



## BELLBROOK CITY COUNCIL AGENDA

October 29, 2018

### **6:00 pm - Work Session - 2019 Budget Review - Administration and Service Departments**

### **7:00 pm - Regular Meeting**

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Formal Approval of Minutes
  - Regular Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2018.
5. Mayor's Announcements/Special Guest
  - Jeff Brock, Greene Memorial Hospital
  - Swearing in of Fire Lieutenant Jon Nickerson
6. Public Hearing of Ordinances
7. Introduction of Ordinances
8. Resolutions
  - Resolution 2018-HH A** Resolution Authorizing the Submittal of Application for Federal Fast Act Funds through the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission
9. City Manager's Report
10. Committee Reports
  - A. Service
  - B. Safety
  - C. Finance/Audit
    - a. Accepting the third quarter financials
  - D. Community Affairs
11. Old Business
12. New Business
  - Process for hiring Clerk of Council
13. Open Discussion
14. Adjourn

City of Bellbrook  
15 E. Franklin Street  
Bellbrook, Ohio 45305

T (937) 848-4666  
F (937) 848-5190

[www.cityofbellbrook.org](http://www.cityofbellbrook.org)



**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**  
Minutes of Bellbrook City Council Meeting  
October 8, 2018

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Baird called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.

**ROLL CALL**

Present were Mr. Forrest Greenwood, Mr. Darryl McGill, Mrs. Elaine Middlestetter and Mayor Bob Baird. Also present was City Manager Ms. Melissa Dodd.

Deputy Mayor Schweller was absent. Mrs. Middlestetter made a motion to excuse Mr. Schweller. Mr. McGill seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Greenwood, yes; Mr. McGill, yes; Mrs. Middlestetter, yes; Mayor Baird, yes. The motion carried 4-0.

Mrs. Seger-Lawson was absent. Mrs. Middlestetter made a motion to excuse Mrs. Seger-Lawson. Mr. McGill seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Greenwood, yes; Mr. McGill, yes; Mrs. Middlestetter, yes; Mayor Baird, yes. The motion carried 4-0.

Mr. Edwards was absent. Mr. McGill made a motion to excuse Mr. Edwards. Mr. Greenwood seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Greenwood, yes; Mr. McGill, yes; Mrs. Middlestetter, yes; Mayor Baird, yes. The motion carried 4-0.

**Mrs. Middlestetter made a motion to go into Executive Session at 6:33 pm to discuss the employment of a public official.** Mr. McGill seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Greenwood, yes; Mr. McGill, yes; Mrs. Middlestetter, yes; Mayor Baird, yes. The motion carried 4-0.

Being no further business, the Executive Session ended at 6:51 pm.

**FORMAL APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

After polling members of City Council, as there were no corrections or additions to the regular meeting minutes of September 24, 2018, Mayor Baird declared the minutes approved as written.

**MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS/SPECIAL GUEST**

Karen Puterbaugh of the Greene County Council on Aging provided the Mayor and Council with information on her organization and the upcoming levy renewal on the November ballot. Mayor Baird expressed his appreciation for having the senior center located within the community. Ms. Puterbaugh also noted that Medicare open enrollment begins on Monday and how important it is to review your plan.

Beth Rubin of the Greene County Department of Job and Family Services provided the Mayor and Council with information on Children's Services and the upcoming levy renewal on the November ballot.

Mayor Baird read a Proclamation declaring October Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Mrs. Middlestetter added that the Greene County Family Violence Prevention Center was chosen by the

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**  
Minutes of Bellbrook City Council Meeting  
October 8, 2018

Allstate Foundation to be one of only 6 organizations in the state to be a participant in the Purple Purse Challenge.

**PUBLIC HEARING OF ORDINANCES**

There were no public hearings this evening.

**INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES**

There were no ordinances introduced this evening.

**RESOLUTIONS**

Mayor Baird **read Resolution 2018-FF** A Resolution Honoring Retiring Police Officer Robert Loudermilk.

Mr. McGill made a motion to **adopt Resolution 2018-FF**. Mrs. Middlestetter seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Greenwood, yes; Mr. McGill, yes; Mrs. Middlestetter, yes; Mayor Baird, yes. The motion carried 4-0.

Chief Doherty recognized Officer Loudermilk and thanked him for his service. He then asked Officer Loudermilk to join him at the podium and presented him with a plaque recognizing his time with the department as well as a retiree badge.

Officer Loudermilk reflected on his career and history within the community. He also expressed his thanks to Council, Chief Doherty and his coworkers at the Bellbrook Police Department.

Mayor Baird expressed his thanks for his service and his dedication to Bellbrook.

Mr. Greenwood recognized Officer Loudermilk's long and successful career with the City of Bellbrook. He also thanked Officer Loudermilk for his service and wished him an enjoyable retirement.

Mr. McGill recognized his professionalism and abilities as a police officer.

Mrs. Middlestetter thanked Officer Loudermilk for his dedicated service.

Mr. Greenwood **read Resolution 2018-GG** A Resolution Presenting Officer Loudermilk with his Service Weapon and Providing for a Release of Claims Relating to Said Weapon.

Mr. Greenwood made a motion to **adopt Resolution 2018-GG**. Mr. McGill seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Greenwood, yes; Mr. McGill, yes; Mrs. Middlestetter, yes; Mayor Baird, yes. The motion carried 4-0.

Officer Ruble presented Officer Loudermilk with his service weapon as a symbol of what has brought himself safety as an officer as well as the safety of the citizens of Bellbrook. It is also a token of appreciation from the citizens of Bellbrook along with his fraternal brothers and sisters in blue.

Mayor Baird thanked Officer Loudermilk again for his service.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**  
Minutes of Bellbrook City Council Meeting  
October 8, 2018

**CITY MANAGER REPORT**

Interviews were completed for Fire Lieutenant and Jon Nickerson was selected. He will be sworn in at the next Council meeting. A full time internal position has been posted to fill the position vacated by Lieutenant Nickerson.

The position of Administrative Assistant – Finance has been filled which was vacated by Jami Kinion who was also Clerk of Council. The position was filled by Melissa Jones who was our Code Enforcement Officer. The search is still being conducted for the next Clerk of Council.

Ms. Dodd met with representatives from Piqua and Tipp City to learn more about their experiences with Heritage Ohio and being a downtown Mainstreet program member.

Ms. Dodd attended a seminar on Ohio PACE financing which is a program used to finance energy efficient improvements. The funding for the improvements is applied as a special assessment onto the property's taxes.

The Comprehensive Plan update is still continuing. Devon Shoemaker of Greene County Regional Planning is now leading the charge. The Planning Board will meet this Thursday at 6pm to talk about visioning ahead of the next meeting which will be the community meeting. It will be held on November 5<sup>th</sup> at 7pm at the Community Center within the Bellbrook Sugar creek Parks District office. The meeting will be interactive to gather input on the future of Bellbrook.

Ms. Dodd will be attending the Heritage Ohio Conference at the end of October along with Planning Board Chair Dr. Dave Van Veldhuizen as well as Mr. McGill. The next Council meeting will be held on October 29<sup>th</sup> due to the Heritage Ohio Conference being held at the regularly scheduled Council meeting date.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Service:** No Report.

**Safety:** Mr. Greenwood noted the Fire Department Open House will be held on the 9<sup>th</sup> from 6-8pm. There will be a number of events held for young and old alike. He also thanked everyone for supporting the recent fire levy.

**Finance/Audit:** No Report.

**Community Affairs:** Mrs. Middlestetter reminded folks of Halloween in the Park on Saturday, October 20.

**OLD BUSINESS** - none

**NEW BUSINESS**

Mayor Baird noted that we are looking for a new Clerk of Council due to the resignation of Jami Kinion. He also thanked Ms. Kinion for her service. With the vacancy being created, an interim Clerk of Council

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

## Minutes of Bellbrook City Council Meeting

October 8, 2018

needs to be designation. A motion was made by Mr. McGill to appoint Melissa Dodd as Interim Clerk of Council. Mr. McGill seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Greenwood, yes; Mr. McGill, yes; Mrs. Middlestetter, yes; Mayor Baird, yes. The motion carried 4-0.

A draft resolution was presented to Council for a grant submission to the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission for a bridge project. Ms. Dodd explained that grant submissions are being solicited by Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission for the Transportation Alternatives Program. The application is due on October 10 by 1pm and in order to apply a draft resolution needed to be presented to Council. The application is for a pedestrian walkway to be added to West Franklin Street across the bridge and connecting the two sidewalks on the west and east sides of the bridge. There was a previous proposal in 2009 to add a separate bridge as a solution. It was determined after meeting with the engineers that this solution would make the most sense given the width of the bridge. This project would also include the removal of the guardrail and installation of a new concrete sidewalk and curb as well as a mid-block crosswalk. This is an area noted in our walkability study that MVRPC was involved in as well. The project is currently scored at 42 points which gives it a higher likelihood of being funded. The total project costs were revised and are now estimated at \$548,000. The maximum amount of federal funds available is \$350,000. The local match would be \$198,000. The project would be awarded with a start date of 2024/2025. OPWC funding could be available for the local match but would not be available to be applied for until two years before the project start date. If council is supportive, the application can be submitted with a formal resolution to follow at the next Council meeting.

Mayor Baird indicated his support and noted that the Finance Committee should look at this. Without them being present at this meeting, perhaps that could be done in a work session. He also noted that he would like a better drawing than what is being presented to understand the project.

Mr. McGill noted the previous approach of adding a separate structure. He indicated his support of the project. He also noted his concerns of pedestrians being unprotected currently by those driving into the striped lane.

Mrs. Middlestetter mentioned that there is currently trouble turning left onto Little Sugarcreek when traveling eastbound and that needs to be addressed as well. She echoed the need for the pedestrian walkway.

Mr. McGill stated that it is a reasonable plan that fits into the 725 corridor plan.

Mayor Baird indicated that it will be interesting to see how the project fits into the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Greenwood stated this is a very worthwhile project and one of the most problematic areas for safety. Mr. Greenwood asked if the application would be able to change after the submission. Ms. Dodd noted that there could not be substantial changes made to the proposal. She noted that the engineers and staff all agreed that this option made the most sense.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**  
Minutes of Bellbrook City Council Meeting  
October 8, 2018

**OPEN DISCUSSION**

**Staci Turner of 3980 Locust Bend Drive** spoke of the awareness of annexation and the possibility of a merger. She asked Council where things stand in terms of a merger.

Mayor Baird informed Ms. Turner of the process and indicated that it starts with the citizens.

Mayor Baird also gave historical information on the last two merger attempts and discussed the types of annexations and impacts.

Ms. Turner indicated that she is organizing residents of both Bellbrook and Sugarcreek in November to discuss the topic of merging. She then outlined the need for either a new levy or income tax. Mayor Baird then discussed levies and the issues with replacing them.

Ms. Turner noted the increased support of merging due to the Cornerstone development.

Mayor Baird outlined some of the complexities and considerations that would need to be looked at related to merging. He also offered to come and talk to the group that will be meeting. He spoke to the issues regarding development and the limited abilities to influence development on the part of the City.

Ms. Turner noted that annexation would be prevented with a merger. Mayor Baird stated that annexation would not be an option for three years after a merger.

Ms. Turner expressed her concern for the capacity of the schools with all of the development.

Mrs. Middlestetter spoke to an issue at the state level on annexation that is forthcoming.

Mr. McGill would like to learn more about the costs associated with a merger.

Ms. Turner indicated that the group she is organizing is trying to look at all of the options and which make the most sense.

Mr. Greenwood stated that it is a good thing to look at but that it is complex.

Ms. Turner outlined that the meeting is scheduled for November 7<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 pm at the High School.

**Louie Schatzberg of 4082 Ridgetop Drive** spoke to the merger study and the fact that the fire, police and service departments of both jurisdictions are both lean and there is not enough duplication to realize much savings. The cost of the roads and bridges would also be an issue with merging. Mr. Schatzberg also thanked Council for honoring Officer Loudermilk.

**Trish Evans of 4051 Clarkston Drive** offered her concerns related to a merger. She asked if shoestring or flagpole annexations have been considered instead. Ms. Evans questioned different mechanisms

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**  
Minutes of Bellbrook City Council Meeting  
October 8, 2018

that could be put in place to stop or slow development. She also noted development's effect on the schools.

Mayor Baird spoke to the limitations on regulating development based on what the surrounding areas look like.

Ms. Evans inquired about annexation possibilities for Bellbrook. Mayor Baird outlined the fact that any potential annexed properties would need to be contiguous to the City.

**ADJOURN**

Being no further business to come before this regular session of the Bellbrook City Council, Mayor Baird declared the meeting adjourned at 8:08 pm.

---

Robert L. Baird, Mayor

---

Melissa J. Dodd, Interim Clerk of Council



# RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2018-HH

October 29, 2018

## City of Bellbrook

### Resolution No. 2018-HH

#### **A Resolution Authorizing the Submittal of Application for Federal Fast Act Funds Through the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission**

WHEREAS, the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) has solicited local government entities to submit new transportation projects for funding consideration in the Transportation Alternatives Program (TA); and

WHEREAS, the City of Bellbrook has identified a project in which meets all of the requirements of the application; and

WHEREAS, the City of Bellbrook is committed to a timely project development schedule and will commit the necessary resources to support the estimated local cost portion of the project and the will submit the project listed below to MVRPC:

1. Pedestrian Sidewalk Project - Estimated Local Share \$204,888

#### **Now, Therefore, the City of Bellbrook Hereby Resolves:**

Section 1. This Resolution shall serve to authorize the transmittal and submittal of applications for the Pedestrian Sidewalk Project to MVRPC for funding consideration in the Transportation Alternatives Program (TA).

Section 2. The City Manager is hereby authorized to sign on behalf of the City the application for funds as referred to in Section I of this Resolution.

Section 3. The City Manager is hereby directed and authorized to take or cause to be taken all other action necessary and proper to secure the funding sought by the application referred to herein, and provide any additional information sought by reviewing agencies during the time the application is under reviewed. The City Manager is further directed and authorized to cause compliance with all reporting requirements required by the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) as required as part of the funding process.

Section 4. Upon application approval, the City hereby states its commitment to the local contribution for the project as identified in these applications, including local contribution of costs exceeding the current estimates or subsequent revised estimates as accepted by the MVRPC.

Section 5. It is hereby found and determined that all formal actions of this Council concerning and relating to the adoption of this Resolution were adopted in an open meeting of this Council, and that any and all deliberations of this Council and any of its committees that resulted in such formal action were in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all legal requirements, including, but not limited to Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

# RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2018-HH

October 29, 2018

Section 6. That this resolution shall take effect and be in force forthwith.

---

Robert L. Baird, Mayor

---

Melissa J. Dodd, Interim Clerk of Council

**CONGESTION MITIGATION / AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) & SURFACE  
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) & TRANSPORTATION  
ALTERNATIVES (TA) PROJECT APPLICATION**  
(Non-Transit Projects)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** All materials included in the application must be in 8.5" x 11" format and 3-hole punched. Complete the application form and all required information outlined herein and submit **one hard copy and one electronic copy per application** to MVRPC, attention: Paul Arnold, 10 North Ludlow Street, Suite 700, Dayton, OH 45402

**Please note: MVRPC requires that all projects:**

- Are included or justified in a local plan or program
- Provide evidence that alternative project funding sources have been considered
- Comply with MVRPC's Regional Complete Streets Policy
- Upon funding approval, applicants are required to attend Biannual Project Review meetings as setup by MVRPC staff

City of Bellbrook	October 10, 2018		
Applicant	Date		
15 East Franklin Street	Bellbrook, Ohio		
Mailing Address	City-State		
	45305		
	Zip Code		
Melissa Dodd	City Manager	937-310-3222	M.Dodd@cityofbellbrook.org
Contact Person	Title	Phone	Email

**Franklin Street Pedestrian Improvements**

Proposal Name			
State Route 725		1.91	2.01
Proposal Location		Begin Log Point	End Log Point
Principal Arterial	10,200 (2012)		13,464 (2044)
Functional Class	Current ADT		Design Year ADT
25 MPH	25 MPH		
Before Speed	After Speed		
10'-15'		550'	
Average Width of Proposed Improvement		Length of Proposed Improvement	

Is the project in MVRPC's 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan? No LRP Project # \_\_\_\_\_

If sufficient funds are not available for the entire project, could a portion split into phases? No If yes, please provide phased funding scenarios in your application.

Have there ever been industrial or commercial development areas along the project corridor? Yes If yes, please check EnviroMapper (<https://www.epa.gov/emefdata/em4ef.home>) and list any findings by attaching the reports to your application.

Has your jurisdiction completed and is implementing an ADA Transition Plan? No If yes, please provide a copy or link to your ADA Transition Plan with your application. If no, enter estimated date for completion of an ADA Transition Plan. N/A <50 employees **For more information, see Appendix G of MVRPC's Policies and Procedures for STP/CMAQ/TA Funds.**

**Please identify the fund source you anticipate this project to be funded under:**

- Congestion Mitigation / Air Quality (CMAQ)
- Surface Transportation Program (STP)
- Transportation Alternatives Program (TA)

**In the space below, provide a short description (1-3 sentences) of the project. (Additional detailed description also required as an attachment to the application.)**

Construction of curb, gutter and sidewalk along the south side of Franklin Street (SR 725) from the existing sidewalk west of the Little Sugarcreek Road intersection to the alley west of West Street in the City of Bellbrook. Construction of a pedestrian midblock crossing west of the alley. Modification of the bridge over Little Sugar Creek to accommodate the raised sidewalk.

**In the space below, provide a short description (1-3 sentences) of the need and benefits of the project. (Additional detailed description also required as an attachment to the application.)**

The construction of curb, gutter and sidewalk across the Franklin Street Bridge over Little Sugar Creek will improve the safety of pedestrians traveling between residential areas west of the project and the downtown business district along the Germantown-Bowersville Connector. The project will also include traffic calming elements by narrowing the pavement and improving the aesthetics of the corridor by removing the guardrail on the south side of the road. The midblock pedestrian crossing improves connectivity and safety for pedestrians accessing businesses on the north side of the street.

**Please identify how this project complies with MVRPC's Regional Complete Streets Policy (STP/CMAQ only):**

- Project includes complete street elements that address the needs of all users.
- Project requests one or more exceptions to the Complete Streets Policy.

**The application shall address all of the following criteria:**

In order for MVRPC staff to properly evaluate your project, the application should address all of the following:

- ✓ Complete and detailed description of the proposed project and its relation to the intermodal transportation system and any other phases of the project. Location maps, elevations, photographs included, as necessary, to fully illustrate the project.
- ✓ Complete and detailed breakdown of the proposed construction/implementation costs inflated to year of expenditure - certified by a professional engineer – including funding sources.
- ✓ Complete and detailed description of the project's characteristics and benefits and how it is included or justified in a local plan or program. Description of how the project will be coordinated with a neighboring jurisdiction if project ends at or crosses a corporation line.
- ✓ The anticipated month and year, when the project will be ready for construction (if needed, please contact MVRPC for direction on this issue). Include the present status of property ownership and plan preparation.
- ✓ A certified copy of a resolution from the applicant's governing body authorizing the submission and local prioritization of the application(s) for MVRPC's STP/CMAQ/TA funds and committing to share in the project cost.
- ✓ Complete the Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) project identification worksheet below.

**IMPORTANT FUNDING INFORMATION**

The amount of federal funds available for reimbursement for a project will be capped at the MVRPC Board approved amount. It is expected that all cost estimates will be reliable, well researched, inflated to year of expenditure and not expected to increase. In addition, cost estimates must be certified by a professional engineer, architect or appropriate professional discipline. When compiling cost estimates, please take into consideration that there can be significant costs associated with compliance of federal regulations. Failure to account for such costs may result in your application's approval with insufficient funds to enable the project to be realized. All cost overruns realized at bid opening will be the sole responsibility of the project sponsor. Once approved, a project's scope can not be changed without the Board's approval.

In order to correctly fill out the funding tables below, begin by filling out the Total \$ for each phase. Then take that number and apply the desired Federal % of funding you are seeking (must be a whole number). The result is then entered in the cell for Federal \$. Continue across the row in the same manner to complete the Local % and Local \$ figures.

**STP/CMAQ Project Funding Detail**

<b>PHASE</b>	<b>TOTAL \$</b>	<b>FEDERAL PRO-RATA (3)</b>	<b>FEDERAL \$</b>	<b>LOCAL PRO-RATA (3)</b>	<b>LOCAL \$</b>	<b>TOTAL PRO-RATA</b>
Preliminary Engineering	\$	%	(1) \$	%	\$	100%
Right-of-Way	\$	%	(1) \$	%	\$	100%
Construction	\$	%	\$	%	\$	100%
Construction Engineering (See footnote (2) below)	\$	%	\$	%	\$	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$</b>		<b>\$</b>		<b>\$</b>	

- (1) These phases are not typically funded with MVRPC's STP/CMAQ Funds.
- (2) Construction Engineering (CE) costs should be calculated based on the guidance on the following page. The requested % Federal participation in CE must be the same as the requested % Federal participation in Construction unless the CE will be 100% Local.
- (3) Numbers shown in these columns must be whole numbers.

**TA Project Funding Detail**

PHASE	TOTAL \$	FEDERAL PRO-RATA (2)	FEDERAL \$	LOCAL PRO-RATA (2)	LOCAL \$	TOTAL PRO-RATA
Preliminary Engineering	\$57,903			100%	\$57,903	100%
Right-of-Way	\$0			0%	\$0	100%
Construction	\$445,409	75%	\$334,057	25%	\$111,352	100%
Construction Engineering (See footnote (1) below)	\$44,541	20%	\$8,908	80%	\$35,633	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$547,853</b>		<b>\$342,965</b>		<b>\$204,888</b>	

(1) Construction Engineering (CE) costs should be calculated based on the guidance below. The requested % Federal participation in CE must be the same as the requested % Federal participation in Construction unless the CE will be 100% Local.

(2) Numbers shown in these columns must be whole numbers.

### Construction Engineering and Inspection % Guidance

Groups	Construction less than \$1 Million	Construction greater than \$1 Million
A (Table 1)	4% of Construction	3% of Construction
B (All other work-types)	10% of Construction	7% of Construction

Table 1: Group A – Work Types

Worktype Code	Work Type Name
7	Mill and Fill
8	Minor Rehab -Pavement Primary Sys
11	Resurfacing, Divided Sys
12	Resurfacing, Undivided System
22	Pavement Marking
25	Resurfacing (safety related)
26	Rumble Strips
34	Misc. Traffic Control
102	Relocation
141	Chip Seal
144	Crack Seal
157	Pavement, Shoulder Sealing and/or Repair
206	Bridge Painting
210	Preventive Maintenance
211	Reactive Maintenance
237	Major Rehabilitation
244	Minor Rehab -Pavement General Sys

## ITS Project Identification Worksheet

Does the project include any of the following ITS components? Check all that apply.

### Major ITS Projects

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Integration of ramp meters with adjacent traffic signal systems   | <input type="checkbox"/> ITS system involving multiple political jurisdictions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Integrated transit corridor                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Transit signal priority system                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic signal project that requires integration with FMS or RWIS | <input type="checkbox"/> ITS project involving interagency systems             |

### Minor ITS Projects

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Automated Vehicle Location (AVL) system   | <input type="checkbox"/> Surveillance or control systems that could be integrated into an FMS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Automated toll collection system          | <input type="checkbox"/> Parking management system  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Roadgrip sensor system                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency vehicle preemption system                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway Weather Information System (RWIS) | <input type="checkbox"/> Highway Rail Intersection (HRI) warning system                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Freeway Management System (FMS)           | <input type="checkbox"/> Centrally controlled (off-site) traffic signal system                |

None of the above apply

**NOTE: A project with one or more ITS components is required to comply with the guidelines for Regional ITS Architecture conformity as outlined in Part 13 of the ODOT Traffic Engineering Manual (Revised April 17, 2009).**

## **PROVIDE THE ANTICIPATED PROJECT SCHEDULE**

Schedule based on Traditional ODOT programming

<b><u>ACTION</u></b>	<b><u>MONTH AND YEAR</u></b>
MVRPC Approval Date	<u>March, 2019</u>
Project Programmed into ODOT's Ellis System	<u>June 2019</u> Within 90 days of project approval
Environmental Document Approved Date	<u>December 2021</u> Typically 9-12 months after worst case limits submitted to District
Stage 1 Plans Approved	<u>December 2020</u> Within 12 months of consultant authorization
R/W Authorization Date	<u>June 2021</u> Typically 4 months after Stage 1 Approval
Stage 2 Plans Approved	<u>April 2021</u> Typically 4 months after Stage 1 Approval
Stage 3 Plans Approved	<u>August 2021</u> Typically 4 months after Stage 2 Approval
District R/W Certification Date	<u>December 2021</u> Typically 6 months to 1 year after R/W Authorization
Tracings Complete	<u>February 2022</u> Typically 3 months after R/W Certification (time is For utility relocation)
Plans to Central Office Date (Plan File)	<u>April 2022</u> Typically 2 weeks after R/W Certification
Sale Date	<u>July 2022</u> Typically 3 months after Plan File
Award Date	<u>August 2022</u> Typically 1 month after sale date

**For help filling out the above schedule, please contact MVRPC or your appropriate ODOT District office. If you plan to program your project as "Local-Let" be advised that your jurisdiction must be certified by ODOT prior to programming. An accurate project schedule will help MVRPC keep the TIP fiscally balanced, reducing the possibility of project delays and relieving the need for future TIP amendments**



**FRANKLIN STREET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT  
CITY OF BELLBROOK, GREENE COUNTY, OHIO  
BUDGET CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

LINE NO.	ODOT ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED QUANTITY	UNIT	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST
<b>BRIDGE ITEMS</b>						
1	202	Portions of structure removed, over 20 foot span	1	LS	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 30,000.00
2	202	Wearing course removed	200	SY	\$ 30.00	\$ 6,000.00
3	503	Cofferdams and excavation bracing	1	LS	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 2,000.00
4	509	Epoxy coated reinforcing steel	5,000	LB	\$ 1.50	\$ 7,500.00
5	510	Dowel holes with non-shrink, non-metallic grout	100	EA	\$ 25.00	\$ 2,500.00
6	511	Class QC2 concrete, sidewalks	35	CY	\$ 600.00	\$ 21,000.00
7	511	Class QC2 concrete, abutments	5	CY	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 6,000.00
8	512	Sealing of concrete surfaces (epoxy-urethane)	200	SY	\$ 20.00	\$ 4,000.00
9	515	Prestressed concrete composite box beam bridge members, level 1, CB21-48	3	EA	\$ 17,000.00	\$ 51,000.00
10	516	Elastomeric bearing with internal laminates only (neoprene)	12	EA	\$ 500.00	\$ 6,000.00
11	517	Railing (concrete parapet with double pipe rail)	110	FT	\$ 250.00	\$ 27,500.00
<b>ROADWAY ITEMS</b>						
12	202	Pavement removed, asphalt	744	SY	\$ 11.00	\$ 8,184.00
13	202	Walk removed	233	SF	\$ 7.50	\$ 1,748.00
14	202	Guardrail removed	125	FT	\$ 4.50	\$ 563.00
15	202	Bridge terminal assembly removed	2	EA	\$ 145.00	\$ 290.00
16	203	Excavation	50	CY	\$ 25.00	\$ 1,250.00
17	203	Embankment	165	CY	\$ 25.00	\$ 4,125.00
18	204	Subgrade compaction	281	SY	\$ 3.50	\$ 984.00
19	608	4" Concrete walk	895	SF	\$ 9.00	\$ 8,055.00
20	608	Curb ramp	197	SF	\$ 20.00	\$ 3,940.00
21	608	Sidewalk pavers	432	SF	\$ 10.00	\$ 4,320.00

**FRANKLIN STREET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT  
CITY OF BELLBROOK, GREENE COUNTY, OHIO  
BUDGET CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

<b>EROSION CONTROL ITEMS</b>						
22	601	Rock channel protection, type B with filter	27	CY	\$ 100.00	\$ 2,700.00
23	659	Topsoil	102	CY	\$ 45.00	\$ 4,590.00
24	659	Seeding and mulching	912	SY	\$ 3.00	\$ 2,736.00
25	659	Repair seeding and mulching	46	SY	\$ 1.75	\$ 81.00
26	659	Inter-seeding	46	SY	\$ 1.50	\$ 69.00
27	659	Commercial fertilizer	0.13	CY	\$ 725.00	\$ 95.00
28	659	Lime	0.19	ACRE	\$ 230.00	\$ 44.00
29	659	Water	6	M GAL	\$ 7.25	\$ 44.00
30	832	Erosion control	5,000	EA	\$ 1.00	\$ 5,000.00
<b>DRAINAGE ITEMS</b>						
31	602	Concrete masonry	0.4	CY	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 1,000.00
32	611	12" Conduit, type B	65	FT	\$ 80.00	\$ 5,200.00
33	611	Catch basin, no. 3A	2	EA	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 4,800.00
<b>PAVEMENT ITEMS</b>						
34	301	Asphalt concrete base, PG64-22	17	CY	\$ 350.00	\$ 5,950.00
35	304	Aggregate base	97	CY	\$ 75.00	\$ 7,275.00
36	407	Tack coat	32	GAL	\$ 3.25	\$ 104.00
37	441	Asphalt concrete surface course, type 1, (448), PG64-22	11	CY	\$ 375.00	\$ 4,125.00
38	441	Asphalt concrete intermediate course, type 2, (448)	14	CY	\$ 375.00	\$ 5,250.00
39	452	8" Non-reinforced concrete pavement, class QC1	208	SY	\$ 75.00	\$ 15,600.00
40	609	Combination curb and gutter, type 2	450	FT	\$ 35.00	\$ 15,750.00
41	609	Curb, type 6	35	FT	\$ 30.00	\$ 1,050.00

**FRANKLIN STREET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT  
CITY OF BELLBROOK, GREENE COUNTY, OHIO  
BUDGET CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE**

TRAFFIC CONTROL ITEMS						
42	630	Signs and supports	1	LS	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
43	630	Signing, misc.: RRFB	1	LS	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 20,000.00
44	640	Pavement marking	1	LS	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,000.00
MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ITEMS						
45	614	Work zone traffic signal	1	EA	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
INCIDENTAL ITEMS						
46	614	Maintaining traffic	1	LS	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 10,000.00
47	619	Field office, type B	2	MNTH	\$ 1,600.00	\$ 3,200.00
48	623	Construction layout stakes and surveying	1	LS	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
49	624	Mobilization	1	LS	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 15,000.00

**CONSTRUCTION COST \$ 342,622.00**  
**30% CONTINGENCY (10% Design Risk + 18% Inflation) \$ 102,787.00**  
**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST \$ 445,409.00**

**ENGINEERING & ENVIRONMENTAL \$ 57,903.00**  
**CONSTRUCTION INSPECTION (10%) \$ 44,541.00**

**TOTAL BUDGET PROJECT COST \$ 547,853.00**

I, hereby, certify that the project estimated costs listed above are realistic based on the level of detail currently available for this project.

In evidence, whereof, I set my signature and seal of this date.

LJB Inc.




---

Daniel W. Springer, P.E., PMP

Ohio Engineer's License No. 69627

Date: October 5, 2018

---

## FRANKLIN STREET PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

---

### PROJECT NARRATIVE (CONCEPTUAL DESIGN EXHIBIT ATTACHED)

This project constructs a critical 550-foot long section of sidewalk along the south side of Franklin Street in the City of Bellbrook. The project is necessary to provide a missing link in the safe sidewalk connection between the residential sections of the city west of Little Sugar Creek with the downtown core of the city east of the creek. Franklin Street (State Route 725) is a primary arterial with a speed limit of 25 mph and current ADT of 10,200 according to traffic counts collected in 2012.

The project proposes to construct curb and gutter, with a sidewalk and a stamped concrete or paver buffer at the back of curb between the end of the sidewalk that is part of the Germantown-Bowersville Connector just west of the Little Sugarcreek Road intersection to the first alley east of Little Sugar Creek. The curb and gutter and buffer provide grade separation between the roadway and the sidewalk to increase pedestrian safety and introduce traffic calming measures for eastbound traffic as it enters the 25 mph zone in the central business district by narrowing the pavement. The curb also allows for the guardrail on the south side to be removed from the bridge approaches, providing aesthetic improvements for the entrance to the business district. Modification to the ODOT-owned bridge carrying Franklin Street over Little Sugar Creek is required to construct a raised sidewalk across the bridge. A midblock pedestrian crossing of Franklin Street just west of the alley is planned to connect sidewalks along the north side of Franklin Street to the west side of the creek. The construction of the new curb and gutter on the south side shortens the crossing distance for pedestrians and allows for the curb ramp to be connected to existing sidewalk within ADA guidelines.

The existing SR725 bridge over Little Sugar Creek (SFN 2902788) is a single span (55 feet), non-composite prestressed concrete box beam bridge on reinforced concrete wall type abutments. The bridge currently has an overall width of 40 feet and is composed of 10 – B21-48 box beams. The roadway width is 38'-8" face-to-face of the steel guardrail and has a 9'-6" shoulder on the south side of the bridge. The proposed sidewalk on the bridge will be placed on the south side of the bridge while maintaining the edge of lane and we anticipate that the typical section of the bridge will be modified on the south side only. Maintaining the south edge of lane line, utilizing a 1'-6" shoulder and the ODOT Standard BR-2-15 sidewalk railing with concrete barrier will allow the sidewalk width on the bridge to be 7 feet, with a sidewalk curb height of 8 inches. The existing box beams are non-composite and were not designed for a sidewalk application. Therefore, we anticipate that the three beams on the south side of the bridge will be removed and replaced with CB21-48 composite prestressed concrete box beams. New elastomeric bearing pads will be used to support these three new box beams. The expansion joints at the abutments will require modifications on the south side to accommodate the new sidewalk on both the new beams and existing approach slabs. The new concrete sidewalk can be doveled into the existing 25-foot approach slabs. The BR-2-15 sidewalk railing transition will extend to the ends of the existing approach slabs.

One lane of signalized traffic on the north side of the bridge will be maintained during construction. This will be accomplished by coordinating the existing traffic signal at Little Sugarcreek and placing a temporary signal east of the bridge. One 11-foot temporary lane will be shifted to 1 foot from the north bridge railing so that portable concrete barrier will not need to be anchored into the existing bridge beams.

No impacts to the Little Sugar Creek are anticipated and the project is likely to be completed inside the existing right of way. If funding becomes available, the project schedule could potentially be accelerated.

**PROJECT PICTURES**



**Pedestrian walking along shoulder over SR725 bridge**



**SR725 looking west along bridge**



SR725 looking east from bridge



SR725 looking west from bridge



SR725 looking east along bridge



SR725 looking west at bridge



**SR725 approximate location of proposed midblock crossing**



**Underneath bridge photo showing prestressed concrete box beams**





# RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2018-

October 29, 2018

## City of Bellbrook

### Resolution No. 2018-

#### **A Resolution Authorizing the Submittal of Application for Federal Fast Act Funds Through the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission**

WHEREAS, the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) has solicited local government entities to submit new transportation projects for funding consideration in the Transportation Alternatives Program (TA); and

WHEREAS, the City of Bellbrook has identified a project in which meets all of the requirements of the application; and

WHEREAS, the City of Bellbrook is committed to a timely project development schedule and will commit the necessary resources to support the estimated local cost portion of the project and the will submit the project listed below to MVRPC:

1. Pedestrian Sidewalk Project - Estimated Local Share \$233,839

#### **Now, Therefore, the City of Bellbrook Hereby Resolves:**

Section 1. This Resolution shall serve to authorize the transmittal and submittal of applications for the Pedestrian Sidewalk Project to MVRPC for funding consideration in the Transportation Alternatives Program (TA).

Section 2. The City Manager is hereby authorized to sign on behalf of the City the application for funds as referred to in Section I of this Resolution.

Section 3. The City Manager is hereby directed and authorized to take or cause to be taken all other action necessary and proper to secure the funding sought by the application referred to herein, and provide any additional information sought by reviewing agencies during the time the application is under reviewed. The City Manager is further directed and authorized to cause compliance with all reporting requirements required by the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) as required as part of the funding process.

Section 4. Upon application approval, the City hereby states its commitment to the local contribution for the project as identified in these applications, including local contribution of costs exceeding the current estimates or subsequent revised estimates as accepted by the MVRPC.

Section 5. It is hereby found and determined that all formal actions of this Council concerning and relating to the adoption of this Resolution were adopted in an open meeting of this Council, and that any and all deliberations of this Council and any of its committees that resulted in such formal action were in meetings open to the public, in compliance with all legal requirements, including, but not limited to Section 121.22 of the Ohio Revised Code.

# RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 2018-

October 29, 2018

Section 6. That this resolution shall take effect and be in force forthwith.

---

Robert L. Baird, Mayor

---

Melissa J. Dodd, Interim Clerk of Council

DRAFT



Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission  
Project Evaluation System  
Bikeway/Pedestrian Project

Project Name: Franklin Street Pedestrian Improvements

REGIONAL CONTEXT/COORDINATION

1. Regional Cooperation: Is the project based on multi-jurisdictional cooperation efforts such as joint application or funding?

     Yes, 3 or more jurisdictions/organizations (5 points)      Yes, 2 jurisdictions/organizations (3 points)   X   No (0 points)

2. Enhance Transportation System: Does the project improve the bikeway/pedestrian system? Points are awarded based on facility type and project scope. If the project is new construction, please score according to the proposed facility type and project scope. See Attachment B.

     Regional Improvement (5 points)   X   Local Improvement (3 points)      NA (0 points)

3. Regional Transportation Network Connectivity: Does the project contribute to the completion of the regional bikeway/pedestrian network? See Attachment B.

     Yes - Regional Bikeway Connection (5 points)   X   Yes - Local Bikeway Connection (3 points)      NA (0 points)

*If needed, please provide additional project information that supports points awarded under REGIONAL CONTEXT/COOPERATION*

The project improves the pedestrian system by removing the gap in the existing separated sidewalk network along Franklin Street. It provides a grade separated facility across the bridge that improves safety of the crossing of the Germantown-Bowersville Connector. It also provides for a reduced pavement width, signed and marked midblock crossing east of the bridge near the top of the crest vertical curve, increasing the accessibility and safety for pedestrians on the north side of the street.

The project extends the Germantown-Bowersville Connector over the bridge over Little Sugar Creek with a separated path similar to the trail that exists west of the bridge.

**TRANSPORTATION CHOICES**

**4. Alternative Modes: Does the project include alternative modes of transportation? All bikeway/pedestrian projects will be awarded 3 points. (Two additional points will be awarded for infrastructure improvements within 1/2 mile of a school (not including colleges or universities). Documentation is required to receive these two additional points.)**

X Yes (3 points)

\_\_\_ Improves non-motorized transportation in the vicinity of a school (2 points)

**5. Inter-modal connectivity: Does the project create, improve, or enhance connectivity to other modes of transportation? See Attachment A and B.**

\_\_\_ Yes - Multiple modes (5 points)

X Yes – One mode (3 points)

\_\_\_ No (0 points)

***If needed, please provide additional project information that supports points awarded under TRANSPORTATION CHOICES***

The project improves connectivity for pedestrians by providing a grade separated link between the Germantown-Bowersville Connector regional bikeway at the west end of the project and the sidewalks at the east end of the project as indicated in the MVRPC Multi-Modal mapping. The project also improves the connection of sidewalks north of Franklin Street with those on the south side by adding a safer midblock crossing.

**TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT**

**6. Safety/Security: Does the project address a safety issue of the existing bikeway/pedestrian system or include a design feature that enhances the safety or security of a new route? See Attachment A.**

Yes – Significant Improvement (5 points)       Yes – Moderate Improvement (3 points)       No (0 points)       NA

**7. Preserve/Upgrade Existing Transportation System: Does the project preserve/upgrade the existing bikeway/pedestrian network? See Attachment A.**

Yes (3 points)       No (0 points)

**8. System Amenities: Does the project improve the bikeway/pedestrian network by providing bikeway/pedestrian amenities? See Attachment A.**

Yes (3 points)       No (0 points)       NA

**If needed, please provide additional project information that supports points awarded under TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT**

This project adds pedestrian grade separation to an area that is currently the bottleneck between adjacent sections of separated sidewalks. In the existing condition, pedestrians are required to enter the shoulder of the pavement to cross the bridge. The project will improve the safety for these users by adding curb across the bridge and preventing the pedestrians to enter the pavement shoulder on either side of the structure.

The midblock crossing at the crest in the roadway will improve the safety of pedestrians crossing the street. The narrowing of the pavement through the construction of curb and gutter on the south side of the road will reduce the distance the pedestrians have to travel unprotected and improve safety of crossing Franklin Street. Signage and pavement markings at this location will further improve the awareness of drivers to the potential for pedestrians in the area.

LAND USE

9. Urban Revitalization/Preservation: How much impact does the project have in revitalizing/preserving a given jurisdiction's urban core, community center, or neighborhood? (Explanation is required to receive points)  High (5 points)  Medium (3 points)  Low (1 point)  No Impact (0 points)

10. Environmental Justice: Does the project have a positive impact within a concentrated minority and/or poverty area? (Explanation is required to receive points) See Attachment B.

Yes - Significant (5 points)  Yes - Moderate (3 points)  No (0 points)

11. Land Use/Project/Study Coordination: Is the project the result of, and compatible with, bikeway/pedestrian related study or a given jurisdiction's adopted comprehensive plan, thoroughfare plan, or study? See Attachment A.

Yes (3 points)  No (0 points)

*If needed, please provide additional project information that supports points awarded under LAND USE*

Extending Franklin Street sidewalks to the Little Sugarcreek intersection was identified as one of the Summary goals from the April 12, 2017 Walkable Community Workshop report prepared by Regional Planning and Coordinating Commission of Greene County, Ohio in collaboration with the city and MVRPC. Page 3 of the report available at: <http://www.cityofbellbrook.org/upload/common/city%20manager/news/Walkable%20Community%20Report%202017.pdf> states "While the majority of Franklin Street has sidewalks, extending the sidewalks ... to Little Sugarcreek Road would make the entire downtown more accessible." The report also suggested adding a crosswalk across Franklin Street at Dot's Supermarket (the location of the proposed midblock crossing is close to Dot's but maintains the safety advantage of crossing near the top of the crest in the roadway). It is also noted in the report that children were seen crossing at Little Sugarcreek during the walkabout. The midblock crossing hopes to allow these children to safely cross the road at that location rather than getting to the very narrow north side of the Little Sugarcreek intersection. This project is compatible with this bike/pedestrian study that was completed as part of the city's comprehensive plan update.

The project will have an impact on revitalizing Bellbrook's urban core by increasing the walkability of the area and access to the urban core for residents that live west of Little Sugar Creek. The new parapet and railing and removal of the guardrail from the south side of the bridge approaches will improve the aesthetics of the entrance to the urban core.

The project will have a positive impact on the concentrated poverty area that is adjacent to the northwest corner of the Franklin Street and Little Sugarcreek Road intersection. This neighborhood is connected to the Germantown-Bowersville Connector just to the west of the project and will benefit through improved safety and accessibility of pedestrian access to the downtown core of Bellbrook.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

**12. Public-Private Partnership: Does the project include a public-private partnership such as joint funding, right-of-way donations, or a working relationship? (Explanation is required to receive points)**

\_\_\_ Yes (2 points)

\_\_\_ Potential (1 point)

X No (0 points)

**13. Economic Impact: How much of an economic impact does the project have? Does the project contribute to the economic development of the area? Please select all that apply. (Maximum total points are 8 points and explanation is required to receive points)**

\_\_\_ Improves access to/from regional business and employment opportunities (0 - 3 points)

\_\_\_ Contributes to business growth/retention in community revitalization areas (0 - 3 points)

\_\_\_ Improves value of the surrounding public space (0 - 2 points)

X NA

***If needed, please provide additional project information that supports points awarded under ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT***



**ENVIRONMENT**

**14. Air Quality: Does the project improve air quality by reducing the demand of motor vehicle travel? All bikeway/pedestrian projects will receive at least 3 points, additional points will be awarded if the project includes transportation demand strategies (TDM) with potential to reduce the need for motor vehicle travel. (Maximum total points are 6 points and documentation is needed to get points)**

Bikeway/Pedestrian

TDM Strategies See Attachment A.

X (3 points)

\_\_\_ Yes - High Potential Reduction(3 points)

\_\_\_ Yes - Low Potential Reduction ( 1 point)

\_\_\_ No/NA (0 points)

**15. Environmental enhancement: Does the project improve an environmentally sensitive area? (Explanation is required to receive points) See Attachment A.**

\_\_\_ Yes (2 points)

\_\_\_ No (0 points)

X NA

**16. Attractiveness: Does the project include beautification or aesthetic improvement components? (Explanation is required to receive points)**

X Yes (3 points)

\_\_\_ No (0 points)

***If needed, please provide additional project information that supports points awarded under ENVIRONMENT***

The project will remove the guardrail from the bridge approaches on the south side and construct a sidewalk with stamped concrete or brick paver buffer area to improve the aesthetics of the entrance to the downtown. Little Sugar Creek will remain visible to pedestrians using the new sidewalk.

**OTHER (This criteria is used only for ranking regionally controlled project applications.)**

**17. Funding Provisions:** Projects will be awarded points based on the percentage share of local funds used to match the requested Federal funds. (Maximum total points are 10 points) *See Attachment A.*

- \_\_\_ 0% to 20.9 (0 points)                      X   30% to 34.9 (6 points)
- \_\_\_ 21% to 24.9 (2 points)                \_\_\_ 35% to 39.9 (8 points)
- \_\_\_ 25% to 29.9 (4 points)                \_\_\_ above 40% (10 points)

**18. Local Project Priority:** For jurisdictions submitting multiple projects for funding consideration, regardless of fund source, please prioritize the projects with 1 being highest priority. (Maximum total points are 5 points, a project ranked #1 receives 5 points, a #2 project receives 3 points, a #3 project receives 1 point, and all other projects receive 0 point)

- \_\_\_1\_\_\_ Project Rank              X   #1 (5 points)            \_\_\_ #2 (3 points)            \_\_\_ #3 (1 point)            \_\_\_ #4 (0 points)

**19. Project Phasing and Coordination with Other Projects:** Does the project support a major regionally significant project such as interstate/interchange reconstruction or reconfiguration, or is the project part of a regionally significant multi-phase project?

- \_\_\_ Project supports a major regionally significant project (5 points)    \_\_\_ Project is a phase of a multi-phase project (2 points)      X   None (0 points)

**20. Other Regional Considerations:** This category awards up to 10 points based upon staff analysis of equitable distribution of MVRPC controlled Federal funding and previous/current regional funding commitments within the corridor or jurisdiction. (Applicants are not to complete this question as part of the self scoring process.)

- \_\_\_ Other Regional Considerations STP/CMAQ/TA projects (0-10 points)            \_\_\_ Delay/Withdrawal Penalty (-5 points per project)

**PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM SCORE SUMMARY**

**Total Score from Questions 1 – 19**..... **42** \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Score from Question 20 (To be determined by MVRPC Staff)**..... \_\_\_\_\_

**GRAND TOTAL** ..... \_\_\_\_\_