

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

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

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

*will use standard rounding procedures

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		Jurisdiction has withdrawn on its Local Share commitment within the last 4 years.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

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

Note #2: Jurisdiction must submit their budget documents, or portions of, to the District to verify the above.

164.14(E)(4)	4.	What is the status or availability of Non-Local Revenue requested? (3 points max):	
		Eligible, application has been made, not funded	3
		Eligible, application has been made, funded	2
		Not eligible, or excellent case not to use	1
		Eligible, but not applying for funds	0
	5.	Choose either 5(a) or 5(b) - whichever is applicable along with 5(c) (15 points max.) Please check one.	
164.06(B)(1) 164.06(B)(2) 164.14(E)(9)	(a)	What is the remaining useful life of repair and replacement projects?	
		Past useful life - not in service	10
		Past useful life and declining rapidly or substandard	
		-Major reconstruction or replacement	9
		-Projects that bring infrastructure up to standards	8
		At or near useful life and declining	
		Minor Reconstruction Resurfacing:	
		-Two course with minor full depth repair	7
		-One course with minor full depth repair	6
		Preventive Maintenance Resurfacing:	
		-Two Course	6
		-One Course	5
		Not near useful life or declining, but functioning poorly (micro surfacing)	3
164.14(E)(7)	(b)	The new or expansion project has significance for:	
		-District wide significance or need	10
		-Multi-jurisdictional significance or need	8
		-Applicant significance or need	6
		-Neighborhood significance or need	3
		-No real significance or need	0

(c)	Useful Life of Projects	
	20 years & above	5
	15 – 19 years	4
	10 – 14 years	2
	7 – 9 years	1

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

164.06(B)(1)

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

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

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

GROUP 2 - Benefit to users

D.I.C.

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

Persons per household = 2.46

***GROUP 3 - Type of project**

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

	Stormwater Collection	9
	Wastewater Collection/P.S.	8
	Roads and Streets	7
	Bridges	6
	Culverts	5
164.06(B)(1)	Water Distribution/P.S./Water Towers	4
	Water Supply Systems	3
	Solid Waste	2
	Wastewater Systems	1

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

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

ROADS

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

STORM SEWERS

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

BRIDGES- Sufficiency rating

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

CULVERTS

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

SANITARY TREATMENT PLANTS

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

SANITARY SEWERS/P.S.

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

WATER TREATMENT PLANT

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

WATER LINES/PUMPS/WATER TOWERS

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

164.14(E)(6) D.I.C. 8. Past history of the applicant community's investment in infrastructure improvements. Use the District's 5 Year C.I.R. Report as guideline: (8 points max):

History of Investing

Excellent	8
Good	5
Poor	2

164.06(B)(8) 164.14(E)(6) 9. Applicant Subdivisions' economic health based on the most current Median Household Income data available (10 points max.)

MUNICIPALITY

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

	Pts.		
Ottawa Hills	0	\$110,135.00	VERY EXCELLENT
Monclova Township	0	\$ 96,121.00	
Richfield Township	2	\$ 81,641.00	EXCELLENT
Harding Township	2	\$ 80,625.00	
Whitehouse Village	4	\$ 73,225.00	
Waterville Township	4	\$ 72,652.00	
Sylvania Township	4	\$ 72,602.00	
Waterville City	4	\$ 72,245.00	VERY GOOD
Berkey Village	4	\$ 71,667.00	
Sylvania City	4	\$ 68,488.00	
Jerusalem Township	4	\$ 66,607.00	
Providence Township	4	\$ 64,667.00	
Spencer Township	6	\$ 62,803.00	
Maumee City	6	\$ 52,267.00	GOOD
Washington Township	6	\$ 55,873.00	
Springfield Township	6	\$ 53,767.00	
Swanton Township	6	\$ 51,914.00	

MUNICIPALITY

MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

	<u>Pts.</u>		
Oregon City	6	\$ 50,605.00	
Holland Village	8	\$ 46,875.00	FAIR
Lucas County	8	\$ 38,773.00	
Harbor View Village	10	\$ 31,734.00	POOR
Toledo City	10	\$ 31,708.00	

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

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

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

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

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

Note: Fees and assessments would only occur if this specific project is built.

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

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

164.06(B)(10)
164.14(E)(10)

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

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

Air Pollution

Examples:

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

Water Pollution

Examples:

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

Recycled Material

1

D.I.C.

b) For "most important project" to applicant (8 points)

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

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

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

- a. Projects which rehabilitate or renovate existing infrastructure as opposed to extending new infrastructure to undeveloped areas (3 points)
- b. Projects which do not increase capacity to undeveloped areas thereby encouraging their development (2 points)
- c. Projects which reduce roadblocks to redevelopment of and investment in core urban areas. (2 points)
- d. Projects which increase transportation choices and reduce reliance on the

automobile such as developing sidewalks and pedestrian ramps in a developed area which does not have them or developing mass transit facilities in a developed area where these are lacking. (3 points)

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

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

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

- a. Any project from Program Year 2013 has not gone to construction by November 1, 2014.
- b. Any project from Program Year 2012 has not been closed out with OPWC by November 1, 2014. Closed out means final disbursement has been requested and the appropriate paperwork accepted by OPWC to close this project.

Note: An approved project extension by OPWC does not matter at the district level when evaluating projects with this question. Which means project schedules in the formal project agreements with OPWC does not matter when considering scoring applications. These schedules and extensions are for funding considerations between OPWC and Jurisdictions. There will be multi-million dollar projects that require more than two years to construct (see attached listed projects). These projects will be exempt from the Program Year 2012 delinquent condition. Multi-year project schedules will be approved by D.I.C. when they approve project funding.

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

NEW

16. **Past Funding Distribution:**

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

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

NEW

17. Application Submission Policies

- a. **No time extensions will be granted for SCIP/LTIP applications. Applications will be due by 4:00 p.m. on the day of the application deadline. Any application received after this time will be rejected and not considered for funding during the current round.**

- b. **Staff will be subtracting points from the applicant’s final score for missing, incomplete or incorrect information. Each application must contain the items listed on the Application Submission Checklist. Failure to submit these items or items submitted that are incomplete or incorrect will result in points being deducted from the project’s total score in the amount indicated in parentheses.**
 - 1) **Official OPWC application for Financial Assistance Form, pages 1- 6) (4 points penalty). Located on the OPWC website.**
 - 2) **District 12 Project Ranking Information for current funding round (5 points penalty) Located on the OPWC website.**
 - 3) **Engineer’s Certifications:**
 - **“Detailed” Professional Engineer’s Estimate - Must certify contingency and construction costs (5 points penalty)**
 - **Certification by Professional Engineer of Cost Estimate/Design Service & Useful Life Certification (3 points penalty)**
 - 4) **Required Certifications/Agreements:**
 - **Status of Funds Letter following OPWC template (3 points penalty)**
 - **Approved Authorizing Legislation (1 point penalty)**
 - **Cooperation Agreement (if multi-jurisdictional) (1 point penalty)**
 - **Loan repayment certification Letter if loan or (grant + loan) only (1 point penalty)**
 - 5) **Map Defining Geographic Scope of Project (1 point penalty)**

- c. **Deadline for Providing Missing/Corrected Application Information**

Staff will review each application for the required information requested on the Application Submission Checklist. Staff will then inform the applicant by e–mail of any required corrections and will give the applicant five (5) working days to provide the necessary information. Failure to respond within this timeframe will result in staff rejecting the application for that funding round.

- d. Minimum Local Match Must Be Met**
When applying for SCIP or LTIP funding, an applicant must meet the 10% minimum local match requirement in order to be evaluated for funding in that round. Failure to provide the minimum local match will deem the project ineligible for funding in that program and the project will be rejected.

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

Revised: July 15, 2014

G:\data\ENGINEER\mdrennen\DIC Business\Issue 2 Handbook\2014\Project Evaluation Criteria.doc

QUESTION 15 DEADLINES

November 1, 2013:

2012 Projects need to be closed out
2013 Projects need to be let (NTP)

November 1, 2014:

2012 Projects need to be closed out
2013 Projects need to be let (NTP)

November 1, 2015:

2013 Projects need to be closed out
2014 Projects need to be let (NTP)

November 1, 2016:

2014 Projects need to be closed out
2015 Projects need to be let (NTP)

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

2011

Toledo Ayers/Monroe Storage Pipeline ~ \$6,650,000 (Closed out by November 1, 2014)
Toledo Parkside Sanitary Sewer Overflow Elimination ~ \$13,336,375 (Closed out by November 1, 2014)
Toledo Oakdale Storage Basin ~ \$17,840,000 (Closed out by November 1, 2014)

2012

No Projects Affected

2013

Holland McCord Road Separation ~ \$33,915,000 (Closed out by November 1, 2018)

2014

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

2015

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

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