resurfacing of pavement within and beyond the stated project limits of the storm water sewer to be constructed. Resurfacing costs represent 46% of the estimated total project cost.

- The cost of the storm sewer (\$676,000) represents 52% of the total project cost estimate
- The cost of pavement resurfacing (\$598,000) represents 46% of the total project cost estimate
- The physical condition of the storm sewer is rated as being in critical condition (20 points)
- The physical condition of the pavement is rated as being in poor condition (15 points)
- **The final physical condition rating would be 17.3** $52\% \text{ of } 20 (10.4) + 46\% \text{ of } 15 (5.9) = 17.3$

New / Expansion Projects

New/expansion infrastructure that **does not total more than 10%** of the total construction cost of the project will not be considered when rating the project's Condition. If the new/expansion costs **are greater than 10%** of

the total project cost the new/expansion infrastructure shall be rated with a condition of “New” (0), which will be factored into a weighted average which includes the rating for the existing portion of the infrastructure to determine the condition score.

Roadway Expansion / Relocation Projects

If the length of a road is extended or portion of the road widened, or a portion of roadway is to be realigned or rerouted, or an intersection is to be reconfigured, the expanded portion shall be rated with a condition of “New” (0), which will be factored into a weighted average which includes the rating for the existing portion of the road to determine the condition score.

For projects which are to result in the expansion of existing infrastructure the applicant must include the amount of the expansion as requested on page 3 of 6 of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance (Section 2.0). If the applicant neglects to include this information, the Support Staff will assign an amount based upon the current dimensions of the infrastructure, the project scope, and the engineer’s estimate.

Multiple Infrastructure Considerations

If deemed necessary, one or more of the project’s components may be divided into multiple segments or portions when rated. For example, determining the physical condition of the infrastructure applied for, as demonstrated in the example below of a roadway:

- 70% of the physical condition of the roadway is rated as being in critical condition (20 points)
- 30% is rated as being in poor condition (15 points)
- **The final condition rating is 18.5** $70\% \text{ of } 20 (14) + 30\% \text{ of } 17 (4.5) = 18.5$

Initial Rating Work Session

The Liaison Officer presides over the Support Staff work session, providing a list of the order in which projects are to be reviewed.

Each rating team presents the projects it rated to the entire Support Staff.

Support Staff members may not be involved in discussion concerning the rating of a project(s) for the jurisdiction they are employed by. When this situation arises, the Staff member(s) will leave the room.

Following this session, the Liaison Officer provides all applicants with the District’s preliminary rating scores and informs them of the opportunity to appeal any criterion/criteria the applicant deems insufficient.

Rules for Appeal

Deadline for project rating appeal submittals - Friday, November 3rd, 2023 (2:00 p.m.)

Overview

Applicants may appeal preliminary ratings assigned for each of the District's fourteen (14) rating criteria. Appeal reviews will be based solely on information **provided in the original application**. **New information will not be considered.**

Rating of Projects

If required, a second field rating is performed for appealed projects in the same manner prescribed for the initial project field rating with the following exceptions:

- A different rating team than that for the initial project rating is assigned to review the project.
- Rating teams may be reconfigured to take advantage of specific expertise, otherwise, they remain unchanged.
- Technically difficult or potentially problematic applications will be reviewed by all Support Staff members not assigned to initially rate the project.
- Scores for appealed criterion/criteria **may go unchanged, be increased, or be decreased** at the conclusion of the appeal process.

Appealed Rating Work Session

The Support Staff gathers to review all appealed projects in the same manner prescribed for the initial project rating work session.

- No further appeals to the Support Staff will be accepted.

Project Funding

Rules for Award

The following decisions rest solely with the District 2 Integrating Committee:

- Points awarded to a project application
- Number and cost of the projects recommended for funding
- Loan rates

An affirmative vote by **seven (7) of the nine (9) members** of the Committee is required for approval.

All decisions of the Committee are final and cannot be further appealed at the District level.

Funds for projects approved by the OPWC become available **July 1st, 2024**.

LTIP Minimum

As per the ORC, the District must meet a minimum funding allocation for LTIP projects. To meet this requirement the Liaison Officer will monitor LTIP project funding to ensure compliance. In the event compliance cannot initially be attained, the Support Staff will prepare recommendations for the Integrating Committee's consideration to resolve this matter.

Small Government

The District will submit **seven (7)** qualifying projects to the OPWC for consideration by the Small Government Commission (SGC).

The Liaison Officer and Integrating Committee Small Government Subcommittee reviews all qualifying projects, utilizing the SGC rating methodology criterion two (2) thru eleven (11), to draft the District's SGC Priority Listing for the Integrating Committee's consideration and approval.

The Priority Listing awards "District Priority" points to the projects in descending order.

Useful Life Requirement

The average useful life of all projects recommended for funding cannot be less than 20 years.

Ranking the Projects

After appealed project ratings have been reviewed and scoring revisions have been factored, projects are posted in the order of cumulative SCIP and LTIP scores (tiebreakers applied if necessary) on the District's Preliminary Priority spreadsheets; one for the SCIP Program, and one for the LTIP Program.

Tiebreaking methodology

- First Tiebreaker: Score of Rating Criterion 1 - Condition
- Second Tiebreaker: Rating Criterion 14 - Number of Users.

A "**cutline**" is established for each funding program (SCIP grant, SCIP loan, RLP, and LTIP) as per ORC Chapter 164. The cutline is set between the last project that can be fully funded and the next, which cannot.

The Liaison Officer then prepares funding recommendations in the form of spreadsheets for each funding program for the full Support Staff's review and comment.

Loan Funds

The Liaison Officer & Technical Assistants must ensure the District's **minimum loan requirements** are met (at least 10% of the total SCIP Fund allocation).

If, upon recommending the funding of all loan projects above the cutline, **the total amount of loan funds to be awarded does not satisfy the District's minimum loan responsibilities**, the Liaison Officer will contact those applicants who noted their willingness to consider accepting loan funding in lieu of grant funding on the cover page of the Additional Support Information document. The Liaison Officer begins at the first project below the cutline, contacting the applicant(s) to ask if they will accept loan funding in lieu of grant funding for their project.

- **The applicant will have three (3) working days** to accept or reject the offer, informing the Liaison Officer of their decision in writing, forwarded via email.
 - † The Liaison Officer continues in this manner until the minimum SCIP & RLP loan requirements are met.

Projects positioned above the cut line to be awarded SCIP or RLP loans will be funded at **100%** of their request, even if this results in the SCIP loan allocation exceeding the statutory minimum.

The Integrating Committee may elect to exceed the **minimum 10% loan allocation** and fund as many projects as they deem appropriate by means of a loan. When this policy is implemented the following guidelines will be applied:

- A jurisdiction with a loan project or projects positioned above the funding cutline will be permitted only one (1) project funded with grant funding per funding round.
- Limit the number of grant projects impacted by a jurisdiction to one (1) per funding round.

Example:

- Jurisdiction A - Two loan projects positioned above the cutline
 - † The 10% minimum loan requirement has been met

- Jurisdiction B - Two grant projects positioned above the cutline, but neither is as well positioned as the Jurisdiction A loan projects
 - † Positioned as the last two projects above the cutline

Example Policy Implementation

- Grant funding for the lowest ranked Jurisdiction B project **will be reallocated** as loan funding for the highest scoring Jurisdiction A loan project.

- The second (lower) ranked Jurisdiction A loan project **will not be funded** with reallocated grant funds.

- Grants funding for the higher scoring Jurisdiction B project will **not see grant funds reallocated**.

Loans may not be combined from the two loan funding sources (SCIP & RLP).

The OPWC will select which loan fund each approved project will be allocated with the objective of maximizing the number of loan projects funded.

Projects will continue to be selected for loan funding until the balances are not sufficient to fully fund the next loan eligible project. Unfunded projects will be eligible to receive “residual loan funding” the OPWC returns to the District’s RLP balance.

Recommended Funding Package

It is the District’s longstanding objective to fund as many projects as possible.

The Liaison Officer and Technical Assistants determine which projects are to be recommended for funding, and the **grant funding program** to which each is to be assigned. The **OPWC** determines which **loan program** a project is to be assigned. These recommendations are referred to as the Recommended Funding Package. It consists of:

- Priority Listings of projects for both the SCIP & LTIP Programs

- The grant funding recommendations for both the SCIP & LTIP Programs

- The SCIP & RLP loan/loan assistance program funding recommendations

- The SGC program prioritization recommendations

- The cumulative useful life for the SCIP, LTIP, and RLP programs.

Project Approval

The Liaison Officer distributes the District’s Project Priority Listings & Recommended Funding Package to the Support Staff for review and comment. Upon completion of this review the documents are distributed to the Integrating Committee and their alternates.

The Integrating Committee will convene on **Friday, December 1st, 2023** to consider the District’s Project Priority Listings & Recommended Funding Package.

- The Project Priority Listings & Recommended Funding Package must receive **seven (7) out of a possible nine (9)** votes by the Integrating Committee.

Following approval of the District's Project Priority Listings & Recommended Funding package, the Liaison Officer files the package with the **OPWC** for final approval.

Residual Project Funding

When a District 2 project funded in a preceding funding round is completed without expending all OPWC funds allocated for that project, the balance of unexpended funds is returned to the appropriate District 2 program balance. These funds are designated as “**residual funds**” and may be awarded as SCIP loan or grant funds, LTIP grant funds, or RLP loan funds.

SCIP and LTIP funds **cannot be combined**.

SCIP loan and RLP loan funds **cannot be combined**.

The Liaison Officer is informed by the OPWC when residual funds become available. The Priority List from the preceding funding round is then used to determine which additional project(s) are to be offered funding.

The Liaison Officer contacts the first applicant below the cutline making them aware of the availability of residual funds.

- Upon notification of the availability of residual funds the applicant **will have ten (10) days** to decide if they will accept the amount of residual funds offered.

In the event the applicant chooses **not to accept** the amount of residual funding offered, the Liaison Officer will then offer the available residual funds to the next project on the Priority List, and so on, until the balance of funds are accepted and/or is not sufficient to fund additional projects.

If notified by the OPWC that the residual fund balance has again become sufficient to fund a project or projects, the Liaison Officer will start the process anew, beginning with the first, or highest rated project below the cutline on the respective Program Priority List.

Residual funds for the **SCIP grant & loan programs, LTIP grant program, and RLP loan program** will be available for FY24 projects until **September 29, 2023**, at which time these funds will be added to the balances for FY25.

Annual Program Review

The District's methodology is the product of detailed analysis, and application of State of Ohio laws which govern the OPWC and its Programs. **To ensure compliance, the Integrating Committee has implemented the following procedures.**

Annually, at their meeting at which the District's Project Rating Methodology is approved for the current funding round, the Integrating Committee will appoint two (2) of its members to attend Support Staff project rating meetings and to work with Staff to identify issues that may require the attention of the Integrating Committee when considering the District's methodology for the next round of funding.

A meeting of the full Integrating Committee will be held in January of each year to review the District's methodology and to discuss any issues identified in the preceding funding round.

Following this meeting, the Integrating Committee appointees, the District Liaison Officer, and the Support Staff's Technical Assistants will work closely with the full Support Staff to address:

- Issues identified in the previous funding round
- Develop procedures to remediate these issues
- Draft revised language for the consideration of the Integrating Committee for inclusion in the District's methodology

The Liaison Officer will forward to the Integrating Committee the recommendations developed by the Integrating Committee appointees for their review and comment.

Revisions recommended by the Integrating Committee for inclusion in the final draft of the District's methodology will be incorporated into that document.

The Integrating Committee will meet to finalize and approve the District's methodology for the upcoming round of funding.

The Integrating Committee encourages all of its members to attend, in full or in part, the project rating meetings of the Support Staff. It also encourages each of its members to consider making time to join Support Staff rating teams in their field review of projects for which applications for funding have been submitted.

The Liaison Officer annually reviews the applicable U.S. Census data utilized to formulate Relative Economic Strength (RES). Any revisions noted are factored into the RES ratings for the upcoming round of funding.

On a triennial basis, beginning in 2019, the Integrating Committee shall appoint a Subcommittee to work with the Support Staff and Liaison Officer to perform a comprehensive review of the methodology and policies & procedures of the District. If it is determined that the need for such a review is required prior to the scheduled triennial review, the Integrating Committee may appoint a Subcommittee at any time for the same purpose.

District 2 Integrating Committee

<u>Member</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Eric Beck - Chairman	Hamilton County	946-8903
Paula Lampley	Hamilton County - At Large	910-6066
Lori Burchett	City of Cincinnati	207-5709
Greg Long	City of Cincinnati	352-5289
Sheryl Long	City of Cincinnati	352-6249
Monica Morton	City of Cincinnati	352-3223
Robert Bemmes	Hamilton Co. Municipal League	733-3725
Lee Czerwonka	Hamilton Co. Municipal League	745-0402
Denny Connor	Hamilton Co. Township Assoc.	378-5254
Tony Rosiello	Hamilton Co. Township Assoc.	317-2861

District 2 Integrating Committee Alternates

<u>Member</u>	<u>Alternate for</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Mary Welsh	Paula Lampley	378-8370
Todd Long	Eric Beck	946-4254
John Brazina	Greg Long	352-6249
Brian Gay	Monica Morton	352-6276
Angela Wright	Sheryl Long	352-5335
Craig Margolis	Robert Bemmes	891-2424
Carson Shelton	Lee Czerwonka	527-6504
Josh Gerth	Tony Rosiello	688-8400
Dan Unger	Denny Connor	385-7500

District 2 Support Staff

<u>Member</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Cindy Klopfenstein*	Hamilton Co. Municipal League	683-0150
Chris Bender	City of Cincinnati	352-6502
Joe Conway	City of Cincinnati	352-1949
Brad Johnston	City of Cincinnati	352-3634
Brandon Lecrone	City of Cincinnati	352-6160
Todd Gadbury	Hamilton County Engineer	946-8445
Dan Jones	Hamilton County Engineer	946-8429
Jeff Newby	Hamilton County Engineer	946-8421
Mike Gould*	Hamilton Co. Township Assoc.	522-4004
Steve Reutelshofer	Hamilton Co. Township Assoc.	792-7258

*Technical Assistant

District 2 Liaison Officer

Fred Schlimm Hamilton County Engineer's Office 946-8912

OPWC District 2 Program Representative

Ashley Ellrod 65 East State Street - Suite 312, Columbus, Ohio 43215 (614) 745-9076

OPWC District 2 Subdivision Codes

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>Code</u>	<u>Township</u>	<u>Code</u>
Addyston	061-00436	Anderson	061-01980
Amberley Village	061-01672	Colerain	061-16616
Arlington Heights	061-02428	Columbia	061-16882
Blue Ash	061-07300	Crosby	061-19470
Cheviot	061-14128	Delhi	061-21504
Cincinnati	061-15000	Green	061-31752
Cleves	061-16028	Harrison	061-33852
Deer Park	061-21266	Miami	061-49364
Elmwood Place	061-25186	Springfield	061-74121
Evendale	061-25802	Sycamore	061-75973
Fairfax	061-25942	Symmes	061-76028
Forest Park	061-27706	Whitewater	061-84938
Glendale	061-30380		
Golf Manor	061-30786		
Greenhills	061-32158	<u>County</u>	<u>Code</u>
Harrison	061-33838	Hamilton	061-00061
Indian Hill	061-76582		
Lincoln Heights	061-43722		
Lockland	061-44366	<u>Other</u>	<u>Code</u>
Loveland	061-45108	Whitewater Regional	061-00283
Madeira	061-46312	Sewer District	
Mariemont	061-47600		
Montgomery	061-51716		
Mount Healthy	061-52752		
Newtown	061-55678		
North Bend	061-56182		
North College Hill	061-56322		
Norwood	061-57386		
Reading	061-65732		
Sharonville	061-71892		
Silverton	061-72522		
Springdale	061-74104		
St. Bernard	061-69470		
Terrace Park	061-76428		
Woodlawn	061-86366		
Wyoming	061-86730		

Additional Support Information

For OPWC Fiscal Year 2025 (July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024) applicants shall complete & submit the **Additional Support Information (ASI)** form to assist the Support Staff in its rating of the project. Information provided by the applicant must be accurate and based upon sound engineering principles. **Applicants are strongly encouraged to utilize the District's Applicant Manual and Project Selection Criteria (PSC) documents as a guide when drafting the ASI form.**

Documentation

Six (6) of the fourteen (14) rating criterion require the submittal of specific documentation if applicable to the project. A notation is provided for each. These are:

- Criterion 5- User Fees
- Criterion 7- Local Matching Funds
- Criterion 8- Other Matching Funds
- Criterion 12- Ban
- Criterion 13- Users
- Criterion 14- Fees, Levies & Taxes

Failure to submit required documentation for applicable criteria will result in the project's disqualification for FY25!

In most cases, the awarding of a rating **greater than the lowest possible rating**, documentation detailing the issue(s) identified for each criterion, and how they are to be corrected **is required**.

All applicants are required to answer the following two questions!

If applying for grant funding, is the applicant willing to accept loan funding in lieu of grant funding if grant fund allocations have been depleted? Answering "Yes" will not increase the score; answering "No" will not decrease the score.

Yes

No

Will construction be underway by June 30, 2025?

ORC 164.06 B (9); 164.14 E (5)

Projects with schedules that lend themselves to a future program year will be required to be submitted at a later date.

Yes

No

Small Government Commission Eligible Communities Only!

Townships or villages eligible for Small Government Commission (SGC) funding (population of less than 5,000 residents) **can elect to seek grant funding for a project primarily involving repair, reconstruction, or construction of facilities which are part of a system collecting fees from its users, if they agree to accept a 20-point deduction in their final project score.** SGC eligible jurisdictions can elect to apply for loan funding to cover 100% of the cost of a project primarily involving repair, reconstruction or construction of facilities which are part of a system collecting fees from its users without a deduction in points.

If the applicant is a SGC funding eligible jurisdiction, do you elect to accept the 20-point deduction so to be eligible for grant funding for this project?

Yes

No

The lowest possible rating will be awarded for each criterion in which a question is left unanswered! The District provides **Yes or No choices for each rating criterion** to assist in ensuring that all questions have been answered. Checking one of these options satisfies this requirement.

It is highly recommended that more detailed information, preferably supported by documentation, be included in all applicable rating criterion, whether noted as required or not.

Examples noted in this document are not a complete offering of factors rating teams may consider but represent a small sampling of those which may be relevant to a given project.

Criterion 1 - Physical Condition

ORC 164.06 B (2); 164.14 E (2, 8 & 9)

Describe the physical condition of the infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired? What is required to improve the infrastructure so that it will realize its stated useful life? Provide a statement detailing the deficient conditions of the infrastructure exclusive of capacity, serviceability, safety and/or health issues. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded. **It is strongly recommended that whenever possible, documentation should be provided to support your statements.** Documentation may include, but is not limited to; ODOT BR86 reports, pavement management condition reports such as those modeled on the ODOT Pavement Condition Rating System, televised underground infrastructure reports, age inventory reports, maintenance records, etc., and will only be considered if included in the original application. **It is likely the infrastructure will rate no better than Good condition if evidence or documentation is not provided.**

YES

NO

Criterion 2 - Safety

ORC 164.06 B (4); 164.14 E (1)

How important is the project to the safety of the public and the citizens of the District and/or service area? Provide a statement detailing the project's impact on the safety of the service area, noting how the design of the project is intended to reduce existing accident rates, promote safer conditions, and reduce the danger of risk, or injury for motorists, pedestrians, and other vulnerable users. Does the infrastructure create an obstruction and/or impediment that affects the safety of the public? Typical examples may include the impact of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, and highway capacity. **Please be specific and provide documentation to substantiate the data. The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems, and the method of correction. Stating the situation is unsafe without offering any supporting documentation or rationale is not sufficient. In all cases, specific documentation is required, most notably photos and/or video.**

YES

NO

Criterion 3 - Health

ORC 164.06 B (4)

Describe each public health problem or unhealthy condition. Explain how the existing infrastructure contributed to it, and how the proposed project will correct or mitigate it. The score within the specified range will be based on a combination of the severity, frequency, and quality of supportive evidence. Supportive evidence, such as letters from officials, public health notices, photos, media articles, enforcement actions, communications to or from residents, etc., is required for each condition. Contamination must be documented with evidence of the presence of contamination in excess of standards protective of public health.

YES

NO

Criterion 4 - Priority

ORC 164.06 B (1); 164.14E (10)

Does the project meet the infrastructure repair & replacement needs of the applying jurisdiction? The applicant must submit a listing of the projects, in order of priority, for which it is applying. Points will be awarded on the basis of the project's priority.

YES

NO

Priority 1

Priority 2

Priority 3

Priority 4

Priority 5

Criterion 5 - User Fee

ORC 164.06 B (3)

To what extent will a user fee funded agency be participating in the funding of the project? An example of such an agency is one that charges a fee for water or sewer service, or frontage assessments. Please identify the user fee funded agencies involved in the project and the amount (user fee infrastructure cost and percentage of total project cost) of that portion of the project. **Documentation Required!**

YES

NO

Criterion 6 - Economic Growth

ORC 164.14 E (3)

Provide a statement detailing how the project will enhance economic growth. Will the project see development of unutilized or underutilized property for development that will create jobs and increase the value of adjacent parcels? The applicant shall provide detailed information explaining how the project will enhance economic growth such as the type of development (commercial, professional office, manufacturing/industrial, residential). How much area is to be developed or redeveloped (acreage or square feet)? How many jobs (full & part-time) will the development create or retain? Can the applying jurisdiction anticipate an increase in tax revenue as a result of the development? If so, provide a true and honest assessment. For the awarding of a rating greater than the least applicable, documentation is required.

YES

NO

Criterion 7 - Matching Funds (Local)

ORC 164.06 B (6)

Information is provided by the applicant in Section 1.2 (b) of the OPWC Application. **Documentation Required!** The Applicant is not required to provide information other than "Yes" or "No". Rating to be based upon amount noted on page 2 of 6 of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance.

YES

NO

Criterion 8 - Matching Funds (Other)

ORC 164.06 B (7); 164.14 E (4)

Information is provided by the applicant in Section 1.2 (c) of the OPWC Application. Below please list all other funding sources. **Documentation Required!** The Applicant is not required to provide information other than “Yes” or “No”. Rating to be based upon amount noted on page 2 of 6 of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance.

YES

NO

Criterion 9 - Alleviate Capacity Problems

ORC 164.14 E (2)

Will the project alleviate serious capacity problems or future level of service needs of the District? Provide details and preferably documentation demonstrating how the proposed project will alleviate serious capacity problems (be specific).

YES

NO

Level of Service (LOS) calculations shall be for the planned improvement. If this project is a phase of a larger project then any preceding phases shall be considered existing conditions for the LOS calculations. Any future project phases shall not be considered as part of this application’s LOS calculations. For roadway betterment projects, provide the existing and proposed (LOS) of the facility using the methodology outlined within AASHTO’S “Geometric Design of Highways and Streets” and the current edition of the Highway Capacity Manual. If the proposed design year LOS is not “C” or greater, explain why this cannot be achieved.

No Build
Current Year LOS

Proposed Geometry
Current Year LOS

Design Year LOS

Design Year LOS

If the proposed design year LOS is not “C” or better, explain why LOS “C” cannot be achieved.

Criterion 10 - Regional Impact

ORC 164.14 E (7)

Provide a statement concerning the regional significance of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

YES

NO

Criterion 11 - Relative Economic Strength (RES)

ORC 164.06 B (8)

The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the jurisdiction’s economic health. The economic health of jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when US Census data is updated. Please see page 14 of the District 2 Applicant Manual to find your jurisdictions’ RES rating.

Criterion 12 - Ban

ORC 164.06 B (10); 164.14 E (10)

Describe what formal action has been taken which resulted in a ban of the use of, or expansion of use, for the infrastructure involved? Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of building permits, etc. The ban must have been caused by structural or operational deficiencies to be considered valid. **Documentation Required!** Submission of a copy of the approved legislation is required.

YES

NO

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed?

Yes

No

Criterion 13 - Existing Daily Users

ORC 164.06 B (10); 164.14 E (10)

Applicant Submission Checklist

The Applicant Submittal Checklist must be submitted with all applicable items required for project eligibility.

Applicant:

Project:

Except as noted, the following **must** be submitted by the **September 29th, 2023** filing deadline for the District to consider the application **complete & eligible** for funding.

- OPWC Application for Financial Assistance (signed by CEO)
- District 2 Additional Support Information form
- Detailed Cost Estimate & Useful Life Certification (signed & sealed by P.E.)
- Traffic /User Certification (signed and stamped/sealed by P.E.)
 - † Projects involving less than 3,000 users are not required to submit certification
- Status of Funds Certification / Loan Repayment letter (on letterhead, signed by CFO)
- Fees, Levies & Taxes Certification
- Enabling Legislation (**must be submitted by 2:00 p.m. Tuesday, January 31st, 2024**)
- Cooperative Agreement (**must be submitted by 2:00 p.m. Tuesday, January 31st, 2024**)
- Project vicinity map
- Project photos

Documentation supporting the following **must** be submitted with the application in order for the District **to consider the maximum points available** for the project (specify type of submission, if none please state so, do not leave blank).

Infrastructure Condition

Infrastructure Safety

Infrastructure Health

User Fee/Assessment

Economic Growth

Alleviate Traffic Hazards/LOS

Ban/Moratorium

Users Certification

I have personally reviewed this project submittal and certify that all applicable documents noted in this Checklist are included. By signing, I acknowledge I have read & understand the [OPWC FY25 District 2 Applicant & Rating Methodology Manuals](#), and that omission of any required information will impact the rating of the project and may also cause the application to be ineligible.

Signature

Printed Name

Title

OPWC District 2

Fiscal Year 2025 Pre-Application Form

Applicant

Project

Contact

Phone

Email

Date of scheduled maintenance

Project Information

If the Project is multi-jurisdictional, information must be consolidated in this section.

Brief Project Description (attach additional sheets if necessary)

Specific Location (Provide a location description that includes the project termini and location map.)

Physical Dimensions (Describe the physical dimensions of the existing infrastructure and the proposed infrastructure. Include length, width, quantity & sizes, in detail.)

Project Components (Describe the specific work to be completed.)

Pre-application Information

- ⊠ Jurisdiction shall provide the information requested below to assist in determining the pre-application rating.
- ⊠ Information must be accurate, and where called for, based on sound engineering principles.
- ⊠ Documentation to substantiate the individual items noted is required.
- ⊠ Use additional sheets if necessary.

What is the physical condition of the existing infrastructure?

Describe the reason for, and the nature of, the maintenance activity to be performed which necessitates the pre-application.

Appendices

The following appendices are identical copies of OPWC template documents excerpted from the OPWC's *"Instructions for Financial Assistance"* manual.

If the applicant chooses to use a format different than that of the OPWC templates, all information to be provided by the applicant (as indicated by blank horizontal lines, the word "Insert" contained in parentheses) is required!

Appendix A

**CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER'S
CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL FUNDS / LOAN REPAYMENT LETTER**

[Insert Date]

I, [Insert name & title] of the [Insert name of political subdivision], hereby certify that [Insert name of political subdivision] has the amount of [Insert amount of local funds] in the [Insert name of account/fund] and that this amount will be used to pay the local share for the [Insert name of project] when it is required.

{NOTE: If the application is for a loan or grant/loan combination the following paragraph is also required.}

I, [Insert name & title] of the [Insert name of political subdivision], hereby certify that [Insert name of political subdivision] has/will have /will collect the amount of [Insert amount of loan] in the [Insert Name of Account/Fund] and that this amount will be used to repay the Ohio Public Works Commission SCIP or RLP loan requested for the [Insert name of project] over a [Insert number of years] term.

[Name, Title and Signature of Chief Financial Officer]

Appendix C

AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING [INSERT NAME AND/OR TITLE] TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND/OR LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM(S) AND TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS AS REQUIRED

WHEREAS, the State Capital Improvement Program and the Local Transportation Improvement Program both provide financial assistance to political subdivisions for capital improvements to public infrastructure, and

WHEREAS, the [Insert Name of Political Subdivision] is planning to make capital improvements to [Insert Project Name], and

WHEREAS, the infrastructure improvement herein above described is considered to be a priority need for the community and is a qualified project under the OPWC programs,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by [Insert Name of Political Subdivision]:

Section 1: The [Insert Name and/or Title of the individual who signs page 6 of the application] is hereby authorized to apply to the OPWC for funds as described above.

Section 2: The [Insert Name and/or Title of the Chief Executive Officer on page 5 of the application] is authorized to enter into any agreements as may be necessary and appropriate for obtaining this financial assistance.

Passed: [Insert Date]

[All Required Signatures Here]

Appendix D

Traffic Certification Statement

I hereby certify that the total number of users for _____
(Street name)

in _____, Ohio is _____ users per day.
(Applying jurisdiction)

The source of the traffic data was derived from _____
(Source: examples provided below)*

(Certifying Engineer's Signature)

(Date)

(Print Certifying Engineer's Name)

*Examples include but are not limited to:

- Applicant mechanical count
- Applicant manual count
- Consultant mechanical count
- Consultant manual count
- Hamilton County Engineer
- OKI
- ODOT

Appendix E

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

{NOTE: Execute a cooperation agreement if your project is a joint project in which there are two or more political subdivisions. A letter from a subdivision is not a substitute.}

RESOLUTION NUMBER/DATE

[Insert name of subdivision “A”] and [Insert name of subdivision “B”] enter into a cooperation agreement to submit an application to the Ohio Public Works Commission for the [insert project name].

[Subdivision A] will provide funds equal to [insert percent] percent of the total project cost. Such funds will come from [insert name of account/fund].

[Subdivision B] will provide funds equal to [insert percent] percent of the total project cost. Such funds will come from [insert name of account/fund].

[Subdivision B] authorizes [Subdivision A] to serve as lead applicant and to sign all necessary documents.

[Subdivision A] agrees to pay its [insert percentage] of the cost as invoices are due/at the end of the project/as otherwise agreed upon.

[Subdivision B] agrees to pay its [insert percentage] of the cost as invoices are due/at the end of the project/as otherwise agreed upon.

Signatures for Subdivision A

Signatures for Subdivision B