



**Public Works
Commission**

Public Works For You

Ohio Public Works Commission

Small Government Capital Improvements Program

FY 26 / Round 39 Methodology - Rating Scales
(July 1, 2025, Agreement Release)

Approved May 9, 2024

Ohio Public Works Commission

<https://publicworks.ohio.gov/programs/infrastructure/government/03-small-government>

Complete and compliant support documentation must be provided for a criterion to be awarded points. See Applicant Manual for more information.

1. Ability and Effort of the Applicant to Finance the Project (Maximum 10 points)

A. Roads, Bridges/Culverts, Storm Water, Solid Waste Projects Only – “Auditor’s Certificate of Estimated Resources” showing fund detail, as provided in ORC sections 5705.35 and 5705.36 is used to determine potential financial resources available for the project. Score is based on the project’s total cost as a percentage of financial resources.

- | | |
|----|---|
| 0 | Total project cost represents 0 to 20% of subdivision's total combined funds legally eligible for infrastructure type |
| 2 | Total project cost represents 21 to 40% of subdivision's total combined funds legally eligible for infrastructure type |
| 4 | Total project cost represents 41 to 60% of subdivision's total combined funds legally eligible for infrastructure type |
| 6 | Total project cost represents 61 to 80% of subdivision's total combined funds legally eligible for infrastructure type |
| 8 | Total project cost represents 81 to 100% of subdivision's total combined funds legally eligible for infrastructure type |
| 10 | Total project cost exceeds 100% of subdivision's total combined funds legally eligible for infrastructure type, or subdivision is in fiscal emergency |

B. Water and Wastewater Projects Only – Determined by SG Administrator according to the Water & Wastewater Ability & Effort calculation described in Applicants Manual. Information is obtained from both water and wastewater rate ordinances, Small Government Water & Wastewater Ability & Effort Supplemental, and data from the *U.S. Census Bureau*. Points are provided for the hours worked to pay for water and wastewater services according to the highest of two variances as a percentage above or below State Averages: weighted average of household income or percentage of households making less than \$25,000.

- | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|
| 0 | More than 50% above state average |
| 2 | 25.1% - 50% above state average |
| 4 | 0 - 25% above state average |
| 6 | 0.1% - 25% below state average |
| 8 | 25.1% to 50% below state average |
| 10 | More than 50% below state average |

2. Importance of Project to Health and Safety of Citizens – Score is assigned according to the application project description and any pertinent supplemental documentation. (Maximum 10 points)

A. Road, Bridge, Culvert

- | | |
|---|--|
| 0 | New infrastructure to meet future or projected needs |
| 2 | New infrastructure to meet current needs; Roadway surface paving less than 2 inches; Bridges with General Appraisal of 6 or above or with a Sufficiency Rating of 81-100 |

- 4 Roadway surface paving equal to or greater than 2 inches with/without milling; Replace or install signal where warranted; Bridges with a General Appraisal of 5 or Sufficiency Rating of 66-80; Culvert replacement with no associated damage
- 6 Road widening to add paved shoulders or for safe passage, and/or roadway paving with full-depth base repair equal to or greater than 5% of roadway surface area; Intersection improvement to add turn lanes or realignment; Bridges with a General Appraisal of 4 or Sufficiency Rating of 51-65; Culverts with inadequate flow capacity
- 8 Complete roadway full-depth reconstruction (includes removal/replacement of base) or reclamation with/without drainage; Widening to add travel lanes; Intersection improvements to address excessive accident rate and/or inadequate level of service with Crash Reduction Factor ($0.0 < CRF < 0.2$); Bridges with a General Appraisal of 3 or Sufficiency Rating of 26-50; Culverts with inadequate flow capacity and property damage (i.e. flooding)
- 10 Complete roadway reconstruction or reclamation with/without drainage with widening to add travel lanes; Intersection improvement to address excessive accident rate and/or inadequate level of service with Crash Reduction Factor ($CRF \geq 0.2$); Bridges with General Appraisal of 2 or less, or Sufficiency Rating of less than 26; Culverts that are structurally deficient

B. Water, Wastewater, Storm Water, Solid Waste

- 0 Infrastructure to meet future or projected needs
- 2 Expanded infrastructure to meet specific development proposal
- 4 Infrastructure to meet current needs; Update processes to improve effluent or water quality; To remain in compliance with permit due to increased standards; Increase storm sewer capacity in which there is no associated land damage; Increase sanitary sewer capacity; Replace water meters as part of an upgrade
- 6 OEPA recommendations; District health board recommendations; Increase storm sewer capacity that has associated land damage; Replace undersized waterlines as part of upgrade; Install new meters or replace meters that have exceeded useful life
- 8 Replacement of storm or sanitary sewers due to chronic flooding, back-up, or property damage; Inflow and/or Infiltration; Inadequate capacity to maintain pressure required for fire flows; Replacement of waterlines or towers due to excessive corrosion
- 10 OEPA Findings & Orders, OEPA orders contained in permit, Consent Decree or Court Order; Structural separations (CSOs) Age and Condition of System to be repaired or replaced. This is a two-part criterion. (Maximum 10 points)

3. Age & Condition of System to be repaired or replaced

Part I – Age: This uses provided documentation for existing infrastructure. Documentation pertains to source documentation or from a compliant letter written by an eligible local official who can vouch for the time period during his/her term in office. If no documentation the default score is 1 point. (Maximum 5 points)

Life	20	30	50
Project Type	Road	Wastewater	Bridge/Culvert. Sanitary Sewer, Water, Storm Water, Solid Waste
Points			
0	New / Expansion	New / Expansion	New / Expansion
1	2019-2024	2016-2024	2009-2024
2	2014-2018	2009-2015	1998-2008
3	2009-2013	2001-2008	1986-1997
4	2004-2008	1994-2000	1974-1985
5	2003 or before	1993 or before	1973 or before

Part II – Condition (Maximum 5 points)

- 1 New/Expansion: New or expansion project components represent at least 50% of improvements
- 2 Expansion: New or expansion project components represent between 25% and 49% of improvements
- 3 Poor: Infrastructure requires repair to continue functioning as originally intended and/or upgrade to meet current design standards.
- 4 Critical: Infrastructure requires replacement to continue functioning as originally intended.
- 5 Failed: Not functioning

4. Leveraging Ratio – Local and all non-OPWC funding sources as a percentage of total funding. (Maximum 10 points)

	Repair/Replacement (Poor/Critical/Failed in Criterion 3)	New/Expansion (New/Expansion &/or Expansion in Criterion 3)
0	10.9% or less	50.9% or less
1	11.0 – 15.9 %	51.0 – 55.9 %
2	16.0 – 20.9 %	56.0 – 60.9 %
3	21.0 – 25.9 %	61.0 – 65.9 %
4	26.0 – 30.9 %	66.0 – 70.9 %
5	31.0 – 35.9 %	71.0 – 75.9 %
6	36.0 – 40.9 %	76.0 – 80.9 %
7	41.0 – 45.9 %	81.0 – 85.9 %
8	46.0 – 50.9 %	86.0 – 90.9 %
9	51.0 – 55.9 %	91.0 – 95.9 %
10	56.0% or more	96.0% or more

5. **Population Benefit** – Number of those to benefit directly from the improvement as a percentage of applicant's total population. (Maximum 5 points)

0	10% or less
1	11% - 25%
2	26% - 35%
3	36% - 45%
4	46% - 55%
5	56% or more

6. **District Priority Ranking as provided by District** (Maximum 10 points)

6	5 th ranked district project
7	4 th ranked district project
8	3 rd ranked district project
9	2 nd ranked district project
10	1 st ranked district project

7. **Amount of OPWC funding requested** (Maximum 10 points)

0	\$500,000 or more
5	\$250,000 - \$499,999
10	249,999 or less

8. **Loan Request as a percentage of OPWC assistance** (Maximum 10 points)

0	0 – 14.9% of OPWC assistance
1	15.0 – 29.9% of OPWC assistance
5	30.0 – 49.9% of OPWC assistance
10	50.0 – 100% of OPWC assistance

9. **Useful Life of Project** – Taken from engineer's useful life statement. (Maximum 5 points)

1	7 – 9 years
2	10 – 14 years
3	15 – 19 years
4	20 – 24 years
5	25 years or more

10. **Median Household Income** – Applicant's MHI as a percentage of the statewide MHI. Information derived from the most recent 5-year American Community Survey as published by the Ohio Development Services Agency. (Maximum 10 points)

2	110% or more
4	100% - 109%
6	90% - 99%
8	80% – 89%
10	79% or less

11. Readiness to Proceed (Maximum 10 points)

Part I – Status of Plans – This uses the Small Government Commission’s Engineer’s Plan Status Certification. (Maximum 5 points)

- 0 Plans not yet begun
- 2 Surveying through Preliminary Design Completed (Items A-C)
- 5 Surveying through final construction plans, and secured permits and right-of-way as appropriate (Items A-H)

Part II – Status of Funding Sources – This uses source documentation including CFO certifications and loan letters. (Maximum 5 points)

- 0 All funds not yet committed
- 3 Applications submitted to funding entities
- 5 All funding committed