

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
INTRODUCTION

This document will serve as the official notification to each political subdivision within Mahoning and Trumbull Counties, designated as District 6 within Ohio Revised Code Section 164, that Program Year 2013, comprising the 27th round of funding for the State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) and the 25th round of funding for the Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) is underway. Hereafter, both Round 27 SCIP and Round 25 LTIP will be referred to as Program Year 2013 (or PY13).

The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee (D6PWIC) is charged through ORC 164 to recommend to the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) projects that contribute to improving the district's infrastructure system, but would not be undertaken without financial assistance from either the State Capital Improvement Program or the Local Transportation Improvement Program. This document provides applicants with an overview of District 6's Program Year 2013 requirements and outlines the application and evaluation process. The D6PWIC process will be used to rate each project submitted for consideration to determine its eligibility and the type and amount of financial assistance the applicant should be provided.

To insure that all projects being considered for funding are processed in an efficient and equitable manner ***ALL*** required pre-application documentation ***MUST be submitted before 4:00 p.m., Friday, September 7, 2012*** to be eligible for Program Year 2013 consideration. Updated COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT REPORTS (CIR's) and Five Year Plan/Maintenance of Effort Reports ***MUST*** also be submitted before 4:00 p.m., September 7, 2012 in order for that community to be eligible for consideration for Program Year 2013 funding. ***The information in this document is subject to change by the D6PWIC at any time.***

***DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
DISTRICT 6 PWIC
MEMBERS & ALTERNATES***

The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee was created under Section 164.03 of the Ohio Revised Code, with membership established under Section 164.04 (4), as follows:

“In District Six, the district committee shall consist of nine members appointed as follows:

One member shall be appointed by the board of county commissioners of each county in the district;”

MAHONING COUNTY

Member: **MR. ROBERT LYDEN, P.E. (PY2012 Vice-Chairman)**
MAHONING COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER

**761 INDUSTRIAL ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44509
330-793-5514 (Voice)
330-792-5270 (Fax)
blyden@mahoningcountyoh.gov
Term Expires 27JUN15
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)**

Alternate: **MR. DAVID BENEDETTO**
MAHONING COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER’S OFFICE

**761 INDUSTRIAL ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44509
330-793-5514 Ext. 8208 (Voice)
330-792-5270 (Fax)
dbenedetto@mahoningcountyoh.gov
Term Expires 27JUN15
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)**

TRUMBULL COUNTY

Member: **MR. REX FEE (PY2012 Chairman)**
TRUMBULL COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER'S OFFICE

842 YOUNGSTOWN KINGSVILLE ROAD
VIENNA, OHIO 44473
330-675-2775 (Voice)
330-675-2780 (Fax)
sefee@co.trumbull.oh.us
Term Expires 27JUN15
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: **MR. GARY NEWBROUGH, P.E.**
TRUMBULL COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER

842 YOUNGSTOWN KINGSVILLE ROAD
VIENNA, OHIO 44473
330-675-7753 (Voice)
330-675-2780 (Fax)
senewbro@co.trumbull.oh.us
Term Expires 27JUN15
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

“one member shall be appointed by the chief executive officer of the most populous municipal corporation in each county in the district;”

CITY OF WARREN

Member **MR. PAUL MAKOSKY, P.E.**
CITY ENGINEER

540 LAIRD AVENUE S.E.
WARREN, OHIO 44484
330-841-2973 (Voice)
330-841-2614 (Fax)
pmakosky@warren.org
Term Expires 28JUL15
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate:

Mr. MICHAEL KEYS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

418 South Main Ave.
Warren, Ohio 44483
330-841-2595 (Voice)
330-841-2643 (Fax)
mkeys@warren.org
Term Expires 28JUL15
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

CITY OF YOUNGSTOWN

Member: **MR. CHARLES T. SHASHO**
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF ENGINEERING

26 SOUTH PHELPS STREET
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44503
330-742-8800 (Voice)
330-742-8807 (Fax)
cshasho@cityofyoungstownoh.com
Term Expires 21JUN15
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate:

@cityofyoungstownoh.com
Term Expires
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

“one member shall be appointed alternately by a majority of the chief executives of the municipal corporations, other than the largest municipal corporation, within one of the counties of the district;”

MAHONING MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS

Member **MR. TERRY P. STOCKER**
MAYOR

CITY OF STRUTHERS
6 ELM STREET
STRUTHERS, OHIO 44471
330-755-2181(Voice)
330-755-1550 (Fax)
mayor@cityofstruthers.com
Term Expires 24MAY13
ORC 164.04 (A) (4)

Alternate: **MR. JOSEPH WARINO, P.E., P.S.**
CITY MANAGER

CITY OF CANFIELD
104 LISBON STREET
CANFIELD, OHIO 44406
330-533-1101 (Voice)
330-533-4415 (Fax)
jwarino@ci.canfield.oh.us
Term Expires 24MAY13
ORC 164.04 (A) (4)

“and one member shall be appointed alternately by a majority of the boards of township trustees within one of the counties of the district.”

TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES
TRUMBULL COUNTY

Member: **MR. FRED BOBOVNYK**
WEATHERSFIELD TOWNSHIP FISCAL OFFICER

1861 CLOVERBROOK DRIVE
MINERAL RIDGE, OHIO 44440
330-652-6326 Ext. 105 (Voice)
330-544-7491 (Fax)
fbobovnyk@weathersfieldtwp.com
Term Expires 24MAY13
ORC 164.04 (A) (4)

Alternate: **MS. DARLENE ST. GEORGE**
HOWLAND TOWNSHIP ADMINISTRATOR

205 NILES CORTLAND ROAD
WARREN, OHIO 44484
330-856-6464 (Voice)
330-856- 3278 (Fax)
darlene.stgeorge@twp.howland.oh.us
Term Expires 24MAY13
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

“The two persons who are the county engineers of the counties in the district shall also be members of the committee.”

MAHONING COUNTY

Member: **MR. RICHARD MARSICO, P.E., P.S.**
MAHONING COUNTY ENGINEER

**940 BEARS DEN ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44511
330-799-1581 (Voice)
330-799-4600 (Fax)**

rmarsico@mahoningcountyoh.gov

**Term expires with election/appointment of new engineer
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)**

Alternate: **MS. MARILYN KENNER, P.E.**
CHIEF DEPUTY MAHONING COUNTY ENGINEER

**940 BEARS DEN ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44511
330-799-1581 (Voice)
330-799-4600 (Fax)**

mkenner@mahoningcountyoh.gov

**Term expires with election/appointment of new engineer
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)**

TRUMBULL COUNTY

Member: **MR. RANDY SMITH, P.E., P.S.**
TRUMBULL COUNTY ENGINEER

**650 NORTH RIVER ROAD
WARREN, OHIO 44483
330-675-2640 (Voice)
330-675-2642 (Fax)**

hwsmith@co.trumbull.oh.us

**Term expires with election/appointment of new engineer
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)**

Alternate: **MR. DONALD BARZAK**
TRUMBULL COUNTY ENGINEER’S OFFICE

**650 NORTH RIVER ROAD
WARREN, OHIO 44483
330-675-2255 (Voice)
330-675-2642 (Fax)**

hwbarzak@co.trumbull.oh.us

**Term expires with election/appointment of new engineer
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)**

“At least six of these members shall agree upon the appointment to the committee of a private sector person who shall have experience in local infrastructure planning and economic development.”

PRIVATE SECTOR

Member: **Mr. Gary Machin**

626 Shadowood Lane S.E.

Warren, Ohio 44484

330 – 883 - 2444(Voice)

330- (Fax)

heli21@hotmail.com

Term Expires 09MAY17

ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: **Mr. Michael J. Bertilacci**

71 South Navarre Avenue

Youngstown, Ohio 44515

330 -792 - 9137 (Voice)

330- (Fax)

bert@zoominternet.net

Term Expires 09MAY17

ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
OVERVIEW

AVAILABLE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The following is a preliminary estimate of funding that will be available to District 6 subdivisions from the Ohio Public Works Commission's State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) and the Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) in Program Year 2013:

\$5,099,000 SCIP ALLOCATION TO D6PWIC
\$2,138,000 LTIP ALLOCATION TO D6PWIC
\$1,363,000 REVOLVING LOAN FUND ALLOCATION TO D6PWIC
\$8,600,000 TOTAL ALLOCATION TO D6PWIC

In addition to the above-mentioned funding sources, an additional \$15,000,000 is made available in grants or loans statewide for communities with less than 5,000 in population. The award of these funds is made by the Ohio Public Works Commission-Small Governments Capital Improvements Commission through a statewide competition. These Small Government funds **are not** allocated on a district basis.

Financial assistance will be awarded to the projects selected by the D6PWIC in the form of grants, loans, credit enhancements, and loan assistance, in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code. The D6PWIC is required to program a minimum of 20% of the Districts SCIP allocation for loans and/or loan assistance. In addition, the D6PWIC may award a maximum of 20% of the SCIP funds for new construction. The D6PWIC SCIP funding breakdown is as follows:

\$5,099,000 SCIP TOTAL
\$1,019,800 LOANS/LOAN ASSISTANCE (MINIMUM)
\$4,079,200 SCIP GRANTS (MAXIMUM)
\$1,019,800 NEW CONSTRUCTION (MAXIMUM)

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

The Ohio Public Works Commission will accept final applications for Program Year 2013 through March 1, 2013. The Ohio Public Works Commission's Small Government Program proposals must be included with the D6PWIC submittal. Based on the above deadline, the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee has established the following schedule for the local program:

JUNE 27 and 28, 2012: Pre-application Workshops. Communities receive pre-application information and materials for Program Year 2012.

JUNE 29 to September 7, 2012: Communities prepare pre-applications.

September 7, 2012, 4:00 PM: Deadline for submission of pre-applications, CIRs (CIR'S and Annual Summary) and associated materials to Eastgate Regional Council of Governments. Applicants must submit 1 original and 1 copy of the full pre-application and 20 copies of the 4 page pre-application and location map.

SEPTEMBER 10, to OCTOBER 1, 2012: Processing by Eastgate.

OCTOBER 2, 2012: D6PWIC reviews projects. (3 minutes per project offered to sponsors to present issues and respond to Committee questions).

OCTOBER 23, 2012: D6PWIC will meet to evaluate all of the projects.

NOVEMBER 6, 2012: D6PWIC will meet to address value assignments to all projects, including other factors of regional importance.

NOVEMBER 13, 2012: D6PWIC will meet to provide a final assessment and prioritization of projects to be submitted to the OPWC. The D6PWIC Small Government Subcommittee will also meet to further review and select the projects which will be submitted by District 6 to the administrator of the Ohio Small Gov't. Capital Improvements Commission for consideration for funding.

NOVEMBER 13, to DECEMBER 21, 2012: Communities prepare applications for projects recommended to OPWC.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 21, 2012, 4:00 PM: Communities submit applications to Eastgate Regional Council of Governments.

NO LATER THAN JANUARY 18, 2013: Eastgate Regional Council of Governments will submit applications to the OPWC.

The above schedule may be amended by the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee. Further confirmation of specific dates for Committee and sub committee meetings will be posted on Eastgate's web site at:

<http://www.eastgatecog.org/>

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT REPORT

Each community in District 6 wishing to participate in either the State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) or the Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) SHALL submit and annually update a CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT REPORT as required by Section 164.06 (C) of the Ohio Revised Code:

"Prior to filing an application with its district public works integrating committee for assistance in financing a capital improvement project under this section, a local subdivision shall conduct a study of its existing capital improvements, the condition of those improvements, and the projected capital improvement needs of the subdivision in the ensuing five-year period. After completing this study, the subdivision shall compile a report that includes an inventory of its existing capital improvements, a plan detailing the capital improvement needs of the subdivision in the ensuing five-year period, and a list of the subdivision's priorities with respect to addressing those needs."

The D6PWIC requires ALL Program Year 2013 applicants to complete and file the required annual update of the Capital Improvement Report (CIR) and CIR summary with the Eastgate Regional Council of Governments by September 7, 2012.

The Ohio Public Works Commission has developed a standard reporting format for the Capital Improvement Report (CIR) that must be submitted. No project agreement will be approved or released by the Commission unless a standardized CIR is on file with the Commission. Projects pending release will be rejected by the Commission and returned to the district if an updated CIR for the community is not on file with the Commission.

REQUIRED INVENTORY: The first step in completing the CIR is to inventory infrastructure that is eligible for funding through the OPWC. This five year cycle report was last due at Eastgate for PY 2009 (August 2008). All subdivisions must take a complete inventory of each infrastructure category type under its ownership and maintenance. The inventory included a complete list of individual components and the condition and needed repairs of those components. As part of the inventory, entities must consider the condition of the infrastructure as well as repair and replacement costs. The completed inventory is maintained locally as a management and planning tool, however it must be made available, on request, to OPWC. The inventory should be updated yearly. The completed inventory will be summarized on the inventory SUMMARY, a one page form, and submitted to the District each year to be forwarded to the OPWC. Complete inventories were last submitted by local communities in 2008 (for PY2009). **If your community did not submit a pre-application and inventory since PY08 (calendar 2007), then updated inventories are due to be submitted with your PY2013 pre-application, no later than 4:00 p.m. on September 7, 2012. Updated Inventories Are Due NEXT Year (AUGUST 2013) for ALL Communities.**

REQUIRED FIVE YEAR PLAN: From the completed inventory entities will develop a Five Year Capital Improvement Plan that includes the name, a brief description of the project, project costs, and anticipated year and source of funding. The years covered by the Five Year Plan are 2012 through 2016. The Five Year Plan MUST be submitted to the District to be forwarded to the OPWC on the required FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN/MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT form.

REQUIRED TWO YEAR MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT: As part of a subdivision's Capital Improvement Report, the OPWC requires a listing of infrastructure projects undertaken during the previous two year period (2010 and 2011). This TWO YEAR MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT must include the name, a brief description of the project, project costs, and source of funding. The Two Year Maintenance of Effort MUST be submitted to the District to be forwarded to the OPWC on the required TWO YEAR MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT form.

PRE-APPLICATION

The pre-application is a requirement of the D6PWIC that provides the detailed information and documentation necessary for project evaluation for funding by the committee. All communities seeking funding in Program Year 2013 must submit a pre-application for those projects of highest priority. The necessary forms and instructions for the completion of the pre-application are included in the Program Manual and are available electronically by calling Eastgate. Instructions for the completion of the pre-application are included in Appendix E of this manual.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The D6PWIC will evaluate each project submitted for funding based on the information supplied by each community in the pre-applications. This evaluation will use criteria based on the requirements of Section 164 of the Ohio Revised Code. Evaluations are conducted in open public meetings as required by the Ohio Revised Code. Field checks of proposed projects may be made by committee members and additional documentation may be required to verify information submitted in the pre-applications. The basic methodology to be used in Program Year 2013 may contain revisions in the evaluation rating and criteria system. The committee approves revisions for clarity and objectivity of the rating system. Evaluation considerations that have been developed and refined over the past 26 funding rounds are as follow:

1. a.) Is the applicant the appropriate legal authority for submitting this project?
Does the Applicant own the project? If the Applicant does not own the infrastructure or will not own it when it is built, they cannot apply for OPWC funding for that project!
- b.) Does the project meet the infrastructure needs of the area?
- c.) Is the estimated construction start date of the project before June 30, 2013?

___ *YES ON ALL THREE (CONTINUE)*

___ *NO ON ONE or MORE - **STOP** - PROJECT DOES NOT QUALIFY*

FOR SEWER/WATER PROJECTS ONLY

2a. Does the proposed infrastructure activity improve the general health and welfare of the service area? The Sponsor must confirm with supporting documentation and a Certified Engineering Statement.

Critical - Failed infrastructure requiring complete reconstruction or improvements that are mandated by EPA orders in the form of a consent decree or court orders. 10 points

Significant- Infrastructure requiring repair or rehabilitation of majority of components, or requiring updates or replacements due to EPA findings or recommendations, or chronic backup or flooding, resulting in structure damage. 5 points

Moderate - Infrastructure requiring increased capacity to meet current needs, improve water quality, or to meet a specific development proposal, flooding resulting in land damage. 3 points

No Impact or pre-application lacks documentation/statement 0 points

Include data for either 2b or 2c. Points will be granted in **ONE (1) SECTION ONLY, not both.**

2b. What are the numbers of homes and/or businesses directly impacted by the health and safety hazard? **MUST BE DOCUMENTED** (ex: damage reports, call sheets/work orders).

Homes/Businesses
Impacted

1-2	2 points
3-4	4 points
5-6	6 points
7-8	8 points
9 or more	10 points

2c. In projects that have a service area determined by an engineering study (i.e. sanitary sewer or waterline extensions, waste water or water treatment plant improvements, etc.); what is the number of homes and/or businesses directly impacted?

Homes/Businesses

Impacted

0-19	2 points
20-34	4 points
35-49	6 points
50-79	8 points
80 or more	10 points

FOR TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS ONLY

3a. Will the project alleviate serious traffic problems or hazards or will it respond to needs caused by rapid growth and/or development? These criteria must be documented with Traffic Studies and/or Certified Engineering Statement.

Critical -	Road/bridge reconstruction, including widening and/or geometric improvements <u>as documented by appropriate traffic engineering studies that identify the hazard and recommends the proposed improvement.</u>	10 points
Significant -	Road/bridge reconstruction, including widening and/or geometric improvements.	5 points
Moderate -	Road/bridge improvement that is predominately resurfacing without significant reconstruction, widening, or geometric improvements or a new road that will improve traffic flow and access in the area of construction.	3 points
No Impact -		0 points

3b. What is the Average Daily Traffic of the project area? To be valid, all counts must be provided from a source approved by Eastgate Regional Council of Governments using generally accepted 24 hour traffic counting procedures. **ADT counts must have been conducted no more than five (5) years prior to the date of submitting the pre-application and counts must be conducted within the work limits of the proposed improvement.** Counts will have to be checked against those posted on Eastgate's website (www.eastgatecog.org), since some may not meet the 5 year requirement. Eastgate staff will also conduct any traffic counts required for this program, if given sufficient notification. Please call 330-779-3800.

Existing Traffic		Existing Traffic	
50 ----- 149	2 points	2,500 – 4,999	8 points
150 ----- 999	4 points	5,000 & Over	10 points
1,000 ---- 2,499	6 points		

FOR ALL PROJECTS

4. What is the condition of the infrastructure? **MUST BE DOCUMENTED.**

Critical -	<u>Primary component has failed, and the infrastructure is closed, or inoperable.</u> The infrastructure requires a significant repair/upgrade to return to the intended level of service and meet current design standards. Infrastructure closed for any reason except failure will receive "0" points.	10 points
Poor -	Infrastructure has major deficiency with <u>imminent failure</u> , major repairs are required.	8 points
Moderate -	Infrastructure contains a major deficiency and will require repair in order to function and meet current design standards.	5 points
Fair -	Infrastructure functions as originally intended, but requires minor repairs and/or upgrades to meet current design standards.	3 points
Good -	No repair is required, or no supporting documentation was submitted.	0 points

5. What is the project's local share (all funds other than OPWC)?
- | | |
|------------|-----------|
| OVER 60% | 15 points |
| 31% to 60% | 10 points |
| 16% to 30% | 5 points |
| 11% to 15% | 3 points |
| 0% to 10% | 0 points |
6. Is the OPWC request a loan, loan/grant combination, or credit enhancement?
The committee will not accept any loan application for less than \$50,000.
- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 100 % OPWC Loan/Credit Enhancement | 10 points |
| 76 to 99% OPWC Loan | 6 points |
| 51 to 75% OPWC Loan | 4 points |
| 26 to 50% OPWC Loan | 2 points |
| 1 to 25% OPWC Loan | 0 points |
7. The sponsor community's Median Household Income (MHI) is what percent of the State of Ohio MHI (\$47,358)?
- | | |
|-------------|----------|
| BELOW 70% | 5 points |
| 70 to 79.9% | 4 points |
| 80 to 89.9% | 3 points |
| 90 to 99.9% | 2 points |
8. What is the community priority of this project?
- | | |
|----|-----------|
| #1 | 20 points |
| #2 | 18 points |
| #3 | 16 points |
| #4 | 14 points |
| #5 | 12 points |
| #6 | 10 points |
| #7 | 7 points |
| #8 | 4 points |
| #9 | 2 points |

9. What is the OPWC funding request for the number 1 priority project?

\$1 to \$50,000	15 points
\$50,001 to \$100,000	7 points
\$100,001 to \$150,000	3 points

10. Is the project a joint project between two or more communities that are within the legal boundaries of the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee? Both communities must have a financial commitment in the local share and this commitment must be documented through a legally binding agreement between both communities that shall be submitted with the lead agency's pre-application.

50%-50% Local cost share between communities	5 points
60%-40% Local cost share between communities	4 points
70%-30% Local cost share between communities	3 points
80%-20% Local cost share between communities	2 points
90%-10% Local cost share between communities	1 point

11. Other factors of regional importance.

The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee members, exercising their independent judgment, will utilize this category to determine a projects compliance/consistency with OPWC guidelines, regional plans, policies and/or objectives, development and maintenance of District's infrastructure, and other factors deemed necessary by committee members.

Factors of Regional Importance	0 to 25 points
--------------------------------	----------------

General Notes to D6PWIC Ranking System:

- A. At the conclusion of the 11 criteria ranking process, projects tied in total points will be prioritized in the manner that was approved by the D6PWIC on June 17, 2003. Improvements with the lowest dollar request for D6PWIC funding consideration will be recommended to receive the more favorable priority and improvements with greater dollar requests for funding within the tied field will receive progressively less favorable priority. Examples of project fields tied at 70 and 69 points would be prioritized as follows:

Point Field	Funding Request to D6PWIC	D6PWIC's Final Priority
70	\$60,000	70 Points - Number 1
70	\$75,000	70 Points - Number 2
70	\$75,001	70 Points - Number 3
69	\$55,000	69 Points - Number 1
69	\$70,000	69 Points - Number 2
69	\$99,000	69 Points - Number 3

- B. Each year the D6PWIC submits applications from a prioritized list of projects up to an amount of approximately 115% of funding that is anticipated to be available for the program year. Projects from a prioritized list of improvements that may advance from beyond the 115% approved ranking will only be funded up to the final adjusted dollar amount, determined by the OPWC, that shall be available to D6PWIC in that same program year.
- C. Based on evaluation of the pre-applications considered for funding, the D6PWIC will select eligible projects and determine a recommended slate of projects within appropriate funding levels of the available SCIP/LTIP/RLP for all projects that shall be submitted to the OPWC. In addition to evaluation points, meeting Useful Life requirements will be used to select and prioritize projects for recommendation of funding to the Ohio Public Works Commission.

**DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
USEFUL LIFE**

Section 164-1-13, (A) of the Ohio Administrative Code requires every SCIP and LTIP project to have a useful life of at least 7 years. Section 164-1-13, (B) of the Ohio Administrative Code requires "...that the infrastructure covered by all project applications so submitted in any given year from the district have, on average, an approximate useful life of at least twenty years." For example, for every \$100,000 of projects with a useful life of seven years there must be \$100,000 in projects with a useful life of at least 33 years to meet the 20 year requirement. An additional requirement calls for SCIP and LTIP to be calculated separately. Because of the high useful life of sewer and water projects that can only be funded in the SCIP category, SCIP is usually not a problem. Because of a relative lower useful life for road projects, especially resurfacing projects, the LTIP slate generally has a more difficult time in meeting the useful life requirement. Useful life for the district submission is calculated on a dollar-weighted basis as follows:

	USEFUL LIFE		TOTAL PROJECT COST	=	LIFE COST
Project A	22	x	\$202,200	=	\$4,448,400
Project B	7	x	\$355,400	=	\$2,487,800
Project C	14	x	\$251,200	=	\$3,516,800
Project D	35	x	\$232,540	=	\$8,138,900
Project E	33	x	\$155,000	=	\$5,115,000
Project F	8	x	\$95,540	=	\$ 764,320
TOTALS			\$1,291,880		\$24,471,220

***To calculate the USEFUL LIFE of this package
the total LIFE COST is divided by TOTAL PROJECT COST
\$24,471,220 / \$1,291,880 = 18.9423321051 years USEFUL LIFE
Under OAC 164-1-13 (b) this package is UNACCEPTABLE***

In past years, as in the example above, the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee has had difficulty meeting the useful life requirements for the LTIP package. In some instances the useful life of a given project can be recalculated. Using the example above, Project B is a paving project that included 24 culverts that had an estimated cost of \$24,000. Project F is also a paving project that included 6 culverts that had an estimated cost of \$10,000. The useful life of these 2 projects could have been calculated as follows:

<i>Project B</i>	USEFUL LIFE		TOTAL COST	=	LIFE COST
24 Culverts	50	x	\$ 24,000	=	\$1,200,000
Pavement	7	x	\$331,618	=	\$2,321,326
Totals	9.9		\$355,618		\$3,521,326

<i>Project F</i>	USEFUL LIFE		TOTAL COST	=	LIFE COST
6 Culverts	50	x	\$10,000	=	\$ 50,000
Pavement	8	x	\$85,540	=	\$684,320
Totals	12.396		\$95,540		\$1,184.320

When the recalculated useful life is used, the package becomes acceptable:

	USEFUL LIFE		TOTAL COST	=	LIFE COST
Project A	22	x	\$202,200	=	\$4,448,400
Project B	9.9	x	\$355,400	=	\$3,518,460
Project C	14	x	\$251,200	=	\$3,516,800
Project D	35	x	\$232,540	=	\$8,138,900
Project E	33	x	\$155,000	=	\$5,115,000
Project F	12.396	x	\$95,540	=	\$1,184,314
TOTALS	20.065		\$1,291,880		\$25,921,874

The example shown above exhibits one way to meet the requirement. However it is up to the applicant to certify the highest possible useful life. When the committee is faced with the possibility of not meeting the requirement, such as in Program Year 2006, a bridge project with a useful life of 50 years was moved up the slate past several higher rated projects to meet the useful life requirement.

It is up to the applicant to use the **highest certifiable useful life**. The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee (D6PWIC) **has and will continue take useful life into consideration when evaluating and awarding projects**. The D6PWIC also reserves the right to **skip over higher rated projects with a lower useful life in favor of a lower rated project with a higher useful life** in order to meet the district's useful life requirement.

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
SCIP AFFORDABILITY STANDARDS

In accordance with the recommendations of the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC), the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee has adopted AFFORDABILITY standards for user fee projects, namely sanitary sewer and water. User fees consist of charges assessed to the consumers on a periodic basis (monthly, quarterly, etc.) in relation to the level of service provided, plus any special assessments imposed upon the users where the resultant funds are used to finance improvements and/or maintenance to either of the water or wastewater systems. The AFFORDABILITY standards are based upon the use of the most current data available regarding the subdivision's median household income (MHI), the 2010 Census, in comparison to that of the State's most current figure of \$47,358.

If the applicant subdivision's MHI is less than 90 percent of the State's MHI, then:

Drinking water user fees should be affordable at 1.1 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount;

Wastewater user fees should be affordable at 1.5 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount;

Combined Water Wastewater user fees should be affordable at 2.6 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount.

If the applicant subdivision's MHI is greater than or equal to 90 percent of the State's MHI, but less than or equal to 110 percent of it, then:

Drinking water user fees should be affordable at 1.3 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount;

Wastewater user fees should be affordable at 1.7 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount;

Combined Water Wastewater user fees should be affordable at 3.0 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount.

If the applicant subdivision's MHI is greater than 110 percent of the State's MHI, then:

Drinking water user fees should be affordable at 1.5 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount;

Wastewater user fees should be affordable at 1.8 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount;

Combined Water Wastewater user fees should be affordable at 3.3 percent of the subdivision's MHI amount;

Projects not meeting these AFFORDABILITY standards are considered ineligible for grants and are prime candidates for loans. All water and sanitary sewer projects must submit an AFFORDABILITY work sheet with each water/sanitary sewer pre-application. The AFFORDABILITY work sheet is included in Appendix E of the D6PWIC program manual.

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
GRANTS

STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (SCIP)
DISTRICT ALLOCATION

The District Allocations are those funds allocated by the Ohio Public Works Commission to the nineteen Public Works Integrating Committees throughout Ohio. For Program Year 2013, preliminary figures place the State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) funds at \$5,099,000 for District 6. Because Section 164 of the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) requires that a minimum of 20% or \$1,019,800 of the District Allocation go to loans and/or loan assistance, a maximum of 80% or \$4,079,200 will be available for SCIP grants. New construction and/or projects that include expansion are limited to a maximum of 20% or \$1,019,800 of the District's SCIP allocation.

In addition to the above amounts, additional monies may become available from funds awarded but not used in previous rounds. The Ohio Public Works Commission requires districts to submit a priority listing of projects recommended for funding that totals 115% of the committee's preliminary allocation. As a matter of policy the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee will fund all projects submitted as part of this 115% package. Any projects included in the "115% package" that are not funded with Program Year 2013 allocations, or funds returned to the District account from previous rounds, will be the first projects funded with Program Year 2014 allocations. As in the past, projects will be awarded to the level of the projected dollar figures at the time of selection.

Grants of up to 90% of eligible cost are available to local political subdivisions for infrastructure repair/replacement projects and up to 50% for new/expansion projects listed as eligible for funding under the SCIP. The eligible project types are:

1. Roads
2. Bridges
3. Culverts
4. Waste Water Treatment Systems
5. Water Supply Systems
6. Solid Waste Disposal Facilities
7. Storm Water and Sanitary Collection, Storage, and Treatment Systems and Facilities

*Projects recommended for SCIP funding from the District Allocation must have a minimum useful life of 7 years to be eligible for a grant. Section 164-1-13, (B) of the Ohio Administrative Code also requires “...that the infrastructure covered by all project applications so submitted in any given year from the district have, on average, an approximate useful life of at least twenty years.” Useful life is defined as the remaining life of a particular infrastructure, assuming normal maintenance, and prior to its need to be replaced or rebuilt. See pages 20-22 of this manual for a thorough explanation of Useful Life. A **Professional Engineer must certify the useful life statement when the project is in the pre-application phase.***

LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The LTIP funds are a portion of state gasoline tax revenues that are distributed to the nineteen Public Works Integrating Committees. For Program Year 2013, the preliminary LTIP funding that should be available to District 6 is \$2,138,000. In addition to the \$2,138,000 additional monies may become available from funds awarded but not used in previous rounds. The Ohio Public Works Commission requires districts to submit a priority listing of projects recommended for funding that totals 115% of the committee’s preliminary allocation. As a matter of policy the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee will fund all projects submitted as part of this 115% package. Any projects included in the “115% package” that are not funded with PY 2013 allocations, or funding returned to the District account from previous rounds, will be funded from PY 2014 allocations.

As in the past, projects will be awarded to the level of the projected dollar figures at the time of selection.

Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) funds are awarded in the form of grants for up to 100% of eligible project cost. These funds are available to local political subdivisions for infrastructure projects listed as eligible for funding as follow:

1. Roads
2. Bridges

Projects recommended for LTIP funding from the District Allocation must have a minimum useful life of 7 years to be eligible for a grant. Section 164-1-13, (B) of the Ohio Administrative Code also requires "...that the infrastructure covered by all project applications so submitted in any given year from the district have, on average, an approximate useful life of at least twenty years." Useful life is defined as the remaining life of a particular infrastructure, assuming normal maintenance, and prior to its need to be replaced or rebuilt. See pages 20-22 of this manual for a thorough explanation of Useful Life. A useful life statement is required to be certified by a Professional Engineer when the project is in the pre-application phase.

SMALL GOVERNMENT FUNDS

Small Government Funds are a financial resource set aside for villages and townships with populations less than 5,000. During each round of the infrastructure improvement program, \$15,000,000 is available in a competitive statewide program through the Ohio Public Works Commission to these smaller entities. An application must be approved by the District Small Government Subcommittee before being submitted to the Administrator of the Ohio Small Government Capital Improvement Commission (OSGCIC) for consideration, only after unsuccessfully competing for both District SCIP and Local Transportation Improvement Program Funding. Because the evaluation criteria used by the OSGCIC differs from that used by the District 6 Committee, the Committee will use OSGCIC criteria to evaluate projects for recommendation to the OSGCIC (See SMALL GOVERNMENTS PROGRAM GUIDELINES, beginning at Appendix E-16). Final approval is through the authority of the OSGCIC. Beginning in 2009 (PY2010) each District may submit a maximum of seven (7) (5 primary & 2 alternate) projects to OSGCIC for funding consideration.

Grants of up to 90% of eligible cost are available to local political subdivisions, that qualify as Small Governments (less than 5,000 population), for infrastructure repair/replacement projects and up to 50% for new/expansion projects listed as eligible for funding under SCIP. The eligible project types are:

1. Roads
2. Bridges
3. Culverts
4. Waste Water Treatment Systems
5. Water Supply Systems
6. Solid Waste Disposal Facilities
7. Storm Water and Sanitary Collection, Storage, and Treatment Systems and Facilities

EMERGENCY FUNDS

Emergency Funds are limited and funding is conditional based on the immediate preservation of health, safety and welfare usually associated with a natural disaster. A maximum of \$3,000,000 may be available on a statewide basis during any program year.

PROJECT COSTS

ELIGIBLE PROJECT COSTS - Project engineering, acquisition, construction, equipment, direct expenses and contingencies are eligible costs as follows:

PROJECT ENGINEERING: shall include only engineering services that are integral to the project and shall not include any of the subdivision's ongoing overhead expenses involved in carrying out its existing engineering services capacity. If a subdivision chooses to hire an engineer for professional services, the subdivision must enter into a project specific contract (see **ADVISORY-PROCUREMENT OF ENGINEERING/PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES**).

ACQUISITION: only those acquisitions that are integral to the activities involved in the project.

PROJECT CONSTRUCTION: only construction that is integral to the activities involved in the project.

PROJECT EQUIPMENT COSTS: only equipment costs that are integral to the activities involved in the project.

OTHER DIRECT EXPENSES: may be any out-of-pocket costs borne by the Applicant that are directly related to the execution of the project.

CONTINGENCY: must be clearly identified, should not exceed 10% of total project cost.

NON-ELIGIBLE PROJECT COSTS: certain costs associated with a project are not eligible for funding including, but not limited to:

- 1.) Expenditures or proposed expenditures for aesthetic treatment, ornamentations, or adornments to infrastructure.
- 2.) Expenditures or proposed expenditures for landscaping activities and improvements pertaining to infrastructure that go beyond basic requirements or post-construction repairing, stabilizing, and re-seeding of land surfaces.
- 3.) The cost of planning or administrative services related to the review, listing, studying, reporting, planning, recording, and prioritizing of capital improvement projects by a subdivision.
- 4.) The cost of planning or administrative services of a district committee, executive committee, or small government subcommittee in reviewing, recording, approving, or disapproving project applications.
- 5.) Administrative costs assessed as per Article VIII, Section B of the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee Bylaws.

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
LOANS & CREDIT ASSISTANCE

District 6 is charged with the allocation of a minimum of 20% or \$1,019,800 of the SCIP District Allocation for loans and/or loan assistance and credit enhancement.

LOANS

Interest rates, historically, have been defined by the D6PWIC as zero (0%) percent for use in the making of loans under the SCIP. The loans should be able to address any financing situation that lends itself to AFFORDABILITY - BASED underwriting when user fees are involved. The SCIP Zero Percent (0%) Loan can also be used in situations not involving user fees.

SCIP loans may be used in combination with SCIP grants. SCIP Loan/Grant combination applications will be evaluated as described in rating criteria #6 on Page 17 of this manual.

The advantage to the district in the utilization of loans is that the moneys returned to OPWC in the form of loan repayments will be credited to the district Revolving Loan account to be utilized in future funding rounds.

LOAN ASSISTANCE CREDIT ENHANCEMENT

Two forms of loan assistance are available to support a local subdivision's debt-related activities. First is the use of program funds to "buy-down" the interest rate of another lender's loan to a project. The second form of loan assistance is to fund a "debt service reserve account" that is a typical condition to the issuance of revenue bonds. Program funds may be used toward an up-front purchase of a bond insurance policy on the proposed issue that guarantees debt service of General Obligation Bonds by a community with marginal credit ratings.

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
REVOLVING LOAN FUND

Through each of the preceding funding rounds the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee has awarded SCIP loans as part of the district submission to the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC). OPWC has established a Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) account to credit repayments of loans to District 6. The District 6 RLF account includes the balance of all SCIP District Allocation Loan repayments, both principal and interest. RLF loans are provided each Program Year based on the actual cash amount received from loan recipients within the District. For program Year 2013, the RLF balance is estimated at \$1,363,000.

The District 6 RLF loans can only be allocated after all mandated SCIP loans are awarded. All RLF loans are subject to the Minority Business Enterprise and Useful Life requirements of the Ohio Public Works Commission. RLF projects do not fall under the new construction limitations of the SCIP District Allocation and may fund up to 100% of total project costs.

Projects selected for loans under the RLF program will be selected along with and through the same evaluation and selection process as the SCIP District Allocation and the LTIP programs.

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Since the passage of the State Bond Issue 2 in November of 1987, the *Eastgate Regional Council of Governments* (Eastgate), formerly known as the Eastgate Development and Transportation Agency (EDATA), has provided political subdivisions within Mahoning and Trumbull Counties with guidance on the SCIP/LTIP. Eastgate was chosen by the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee to administer the program for the District, and has taken an active role to insure that projects are submitted on time and in an acceptable format for funding evaluation by the Ohio Public Works Commission.

In its administrative role, Eastgate staff has prepared numerous documents that have been used as a basis for initial project submittal by communities in District 6, developed computer programs to store and track project data and sort projects for district evaluation, preparation of the annual Program Manual, assisted in developing the Bylaws of the District, and coordinated the final project submittals with those applicants whose projects had been selected by the District for funding. These duties are ongoing along with the day to day administration of the SCIP/LTIP programs.

On Oct. 24, 1988, the District Committee, aware of the costs involved, approved a methodology that provided for program administration funding. This funding methodology was included in the District Bylaws in Article VIII, Section B-Administrative Expenses. On Feb. 11, 2002, the Bylaws were amended to read as follows:

“Necessary costs incurred by Eastgate in the administrative process of SCIP/LTIP Program of District 6 shall be covered by a one and one half percent (1 1/2%) administrative fee to be provided by the political entities which receive funding under the provisions of SCIP/LTIP. Upon formal application by a political subdivision through the District 6 Committee for funding for an SCIP/LTIP

Project, the applicant will acknowledge that, upon completion of the project, Eastgate will invoice the applicant for an amount equal to one and one half percent of the SCIP/LTIP funds used. The funds provided by the applicants to Eastgate for SCIP/LTIP program administration shall be provided from sources other than SCIP/LTIP funds.”

Although Eastgate is authorized to bill at an amount equal to one and one half percent of the amount awarded, Eastgate bills at an amount equal to one and one half percent of the amount actually used by the community.

**A/O the date that this manual was sent to
be printed, May 30, 2012, the future of
the Clean Ohio Programs were uncertain.**

***DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
CLEAN OHIO PROGRAM***

Originally, the Clean Ohio Program was created by House Bill No. 3, approved by the Ohio Legislature and signed by Governor Taft on July 26, 2001, implementing authority of Issue 1 which was approved by Ohio voters in November 2000. Then, due to overwhelming success, Clean Ohio was placed on the ballot again in 2008, where Ohio voters extended the Fund with another \$400 million bond program.

The Clean Ohio Fund provides program dollars for “Brownfield” environmental clean-up projects and “Greenfield” open space and conservation projects.

The fund has four sub-programs which are: 1) Farmland preservation, 2) Recreational Trails, 3) Open Space and Watershed Conservation, and 4) Brownfields Programs.

Farmland Preservation

The Clean Ohio *Agricultural Easement Purchase Program* provides funding to assist landowners and communities in preserving Ohio's farmland. The Clean Ohio program also helps family farms transition to the next generation and protects the economic foundation of Ohio's largest industry. The program will be administered by the Department of Agriculture with the consult of a Farmland Preservation Advisory Board.

Recreational Trails

The Clean Ohio **Trails Fund** works to improve outdoor recreational opportunities for Ohioans by funding trails for outdoor pursuits of all kinds. Special emphasis was given to projects that:

- Are consistent with the statewide trail plan;
- Complete regional trail systems and links to the statewide trail plan;
- Link population centers with outdoor recreation area and facilities;
- Involve the purchase of rail lines linked to the statewide trail plan;
- Preserve natural corridors;
- Provide links in urban areas to support commuter access and provide economic benefit.

The program will be administered by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources with the consult of a Clean Ohio Trail Advisory Board.

The two sub-programs which require significant involvement from the district public integrating committees are the Brownfield Program and the Open Space and Conservation Program.

Brownfield Program

Applications for grants should be submitted to the applicant's respective district integrating committee for evaluation and prioritization, with the six highest ranking projects being forwarded to the Clean Ohio Council for final consideration on a state-wide basis. The program is administered by the Ohio Department of Development, in close coordination with the Ohio EPA. Applications for projects and guidelines for prioritizing projects were developed for the district integrating committees by the Ohio Department of Development and are available at Eastgate Regional Council of Governments.

The **Clean Ohio Council** is made up of 13 members appointed by the Governor and determines the final projects to be funded. Each district integrating committee can submit up to 6 projects to be forwarded to the Clean Ohio Council. Funding must be spent three years after the award is made. This is a statewide competitive program.

Eligibility for funding: Townships, municipalities, counties, port authorities, non-profits, for profits can enter into an agreement with a municipality, county, or township.

Types of projects eligible: Acquisition of property, clean-up of property, razing of buildings at a site, or funding of a minimum amount of infrastructure to make the site re-usable.

Please see the state website for full program requirements and information:
<http://clean.ohio.gov/BrownfieldRevitalization/>

Open Space and Watershed Conservation:

Each District Integrating Committee appointed an eleven member Natural Resource Assistance Council which receives and prioritizes applications in a process similar to the integrating committee's existing program. Unlike the Brownfield program, this is ***not a statewide competitive program*** and funding is allocated yearly to each district committee based on population of the geographical area that it covers.

Each Natural Resource Assistance Council developed a project selection methodology to prioritize and evaluate applications. **There is a 25% match requirement.**

Eligibility for funding: Townships, municipalities, counties, port authorities, non-profits, for profits can enter into an agreement with a municipality, county, or township.

Types of projects eligible: Some include: purchase of property including conservation easements, open space planning, economic development that relies on recreation, protection of habitat of rare or endangered species, or preservation of high quality habitat, preservation of high quality wetlands, preservation or restoration of water quality, natural stream channels, functioning flood plains, stream side forests, wetlands, etc.

For the most recent information, please call Eastgate or go to www.pwc.state.oh.us

**DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2013
PY2012 AWARD SUMMARY**

Community	Project Name	Loan Request	SCIP Grants	LTIP Grants	Local Funds	TOTAL POINTS
2011 BUBBLE PROJECTS						
Village of McDonald	Water Storage Tanks Rehabilitation Project	\$0	\$408,085	\$0	\$0	
Tru. Cty. San. Eng.	Champion Ave. East San. Sewer Imp. Project	\$221,740	\$0	\$0	\$221,740	15
2012 PROJECTS						
2012 SCIP Projects						
Tru. Cty. San. Eng.	Kinsman Sanitary Sewer Imp. Proj. - Phase 2	\$0	\$750,000	\$0	\$9,175,000	80
Mah. Cty. San. Eng.	Campbell WWTP Bypass Elimination Project	\$1,143,750	\$750,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	77
Tru. Cty. San. Eng.	Kermont Hghts. Sanitary Sewer Imp. Proj.	\$0	\$250,000	\$0	\$3,005,491	74
Austintown Twp.	Pinecrest Ave. Storm Sewer Imp. - Ph. 1	\$0	\$149,940	\$0	\$28,560	69
Mah. Cty. Hwy. Eng.	Crum Rd. Safety Upgrade	\$0	\$425,839	\$0	\$650,000	69
Mah. Cty. San. Eng.	Mah. Ave.-Bailey Rd.-SR 45 Waterline Repl.	\$196,383	\$558,937	\$0	\$93,355	69
City of Newton Falls	South Canal Waterline Replacement - Phase 1	\$0	\$149,000	\$0	\$32,675	68
Mah. Vall. San. Dist.	Lagoon Sludge Line Repl. Proj. - Ph. 1	\$0	\$297,000	\$0	\$133,400	68
Village of Sebring	Clarifier Rehabilitation Project	\$0	\$313,500	\$0	\$140,870	68
2012 SCIP Bubble Projects			\$4,052,301			
Tru. Cty. Hwy. Eng.	Olive St. Bridge Replacement Project	\$0	\$1,320,000	\$0	\$5,280,000	77
2012 LTIP Projects			\$1,320,000			
City of Struthers	Lowellville Rd. Resurfacing Project	\$0	\$0	\$87,900	\$361,100	80
City of Warren	2012 City Road Reconstruction Program	\$0	\$0	\$664,698	\$298,632	74
City of Youngstown	Elm Street Bridge Replacement Project	\$0	\$0	\$542,000	\$2,168,000	72
Champion Twp.	Towson Drive Resurfacing	\$0	\$0	\$65,805	\$102,925	71

Village of McDonald	2012 Ohio Avenue Resurfacing	\$0	\$0	\$148,200	\$400,000	71
City of Warren	Park Avenue Resurfacing Project	\$0	\$0	\$171,158	\$684,633	71
Mah. Cty. Hwy. Eng.	Mahoning County Infrastructure Program 2012	\$0	\$0	\$1,084,748	\$500,000	71
Springfield Twp.	Rapp Road Safety Upgrade - Phase 2	\$0	\$0	\$49,822	\$34,623	70
City of Campbell	2012 Street Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$0	\$148,300	\$232,000	70
Howland Twp.	Howland Springs Road Improvement	\$0	\$0	\$60,720	\$27,280	69
Canfield Twp.	Orlando Dr. Rdwy. & Culvert Upgrade Proj.	\$0	\$0	\$35,600	\$4,400	68
Liberty Twp.	2012 Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$0	\$206,752	\$92,889	67
2012 LTIP Bubble Projects				\$3,265,703		
City of Niles	McKees Lane Mill and Fill	\$0	\$0	\$241,017	\$108,283	67
Tru. Cty. Hwy. Eng.	2012 Trumbull County Road Imp. Prog.	\$0	\$0	\$446,443	\$200,576	67
2012 Loan Projects				\$687,460		
City of Newton Falls	Elevated Water Storage Tank Rehabilitation	\$402,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	64
City of Campbell	Tenney, Pin Oaks, & Penhale Ave. S.W. Mgmt.	\$195,600	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	62
Loan Bubble Projects		\$2,159,723				
City of Cortland	Downtown Waterline Replacement Project	\$417,800	\$0	\$0	\$0	60
City of Canfield	City-wide Res. Watermeter Replmt. Pgm. - Ph. 1	\$603,500	\$0	\$0	\$100,000	59
Small Government Projects		Small Gov't. Request				
Village of Lowellville	2012 Infrastructure Repair & S.U. Proj.	\$147,000	\$0	\$0	\$28,000	62
Milton Twp.	Canyon Blvd. Roadway Improvements - Ph. 4	\$73,774	\$0	\$0	\$33,145	61
Mecca Twp.	Morrell-Ray Rd. Safety Upgrade - Phase 1	\$136,144	\$0	\$0	\$61,166	61
Smith Twp.	Township Infrastructure Imp. - Phase 1	\$58,560	\$0	\$0	\$38,440	57
Braceville Twp.	Shanks - Phalanx Rd. S.U. - Ph. 3	\$81,729	\$0	\$0	\$36,747	63
Village of Poland	Infrastructure Repair Program - Phase 1	\$146,280	\$0	\$0	\$65,720	55
Vill. of N. Middletown	E. Middletown Rd. Waterline Repl. - Ph. 2	\$149,283	\$0	\$0	\$20,357	55