# Ohio Public Works Commission

## Application for Financial Assistance

**State of Ohio**  
**Public Works Commission**

** Applicant:** Freedom Township  
**Subdivision Code:** 173-28756  
**District Number:** 5  
**County:** Wood  
**Contact:** Richard C. Raha, Trustee Chairman  
*(This individual will be available during business hours and who can best answer or coordinate the responses to questions)*

**Date:** 09/05/2018  
**Phone:** (419) 308-4335  
**Email:** RCR411@frontier.com  
**FAX:** (419) 287-4479

---

**Project Name:** Freedom Township FY2019 Roadway Improvements  
**Zip Code:** 43450

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision Type</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Funding Request Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Select one)</td>
<td>(Select single largest component by $)</td>
<td>(Automatically populates from page 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. County</td>
<td>1. Road</td>
<td>Total Project Cost: 458,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. City</td>
<td>2. Bridge/Culvert</td>
<td>1. Grant: 228,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Township</td>
<td>3. Water Supply</td>
<td>2. Loan: 183,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Village</td>
<td>4. Wastewater</td>
<td>3. Loan Assistance/Credit Enhancement: 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**District Recommendation**  
*(To be completed by the District Committee)*

**Funding Type Requested**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Select one)</th>
<th>SCIP Loan - Rate: % Term: Yrs</th>
<th>Amount: .00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>RLP Loan - Rate: % Term: Yrs</td>
<td>Amount: .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td>Grant:</td>
<td>Amount: .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolving Loan Program</td>
<td>LTIP:</td>
<td>Amount: .00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Government Program</td>
<td>Loan Assistance / Credit Enhancement:</td>
<td>Amount: .00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District SG Priority:**

---

**For OPWC Use Only**

**STATUS**  
**Grant Amount:** .00  
**Loan Amount:** .00  
**Total Funding:** .00  
**Date Construction End:**  
**Date Maturity:**  
**Release Date:**  
**Local Participation:** %  
**Rate:** %  
**Term:** Yrs  
**OPWC Approval:**  
**OPWC Participation:** %
1.0 Project Financial Information  (All Costs Rounded to Nearest Dollar)

1.1 Project Estimated Costs

Engineering Services

Preliminary Design:  4,500.00
Final Design:  23,000.00
Construction Administration:  14,000.00

Total Engineering Services:  a.)  41,500.00  11%
Right of Way:

Construction:

c.)  378,635.00

Materials Purchased Directly:
d.)

Permits, Advertising, Legal:
e.)

Construction Contingencies:
f.)  37,865.00  10%

Total Estimated Costs:
g.)  458,000.00

1.2 Project Financial Resources

Local Resources

Local In-Kind or Force Account:
a.)

Local Revenues:
b.)  45,800.00

c.)

Other Public Revenues:

ODOT / FHWA PID:
d.)

USDA Rural Development:
e.)

OEPA / OWDA:
f.)

CDBG:

County Entitlement or Community Dev. "Formula"
Department of Development

g.)

Other:  h.)

Subtotal Local Resources:
i.)  45,800.00  10%

OPWC Funds  (Check all requested and enter Amount)

Grant:  56 % of OPWC Funds  j.)  228,900.00

Loan:  44 % of OPWC Funds  k.)  183,300.00

Loan Assistance / Credit Enhancement:
l.)  0.00

Subtotal OPWC Funds:
m.)  412,200.00  90%

Total Financial Resources:
n.)  458,000.00  100%
1.3 Availability of Local Funds

Attach a statement signed by the Chief Financial Officer listed in section 5.2 certifying all local resources required for the project will be available on or before the earliest date listed in the Project Schedule section. The OPWC Agreement will not be released until the local resources are certified. Failure to meet local share may result in termination of the project. Applicant needs to provide written confirmation for funds coming from other funding sources.

2.0 Repair / Replacement or New / Expansion

2.1 Total Portion of Project Repair / Replacement: 458,000 .00 100 %
2.2 Total Portion of Project New / Expansion: 0 .00 0 %
2.3 Total Project: 458,000 .00 100 %

3.0 Project Schedule

3.1 Engineering / Design / Right of Way Begin Date: 04/01/2019 End Date: 08/01/2019
3.2 Bid Advertisement and Award Begin Date: 08/01/2019 End Date: 09/01/2019
3.3 Construction Begin Date: 09/15/2019 End Date: 07/01/2020

Construction cannot begin prior to release of executed Project Agreement and issuance of Notice to Proceed. Failure to meet project schedule may result in termination of Project Agreement and issuance of Notice to Proceed. Modification of dates must be requested in writing by project official of record and approved by the Commission once the Project Agreement has been executed.

4.0 Project Information

If the project is multi-jurisdictional, information must be consolidated in this section.

4.1 Useful Life / Cost Estimate / Age of Infrastructure

Project Useful Life: 16 Years Age: 2000 (Year built or year of last major improvement)

Attach Registered Professional Engineer’s statement, with seal or stamp and signature confirming the project’s useful life indicated above and detailed cost estimate.

4.2 User Information

Road or Bridge: Current ADT 1,787 Year 2018 Projected ADT 1,850 Year 2038

Water / Wastewater: Based on monthly usage of 4,500 gallons per household; attach current ordinances.

Residential Water Rate Current $ N/A Proposed $ N/A

Number of households served: N/A

Residential Wastewater Rate Current $ N/A Proposed $ N/A

Number of households served: N/A

Stormwater: Number of households served: N/A
4.3 Project Description

A: SPECIFIC LOCATION (Supply a written location description that includes the project termini; a map does not replace this requirement.) 500 character limit.

The project is located on five road segments:

1. Wegman Road from the intersection of Sugar Ridge Rd to a point 1900 feet south of Sugar Ridge Rd.
2. Housekeeper Road from SR199 to the west Township Limits.
3. Wayne Road from Alexander Road to N. River Road.
4. Alexander Road from Wayne Road to a point 200 feet east of the Portage River Trail walking path, approximately 2,800 feet east of Wayne Road.

B: PROJECT COMPONENTS (Describe the specific work to be completed; the engineer's estimate does not replace this requirement) 1,000 character limit.

The project involves A) the resurfacing and point repairs of Alexander Rd from Wayne Rd to a point 200 feet east of the Portage River Trail walking path (approximately 2,800 feet east of Wayne Road) B) 2' widening, point repairs, and resurfacing of Housekeeper Rd from SR 199 to the west Twp. Limits; C) resurfacing and point repairs of Wayne Rd. from Alexander Rd to North River Rd, and D) resurfacing and point repairs of Wegman Rd from Sugar Ridge Rd to 1900' south of Sugar Ridge.

The project components include: 1000 SY of pavement planing, 5200 CY of excavation; 50 CY of embankmen, 1870 SY of subgrade compaction; 206 CY of stone base, 250 CY of stone berm, 1220 CY of asphalt surface course, 311 CY of asphalt base course, 9900 SY of chip seal, 250 CY of stone berm, 1050 SY of pavement repairs, 4765 gal. of tack coat, restoration, maintaining traffic, and other related items.

C: PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS (Describe the physical dimensions of the existing facility and the proposed facility. Include length, width, quantity and sizes, mgd capacity, etc. in detail.) 500 character limit.

The road being resurfaced on Alexander Rd is approx. 2800' long and 18.6' wide. Housekeeper Rd is approx. 5600 feet long and being widened 2' from 16.5' to 18.5' and will be resurfaced; along with adding a 1' wide stone berm. The part of Wayne Rd being resurfaced from Alexander Rd to Swan Rd is 5280' long and 18' wide, and the section of Wayne Rd being resurfaced from Swan Rd to N River Rd is 1300' long and 19.2' wide. The part of Wegman Road being resurfaced is 1900' long and 19.7' wide.
5.0 Project Officials

Changes in Project Officials must be submitted in writing from an officer of record.

5.1 Chief Executive Officer
(Person authorized in legislation to sign project agreements)

Name: Richard C. Rahe
Title: Trustee Chairman
Address: P.O. Box 796

City: Pemberville State: OH Zip: 43450
Phone: (419) 287-4979
Fax: 
E-Mail: RCR411@frontier.com

5.2 Chief Financial Officer
(Can not also serve as CEO)

Name: Ron Golightly
Title: Fiscal Officer
Address: P.O. Box 796

City: Pemberville State: OH Zip: 43450
Phone: (419) 467-0696
Fax: 
E-Mail: freedomclerk@amplex.net

5.3 Project Manager

Name: Steven Darmofal, P.E.
Title: Project Engineer
Address: Feller, Finch & Associates, Inc.
1683 Woodlands Dr

City: Maumee State: OH Zip: 43537
Phone: (419) 893-3680
Fax: (419) 893-2982
E-Mail: sdarmofal@fellerfinch.com
6.0 Attachments / Completeness review

Confirm in the boxes below that each item listed is attached (Check each box)

☑ A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to sign and submit this application and execute contracts. This individual should sign under 7.0, Applicant Certification, below.

☑ A certification signed by the applicant's chief financial officer stating the amount of all local share funds required for the project will be available on or before the dates listed in the Project Schedule section. If the application involves a request for loan (RLP or SCIP), a certification signed by the CFO which identifies a specific revenue source for repaying the loan also must be attached. Both certifications can be accomplished in the same letter.

☑ A registered professional engineer's detailed cost estimate and useful life statement, as required in 164-1-13, 164-1-14, and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimates shall contain an engineer's seal or stamp and signature.

☐ A cooperative agreement (if the project involves more than one subdivision or district) which identifies the fiscal and administrative responsibilities of each participant.

☐ Farmland Preservation Review - The Governor's Executive Order 98-IV, "Ohio Farmland Protection Policy" requires the Commission to establish guidelines on how it will take protection of productive agricultural and grazing land into account in its funding decision making process. Please include a Farm Land Preservation statement for projects that have an impact on farmland.

☐ Capital Improvements Report, CIR Required by O.R.C. Chapter 164.06 on standard form.

☑ Supporting Documentation: Materials such as additional project description, photographs, economic impact (temporary and/or full time jobs likely to be created as a result of the project), accident reports, impact on school zones, and other information to assist your district committee in ranking your project. Be sure to include supplements which may be required by your local District Public Works Integrating Committee.

7.0 Applicant Certification

The undersigned certifies: (1) he/she is legally authorized to request and accept financial assistance from the Ohio Public Works Commission as identified in the attached legislation; (2) to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are part of this application are true and correct; (3) all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the applicant; and, (4) should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio Law, including those involving Buy Ohio and prevailing wages.

Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in the application has NOT begun, and will not begin until a Project Agreement for this project has been executed with the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary will result in termination of the agreement and withdrawal of Ohio Public Works Commission funding from the project.

Richard C. Rahe, Trustee Chairman

Certifying Representative (Printed form, Type or Print Name and Title)

Original Signature / Date Signed

9-5-18
AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

RESOLUTION 08.28.18

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FREEDOM TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES 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 FOR WEGMAN RD, HOUSEKEEPER RD, WAYNE ROAD, ALEXANDER ROAD.

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 FREEDOM TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES is planning to make capital improvements to., WEGMAN RD, HOUSEKEEPER RD, WAYNE ROAD, ALEXANDER ROAD, and

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

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by FREEDOM TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES

Section 1: The Trustee Chairman Richard C. Rahe is hereby authorized to apply to the OPWC for funds as described above.

Section 2: The Chairman of the Trustees Richard C. Rahe is authorized to enter into any agreements as may be necessary and appropriate for obtaining this financial assistance.

Passed: 8/28/18

Richard C. Rahe

David R. Bruning

Kent A. Schuerman

Attest:

FREEDOM TOWNSHIP
FISCAL OFFICER
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER’S CERTIFICATION OF LOCAL FUNDS

LOAN REPAYMENT LETTER

August 28, 2018

I, Ronald D. Golightley, of Freedom Township, Wood County, Ohio hereby certify that Freedom Township has the amount of $45,800.00 in the Road and Bridge Fund and this amount will be used to pay the local share for the Wegman Rd, Housekeeper Rd, Wayne Rd, and Alexander Road Improvement Project (“Project”) when it is required.

I, Ronald D. Golightley, Fiscal Officer of Freedom Township, hereby certify that Freedom Township will collect the amount of $183,300. in the Road and Bridge Fund and that this amount will be used to repay the Ohio Public Works Commission SCIP or RLP loan requested for the Wegman Rd, Housekeeper Rd, Wayne Rd, and Alexander Rd Improvement Project over a (number of years) term.

Sincerely,

Ronald D. Golightley
Fiscal Officer
Freedom Township
Wood County, Ohio
# FREEDOM TOWNSHIP FY2019 ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS
### FREEDOM TOWNSHIP, WOOD COUNTY, OHIO

## ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE OF CONSTRUCTION
### PROJECT NO. 10G00125
**September 5, 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excavation</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$6,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subgrade Compaction</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1,870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chip Seal</td>
<td>9900</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$24,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Embankment</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$28.00</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aggregate Base</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$8,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stone Berm</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$10,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Asphalt Surface Course</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$183.00</td>
<td>$223,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asphalt Base</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>$49,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pavement Planing</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pavement Repairs</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$31,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tack Coat</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$2,295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maintaining Traffic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Video recording</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Construction Layout Stakes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$2,150.00</td>
<td>$2,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Erosion Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL**

| Contingency | $37,865.00 |

**ENGINEERING SERVICES**

- Preliminary Design: $4,500.00
- Final Design and Bidding: $23,000.00
- Construction Project Representative and Administration: $14,000.00

**SUBTOTAL ENGINEERING SERVICES**

|        | $41,500.00 |

**TOTAL PROJECT COST**

|        | $458,000.00 |

I hereby certify that the project cost estimate is $458,000.00

I also hereby certify that the useful life of this proposed project is Sixteen (16) years based upon use, location, design criteria, etc.

Signature: Steven J. Darmofal, P.E.

The above document is an estimate of the cost for the Freedom Township FY2019 Roadway Improvements project. The estimated cost is $458,000.00, with contingencies and engineering services contributing to the total.

**Feller Finch & Associates, Inc.**

Engineers • Surveyors

1683 Woodlands Drive, Maumee, Ohio 43537
Phone: (419) 893-3680
Fax: (419) 893-2982
www.fellerfinch.com
Freedom Township, Wood County, OH
Freedom Township FY2019 Roadway Improvements
Project Description

Freedom Township has four roads: Alexander Road, Housekeeper Road, Wayne Road, and Wegman Road, which need critical pavement improvements:

- **Alexander Road from Wayne Road to a point 200 feet east of the Portage River Trail walking path (approximately 2,800 feet east of Wayne Road)** is experiencing areas of moderate to severe surfaces distresses along with occasional areas of base failures as shown in the attached photographs. This portion of Alexander Road will require resurfacing along with some isolated areas of full depth point repairs in order to rehabilitate and extend the life of the roadway.

- **Housekeeper Road from SR199 to the west Township Limits** is experiencing areas of moderate to severe surfaces distresses along with occasional areas of base failures as shown in the attached photographs. This portion of road is also only 16.5 feet wide on average and two cars cannot safely pass each other in opposite directions without going off the paved road. We will add 2 feet of width on the north side of Housekeeper Road so that vehicles will be able to safely pass each other while remaining on the paved surface. There will also be some isolated areas of full depth point repairs. The entire road will also receive a surface course of asphalt. These improvements will both increase safety and rehabilitate and extend the life of the roadway.

- **Wayne Road from Alexander Road to North River Road** is experiencing areas of moderate to severe surfaces distresses along with occasional areas of base failures as shown on the attached photographs. This part of Wayne Road requires resurfacing along with some isolated areas of full depth point repairs in order to rehabilitate and extend the life of the roadway.

- **Wegman Road from Sugar Ridge to a point approximately 1900 feet south of Sugar Ridge Road** is experiencing areas of moderate to severe surfaces distresses along with occasional areas of base failures as shown on the attached photographs. This part of Wegman Road requires resurfacing along with some isolated areas of full depth point repairs in order to rehabilitate and extend the life of the roadway.

All of these roads are considered Major Access Roads because they provide access to adjacent properties and they both provide through and connecting service to other roads. TMACOG conducted traffic counts on Alexander Road, Wayne Road and Wegman Road in 2017. The average daily traffic count on Alexander Road was 293, the count on Wayne Road was 193, and the traffic count on Wegman Road was 1103. The Wood County Engineer conducted a traffic count on Housekeeper Road in 2018 and the average is 197 vehicles per day. The combined traffic count of 1787 for this project.

Alexander Road was last repaired/resurfaced in 1995, Housekeeper Road and Wayne Road were both last resurfaced/repaired in 1997, and Wegman Road was last repaired/resurfaced in 2010. The average age of the last improvement on these four sections of road is over 18 years.

This is an important project for the Township to maintain its aging pavement infrastructure. Funding is needed because the Township has very limited resources and cannot make the improvements on their own. The total project estimate is $458,000. The Township is contributing a 50% local match, towards the project with a $45,800 coming from local funds and $183,300 coming through an OPWC loan. The remaining $228,900 of the project will be paid as part of the grant being requested from OPWC.
Freedom Township
Freedom Township FY2019 Roadway Improvements
Photos of Existing Conditions

Figure 1 – Wayne Road between Alexander Rd and Swan Rd

Figure 2 – Wayne Road South of Swan Road
Freedom Township
Freedom Township FY2019 Roadway Improvements
Photos of Existing Conditions

Figure 3 – Housekeeper Road

Figure 4 – Housekeeper Road
Freedom Township
Freedom Township FY2019 Roadway Improvements
Photos of Existing Conditions

Figure 5 – Alexander Road

Figure 6 – Alexander Road
Figure 7 – Wegman Road
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[Map of Freedom Township with a highlighted project area]

© 2018 FELLER, FINCH & ASSOC., INC.

1683 Woodlands Drive, Maumee, Ohio 43537
Phone: (419) 893-3680
Fax: (419) 893-2982
www.fellerfinch.com
## District 5

**Capital Improvement Project**

**Priority Rating Sheet, Round 33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY:</th>
<th>PROJECT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood Township FY 2019 Roadway Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROJECT NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9558.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criteria, Criteria Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Repair or Replace) vs. (New or Expansion)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Building Physical Condition</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Probability of Local Share (Local funds are funds derived from the applicant or a loan to be paid back through the applicant's budget, assessment, rates or tax revenues)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other Funding Sources (Excluding Local Funds)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criteria To Be Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OPM Grant and Loan Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OPM Grant and Loan Funding

- Grant/Lend Combination
  - $100,000
  - $200,000
  - $500,000
  - $1,000,000
  - $2,000,000
  - $5,000,000

When scoring a project that is only grant or only loan, please use the chart labeled "Grant or Loan Only." When scoring a grant/loan combination, score the project for the grant or loan in the first chart. Then use the second chart labeled "Grant/Loan Combination" to score the third grant and loan combined. Use the lower of the box as the score.

### Criteria, Criteria To Be Considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight Factor</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Will the Proposed Project Create Permanent Jobs or a Nicasa with that will be able to be permanently housed (Written Documentation Required)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Benefits to Existing Users such as new or more parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other Info:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grand Total, Ranking Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>COUNTY RANKING POINTS</th>
<th>9558.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>COUNTY RANKING POINTS</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>COUNTY RANKING POINTS</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL, RANKING POINTS</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Applicants must certify local share contribution. Specify all funding sources to be utilized as local share at the time of application submission.
The following questions are to be answered for each application submitted for State Issue II SCIP, LTIP and Loan Projects. Please provide specific information using the best documentation available to you. Justification of your responses to these questions will be required if your project is selected for funding, so please provide correct and accurate responses. Communities and Townships under 5,000 in population should also complete the Small Government Criteria.

1. What percentage of the project in repair A=81%, replacement B=19%, expansion C= %, and new D=___%? (Use dollar amounts of project to figure percentages and make sure the total equals one hundred (100) percent) A+B=100%  C+D=___%

   Repair/Replacement = Repair or Replacement of public facilities owned by the government (any subdivision of the state).

   New/Expansion = Replacement of privately owned wells, septic systems, private water or wastewater systems, etc.

2. Give the physical condition rating:

   Closed or Not Operating: The condition is unusable, dangerous and unsafe. The primary components have failed. The infrastructure is not functioning at all.

   Critical: The condition is causing or contributing to a serious non-compliance situation and is threatening the intended design level of service. The infrastructure is functioning at seriously diminished capacity. Imminent failure is anticipated within 18 months. Repair and/or replacement is required to eliminate the critical condition and meet current design standards. (For Road Projects structural repair items would represent a minimum of 25% of the total Project Cost).

   Poor: The condition is substandard and requires repair/replacement in order to return to the intended level of service and comply with current design standards. Infrastructure contains a major deficiency and is functioning at a diminished capacity.

   Fair: The condition is average, not good or poor. The infrastructure is still functioning as originally intended. Minor deficiencies exist requiring repair to continue to function as originally intended and/or to meet current design standards.
Good: The condition is safe and suitable to purpose. Infrastructure is functioning as originally intended, but requires minor repairs and/or upgrades to meet current design standards.

Excellent: The condition is new, or requires no repair. Or, no supporting documentation has been submitted.

* In order to receive points provide supporting documentation (e.g. photos, a narrative, maintenance history, or third party findings) to justifying the rating.

3. If the proposed project is not approved what category would best represent the impact on the general health and/or public safety?

**ROADS**

Extremely Critical: Resurfacing, Restoration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (4R) of a Major Access Road.*

Critical: Resurfacing, Restoration and Rehabilitation (3R) of a Major Access Road.*

Major: Resurfacing, Restoration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (4R) of a Minor Access Road.*

Moderate: Resurfacing, Restoration and Rehabilitation (3R) of a Minor Access Road.*

Minimal: Preventative Maintenance of a Major Access Road.

No Impact: Preventative Maintenance of a Minor Access Road.

Projects that have a variety of work will be scored in the **LOWEST** category of work contained in the Construction Estimate.

**Road/Street Classifications:**

**Major Access Road:** Roads or streets that have a dual function of providing access to adjacent properties and providing through or connecting service between other roads.

**Minor Access Road:** Roads or streets that primarily provide access to adjacent properties without through continuity, such as cul-de-sacs or loop roads or streets.

**Preventative Maintenance:** Non Structural Pavement work such as chip sealing, cape sealing, microsurfacing, crack sealing, etc.

*(3R) Resurfacing, Restoration and Rehabilitation - Improvements to existing roadways, which have as their main purpose, the restoration of the physical features (pavement, curb, guardrail, etc.) without altering the original design elements.

*(4R) Resurfacing, Restoration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction - Much like 3R, except that 4R allows for the complete reconstruction of the roadway and alteration of certain design elements (i.e., lane widths, shoulder...
BRIDGES SUFFICIENCY RATING

Extremely Critical: 0-25, or a General Appraisal rating of 3 or less.
Major: 51-65 or a General Appraisal rating of 5 or 6.
Minimal: 81-100 or a General Appraisal rating of more than 7.
No Impact: Bridge on a new roadway.

WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANTS

Extremely Critical: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) orders in the form of a consent decree, findings and orders or court order. Health Department Construction Ban.
Critical: Improvements ordered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the form of NPDES Orders.
Major: Replace deficient appurtenances. Update existing processes due to EPA recommendations.
Moderate: Increase capacity to meet current needs or update processes to improve effluent quality.
Minimal: New/Expansion project to meet a specific development proposal.
No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or projected needs.

WATER TREATMENT PLANT

Extremely Critical: EPA orders in the form of a consent decree, findings and orders or court order.
Critical: Improvements to meet Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Safe Drinking Water Regulations and/or NPDES Orders.
Major: Replace deficient appurtenances. Update existing processes due to EPA recommendations.
Moderate: Increase capacity to meet current needs or update processes to improve water quality.
Minimal: New/Expansion project to meet a specific development proposal.
No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or projected needs.
COMBINED SEWER SEPARATIONS (May be construction of either new storm or sanitary sewer as long as the result is two separate sewer systems.)

Extremely Critical: EPA orders in the form of a consent decree, findings and orders or court order. Health Department Construction Ban.

Critical: Separate, due to chronic backup or flooding in basements.

Major: Separate, due to documented water quality impairment, or due to EPA recommendations.

Moderate: Separate, due to specific development proposal within or upstream of the combined system area.

Minimal: Separate, to conform to current design standards.

No Impact: No positive health effect.

STORM SEWERS

Extremely Critical: EPA orders in the form of a consent decree, findings and orders or court order.

Critical: Chronic flooding (structure damage).

Major: Inadequate capacity (land damage).

Moderate: Inadequate capacity with no associated damage.

Minimal: New/Expansion to meet current needs.

No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or project needs.

CULVERTS

Extremely Critical: Structurally deficient or functionally obsolete. Deterioration has already caused a safety Critical: hazard to the public.

Critical: Inadequate capacity with land damage and the existing or high probability of property damage.

Major: Inadequate capacity (land damage).

Moderate: Inadequate capacity with no associated damage.

Minimal: New/Expansion to meet current needs.

No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or projected needs.
SANITARY SEWERS

Extremely Critical: EPA orders in the form of a consent decree, findings and orders or court order. Health Department Construction Ban.

Critical: Replace, due to chronic pipe failure, chronic backup or flooding in basements. Improvements ordered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the form of NPDES Orders.

Major: Replace, due to inadequate capacity or infiltration, or due to EPA recommendations.

Moderate: Rehabilitate to increase capacity to meet current needs or to reduce inflow and infiltration.

Minimal: New/Expansion project to meet a specific development proposal.

No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or projected needs.

SANITARY LIFT STATIONS AND FORCE MAINS

Extremely Critical: Structurally deficient. Deterioration has already caused a safety/health hazard to the public, or, EPA orders in the form of a consent decree, findings and orders or court order.

Critical: Inadequate capacity with actual or a high probability of property damage. Improvements ordered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the form of NPDES Orders.

Major: EPA recommendations, or, reduces a probable health and/or safety problem.

Moderate: Rehabilitate to increase capacity to meet current needs.

Minimal: New/Expansion to meet a specific development proposal.

No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or projected needs.

WATER PUMP STATIONS

Extremely Critical: Structurally deficient. Deterioration has already caused a safety hazard to the public, or, EPA orders in the form of a consent decree, findings and orders or court order.

Critical: Inadequate capacity with the inability to maintain pressure required for fire flows.

Major: Replace due to inadequate capacity or EPA recommendations.

Moderate: Rehabilitate to increase capacity to meet current needs.
Minimal: New/Expansion to meet a specific development proposal.

No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or projected needs.

WATER LINES/WATER TOWERS

Extremely Critical: Solve low water pressure or excessive incidents of main breaks in project area.

Critical: Replace, due to deficiency such as excessive corrosion, etc.

Major: Replace undersized water lines as upgrading process.

Moderate: Increase capacity to meet current needs.

Minimal: New/Expansion project to meet a specific development proposal.

No Impact: New/Expansion to meet future or projected needs.

OTHER

Extremely Critical: There is a present health and/or safety threat.

Critical: The project will provide immediate health and/or safety benefit.

Major: The project will reduce a probable health and/or safety problem.

Moderate: The project will delay a health and/or safety problem.

Minimal: A possible future health and/or safety problem mitigation.

No Impact: No health and/or safety effect.

NOTE: Combined projects that can be rated in more than one subset may be rated in the other category at the discretion of the District 5 Executive Committee. In general, the majority of the cost or scope of the project shall determine the category under which the project will be scored.

(Submitts without supporting documentation will receive 0 Points for this question.)

Extremely Critical ___, Critical ___, Major ___, Moderate ___, Minimal ___, No Impact ___. Explain your answer.

______________________________

(Additional narrative, charts and/or pictures should be attached to questionnaire)
4. Identify the amount of local funds that will be used on the project as a percentage of the total project cost.
   A.) Amount of Local Funds = $229,100.00 (including local cash contribution plus loan)
   B.) Total Project Cost = $458,000.00

   RATIO OF LOCAL FUNDS DIVIDED by TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (A/B) = 50 %
   Note: Local funds should be considered funds derived from the applicant budget or loans funds to be paid back through local budget, assessments, rates or tax revenues collected by the applicant.

5. Identify the amount of other funding sources to be used on the project, excluding State Issue II or LTP Funds, as a percentage of the total project cost.
   Grants 0 %, Gifts 0 %, Contributions 0 %
   Other 0 % (explain) , Total 0 %

   Note: Grant funds and other revenues not contributed or collected through taxes by the applicant should be considered other funds. The Scope of Work for each Funding Source must be the same.

6. Total Amount of SCIP and Loan Funding Requested- An Applicant can request a grant per the categories below for points as indicated on the Priority Rating Sheet. If the Applicant is including a loan request equal to, but not exceeding 50% of the OPWC funding amounts listed below, there will be no point penalty. If loan funds requested are more than 50%, points as listed in the Priority Rating Sheet will apply.

   - $500,001 or More
   - $400,001-$500,000
   - $325,001-$400,000
   - $275,001-$325,000
   - $175,001-$275,000
   - $175,000 or Less

   There are times when the District spends all of the grant money and has loan money remaining. When this happens, the district makes a loan offer in the amount of the requested grant to the communities that were not funded. The offers are made in the order of scoring. We need to know if you are not successful in obtaining grant dollars for your project if you would be interested in loan money:

   YES ✓ / NO (This will only be considered if you are not funded with grant money and there is remaining loan money.) Please note: if you answer “no” you will not be contacted, only if you answer “yes” will an offer be made in the event that there is loan money remaining.

7. If the proposed project is funded, will its completion directly result in the creation of permanent full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs (FTE jobs shall be defined as 35 hours/week)? Yes ___ No ✓. If yes, how many jobs within eighteen months? ___ Will the completed project retain jobs that would otherwise be
permanently lost? Yes ___ No ✓. If yes, how many jobs ___ will be created/retrained within 18 months following the completion of the improvements?

(Supporting documentation in the form of letter from affected industrial or commercial enterprises that specify full time equivalent jobs that will be retained or created directly by the installation or improvement of Public infrastructure. Additional items such as; 1) newspaper articles or other media news accounts, 2) public meeting minutes, and/or 3) a letter from the County Economic Development Director or State of Ohio Economic Development Professional that alludes to the requirement for the infrastructure improvement to support the business. Submittals without supporting documentation will receive 0 points for this question.)

8. What is the total number of existing users that will directly benefit from the proposed project if completed? 1,787. (Use households served, traffic counts, etc. and explain the basis by which you arrived at your number.)

9. Is subdivision's population less than 5,000 Yes ✓ No ___

If yes, continue. You may want to design your project per Small Government Project Evaluation Criteria, released for the current OPWC Round to assist in evaluating your project for potential Small Government Funding. The Small Government Criteria is available on the OPWC website at http://www.pwc.state.oh.us/Meth.SG.PDF. If No, skip to Question 11.

10. OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION SMALL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

All projects that are sponsored by a subdivision with a population of 5,000 or less, and not earning enough points for District Funding from SCIP or LTIP Funds, are then rated using the Small Government Program Rating Criteria for the corresponding funding round. In order to be rated the entity must submit the Small Government Supplement and their required budgets with their application. Only infrastructure that is village- or township-owned is eligible for assistance. The following policies have been adopted by the Small Government Commission:

- District Integrating Committees may submit up to seven (7) applications for consideration by the Commission. All 7 must be ranked, however, only the top five (5) will be scored. The remaining two (2) will be held as contingency projects should an application be withdrawn.

- Grants are limited to $500,000. Any assistance above that amount must be in the form of a loan.

- Grants for new or expanded infrastructure cannot exceed 50% of the project estimate.

- The Commission may deny funding for water and sewer systems that are deemed to be more
cost-effective if regionalized.

• If a water or sewer project is determined to be affordable, the project will be offered a loan rather than a grant. Pay special attention to the Water & Wastewater Affordability Supplemental and the Small Government Water & Wastewater Affordability Calculation Worksheet. Both are available on the Small Government Program Tab at http://www.pwc.state.oh.us/SmallGovernment.html

• Should there be more projects that meet the “annual score” than there is funding, the tie breaker is those projects which scored highest under Health & Safety, with the second tie breaker being Condition. If multiple projects have equivalent Health & Safety and Condition scores they are arranged according to the amount of assistance from low to high. Once the funded projects are announced, “contingency protects” may be funded from project under-runs by continuing down the approved project list.

• Supplemental assistance is not provided to projects previously funded by the Commission.

• Applicants have 30 days from receipt of application by OPWC without exception to provide additional documentation to make the application more competitive under the Small Government criteria. Applications will be scored after the 30-day period has expired. The applicants for each District's two (2) contingency projects will have the same 30-day period to submit supplemental information but these applications will not be scored unless necessary to do so. It is each applicant's responsibility for determining the need for supplemental material. The applicant will not be asked for or notified of missing information unless the Commission has changed the project type and it affects the documentation required. Important information may include, but is not limited to: age of infrastructure, utility counts or utility users, median income information, user rates ordinances, and the Auditor's Certificate of Estimated Revenues or documentation from the Auditor of State that subdivision is in a state of fiscal emergency.

If you desire to have your Round 33 project considered for Small Government Funding please download the Small Government Evaluation Criteria applicable to Round 33 by accessing the OPWC Website at http://www.pwc.state.oh.us/Meth.SG.PDF. Please complete the Small Government Evaluation Criteria and attach all required supporting documentation and attach it to the District 5 Questionnaire for Round 32.

11. MANDATORY INFORMATION, DISTRICT 5, DISCRETIONARY RANKING POINTS

List all specific user fees: Amount or ROAD & BRIDGE PROJECTS: (OHIO REVISED CODE) Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permissive license fee</th>
<th>4504.02 or 4504.06</th>
<th>4504.15 or 4504.17</th>
<th>4504.16 or 4504.171</th>
<th>4504.172</th>
<th>4504.18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special property taxes 5555.48 5555.49

Freedom Township received a total of $5,983,74 in Permissive license fees in 2017.
Municipal Income Tax  N/A
County Sales Tax  0.75%
Others ____________________________________________________________

(DO NOT INCLUDE SCHOOL TAXES)

SPECIFIC PROJECT AREA INFORMATION.
Median household income $80,023
Monthly utility rate: Water N/A
                    Sewer N/A
                    Other

List any special user fees or assessment (be specific)

POLITICAL SUBDIVISION= _______________________________________
COUNTY= _______________________________________
DISCRETIONARY POINTS (BY DISTRICT COMMITTEE ONLY)= ________________
(25-20-15)

Date:  9/5/2018
Signature:  STEVEN J DARMOPAL
Title:  PROJECT ENGINEER
Address:  FELLER, FINCH & ASSOCIATES, INC., 1683 WOODLANDS DR, MAUMEE, OH 43537
Phone:  (419) 893-3680
FAX:  (419) 893-2982
Email:  sdarmopal@fellerfinch.com
OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
SMALL GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

PY 33 METHODOLOGY

May 2018
EVALUATION CRITERIA

Complete and appropriate support documentation must be provided for a criterion in order to be awarded points. See Applicants Manual for guidance, forms and checklist.

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 and the Small Government Water & Wastewater Ability & Effort Supplemental.

       0  +2 or more standard deviations above Average Variance
       2  +1 to +2 standard deviations above Average Variance
       4  0 to +1 standard deviations above Average Variance
       6  0 to -1 standard deviations below Average Variance
       8  -1 to -2 standard deviations below Average Variance
       10 -2 or more standard deviations below Average Variance, or subdivision is in fiscal emergency
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 3% 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 (0.8 < CRF < 0.2); Bridges with a General Appraisal of 3 or Sufficiency Rating of 26-50, or posted load reduction; 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 >= 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)
3. Age and Condition of System to be repaired or replaced. This is a two-part criterion. (Maximum 10 points)

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Points</th>
<th>Road 20</th>
<th>30 Wastewater</th>
<th>50 Bridge/Culvert, Sanitary Sewer, Water, Storm Water, Solid Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>New / Expansion</td>
<td>New / Expansion</td>
<td>New / Expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Before 1998 or closed</td>
<td>Before 1988 or out of service</td>
<td>Before 1968 or closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II – Condition (Maximum 5 points)

1. New/Expansion: New or expansion project components represent at least 50% of improvements

3. Poor: Infrastructure requires repair to continue functioning as originally intended and/or upgrade to meet current design standards.

5. Failed: Not functioning

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repair/Replacement</th>
<th>0 (10 or less)</th>
<th>1 11-15</th>
<th>2 16-20</th>
<th>3 21-25</th>
<th>4 26-30</th>
<th>5 31-35</th>
<th>6 36-40</th>
<th>7 41-45</th>
<th>8 46-50</th>
<th>9 51-55</th>
<th>10 56 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New/Expansion</td>
<td>50 or less</td>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>76-80</td>
<td>81-85</td>
<td>86-90</td>
<td>91-95</td>
<td>96 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LAST IMPROVEMENTS
ALEXANDER RD. 1995
HOUSEKEEPER RD 1997
WAYNE RD 1997
WEGMAN RD 2010
AVERAGE = 1999.8
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5. Population Benefit – Number of those to benefit directly from the improvement as a percentage of applicant’s total population. (Maximum 5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10% or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25% - 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35% - 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45% - 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55% - 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56% or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

7. Amount of OPWC grant and loan funds requested (Maximum 10 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Amount Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>$500,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$400,000 - $499,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$300,000 - $399,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$200,000 - $299,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$100,000 - $199,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$99,999 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Loan request – Amount of loan funds as a percentage of total OPWC assistance. (Maximum 10 points)

- 1 15 - 29% of OPWC assistance
- 5 30 - 49% of OPWC assistance
- 10 50 - 100% of OPWC assistance

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7 - 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 - 19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 - 24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25 years or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>110% or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100% - 109%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>90% - 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>80% - 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>79% or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Freedom Twp MHI} \times 100\% = 158\% \]

\[ \text{Ohio MHI} \times 100\% = 158\% \]
11. Readiness to proceed. This is a two-part criterion. (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
OFFICIAL CERTIFICATE OF ESTIMATED RESOURCES

Office of the Budget Commission, Wood County, Ohio

BOWLING GREEN, OH

TO: FREEDOM TOWNSHIP

FREEDOM TWP OFF

8/7/2018

The Budget Commission of Wood County, Ohio, hereby makes the following Official Certificate of Estimated Resources for the BUDGET YEAR beginning January 1, 2019 which shall govern the total of appropriations made at any time during such budget year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND NAME</th>
<th>UNENCUM BAL JAN. 1, 2019</th>
<th>TAXES</th>
<th>OTHER SOURCES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td>$ 148,000.00</td>
<td>$ 121,190.09</td>
<td>$ 16,601.51</td>
<td>$ 285,791.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL REVENUE</td>
<td>$ 569,235.00</td>
<td>$ 398,123.56</td>
<td>$ 245,359.61</td>
<td>$ 1,212,718.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL PROJECT</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERMANENT</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERPRISE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL SERVICE</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST/AGENCY</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 717,235.00</td>
<td>$ 519,313.65</td>
<td>$ 261,961.12</td>
<td>$ 1,498,509.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIGNED: [Signature]
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### FREEDOM TWP OFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND NAME</th>
<th>UNENCUM BAL JAN. 1, 2019</th>
<th>TAXES</th>
<th>OTHER SOURCES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>$148,000.00</td>
<td>$121,190.09</td>
<td>$16,601.51</td>
<td>$285,791.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPECIAL REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Unencum Bal</th>
<th>Taxes</th>
<th>Other Sources</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MVL</td>
<td>$16,735.00</td>
<td>$14,400.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$30,135.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS TAX</td>
<td>$114,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$194,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD &amp; BRIDGE</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$88,324.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$148,324.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEMETERY</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$26,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE PROT.</td>
<td>$72,000.00</td>
<td>$25,012.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$97,012.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE/EMS</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$186,568.98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$276,568.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE/AMBULANCE</td>
<td>$73,000.00</td>
<td>$62,531.58</td>
<td>$58,959.61</td>
<td>$194,491.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD IMP</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$35,685.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$55,685.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERM MVL</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$45,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMBULANCE SERVICE</td>
<td>$69,000.00</td>
<td>$76,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$145,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $569,235.00 $398,123.56 $245,359.61 $1,212,718.17

### DEBT SERVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debt Service</th>
<th>Total Debt Service</th>
<th>Total Cap Proj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPITAL PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Projects</th>
<th>Total Cap Proj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Funds available for roadway projects
### Average Hourly Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>EAST BOUND</th>
<th>WEST BOUND</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00 AM</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 AM</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 AM</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 AM</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 AM</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 AM</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 AM</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 PM</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 PM</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 PM</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Daily Traffic (ADT)**

- **EAST BOUND**: 107.2
- **WEST BOUND**: 90.2
- **Combined**: 197.3

### Volume Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>EAST BOUND</th>
<th>WEST BOUND</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>238</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **54.5 %**
- **45.5 %**
RON GOLIGHTLEY
FISCAL OFFICER
FREEDOM TOWNSHIP
OFFICE - 419.287.4626
FAX - 419.287.4479

From: Hertzfeld, Rich [mailto:rhertzfeld@co.wood.oh.us]
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 7:33 AM
To: Ron Golightley <freedomclerk@amplex.net>
Subject: FW: Freedom Twp. Traffic Counts
Importance: High

Ron,

Rick Rahe requested these traffic counts. Please pass them along to him and the other Trustees.

Please contact me if you have questions.

Thank you,

Richard Hertzfeld, PE
Roadway Project Manager
Wood County Engineer’s Office
One Courthouse Square
Bowling Green, Ohio 43402
419.354.9060 Office

From: Stohl, Nick
Sent: Thursday, May 17, 2018 6:41 AM
To: Hertzfeld, Rich <rhertzfeld@co.wood.oh.us>
Subject: Freedom Twp. Traffic Counts

Rich,

Attached is the counts for Freedom Twp. You requested. Thanks Nick

Nick Stahl
Wood County Highway Dept.
Sign Shop
Office: 419-354-9688
Cell: 419-308-3584
ALEXANDER ROAD – NO. 254 A.

1974: WIDEN ROAD FROM FISH ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD
TOTAL COST: $8,335.41

1975: TOWNSHIP INSTALLED CULVERT AND TILE THROUGH THE ROADWAY BY ERNESTINE HILLE FARM ACROSS FROM FARM BUILDINGS.

DEAN BROS. BUILT CATCH BASINS ON ALEXANDER & ZEPERNICK ROADS ($846.44)

DEAN BROS. INSTALLED CULVERT TO WIDEN RAILROAD CROSSING AND DON RAHE PAVING CO. WIDEN CROSSING ($591.84)

PAVED ROAD FROM FISH ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD (1.88 MILES) C. J. LAFFETY PAVING CO. ($25,481.77)

1985: STRIPED ROAD FROM FISH ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD

1987: SURFACE TREATED BY COUNTY FROM WAYNE ROAD TO FISH ROAD

1988: REMOVED ABANDONED RAILROAD CROSSING APPROACHES AND REPLACED TILE. ALTON BEEKER & SONS ($2,417.85)

1989: REPAVED ABANDONED RAILROAD (200’ X 18’)
WHITTA CONSTRUCTION – MOTOPAVER ($2,750.00)

SURFACE TREATED BY COUNTY FROM WAYNE ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD.

APPROXIMATELY 700’ OF TEN INCH SEWER FROM CATCH BASIN TO THE RIVER ON THE HILLE FARM WAS RECONSTRUCTED BY RON SHELDRICK FOR $1,058.46. ERNESTINE HILLE WAS CHARGED THE SAME AMOUNT.

1995: REPAVED ROAD FROM FISH ROAD TO KOHRING ROAD WITH 405 BITUMINOUS COLD MIX AND PAVE AN 8’ WEDGE ON SOUTH SIDE OF ROAD FROM KOHRING ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD USING SAME COLD MIX AS ABOVE. WORK DONE BY HENRY W. BERGMAN, INC. AT A COST OF $24,531.61.

2002: JET CLEANED OUT ROAD TILE STARTING AT FISH ROAD AND GOING EAST. WORK DONE BY NORTHWESTERN WATER & SEWER. ($916.58)
2011: REPAIR CLAY TILE NEAR CATCH BASIN WEST OF WAYNE ROAD BY COUNTY FORCES AT A COST OF $168.68.

2011: MILLED 350' SECTION OF ROAD AT KOHRING ROAD INTERSECTION PAVED WITH 1.5" ASPHALT CONCRETE AND 1.5" SURFACE COURSE TYPE 1 AT A COST OF $8,261.00 BY GEDDIS PAVING.

2015: PAVED SECTIONS WITH TWO COURSES OF #448-1 HOT MIX TO LEVEL DIPS IN ROAD – WHITTA $22,733.10 THIS IS THE COST FOR BOTH ALEXANDER AND WAYNE ROADS.
HOUSEKEEPER ROAD – NO 244 A

1978: SURFACE TREATED EAST 50 RODS. ($839.06)

1979: SURFACE TREATED FROM RTE. 199 TO ZEPERNICK ROAD IN EXCHANGE FOR PEMBERVILLE ROAD.

1983: RESURFACED FROM ST. RT. 199 TO ZEPERNICK ROAD WITH MOTO-PAVER TOP. CONTRACTOR: HENRY W. BERGMAN ($9,488.35)

1984: SURFACE TREATED FROM ST. RT. 199 TO CENTER TWP. LINE BY GLENN GRAFFICE ($4,010.55)

1988: WIDENED JOG 4’ AT THE CENTER TWP./FREEDOM TWP. LINE IN FRONT OF CARL KNAUSS RESIDENCE. CONTRACTOR: RALPH W. SHERMAN ($1,079.85)

1991: SURFACE TREATED FROM ZEPERNICK ROAD TO CENTER TWP. LINE BY COUNTY FORCES AT A COST OF $6,727.10.

1997: SURFACE TREATED FROM ZEPERNICK ROAD WEST TO TOWNSHIP LINE BY COUNTY FORCES. ($6,727.10)

2010: REPLACE TILE UNDER ROAD/REPAVE ROAD ½ MILE WEST OF ST RT 199 BY COUNTY FORCES. ($1,895.77)
WAYNE ROAD – 112 C

1977: WIDENED ROAD FROM ALEXANDER ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD BY 3 FT. (1.31 MILES) COUNTY FORCES. ($7,968.38)

1978: WIDENED ROAD BY 4 FT. ON WEST SIDE OF ROAD BY COUNTY FORCES. ($9,185.93)

1979: SURFACED 18’ ROAD FROM ALEXANDER ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD USING 2” HOT MIX BY COUNTY FORCES IN EXCHANGE FOR PEMBERVILLE ROAD.

1982: SURFACE TREATED ROAD FROM ALEXANDER ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD. RALPH SHERMAN, CONTRACTOR. ($4,714.12)

1984: SURFACE TREATED ROAD FROM ALEXANDER ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD. GLENN GRAFFICE & SON, CONTRACTOR. ($6,338.70)

1990: SURFACE TREATED ROAD FROM ALEXANDER ROAD TO NORTH RIVER ROAD BY COUNTY FORCES.

1997: SURFACE TREATED ROAD FROM NORTH RIVER ROAD TO ALEXANDER ROAD BY COUNTY FORCES. ($6,521.80)

WEGMAN ROAD – NO. 280 A

1969: WIDENED ROAD TO 22 FT. WITH 6 FT. BASE BY COUNTY. ($8,844.00)

1970: BLACK TOPPED ROAD BY COUNTY. ($9,724.44)

1980: STRIPED ROAD BY CHEMI-TROL CHEMICAL CO.

1983: SURFACE TREATED ROAD FROM SUGAR RIDGE TO COLLEGE AVE. HENRY W. BERGMAN, CONTRACTOR. ($4,310.96)

1985: STRIPED ROAD FROM SUGAR RIDGE ROAD TO COLLEGE AVE.

1989: INSTALLED A 4’ MOTOPAVER WEDGE FROM SUGAR RIDGE ROAD TO COLLEGE AVE. WHITTA CONSTRUCTION, CONTRACTOR. ($2,043.00 – VILLAGE REIMBURSED TWP. FOR ½ COST)

1998: SURFACE TREATED ROAD FROM PEMBERVILLE LIMITS TO SUGAR RIDGE ROAD BY COUNTY FORCES. ($6,425.00)

2007: SURFACE TREATED ROAD FROM SUGAR RIDGE SOUTH TO BRIDGE BY COUNTY FORCES - 0.189 MILES ($1,460.78)

2009: WOOD COUNTY FORCES REPLACED TILE UNDER ROAD AND CATCH BASIN ON EAST SIDE OF ROAD SOUTH OF BRIDGE. COST OF PROJECT INCLUDED $1,587.09 TO BLACKTOP CUT AND $3,760.25 TO REPLACE CATCH BASIN AND TILE.

2009: INSTALLED 8.5’ WEDGE ON BOTH SIDES OF ROAD FROM SUGAR RIDGE ROAD TO VILLAGE LIMITS. WHITTA CONSTRUCTION, INC. ($32,521.00)

2010: CHIPSEAL ROAD FROM SUGAR RIDGE ROAD TO VILLAGE LIMITS AT A COST OF $15,419.30 BY WHITTA CONSTRUCTION INC.
## Median Household Income (MHI) & Population

The Small Government Administrator will use data below to score criteria 1.B., 5, and 10. Information is listed by county with municipalities first followed by townships. If a municipality is situated in two counties, there will be a listing in both counties. The source for municipalities and whole townships MHI is the 2012-2016 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. The MHI figures shown for the unincorporated areas of townships (denoted as "Remainder of") were estimated since such data are no longer available through ACS. The population figures are from the 2010 Census. This information has been provided by the Ohio Department Services Agency, Office of Research, for the exclusive use of the Ohio Small Government Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>MHI 2012-2016</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Cherry Fork village</td>
<td>$43,548</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Manchester village</td>
<td>$29,077</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Peebles village</td>
<td>$28,558</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Rome village</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Seaman village</td>
<td>$31,974</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>West Union village</td>
<td>$20,479</td>
<td>3,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Winchester village</td>
<td>$28,690</td>
<td>1,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Bratton township</td>
<td>$40,720</td>
<td>1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Brush Creek township</td>
<td>$33,650</td>
<td>1,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Franklin township</td>
<td>$31,983</td>
<td>1,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Green township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$37,428</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Jefferson township</td>
<td>$26,324</td>
<td>1,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Liberty township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$46,064</td>
<td>1,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Manchester township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Meigs township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$36,813</td>
<td>2,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Monroe township</td>
<td>$26,375</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Oliver township</td>
<td>$26,675</td>
<td>1,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Scott township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$46,907</td>
<td>1,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Sprigg township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$51,176</td>
<td>1,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Tiffin township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$45,286</td>
<td>2,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Wayne township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$59,881</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Winchester township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$72,891</td>
<td>1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Beavercreek village</td>
<td>$47,344</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Bluffton village</td>
<td>$73,132</td>
<td>4,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Cairo village</td>
<td>$46,875</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Delphos city</td>
<td>$44,528</td>
<td>7,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Elida village</td>
<td>$70,069</td>
<td>1,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Harrod village</td>
<td>$47,321</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Lafayette village</td>
<td>$41,625</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Center township</td>
<td>$95,556</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Freedom township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$80,023</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Grand Rapids township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$68,478</td>
<td>642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Henry township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$55,213</td>
<td>743</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Jackson township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$61,103</td>
<td>489</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Lake township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$64,963</td>
<td>6,753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Liberty township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$48,598</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Middleton township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$85,067</td>
<td>3,266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Milton township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$53,514</td>
<td>656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Montgomery township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$53,660</td>
<td>1,752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Perry township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$74,625</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Perrysburg township</td>
<td>$56,057</td>
<td>12,512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Plain township</td>
<td>$74,803</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Portage township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$87,011</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Troy township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$47,955</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Washington township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$98,234</td>
<td>1,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Webster township</td>
<td>$70,333</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Weston township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$70,781</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Grey village</td>
<td>$50,417</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Harpster village</td>
<td>$43,295</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Kirby village</td>
<td>$29,375</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Marseilles village</td>
<td>$48,125</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Nevada village</td>
<td>$46,042</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Sycamore village</td>
<td>$42,426</td>
<td>861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Upper Sandusky city</td>
<td>$40,397</td>
<td>6,596</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Wharton village</td>
<td>$42,969</td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Antrim township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$51,184</td>
<td>764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Crane township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$56,304</td>
<td>922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Crawford township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$68,559</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Eeen township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$65,775</td>
<td>811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Jackson township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$51,208</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Marseilles township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$74,250</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Mifflin township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$82,777</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Pitt township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$76,136</td>
<td>804</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Richland township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
<td>513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Ridge township</td>
<td>$64,167</td>
<td>524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Salem township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$62,740</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Sycamore township (Remainder of)</td>
<td>$70,461</td>
<td>739</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot Tymochtee township</td>
<td>$56,771</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>