



Hamilton County, Ohio



Ohio Public Works Commission
District 2 Integrating Committee
Fiscal Year 2023 - Round 36
Rules & Regulations

Applicant Manual

Adopted August 20th, 2021

Table of Contents

Schedule	3
Revisions of Note	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	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	14-23
□ Filing Instructions	14-15
□ General Submittal Rules & Guidelines	16-19
† Required Documentation	16
† Recommended Additional Support Documentation	17
† Errors & Omissions	17-19
□ Specific Submittal Rules & Guidelines	20-23
† OPWC Application for Financial Assistance	20
† Additional Support Information	21
† Detailed Cost Estimate	21
† Useful Life Statement	21
† Certification of Funds / Loan Repayment Letter	21
† Authorizing Legislation	21
† Certification of Traffic	22
† Public Infrastructure / Right-of-Way	22
† Cooperative Agreement	22
† Certification of Fees, Levies & Taxes	22
† Project Photos / Video	22
† Project Vicinity Map	22
† CD ROM/Flash Drive	23
† Submission Checklist	23

Project Rating	24-27
☐ Submittal Review	24
☐ Rating Teams	24-25
☐ Project Distribution	25
☐ Rating of Projects	25-26
☐ Initial Rating Work Session	27
Rules for Appeal	28
☐ Overview	
☐ Rating of Projects	
☐ Appealed Rating Work Session	
Project Funding	29-32
☐ Rules for Award	29
☐ Ranking the Projects	29-30
☐ LTIP Minimum	31
☐ Small Government	31
☐ Useful Life Requirement	31
☐ Recommended Funding Package	31
☐ Project Approval	31-32
Residual Project Funding	32
Annual Program Review	33
Roster of District Officials	34-35
Subdivision Codes	36
Documents Required for Submittal	37-45
☐ Additional Support Information	37-43
☐ Applicant Submission Checklist	44-45
Pre-Application Form	46-48
Appendices	49-53
☐ Appendix A Detailed Engineer's Estimate/Useful Life Statement	49
☐ Appendix B Certification of Local Funds/Loan Repayment Letter	50
☐ Appendix C Authorizing Legislation	51
☐ Appendix D Traffic Certification Statement	52
☐ Appendix E Cooperative Agreement	53

OPWC District 2

Schedule - Fiscal Year 2023 / Funding Round 36

September

Friday 17th

Pre-application deadline 2:00 p.m.

Friday 24th

Residual funds disbursement deadline

October

Friday 29th

Application submittal deadline 2:00 p.m.

November

Monday 1st thru Friday, 5th

Submittal Review & Data Entry (Liaison Officer)

Monday 8th thru Friday 19th

Field rating of projects

Monday 22nd thru Tuesday 23rd

Support Staff rating review

Wednesday 24th

Preliminary ratings emailed to applicants

December

Friday 3rd

Rating appeals due 2:00 p.m.

Monday 6th thru Friday 10th

Field rating of appealed projects

Tuesday 14th

Support Staff appeal rating review

Wednesday 15th

Appeal results emailed to applicants

Friday 17th

Integrating Committee District priority approval

January

Monday 31st

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

Revisions of Note

Applicant Guidelines

Section	Page
Revolving Loan Program	11
Rules for Application	14
▫ Filing Instructions	
General Submittal Rules & Guidelines	16-19
▫ Errors & Omissions	17-19
Specific Submittal Rules & Guidelines	20-23
▫ Project Financial Information	20
▫ Project Schedule	20
▫ Certification of Fees, Levies & Taxes	22
Project Rating	24-27
▫ Submittal Review	24
▫ Rating Teams	24-25
▫ Project Distribution	25
Rules for Appeal	28
▫ Overview	28
Project Funding	29-32
▫ Rules for Award	29
Appendices	37-43
▫ Relative Economic Strength Policy & Methodology	37-38

District Documents

Schedule

- Liaison Officer application completeness review

Program Administration

Integrating Committee

Structure (as per the Ohio Revised Code 164.04)

The district 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 public works 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 select the requests for financial assistance that will be formally submitted by the district to the director of the Ohio Public Works Commission.

In order to provide for the efficient use of the District's State Capital Improvements Fund allocation each year, a district committee shall assist its 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 select 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 and policies & procedures.
- Recommend revisions to the methodology for consideration & approval of the Integrating Committee, if necessary.
- Assist communities in interpreting the methodology and 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 are eligible for OPWC funding.
- 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

Costs for landscaping activities and improvements pertaining to infrastructure that go beyond basic requirements of post-construction repair, stabilization, and reseeded 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

Construction administration

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.

The District 2 Integrating Committee may consider requests for additional funding **only if** completion of the project is jeopardized and the cost overrun is the result of circumstances beyond the control of, or without prior knowledge of the applicant, and which could not have been anticipated at the time of initial application. In such case, the applicant must request and be granted the approval of the District 2 Integrating Committee to appeal to the Director of the OPWC for the granting of additional funding via contract amendment.

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 grant funding awarded cannot be greater than **90%** of the District's allocation.

Grant funds 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 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 loan 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 submittal to the OPWC for further consideration.

Upon approval of the Integrating Committee, projects are filed with the SGC.

- **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 (FY23/R36).

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 document 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, September 17th, 2021**

Rules for Application

Application Deadline - October 29th, 2021 (2:00 p.m.)
Applications filed after the deadline will not be accepted.

Filing Instructions

The applicant is to submit ~~one (1) signed original application and one (1) copy in PDF format on a CD-ROM or flash drive.~~

The submittal of the original document ~~shall be bound only with a sturdy and easily removable paper clip or binder clip.~~

- ~~□ Do not bind by stapling.~~
- ~~□ Spiral bound, folder bound, or other means of binding are not permitted.~~

If a jurisdiction is applying for **multiple projects**, the PDF versions of all applications ~~should be included on the same disc or flash drive.~~

Copies of all application documents on a CD ROM or flash drive must be an ~~exact and complete copy of the following documents submitted as part of the original application:~~

- ~~□ OPWC Application for Financial Assistance~~
- ~~□ District 2 Additional Support Information form (ASI)~~
- ~~□ Detailed Cost Estimate (signed and sealed by professional engineer)~~
- ~~□ Useful Life Statement (signed and sealed by professional engineer)~~
- ~~□ Jurisdiction User Fee / Assessment data~~
- ~~□ Certification of Funds / Loan Repayment Letter (signed by fiduciary officer)~~
- ~~□ Authorizing Legislation (must be submitted by **Friday November 12th, 2021**)~~
- ~~□ Certification of Fees, Levies and/or Taxes~~
- ~~□ Certification of Users / Traffic (signed by a registered professional engineer)~~
- ~~□ Cooperative Agreement (if applicable must be submitted by **Friday November 12th, 2021**)~~
- ~~□ Public Infrastructure / Right of Way documentation (if applicable)~~
- ~~□ Ban/Moratorium Documentation (a copy of legislation passed by the jurisdiction is required)~~
- ~~□ Project Vicinity Map~~
- ~~□ Project Photos / Video (photos to be printed or mounted on 8 ½" x 11" sheet of paper)~~

- ~~CD-ROM or flash drive with the entire application in PDF format~~
 - ‡ ~~If a jurisdiction is submitting **multiple projects**, the PDF versions of all applications should be included on the same disc or flash drive.~~

- ~~Submission Checklist (signed)~~

- ~~Supporting documentation~~
 - ‡ ~~Infrastructure condition documentation~~

 - ‡ ~~Infrastructure safety documentation~~

 - ‡ ~~Infrastructure health documentation~~

 - ‡ ~~Infrastructure users documentation~~

 - ‡ ~~Economic growth documentation~~

 - ‡ ~~Alleviate traffic hazards/LOS documentation~~

~~Projects can be filed at the Hamilton County Engineer's Office, 10480 Burlington Road, Cincinnati 45231, or at the downtown office, 138 East Court Street, County Administration Building, Room 700, Cincinnati 45202 only.~~

The applicant is solely responsible for filing the application and for the content of the applications(s) filed. Applications will not be accepted by email or fax.

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 an application to be considered complete and eligible for funding are:

- ☐ OPWC Application for Financial Assistance
- ☐ District 2 Additional Support Information (ASI)
- ☐ Detailed Cost Estimate (signed and sealed by professional engineer)
- ☐ Useful Life Statement (signed and sealed by professional engineer)
- ~~☐ Jurisdiction User Fee / Assessment data~~
- ☐ Certification of Funds / Loan Repayment Letter (signed by fiduciary officer)
- ☐ Authorizing Legislation (must be submitted by **Friday November 12th, 2021**)
- ☐ 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**
- ☐ Cooperative Agreement (if applicable - must be submitted by **Friday November 12th, 2021**)
- ☐ 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 - (photos to be printed or mounted on 8 ½" x 11" sheet of paper)
- ~~☐ CD-ROM or flash drive with the entire application in PDF format~~
 - ‡ ~~If a jurisdiction is submitting **multiple projects**, the PDF versions of all applications **should be included on the same disc or flash drive.**~~
- ☐ 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 separate application, or with a group of streets, but not both.

The District no longer accepts applications early for the purpose of being reviewed for completeness.

Errors & Omissions

Omission of any document or item required to be submitted by either the OPWC or the District will result in the disqualification of the project for consideration in OPWC FY23/R36.

OPWC

The following are required to be submitted by the OPWC:

- A **certified copy of the legislation** by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to sign and submit this application and execute contracts.
- **Certification signed by the applicant's chief financial officer** stating the amount of funds required for the project will be available on or before the dates listed in the Project Schedule section.
- If the application involves a request for loan (RLP or SCIP), **certification signed by the CFO** which identifies a **specific revenue source** for repaying the loan also must be attached.
- **Registered professional engineer's detailed cost estimate and useful life statement**, 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.
- **Cooperative agreement (if the project involves more than one subdivision or district)** which identifies the fiscal and administrative responsibilities of each participant.

- ☐ **Farmland Preservation Review** - The Governor's Executive Order 98-11V, "Ohio Farmland Protection Policy" requires the Commission to establish guidelines on how it will take protection of productive agricultural and grazing land into account in its funding decision making process. Please include a Farmland Preservation statement for projects that have an impact on farmland.
- ☐ **Supporting Documentation** - Materials such as additional project description, photographs, economic impact (temporary and/or full-time jobs likely to be created as a result of the project), accident reports, impact on school zones, and other information to assist your district committee in ranking your project.

Please note:

- ☐ Submission of a Capital Improvements Report is noted as a requirement on the OPWC Applicant Checklist. This is no longer a required submittal.

District 2

The following are required to be submitted in addition to those items required by the OPWC:

- ☐ OPWC Application for Financial Assistance
- ☐ District 2 Additional Support Information document
- ~~☐ Jurisdiction User Fee / Assessment data~~
- ☐ Certification of Fees, Levies & 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 (if applicable)
- ☐ Ban/Moratorium Data (a copy of legislation passed by the jurisdiction is required)
- ☐ Project Vicinity Map
- ☐ Project Photos / Video
- ~~☐ CD-ROM or flash drive with the entire application in PDF format~~
- ☐ District 2 Applicant Submission Checklist (signed)

If errors, discrepancies, or omissions are found to be present in documents relevant to financial information the project will be disqualified for consideration in OPWC FY23/R36. These documents are:

- ☐ OPWC Application for Funding
- ☐ Additional Support Information
- ☐ Certification of Local Matching Funds
- ☐ Certification of Other Matching Funds
- ☐ Loan Repayment Letter
- ☐ Signed & Sealed Project Cost Estimate

Page 2 of 6 of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance (OPWC Application)

- ☐ Applicants should list only those costs for which it is requesting funding for.
 - † For example, the applicant will 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 on page 2 of the OPWC Application!**

If errors, discrepancies or omissions not subject to disqualification are found in any of the criteria contained in the Additional Support Information document which an applicant must complete, or in a section of the OPWC application for which a rating is assigned, that criterion will be awarded zero (0) points.

It should be noted that 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 project's total cost.

Loan requests require no local share, but will be awarded points 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 Round 35 funding, construction must be underway no later than July 1st, 2022.

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 problems(s) identified is 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 in the ASI form. The Support Staff relies heavily on the ASI when scoring 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. 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.**

All questions must be answered; leave no section blank. The District has added Yes - No - N/A 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 detailed information, preferably supported by documentation, be included for all applicable rating criteria, whether noted as required or not.

Detailed Cost Estimate- I64.06(B) (5) (please see Appendix B for an example)

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.**

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

Useful Life Statement (please see Appendix B for an example)

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 C for an example)

Must certify that the local matching funds are or will be available.

Must be on jurisdiction letterhead and signed by the Chief Fiscal Officer.

Must be included for each funding source listed in the application. The applicant must use the format specified by the OPWC, a template for which can be found on the OPWC's website, or see Appendix B for an example.

Authorizing Legislation (please see Appendix D for an example)

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 to the District Liaison Officer by TBD.

Applicants must submit new enabling legislation each funding round.

Certified Traffic Count (please see Appendix D for an example)

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

- ☐ The name of the street or streets / facility
- ☐ 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 a local subdivision. Failure to include such documentation will result in the project being recommended as ineligible. Examples include but are not limited to:

- ☐ Deed of Acceptance or Easement or Right of Way acquisition documentation

Cooperative Agreement (please see Appendix E for an example)

Required only if project involves more than one subdivision

- † **Must be submitted to the District Liaison Officer by January 15th, 2020.** A draft version of the Agreement may be submitted in lieu of a final copy

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.
 - ☉ The certification letter of the FLT must definitively state that the infrastructure being applied for is earmarked for funding from the FLT noted.
- ☐ For 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

A detailed map assists the rating team in identifying unique circumstances concerning the infrastructure applied for. The applicant may 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.

CD ROM / Flash Drive

A jurisdiction applying for multiple projects should include the PDF version of all the applications on one (1) disc or flash drive.

Submission Checklist

The Submission Checklist is a tool provided to ensure the application is complete, including all required documentation. It must be signed by an official of the applying agency.

- With the signature of the applicant's representative, the applicant acknowledges that they have read and understand the most current edition of the OPWC District 2 Integrating Committee 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:

- Contained in both the OPWC & District 2 Applicant Checklists
- Requiring signatures or an engineer's seal have been signed & sealed
 - † Please refer to the OPWC & District 2 Applicant Checklists, and pages 14-22 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 will result in the disqualification of the project for consideration in OPWC Funding Round 35.

In the event a submittal is found to have omitted a document(s) or item(s) required to be submitted by either the OPWC or the District, 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 Round 35.

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 Round 35 as noted in the preceding paragraph.

Rating Teams

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) member Support Staff are each 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
- When applicable, a Support Staff member with years of project rating experience will be teamed with a newer or 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 polices & 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

The Liaison Officer and Technical Assistants determine the makeup of the rating teams. 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 Hamilton County
 - † 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 are appealed by the applicant, all of the Support Staff members not assigned to initially rate the project will review the appeal.

A rating team will not be assigned a project(s) which has been 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

The District will rate only the components/factors of a project directly associated with the type of infrastructure as indicated on the first page of the OPWC Application for Funding.

The OPWC recognizes the District's authority to exercise discretion in determining if additional components/factors will be rated. Examples include but are not limited to:

- Factors the applicant notes in their submittal, such as age, condition, safety or capacity.
- Information contained in applicant's submittal such as disparities in the detailed cost estimate.

Two examples of how the Support Staff may review/rate a project are as follows:

Example 1

On the first page of the OPWC Application for Grant Funding the applicant designated the Project Type as **Road**.

- Included in the project's scope is the replacement of a substantial amount of water main due to profile changes of the roadway.
- The water main component is noted only in the project scope and detailed cost estimate.
- The applicant makes no further mention of the water main in the application or Additional Support Information.
- **The roadway is the only component of this project to be rated.**

Example 2

- On the first page of the OPWC Application for Grant Funding 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 a substantial percentage of the estimated project cost.
 - † In addition, the applicant makes a case for the awarding of points associated with the improvement of the pavement.
- **The pavement to be resurfaced as part of this project will also be rated.**

When rating projects with **more than one major component**, the final **Physical Condition** rating will be determined by calculating the percentage each component represents in terms of the total project cost, as indicated on the first page of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance.

Using the scenario noted in example 2 above, this will be determined as follows:

- 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 $17.3 - 52\% \text{ of } 20 (10.4) + 46\% \text{ of } 15 (5.9) = 17.3$**

If deemed necessary, **one or more of a project's components may be divided into multiple segments or portions** when rated by the Support Staff. 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 a roadway is rated as being in critical condition (20 points)
- 30% is rated as being in poor condition (15 points)
- **The final physical condition rating would be $18.5 - 70\% \text{ of } 20 (14.0) + 30\% \text{ of } 17 (4.5) = 18.5$**

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.

A Support Staff member may not be involved in discussion concerning the rating of a project(s) for the jurisdiction they are employed by. The member may be in attendance, but cannot speak to the merits of the project during the rating process.

Following this session the Liaison Officer provides all applicants 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 - December 18th, 2021 (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.

Upon review of the appeal, the Support Staff may elect to **not change, increase or decrease** the points initially awarded for any appealed criterion.

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 of the Support Staff members not assigned to initially rate the project.
- Appeal ratings are performed only on the criterion/criteria being appealed.
- Appealed projects are rated solely on the information provided in the original application, new information will not be considered.
- 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 dollar amount of the projects funded
- Loan rates
- Criteria used for project selection

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

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

Funds for projects approved by the OPWC become available **July 1st, 2021**.

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 (tie breakers applied if necessary) on the Preliminary Priority spreadsheets; one for the SCIP Program, and one for the LTIP Program.

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

The Liaison Officer and the Technical Assistants meet to review the Priority Listings.

A “cut-line” is established for each funding program. Cut-lines are established:

- Between the last project that can be fully funded and the next, which cannot.
- Determining the funding source for all grant projects as per O.R.C. Chapter 164.

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 cut-line, 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 on the cover page of the Additional Support Information document its willingness to consider accepting a loan if grant funding is depleted.

If the District’s minimum loan responsibilities still cannot be met, the Liaison Officer begins at the first project below the cut line, and contacts the applicant(s) to ask if they will accept loan funding for their project.

- The applicant will have one (1) working day 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 loans will be funded at 100% of their request, even if this results in the SCIP 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 cut-line 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 cut-line
 - † The 10% minimum loan requirement has been met
- Jurisdiction B - Two grant projects positioned above the cut-line, but neither is as well positioned as the Jurisdiction A loan projects
 - † Positioned as the last two projects above the cut-line

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 from 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.

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.

The District’s practice of splitting the awarding of funds over two funding rounds for projects requiring two-years or more to construct was terminated following OPWC Funding Round 32.

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.

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 loan/loan assistance program funding recommendations
- The RLP loan 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, distributes these documents to the Integrating Committee and their alternates.

The Integrating Committee will convene on **January 29th, 2021** 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 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, or LTIP grant funds.

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

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 cut-line 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 cut-line on the respective Program Priority List.

Residual funds for the **SCIP & LTIP grant programs** will be available for Round 34 projects until **September 18th, 2020**, at which time these funds will be added to the balances for Round 35.

Residual funds for the **SCIP & Revolving Loan programs** will be available for Round 34 projects until **September 30th, 2020**, at which time these funds will be added to the balances for Round 35.

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, in 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 to for the same purpose.

District 2 Integrating Committee

<u>Member</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Eric Beck - Chairman	Hamilton County	946-4250
Thomas Hart	Hamilton County - At Large	245-1010
Chris Bigham	City of Cincinnati	352-1518
Don Gindling	City of Cincinnati	352-5328
Sheryl Long	City of Cincinnati	352-6249
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>
Todd Long	Eric Beck	946-4254
David Krings	Thomas Hart	200-4222
John Brazina	Don Gindling	352-6249
Kelly Carr	John Juech	352-3486
Karen Alder	Chris Bigham	352-2551
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
Greg Long*	City of Cincinnati	352-5289
Joe Conway	City of Cincinnati	352-1949
Brandon Lechrone	City of Cincinnati	352-6160
Bryan Williams	City of Cincinnati	352-4506
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
Tracy Kellums	Hamilton Co. Township Assoc.	791-8447

*Technical Assistant

District 2 Liaison Officer

Fred Schlimm	Hamilton County Engineer's Office	946-8912
--------------	-----------------------------------	----------

OPWC District 2 Program Representative

Abbey DeHart	65 East State Street - Suite 312, Columbus, Ohio 43215	614-728-2466
--------------	--	--------------

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 Program Year 2022 (July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021) applicants shall furnish the following additional support information to assist the Support Staff when rating the project. Information

provided by the applicant must be accurate, and where called for, based upon sound engineering principles. **Documentation** detailing how the problems(s) identified is to be corrected **is required** to substantiate the individual items noted in the submittal. Applicants are strongly encouraged to utilize the District's Applicant Guidelines and Project Selection Criteria (PSC) documents as a guide when this Additional Support Information document.

For Round 35, significant revision has been made to the Project Selection Criteria document used by Support Staff rating teams. Additional descriptive examples have been provided to better illustrate the factors considered as a project is rated. These revisions are to be found in the following rating criteria:

- ❑ **Physical Condition**
- ❑ **Safety**
- ❑ **Health**
- ❑ **Alleviate Capacity**

All applicants are required to answer the following questions!

- 1) If applying for grant funding, is the applicant willing to accept a loan if asked by the District? Answering "Yes" will not increase the score; answering "No" will not decrease the score.

_____Yes _____No

- 2) Will construction be underway by June 30, 2022? 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 that are 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 Townships or Villages 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 Small Government Commission funding eligible jurisdiction, do you elect to accept the 20 point deduction so to be eligible for grant funding for this project?

_____Yes _____No

Note!

If any question(s) are left blank, a score of zero (0) will be awarded!

- † The District has added Yes - No - N/A 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 for all applicable rating criterion, whether noted as required or not.
- † The line following the Yes - No - N/A choices for each rating criterion is provided for the applicant to present as much additional support information as they choose.
 - § The Additional Support Information document found on the District's (Hamilton County Engineer's) website is a Word document which will permit the applicant to provide as expansive presentation of additional support information as they choose.

The examples listed in this Additional Support Information document are not a complete offering of examples, but only a small sampling that may be relevant to a given project.

Criterion 1 - Physical Condition **ORC Reference: 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, televised underground system 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 _____ N/A _____

Criterion 2 - Safety ORC Reference: 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 effect 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. Does the infrastructure create an obstruction and/or impediment that affects the safety of the public? Typical examples may include the effect 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.

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Criterion 3 - Health ORC Reference: 164.06 (B) (4)

How important is the project to the health of the public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

Provide a statement detailing the project's effect on the health of the service area, noting how the design of the project will improve the overall condition of the infrastructure so as to reduce or eliminate potential for disease, or correct concerns regarding the environmental health of the area. Does the infrastructure create an obstruction and/or impediment that affects the health of the public? Typical examples may include the effects of the completed project by improving or adding storm drainage or sanitary facilities, etc. **Please be specific and provide documentation to substantiate data.** The applicant must demonstrate the type of problems that exist, the frequency and severity of the problems, and the method of correction.

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Criterion 4 - Priority ORC Reference: 164.06 (B) (1); 164.14(E) (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 _____ N/A _____

Priority 1 _____

Priority 2 _____

Priority 3 _____

Priority 4 _____

Priority 5 _____

Criterion 5 - User Fee ORC Reference: 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.

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Criterion 6 - Economic Growth ORC Reference: 164.14(E) (3)

Provide a statement detailing how the project will enhance economic growth.

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Criterion 7 - Matching Funds (Local)

ORC Reference: 164.06 (B) (6)

Information is provided by the applicant in Section 1.2 (b) of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance.

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Criterion 8 - Matching Funds (Other)

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

Information is provided by the applicant in Section 1.2 (c) of the OPWC Application for Financial Assistance. Below, please list all other funding sources.

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Criterion 9 - Alleviate Capacity Problems

ORC Reference: 164.14(E) (2)

Will the project alleviate serious capacity problems or future level of service needs of the District? Describe how the proposed project will alleviate serious capacity problems (be specific).

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Level of Service (LOS) calculations shall be for the improvements being made in the application. 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.

No Build

Proposed Geometry

Current Year LOS _____

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 Reference: 164.14(E) (7)

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

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Criterion 11 - Relative Economic Strength

ORC Reference: 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.

Criterion 12 - Ban

ORC Reference: 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. **Submission of a copy of the approved legislation is required.**

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed? Yes ___ No___ N/A__

Criterion 13 - Existing Daily Users

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

What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? For roads and bridges, multiply current Average Daily Traffic (ADT) by 1.20. For inclusion of

public transit, submit documentation substantiating the count. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by four. **User information must be documented and certified by a professional engineer (signed) and include the name of the infrastructure and the total number of users.**

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Traffic: ADT _____ x 1.20= _____

Water/Sewer: Homes _____ x 4.00= _____

Criterion 14 - Fees, Levies & Taxes ORC Reference: 164.06 (B) (6); 164.14(E) (6)

Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license tag fee, and infrastructure levy, a user fee or dedicated or dedicated tax for the pertinent infrastructure? TIF & JED Districts will be considered. The applicant shall list all fees, levies, or taxes dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for (check all that apply). **Documentation must be provided; i.e. a copy of a resolution establishing a fee, levy or tax dedicated for the infrastructure applied for.**

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Optional \$5.00 License Tax _____

Infrastructure Levy _____ Specify type _____

Facility User Fee _____ Specify type _____

Dedicated Tax _____ Specify type _____

Other Fee, Levy or Tax _____ Specify type _____

OPWC District 2 - Applicant Submission Checklist

Checklist must be submitted with all items required for project eligibility.

Applicant: _____

Project: _____

Except as noted, the following **must** be submitted by the September 18th, 2020 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 by P.E.)
- Status of Funds Certification / Loan Repayment letter (on letterhead, signed by CFO)
- Enabling Legislation (*must be submitted by 2:00 p.m. Friday, January 15th, 2021*)
- Cooperative Agreement (if applicable) (*must be submitted by 2:00 p.m. Friday, January 15th, 2021*)
- Project vicinity map
- Project photos
- CD ROM or flash drive in PDF form (copy of complete application submittal)

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 the submittal and approve this Checklist. By signing, I acknowledge I have read & understand the OPWC District 2 Fiscal Year 2022 / Round 35 Applicant Manual, 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 2022 - Funding Round35**

Pre-Application Form

Date _____

Applicant _____

Project _____

Contact _____

Phone _____

Email _____

Date of scheduled maintenance _____

Subdivision Type (Check only 1)

Project Type (Check largest component)

_____ County

_____ Road

_____ City

_____ Bridge

_____ Township

_____ Village

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 (include a location map)

Project Components

Physical Dimensions

Pre-application Information

- Applicant 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 which necessitates the pre-application.

Appendix A

DETAILED ENGINEER’S ESTIMATE/USEFUL LIFE STATEMENT

{NOTE: The Estimate should specify items with prices and quantities necessary for the project. Do not summarize construction into one item. A construction contingency up to 10% is permitted but inflationary adjustments are not. If the Useful Life Statement is provided on a separate page then both pages must have an engineer's seal or stamp and signature.}

[Insert Project Name]

ITEM	QUANTITY	UNIT	PRICE	AMOUNT
TOTAL				

The estimated useful life of the [Insert name of project] is _____ years.

Engineer's Signature and Stamp or Seal

Appendix B

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

[Insert Date]

I, [Insert 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 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