

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2018
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 (ORC) Section 164, that Program Year 2018 (PY32), comprising the 32nd round of funding for the State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) and the 30th round of funding for the Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) is underway. Hereafter in this Program Manual, both Round 32 SCIP and Round 30 LTIP will be referred to as Program Year 2018 (or PY18).

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 2018 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., Monday, August 28, 2017*** to be eligible for Program Year 2018 consideration. Updated COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT REPORTS (CIR's) and Five Year Plan/Maintenance of Effort Reports ***MUST*** also be submitted before 4:00 p.m., August 28, 2017 for that community to be eligible for consideration for Program Year 2018 funding. ***The information in this document is subject to change by the D6PWIC at any time.***

***DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2018
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. JOSEPH MUCCIO
MAHONING COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER’S OFFICE
761 INDUSTRIAL ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44509
330-793-5514 Ext. 8208 (Voice)
330-792-5270 (Fax)
jmuccio@mahoningcountyoh.gov
Term Expires: JUNE 27, 2018
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: MS. KRISTEN OLMI
MAHONING COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER’S OFFICE
761 INDUSTRIAL ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44509
330-793-5514 Ext. 8208 (Voice)
330-792-5270 (Fax)
kolmi@mahoningcountyoh.gov
Term Expires: JUNE 27, 2018
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

TRUMBULL COUNTY

Member: **MR. GARY NEWBROUGH, P.E.**
DEPUTY SANITARY ENGINEER
TRUMBULL COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER'S OFFICE
842 YOUNGSTOWN KINGSVILLE ROAD
VIENNA, OHIO 44473
330-675-7753 (Voice)
330-675-2780 (Fax)
senewbro@co.trumbull.oh.us
Term Expires: JUNE 27, 2018
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: **MR. SCOTT VERNER, P.E.**
SPECIAL PROJECTS DIRECTOR
TRUMBULL COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER'S OFFICE
842 YOUNGSTOWN KINGSVILLE ROAD
VIENNA, OHIO 44473
330-675-7753 (Voice)
330-675-2780 (Fax)
severner@co.trumbull.oh.us
Term Expires: JUNE 27, 2018
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: JULY 28, 2018
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: **MR. CHRISTOPHER STEPHENSON**
GRANTS/PROJECTS COORDINATOR
391 Mahoning Ave.
Warren, Ohio 44483
330-841-2771 (Voice)
330-841-2676 (Fax)
cstephenson@warren.org
Term Expires: JULY 28, 2018
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: JUNE 21, 2015
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: MR. KEDAR BHIDE, P.E.
CONSTRUCTION ENGINEER
26 SOUTH PHELPS STREET
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44503
330-742-8800 (Voice)
330-742-8807 (Fax)
kbehide@cityofyoungstownoh.com
Term Expires: JUNE 21, 2015
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;”

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS – TRUMBULL COUNTY

Member: MR. JACK HANEY, PY18 Sm. Gov’t. Comm. Chairman
VILLAGE MANAGER
VILLAGE OF NEWTON FALLS
19 NORTH CANAL STREET
NEWTON FALLS, OHIO 44444
330-872-0806 (Voice)
330-872-0544 (Fax)
citymgr@ci.newtonfalls.oh.us
Term Expires: MAY 24, 2018
ORC 164.04 (A) (4)

Alternate: MR. DON WITTMAN, P.E.
SERVICE DIRECTOR
CITY OF CORTLAND
400 NORTH HIGH STREET
CORTLAND, OHIO 44410
330-637-4637 (Voice)
dbwittman@cityofcortland.org
Term Expires: MAY 24, 2018
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 - MAHONING COUNTY

Member: **MR. TOM COSTELLO, PY18 Sm. Gov't. Comm. Vice-Chairman**
BOARDMAN TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE
8299 MARKET STREET
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44512
330-726-4150 Ext. 1187 (Voice)
330-729-2054 (Fax)
tcostello@twp.boardman.oh.us
Term Expires: MAY 24, 2018
ORC 164.04 (A) (4)

Alternate: **MS. MARIE IZZO CARTWRIGHT**
CANFIELD TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE
6129 LEFFINGWELL RD.
CANFIELD, OHIO 44406
330-518-5229 (Voice)
330- (Fax)
micioo@zoominternet.net
Term Expires: MAY 24, 2018
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. PATRICK GINNETTI, P.E., P.S. (PY18 D6PWIC Chairman)**
MAHONING COUNTY ENGINEER
940 BEARS DEN ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44511
330-799-1581 (Voice)
330-799-4600 (Fax)
pginnetti@mahoningcountyoh.gov
Term expires with election/appointment of new County Engineer
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: VACANT
MAHONING COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE
940 BEARS DEN ROAD
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44511
330-799-1581 (Voice)
330-799-4600 (Fax)
@mahoningcountyoh.gov

Term expires with election/appointment of new County Engineer
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

TRUMBULL COUNTY

Member: MR. RANDY SMITH, P.E., P.S. (PY18 D6PWIC Vice-Chairman)
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 County Engineer
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: MR. GARY SHAFFER, P.E.
TRUMBULL COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE
650 NORTH RIVER ROAD
WARREN, OHIO 44483
330-675-2255 (Voice)
330-675-2642 (Fax)
hwshaffer@co.trumbull.oh.us

Term expires with election/appointment of new County 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. R. P. SAMULKA**
100 EAST FEDERAL STREET
SUITE 1000
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44503
330- (Voice)
rpsamulka@zoominternet.net
Term Expires: MAY 11, 2018
ORC 164.04 (A) (4) and 164.04 (C)

Alternate: **VACANT**
100 EAST FEDERAL STREET
SUITE 1000
YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO 44503
330-(Voice)
[.com](#)
Term Expires: MAY 11, 2018
ORC 164.04 (B) and 164.04 (C)

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2018
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 2018:

\$ 5,964,000 SCIP ALLOCATION TO D6PWIC
\$ 2,449,000 LTIP ALLOCATION TO D6PWIC
\$ 1,676,000 REVOLVING LOAN FUND ALLOC. TO D6PWIC
\$10,089,000 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 10% 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:

\$5,964,000 SCIP TOTAL
\$ 596,400 LOANS/LOAN ASSISTANCE (MINIMUM)
\$5,367,600 SCIP GRANTS (MAXIMUM)
\$1,192,800 NEW CONSTRUCTION (MAXIMUM)

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

The Ohio Public Works Commission will accept final applications for Program Year 2018 through March 1, 2018. 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 19 and 20, 2017: Pre-application Workshops. Communities receive pre-application information and materials for Program Year 2017.

June 21 to August 26, 2017: Communities prepare pre-applications.

August 28, 2017 (MONDAY), 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, including maps and other attachments and 20 copies of the 4-page pre-application and location map.

AUGUST 29 to SEPTEMBER 18, 2017: Processing by Eastgate.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2017: D6PWIC reviews projects. (3 minutes per project is offered to sponsors to present issues and respond to Committee questions).

OCTOBER 17, 2017: D6PWIC will meet to evaluate all the projects and begin to award points to each project.

OCTOBER 31, 2017: D6PWIC will meet to review all points already assigned and to assign Regional Significance points to all projects.

NOVEMBER 14, 2017: 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 seven (7) projects (5 Primary & 2 Alternate) which will be submitted by District 6 to the administrator of the Ohio Small Gov't. Capital Improvements Commission for consideration for Small Government funding.

NOVEMBER 15, to DECEMBER 21, 2017: Communities prepare full applications for projects recommended to OPWC for funding.

DECEMBER 22, 2017, (FRIDAY) 4:00 PM: Communities submit full applications with all attachments to Eastgate Regional Council of Governments.

NO LATER THAN JANUARY 26, 2018: Eastgate Regional Council of Governments will submit applications to the OPWC office in Columbus.

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 2018 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 August 27, 2017.

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 2014 (September 2013). 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 2013 (for PY14). **If a community did not submit a project and 5-year inventory, or a 5-year inventory alone in 2013 (PY2014 Pre-Applications), that community MUST submit an inventory with their PY2018 project application for it to be considered for funding. Inventories for all other Communities will not be due until 2018 (PY2019).**

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 2017 through 2021. 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 (2015 and 2016). 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 2018 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 2018 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 30 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 after June 30, 2018 and before Dec. 31, 2019?

_____ **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 supporting data for either section 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 be checked against those posted on Eastgate's website 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 Jeff Gollner at 234-254-1512. Traffic counts must be accompanied by a signed and stamped Traffic Count Certification form.**

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><i>Primary component has failed, and the infrastructure is closed, or inoperable.</i></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><i>imminent failure</i></u> , major repairs are required. | 8 points |
| Moderate - | Infrastructure contains a major deficiency and will require repair 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)?
(Revised May 2014)
- | | |
|------------|-----------|
| OVER 60% | 15 points |
| 46% to 60% | 11 points |
| 31% to 45% | 7 points |
| 16% to 30% | 3 points |
| 0% to 15% | 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?
(Only the Priority 1 project for each applicant will receive points in this category)

\$1 to \$75,000	15 points+
\$75,001 to \$150,000	8 points
\$150,001 to \$225,000	4 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. After 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 2018
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, the SCIP slate of projects 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 = 18.94 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 to 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 (and OPWC's) useful life requirement.**

DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2018
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% of the State's MHI, then:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Combined Water Wastewater user fees should be affordable at 3.3% 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 2018
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 2018, preliminary figures place the State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) funds at \$5,964,000 for District 6. Because the Ohio Revised Code (ORC) requires that a minimum of 10% or \$596,400 of the District Allocation go to loans and/or credit assistance, a maximum of 90% or \$5,367,600 will be available for SCIP grants. New construction and/or projects that include expansion are limited to a maximum of 20% or \$1,192,800 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 2018 allocations, or funds returned to the District account from previous rounds, will be the first projects funded with Program Year 2019 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 2018, the preliminary LTIP funding that should be available to District 6 is \$2,449,000. In addition to the \$2,449,000 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 2018 allocations, or funding returned to the District account from previous rounds, will be funded from PY 2019 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 townships with populations less than 5,000 and for all villages. During each round of the infrastructure improvement program \$17,500,000 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

See the OPWC Small Government web pages at:

<http://www.pwc.state.oh.us/Documents/SmallGovernmentMethodologyPY28.pdf>

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 \$3,500,000 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 2018
LOANS & CREDIT ASSISTANCE

District 6 is charged with the allocation of a minimum of 15% or \$894,600 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 2018
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 2018, the RLF balance is estimated at \$1,676,000.

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 2018
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 ensure 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/RLF funds used. The funds provided by the applicants to Eastgate for SCIP/LTIP/RLF program administration shall be provided from sources other than SCIP/LTIP/RLF funds.”

Although Eastgate is authorized to bill at an amount equal to one and one half percent (.015) of the amount awarded, since 2010 Eastgate has billed at an amount equal to one and one half percent (.015) of the amount actually used by the community.

In 2016 the Eastgate staff reevaluated the administration fee for Emergency Projects. It was decided that, because of their nature, Emergency Projects would be assessed a fee of \$500 or 1/2 of 1% (.005), whichever is LESS, of the OPWC funding granted to the Emergency Project.

***DISTRICT 6 PUBLIC WORKS INTEGRATING COMMITTEE
PROGRAM YEAR 2018
PY2017 AWARD SUMMARY***

Community	Project Name	Loan Request	SCIP Grants	LTIP Grants	Local Funds	TOTAL POINTS
2016 BUBBLE PROJECTS	NONE					
PY2017 PROJECTS						
PY2017 SCIP Projects						
Trumbull County Sanitary Engineer	Belmont Park San. Sewer Imp. Project	\$0	\$750,000	\$0	\$1,851,220	82
Mahoning Valley San. Dist.	Potassium Permanganate Feed Sys. Imp.	\$0	\$150,000	\$0	\$231,000	80
Weathersfield Twp.	Townshipwide Road Improvements	\$0	\$74,848	\$0	\$63,760	80
Village of Poland	2017 Infrastructure Repair Project	\$0	\$70,115	\$0	\$109,668	77
City of Cortland	2017 City Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$74,999	\$0	\$117,306	77
City of Warren	Tod & Atlantic Resurfacing Project	\$0	\$353,193	\$0	\$1,412,772	77
City of Campbell	2017 Street Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$150,000	\$0	\$536,936	75
Mahoning County Engineer	2017 OPWC Road & Bridge Safety Upgrade	\$0	\$1,216,484	\$0	\$1,036,265	75
Mahoning County Sanitary Engineer	New Middletown Pump Sta. & Forcemain Relocation	\$0	\$500,000	\$0	\$3,509,821	74
City of Niles	Water Loop Improvement Project	\$0	\$148,948	\$0	\$68,495	73
Warren Township	Caleb Road Drainage Upgrade	\$0	\$69,738	\$0	\$31,332	72
Village of Newton Falls	South Canal Waterline - Phase 5	\$202,098	\$71,329	\$0	\$122,844	72
Mahoning County Sanitary Engineer	Wickliff Area Rehab. Improv. - Phase 3	\$0	\$428,026	\$0	\$364,614	72
Village of Lordstown	Highland Ave. Sanitary Sewer Imp.	\$0	\$150,000	\$0	\$1,786,709	71
Newton Township	Oak Knoll Ave. Widening & Resurfacing	\$0	\$74,981	\$0	\$63,872	70

Champion Twp.	2017 Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$95,755	\$0	\$149,771	70
Johnston Township	Corinth-Court Road & Bridge S. U.	\$50,487	\$224,386	\$0	\$631,610	70
City of Warren	Starr Allot. San. & Storm Improvements	\$0	\$230,100	\$0	\$359,900	70
City of Girard	2017 City Street Paving Project	\$0	\$164,600	\$0	\$257,500	69
Springfield Twp.	Brungard Rd. Upgrades-Phase 1	\$0	\$39,000	\$0	\$61,000	68
Smith Twp.	W. Pine Lake Rd. Safety Upgrade-Phase 1	\$0	\$61,450	\$0	\$27,610	67
PY2017 SCIP Bubble Projects		\$252,585	\$5,097,952		\$12,794,005	
Trumbull County Sa. Engineer	Swift Dr. San. Sewer Imp. Project	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$279,171	67
Village of Lowellville	2017 Road & Sidewalk Improvements	\$187,836	\$75,000	\$0	\$227,644	66
Village of Sebring	California Ave. Resurf. (15 th to Johnson)	\$0	\$151,378	\$0	\$129,258	66
City of Girard	Girard/Liberty Twp. East Dr. Waterline Replacement Project	\$0	\$167,200	\$0	\$75,100	66
Trumbull County San. Engineer	Elm Rd. Waterline Improvement Proj.	\$0	\$750,000	\$0	\$872,956	66
PY2017 LTIP Projects		\$187,836	\$1,793,938		\$1,584,129	
City of Hubbard	Myron Street Resurfacing	\$0	\$0	\$92,011	\$78,379	74
Poland Township	2017 Road Resurfacing Project	\$0	\$0	\$95,600	\$143,400	74
Village of New Middletown	East Middletown Rd. Mill & Fill	\$0	\$0	\$131,760	\$112,240	74
City of Struthers	2017 Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$0	\$144,468	\$225,964	74
Boardman Twp.	2017 Infrastructure Repair Project	\$0	\$0	\$145,062	\$226,893	74
Coitsville Twp.	John White Rd. Resurfacing Project	\$0	\$0	\$23,946	\$37,454	73
Jackson Township	Commerce Park Infrastructure Repair-Ph.2	\$0	\$0	\$59,660	\$50,822	73
Austintown Twp.	2017 Road Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$0	\$150,000	\$297,125	73
Hubbard Township	2017 Widening & Resurfacing Pgm.	\$0	\$0	\$74,928	\$63,827	72
Liberty Township	2017 Resurfacing Program	\$0	\$0	\$133,668	\$209,070	72
City of Youngstown	2017 Youngstown Infrastructure Improvement & Safety Upgrade Program	\$0	\$0	\$1,029,319	\$462,448	72
Greene Twp. (Tru. Cty.)	Durst-Colebrook Widening & Resurfacing-Phase 1	\$0	\$0	\$74,946	\$63,843	71
City of Warren	2017 City Road Program	\$0	\$0	\$415,065	\$353,575	71
PY2017 LTIP Bubble Projects				\$2,570,433	\$2,325,040	
Trumbull County Engineer	Dietz Road Reconstruction	\$0	\$0	\$621,000	\$279,000	70
PY2017 Loan Projects				\$621,000	\$279,000	

Mahoning County San. Engineer	Meander WWTP Raw Influent Pumps Replacement	\$410,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	74
Village of McDonald	2017 Street Resurfacing Program	\$615,105	\$0	\$0	\$0	56
City of Canfield	Palmyra Rd. Sanitary Sewer-Phase 1	\$560,243	\$0	\$0	\$560,243	49
Canfield Township	Starr Center Storm & Road Rehab.-Phase 2	\$273,222	\$0	\$0	\$52,042	56
Howland Township	2017 Road Resurfacing Program	\$404,619	\$0	\$0	\$181,786	56
PY2016 Small Gov't. Primary Projects		\$2,703,610		OPWC Grant Req.	\$794,071 Local Funds	
Milton Township	Stoltz Rd. Improvements-Phase 1	\$0	\$0	\$45,900	\$39,100	N/A
Vienna Township	Smith-Stewart Road Resurfacing	\$0	\$0	\$124,871	\$56,101	N/A
Kinsman Township	Delin-Thomas Rd. Widening & Resurfacing	\$0	\$0	\$125,785	\$107,150	N/A
Braceville Twp.	McConnell East Rd. Safety Upgrade-Ph. 2	\$0	\$0	\$149,866	\$127,664	N/A
Farmington Twp.	Larson West Road Resurfacing	\$0	\$0	\$138,691	\$62,311	N/A
Small Gov't. Projects (Alternates)				OPWC Grant Req.	Local Funds	
Braceville Twp.	Barclay-Messerley Rd. Drain. Up.-Phase 1	\$0	\$0	\$74,636	\$63,579	N/A

