

**To be used for Program Years 2018/2019 Applications.
Approved on June 15, 2017.**

**LUCAS COUNTY
DISTRICT 12 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
STANDING RULES**

I. INTEGRATING COMMITTEE

- 164.04(B) A. The nine appointments to the Integrating Committee are for terms of 3 years and the person may be reappointed for additional term/s.
- B. All formal actions by Committee will be by members or their designated alternates.
- 164.04(A)(3) C. The appointment of the private sector member shall be by a majority of the committee members.
- 164.04 (A)(3) D. The affirmative vote of at least seven (7) committee members is required for any action taken by a vote of the committee.

II. PREREQUISITES FOR PROJECT CONSIDERATION:

- 164.06 A. An adopted 5-year Capital Improvement Plan with priorities exists for the sponsoring
164-1-31 jurisdiction and is on file with the District including a two year maintenance of effort report.
- 164 1-21 B. Complete the project application in accordance with the requirements of District 12 and Chapter 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code.
- 164 1-13(A) C. No project shall be approved for funding unless the project is designed to have a useful life of at least seven years. In addition, the average weighted useful life of all projects submitted in one Program Year shall not be less than twenty years.
- 164.06 D. A complete inventory including condition rating of the jurisdiction infrastructure
164-1-31 exists and documentation is on file with the District.
- 164-1-15 E. The project estimate must separately show non-eligible cost items and must show
164-1-31 the division of items between repair/replacement and new/expansion, if applicable.
- D.I.C. F. 164.14(B) of the Ohio Revised Code states that L.T.I.P. grants may provide up to one hundred percent of the estimated cost of a project. But the D.I.C. recommends design and engineering plan preparation should be the minimum amount of applicant's local share. When design and engineering is in-house, the applicant will make a minimum 10% cash contribution toward the total project cost. If a jurisdiction demonstrates this recommendation to be a financial hardship, the D.I.C. will review the

- circumstances and determine if a waiver is deemed appropriate.
- 164.05 (D) G. S.C.I.P. funding shall not exceed ninety percent of the estimated total cost of the capital improvement project.
- 164.05(D) H. S.C.I.P. funding for new or expanded infrastructure shall not exceed fifty percent of the estimated cost of the new or expansion elements of the capital improvement project.
- 164.05(D)(4) I. S.C.I.P. monies and L.T.I.P. monies can not be used together to fund a infrastructure improvement project.

III. RANKING OF PROJECTS

- 164.04(A)(3)
164-1-11 A. Project ranking will be approved by at least seven (7) of the nine (9) committee members and in accordance with the District evaluation criteria.
- 164.06 (B) B. The Committee reserves the authority to revise local funding allocations depending on the number of applications submitted and the total amount of funding requested in any one year.
- D.I.C. C. A project application approved for funding in a program year other than the current year is considered a pipeline project. An applicant will start the design of their pipeline(s) as soon as they are formally notified of their status from the funding round. If during the funding round review, a pipeline project's progress is determined to be behind schedule and will not make its original timetable, it will be removed from the pipeline and the sponsor will have to re-submit the application for possible funding. A pipeline project's funding will remain secured only if it stays on schedule.
- D. A pipeline project application must be submitted to District 12 administration thirty (30) days prior to the submittal date for new applications. If the pipeline project application is not complete, it will be treated as a new project and will have to compete with all the new project submittals. To be considered complete, a pipeline must have:
1. Plans should be substantially underway if not complete. Simplified plans may be exempt with statement verifying such.
 2. Based on the application, right of way is on schedule.
 3. A complete and signed OPWC application – most current version
 4. Legislation
 5. Status of Funds/Loan Letter – follow OPWC template.
 6. Detailed cost estimate and useful life statement – signed and certified.

IV. LOAN REQUIREMENTS AND LOAN PROJECTS

D.I.C. A. The Ohio Public Works Commission encourages Districts to fund future infrastructure needs by the increased use of low or no interest loans in the current program. 164.05(j) of the Ohio Revised Code (O.R.C.) States a minimum of twenty percent (20%) of a District=s yearly S.C.I.P. allocation shall be used for Loans or Local Debt Support and Credit Enhancement. But to provide a continuing program for future matching funds for Capital Improvements in Lucas County, the District Integrating Committee has set a loan percentage requirement for S.C.I.P. funds over the minimum percentage required by the O.R.C. Those percentage for the following

Program Years are as follows:

	<u>District 12</u>
Program Year 2000-2016	20%

D.I.C. All projects are subject to this District Loan requirement for each Program Year. The D.I.C. will select the highest ranked project that requests a Loan and proceed in a descending order until this requirement is met. If this requirement can not be met with the projects that request Loans, then this requirement will be fulfilled by beginning with the highest ranked project which had its Grant funding request reduced or denied and proceed in an descending order through all applications until this Loan requirement is met.

B. All other projects may be resubmitted as if it were a new project.

D.I.C. C. *Loan terms for the numerous infrastructure improvements are:

Roads	10 yrs.	Maximum
Bridges	20 yrs.	Maximum
Culverts	20 yrs.	Maximum
Water Supply Systems	20 yrs.	Maximum
Water Distribution	20 yrs.	Maximum
Wastewater Systems	20 yrs.	Maximum
Wastewater Distribution	20 yrs.	Maximum
Stormwater Collection	20 yrs.	Maximum

* In no case will a loan term exceed the certified useful life of a project.

These loan terms are D.I.C. recommended guidelines for the various improvement projects. For Road Improvements, if a ten year loan would cause a jurisdiction financial hardship, the term may be adjusted by the D.I.C. depending on the circumstances presented to the Committee.

164.08 D. Revolving Loan Program Requirements

1. District must first use loan allocations provided under State Capital

Improvements Program (SCIP), then may draw funds from RLP. Districts with significant loan balances under the SCIP or RLP will be requested to submit additional applications.

2. Loans approved under the RLP are not subject to the 20% new and expansion limitations for each Program Year and may fund up to 100% of total projects costs. (S.B. 257)
 3. Grant/Loan combinations for the same project - a SCIP grant with an RLP loan will be allowed. NO Grant/Loan/Loan combinations - a SCIP grant, a SCIP loan and an RLP loan for the same project.
 4. Using RLP funds as match for projects approved under Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) - not allowed.
 5. District will continue to recommend interest rates for loans. Allowable rates will range from 0% to 3% (annual). Allowable terms are the same as for regular S.C.I.P. Loans.
- E. For any project that extends past the boundaries of Lucas County and/or serves non-Lucas County residents, the applicant's funding request will be 50/50 loan/grant combination. This will ensure half of the District's funds will come back to the District.

V. WHEN PREPARING AN O.P.W.C. APPLICATION, THE APPLICANT WILL BE REQUIRED TO:

- 164-1-21 A. Complete the project application in accordance with the requirements of District 12 and Chapter 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code.
- D.I.C. B. Successful applicants will be requested to contribute up to 0.75% of their approved grant amount to cover additional District administration costs over the \$65,000 amount funded yearly by the O.P.W.C. for such Administrative Expenses.
- 164-1-17 C. A multi-jurisdictional project must be accompanied by assurances signed by each jurisdiction that they will cooperate fully with the applicant.
- D.I.C. D. The project sponsor shall cooperate with the District Liaison to provide, in writing, quarterly progress reports to the D.I.C. including the following:
1. Project schedule and progress.
 2. Any changes in funding due to cost overruns or underruns.
 3. **If a jurisdiction does not respond to the District Liaison's request for a**

project update, that jurisdiction will receive a -10 points for each project the next time it applies for possible funding. It will be up to the jurisdiction to have proof that it complied with the Liaison's quarterly request during the project management process. Requests will be done by e-mail.

- 4. The third (3rd) quarter project management request will include a Status Certification Form that will have to be certified and stamped by a Professional Engineer. A single certification will suffice for several projects by a jurisdiction. The Status Certification Form is certifying that the information status on the project management report for the jurisdiction is true and correct for their project(s).**
- 5. If a jurisdiction has not submitted Item #4 to the District Liaison, the new project application(s) will be considered non-compliant and will not be scored by the D.I.C.**

E. Tie Scores: Tie to be broken in following order:

1. Entity not previously funded in the round.
2. Project with the highest score on Question #5.
3. Project with the highest score on Group 2, Question #6.
4. Reduce amount of request equally percentage amongst tied projects.

Note: If the projects at the cut-off all belong to one public jurisdiction, that jurisdiction can determine how the remaining funding can be distributed amongst those projects.

Revised: July 15, 2014; March 19, 2015; June 15, 2017

**LUCAS COUNTY
DISTRICT 12 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA**

164.06(B)(7)	1.	Documented Non-Local Revenue (6 points max): (Verified by a funding source)	
		71% or more	6
		46-70%	4
		26-45%	3
		11-25%	2

164.06(B)(6)	2.	*Percentage of project funded with OPWC funds (14 points max):	
		70% or more	1
		65 - 69%	2
		60 - 64%	3
		55 - 59%	4
		50 - 54%	5
		40 - 49%	9
		35 - 39%	10
		30 - 34%	11
		25 - 29%	12
		20 - 24%	13
		10 - 19% or Less	14

*will use standard rounding procedures

164.06(B)(6)	3.	*Effort and ability of applicant to provide local match funds (2 points max):	
		Partial funds are actually budgeted in the current year to reflect the stage the project is in, i.e. design, R/W, ready for construction.	2
		Jurisdiction has withdrawn on its Local Share commitment within the last 4 years.	-2
		Jurisdiction has defaulted on its Local Share commitment within the last 4 years. This means the project was not built in the year according to the agreement because the local funds were not available.	-4

Note #1: If the application does not have an acceptable Status of Funds Letter and/or Loan Re-Payment Letter, the applicant gets 0 Points (must follow OPWC template(s)).

Note #2: Jurisdiction must submit their budget documents, or portions of, to the District to verify the above. This could include an amended certificate of estimate resources, purchase orders, payroll information, paid invoices, etc.

- 164.14(E)(4) 4. What is the status or availability of Non-Local Revenue requested? (3 points max):
- | | |
|---|---|
| Eligible, application has been made, not funded | 3 |
| Eligible, application has been made, funded | 2 |
| Not eligible, or excellent case not to use | 1 |
| Eligible, but not applying for funds | 0 |
5. Choose either 5(a) or 5(b) - whichever is applicable along with 5(c) (15 points max.) Please check one.
- 164.06(B)(1) (a) What is the remaining useful life of repair and replacement projects?
 164.06(B)(2)
 164.14(E)(9) **1. Past useful life and declining rapidly or substandard (8 to 9 points)**

Examples

Roads

- a. Major Reconstruction 9
- b. Widening & Resurfacing 8
- c. Shoulder Improvements to Standard 8
- d. Signalization 8

Bridges

- a. Replacement 9
- b. Repair < 40% 8

Sanitary Treatment Plants

- a. Replacement/Rehabilitation 9
- b. Operational Improvements to Existing Plants 8
- c. New Process to Existing Plant 8

Storm Sewers

- a. Replacement 9
- b. Bring Up to Standards/Size 8

Culverts

- a. Replacement 9
- b. Repair/Replace Abutment, Drainage Structure, Headwall/Wingwall > 40% 8

Sanitary Sewers / Pump Stations

- a. Replacement/Rehabilitation 9
- b. Sewer Mains/Lateral Replacement/ Rehabilitation 9
- c. CSO/SSO Control and/or Elimination 8
- d. Septic System Replacement 8
- e. Operational Improvements (SCADA, telemetry...) 8

Water Treatment Plant

- a. Replacement/Rehabilitation 9
- b. Operational Improvements to Existing Plants 8
- c. New Process to Existing Plant 8

Waterlines / Pumps / Water Towers

- a. Replacement/Rehabilitation 9
- b. Water Tower added to System for Pressure Stability 8
- c. Operational Improvements (SCADA, telemetry...) 8
- d. Looping water system to stabilize system pressure 8

2. At or near useful life and declining (6 to 7 points)

Examples

Roads

- a. Two Course with Minor Full-Depth Repair 7
- b. One Course with Minor Full-Depth Repair 6
- c. Two Course Resurfacing 6

Bridges

- a. Repair Deck > 40% 6

Sanitary Treatment Plants

- a. Mandated Projects by EPA 7
- b. Recommended Projects by EPA or Health Dept. 6

Storm Sewers

- a. Washout – Starting to Fail 6
- b. Washout – Still Meet Use 6

Culverts

- a. Replace Barrel Section in difficult Location/ Depth 7
- b. Same categories above but difficult Location/ Depth 7
- c. Repair/Replace Headwall/Wingwall > 20% 6
- d. Repair Slab/Abutment > 20% 6
- e. Repair/Reset Culvert Barrel Section 6

Sanitary Sewers / Pump Stations

- a. Mandated Projects by EPA 7
- b. Recommended Projects by EPA or Health Dept. 6

Water Treatment Plant

- a. Mandated Projects by EPA 7
- b. Recommended Projects by EPA or Health Dept. 6

Waterlines / Pumps / Water Towers

- a. Mandated Projects by EPA 7
- b. Recommended Projects by EPA or Health Dept. 6

Preventive Maintenance Resurfacing:

- Two Course 6
- One Course 5
- Not near useful life or declining, but functioning poorly (micro surfacing) 3**

164.14(E)(7)

- (b) The new or expansion project has significance for:
 - District wide significance or need 10
 - Multi-jurisdictional significance or need 8
 - Applicant significance or need 6
 - Neighborhood significance or need 3
 - No real significance or need 0

(c)	Useful Life of Projects	
	20 years & above	5
	15 – 19 years	4
	10 – 14 years	2
	7 – 9 years	

6. Addresses infrastructure needs of the District - existing users not projected users (25 points max). Select one from each Group

164.06(B)(1)

GROUP 1 - Joint Financial Projects (8 points max.)
 Local Share contributing by other Political Jurisdictions
 (Does not include Federal or State agencies)

	1%	1
	2 - 4%	2
	5 - 7%	3
	8 - 10%	4
	11 - 13%	5
	14 - 16%	6
	17 - 19%	7
	20% or More	8

*Included with Application, there must be a letter from each participating jurisdiction indicating the dollar amount (grant or in-kind) it is contributing to the project if the lead agency is to receive points in Group 1. Point(s) are based on the percentage of funds contributed to the Local Share by each contributing Jurisdiction(s). For the purpose of this calculation the agency contributing the largest Local Share will not be considered.

GROUP 2 - Benefit to users

	Benefits more than 20,000 user persons	8
	15,001 to 20,000 user persons	7
	10,001 to 15,000 user persons	6
	7,501 to 10,000 user persons	5
	5,001 to 7,500 user persons	4
	1,001 to 5,000 user persons	3
	100 to 1,000 user persons	2
	0 to 99 user persons	0

D.I.C.

Persons per household = 2.46

***GROUP 3 - Type of project**

(Based on Yearly District C.I.R. Report)

	Stormwater Collection	9
	Wastewater Collection/P.S.	8
	Roads and Streets	7

	Bridges	6
	Culverts	5
164.06(B)(1)	Water Distribution/P.S./Water Towers	4
	Water Supply Systems	3
	Solid Waste	2
	Wastewater Systems	1

*for a combination project with substantial types of different work - weigh the points.

164.06(B)(4) 7. What effect will the project have on Public Health, Safety or Hazard Problems?
 164.14 (E)(1) (10 points max.):

ROADS

Reconstruction (unsafe @ legal speed)	10
Road Reconstruction	8
Road Widening & Resurfacing)	7
Road Resurfacing	6
New Road	3

STORM SEWERS

EPA/Separation	10
Chronic Flooding (structure damage)	8
Inadequate Capacity (land damage)	6
New/Expansion	3

BRIDGES- Sufficiency rating

0-25	10
26-50	8
51-75	6
76-100	3

CULVERTS

Structurally Deficient	10
Geometrically Inadequate	8
Inadequate Capacity	6
New or Expansion	3

SANITARY TREATMENT PLANTS

EPA Orders	10
Update Existing Processes	8
Replace Existing Appurtenances	6
Increase Capacity	3

SANITARY SEWERS/P.S.

EPA Orders	10
Replace (chronic backup or flooding of basements)	8
Replace (inadequate capacity or infiltration)	6
New or Expansion	3

WATER TREATMENT PLANT

EPA Orders	10
Update Existing Processes	8
Replace Existing Appurtenances	6
Increase Capacity	3

WATER LINES/PUMPS/WATER TOWERS

Low Water Pressure or EPA Order	10
Replace due to deficiency such as excessive corrosion, etc.	8
Replace Undersized Waterlines as Upgrading Process	6
New or Expansion	3

164.14(E)(6)
D.I.C.

8. Past history of the applicant community's investment in infrastructure improvements. Use the District's 5 Year C.I.R. Report as guideline: (8 points max):

<u>History of Investing</u>	
Excellent	8
Good	5
Poor	2

164.06(B)(8)
164.14(E)(6)

9. Applicant Subdivisions' economic health based on the most current Median Household Income data available (10 points max.)

<u>MUNICIPALITY</u>	<u>Pts.</u>	<u>MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME</u>	
Ottawa Hills	0	\$110,135.00	VERY EXCELLENT
<u>Monclova Township</u>	0	\$ 96,121.00	
Richfield Township	2	\$ 81,641.00	EXCELLENT
<u>Harding Township</u>	2	\$ 80,625.00	
Whitehouse Village	4	\$ 73,225.00	
Waterville Township	4	\$ 72,652.00	
Sylvania Township	4	\$ 72,602.00	
Waterville City	4	\$ 72,245.00	VERY GOOD
Berkey Village	4	\$ 71,667.00	
Sylvania City	4	\$ 68,488.00	
Jerusalem Township	4	\$ 66,607.00	
<u>Providence Township</u>	4	\$ 64,667.00	
Spencer Township	6	\$ 62,803.00	
Maumee City	6	\$ 52,267.00	GOOD
Washington Township	6	\$ 55,873.00	
Springfield Township	6	\$ 53,767.00	
Swanton Township	6	\$ 51,914.00	
<u>Oregon City</u>	6	\$ 50,605.00	
Holland Village	8	\$ 46,875.00	FAIR
<u>Lucas County</u>	8	\$ 38,773.00	
Harbor View Village	10	\$ 31,734.00	POOR
Toledo City	10	\$ 31,708.00	

164.14(E)(3) 10. Economic, growth or development benefits and opportunities (9 points max):
 (*Based on retaining or creating office/manufacturing jobs only. - No retail or commercial jobs)

- *Direct benefit to the entire district 9
- *Direct benefit to multiple jurisdictions 6
- *Direct benefit to the applicant only 3

*Need letter from company specifically stating anticipated jobs created or retained as a result of this project to get any points

164.06(B)(3) 11. What percentage of the total project cost will be financed with new user fees or assessments. (8 points max)

- 71% or more 8
- 46 - 70% 6
- 26 - 45% 4
- 11 - 25% 2
- 5 - 10% 1

Note: Fees and assessments would only occur if this specific project is built. Must include ordinance that outlines specific project(s) and the amount and terms for user fee or assessment.

D.I.C. 12. Loan Request - (10 points max based on 100%)

- 100% 10
- 90% 9
- 80% 8
- 70% 7
- 60% 6
- 50% 5
- 0-49% 0

Note: Loan request must be in even 10% increments. Not doing so will be rounded down.

164.06(B)(10) 13. Other project factors important or relevant to the District with emphasis placed on
 164.14(E)(10) the following (20 points max):

a) Protects or has positive effect on the environment (3 points)

Air Pollution

Examples:

- Signalization with additional turn lanes 1
- Additional through lane 1 to 2
- Roundabout 3

Water Pollution

Examples:

Overflow	3
Combined Sewers	3
Infiltration/In Flow	1 to 3

Recycled Material

1

List Examples

D.I.C.

- b) For "most important project" to applicant (**10** points)
- c) Amount of funding requested (Negative 10 points to positive 9 points)

0 - \$ 100,000	9	1,000,001 - 1,100,000	-1
\$ 100,001 - \$ 200,000	8	1,100,001 - 1,200,000	-2
\$ 200,001 - \$ 300,000	7	1,200,001 - 1,300,000	-3
\$ 300,001 - \$ 400,000	6	1,300,001 - 1,400,000	-4
\$ 400,001 - \$ 500,000	5	1,400,001 - 1,500,000	-5
\$ 500,001 - \$ 600,000	4	1,500,001 - 1,600,000	-6
\$ 600,001 - \$ 700,000	3	1,600,001 - 1,700,000	-7
\$ 700,001 - \$ 800,000	2	1,700,001 - 1,800,000	-8
\$ 800,001 - \$ 900,000	1	1,800,001 - 1,900,000	-9
\$ 900,001 - \$1,000,000	0	1,900,001 - or Greater	-10

- 14. Does the project promote Smart Growth (6 points max.)
 - a. Projects which rehabilitate or renovate existing infrastructure as opposed to extending new infrastructure to undeveloped areas (3 points)
 - b. Projects which do not increase capacity to undeveloped areas thereby encouraging their development (2 points)
 - c. Projects which reduce roadblocks to redevelopment of and investment in core urban areas. (2 points)
 - d. Projects which increase transportation choices and reduce reliance on the automobile such as developing sidewalks and pedestrian ramps in a developed area which does not have them or developing mass transit facilities in a developed area where these are lacking. (3 points)

Note: An undeveloped area does not necessarily mean any areas outside the city limits of the largest city in Lucas County.

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

- 15. Project Management and Adequacy of Planning (8 points max.)
A project is delinquent when any of the following conditions are met:

- a. Any project from Program Year **2015 or 2016** that has not gone to **construction 100%** by November 1, **2017**.
- b. Any project from Program Year 2015 has not been closed out with OPWC by November 1, **2017**. Closed out means final disbursement has been requested and the appropriate paperwork accepted by OPWC to close this project.

Note: An approved project extension by OPWC does not matter at the district level when evaluating projects with this question. Which means project schedules in the formal project agreements with OPWC does not matter when considering scoring applications. These schedules and extensions are for funding considerations between OPWC and Jurisdictions. There will be multi-million dollar projects that require more than two years to construct (see attached listed projects). These projects will be exempt from the 2017 Funding Round delinquent condition. Multi-year project schedules will be approved by D.I.C. when they approve project funding.

- 1. Applicant has zero delinquent projects (8 points)
- 2. Applicant has one delinquent project (4 points)
- 3. Applicant has two or more delinquent projects (0 points)

16. Past Funding Distribution:

If a jurisdiction has not been approved for District OPWC funds within the past 3 rounds/years, then, their #1 project will get the following points:

3 – 4 Years	4
5 – 6 Years	6
7 or More Years	8

17. Application Submission Policies

- a. No time extensions will be granted for SCIP/LTIP applications. Applications will be due electronically, by mail or dropped off to the Lucas County Engineer’s Office, 1049 S. McCord Road, Building A, Holland, OH 43528 by 4:00 p.m. on the day of the application deadline. Any application received after this time will be rejected and not considered for funding during the current round.
- b. Staff will be subtracting points from the applicant’s final score for missing, incomplete or incorrect information. Each application must contain the items listed on the Application Submission Checklist. Failure to submit these items or items submitted that are incomplete or incorrect will result in points being deducted from the project’s total score in the amount indicated in parentheses.

- 1) Official OPWC application for Financial Assistance Form, pages 1- 6) (4 points penalty). Located on the OPWC website.
 - 2) District 12 Project Ranking Information for current funding round (5 points penalty) Located on the OPWC website.
 - 3) Applicant failed to complete self-scoring (1 point penalty)
 - 4) Engineer's Certifications (following OPWC templates):
 - "Detailed" Professional Engineer's Estimate - Must certify contingency and construction costs (5 points penalty)
 - Must identify design build projects and submit industry standard estimate.
 - Detailed cost estimate includes items that are ineligible for OPWC reimbursement (2 points penalty)
 - Certification by Professional Engineer of Useful Life (3 points penalty)
 - 5) Required Certifications/Agreements (all following OPWC templates):
 - Status of Funds Letter (3 points penalty)
 - Approved Authorizing Legislation (1 point penalty)
 - Cooperation Agreement (if multi-jurisdictional) (1 point penalty)
 - Loan repayment certification Letter if loan or (grant + loan) only (1 point penalty)
 - 6) Map Defining Geographic Scope of Project (1 point penalty)
- c. Deadline for Providing Missing/Corrected Application Information
 Staff will review each application for the required information requested on the Application Submission Checklist. Staff will then inform the applicant by e-mail of any required corrections and will give the applicant five (5) working days to provide the necessary information. Failure to respond within this timeframe will result in staff rejecting the application for that funding round.
- d. Minimum Local Match Must Be Met
 When applying for SCIP or LTIP funding, an applicant must meet the 10% minimum local match requirement in order to be evaluated for funding in that round. Failure to provide the minimum local match will deem the project ineligible for funding in that program and the project will be rejected.

e. Construction Start Date

All projects must have a construction start date no later than May 31 of the year following the program year of funding. If a project's construction start date is June 1, or later, the project will be rejected for consideration for the current round.

Revised: July 15, 2014; March 19, 2015; April 14, 2016; June 15, 2017

G:\data\ENGINEER\DIC Business\Issue 2 Handbook\2017\Project Evaluation Criteria.doc

QUESTION 15 DEADLINES

November 1, 2016:

2014 Projects need to be closed out

2015 Projects need to be let (NTP)

November 1, 2017:

2015 Projects need to be closed out

2016 Projects need to be let (NTP)

November 1, 2018:

2017 Projects need to be closed out

2018 Projects need to be let (NTP)

November 1, 2019:

2018 Projects need to be closed out

2019 Projects need to be let (NTP)

PROJECTS THAT D.I.C. APPROVED AS MULTI-YEAR PROJECTS

2014

Toledo Dearborn CSO Storage - \$10,021,000 (Closed out by November 1, 2017)

Toledo Ottawa River South Storage Basin (Closed out by November 1, 2018)

2015

Oregon WWTP Secondary Treatment Phase 2 (Closed out by November 1, 2018)

2016

Toledo International Park SS Storage Basin (closed out by November 1, 2019)

To be used for Program Years 2018/2019 Applications. Approved on June 15, 2017.

DISTRICT 12 - LUCAS COUNTY
PROJECT RANKING INFORMATION

PROJECT NO. _____

APPLICANT: _____

FOR DISTRICT
USE ONLY

PROJECT NAME: _____

SCORE

1. Non-Local Revenue (minus Local or OPWC funds)
(Verified by a funding source) (6 points max): 1. _____

2. Percentage of project funded with OPWC funds
(14 pts. max): Information on file to be used
by District 2. _____

3. Please mark status of local match funds (2 points max):
Check one

_____ Partial funds are actually budgeted in Current
Year.

_____ Jurisdiction has withdrawn its local share
commitment within the last 4 years.

_____ Jurisdiction has defaulted on its local share
Commitment within the last 4 years. 3. _____

4. What is the status or availability of Non-Local Revenue
Requested (3 points max): Check one and fill in funding
program and dates. **Proof of making application is required.**

_____ Eligible application made, not funded

_____ Eligible application has been made, funded

_____ Not eligible or excellent case not to use

_____ Eligible, but not applying for funds 4. _____

Page #1 Total _____

5. Choose either 5(a) or 5(b), whichever is applicable
10 points max.):

(a) Existing Infrastructure

What is the remaining useful life of repair and replacement projects? Age of facility _____; Describe ability to service or function for present needs _____

Check one:

- _____ Past useful life and declining rapidly or substandard
- _____ At or near useful life and declining

5a. _____

(b) New or Expansion Project:

Check one:

- _____ District wide significance or need
- _____ Multi-jurisdictional significance or need
- _____ Applicant significance or need
- _____ Neighborhood significance or need
- _____ No real significance or need

5b. _____

Explain Choice: _____

(c) Useful Life of Projects (5 pts. Max):

Check one:

- _____ 20 years & above
- _____ 15 - 19 years
- _____ 10 - 14 years
- _____ 7 - 9 years

5c. _____

6. Address infrastructure needs of the District - existing users not projected users (25 points max.)

Percentage of Local Share by contributing Political Jurisdiction(s) other than lead agency (8 pts. max.):
Information on file to be used by District.

Percentage _____%

Group 1 _____

*GROUP 2 - Benefit to users (8 pts. max.)

Check One:

- _____ Benefits more than 20,000 user persons
- _____ 15,001 to 20,000 user persons
- _____ 10,001 to 15,000 user persons
- _____ 7,501 to 10,000 user persons
- _____ 5,001 to 7,500 user persons
- _____ 1,001 to 5,000 user persons
- _____ 100 to 1,000 user persons
- _____ 0 to 99 user persons

Group 2 _____

GROUP 3 - Type of project (9 pts. max.)

Check One:

- _____ Stormwater Collection
- _____ Wastewater Collection/P.S.
- _____ Roads and Streets
- _____ Bridges
- _____ Culverts
- _____ Water Distribution/P.S./Water Towers
- _____ Water Supply Systems
- _____ Solid Waste
- _____ Wastewater Systems

Group 3 _____

Page #3 Total _____

7. What effect will the project have on Public Health, Safety or Hazard Problems? (10 points max.):

Check One:

ROADS

STORM SEWERS

Reconstruction (unsafe @ legal speed) _____
Road Reconstruction _____
Road Widening & Resurfacing _____
Road Resurfacing _____
New Road _____

EPA/Separation _____
Chronic Flooding (structure damage) _____
Inadequate Capacity (land damage) _____
New/Expansion _____

BRIDGES- Sufficiency rating

CULVERTS

0-25 _____
26-50 _____
51-75 _____
76-100 _____

Structurally Deficient _____
Geometrically Inadequate _____
Inadequate Capacity _____
New or Expansion _____

SANITARY TREATMENT PLANTS

SANITARY SEWERS/P.S.

EPA Orders _____
Update Existing Processes _____
Replace Existing Appurtenances _____
Increase Capacity _____

EPA Orders _____
Replace (chronic backup or flooding of basements) _____
Replace (inadequate capacity or infiltration) _____
New/Expansion _____

WATER TREATMENT PLANT

WATER LINES/PUMPS/WATER TOWERS

EPA Orders _____
Update Existing Processes _____
Replace Existing Appurtenances _____
Increase Capacity _____

Low Water Pressure or EPA Order _____
Replace Due To Deficiency Such As Excessive Corrosion, etc. _____
Replace Undersized Waterlines As Upgrading Process _____
New or Expansion _____

Page #4 Total _____

SCORE

8. Past history of applicant community's investment in this type of project (8 points max): C.I.R. on file to be used by District. 8. _____

9. Applicant subdivision's economic health based on the most current Median Household Income Data available - (10 points max): 9. _____

10. Economic growth or development benefits and opportunities (9 points max): check one

Direct Benefit & Opportunity to:

District _____

Multi-juris. _____

Applicant _____

Explain Choice _____

10. _____

11. Percentage of total project cost financed with new user fees or assessments. _____% (8 points max.) 11. _____

12. Loan request _____% (10 points max. based on 100%)

Request Loan? Yes _____ : No _____ 12. _____

13. Other factors important or relevant to Project (20 points max):

(a) Explain if project protects or has positive effect on environment (3 points):

Explain _____

13a. _____

(b) For "most important project" (10 points max.)

Yes _____ : No _____

13b. _____

(c) Amount of funding requested
(Negative 10 points to Positive 9 points)

Please circle the appropriate category:

- 0 - \$ 100,000 \$1,000,001 - \$1,100,000
- \$ 100,001 - \$ 200,000 \$1,100,001 - \$1,200,000
- \$ 200,001 - \$ 300,000 \$1,200,001 - \$1,300,000
- \$ 300,001 - \$ 400,000 \$1,300,001 - \$1,400,000
- \$ 400,001 - \$ 500,000 \$1,400,001 - \$1,500,000
- \$ 500,001 - \$ 600,000 \$1,500,001 - \$1,600,000
- \$ 600,001 - \$ 700,000 \$1,600,001 - \$1,700,000
- \$ 700,001 - \$ 800,000 \$1,700,001 - \$1,800,000
- \$ 800,001 - \$ 900,000 \$1,800,001 - \$1,900,000
- \$ 900,001 - \$1,000,000 \$1,900,001 - or Greater

13c. _____

14. Does the project promote Smart Growth (6 points max.)

(a) Does the project rehabilitate existing infrastructure or create new infrastructure?

Explain: _____

_____ 14a. _____

(b) Does project increase capacity to undeveloped areas?

Explain: _____

_____ 14b. _____

(c) Does project reduce roadblocks to redevelopment of and investment in core urban area?

Explain: _____

_____ 14c. _____

(d) Does project increase transportation choices?

Explain: _____

_____ 14d. _____

SCORE

15. Project Management and Adequacy of Planning - Check appropriate category (8 points max.):

_____ Applicant has zero delinquent projects

_____ Applicant has one delinquent project

_____ Applicant has two or more delinquent projects.

15. _____

16. Past Funding (8 points max.):

No funding in Past 3 - 4 years _____

No funding in Past 5 - 6 years _____

No funding in Past 7 or more years _____

16. _____

17. Project Application Submittal (-27 points max.):

1. Official OPWC Application _____

2. District 12 Ranking Information
Not current or none _____

3. Self-Scored Project _____

4. Engineer's Certification:
•Detailed Cost Estimate _____
•Detailed Cost Estimates includes
ineligible costs _____
•Stamped Useful Life _____

5. Required Certifications/Agreements
•Status of Funds Letter _____
•Legislation _____
•Cooperation Agreement _____
•Loan Re-Payment Letter _____

6. Site Map _____

17. _____

Page #7 Total _____

GRAND TOTAL OF ALL PAGES _____