



EASTGATE

Regional Council of Governments

**Ohio Public Works Commission
District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee**

**FY 2026 Program Manual
Round 39**

**State Capital Improvement Program
Local Transportation Improvement Program**

Title VI/Non-Discrimination Policy

It is Eastgate's Policy that all recipients of federal funds that pass through this agency ensure that they are in full compliance with Title VI and all related regulations and directives in all programs and activities.

No person shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, low-income status, or limited English proficiency be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any of Eastgate's programs, policies, or activities.

This report was financed by the Ohio Department of Transportation and Eastgate Regional Council of Governments.

EASTGATE REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Serving Northeast Ohio since 1973

The Eastgate Regional Council of Governments is a multipurpose Regional Council of Governments for Ashtabula, Mahoning and Trumbull Counties, as established by Section 167.01 of the Ohio Revised Code. Eastgate is the agency designated or recognized to perform the following functions:

- Serve as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in Mahoning and Trumbull counties, with responsibility for the comprehensive, coordinated, and continuous planning for highways, public transit, and other transportation modes, as defined in Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) legislation.
- Perform continuous water quality planning functions in cooperation with Ohio and U.S. EPA.
- Provide planning to meet air quality requirements under FAST Act and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.
- Administration of the Economic Development District Program of the Economic Development Administration.
- Administration of the Local Development District of the Appalachian Regional Commission.
- Administration of the State Capital Improvement Program for the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee.
- Administer the area clearinghouse function, which includes providing local government with the opportunity to review a wide variety of local or state applications for federal funds.
- Administration of the Clean Ohio Conservation Funds
- Administration of the regional Rideshare Program for Ashtabula, Mahoning, and Trumbull Counties.
- With General Policy Board direction, provide planning assistance to local governments that comprise the Eastgate planning area.

GENERAL POLICY BOARD (2024-2025)

Chair – Pat Ginnetti, Mahoning County Vice Chair – Gary Shaffer, Trumbull County

Mayor Eric Augustein, Village of Beloit
Acting Mayor John Baryak, Village of Newton Falls
Mayor James Becker, Village of Craig Beach
Mayor Ruth Bennett, Village of Orangeville
Mayor Tito Brown, City of Youngstown
Mauro Cantalamessa, Trumbull County Commissioner
David Ditzler, Mahoning County Commissioner
Mayor Don Dragish, City of Canfield
J.P. Ducro, IV, Ashtabula County Commissioner
David Emerman, OEPA NE District Chief
Mayor Douglas Franklin, City of Warren
Niki Frenchko, Trumbull County Commissioner
Genevieve Germaniuk, Citizens Advisory Board
Representative, Trumbull County
Mayor James Harp, Village of Sebring
Dean Harris, Executive Director, Western Reserve
Transit Authority
Mayor James Iudicani, Sr., Village of Lowellville
Mayor Harry Kale, Village of New Middletown
Casey Kozlowski, Ashtabula County Commissioner
Mayor Benjamin A. Kyle, City of Hubbard
Mayor Ray Lewis, Village of McDonald
Denny Malloy, Trumbull County Commissioner

Mayor Shirley McIntosh, Village of West Farmington
Mayor Steve Mientkiewicz, City of Niles
Mayor Catherine Cercone Miller, City of Struthers
Gery Noirot, District Deputy Director, ODOT District 4
Mayor Deidre Petrosky, City of Cortland
Carol Rimedio-Righetti, Mahoning County Commissioner
Michael Salamone, Trumbull County Transit
Mayor Timothy Sicafuse, Village of Poland
Randy Smith, Trumbull County Engineer
Teresa Stratton, Goshen Township Trustee
Mayor Ronald D. Stevens, Village of Washingtonville
Zachary Svette, Trumbull County Metro Parks
Mayor Brian Tedesco, City of Campbell
Jim Timonere, City of Ashtabula
Anthony Traficanti, Mahoning County Commissioner
Anthony Trevena, Western Reserve Port Authority
Kathryn Whittington, Ashtabula County Commissioner
Mark Winchell, Ashtabula County
Mayor Jackie Woodward, Village of Lordstown
Samantha Yannucci, Citizens Advisory Board
Representative, Mahoning County
Aaron Young, Mill Creek Metro Parks
Mayor Mark Zuppo, City of Girard

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (2024)

Chair - Gary Shaffer Vice Chair – Bob Durbin

CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD (2024)

Chair - Kevin Kern Vice Chair – Vacant

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Members and Alternates	2
Overview	6
Available Financial Assistance.....	6
Program Schedule	7
Capital Improvement Report.....	8
Pre-Application	8
Evaluation and Point System.....	9
Contingency Projects	18
Useful Life	19
SCIP Affordability Standards.....	21
Grants	23
State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP)	23
Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP)	24
Small Government Program	25
Emergency Program.....	25
Loans and Credit Assistance.....	26
Loans	26
Loan Assistance Credit Enhancement.....	26
Revolving Loan Fund	27
Project Costs	28
Program Administration	30
Round 38 (FY25) Award Summary.....	31
Pre-Application	33
Community Codes.....	38
Small Government Program	39
Authorizing Legislation	41
CFO Certification of Local Funds and Repayment Letter.....	42
Affordability Table - Median Household Income (MHI)	43
Affordability Worksheet	44

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 Round 39 (FY26), comprising the 39th round of funding for the State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) and the 37th round of funding for the Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) is underway. Hereafter in this Program Manual, both Round 39 SCIP and Round 37 LTIP will be referred to as Round 39 (FY26).

The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee (D6PWIC) covers the communities of Mahoning and Trumbull Counties and is charged through ORC 164 to recommend to the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) projects that contribute to improving the district's infrastructure that could 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 Round 39 (FY26) 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 ensure all projects being considered for funding are processed in an efficient and equitable manner all required pre-application documentation must be submitted before 3:00 p.m., Thursday, August 29, 2024 to be eligible for Round 39 (FY26) consideration. The information in this document is subject to change by the D6PWIC at any time.

Members and Alternates

The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee was created under Section 164.03 of the Ohio Revised Code.

Membership established under Section 164.04 (A) (4)

Alternates are established under Section 164.04 (B)

Member and alternate terms are discussed under Section 164.04 (C)

“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

Terms Expire: June 27, 2024

Member: **Mr. Joseph Muccio**

Mahoning County Sanitary Engineer’s Office
761 Industrial Road
Youngstown, Ohio 44509
330-793-5514 Ext. 8208 (Voice)
jmuccio@mahoningcountyoh.gov

Alternate: **Ms. Lisa Yurcho**

Mahoning County Sanitary Engineer’s Office
761 Industrial Road
Youngstown, Ohio 44509
330-793-5514 Ext. 8208 (Voice)
lyurcho@mahoningcountyoh.gov

Trumbull County

Terms Expire: June 27, 2024

Member: **Mr. Gary Newbrough, P.E.**

Sanitary Engineer
Trumbull County Sanitary Engineer’s Office
842 Youngstown Kingsville Road
Vienna, Ohio 44473
330-675-7753 (Voice)
senewbro@co.trumbull.oh.us

Alternate: **Mr. Scott Verner, P.E.**

Assistant Sanitary Engineer
Trumbull County Sanitary Engineer’s Office
842 Youngstown Kingsville Road
Vienna, Ohio 44473
330-675-7753 (Voice)
severner@co.trumbull.oh.us

“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

Terms Expire: July 28, 2024

Member: **Mr. Paul Makosky, P.E.**

City Engineer
540 Laird Avenue S.E.
Warren, Ohio 44484
330-841-2973 (Voice)
pmakosky@warren.org

Alternate: **Mr. Erik Jennings**

City Planning Coordinator
391 Mahoning Ave.
Warren, Ohio 44483
330-841-2771(Voice)
cstephenson@warren.org

City of Youngstown

Terms Expire: June 21, 2024

Member: **Mr. Charles T. Shasho**

Deputy Director of Public Works
26 South Phelps Street
Youngstown, Ohio 44503
330-742-8800 (Voice)
cshasho@cityofyoungstownoh.com

Alternate: **Mr. James Murray, P.E.**

Capital Project Engineer
26 South Phelps Street
Youngstown, Ohio 44503
330-742-8800 (Voice)
jmurray@cityofyoungstownoh.com

“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;”

Trumbull County
Municipal Corporations

Terms Expire: May 24, 2028

Member: **Mayor Ben Kyle** (Sm. Govt. Vice-Chairman)
City of Hubbard
220 West Liberty Street
Hubbard Ohio, 44425
330-534-3090 (Voice)
b.kyle@cityofhubbard-oh.gov

Alternate: **Mr. Kevin Robertson**
Project Manager/Infrastructure Coordinator
City of Niles
34 West State Street
Niles Ohio, 44446
330-544-9000 (Voice)
krobertson@thecityofniles.com

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

Mahoning County
Township Trustees

Terms Expire: May 24, 2028

Member: **Mr. Tom Costello** (Sm. Govt. Chairman)
Boardman Township Trustee
8299 Market Street
Boardman, Ohio 44512
330-726-4177 (Voice)
tcostello@boardmantwp.com

Alternate: **Ms. Marie Cartwright**
Canfield Township Trustee
21 South Broad Street
Canfield, Ohio 44406
330-533-4239 (Voice)
mic100@zoominternet.net

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

Mahoning County

Terms expire with election or
appointment of new County Engineer

Member: **Mr. Patrick Ginnetti, P.E., P.S.** (D6 Chairman)
Mahoning County Engineer
940 Bears Den Road
Youngstown, Ohio 44511
330-799-1581 (Voice)
pginnetti@mahoningcountyoh.gov

Alternate: **Mr. Bob Durbin, P.E., P.S.**
Mahoning County Engineer’s Office
940 Bears Den Road
Youngstown, Ohio 44511
330-799-1581 (Voice)
bdurbin@mahoningcountyoh.gov

Trumbull County

Terms expire with election or
appointment of new County Engineer

Member: **Mr. Randy Smith, P.E., P.S.** (D6 Vice-Chairman)
Trumbull County Engineer
650 North River Road
Warren, Ohio 44483
330-675-2640 (Voice)
hwsmith@co.trumbull.oh.us

Alternate: **Mr. Gary Shaffer, P.E.**
Trumbull County Engineer’s Office
650 North River Road
Warren, Ohio 44483
330-675-2255 (Voice)
hwshaffer@co.trumbull.oh.us

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

Terms Expire: May 18, 2027

Member: **Mr. Tim Yova**
49yova@gmail.com

Alternate: **Mr. Gary Diorio**
dioriogary@gmail.com

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 Round 39 (FY26):

\$ 6,093,000 SCIP Allocation to D6PWIC
\$ 2,256,000 LTIP Allocation to D6PWIC
\$ 2,051,000 Revolving Loan Fund Allocation to D6PWIC
\$10,400,000 Total Allocation to D6PWIC

In addition to the above-mentioned funding sources, an additional \$23,334,000 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 Government 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:

\$6,093,000	SCIP Total
\$609,300	Loans/Loan Assistance (Minimum)
\$5,483,700	SCIP Grants (Maximum)
\$1,218,600	New Construction (Maximum)

The Ohio Public Works Commission requires districts to submit a priority listing of projects recommended for funding that totals a minimum of 105% of the committee's preliminary allocation. District 6 generally uses 115% of the allocation.

Program Schedule

The Ohio Public Works Commission will accept final applications for Round 39 (FY26) through February 28, 2025. Small Government Program projects 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 18, 2024: District 6 Workshop. Communities receive pre-application information and materials for Round 39 (FY26).

June 19 to August 28, 2024: Communities prepare pre-applications.

August 29, 2024 (Thursday), 3:00 PM: Deadline for submission of pre-applications and associated materials to Eastgate Regional Council of Governments. Applicants must submit 1 full pre-application, including maps and other attachments and 18 copies of the 4-page pre-application and location map.

August 30 to September 16, 2024: Processing by Eastgate.

September 17, 2024: D6PWIC reviews projects. (3 minutes per project is allocated for sponsors to present issues and respond to committee questions).

September 27, 2024: District 6 Engineer's Plan Status sheet due.

October 1, 2024: D6PWIC will meet to evaluate all the projects and begin to award points to each project.

October 15, 2024: D6PWIC will meet to review all points already assigned and to assign Regional Significance points to all projects.

October 29, 2024: 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 review and select seven (7) projects for submission to the administrator of the Ohio Small Government's Capital Improvements Commission for consideration for funding.

October 30 to December 19, 2024: Communities prepare full applications for projects recommended to OPWC for funding.

December 20, 2024, (Friday) 3:00 PM: Communities submit full applications with all attachments using the Public WorksWise online portal.

The above schedule may be amended by the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee. Meetings will be posted on Eastgate's web site at: <https://eastgatecog.org/>

Capital Improvement Report

No longer required by District 6.

Forms and Reports no longer required:

- Summary Form
- Five Year Capital Improvement Plan/ Maintenance of Effort
- Inventory of all infrastructure (updated every five years).

Pre-Application

The pre-application is a requirement of the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee that provides detailed information and documentation necessary for project evaluation for funding by the committee. All communities seeking funding in Round 39 (FY26) must submit a pre-application for those projects of highest priority. The District 6 Program Manual and pre-application are available electronically on Eastgate's website.

<https://eastgatecog.org/programs/regional-planning/ohio-public-works-commission>

Evaluation and Point System

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 Round 39 (FY26) 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 38 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? Mahoning and Trumbull County populations have been declining for a few decades. The greatest need is to maintain the existing infrastructure. Most of District 6 projects submitted each year are repair and replace. However, District 6 will accept new/expansion projects to help expand the population and/or tax base. The entire list of submitted projects to District 6 represent the current needs for all communities. ORC - 164.06(B)(1)

c.) Will the project be started on time? Construction cannot start until July 1, 2025 or until a contract is in place with OPWC and MUST start no later than June 2026. Any project with a start date July 1, 2026 or after will be rejected by the OPWC and must apply in funding Round 40 (FY27).

___ 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. ORC - 164.06(B)(4)

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	Pre-application lacks documentation/statement	0 points

**Points will be awarded for either 2b or 2c. Not both.
Include supporting documentation for either section.**

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).

ORC - 164.06(B)(4)

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, wastewater or water treatment plant improvements, stormwater, etc.); what is the number of homes and/or businesses directly impacted?

ORC - 164.06(B)(4)

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 safety hazards? 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. ORC - 164.06(B)(4) ORC - 164.14(E)(1) ORC - 164.14(E)(2)

Critical	Road/bridge reconstruction, including widening and/or geometric improvements as documented by appropriate traffic engineering studies that identify the hazard and recommends the proposed improvement.	10 points
Significant	Road/bridge reconstruction, including widening and/or geometric improvements. Projects include roundabouts and road diets.	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.	3 points
No Impact		0 points

3b. Traffic counts are no longer required by the District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee. However, the point system is still based on traffic count totals. It is up to each community to decide whether to ask for a traffic count or not. Requested traffic counts must be conducted within the project limits. Traffic count requests submitted to Eastgate must be received by June 28, 2024. Roads with no traffic count will receive a default number "249" and 2 points will be awarded.

For projects with more than one road, a weighted average shall be determined using a cost-based method. A worksheet must be included with the pre-application. When developing the weighted average, roads without a traffic count shall use "249" as a default number.

For Round 39 (FY26), traffic counts from 2020 through 2024 are acceptable.

Existing Traffic

0 - 249	2 points
250 - 499	4 points
500 - 999	6 points
1,000 - 3,999	8 points
4,000 & Over	10 points

For All Projects

4. What is the condition of the infrastructure? Must be documented

ORC - 164.06(B)(2) ORC - 164.14(E)(9)

Critical	Primary component has failed, and the infrastructure is closed, or inoperable. 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 imminent failure, 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 age of the existing infrastructure?

New/expansion projects will receive 0 points.

If no age is given, projects will receive 0 points.

ORC - 164.06(B)(2)

For road projects - Must be when the last major resurfacing was completed.

15+ years	2 points
10-14 years	1 point
Less than 10 years	0 points

For bridge and culvert projects - Must be when bridge or culvert were built.

50+ years	2 points
31-49 years	1 point
Less than 31 years	0 points

For water, sewer, and stormwater projects - Must be when infrastructure was built.

50+ years	2 points
31-49 years	1 point
Less than 31 years	0 points

The District 6 committee may adjust points for a project that does not fit these categories.

6. What is the project's local share (all funds other than OPWC)?

ORC - 164.06(B)(6) ORC - 164.14(E)(4) ORC - 164.14(E)(6)

61% and over	15 points
46% to 60%	11 points
31% to 45%	7 points
16% to 30%	3 points
0 to 15%	0 points

7. Is the OPWC request a loan, loan/grant combination, or credit enhancement?
 Percentages are based on the loan amount divided by the total project cost.
 The minimum loan amount is \$50,000.
 ORC - 164.06(B)(5)

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
0 to 25% OPWC Loan	0 points

8. The sponsor community's Median Household Income (MHI) is what percent of the State of Ohio MHI (\$66990)? ORC - 164.06(B)(6) ORC - 164.06(B)(8) ORC - 164.14(E)(6)

Below 70%	5 points
70% to 79.9%	4 points
80% to 89.9%	3 points
90% to 99.9%	2 points

9. 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

10. What is the OPWC funding (grant and loan) request for the number 1 priority project?
 (Only the Priority 1 project for each applicant will receive points in this category)
 ORC - 164.06(B)(5)

\$1 to \$75,000	15 points
\$75,001 to \$150,000	8 points
\$150,001 to \$225,000	4 points

11. 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.

ORC - 164.14(E)(7)

Local cost share between communities

50% / 50%	5 points
60% / 40%	4 points
70% / 30%	3 points
80% / 20%	2 points
90% / 10%	1 point

12. What is the status for the planning and readiness of the project?

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

Part I – Status of Plans – This uses the Small Government Commission’s Engineer’s Plan Status Certification. (Maximum 2 points)

Plans not yet begun	0 points
Surveying through preliminary design completed (Items A-C)	1 point
Surveying through final construction plans, secured permits, and right-of-way as appropriate (Items A-I)	2 points

Part II – Status of Funding Sources – This uses source documentation including CFO certifications and loan letters. (Maximum 2 points)

All funds not yet committed	0 points
Applications submitted to funding entities	1 point
All funding committed	2 points

The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee will review projects that are not in contract within a year or not completed within two years of the project agreement to determine if the committee will recommend termination by OPWC.

13. Will the project generate revenue in the form of user fees or assessments?
 ORC - 164.06(B)(3)

No new user fees or assessments	1 point
New user fees or assessments	0 points

14. Does the project have other funding besides local or OPWC dollars?
 Federal, state, private funding.
 ORC - 164.06(B)(7)

66% or more	1 point
Less than 66%	0 points

15. Other factors of regional importance
 ORC - 164.06(B)(10) ORC - 164.14(E)(2) ORC - 164.14(E)(3) ORC - 164.14(E)(10)

The District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee members, exercising their independent judgment, will utilize this category to determine:

- compliance/consistency with OPWC guidelines
- compliance/consistency with regional plans, policies and/or objectives
- development and maintenance of District’s infrastructure
- creation of significant and specific economic development
- other factors deemed necessary by committee members

Factors of Regional Importance 0 to 25 points

Tie Breaker

If there is a tie score on more than one project, the following factors determine the funding order.

1. Smallest OPWC funding request
2. Highest percentage of local funding
3. Lowest median household income
4. Regional significance points (highest to lowest)

Contingency Projects

The Ohio Public Works Commission requires districts to submit a priority listing of projects recommended for funding that is a minimum of 105% of the district's allocation. The District 6 slate of projects for Round 29 (FY26) will be submitted in January 2025. At this time, projects approved for funding by the District 6 committee but not funded with the District allocation and funding balances are placed on the contingency list. If those projects are not funded by July 1st of that year, they are terminated for that round. The projects can be resubmitted for the next round of funding. Also giving the applicant, a chance to adjust the project for additional points.

Useful Life

Section 164.05 (J) and 164.14 (C) of the Ohio Administrative Code requires every SCIP, RLP and LTIP project to have a useful life of at least 7 years and the combined slate of projects for each section to have a combined useful life of 20 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 34 years to meet the 20-year requirement. An additional requirement calls for SCIP, RLP 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 x Project Cost = Life Cost

	Useful Life / Years	Project Cost	Life Cost
Project A	22	\$202,200	\$4,448,400
Project B	7	\$355,400	\$2,487,800
Project C	14	\$251,200	\$3,516,800
Project D	35	\$232,540	\$8,138,900
Project E	33	\$155,000	\$5,115,000
Project F	8	\$95,540	\$764,320
TOTALS	18.94	\$1,291,880	\$24,471,220

To calculate the useful life of this package, the Total Life Cost is divided by the Total Project Cost - \$24,471,220 / \$1,291,880 = 18.94 years. Under Ohio Revised Code 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:

Project B	Useful Life / Years	Project Cost	Life Cost
24 Culverts	50	\$24,000	\$1,200,000
Pavement	7	\$331,400	\$2,319,800
TOTALS	9.9	\$355,400	\$3,519,800

Project F	Useful Life / Years	Project Cost	Life Cost
6 Culverts	50	\$10,000	\$ 50,000
Pavement	8	\$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 / Years	Project Cost	Life Cost
Project A	22	\$202,200	\$4,448,400
Project B	9.9	\$355,400	\$3,518,460
Project C	14	\$251,200	\$3,516,800
Project D	35	\$232,540	\$8,138,900
Project E	33	\$155,000	\$5,115,000
Project F	12.396	\$95,540	\$1,184,320
TOTALS	20.065	\$1,291,880	\$25,921,880

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 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 D6PWIC has and will continue to take useful life into consideration when evaluating and awarding projects. The Committee 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 to meet the District's (and OPWC's) useful life requirement.

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 from the American Community Survey (ACS) regarding the subdivision's Median Household Income (MHI), in comparison to the State's most current figure of \$66,990.

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 District 6 Affordability Worksheet is available electronically on Eastgate's website.

<https://eastgatecog.org/programs/regional-planning/ohio-public-works-commission>

Grants

State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP)

For Round 39 (FY26), the State Capital Improvement Program (SCIP) funds for District 6 are \$6,093,000. The Ohio Revised Code (ORC) requires that a minimum of 10% or \$609,300 of the District Allocation go to loans and/or credit assistance, therefore a maximum of 90% or \$5,483,700 will be available for SCIP grants. New construction and/or projects that include expansion are limited to a maximum of 20% or \$1,218,600 of the District's SCIP allocation. Additional monies may become available from funds awarded but not used in previous rounds and from projects completed under budget.

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. Wastewater Treatment Systems and Facilities
5. Water Supply Systems and Facilities
6. Stormwater Systems
7. Solid Waste Disposal 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 an infrastructure, assuming normal maintenance, and prior to its need to be replaced or rebuilt. See pages 19-20 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 (LTIP)

The LTIP funds are a portion of state gasoline tax revenues that are distributed to the nineteen Public Works Integrating Committees. For Round 39 (FY26), the District 6 allocation is \$2,256,000. In addition to the \$2,256,000, monies may become available from funds awarded but not used in previous rounds and from projects completed under budget.

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:

The eligible project types are:

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 an infrastructure, assuming normal maintenance, and prior to its need to be replaced or rebuilt. See pages 19-20 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 Program

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 \$23,334,000 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 Commission for consideration, only after unsuccessfully competing for both District SCIP and Local Transportation Improvement Program Funding. Because the evaluation criteria used by the Small Government Commission differs from that used by the District 6 Committee, the Committee will use Small Government criteria to evaluate projects for recommendation to the Commission (See Small Government Program in the Appendix). Final approval is through the authority of the Commission. Each District may submit a maximum of seven projects to the Small Government Commission 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:

<https://www.pwc.ohio.gov/Programs/Infrastructure-Programs/Small-Government>

Emergency Program

Emergency money is limited, and funding is conditional based on the immediate preservation of health, safety and welfare usually associated with a natural disaster. A maximum of \$12,106,000 will be available on a statewide basis starting July 1, 2025. Communities must submit the project to their OPWC representative to determine if it qualifies. The final decision is made by the OPWC Director.

Loans and Credit Assistance

District 6 is charged with the allocation of a minimum of 10% or \$609,300 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 scoring criteria #7 on Page 15 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.

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 Round 39 (FY26), the RLF allocation is estimated at \$2,051,000.

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.

Project Costs

Eligible Project Costs

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

1. **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).
2. **Acquisition:** only those acquisitions that are integral to the activities involved in the project.
3. **Project Construction:** only construction that is integral to the activities involved in the project.
4. **Project Equipment Costs:** only equipment costs that are integral to the activities involved in the project.
5. **Other Direct Expenses:** may be any out-of-pocket costs borne by the Applicant that are directly related to the execution of the project.
6. **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.

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 State Capital Improvement Program, Local Transportation Program, Small Governments Program and Emergency Program. 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 October 10, 2023, the Bylaws were amended to read as follows:

“Necessary costs incurred by Eastgate in the administrative process of SCIP/LTIP and Small Government Programs of District 6 shall be covered by a 1½ percent administrative fee to be provided by the political entities which receive funding under the provisions of the OPWC. Upon completion of the project, Eastgate will invoice each political subdivision for an amount equal to 1½ percent of the OPWC funds used on their project(s). The funds provided by the applicants to Eastgate for SCIP/LTIP and Small Government program administration shall be provided from sources other than OPWC funds.”

Round 38 (FY25) Award Summary

D6 PWIC FY 2025 (Round 38)

SCIP Projects

Community	Project Name	Priority Number	Major Project Type	Useful Life	OPWC Grant Request	OPWC Loan Request	Local Commitment	Total OPWC Request	Local %	OPWC %	Total Proj. Cost	Life Cost	Total Points	
Trumbull County	Pendleton/Gillmer Sanitary Sewer Improvements Project	0	Wastewater	36	\$ 750,000	\$ -	\$ 5,537,750	\$ 750,000	88%	12%	\$ 6,287,750	\$ 226,359,000	91	Previous Round
Sebring Village	Sanitary Sewer Manhole Rehabilitation	1	Wastewater	30	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 105,000	\$ 75,000	58%	42%	\$ 180,000	\$ 5,400,000	92	
Weathersfield Township	TH 65A Ohtown Rd	1	Road	15	\$ 56,746	\$ -	\$ 226,986	\$ 56,746	80%	20%	\$ 283,732	\$ 4,255,980	90	
Mahoning County	2024 Mahoning County Raccoon, Southern, Kirk, Hitchcock, Paving & Silicia Road Bridge #6	1	Road	20	\$ 800,000	\$ -	\$ 1,532,883	\$ 800,000	66%	34%	\$ 2,332,883	\$ 46,657,660	87	
Cortland City	Asphalt Improvements for Corrin, Charles, Frostwood, Richards, Woodview, Fowler,	1	Road	10	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 202,973	\$ 100,000	67%	33%	\$ 302,973	\$ 3,029,730	85	
Warren City	Bane Street SW and Miller SW Waterline Replacements	2	Water	50	\$ 439,600	\$ 408,200	\$ 722,200	\$ 847,800	46%	54%	\$ 1,570,000	\$ 78,500,000	85	
Hubbard City	Caroline & Rebecca Street Improvement Project	1	Road	15	\$ 141,596	\$ -	\$ 222,404	\$ 141,596	61%	39%	\$ 364,000	\$ 5,460,000	84	
Trumbull County	Crain Drive Sanitary Sewer Improvements	1	Wastewater	40	\$ 750,000	\$ -	\$ 1,187,000	\$ 750,000	61%	39%	\$ 1,937,000	\$ 77,480,000	83	
Mahoning County	Mahoning Avenue Industrial Corridor Upgrade	2	Road	28	\$ 1,179,818	\$ -	\$ 3,692,578	\$ 1,179,818	76%	24%	\$ 4,872,396	\$ 136,427,088	83	
Howland Township	Venice Ht, Rosewood Dr, Bayhill Dr, etc. Road Improvements	1	Road	13	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 527,563	\$ 150,000	78%	22%	\$ 677,563	\$ 8,808,319	80	
Trumbull County	Larchmont Ave Resurfacing	3	Road	16	\$ 187,500	\$ -	\$ 750,002	\$ 187,500	80%	20%	\$ 937,502	\$ 15,000,032	80	
Warren City	2024 OPWC/CDBG Road Project Mahoning, Perkinswood, Central Parkway, Eastland	1	Road	15	\$ 572,400	\$ -	\$ 487,600	\$ 572,400	46%	54%	\$ 1,060,000	\$ 15,900,000	80	
Warren Township	TH 84A,B&D Hewitt Gifford Rd	1	Road	14	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ 225,077	\$ 225,000	50%	50%	\$ 450,077	\$ 6,301,078	79	
Girard City	Tibbets Wick Road Booster Pump Station Improvements	2	Water	24	\$ 378,540	\$ -	\$ 322,460	\$ 378,540	46%	54%	\$ 701,000	\$ 16,824,000	79	
Austintown Township	Charlestown, Yorktown, Country Green, etc Street Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ 224,466	\$ -	\$ 1,119,641	\$ 224,466	83%	17%	\$ 1,344,107	\$ 16,129,284	78	
Niles City Road	Nancy, George, Washington, etc. Road Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ 224,675	\$ -	\$ 592,325	\$ 224,675	73%	28%	\$ 817,000	\$ 9,804,000	78	
Boardman Township	Straley, Baymar and Other Roads in Boardman Township	1	Road	15	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ 1,434,108	\$ 225,000	86%	14%	\$ 1,659,108	\$ 24,886,620	78	Contingency
Lowellville Village	Lowellville Paving Safety Upgrade	2	Road	10	\$ -	\$ 274,122	\$ -	\$ 274,122	0%	100%	\$ 274,122	\$ 2,741,220	63	SCIP Loan
Boardman Township	Johnston, Canavan and Other Roads in Boardman Township	2	Road	15	\$ -	\$ 486,517	\$ -	\$ 486,517	0%	100%	\$ 486,517	\$ 7,297,755	63	SCIP Loan
Canfield Township	Villa Rosa, Albany, Montereale, etc. Street Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ -	\$ 795,760	\$ -	\$ 795,760	0%	100%	\$ 795,760	\$ 9,549,120	63	SCIP Loan
					\$ 6,480,341	\$ 1,964,599					\$ 27,333,490	\$ 716,810,886		
												Useful Life	\$ 26.22	

LTIP Projects

Community	Project Name	Priority Number	Major Project Type	Useful Life	OPWC Grant Request	OPWC Loan Request	Local Commitment	Total OPWC Request	Local %	OPWC %	Total Proj. Cost	Life Cost	Total Points	
Cortland City	Asphalt Improvements for Corrin, Charles, Frostwood, Richards, Woodview, Fowler,	1	Road	10	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ 202,973	\$ 100,000	67%	33%	\$ 302,973	\$ 3,029,730	85	
Springfield Township	E. South Range Road Box Culvert Replacement	1	Culvert	47	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 173,000	\$ 75,000	70%	30%	\$ 248,000	\$ 11,656,000	84	
Youngstown City	Industrial Road Improvement Project	1	Road	28	\$ 543,000	\$ -	\$ 857,000	\$ 543,000	61%	39%	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 39,200,000	84	
Beaver Township	Miley Road and Fox Run Lane Road Improvements - Phase 2	1	Road	12	\$ 74,997	\$ -	\$ 117,303	\$ 74,997	61%	39%	\$ 192,300	\$ 2,307,600	83	
Youngstown City	Mahoning Avenue - Phase 1 & 2	2	Road	21	\$ 658,571	\$ -	\$ 2,984,629	\$ 658,571	82%	18%	\$ 3,643,200	\$ 76,507,200	83	
Newton Township	TH 72A Salt Springs Rd Phase 1	1	Road	13	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 117,716	\$ 75,000	61%	39%	\$ 192,716	\$ 2,505,308	82	
Poland Township	Denver Drive, Polo Blvd Improvements Project	1	Road	15	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 257,269	\$ 75,000	77%	23%	\$ 332,269	\$ 4,984,035	82	
Brookfield Township	Golf Dr, Spring Rd, Wintergreen Dr, etc. Road Improvements	1	Road	14	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 599,814	\$ 150,000	80%	20%	\$ 749,814	\$ 10,497,396	81	
Campbell City	13th/Sanderson/Park Resurfacing	1	Road	14	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 249,444	\$ 150,000	62%	38%	\$ 399,444	\$ 5,592,216	80	
Canfield City	South Hillside, Oak, Manor Hill Improvements	1	Road	15	\$ 127,248	\$ -	\$ 199,870	\$ 127,248	61%	39%	\$ 327,118	\$ 4,906,770	79	
Weathersfield Township	TH 65C&D Ohtown Rd / County Line Rd	2	Road	17	\$ 166,288	\$ -	\$ 665,154	\$ 166,288	80%	20%	\$ 831,442	\$ 14,134,514	79	
Milton Township	Pointview, Breezewood, Florence, and Heston Road Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ 63,180	\$ -	\$ 98,820	\$ 63,180	61%	39%	\$ 162,000	\$ 1,944,000	78	Contingency
McDonald Village	Connecticut Avenue Resurfacing	1	Road	15	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 124,500	\$ 75,000	62%	38%	\$ 199,500	\$ 2,992,500	78	Contingency
					\$ 2,333,284						\$ 8,980,776	\$ 180,257,269		
												Useful Life	20.07	

Revolving Loan Projects

Community	Project Name	Priority Number	Major Project Type	Useful Life	OPWC Grant Request	OPWC Loan Request	Local Commitment	Total OPWC Request	Local %	OPWC %	Total Proj. Cost	Life Cost	Total Points
Trumbull County	Everett Hull Rd, Warren Meadville Rd, Brookfield Ave, Durst Colebrook Rd	2	Road	17	\$ -	\$ 1,293,105	\$ -	\$ 696,984	46%	54%	\$ 1,293,105	\$ 21,982,785	76
Mahoning County	Boardman Wastewater Treatment Plant Belt Press Project #536	3	Wastewater	25	\$ -	\$ 900,000	\$ -	\$ 900,000	0%	100%	\$ 900,000	\$ 22,500,000	71
Brookfield Township	Hubbard Thomas Rd, Upper Grove St, etc Road Rehab	2	Road	14		\$ 1,819,694		\$ 1,819,694	0%	100%	\$ 1,819,694	\$ 25,475,716	60
\$ 4,012,799											\$ 4,012,799	\$ 69,958,501	

17.43

Small Governments Projects

Community	Project Name	Priority Number	Major Project Type	Useful Life	OPWC Grant Request	OPWC Loan Request	Local Commitment	Total OPWC Request	Local %	OPWC %	Total Proj. Cost	Life Cost	Total Points	
Lowellville Village	River/McGaffney/Jackson Overlay	1	Road	20	\$ 469,352	\$ 469,500	\$ 1,663,920	\$ 938,852	64%	36%	\$ 2,602,772	\$ 52,055,440	75	Funded
Farmington Township	TH 2258 Ensign Rd	1	Road	15	\$ 149,914	\$ -	\$ 202,500	\$ 149,914	57%	43%	\$ 352,414	\$ 5,286,210	67	Funded
Mecca Township	Th 1141 Lakeview Dr	1	Road	16	\$ 75,000	\$ -	\$ 87,751	\$ 75,000	54%	46%	\$ 162,751	\$ 2,604,016	77	Funded
Goshen Township	South Duck Creek Road Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ 93,600	\$ -	\$ 146,400	\$ 93,600	61%	39%	\$ 240,000	\$ 2,880,000	75	Funded
New Middletown Village	Kerrywood and Eastwood Drive Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ 64,680	\$ -	\$ 12,320	\$ 64,680	16%	84%	\$ 77,000	\$ 924,000	70	Funded
Braceville Township	TH 1238 Barday Messerly Rd Drainage Upgrade Phase 3	1	Stormwater	30	\$ 68,000	\$ -	\$ 30,900	\$ 68,000	31%	69%	\$ 98,900	\$ 2,967,000	70	Unfunded
Craig Beach Village	Jersey Street Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ 97,225	\$ -	\$ 18,520	\$ 97,225	16%	84%	\$ 115,745	\$ 1,388,940	63	Unfunded
\$ 1,017,771											\$ 469,500			

Unfunded Projects

Community	Project Name	Priority Number	Major Project Type	Useful Life	OPWC Grant Request	OPWC Loan Request	Local Commitment	Total OPWC Request	Local %	OPWC %	Total Proj. Cost	Life Cost	Total Points
Liberty Township	Haviland, St Andrews, Biscayne, etc. Road Improvements	1	Road	14	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 417,049	\$ 150,000	74%	26%	\$ 567,049	\$ 7,938,686	77
Bazetta Township	TH 201 McCleary Jacoby Rd	1	Road	15	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ 463,141	\$ 225,000	67%	33%	\$ 688,141	\$ 10,322,115	77
Girard City	Mosier Road Waterline Replacement	1	Water	22	\$ 284,638	\$ -	\$ 242,470	\$ 284,638	46%	54%	\$ 527,108	\$ 11,596,376	77
Hartford Township	TH 158A King Graves Rd Resurfacing Phase 1	1	Road	14	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	50%	50%	\$ 300,000	\$ 4,200,000	75
Vienna Township	Aero Park Dr & Vienna Pkwy Improvements	1	Road	17	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 128,648	\$ 150,000	46%	54%	\$ 278,648	\$ 4,737,016	74
Hubbard Township	Anthony Cr, Mt Everett Rd & Laurel Park Dr Resurfacing	1	Road	15	\$ 134,392	\$ -	\$ 114,944	\$ 134,392	46%	54%	\$ 249,336	\$ 3,740,040	73
Johnston Township	TH 843 Dunbar Lane	1	Road	12	\$ 52,355	\$ -	\$ 23,632	\$ 52,355	31%	69%	\$ 75,987	\$ 911,844	68
Champion Township	Durst Dr, Walker St & Hummel Dr Resurfacing	1	Road	15	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 132,783	\$ 150,000	47%	53%	\$ 282,783	\$ 4,241,745	67
Poland Village	Walker and Pamela Court Pavement Project	1	Road	16	\$ 109,783	\$ -	\$ 49,323	\$ 109,783	31%	69%	\$ 159,106	\$ 2,545,696	61
Smith Township	Oyster Road Resurfacing	1	Road	12	\$ 288,500	\$ -	\$ 130,000	\$ 288,500	31%	69%	\$ 418,500	\$ 5,022,000	58
Poland Village	Hill Street Pavement Project	2	Road	16	\$ 115,193	\$ -	\$ 51,753	\$ 115,193	31%	69%	\$ 166,946	\$ 2,671,136	52
Poland Village	Windemere Place Pavement Project	3	Road	16	\$ 69,179	\$ -	\$ 31,080	\$ 69,179	31%	69%	\$ 100,259	\$ 1,604,144	50

Pre-Application

District 6 Public Works Integrating Committee Round 39 (FY26) Pre-Application

Project

Project Name

Project Type

Subdivision

Are Multiple Subdivisions Involved

Applicant

Email

Project Zip Code

Project Financial Information - Project Estimated Costs

Estimated Engineering

Estimated Construction Administration

Estimated Total Engineering Services

Percentage Total Engineering Services

Estimated Right-of-Way

Total Engineering Services Exceeds 20%

Estimated Construction

Estimated Permits, Advertising, Etc.

Estimated Construction Contingencies

Percentage Construction Contingencies

Total Estimated Costs

Project Financial Resources - Local Resources

Local In-Kind or Force Account

Local Revenues

Public Revenue: ODOT / FHWA

Public Revenue: ODOT / FHWA Type

ODOT PID

Public Revenue: OEPA / OWDA

Public Revenue: Other

Public Revenue: Other Description

Subtotal Local Resources

Percentage Local Resources

Project Financial Resources - OPWC Funds

Grant Request

Loan Request

Loan Term

Loan Assistance Request

Subtotal OPWC Funds

Total Financial Resources

Grant - Percentage of OPWC Funds

Loan - Percentage of OPWC Funds

Percentage OPWC Funds

Percentage Total Financial Resources

New / Expansion

Portion of Project New / Expansion

Project Schedule

Engineering / Design / RoW Begin Date

Bid Advertisement and Award Begin Date

Construction Begin Date

Engineering / Design / RoW End Date

Bid Advertisement and Award End Date

Construction End Date

Project Information

Project Useful Life

Estimated Year of Last Improvement

User Information

Road or Bridge Current ADT

Age in Years

Road or Bridge ADT Year Taken

Water / Wastewater based on monthly usage of 4,500 gallons per household: attach current ordinance

Current Residential Water Rate

Current Residential Wastewater Rate

Stormwater - # Households

Residential Water - # Households

Residential Wastewater - # Households

Project Descriptions

Specific Location

Identify the Problem

Project Scope

Additional Notes from Applicant

Do not fill in this section.

Project Notes

Do not fill in this section.

Project Officials

Chief Executive Officer

Email

Chief Financial Officer

Email

Project Manager

Email

Additional Information for District 6 Pre-application Scoring

Project Priority Number

If Not Approved for Grant, is Loan Acceptable?

Condition of Infrastructure

Generation of Revenues

Water, Wastewater, Stormwater - Which Point Category (2B or 2C)?

If Multiple Subdivisions - List other Subdivisions

Health and Safety

Have other funding sources been applied for? List by percentage.

Is the project needed for new economic or residential growth?

OEPA Sanctions/Mandates

If yes include EPA orders

Checklist

Certified Engineer's Cost Estimate

Certified Engineer's Statement of Impact - Problem Solution (If Applicable)

Traffic Studies - Engineering Reports (If Applicable)

Certified Engineer's Useful Life Estimate

Location Map – 8.5" x 11" maps are preferable.

Age and Traffic Count Weighted Average Worksheet

Affordability Worksheet (water and sanitary system projects only)

Copy of All Cooperative Agreements (projects involving more than one political subdivision)

Engineer's Plan Status Certification

Auditor's Certificate of Estimated Resources (Communities under 5,000) This is required to score projects for the Small Government Program and must be included with the pre-application.

Each submission must include 1 copy of the full application and 18 copies of the 4-page pre-application with a copy of an 8.5"x11" project location map attached to each of the 18 copies.

Questions can be directed to:

Ed Davis, OPWC Program Manager
Eastgate Regional Council of Governments
100 East Federal Street – Suite 1000
Youngstown, Ohio 44503

Phone: 234-254-1511
E-mail: edavis@eastgatecog.org

Ashley Ellrod, Program Representative
Ohio Public Works Commission

Phone: 614-745-9076
E-mail: ashley.ellrod@pwc.ohio.gov

OPWC application, instructions and attachments

<https://publicworks.ohio.gov/Programs/Infrastructure-Programs/Infrastructure-Application>

Community Codes

Community	Code
Trumbull County	155-00155
Bazetta Township	155-04444
Bloomfield Township	155-07160
Braceville Township	155-08056
Bristol Township	155-08938
Brookfield Township	155-09190
Champion Township	155-13470
Cortland City	155-18812
Farmington Township	155-26684
Fowler Township	155-28098
Girard City	155-30198
Greene Township	155-32046
Gustavus Township	155-32732
Hartford Township	155-34230
Howland Township	155-36554
Hubbard City	155-36582
Hubbard Township	155-36596
Johnston Township	155-39298
Kinsman Township	155-40502
Liberty Township	155-43344
Lordstown Village	155-44912
McDonald Village	155-45934
Mecca Township	155-48678
Mesopotamia Township	155-49210
Newton Township	155-55636
Newton Falls Village	155-55650
Niles City	155-55916
Orangeville Village	155-58674
Southington Township	155-73397
Vernon Township	155-79856
Vienna Township	155-80052
Warren City	155-80892
Warren Township	155-80906
Weathersfield Township	155-82446
West Farmington Village	155-83384
Yankee Lake Village	155-86856

Community	Code
ABC Water and Storm Water District	099-00401
Mahoning County	099-00099
Austintown Township	099-03198
Beaver Township	099-04668
Beloit Village	099-05410
Berlin Township	099-05858
Boardman Township	099-07468
Campbell City	099-11066
Canfield City	099-11360
Canfield Township	099-11374
Coitsville Township	099-16476
Craig Beach Village	099-19106
Ellsworth Township	099-25088
Goshen Township	099-31038
Green Township	099-31794
Lowellville Village	099-45178
Milton Township	099-50638
New Middletown Village	099-55118
Jackson Township	099-56672
Poland Township	099-63954
Poland Village	099-63968
Sebring Village	099-71200
Smith Township	099-72740
Springfield Township	099-74124
Struthers City	099-75126
Youngstown City	099-88000
Mahoning Valley Sanitary District	099-00259

Small Government Program

Application Guidelines

All communities must first submit projects for funding through the district allocation. Pre-Applications are due in Eastgate's office by 3:00 pm on August 29, 2024. Since the scoring criteria used for the Small Government Program is different than that used by District 6, it is important that small governments prepare the application to be scored by both methodologies. Projects must be rated and ranked for funding by District 6 before recommended to the Small Government Commission. The District 6 rating system is available in this manual. The District 6 committee requires communities under 5,000 in population to provide additional information that will improve the competitiveness of applications when rated using Small Government criteria. The latest Auditor's Certificate of Estimated Resources must be included with the District 6 Pre-Application.

If unsuccessful with district funding, communities under 5,000 in population will be scored using the Small Government criteria. The District 6 Small Government committee will select the projects with the best chance to receive funding. Seven projects can be submitted from each district.

Small Government Scoring Criteria

1. Ability and Effort to Finance the Project
2. Importance to Health and Safety
3. Age and Condition of System
4. Leveraging Ratio
5. Population Benefit
6. District Priority Ranking
7. Amount of OPWC Funding Requested
8. Loan Request as Percentage
9. Useful Life of Project
10. Median Household Income

Final applications for Small Government funding are due on December 20, 2024 and submitted using the PublicWorksWise online portal.

In order to receive maximum points, communities are asked to have their plans completed by the Small Government Engineer's Plan Status Certification deadline (around the end of March).

Once a communities' project has been selected and submitted for Small Government consideration, the process is as follows:

- ***Intent to Apply*** - No longer required by the OPWC.
- ***Cure Period*** - Confirmed applicants (all listed contacts with valid email addresses) are provided a "cure" notification with deadline stating they have 30 calendar days, to provide required and/or additional documentation according to the Small Government requirements and methodology. All submissions must be received by midnight on the due date with only one exception. This exception is that all applicants have the same date, March 31, 2025, to submit the required Small Government Engineer's Plan Status Certification. As part of the cure, applicants may make changes to the amount and type of funding assistance requested (grant and loan), as well as engineering if the originating district does not permit engineering as part of the application.
- ***Composite Score*** - After the 30-day cure, the applications are scored. Applicants (contact listed on page 1 of application) are emailed their final composite score and, if applicable, calculated combined annual water/wastewater rates. Applicants are given one week to refute discrepancies.
- ***Awards*** - About noon on the day of the Small Government Commission meeting the final results are posted on this website. Each district liaison is then sent their district results and each applicant who is awarded funds receives a congratulatory email with information pertaining to the release of agreements.

Guidelines and project materials for the OPWC Small Government Program are available at

<https://publicworks.ohio.gov/programs/infrastructure/government>

Authorizing Legislation

AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING [INSERT NAME AND / OR TITLE] TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION STATE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND / OR LOCAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM(S) AND TO EXECUTE CONTRACTS AS REQUIRED

WHEREAS, the State Capital Improvement Program and the Local Transportation Improvement Program both provide financial assistance to political subdivisions for capital improvements to public infrastructure, and

WHEREAS, the [Insert Name of Political Subdivision] is planning to make capital improvements to [Insert Project Name], and

WHEREAS, the infrastructure improvement herein above described is a priority need for the community and is a qualified project under the OPWC programs,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by [Insert Name of Political Subdivision]:

Section 1: The *[Insert Name and/or Title of the individual who signs page 6 of the application]* is hereby authorized to apply to the OPWC for funds as described above.

Section 2: *The [Insert Name and/or Title of the Chief Executive Officer on page 5 of the application]* is authorized to enter into any agreements as may be necessary and appropriate for obtaining this financial assistance.

Passed: [Insert Date]

[All Required Signatures Here]

CFO Certification of Local Funds and Repayment Letter

Chief Financial Officer's Certification of Local Funds

[Insert Date]

I, [Insert title] of the [Insert name of political subdivision], hereby certify that [Insert name of political subdivision] has the amount of [Insert amount of local funds] in the [Insert name of account / fund] and that this amount will be used to pay the local share for the [Insert name of project] when it is required.

[Name, Title and Signature of Chief Financial Officer]

Chief Financial Officer's Loan Repayment Letter

[Insert Date]

I, [Insert title] of the [Insert name of political subdivision], hereby certify that [Insert name of political subdivision] has / will have / will collect the amount of [Insert amount of loan] in the [Insert Name of Account / Fund] and that this amount will be used to repay the Ohio Public Works Commission SCIP or RLP loan requested for the [Insert name of project] over a [Insert number of years] term.

[Name, Title and Signature of Chief Financial Officer]

Affordability Table - Median Household Income (MHI)

Community	Community Median Household Income	State Median Household Income	Community Percent of State MHI	Drinking Water Affordability Rate	Waste Water Affordability Rate	Combined Affordability Rate	Line 10 Water (A)	Line 21 Sewer (B)	Line 26 Combined (C)
ABC Water and Storm Water District	\$63,256	\$66,990	94.43%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$822.33	\$1,075.35	\$1,897.68
Austintown Township	\$53,897	\$66,990	80.46%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$592.87	\$808.46	\$1,401.32
Bazetta Township	\$66,563	\$66,990	99.36%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$865.32	\$1,131.57	\$1,996.89
Beaver Township	\$92,530	\$66,990	138.13%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,387.95	\$1,665.54	\$3,053.49
Beloit Village	\$50,682	\$66,990	75.66%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$557.50	\$760.23	\$1,317.73
Berlin Township	\$71,953	\$66,990	107.41%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$935.39	\$1,223.20	\$2,158.59
Bloomfield Township	\$61,579	\$66,990	91.92%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$800.53	\$1,046.84	\$1,847.37
Boardman Township	\$64,356	\$66,990	96.07%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$836.63	\$1,094.05	\$1,930.68
Braceville Township	\$57,031	\$66,990	85.13%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$627.34	\$855.47	\$1,482.81
Bristol Township	\$75,329	\$66,990	112.45%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,129.94	\$1,355.92	\$2,485.86
Brookfield Township	\$52,568	\$66,990	78.47%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$578.25	\$788.52	\$1,366.77
Campbell City	\$43,176	\$66,990	64.45%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$474.94	\$647.64	\$1,122.58
Canfield City	\$100,219	\$66,990	149.60%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,503.29	\$1,803.94	\$3,307.23
Canfield Township	\$94,967	\$66,990	141.76%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,424.51	\$1,709.41	\$3,133.91
Champion Township	\$70,660	\$66,990	105.48%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$918.58	\$1,201.22	\$2,119.80
Cottsville Township	\$61,964	\$66,990	92.50%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$805.53	\$1,053.39	\$1,858.92
Cortland City	\$60,767	\$66,990	90.71%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$789.97	\$1,033.04	\$1,823.01
Craig Beach Village	\$71,750	\$66,990	107.11%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$932.75	\$1,219.75	\$2,152.50
Ellsworth Township	\$78,188	\$66,990	116.72%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,172.82	\$1,407.38	\$2,580.20
Farmington Township	\$61,796	\$66,990	92.25%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$803.35	\$1,050.53	\$1,853.88
Fowler Township	\$59,516	\$66,990	88.84%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$654.68	\$892.74	\$1,547.42
Girard City	\$43,504	\$66,990	64.94%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$478.54	\$652.56	\$1,131.10
Goshen Township	\$62,526	\$66,990	93.34%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$812.84	\$1,062.94	\$1,875.78
Green Township	\$102,289	\$66,990	152.69%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,534.34	\$1,841.20	\$3,375.54
Greene Township	\$48,580	\$66,990	72.52%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$534.38	\$728.70	\$1,263.08
Gustavus Township	\$49,338	\$66,990	73.65%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$542.72	\$740.07	\$1,282.79
Hartford Township	\$59,973	\$66,990	89.53%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$659.70	\$899.60	\$1,559.30
Howland Township	\$75,208	\$66,990	112.27%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,128.12	\$1,353.74	\$2,481.86
Hubbard City	\$61,064	\$66,990	91.15%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$793.83	\$1,038.09	\$1,831.92
Hubbard Township	\$46,604	\$66,990	69.57%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$512.64	\$699.06	\$1,211.70
Jackson Township	\$54,423	\$66,990	81.24%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$598.65	\$816.35	\$1,415.00
Johnston Township	\$67,143	\$66,990	100.23%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$872.86	\$1,141.43	\$2,014.29
Kinsman Township	\$54,211	\$66,990	80.92%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$596.32	\$813.17	\$1,409.49
Liberty Township	\$62,466	\$66,990	93.25%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$812.06	\$1,061.92	\$1,873.98
Lordstown Village	\$64,116	\$66,990	95.71%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$833.51	\$1,089.97	\$1,923.48
Lowellville Village	\$51,458	\$66,990	76.81%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$566.04	\$771.87	\$1,337.91
Mahoning County	\$54,279	\$66,990	81.03%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$597.07	\$814.19	\$1,411.25
McDonald Village	\$75,315	\$66,990	112.43%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,129.73	\$1,355.67	\$2,485.40
Mecca Township	\$50,833	\$66,990	75.88%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$559.16	\$762.50	\$1,321.66
Mesopotamia Township	\$55,061	\$66,990	82.19%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$605.67	\$825.92	\$1,431.59
Milton Township	\$82,233	\$66,990	122.75%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,233.50	\$1,480.19	\$2,713.69
Mahoning Valley Sanitary District	\$47,350	\$66,990	70.68%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$520.85	\$710.25	\$1,231.10
New Middletown Village	\$48,466	\$66,990	72.35%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$533.13	\$726.99	\$1,260.12
Newton Falls Village	\$50,738	\$66,990	75.74%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$558.12	\$761.07	\$1,319.19
Newton Township	\$73,073	\$66,990	109.08%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$949.95	\$1,242.24	\$2,192.19
Niles City	\$48,860	\$66,990	72.94%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$537.46	\$732.90	\$1,270.36
Orangeville Village	\$36,563	\$66,990	54.58%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$402.19	\$548.45	\$950.64
Poland Township	\$92,173	\$66,990	137.59%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,382.60	\$1,659.11	\$3,041.71
Poland Village	\$82,024	\$66,990	122.44%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,230.36	\$1,476.43	\$2,706.79
Sebring Village	\$46,387	\$66,990	69.24%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$510.26	\$695.81	\$1,206.06
Smith Township	\$73,369	\$66,990	109.52%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$953.80	\$1,247.27	\$2,201.07
Southington Township	\$71,520	\$66,990	106.76%	0.013	0.017	0.030	\$929.76	\$1,215.84	\$2,145.60
Springfield Township	\$57,570	\$66,990	85.94%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$633.27	\$863.55	\$1,496.82
Struthers City	\$48,125	\$66,990	71.84%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$529.38	\$721.88	\$1,251.25
Trumbull County	\$53,537	\$66,990	79.92%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$588.91	\$803.06	\$1,391.96
Vernon Township	\$55,282	\$66,990	82.52%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$608.10	\$829.23	\$1,437.33
Vienna Township	\$74,818	\$66,990	111.69%	0.015	0.018	0.033	\$1,122.27	\$1,346.72	\$2,468.99
Warren City	\$33,296	\$66,990	49.70%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$366.26	\$499.44	\$865.70
Warren Township	\$43,934	\$66,990	65.58%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$483.27	\$659.01	\$1,142.28
Weathersfield Township	\$51,237	\$66,990	76.48%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$563.61	\$768.56	\$1,332.16
West Farmington Village	\$57,159	\$66,990	85.32%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$628.75	\$857.39	\$1,486.13
Yankee Lake Village	\$42,500	\$66,990	63.44%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$467.50	\$637.50	\$1,105.00
Youngstown City	\$34,295	\$66,990	51.19%	0.011	0.015	0.026	\$377.25	\$514.43	\$891.67

0-69.99% MHI
 70-79.99% MHI
 80-89.99% MHI
 90-99.99% MHI
 100%+ MHI

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census, 2018-2022 ACS

Affordability Worksheet

AFFORDABILITY WORKSHEET FOR SANITARY SEWER AND WATER PROJECTS MUST BE COMPLETED FOR EACH WATER AND/OR SANITARY SEWER PROJECT

COMMUNITY:	
PROJECT NAME:	
1. AMOUNT OF REQUEST FOR WATER PROJECT	
2. USEFUL LIFE OF WATER PROJECT (MAXIMUM OF 20 YEARS)	
3. NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL WATER USERS	
4. TOTAL ANNUAL WATER USAGE FEES (93,000 GAL PER YEAR)	
5. PROJECTED ANNUAL USER FEE INCREASE FOR THIS PROJECT	
6. ADD LINES 4 AND 5	\$ -
7. DIVIDE LINE 1 BY LINE 2	#DIV/0!
8. DIVIDE LINE 7 LINE 3	#DIV/0!
9. ADD LINES 6 AND 8	#DIV/0!
10. ENTER AMOUNT FROM AFFORDABILITY TABLE COLUMN A*	#N/A
11. SUBTRACT LINE 9 FROM LINE 10	#N/A
12. AMOUNT OF REQUEST FOR SANITARY SEWER PROJECT	
13. USEFUL LIFE OF SANITARY SEWER PROJECT (MAXIMUM OF 20 YEARS)	
14. NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL SANITARY SEWER USERS	
15. TOTAL ANNUAL SANITARY SEWER USAGE FEES (93,000 GAL PER YEAR)	
16. PROJECTED ANNUAL USER FEE INCREASE FOR THIS PROJECT	
17. ADD LINES 15 AND 16	\$ -
18. DIVIDE LINE 12 BY LINE 13	#DIV/0!
19. DIVIDE LINE 18 BY LINE 14	#DIV/0!
20. ADD LINES 17 AND 19	#DIV/0!
21. ENTER AMOUNT FROM AFFORDABILITY TABLE COLUMN B*	#N/A
22. SUBTRACT LINE 20 FROM LINE 21	#N/A
23. ADD LINES 8 AND 19	#DIV/0!
24. ADD LINES 6 AND 17	\$ -
25. ADD LINES 23 AND 24	#DIV/0!
26. ENTER AMOUNT FROM AFFORDABILITY TABLE COLUMN C*	#N/A
27. SUBTRACT LINE 25 FROM LINE 26	#N/A

* ON PREVIOUS TABLE

FOR WATER PROJECT TO BE GRANT ELIGIBLE LINE 11 OR LINE 27 MUST BE NEGATIVE
FOR A SANITARY SEWER PROJECT TO BE GRANT ELIGIBLE LINE 22 OR LINE 27 MUST BE NEGATIVE