District 3 - Franklin County, Ohio

SCIP/LTIP INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

PWIC METHODOLOGY FOR SCORING

APPLICANT EVALUATION CRITERIA – Round FY25

# Applicant Evaluation Criteria

**Instructions:** Read each criterion carefully and respond as directed. Many criteria will ask you to enter information in a table. Enter other information for each criterion under the **RESPONSE** prompts. Note that all responses under Applicant Evaluation Criteria are limited to one page per question.

Each question (A1-A16) has a raw score between 0 and 5 points. The raw score for each criterion will be multiplied by its weight to determine its final score.

Begin by completing the project component chart below.

*** Documentation Required***

*Attach a plan view or map to illustrate the scope of the project.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Component** | **Existing?****(Y/N)** | **Quantity** | **Proposed Change?****(Y/N)** | **Quantity** |
| ADA curb ramps |  |  |  |  |
| Bike lanes |  |  |  |  |
| Bridge/Culvert |  |  |  |  |
| Bus stop/shelter |  |  |  |  |
| Curb and gutter |  |  |  |  |
| Multi-use path |  |  |  |  |
| Road |  |  |  |  |
| Roundabout |  |  |  |  |
| Sanitary sewer |  |  |  |  |
| Sidewalks |  |  |  |  |
| Street lighting |  |  |  |  |
| Storm sewer |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic signal |  |  |  |  |
| Turn lane(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Waterlines |  |  |  |  |
| Other (specify) |  |  |  |  |

**A1) PHYSICAL CONDITION (Weight: SCIP= 8; LTIP= 6)** – ORC 164.06(B)(2), 164.14(E)(9)

Skip this question if your project is 100% new or expansion work. If the existing facility is not being abandoned or repaired, but a new facility is being built, it shall be considered as an expansion project.

Condition is based on the amount of deterioration that is field verified or documented exclusive of capacity, serviceability, or health, safety, and welfare issues. Condition is rated only on the existing facility being repaired or abandoned. The proportion of a project which is new or expansion work will be considered when scoring projects which are constructing a new roadway.

Complete chart below for each type of infrastructure to be repaired or replaced. If the infrastructure type does not have an applicable table, complete the “Other” chart.

*** Documentation Required***

*Attach documentation of how the condition rating was determined (with the pavement condition rating form, ODOT Bridge Inspection Field Report, documentation of waterline break frequency, etc.). Applicants are encouraged to provide photos depicting the current physical conditions.*

**Roads, Bridges and Culverts**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Location (Road Segment, Bridge Location, etc.)** | **Rating (e.g. PCR, Bridge Rating)** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Water Supply**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Average annual number of breaks per 1000 miles of pipe |  |
| Percent of water unaccounted for (out of total produced) |  |
| Number of EPA violations in the past year  |  |
| Peak demand compared to design capacity (percent) |  |
| Tuberculation in water lines (Yes/No) |  |

**Wastewater Systems**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Facility influent flows and/or organic loads compared to design levels (percent) |  |
| Number of violations that exceed 20% of the NPDES permit limits in the past year \*  |  |
| Have formal enforcement proceedings started? (Yes/No) |  |

\* *Do not include violations due to improper operation of the facility*.

**Stormwater Collection**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Average number of breaks per 1000 miles of pipe |  |
| **\*Instances of flooding (select one):** |  |
|  After heavy storms, in limited areas |  |
|  After heavy storms, fairly widespread |  |
|  Often, in limited areas |  |
|  Often, fairly widespread |  |
| \* *Documentation includes testimony from utility, emergency and public services and/or property owners. Provide pictures if possible*. |

**Solid Waste**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Start year of operations |  |
| Percent of approved floor space filled |  |
| Estimated remaining life (years and months) |  |
| List any best available technology (BAT) features in use: |

**Other (signals, curb ramps, etc.)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated remaining years of useful life |  |
| Other applicable condition rating (cite methodology) |  |

**For any project type,** consider the information provided and select the condition rating that represents the average physical condition of all components of the infrastructure to be repaired or replaced.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Select Condition** | **Condition Rating** | **Description** | **Points** |
|  | Good | Requires routine maintenance and periodic repairs to maintain integrity. | 1 |
|  | Fair | Requires minor rehabilitation to maintain integrity. | 2 |
|  | Poor | Requires partial reconstruction or extensive rehabilitation to maintain integrity. | 3 |
|  | Critical | Requires major reconstruction to maintain integrity. | 4 |
|  | Failed | Permanently closed or out of service. Beyond any corrective action. | 5 |

Why did you select the physical condition checked above? Explain. Identify the methodology applied for rating the condition.

**RESPONSE:**

**A2) AGE (Weight: SCIP = 1; LTIP = 1)** – ORC 164.06(B)(2)

How many years have passed since the last major rehabilitation of the primary infrastructure involved in the project? Describe the scope of the major rehabilitation. If the infrastructure was never rehabilitated, provide the number of years since it was constructed. No documentation is necessary. However, OPWC’s Small Government Program does require proof of age.

**RESPONSE:**

Points are awarded based on the primary type of infrastructure/project and its associated life expectancy, according to the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Infrastructure Type** | **Typical Useful Life (years)** | **5 points** | **4 points** | **3 points** | **2 points** | **1 point** |
| **Years Since Last Major Rehabilitation is at Least:** |
| Bridges | 75 | 75 | 60 | 45 | 30 | 15 |
| Traffic signals | 12 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| Full-depth road construction | 25 | 25 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 |
| Less than full-depth replacement | 15 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 3 |
| Pump, lift station, equipment | 15 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 6 | 3 |
| Sanitary sewers | 40 | 40 | 32 | 24 | 16 | 8 |
| Storm sewer | 40 | 40 | 32 | 24 | 16 | 8 |
| Water lines | 40 | 40 | 32 | 24 | 16 | 8 |
| ADA curb ramps | 25 | 25 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 5 |

**A3) CRASHES (Weight: SCIP = 3; LTIP = 6)** – ORC 164.14(E)(10)

How will the project reduce the number of fatal and serious injury (FS) crashes?

**RESPONSE:**

In order to receive points, applicant must provide the rationale used and demonstrate that the proposed project will reduce fatal and serious injury (FS) fatal and serious injury (FS) crashes. If this issue is not addressed, no points may be given regardless of the crash rate. Do NOT include police crash reports with the application. A safety study may be provided for additional support.

If the rationale is sufficient, MORPC staff will analyze five years of crash data using information from the Ohio Department of Public Safety and the Ohio Department of Transportation. The following four variables will be used:

1. Crash Frequency or Crash Density
2. FS Crash Frequency or Crash Density
3. FS Crash Rate
4. Pedestrian/Bicyclist FS Crashes

|  |
| --- |
| **CRASH ANALYSIS VARIABLES**  |
| Variable A1 | Crash Frequency is the total number of crashes that have occurred at each intersection. *Crash Frequency = N N = Total number of crashes* |
| Variable A2 | Crash Density is the total number of crashes that have occurred per mile of segments*Crash Density = N/L N = Total number of crashes L=Length*  |
| Variable B1 | FS Crash Frequency is the total number of FS crashes that have occurred at each intersection. *FS Crash Frequency = N N = Total number of FS crashes* |
| Variable B2 | FS Crash Density is the total number of FS crashes that have occurred per mile of segments*FS Crash Density = N/L N = Total number of FS crashes L=Length*  |
| Variable C | FS Crash Rate (per 10 million vehicles) is the total number of FS crashes relative to the average traffic volume entering the intersection and number of crashes per 10 million vehicle miles traveled for segments. *FS Crash Rate =* \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_N\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ADT \* 365 days\* 5 years \* 10-7ADT = Average daily traffic entering the intersection or segmentN = Total number of FS crashes at the project location |
| Variable D | Pedestrian/Bicyclist FS Crashes is the total number of FS crashes involving a pedestrian or bicyclist that have occurred at the project location. *Ped/Bike FS Crashes = Npb Npb = Total number of ped/bike FS crashes*  |

Staff will determine the score from 0 to 5 for each of the four variables from the chart below. The final point score will be determined by the average point value of all four variables (A, B, C, and D).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | A | B | C | D |
| **Points** | **(Intersection)A1.** Crash Freq | **(Segment)A2.** Crash Density (per mile) | **(Intersection)B1.** FS Crash Freq | **(Segment)B2.** FS Crash Density (per mile) | **(Int. or Seg.)C.** FS Crash Rate (per 10M veh/year) | **(Int. or Seg.)D.** Ped/Bike FS Crashes |
| 0 | <10 | <15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 10-19 | 15 to <30 | 1 | 0 to <1.5 | 0 to <0.5 | — |
| 2 | 20-29 | 30 to <50 | 2 | 1.5 to <3.0 | 0.5 to <1.0 | — |
| 3 | 30-39 | 50 to <70 | 3 | 3.0 to <4.5 | 1.0 to <1.5 | 1 |
| 4 | 40-49 | 70 to <100 | 4 | 4.5 to <6.0 | 1.5 to <2.0 | — |
| 5 | 50+ | 100+ | 5+ | 6.0+ | 2.0+ | 2+ |

**A4) PUBLIC SAFETY (Weight: SCIP = 1; LTIP = 2)** – ORC 164.06(B)(4), 164.14(E)(10)

Mark the unsafe conditions currently attributable to the infrastructure that will be ameliorated by the project.

*** Documentation Required***

*Supportive evidence, such as letters from officials, public notices of service disruptions, photos, media articles, communications to or from residents, etc., is required for each unsafe condition.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Applicable** | **Current Condition** | **Points (Cumulative, up to 5)** |
|  | Geometric issues (sharp curve, severe drop-off, poor sight distance, etc.) | 1 to 2 |
|  | Delayed emergency response  | 1 |
|  | Insufficient lighting | 1 |
|  | Frequent flooding or standing water in open areas | 1 |
|  | Loss of water service (more than 24 hours) | 2 |
|  | Insufficient fire hydrant flow  | 1 |
|  | Extended closure resulting in rerouted traffic | 3 |
|  | Extended closure of bridge or emergency route | 5 |
|  | Other unsafe conditions | 1 to 2 |

Describe each unsafe condition or situation caused by the existing infrastructure and how the project would address it. If there are applicable design or safety standards that the infrastructure currently fails to meet, provide the standard and its source, and describe how the project compares to the standard both currently and after the project is completed. Where a range of points is specified for a condition, the score will be based on a combination of the severity and frequency of the unsafe condition and the quality of supportive evidence.

**RESPONSE:**

**A5) PUBLIC HEALTH PROBLEM (Weight: SCIP = 5; LTIP = 0)** – ORC 164.06(B)(4), 164.14(E)(10)

Check applicable conditions ia14n the table that follows.

*** Documentation Required***

*Supportive evidence, such as letters from officials, public heath notices, photos, media articles, enforcement actions, communications to or from residents, etc. is required for each condition. Contamination must be documented with evidence of the presence of contamination in excess of standards protective of public health.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Applicable** | **Current Condition** | **Points (Cumulative, up to 5)** |
|  | Infestation of mosquitoes, insects or rodents | 1 to 2 |
|  | Basement flooding (stormwater) | 1 to 3 |
|  | Basement flooding (sanitary) | 2 to 4 |
|  | Health department or EPA orders to fix | 2 to 4 |
|  | Biofilm in water lines OR contamination of drinking water | 1 to 4 |
|  | Contamination of environment | 2 to 4 |
|  | Other public health problem | 1 to 5 |

Describe each public health problem or unhealthy condition. Explain how the existing infrastructure contributed to it, and how the proposed project will correct or mitigate it. The score within the specified range will be based on a combination of the severity, frequency, and quality of supportive evidence.

**RESPONSE:**

**A6) ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT (Weight: SCIP = 3; LTIP = 5)** – ORC 164.14(E)(3)

This criterion relates to the potential of the project to facilitate the creation or retention of commercial (i.e., office, industrial, or manufacturing) jobs in District 3 (Franklin County). Retail or residential development does not receive credit. Depending on the type of documentation provided, applicants can receive points for either A6a or the sum of A6b and A6c, for a maximum of 5 total points.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Documented** | **Documentation** | **Points** |
|  | A6a) Letter from an economic development entity | 1 |
| **OR** |
|  | A6b) Contract or letter from a commercial developer | 3 |
|  | A6c) Less than 25 jobs created or retained | 1 |
|  | A6c) At least 25 jobs created or retained | 2 |

**A6a) Letter from an Economic Development Entity**

*** Documentation Required***

*Provide a copy of a signed letter from an economic development entity not affiliated with the applicant indicating that the project supports the potential creation or retention of commercial (i.e., office, industrial, or manufacturing) jobs in Franklin County.*

**To receive credit for A6b and A6c, the applicant must provide a satisfactory response to the three items below:**

Is this infrastructure improvement necessary to secure a particular commercial (i.e., office, industrial, or manufacturing) development or redevelopment? If so, please explain the relationship between the project and the development. Stating that the improvement will promote development in the area is not sufficient. A Community Reinvestment Area (CRA) is ineligible unless the agreement clearly states the CRA focuses on commercial development, not retail or residential development.

**RESPONSE:**

Name of the commercial development.

**RESPONSE:**

Identify the type of industry proposed in this commercial development.

**RESPONSE:**

**A6b) Contract or Letter from the Commercial Developer**

*** Documentation Required***

*Provide a copy of a signed contract or letter of commitment from the commercial developer outlining the proposed plan.*

**A6c) Creation of New Jobs or Retention of Existing Commercial Jobs**

*** Documentation Required***

*Provide documentation of a development proposal stating number of permanent jobs that will be located there and the geographical area from which any existing jobs would be relocating. The applicant must provide a letter or agreement from the prospective commercial developer outlining the proposed plan or provide an existing land use plan that this improvement directly supports economic development intended to create commercial/office jobs.*

How many permanent new jobs are being created in District 3?

**RESPONSE:**

How many permanent commercial jobs are being retained within District 3? Provide an explanation below or attach documentation that demonstrates that the jobs would have been lost to the district without the development.

**RESPONSE:**

**A7) CONGESTION (Weight: SCIP = 0; LTIP = 7)** – ORC 164.14(E)(2)

If the facility is currently or forecasted to be congested, complete the chart below with the current and design year (opening + 20 years) peak-hour level of service (LOS) for the no-build and build scenarios. In the “Location of LOS Improvement” column below, specify which portion of the traffic is experiencing the corresponding LOS improvement. For example, does the LOS apply to an entire intersection or to the northbound to westbound turning movement?

*** Documentation Required***

*The level of service calculation (using the Highway Capacity Manual, Synchro or similar, including growth rate rationale and showing peak hour, timing, and movements) must be attached to receive* cre*dit. If current ADT is not from* [*MORPC*](https://www.morpc.org/tool-resource/traffic-counts/) *or* [*ODOT*](https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims)*, a traffic count report is required.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Location of LOS Improvement** | **Peak Hour LOS Improvement for (check applicable)**  | **Opening Year LOS** | **Design Year LOS** |
| All Traffic  | Portion of Traffic  | No-Build Scenario | Build Scenario | No-Build Scenario | Build Scenario |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The scoring rubric below uses the year (current/opening or design) and location of traffic that results in the highest score. Improvements beyond LOS C do not receive credit. If the project is along a road segment that improves multiple intersections, the project will receive a score based on the individual intersection that scores best in the chart.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **LOS Improvement Applicable to:** | **Points** |
| **All** |  | **Portion** |
| - |  | 1 | 1 |
| - |  | 2 | 2 |
|  |  | 3 | 3 |
| 1 |  | - | 4 |
| ≥2 |  | - | 5 |

Please explain how design year ADT was developed, including the growth rate rationale. If these are insufficient, only the Opening Year LOS will be used to determine the score.

**RESPONSE:**

**A8) PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT (Weight: SCIP = 4; LTIP = 4)**

Complete the chart below to identify how the applicant has identified the project as a need.

*** Documentation Required***

*See Required Documentation and Examples in the chart that follows.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Documented** | **Public Participation** | **Required Documentation and Examples** | **Points (Cumulative, up to 5)** |
|  | Oral comments | Summary of comments received (e.g. staff summary of public complaints, log of phone calls, etc.) | 1 |
|  | Written comments | Copy of the comments as received (e.g. letter to the editor, email, comments collected at a public meeting, newspaper articles, 311 records, etc.) | 2 |
|  | \*Public meeting for the project held within the past two years | Sign-in sheet, advance notice of meeting (e.g. flyer, newspaper, neighborhood newsletter, electronic postings, etc.) A social media posting, without any other documentation, is not sufficient evidence of a meeting. A regularly occurring council or board meeting is acceptable *only* if the public receives prior notice of project-specific discussion beyond a typical meeting. | 4 |
|  | Public meeting in combination with written comments | See above | 5 |

\* Follow public health orders and guidelines when conducting meetings. Public meetings may be held remotely via telecommunications. Consider using the procedures and methods the local subdivision has used for virtual public meetings to ensure publicity, documentation, and the ability for the public to participate.

**A9) RECOGNIZED NEED (Weight: SCIP = 3; LTIP = 3)** – ORC 164.06(B)(9), 164.14(E)(5)

Is the project the applicant’s highest priority among the applications (or the only application) submitted this round?

**RESPONSE:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes |  | No |

Complete the following table to identify how the project was identified as a need.

*** Documentation Required***

*Attach an excerpt of the applicable document as proof for each row of the table except priority (i.e., Plans, Programs, and Progress/Readiness). If the origin of the excerpt is unclear, also include the cover, introduction, or executive summary.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Documented** | **Required Documentation and Examples** | **Points (Cumulative, up to 5)** |
|  | Identified as first priority above | 1 |
|  | Plans:* Preliminary engineering study complete
* Comprehensive or community plan
* Special study
* Task force findings
* Other planning document
 | 2 |
|  | Programs:* Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
* Annual budget
* Voluntary submission of a Capital Improvement Report (CIR)
* Other systematic infrastructure inventory
 | 1 |
|  | Progress/Readiness:* Signed engineering design contract specific to the project
* Authorized task order within a general contract
* A statement that design is in-house (or, for townships and villages, will be completed by the Franklin County Engineer's Office)
 | 2 |

**A10) SERVICE TO THE DISTRICT (Weight: SCIP = 6; LTIP = 6)**

Complete the chart below for the applicable project type.

*** Documentation Required***

*Provide the documentation requested in the table to support the number of people or size of area served.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Facility Type** | **Measure & Documentation** | **People/Area Served** | **Scoring Guidelines** |
| RoadBridge | Average Daily Traffic (ADT)Include a traffic count report if the ADT is not from MORPC or ODOT. |  | **Points** | **Min. ADT** |
| 1 | 0 |
| 2 | 3,000 |
| 3 | 8,000 |
| 4 | 15,000 |
| 5 | 30,000 |
| WaterlinesSanitary SewerSolid Waste | Number of residents and employeesORNumber of residences and businessesProvide a map of the service area. |  | <175 people | 1 point |
| 175-231 | 2 |
| 231-519 | 3 |
| 520-1000 | 4 |
| >1000 | 5 |
| ADA Curb Ramps | Number of pedestrians served dailyProvide documentation if available. |  | Staff compares current and past numbers |
| Storm Sewer | Tributary drainage area (in acres)Provide a map of the service area. |  | <41 acres | 1 point |
| 41-160 | 2 |
| 161-480 | 3 |
| 481-800 | 4 |
| >800 | 5 |

**A11) AREA WITH SPECIAL CONDITIONS OR IMPORTANT COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

**(Weight: SCIP= 4; LTIP = 4)**

List community facilities directly served by the project. Community facilities are those that provide public/institutional services, such as hospitals, schools, police/fire stations, community centers, parks, libraries, etc. The facility or combination of facilities must serve a significant number of people daily to count as one item. Commercial facilities shall not be considered important community facilities for purposes of this question.

*** Documentation Required***

*Provide documentation of daily number of users.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Community Facility** | **Address/Location** | **Number of Daily Users** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Complete the table below for other community resources or special conditions directly served by the project.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Applicable** | **Community Resources or Special Conditions** | **Check If Documentation Provided** |
|  | Community facilities (from table above) |  |
|  | Regionally significant facility |  |
|  | Public housing site or Federal CDBG-designated low-income area |  |
|  | Access for persons with disabilities (new sidewalks and ADA curb ramps) |  |
|  | COTA route or bus stop within project limits |  |
|  | Historic district - must be federal or state approved |  |
|  | Tie-in with other improvements, such as neighborhood revitalization, or earlier phases |  |

Provide descriptive information to identify the specific resources claimed in the chart above, such as name, address, etc. Do not repeat information from the Community Facilities table above.

**RESPONSE:**

Scoring:

2 points for one item

4 points for two items

5 points for three or more items

**A12) OTHER INFORMATION (Weight: SCIP = 2; LTIP = 2)**

What other information should the District 3 Committee know that would warrant additional points? Highlight qualities and characteristics that would not be evident elsewhere in the application.

Examples:

* Unusual/unique and relevant material
* Innovative green construction techniques (LEED certification, green infrastructure, etc.)
* Project characteristics considered under other criteria, which either do not meet the standards to receive points or greatly exceed the guidelines for maximum points

**RESPONSE:**

**A13) ABILITY & EFFORT TO FINANCE THE PROJECT (Weight: SCIP= 2; LTIP = 2)** – ORC 164.06(B)(6), 164.14(E)(6)

Is the unfunded project cost more than 25% of the subdivision’s total general fund plus any other funds that can be used for this type of infrastructure? The **unfunded project cost** is the total project cost less any Other Match sources in Criterion S2 (federal, state, private, etc.).

*** Documentation Required***

*To receive credit, the applicant is required to submit a copy of the subdivision’s Annual Tax Budget for the year commencing January 1, 2024. ORC 5705.28 asks subdivisions to submit these budgets to the Franklin County Auditor's office in July 2023. The applicant must highlight or mark the portions of the budget eligible to fund this project. For an application in which more than one subdivision is contributing to the Applicant Match, submit the Annual Tax Budget for the subdivision making the largest contribution to the project.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Documented** | **Percentage of Subdivision’s Total Funds** **for the Infrastructure Type** | **Points** |
|  | Unfunded project cost represents **less than 25%** of subdivision's total annual funding that can be used for this project. | 0 |
|  | Unfunded project cost represents **25% to 50%** of subdivision's total annual funding that can be used for this project. | 3 |
|  | Unfunded project cost represents **more than 50%** of subdivision's total annual funding that can be used for this project. | 5 |

**A14) SPECIAL TAX OR FEE (Weight: SCIP= 3; LTIP = 3)** – ORC 164.14(E)(6)

Complete the table that follows to show any taxes, fees, or funding mechanisms devoted to local public infrastructure eligible for SCIP or LTIP. The revenue source does not have to be directly related to the project in the application. The purpose of this question is to determine the level of effort the applicant has made to fund its infrastructure by enacting a special tax or fee to improve its infrastructure.

*** Documentation Required***

*Documentation (e.g. legislation) is required for any specific tax or fee,* *except for the optional motor vehicle license fee and TIFs that are included in the* [*Franklin County Auditor’s Tax Incentive Hub*](https://franklin-county-tax-incentives-fca.hub.arcgis.com/pages/tif)*.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Check If Documented** | **Special Tax or Fee** |
|  | Permissive $5 motor vehicle license fee  |
|  | Additional permissive $5 motor vehicle license fee  |
|  | Storm water management fee  |
|  | Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Revenue  |
|  | Other (specify, e.g., road levy): |

Scoring:

3 points for one item

5 points for two or more items

**A15) PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE & TRANSIT ACCOMMODATION (Weight: SCIP = 2; LTIP = 2)**

When designing accommodations for all users of the transportation system, it is important to ensure safety, ease of use, and ease of transfer between modes. Information about Complete Streets and a toolkit that contains information on different roadway scenarios that accommodate all user is available at: <http://www.morpc.org/tool-resource/complete-streets/>. Applicants are encouraged to contact MORPC for assistance in designing their project.

Consider the following questions and respond below:

Describe the current accommodations for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users within the project area

**RESPONSE:**

What modifications, improvements, or additions to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit accommodations are included in the project scope? These could include installation, repair, replacement, or other modifications.

**RESPONSE:**

What pedestrian, bicycle and transit accommodations were considered when developing the project scope? Please provide an explanation of any factors which led to pedestrian, bicycle or transit accommodations not being included in the project scope.

**RESPONSE:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Accommodations & Improvements** | **Points** |
| There will be all of the appropriate pedestrian, bicycle and/or transit accommodations, and the project will add or improve them. | 5 |
| There will be all of the appropriate pedestrian, bicycle and/or transit accommodations, but the project will not add or improve them. | 4 |
| There will be some, but not all, of the appropriate pedestrian, bicycle and/or transit accommodations, and the project will add or improve them. | 3 |
| There will be some, but not all, of the appropriate pedestrian, bicycle and/or transit accommodations, but the project will not add or improve them. | 2 |
| There will not be any appropriate pedestrian, bicycle or transit accommodations. However, it would be unreasonable to expect the project to improve them because of reasons provided by the applicant | 1 |
| There will not be any appropriate pedestrian, bicycle or transit accommodations, and the project would reasonably be expected to provide accommodations | 0 |

**A16) JOINT FINANCIAL PARTNERSHIPS (Weight: SCIP = 1; LTIP = 1)** – ORC 164.14(E)(7)

Complete the following table if the project is a joint financial partnership where another agency provides **at least 10% of the required local match or 1% of the total project cost (whichever is higher)** as part of the local share. Eligible participating local entities are all political and taxing jurisdictions in Franklin County. Funds provided by federal or state agencies are not eligible for this criterion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Check If Documented** | **Participating Local Entity** | **Match Provided** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*** Documentation Required***

*A letter documenting financial commitment between the agencies must be attached.*

*NOTE: If your project is a joint project in which two or more political subdivisions are contributing funds to the project, regardless of the portion, OPWC will require an executed cooperation agreement prior to releasing funds. In the application to District 3, a letter of agreement signed by a representative of the subdivision(s) cooperating with the applicant may serve as a placeholder for an executed agreement. However, if District 3 approves funding for the joint project, OPWC will require an executed agreement. The applicant will need to execute a cooperative agreement by the June following the application submittal (June 2024) to receive OPWC funding.*

The score will be determined by the type of partnership in the table below. All partnerships must meet minimum criteria above to receive points.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Partnership** | **Points** |
| **1 entity** is partnering with applicant, providing **less than 20%** of the total project cost | 3 |
| **1 entity** is partnering with applicant, providing **more than 20%** of the total project cost | 5 |
| **2 or more entities** are partnering with applicant | 5 |

District 3 – Franklin County, Ohio

SCIP/LTIP INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

PWIC METHODOLOGY FOR SCORING

STAFF EVALUATION CRITERIA – Round FY25

# Staff Evaluation Criteria

**Instructions:** Read each criterion carefully and respond, if necessary, as directed. Most Staff Evaluation Criteria are scored using information entered into the Ohio Public Works Commission Application for Financial Assistance (on Public WorksWise) and the Applicant Evaluation Criteria. The **RESPONSE** prompts indicate places where the applicant is expected to provide information. The other criteria are provided here to inform the applicant of the scoring methodology.

*Staff will review the information contained in the application to score each of the questions outlined below.*

*Each question (S1- S12) is worth between 0-5 points (raw score). Final score for each question is determined by multiplying the raw score times the weight for each question.*

The Overmatch is the portion of the match that exceeds the Required Minimum Match. Applications that provide an Overmatch earn points for S1 or S2, depending on the source of the match.

Funds from other sources are weighted more heavily than those from the applicant because: the applicant is leveraging OPWC funds, thereby using all available resources; because it demonstrates that another agency has seen enough merit in the applicant’s project to commit funding to it; and the OPWC assistance may prevent the loss of the other funds to the district, if the applicant could not otherwise find enough funding to proceed with the project.

**APPLICANT MATCH – (Weight: SCIP =2; LTIP = 2)** – ORC 164.06(B)(6)

**S1) Is the applicant or other responsible local public agency putting more than the required minimum into the project?**

The Applicant Match is the total local revenues committed to the project by the applicant and any other local agencies that have the responsibility to maintain a portion of the project. It includes:

* Any funds from another local entity that has any maintenance responsibility for the project.
* Tax increment fund (TIF) revenues.
* Permissive license fee revenues, county motor vehicle license tax revenues, or any other funds held by the Franklin County Engineer that are earmarked for a specific local agency.
* Any funds under control of the applicant or other local agencies that have any responsibility to maintain a portion of the project.
* The portion of funds from a Special Improvement District (SID) that were paid by the applicant.

**RESPONSE:** Enter the Applicant Match information.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Local Subdivision with Maintenance Responsibility** | **Cash Contribution** | **In-Kind or Force Account Contribution** |
| Applicant |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |

The Applicant Match does not include federal, state, or private sources or any other sources included in Other Match (Criterion S2).

*** Documentation Required***

*If any agencies, other than the applicant, that have any responsibility to maintain a portion of the project are contributing to the Applicant Match, the applicant must provide a letter of commitment or intent from the entity providing the funds.*

**SCIP**

The Required Minimum Match for SCIP assistance is 10 percent of the repair/replacement portion of the project cost and 50 percent of the new/expansion portion of the project cost.

For SCIP scoring, the SCIP Applicant Match is the sum of the Applicant Match and the SCIP loan requested on the application.

The Applicant Overmatch is the percentage of SCIP Applicant Match minus the percentage Required Minimum Match.

*(Applicant does not need to fill in this table. Staff will perform calculations.)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SCIP Applicant Match: | % | (Local Public Agency Funds + SCIP Loan Request) |
| Required Minimum Match: | % | (10% for repair/replace & 50% for new/expansion) |
| Applicant Overmatch (if > 0)ORUnmet Minimum Match (if < 0) | % | (SCIP Applicant Match - Required Minimum Match) |

If the SCIP Applicant Match is less than the Required Minimum Match, there is unmet minimum match, which must be met with Other Match (S2). The Applicant Overmatch becomes the Unmet Minimum Match in S2.

**LTIP**

There is no Required Minimum Match for LTIP grants. Therefore, the Applicant Overmatch is equal to the Applicant Match.

Points for SCIP and LTIP are awarded on the size of the Applicant Overmatch.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Applicant Overmatch (%) |  |  |
| Greater than or equal to | and | Less than  | earns | Points |
| — | < | 5% |  | 0 |
| ≥ 5% | < | 15% |  | 1 |
| ≥ 15% | < | 25% |  | 2 |
| ≥ 25% | < | 35% |  | 3 |
| ≥ 35% | < | 45% |  | 4 |
| ≥ 45% |  | — |  | 5 |

**OTHER MATCH** **– (Weight: SCIP = 4; LTIP = 8)** – ORC 164.06(B)(7), 164.14(E)(4)

**S2) What other funds (federal, state, private) will be utilized in the project's undertaking?**

Other Match contributions come from sources that are not under the control of the applicant and **not** from agencies with maintenance responsibility for a portion of the project. Applications that attract Other Match and that provide an Overmatch earn points. The Required Minimum Match is first counted against the Applicant Match (S1). Sources of Other Match may include:

* State, federal, or other public sources.
* Private contributions, such as from a developer.
* County Engineer contributions, if the county has no maintenance responsibility for any portion of the project.
* Portion of Special Improvement District (SID) that were not paid by the applicant.

*** Documentation Required***

*The applicant must provide a letter of commitment or intent from any entities contributing to the Other Match.*

**RESPONSE:** Enter the Other Match information below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Other Match Contributor** | **Revenue Contribution** | **Value of In-Kind Contribution** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |

The Other Match does not include funding from the applicant or any other sources included in Applicant Match (Criterion S1).

**SCIP**

There is a Required Minimum Match for SCIP Assistance, which was determined for S1. To determine the Other Overmatch, the Other Match must be reduced by any Unmet Minimum Match, also determined in S1.

*(Applicant does not need to fill in this table. Staff will perform calculations.)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Other Match: | % |  |
| Unmet Minimum Match (if any): | % | From S1, must be < 0. |
| Other Overmatch: | % | (Other Match + Unmet Minimum Match) |

**LTIP**

There is no Required Minimum Match for LTIP grants. Therefore, the Other Overmatch is equal to the Other Match.

Points for SCIP and LTIP are awarded on the size of the Other Overmatch.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Other Overmatch (%) |  |  |
| Greater than or equal to | and | Less than  | earns | Points |
| — | < | 5% |  | 0 |
| ≥ 5% | < | 15% |  | 1 |
| ≥ 15% | < | 25% |  | 2 |
| ≥ 25% | < | 35% |  | 3 |
| ≥ 35% | < | 45% |  | 4 |
| ≥ 45% |  | — |  | 5 |

**SCIP LOAN REQUEST – (Weight: SCIP= 6; LTIP =0)**

**S3) What portion of the total SCIP assistance requested is in the form of a loan or loan assistance?**

The following points will be awarded as long as the SCIP loan requested is no less than $50,000 OR the applicant requests 100% of their assistance in the form of a loan or loan assistance, whichever is less:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Loan Portion of Request |  |  |
| Greater than or equal to | and | Less than  | earns | Points |
| — | < | 10% |  | 0 |
| ≥ 10% | < | 25% |  | 1 |
| ≥ 25% | < | 60% |  | 3 |
| ≥ 60% | < | 100% |  | 5 |

**APPLICANT’S ECONOMIC CONDITION**  **– (Weight: SCIP= 5; LTIP = 0)** – ORC 164.06(B)(8)

**S4) What is the subdivision’s per capita income?**

**(See staff look up table**.)

Agencies with fewer resources available to them earn more points than agencies with more resources. In practice, the community’s per capita income is used as a surrogate for its financial health. Per capita income is taken from census data and cannot be directly affected by the applicant.

**USEFUL LIFE – (Weight: SCIP = 0; LTIP = 1)**

**S5) What is the project’s composite useful life?**

Use the Design Service Capacity & Useful Life Worksheet to determine the weighted useful life of the project. Staff will use the following table to score the useful life.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Useful Life (Years) |  |  |
| Greater than or equal to | and | Less than  | earns | Points |
| 7 | < | 10 |  | 1 |
| 10 | < | 20 |  | 2 |
| 20 | < | 30 |  | 3 |
| 30 | < | 40 |  | 4 |
| 40 |  | — |  | 5 |

If the useful life of any component exceeds the typical useful life outlined in the worksheet instructions, please explain in the response below, and provide any Supportive Documentation if necessary.

**RESPONSE:**

**OLDER LAND-LOCKED SUBURBS (Weight: SCIP= 1; LTIP = 1)**

**S6) Is this project within an older land locked suburb and only repairing or replacing aging infrastructure?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Points |
| Yes | 5 |
| No | 0 |

To receive credit, the following conditions must be met:

1. The project is within the corporate boundary of an “older land locked suburb,” that is, a municipal corporation with a boundary that has been primarily fixed for at least 30 years and for which no substantial opportunity exists for further expansion. These municipalities are listed below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Bexley | Riverlea |
| Brice | Valleyview |
| Grandview Heights | Whitehall |
| Marble Cliff | Worthington |
| Minerva Park | Upper Arlington |

1. The costs of the proposed project are 100% for the repair or replacement of infrastructure as certified on the Design Service Capacity & Useful Life Certification.

**LAST ROUND FUNDED – (Weight: SCIP = 1; LTIP = 1)**

**S7) In what round did the applicant last receive any form of OPWC** **funding: SCIP; LTIP; or the Small Government Commission?**

Staff will use OPWC records to determine the last round in which the applicant received OPWC assistance and determine the number of years that have since elapsed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Years Since Last OPWC Award** | **Points** |
| 0 to 2 | 0 |
| 3 to 4 | 1 |
| 5 to 6 | 3 |
| 7 or more | 5 |

**PERCENT NEW/EXPANSION – (Weight: SCIP= 2; LTIP =0)** – ORC 164.06(B)(1)

**S8)** **What percent of this project is new or expansion?**

Complete the Design Service Capacity & Useful Life Worksheet to determine the percentage of the project that is for new infrastructure or expansion of existing infrastructure.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Expansion (%) |  |  |
| Greater than or equal to | and | Less than  | earns | Points |
| — | < | 0% |  | 5 |
| ≥ 0% | < | 25% |  | 4 |
| ≥ 25% | < | 50% |  | 3 |
| ≥ 50% | < | 75% |  | 2 |
| ≥ 75% | < | 90% |  | 1 |
| ≥ 90% |  | — |  | 0 |

**PERCENT ROAD, BRIDGE, OR STORM DRAINAGE – (Weight: SCIP= 2; LTIP = 0)** – ORC 164.06(B)(3)

**S9) What percent of this project is for road, bridge, or storm drainage infrastructure?**

Complete the Design Service Capacity & Useful Life Worksheet to determine the percentage and calculate the score.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | % × 5 = |  | points |

The District 3 Committee emphasizes the use of SCIP funds for projects that do not have a direct relationship with a user fee collection. In the SCIP program, projects with higher proportions of road, bridge, or storm drainage components earn more points.

**CONSTRUCTION START – (Weight: SCIP=1; LTIP=1)**

**S10) Is the project award date on or before May 31, 2025, and does the applicant have fewer than two delinquent projects from earlier rounds?**

It is important that projects start construction within the program year. To encourage projects to meet this requirement, projects that are scheduled to award a construction contract by May 31 of the program year are eligible to receive points. The award date is the Bid Advertisement and Award End Date on the OPWC application form.

Local agencies are also encouraged to complete construction and close out projects with OPWC without undue delay, because any unused project funds will become available for current applications.

Projects that do not begin construction and close out in a timely fashion are considered delinquent. A project is delinquent when any of the following conditions are met:

* Projects awarded assistance in FY23 (Round 36) or earlier that have not started construction by June 1, 2023. Staff will contact applicants to obtain the construction status of their projects by June 30.
* Projects awarded assistance in FY20 (Round 33) or earlier that have not been closed out with OPWC by June 30, 2023. “Closed out” means final disbursement has been requested and the appropriate paperwork has been submitted to OPWC to close this project.

Beginning in FY26, projects awarded assistance in FY25 (this round) or earlier will be considered delinquent if they have not been awarded by June 30, 2025.

If the project award date is on or before May 31, 2025, then points will be awarded as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Delinquent Projects** | **Points** |
| 0 | 5 |
| 1 | 3 |
| 2 or more | 0 |

Applicants with delinquent projects will be notified by July 31, 2023.

**TOWNSHIP – (Weight: SCIP = 0; LTIP = 2)** – ORC 164.14(E)(8)

**S11) Is the applicant a township?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Points |
| Yes | 5 |
| No | 0 |

Because the District Committee has difficulty in reaching its statutory goal for providing a certain portion of the LTIP funding to townships, bonus points are awarded to township applicants under the LTIP program.

**PORTION OF OPWC FUNDS REQUESTED – (Weight: SCIP = 2; LTIP = 1)** – ORC 164.06(B)(5)

**S12)** **What is the total amount of OPWC assistance requested?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Total **SCIP** Assistance Requested |  |  |
| Greater than or equal to | and | Less than  | earns | Points |
| — | < | $1,000,000 |  | 5 |
| ≥ $1,000,000 | < | $2,000,000 |  | 3 |
| ≥ $2,000,000 | < | $5,000,000 |  | 1 |
| ≥ $5,000,000 | < | — |  | 0 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LTIP** Grant Requested |  |  |
| Greater than or equal to | and | Less than | Earns | Points |
| — | < | $1,000,000 |  | 5 |
| ≥ $1,000,000 | < | $3,500,000 |  | 3 |
| ≥ $3,500,000 | < | — |  | 0 |

**Staff Look-Up Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGENCY** | **TYPE** | **SMALL (1)** | **ECOCOND (2)** | **MVLICFE (3)** | **TOWNSHIP** |  |
| Bexley | City |   | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Canal Winchester | City |   | 3 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Columbus | City |   | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Dublin | City |   | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Gahanna | City |   | 3 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Grandview Heights | City |   | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Grove City | City |   | 3 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Groveport | City |   | 3 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Hilliard | City |   | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |
| New Albany | City |   | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Obetz | City |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Reynoldsburg | City |   | 3 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Upper Arlington | City |   | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Westerville | City |   | 3 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Whitehall | City |   | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Worthington | City |   | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Blendon | Township |   | 3 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Brown | Township | Y | 2 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Clinton | Township | Y | 4 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Franklin | Township |   | 4 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Hamilton | Township | Y | 4 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Jackson | Township | Y | 3 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Jefferson | Township |   | 2 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Madison | Township |   | 3 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Mifflin | Township | Y | 3 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Norwich | Township | Y | 2 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Perry | Township | Y | 2 | 2 | 5 |  |
| Plain | Township | Y | 1 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Pleasant | Township |   | 3 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Prairie | Township |   | 3 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Sharon | Township | Y | 2 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Truro | Township | Y | 4 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Washington | Township | Y | 2 | 0 | 5 |  |
| Brice | Village | Y | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Harrisburg | Village | Y | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Lockbourne | Village | Y | 4 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Marble Cliff | Village | Y | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Minerva Park | Village | Y | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Riverlea | Village | Y | 2 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Urbancrest | Village | Y | 5 | 1 | 0 |  |
| Valleyview | Village | Y | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |
| Franklin County | County |   | 3 | 2 | 0 |  |
| Jefferson W/S | District |   | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |
| (1) SMALL - Any community with a 2020 population of 5,000 or less |
| (2) ECOCOND- based on 2020 per capita income |
| (3) MVLICFE - communities that have enacted one or two $5 increments of the local motor license fee per Chapter 4504 of the Ohio Revised Code. Source: https://www.bmv.ohio.gov/doc-fees.aspx  |

**Instructions for Completing the**

**Design Service Capacity & Useful Life Worksheet:**

***Column a:*** Check all the individual components of the infrastructure that are involved in your project. If there are additional components that are not listed, add them in the blank rows provided. Do not include right-of-way or any engineering.

***Column b:*** Indicate the total cost for each infrastructure component. This should have already been accomplished as part of preparing the engineer’s estimate of the project cost, which should have been divided into the major infrastructure components (see above). Total column b.

***Column c***: Indicate the percentage portion repair or replacement of existing infrastructure that does not substantially increase designed service capacity. Roadway appurtenances or features that contribute to improved safety such as sidewalks, lighting, turn lanes, and upgrades to traffic control will be considered repair/replacement when they are incidental to the project. (These incidental items should not exceed one-third of the total construction costs.) If the existing facility is not being abandoned or repaired, but a new facility is being built, it shall be considered as an expansion project.

***Column d***: Calculate the dollar-repair/replacement product by multiplying column b by column c and insert the total in column d.

***Column e:*** Indicate the individual useful life for each component. If the useful life of any component exceeds the typical useful life outlined below, the applicant must provide Supportive Documentation in the application to verify.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Infrastructure Component** | **Typical Useful Life** |
| Bridge | 75 years |
| Electrical traffic control & lighting | 12 years |
| Full-depth road construction | 25 years |
| Less than full-depth replacement | 15 years |
| Multi-use path | 15 years |
| Pump, lift station, equipment | 15 years |
| Sanitary sewer | 40 years |
| Sidewalk | 25 years |
| Storm sewer | 40 years |
| Water line | 40 years |

***Column f:*** Calculate the dollar-useful life product for each component by multiplying column b by column e and insert the total in column f.

***At the bottom of the form:***

**g.** Calculate the average repair/replacement portion of the project by dividing the total of column d by the total of column b.

**h.**  Calculate the average expansion portion of the project by subtracting the project average repair/replacement percent from 100%.

**i.**  Calculate the average useful life of the project by dividing the total of column f by the total of column b.

**j.**  Calculate the road/bridge/storm portion of the project by dividing the sum of the road/bridge/storm components by the total of column b.

The resulting values of **g., h., and i.** at the bottom of the worksheet must match the corresponding values on the OPWC application and must appear on the Professional Engineer’s Certification form.

**Design Service Capacity & Useful Life Worksheet**

This worksheet is available in Excel format on MORPC’s website.

All applications to the District 3 Public Works Integrating Committee must include this or a similar worksheet.

Applicant:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Project:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **(a)** | **(b)** | **(c)** | **(d)** | **(e)** | **(f)** |
| **Major Component\*** | **Cost ($1,000)** | **Portion Repair / Replace (%)** | **Repair / Replace Product** | **Useful Life (Years)** | **Useful Life Product** |
| **Road/Bridge/Storm**  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bridge |  |  |  | 75 |  |
| Full-depth road construction w/ drainage |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Full-depth road construction w/o drainage |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Partial-depth road construction w/ drainage |  |  |  | 15 |  |
| Partial-depth road construction w/o drainage |  |  |  | 15 |  |
| Storm Sewer |  |  |  | 40 |  |
| Sidewalk |  |  |  | 25 |  |
| Multi-Use Path |  |  |  | 15 |  |
|   |  |  |  |   |  |
| **Non-Road/Bridge/Storm**  |  |  |  |   |  |
| Sanitary Sewer |  |  |  | 40 |  |
| Water Lines |  |  |  | 40 |  |
| Pump, Lift Station |  |  |  | 15 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total** |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Major Infrastructure Components should correspond to the subtotaled elements in the engineer's detailed estimate.

**(g) Portion Repair/Replacement:** S (d)/ S (b) =  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %**

**(h) Portion New or Expansion:** 100% - S (d)/ S (b) = **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %**

**(i) Weighted Useful Life:** S (f)/ S (b) =  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ years**

**(j) Portion Road/Bridge/Storm (RBS):** S (b for RBS)/ S (b) =  **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ %**

**Certification of Detailed Cost Estimate,**

**Design Service Capacity & Useful Life**

**(Must be certified by a registered professional engineer)**

**Project:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Detailed Cost Estimate**

As required by Rule 164-1-16(A) of the Ohio Administrative Code, I hereby certify the prudence of the dollar amounts contained in Project Estimated Costs - Section 1.1 on the OPWC Application and as outlined on the Engineer's Detailed Cost Estimate.

**Design Service Capacity**

In addition, as per 164-1-14(C), I attest that the costs entailed in this project are

**\_\_\_\_\_% for repair** of existing infrastructure without substantially increasing design service capacity or replacement of existing infrastructure with infrastructure that has a design service capacity substantially equivalent to the design service capacity of the existing infrastructure and

**\_\_\_\_%** **for new** infrastructure that adds to existing infrastructure or expansion that replaces existing infrastructure with infrastructure that has a design service capacity substantially greater than the design service capacity of the existing infrastructure,

regardless of the relative physical dimensions of the existing or replacement infrastructure or that uses a substantially different service technology than is used by the existing infrastructure.

**Useful Life**

Further, as required by Rule 164-1-13(A) of the Ohio Administrative Code, I hereby state that this project will result in infrastructure with **a minimum useful life of \_\_\_\_ years** as determined in accordance with generally accepted engineering principles and practices within this state and taking into account both the specific climatic and other environmental conditions of the infrastructure's site as well as the infrastructure's full, anticipated design use loads.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Professional Engineer's Signature & Official Seal***

***(Electronic versions are acceptable)***