



Hamilton County, Ohio



# Ohio Public Works Commission District 2 Integrating Committee

## Rating Methodology Manual

Fiscal Year 2023 - Round 36

Adopted 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021

# Table of Contents

District 2 Methodology Statement	3 & 4
Pre-Application Policy	5
Project Selection Criteria	6 thru 24
Relative Economic Strength Policy	25
Relative Economic Strength Methodology	26
Relative Economic Strength Ratings	27
SCIP & LTIP Program Rating Multipliers	28

# OPWC District 2 Integrating Committee

## Fiscal Year 2023 / Funding Round 36 - Methodology Statement

The Project Selection Criteria (project rating form) used by the Support Staff to arrive at an actual numerical value for each individual project submitted for funding with State Capital Improvement Project (SCIP)/ Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) funds is available on the Hamilton County Engineer's website:

[https://www.hamilton-co.org/government/departments/engineer/funding\\_programs](https://www.hamilton-co.org/government/departments/engineer/funding_programs)

Each project submitted is considered for funding on an equal basis.

- All projects are rated as a SCIP project and an LTIP project.
- Projects are sorted by point value, in descending order, establishing the District 2 Priority Listings for the SCIP and LTIP Programs.
- In the event of a tie, the project with the highest condition score is given priority, followed by the greatest number of users as a second tiebreaker.
- If a project involves more than 50% expansion of the infrastructure, it is considered only for LTIP funding, unless the subdivision is funding 100% of the expansion, plus 10% of the entire construction cost as local share. Such project may then be considered in the SCIP Program.
- A "cut line" is established for each Priority Listing at the point where the amount of available funding is exhausted.
  - § Projects above the cut line are recommended for funding by the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC).
  - § Projects not recommended for funding in either the SCIP or LTIP Programs are designated as "contingency projects". This enables the OPWC to fund the remaining projects with residual funds in the order voted by the Integrating Committee.

The loan program portion of the SCIP program is based on applications that involve a project that is both eligible and revenue generating, or any project a jurisdiction elects to fund through the loan program.

- If the situation should arise where the District cannot meet the minimum loan requirement, the District 2 Liaison Officer will contact jurisdictions whose projects fell below the cutline, and who indicated in the Additional Support Information document that they would be willing to accept loan funding in lieu of grant funding.
- No additional points are awarded for offering to consider a loan.
- Interest rates for all jurisdictions shall be 0%.

If SCIP loan assistance applications are submitted, these applications are rated and ranked in the same manner as all other applications.

Small Government Commission (SGC) eligible jurisdictions that submitted projects for SCIP/LTIP funding which did not rate above either Program's cut line is rated by the District 2 Liaison Officer and District 2 Integrating Committee Small Government Subcommittee utilizing the SGC rating criteria, with the exception of criterion one.

The seven (7) highest rated projects are designated as the District's Small Government priority projects.

In addition to the OPWC application, applicants must complete the District 2 Additional Support Information document, found along with other Round 36 documents on the Hamilton County Engineer's website. This additional information provides the Support Staff with more detailed information with which to determine the merits of the project.

# OPWC District 2

## Fiscal Year 2023 - Funding Round 36

### Project Pre-Application Policy

The purpose of the pre-application process is to allow District jurisdictions that intend to apply for OPWC funding to perform required repair & maintenance to *roads & bridges only* prior to the District's project submittal deadline for a given funding round.

Using the District 2 Pre-Application Form, applicants are able to request a pre-rating of the *physical condition only* of the road and/or bridge prior to the application submittal deadline. Doing so will ensure that the physical condition rating of the road and/or bridge is not severely impacted at the time of the regularly scheduled project rating period.

- The Support Staff will pre-rate the *physical condition of the road and/or bridge only*.
- The pre-rating will be kept by the Liaison Officer until project review and rating of all projects.
- The pre-rating *is not appealable* and will not be made available until all preliminary scores for the current round are released.
- The pre-rating score will count for *75% of the final score*, the condition rating awarded during the regularly scheduled project rating period will count for *25% of the final score*.

Pre-applications will be accepted until *September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021*.

Pre-applicants must provide the date that maintenance activity will begin in order that the Support Staff can rate the project before the work is started.

Pre-rating applications accepted *only for projects to be applied for in OPWC FY23/R36*

The pre-rating score will be valid for *FY23/R36 only*.

When making formal application for OPWC funding, failure to meet the terms, limits, and scope of the project noted in the Pre-Application document could result *in disqualification of the project*.

**OPWC District 2**  
**Fiscal Year 2023 - Funding Round 36**  
**Project Selection Criteria**

Project \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant \_\_\_\_\_

Rating Team \_\_\_\_\_

**General Statement for Rating Criteria**

Ratings awarded for all criteria are based upon:

- Engineering experience of Support Staff Rating Teams
- Field verification
- Additional support information supplied by the applicant which is deemed to be relevant by the Support Staff

Examples provided in this document are not exclusive but provide a small sampling of situations 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 existing infrastructure that is to be replaced or repaired? What is required to improve the infrastructure so that it will realize its stated useful life?

- Condition of the infrastructure to be repaired, reconstructed, or replaced shall be a measure of the degree of reduction in condition from its original state.
- Historic pavement management data based on ASTM D6433-03 or similar current edition rating system may be submitted as documentation.
- Capacity, serviceability, safety, and health **shall not** be considered in this criterion.
- **Documentation to be considered must be included in the application submittal.**
- For underground items which cannot be visually inspected to receive a rating greater than poor, the applicant ***must submit documentation*** demonstrating the physical condition of the infrastructure and the ***frequency and severity*** of problems related to the physical condition, including a summary.

Note: If the infrastructure is in ***“excellent or new” condition*** it will not be considered for funding unless it is an expansion project that will improve serviceability.

# Roadways

Examples given are not intended to be all-inclusive!

Examples are to be used as a guide in determining the condition of the roadway.

Rating teams **are not** required to award a numerical rating that matches one of these examples.

## 25 - Failed

Requires complete reconstruction

- All infrastructure (pavement, road base, curb) unsalvageable
- † No useful life remaining

## 23 - Critical

Requires major reconstruction to maintain integrity

- Pavement and road base require reconstruction, areas of curb salvageable
- † At or near end of useful life

## 20 - Extremely Poor

Requires partial reconstruction or extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- Extensive road base repairs and a structural overlay required; only partial curb repair required

## 17 - Poor

Requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- Moderate full & partial depth and curb repairs with a structural overlay required
- † Limited useful life remaining

## 15 - Moderately Poor

Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- Minor to moderate full & partial depth repairs, moderate curb repairs, with a thin overlay required

## 12 - Fair

Requires extensive maintenance and periodic repairs to maintain integrity

- Extensive crack sealing; moderate partial depth repairs; moderate curb repairs required

## 10 - Moderately Fair

Requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity

- Moderate crack sealing; minor partial depth repairs; minor curb repairs required

## 5 - Good

Requires periodic minor maintenance to maintain integrity

- Minor crack sealing or pavement rejuvenation required

## 0 - Excellent/New

Requires little or no maintenance to maintain integrity

- No repairs required or recently repaired

# Bridges

Examples given are not intended to be all-inclusive!

Examples are to be used as a guide in determining the condition of the bridge.

Rating teams *are not* required to award a numerical rating that matches one of these examples.

## 25 - Failed

### Requires complete reconstruction

- Bridge is unsalvageable and requires complete removal and replacement
  - † No useful life remaining

## 23 - Critical

### Requires major reconstruction to maintain integrity

- Some portions of the structure are salvageable but major structural elements need replacement (i.e., complete superstructure replacement and partial substructure replacement)

## 20 - Extremely Poor

### Requires partial reconstruction or extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- Over half of structure is unsalvageable; minor elements need replacement (i.e., superstructure replacement with minor substructure repairs)

## 17 - Poor

### Requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- Portions of the superstructure need replacement (i.e., complete, or partial deck replacement with minor structural repairs to superstructure and substructure elements)

## 15 - Moderately Poor

### Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- Wearing surface needs replacement; other portions of the superstructure may need replacement or repair; minor repairs to substructure and scour mitigation may be needed

## 12 - Fair

### Requires extensive maintenance and periodic repairs to maintain integrity

- Extensive repairs required such as extensive wearing surface patching, expansion joint replacement and bearing repairs

## 10 - Moderately Fair

### Requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity

- Minor repairs are required

## 5 - Good

### Requires periodic minor maintenance to maintain integrity

- No repairs needed; preventative maintenance required

## 0 - Excellent/New

### Requires little or no maintenance to maintain integrity

- No maintenance or repairs needed or recently repaired

# Underground Utilities

Examples given are not intended to be all-inclusive!

Examples are to be used as a guide in determining the condition of the bridge.

Rating teams *are not* required to award a numerical rating that matches one of these examples.

## 25 - Failed

### Requires complete reconstruction

- ❑ Water main- 6 or more breaks per mile over the course of the last 5 years
- ❑ Storm or sanitary sewers- collapsed sections; seams/joints have failed
- ❑ Water/wastewater treatment plants- complete reconstruction (OEPA documentation required)

## 23 - Critical

### Requires major reconstruction to maintain integrity

- ❑ Water main- 4 to 5 breaks per mile over the course of the last 5 years and numerous valves or fire hydrants (if any) are inoperable, or made of materials not currently recommended for use by the OEPA or AWWA (i.e. asbestos cement, lead, or cast iron with lead joints), or do not meet minimum diameters required by The IO States Standards (6" for water mains with fire protection service or 3" for mains without fire service)
- ❑ Storm/sanitary sewers- sections in threat of collapse; seams/joints have failed
- ❑ Water/wastewater treatment plants- require major reconstruction (OEPA documentation required)

## 20 - Extremely Poor

### Requires partial reconstruction or extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- ❑ Water main- 3 to 4 breaks per mile over the course of the last 5 years, and some valves or fire hydrants (if any) are inoperable
- ❑ Storm/sanitary sewers- large cracks and holes that have caused sinkholes to develop at the ground surface, substantial pipe deformations, or pipe settlements which prohibit positive flow
- ❑ Water/wastewater treatment plants- require replacement of major system components

## 17 - Poor

### Requires standard rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- ❑ Water main- 1 to 2 more breaks per mile over the course of the last 5 years
- ❑ Storm/sanitary sewer- pipe settlements and/or cracks and holes that have caused minor sinking of the ground elevation
- ❑ Water/wastewater treatment plants- require the replacement of deficient major appurtenances

## 15 - Moderately Poor

### Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity

- ☐ Water main- 3 or more breaks per mile over the course of the last 10 years; has experienced breaks within the public portions of water service lines and some valves and fire hydrants are inoperable
- ☐ Storm/sanitary sewers- pipe settlement, seepage & root infiltration at seams/joints, cracks & holes
- ☐ Water/wastewater treatment plants- require the replacement of deficient appurtenances

## 12 - Fair

### Requires extensive maintenance and periodic repairs to maintain integrity

- ☐ Water main- 1 to 2 breaks per mile over the course of the last 10 years
- ☐ Storm/sanitary sewers- minor pipe deformations such as flattening of the bottom, some seepage and/or root infiltration at seams/joints, small cracks, or holes

## 10 - Moderately Fair

### Requires routine maintenance to maintain integrity

- ☐ Water main- 1 to 2 breaks per mile over the course of the last 10 years
- ☐ Storm/sanitary sewers- slight cracking, corrosion, or pitting
- ☐ Water/wastewater treatment plants- require minor repairs

## 5 - Good

### Requires periodic minor maintenance to maintain integrity

- ☐ Water mains- no breaks in the last 10 years but have experienced breaks within the public portions of water service lines
- ☐ Storm/sanitary sewers- functioning as originally intended, but have some superficial rusting or other minor damage
- ☐ Water/wastewater treatment plants- require routine maintenance

## 0 - Excellent/New

### Requires little or no maintenance to maintain integrity

- ☐ Water main- main & service lines have had no breaks over the course of the last 10 years or new water main will not permit an existing water main to be abandoned
- ☐ Storm/sanitary sewers- operational and not in need of repairs
- ☐ Water/wastewater treatment plants- new or expansion project

## Criterion 2 - Safety ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-4); 164.14 (E-1)

How important is the project to the safety of the public & citizens of the District and/or service area? The applicant shall submit documentation of the deficiencies cited and explain how the project will address these deficiencies. For example:

- Have there been vehicular accidents attributable to the problems cited? Do they involve injuries or fatalities?
- Does the infrastructure create an obstruction/impediment that affect public safety?
- In the case of water systems, are existing hydrants non-functional?
- In the case of water lines, is the present capacity inadequate to provide volume or pressure for adequate fire protection?

**In all cases, specific documentation is required.** Problems cited which are poorly documented generally will not a rating greater than 5.

Examples provided are not intended to be all-inclusive!

Examples are to be used as a guide in determining the project's impact on safety.

Rating teams *are not* required to award a numerical rating that matches one of these examples.

**Note: OEPA violations due to improper operation or reporting of facilities may not be included.**

### 25 - Highly Critical Importance

#### Ongoing documented safety problems with multiple critical factors

- **Roads-** documented correctable fatal crashes and/or serious injury crash trends (**OH- 1 Crash Form required documentation**)
- **Water main-** installation of new main with fire protection service where no fire hydrant(s) exist in the directly affected service area or within 600' outside of it

### 20 - Critical Importance

#### Ongoing documented safety problems with critical factors

- **Roads-** documented correctable critical injury crashes, injury crash trends (**crash trend diagrams and/or collision summaries required documentation**)
- **Water main-** installation of new main adding fire protection where significant portions of the directly affected service area are not located within 600' of an existing fire hydrant and the existing water main diameter is 4" or less, or not sufficiently sized to meet AWWA recommendations for flow pressure under all demand conditions while maintaining a minimum of 20 psi at ground level

## 15 - Considerably Significant Importance

### Ongoing documented safety problems

- ☐ **Roads**- documented correctable injury crashes
- ☐ **Water main**
  - † 6" diameter or larger main that will adequately provide for fire protection and serve fire hydrants; will replace an existing 4" or less diameter main not in compliance with the 10 States Standards
  - † Larger diameter main installation will bring flow and/or pressure in compliance with AWWA recommendations for fire protection (which depends on the structures served) while maintaining a minimum of 20 psi at ground level under all demand conditions
- ☐ **Storm/sanitary sewers**- documented street flooding which could restrict emergency vehicle access

## 10 - Moderate Importance

### Intermittent documented safety problems with severe factors

- ☐ **Roads**- documented correctable crashes (above average rate or number)
- ☐ **Water main**- installation to include the addition of fire hydrants bringing compliance with the 10 States Standards (350' - 600' depending on the area served)
- ☐ **Storm/sanitary sewers**- documented street flooding or structure flooding with the potential of reaching electric service

## 5 - Minor Importance

### Minor or potential safety problems noted by the applicant and observed by the rating team

- ☐ **Roads**- documented correctable crashes (at or below average rate); documented potential hazards
- ☐ **Water main**- installation to include replacement of leaking or inoperable fire hydrants without increasing fire hydrant spacing, or improving flow or pressure conditions
- ☐ **Storm/sanitary sewers**- documented flooding of multiple yards or flooding which block access to private property

## 0 - No Measurable Impact

### Application does not indicate a safety problem

- ☐ **Roads**- non-correctable crashes and/or noted potential crashes, or any noted potential hazards
- ☐ **Water main**- Installation of new main that only provides distribution and/or transmission of water, but does not provide fire protection service
- ☐ **Storm/sanitary sewers**- does not address any current deficiencies

### 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? The applicant shall include the type, frequency, and severity of the health problem(s) that will be eliminated or reduced by the project. For example:

- ☐ Can the problem be eliminated *only by* construction of the project, or would routine maintenance be satisfactory?
- ☐ If basement flooding has occurred, was it storm water or sanitary flow?
- ☐ Documented complaints
- ☐ How would new sanitary/storm sewers or water lines improve or reduce health risks?
- ☐ Does the infrastructure create an obstruction/impediment that affect the health of the public?

**In all cases quantified documentation is required.** Problems cited which are poorly documented generally will not receive a rating greater than 5.

Note: Examples provided are not intended to be all-inclusive!

Examples are to be used as a guide in determining the project's impact on health.

Rating teams *are not* required to award a numerical rating that matches one of these examples.

**Note: OEPA violations due to improper operation or reporting of facilities are not to be included.**

### 25 - Highly Critical Importance

#### Ongoing documented health problems with multiple critical factors

- ☐ **Water main-** replacement (existing main to be abandoned) to address OEPA violations and/or has had more than three boil advisories issued over the course of the last 5 years
- ☐ **Water/wastewater treatment plants, storm, and sanitary sewers-** court or OEPA orders issued to address deficiencies (**documentation required**)
- ☐ **Sanitary sewers-** frequently cause structural flooding in living areas

### 20 - Critical Importance

#### Ongoing documented safety problems with critical factors

- ☐ **Water main-** installation of main (existing main to be abandoned) sized to provide adequate flow and pressure as per AWWA demand conditions while maintaining a minimum 20 psi at ground level
- ☐ **Sanitary sewers-** have caused structural flooding in living areas
- ☐ **Sanitary/storm sewer-** systems have CSO or other illicit discharge connections present
- ☐ **Water/wastewater treatment plants-** primary service replaced to address OEPA findings of deficiencies or violations (**documentation required**)

## 15 - Considerably Significant Importance

### Ongoing documented safety problems

- Sanitary/storm sewers- cause structural flooding, and storm sewers have frequently cause structural flooding in living areas
- Water/wastewater treatment plants- updated to meet OEPA recommendations

## 10 - Moderate Importance

### Intermittent documented safety problems with severe factors

- Water main- elimination or looping of dead-end water main
- Storm sewers- have caused structural flooding
- Water/wastewater treatment plants- updated to improve water quality

## 5 - Minor Importance

### Minor or potential safety problems noted by the applicant and observed by the rating team

- Water main- providing a flushing hydrant where none currently exist on a dead-end water main
- Storm/sanitary sewers- have caused flooding

## 0 - No Measurable Impact

### Application does not indicate a safety problem

- Water main- replacement decreases spacing of operable valves, limiting the isolation lengths
- Storm/sanitary sewers- new service or extension projects
- Water/wastewater treatment plants- will *not* improve water quality beyond current levels

## Criterion 4 - Priority ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-1); 164.14(E-10)

Does the project meet the infrastructure repair and replacement priorities of the applying agency? The applicant will list in order of priority the projects for which it is applying in the Additional Support Information document. Points are awarded based solely on this information.

25 - First priority project

20 - Second priority project

15 - Third priority project

10 - Fourth priority project

5 - Fifth priority project or lower

### 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? Examples include but are not limited to fees for water, sewer, or frontage assessments.

10 - 10% or less	5 - 51% - 60%
9 - 11% - 20%	4 - 61% - 70%
8 - 21% - 30%	3 - 71% - 80%
7 - 31% - 40%	2 - 81% - 90%
6 - 41% - 50%	1 - 91% - 95%
	0 - Above 95%

### Criterion 6 - Economic Growth

ORC Reference: 164.14 (E-3)

How will the completed project enhance economic growth and development? Rating teams should consider the affect development will have both on the District and the applying jurisdiction, such as number of jobs to be created, revenue to be generated, and how long the site has gone undeveloped, unutilized, or underutilized.

#### 10 - The project will directly secure *preferred* economic development

The project will bring significant new permanent employment in the industrial, manufacturing or office field (commercial development) to the District. The associated development project is a revitalization of unutilized or previously developed vacant parcels. **The applicant must submit documentation demonstrating the viability of the project and the commitment of the principals involved.**

#### 7 - The project will directly secure economic development

The project will bring significant new permanent employment in the industrial, manufacturing or office field (commercial development) on undeveloped land to the District. **The applicant must submit documentation demonstrating the viability of the project and the commitment of the principals involved.**

#### 2 - The project will permit economic development

The project will provide access to a development site that is underutilized or undeveloped due to a lack of access. **The applicant must submit documentation demonstrating the current constraints on the development site and how the project will eliminate these constraints.**

#### 0 - The project will not impact development

The project will have no impact on business development/employment.

**Criterion 7 - Matching Funds LOCAL**      ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-6)

The percentage of matching funds allocated from the *budget of the applying agency*. A rating will be awarded for loan requests based upon the request's percentage of the total project cost.

List total percentage of LOCAL funds \_\_\_\_\_%

10 - 50% or higher

8 - 40% to 49%

6 - 30% to 39%

4 - 20% to 29%

2 - 10% to 19%

0 - less than 10%

**Criterion 8 - Matching Funds OTHER**      ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-7); 164.14 (E-4)

The percentage of matching funds from *a funding source other than those noted by the applicant* in Criterion 7 (Matching Funds Local). **Documentation detailing the financial participation of others, including the amount of funding to be committed, is required to receive a rating.**

List below each funding source and percentage:

10 - 50% or higher      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_%

8 - 40% to 49%      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_%

6 - 30% to 39%      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_%

4 - 20% to 29%      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_%

2 - 10% to 19%      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_%

1 - 1% to 9%      \_\_\_\_\_      \_\_\_\_\_%

0 - less than 1%

## Criterion 9 - Alleviate Capacity Problems

ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-4)

Will the project alleviate serious capacity problems or hazards, or respond to the future level of service (LOS) needs of the District? The applicant shall provide a narrative and pertinent support documentation which describe the existing deficiencies and demonstrating how congestion will be reduced and/or eliminated, and how service will be improved to meet the needs of any expected growth or development. **A formal capacity analysis must be submitted to receive a rating greater than four (4).**

Projected traffic or demand should be calculated as follows:

**Formula:** Existing volume multiplied by design year factor = projected volume

Design Year	Design Year Factor		
	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Suburban</u>	<u>Rural</u>
20	1.40	1.70	1.60
10	1.20	1.35	1.30

## Surface Infrastructure

Examples provided are not intended to be all-inclusive!

Examples are to be used as a guide in determining the project's impact on capacity.

Rating teams **are not** required to award a numerical rating that matches one of these examples.

### 10 - Project design is for future demand

Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies providing sufficient capacity or service for twenty-year projected demand or fully developed area conditions. **Documentation must be provided in all cases, especially if the area is already largely developed or undevelopable, and thus the factors provided deviate from the table above.**

### 8 - Project design is for partial future demand

Project will eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies, providing sufficient capacity or service for ten-year projected demand or partially developed area conditions. **Justification must be supplied in all cases, especially if the area is largely developed or undevelopable and thus the projection factors used deviate from the above table.**

### 6 - Project design is for current demand

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

### 4 - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity

Project will reduce but not eliminate existing congestion or deficiencies, providing minimal, but less than sufficient, increases in existing capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

### 0 - Project design is for no increase in capacity

Project will have no effect on existing congestion or deficiencies, providing no increase in capacity or service for existing demand and conditions.

# Underground Infrastructure

Note: Examples given are not intended to be all-inclusive!

Examples are to be used as a guide in determining the condition of the infrastructure.

Rating teams *are not* required to award a rating that matches one of these examples.

**Note: OEPA violations due to improper operation or reporting of facilities are not to be included!**

## 10 - Project design for future demand

- **Water main**- diameter of new main increased to a minimum of 6" with fire service, or 3" without fire service, and will meet future user needs under all AWWA demand conditions while maintaining a minimum pressure of 20 psi at ground level
- **Culverts**- sized for future conditions to eliminate roadway overtopping and upstream flooding
- **Storm sewers**- provides capacity required for the design year storm under gravity flow, and the 100-year storm considering the hydraulic grade line with future or built-out ground surface conditions
- **Sanitary sewers**- provide the capacity required for future or build-out loading conditions
- **Wastewater treatment plant**- influent flows and organic loads are more than 85% of the design conditions; agency under formal enforcement proceedings (**documentation required**)
- **Water treatment plant/water tower**- cannot currently provide the volume of water to meet peak day plus fire flow demands required for future or built-out service area

## 8 - Project design for partial future demand

- **Water main**- diameter of new main increased to a minimum of 6" with fire service, or 3" without fire service, and will meet the peak demand needs of current water users under all AWWA demand conditions while maintaining a minimum pressure of 20 psi at ground level
- **Culverts**- sized to alleviate roadway overtopping for the 100-year storm with current ground surface conditions; upsized for future slip lining
- **Storm sewers**- provides capacity required for the design year storm under gravity flow, and the 100-year storm considering the hydraulic grade line with future or built-out ground surface conditions
- **Sanitary sewers**- provides capacity in excess of that required for current loading conditions
- **Wastewater treatment plant**- influent flows and organic loads are greater than 85% of the design conditions and 10 or more violations exceeding 20% of NPDES permit limits have been issued in the last 10 years (**documentation required**)
- **Water treatment plant/water tower**- cannot currently provide the volume of water to meet peak day plus fire flow demands required for the service area

#### 6 - Project design to meet current demand

- ☐ **Water main**- diameter of new main increased to a minimum of 6" with fire service. or 3" without fire service, and will meet the needs of the current water users under all AWWA demand conditions while maintaining a minimum pressure of 20 psi at ground level
- ☐ **Culverts**- sized to alleviate roadway overtopping for the design year storm
- ☐ **Storm sewers**- provides capacity required for the design year storm under gravity flow, and the 100-year storm considering the hydraulic grade line with current ground surface conditions
- ☐ **Sanitary sewers**- provides capacity in excess of that required for current loading conditions
- ☐ **Wastewater treatment plant**- influent flows and organic loads are more than 85% of the design conditions and 1 - 10 violations exceeding 20% of NPDES permit limits have been issued in the last 10 years (**documentation required**)
- ☐ **Water treatment plant/water tower**- cannot currently provide the volume of water to meet average day plus fire flow demands or the peak day demand needed for the service area

#### 4 - Project design is for minimal increase in capacity

- ☐ **Water main**- diameter of new main to be larger than the existing water main
- ☐ **Culverts**- upsized to reduce frequency of roadway overtopping for the design year storm
- ☐ **Storm sewers**- additional catch basins installed, and storm sewer diameter increased
- ☐ **Wastewater treatment plant**- influent flows & organic loads are greater than 85% of design conditions; no violations exceeding 20% of NPDES permit limits issued in the last 10 years
- ☐ **Water treatment plant/water tower**- Increased volume than currently realized

#### 0 - Project design is for no increase in capacity

- ☐ **Water main**- diameter of new main is the same or smaller than the existing main
- ☐ **Culverts**- maintained at current capacity
- ☐ **Storm or sanitary sewer**- replaced with the same or fewer number of catch basins, percentage slope, or diameter as the existing system to be abandoned, or the existing pipe will be slip-lined or otherwise rehabilitated
- ☐ **Wastewater treatment plant**- no increase in treatment capacity or improved water quality
- ☐ **Water treatment plant**- no increase in capacity

## **Criterion 10 - Regional Impact**      **ORC Reference: 164.14 (E-7)**

Does the infrastructure have **regional impact**? For roads and bridges consider the origination and destination of traffic, functional classification, size of service area, and number of jurisdictions served. For all other infrastructure, regional impact will be determined on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration the size of service area and number of jurisdictions served. Other factors to be considered, but which individually do not denote the regional impact of the infrastructure, are as follows:

### **10 - Major Impact- Roads: Major Arterial**

- Provides a great degree of mobility
- Generally, conveys large traffic volumes for distances greater than one (1) mile
- Of regional importance and is intended to serve beyond the county, connecting urban centers with one another and with outlying communities, employment providers, or retail centers
- Intended primarily to serve through traffic
- Provides limited access to property
- Provides direct access to an interstate highway

### **8 - Significant Impact- Roads: Minor Arterial**

- Serves through traffic that is similar in function to a major arterial, but operates with lower traffic volumes, serving trips of shorter distances (but still greater than one (1) mile), and may provide a higher degree of property access than major arterials

### **6 - Moderate Impact- Roads: Major Collector**

- Provides movement between local roads and arterials, or community-wide activity centers
- May also provide direct access to abutting properties such as regional shopping centers, large industrial parks, major subdivisions, and community-wide recreational facilities, but typically not individual residences
- Generally, through streets carrying moderate traffic volumes over moderate distances (generally less than one mile)

### **4 - Minor Impact- Roads: Minor Collector**

- Similar in function to a major collector, but carries lower traffic volumes over shorter distances and has a higher degree of property access
- May serve as main circulation streets within large residential neighborhoods, and may, or may not, be through streets

### **2 - Minimal or No Impact- Roads: Local**

- Primarily intended to provide access to abutting properties
- Accommodates lower traffic volumes, serves short trips (generally within neighborhoods), and provides connections primarily to collector streets rather than arterials

## Criterion II - Relative Economic Strength

ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-8)

What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction? The District 2 Integrating Committee predetermines the relative economic strength (RES) of all jurisdictions comprising the District. The RES of a jurisdiction may periodically be adjusted when pertinent US Census data is updated.

### RES 10

Addyston  
Arlington Heights  
Cheviot  
Cincinnati  
Elmwood  
Golf Manor  
Lincoln Heights  
Lockland  
Mt. Healthy

### RES 8

Forest Park  
North College Hill  
Norwood  
Reading  
Silverton  
Springdale  
Springfield Township  
St. Bernard  
Whitewater Township  
Woodlawn

### RES 6

Cleves  
Colerain Township  
Columbia Township  
Deer Park  
Delhi Township  
Fairfax  
Greenhills  
Hamilton County  
Harrison  
Harrison Township  
Loveland  
Miami Township  
North Bend  
Sharonville  
Sycamore Township

### RES 4

Amberley Village  
Anderson Township  
Blue Ash  
Crosby Township  
Green Township  
Mariemont  
Montgomery  
Newtown  
Symmes Township

### RES 2

Evendale  
Glendale  
Indian Hill  
Madeira  
Terrace Park  
Wyoming

**Criterion 12 - Ban**                      ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-10); 164.14 (E-10)

Has formal action by a federal, state, or local governmental agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the subject infrastructure? The ban or moratorium must be the result of structural or operational deficiencies. Points awarded only if the ban is to be rescinded upon completion of the project. **The applicant shall provide documentation of the official action taken to implement the ban or moratorium.**

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

**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? A registered professional engineer must certify the required documentation which must include ***traffic counts or households served*** (when converted to a measurement of persons) and include the ***name of the infrastructure and the total number of users***. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for road and bridge projects, but ***only if*** certifiable ridership figures are provided.

- 10 - 30,000 or more
- 8 - 21,000 to 29,999
- 6 - 12,000 to 20,999
- 4 - 3,000 to 11,999
- 2 - 2,999 and under

#### Criterion 14 - Fees, Levies, Taxes

ORC Reference: 164.06 (B-6); 164.14 (E-6)

Has the applicant enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, user fee, or other dedicated tax for the infrastructure? The applicant shall document (in the Additional Support Information form) the type of fees, levies or taxes dedicated toward the type of infrastructure being applied for. **Documentation must be provided, i.e., a copy of a resolution establishing a fee, levy or tax dedicated for the infrastructure applied for.**

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

## OPWC District 2 - Relative Economic Strength Policy

It is the policy of the District 2 Integrating Committee to evaluate the relative economic health of all jurisdictions in the District to gauge the ability of these jurisdictions to fund infrastructure projects. Three factors will be considered equally in determining the final Relative Economic Strength (RES) rating for a given jurisdiction:

- Per Capita Income
- Median Household Income
- Poverty Level

Data will be collected from the U.S. Census Bureau, utilizing the most recent data available.

The District 2 Liaison Officer & Support Staff Technical Assistants shall review the Relative Economic Strength rating criteria annually. Any data on the rating tables will be amended during the review period to reflect new economic data. Once the new economic data has been applied, the Relative Economic Strength of jurisdictions will be adjusted accordingly and presented to the Integrating Committee with each annual Rating Methodology proposal.

The actual methodology utilized to determine Relative Economic Strength shall not be amended during these annual reviews without the consent of the Integrating Committee. Only the rankings within each of the Tables will be revised to reflect the most recent U. S. Census Bureau data available.

Note: The District 2 Integrating Committee revised this policy on May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013.

## Methodology for Determining Relative Economic Strength

The United States Census (Selected Economic Characteristics) is the source for the data used to determine a jurisdiction's Relative Economic Strength (RES). Annually, when it becomes available, the Liaison Officer collects the Census data and formulates each District jurisdiction's RES by applying the District's RES formula as follows:

- Census data provided for Median Household Income (MHI), Per Capita Income (PCI), and Poverty Rate (PR) are recorded in individual tables for each community. Tables for MHI and PCI are sorted from lowest to highest. The table for PR is sorted from highest to lowest.
- Beginning with the MHI Table, the Liaison Officer determines the RES Rating for each community (2, 4, 6, 8, or 10). Generally, this is determined by identifying four "breaks" which will delineate a point at which the RES Rating transitions from one rating value to another. Determining these breaks is not an arbitrary exercise but is based on logic and balance. Historically, breaks have been determined at regular monetary increments (example: less than \$25,000 and greater than \$25,000) for MHI and PCI, and percentile increments for PR.
- The RES Rating for each of the three criteria are then added together to create the community's overall RES Rating (MHI + PCI + PR = RES Rating).
- The RES Ratings of all District communities are then analyzed and sorted into the five scoring increments found in the District's Project Selection Criteria for RES Scores.
- Formal documents containing the aforementioned tables and other relevant information are drafted. These are:
  - † One table demonstrating the RES Scores of each jurisdiction for that funding round
  - † A table demonstrating the RES Rating and RES Score for each jurisdiction
  - † Individual tables containing the sorted MHI, PCI & PR data
  - † A spreadsheet containing all of the aforementioned data, plus a comparison of the RES Ratings and RES Scores for the current funding round and the previous round
  - † A one-page document summarizing the District's Relative Economic Strength Policy
- The District Liaison forwards the preliminary RES Scores and relevant resources utilized to determine these Scores to the District 2 Support Staff Technical Assistants for their review and comment. If consensus dictates revisions are warranted, the Liaison Officer revises the Scores as determined.
- The preliminary RES Scores and relevant resources are then forwarded to the full Support Staff for review and comment. Again, if consensus dictates revisions are warranted, the Liaison Officer revises the Scores as directed.
- A memo is drafted for the Integrating Committee summarizing the results of the application of updated Census data, most notably, which jurisdictions RES Scores were revised. The memo and all documents are then forwarded to the Integrating Committee for review and comment.
- The information is formally presented at the Integrating Committee meeting at which the current funding round's methodology is to be approved by the Integrating Committee.

**OPWC District 2**  
**Fiscal Year 2023 - Funding Round 36**  
**Relative Economic Strength (RES) Ratings**

**RES 10**

Addyston  
Arlington Heights  
Cheviot  
Cincinnati  
Elmwood  
Golf Manor  
Lincoln Heights  
Lockland  
Mt. Healthy

**RES 8**

Forest Park  
North College Hill  
Norwood  
Reading  
Silverton  
Springdale  
Springfield Township  
St. Bernard  
Whitewater Township  
Woodlawn

**RES 6**

Cleves  
Colerain Township  
Columbia Township  
Deer Park  
Delhi Township  
Fairfax  
Greenhills  
Hamilton County  
Harrison  
Harrison Township  
Loveland  
Miami Township  
North Bend  
Sharonville  
Sycamore Township

**RES 4**

Amberley Village  
Anderson Township  
Blue Ash  
Crosby Township  
Green Township  
Mariemont  
Montgomery  
Newtown  
Symmes Township

**RES 2**

Evendale  
Glendale  
Indian Hill  
Madeira  
Terrace Park  
Wyoming

**OPWC - District 2**  
**SCIP / LTIP Program**  
**Project Selection Criterion Multipliers**

Rating Criterion	SCIP	LTIP
Physical Condition	5	1
Safety	1	4
Health	1	0
Priority	3	1
User Fees	5	0
Economic Growth	0	4
Matching Funds (Local)	5	1
Matching Funds (Other)	2	5
Alleviate Traffic Problems	0	10
Regional Impact	0	1
Relative Economic Health	2	0
Ban	2	2
Existing Daily Users	2	5
Fees, Levies & Taxes	5	5