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August 22, 2018

Ohio Public Works Commission
District 5 Committee
Issue 1 Round 33
Re: "Resolution # SM-2018-02"

Dear Committee Members,

The Allen Township Trustees are pleased to submit an OPWC Issue I, Round 33 SCIP Grant/Loan application for financial assistance to resurface approximately 1.20 miles of road work resurfacing within the township. Allen Township is submitting the narrative for the CM-150 resurfacing of Martin Williston Road TR#7. The road area to be resurfaced begins north at SR579 and will end at the Lucas County line. The balance of this grant/loan application narrative will include miles in both Carol and Salem Townships.

Martin Williston Road (TR#7 1.20 miles) is in extremely poor condition with spider cracking throughout (see pictures). The road has several potholes that are continuously cleaned and filled. The road is also experiencing major edge peel erosion on the east edge. The road has a poor base and is failing in several locations. The township will provide the berm after the overlay is completed. The township will chip seal the road one year after the repaving is completed. A CM-150 overlay will add a seven to ten-year solution for road use without incurring additional costs of repair. Genoa School’s and OCTA buses travel this road daily to serve students and elderly residents in Allen Township. The Allen Township Cemetery is located on this road and receives a regular influx of traffic for both funerals, ceremonies and family visitations on a weekly basis.

The township received letters of support from The Ottawa County Sheriff, The Allen-Clay Joint Fire District and The Genoa Schools. I have included the original letters within the application for your consideration. The township is applying for a SCIP grant/loan and the township will appropriate the additional matching monies from the township’s 2019 budget for this project.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 419-836-9614 or by email at scott.apr@outlook.com.

Best Regards,

Scott R. Everhardt
Allen Township Trustee,
Ottawa County, Ohio
August 29, 2018

Ohio Public Works Commission
Issue 1 Round 33
Re: “Resolution # SM-2018-02”

Dear Committee Members,

The Carroll Township Trustees are pleased to submit an OPWC Issue I, Round 33 Grant application for financial assistance to resurface approximately 1.49 miles of roadwork resurfacing within the township. Carroll Township is submitting the narrative for the resurfacing of Leutz Road TR#101. The road area to be resurfaced begins at the intersection of Leutz and Salem-Carroll and heads north to Genzman Road. The balance of this grant application narrative will include miles in both Allen and Salem Townships.

**Leutz Road (T-101/ 1.49 mile)** is a section of road with some extreme issues. The road is experiencing severe road base failure along both edges and at the intersections. The road edges drop off in some places up to 8 inches (reference pictures). Leutz Road also has a severe crown, in most places the edge of the road is up to 5 inches below the center of the road. This issue creates poor driving conditions, which are made more hazardous by precipitation. The entire section of road is experiencing severe map cracking. The road surface has been extensively cracked-sealed over the years; it has just exceeded its shelf life.

The township received letters of support from The Ottawa County Sheriff, as well as the Carroll Township Fire and Police Departments. I have included the letters within the application for your consideration. The township is applying for a SCIP grant/loan combination and the township will appropriate the additional matching monies from the township’s 2019 budget for this project.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 419-346-0029 or by email at jbmoores@genoabank.com.

Best Regards,

Jordan B. Moore
Carroll Township Trustee,
Ottawa County, Ohio
August 29, 2018

District 5 Committee, Issue 1, Round 33

Re: Toussaint-Portage Road, T.R. #92 (Salem Township) 1 mile

The Board of Salem Township Trustees is pleased to submit a joint OPWC Issue 1 application with Allen and Carroll Townships for financial assistance to resurface roads in all three townships. The Salem Township portion of the application is for complete resurfacing and base repairs to Toussaint-Portage Road from State Route 163 to Salem Carroll Road, a distance of 1.13 miles. This is a major road connecting western Carroll Township and Salem Township to State Route 163 and Oak Harbor. About ¼ mile of this road is along the side of LaCarpe Creek. We had to complete the riprapping before resurfacing the road in order to stabilize the road base and not damage the new road surface with construction equipment.

Limited finances and increased road repair costs have made it necessary for the township to submit this application for the grant. The total cost of the project is $207,577. Salem Township is requesting a grant of $100,679 with a loan of $20,136 for a total of $120,815 and a township cash outlay of $86,762.

Thank you for considering this grant.
Photos 1 & 2 – Delamination, Pothole Patching, and Edge Fracturing

Photos 3 & 4 – Edge Delaminations
Photos 5 & 6 – Edge Failures and Bleeding in Driving Lanes

Photo 7 – Potholes Forming at Edges
Photos 5 & 6 – Isolated Serious Pavement Failures

Photos 7 & 8 – Edge Settlement and Rutting
Photos 9, 10, 11, & 12 – Widespread Map Cracking and Bleeding
Photos 13, 14, 15, & 16 – Pavement Failure and Settlement of Edge Repairs
Photos 1, 2, 3, & 4 – Widespread Longitudinal and Map Cracking
Photos 5, 6, 7, & 8 – Edge Failures with Rutting and Settlement
Photos 9 & 10 – Patched Pavement Failures
State of Ohio
Public Works Commission
Application for Financial Assistance

Applicant: Carroll Township
Subdivision Code: 123-12266

District Number: 5 County: Ottawa
Date: 09/07/2018

Contact: Ronald P Laiti, Jr., P.E., P.S.
(The individual who will be available during business hours and who can best answer or coordinate the response to questions)
Phone: (419) 734-6777
Email: rlaiti@co.ottawa.oh.us
FAX: (419) 734-6768

Project Name: Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint-Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing
Zip Code: 43449

<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: 566,966.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. City</td>
<td>2. Bridge/Culvert</td>
<td>1. Grant: 275,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Township</td>
<td>3. Water Supply</td>
<td>2. Loan: 55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Village</td>
<td>4. Wastewater</td>
<td>3. Loan Assistance/ Credit Enhancement: 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Water (S119 Water District)</td>
<td>5. Solid Waste</td>
<td>Funding Requested: 330,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Stormwater</td>
<td></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

Project Number: __________
Loan Amount: _______00
Total Funding: _______00
Date Construction End: __________
Date Maturity: __________
Rate: _______%
Local Participation: _______%
OPWC Approval: __________
OPWC Participation: _______%
Term: _______ Yrs

Form OPWC9001 Rev. 12.15
1.0 Project Financial Information  (All Costs Rounded to Nearest Dollar)

1.1 Project Estimated Costs

Engineering Services
Preliminary Design:  ___________ 0.00
Final Design:  ___________ 0.00
Construction Administration:  ___________ 0.00
Total Engineering Services:  a.)  ___________ 0.00  0 %
Right of Way:  b.)  ___________ 0.00
Construction:  c.)  513,623 0.00
Materials Purchased Directly:  d.)  ___________ 0.00
Permits, Advertising, Legal:  e.)  2,001 0.00
Construction Contingencies:  f.)  51,362 0.00  10 %
Total Estimated Costs:  g.)  566,986 0.00

1.2 Project Financial Resources

Local Resources
Local In-Kind or Force Account:  a.)  ___________ 0.00
Local Revenues:  b.)  236,986 0.00
Other Public Revenues:
ODOT / FHWA PID:  c.)  ___________ 0.00
USDA Rural Development:  d.)  ___________ 0.00
OEPA / OWDA:  e.)  ___________ 0.00
CDBG:
☐ County Entitlement or Community Dev. "Formula"
☐ Department of Development
Other:  ____________________________  f.)  ___________ 0.00
Subtotal Local Resources:  g.)  236,986 0.00  42 %

OPWC Funds  (Check all requested and enter Amount)
Grant:  83 % of OPWC Funds  j.)  275,000 0.00
Loan:  17 % of OPWC Funds  k.)  55,000 0.00
Loan Assistance / Credit Enhancement:  l.)  0 0.00
Subtotal OPWC Funds:  m.)  330,000 0.00  58 %
Total Financial Resources:  n.)  566,986 0.00  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: 566,986.00 100 %
2.2 Total Portion of Project New / Expansion: 0.00 0 %
2.3 Total Project: 566,986.00 100 %

3.0 Project Schedule

3.1 Engineering / Design / Right of Way
Begin Date: 02/01/2019  End Date: 06/30/2019

3.2 Bid Advertisement and Award
Begin Date: 07/01/2019  End Date: 08/15/2019

3.3 Construction
Begin Date: 08/16/2019  End Date: 12/31/2019

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 agreement for approved projects. 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: 12 Years  Age: 1995  (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 1,030  Year 2018  Projected ADT 1,257  Year 2038

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

Residential Water Rate
Current $ Proposed $

Number of households served: 

Residential Wastewater Rate
Current $ Proposed $

Number of households served: 

Stormwater: Number of households served: 

Form OPWC0001 Rev. 12.18
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.

- Allen Township - Sections 26, 27, 34 & 35
- Martin-Williston Road TR #7 - State Route 579 north to County Line
- Carroll Township - Sections 22, 23, 28 & 27
- Leutz Road TR #101 - Salem-Carroll to Genzman
- Salem Township - Sections 5, 6, 31 & 32
- Toussaint-Portage Road TR #92 - State Route 163 to Salem-Carroll Road

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

- Martin-Williston Road
  - The existing road pavement will be improved by performing select full depth pavement repairs, placement of an intermediate scratch course for the purposes of profile and crown correction, and placement of an asphalt cold mix overlay. New railroad crossing pavement marking will also be performed.

- Leutz Road
  - The existing road pavement will be improved by performing select full depth pavement repairs, placement of an intermediate scratch course for the purposes of profile and crown correction, and placement of a new asphalt concrete surface course. The existing stone berms will also be improved with new stone.

- Toussaint-Portage Road
  - The existing road pavement will be improved by performing select full depth pavement repairs, placement of an intermediate scratch course for the purposes of profile and crown correction, and placement of a new asphalt concrete surface course.

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.

- Martin-Williston Road TR #7 - 1.20 miles long, 19.5 feet wide
- Leutz Road TR #101 - 1.49 miles long, 18.5 feet wide
- Toussaint-Portage Road TR #92 - 1.13 miles long, 18.5 feet 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: Jordan Moore
Title: Carroll Township Trustee
Address: 11080 W Toussaint East Road

City: Oak Harbor State: OH Zip: 43449
Phone: (419) 346-0029
FAX: (419) 698-0366
E-Mail: jhmoore.moorefarms@gmail.com

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

Name: Tina Gyde
Title: Fiscal Officer
Address: 11080 W Toussaint East Road

City: Oak Harbor State: OH Zip: 43449
Phone: (419) 707-9748
FAX: (419) 698-0366
E-Mail: TinaGyde@yahoo.com

5.3 Project Manager

Name: Ronald P. Lajitl, Jr., P.E., P.S.
Title: County Engineer
Address: 8247 W. State Route #163

City: Oak Harbor State: OH Zip: 43449
Phone: (419) 734-6777
FAX: (419) 734-6768
E-Mail: rlajitl@co.ottawa.oh.us
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.

Jordan Moore, Carroll Township Trustee

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

Original Signature / Date Signed

8-31-18
The Board of Trustees of Carroll Township, Allen Township, and Salem Township, Ottawa County, Ohio, met in special session at the Ottawa County Engineer’s Office, 8247 W State Route #163, Oak Harbor, Ohio on August 21, 2018 with the following in attendance:

Carroll Township: James Meek, Jordan Moore, Tina Gyde
Allen Township: Ernest Cottrell, Scott Everhardt, Sonia Eisenhut
Salem Township: Ronald Buehler, Richard Lenke, Todd Winke, Susan Perrin
Ottawa County: Ron Lajti, Craig Miller, Tina Molnar

James Meek, Carroll Township made the motion, second by Richard Lenke, Salem Township to adopt the following resolution:

Resolution Number: SM-2018-02
Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Issue I Round 33 Ohio Public Works Grant/Loan Application
Cooperation Agreement
Date August 21, 2018

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, Carroll Township, Allen Township and Salem Township are planning to make capital improvements to various roads in their respective townships, and

Whereas, the infrastructure improvements are considered to be a priority need for the communities and are qualified under the OPWC program, and

Whereas, Carroll, Allen and Salem Townships will execute a cooperation agreement for a joint road resurfacing project under Ohio Public Works Commission Issue 1, Round 33, in the amount of $566,986.00.

Be it resolved, Carroll Township, Allen Township, and Salem Township, all of Ottawa County, Ohio, agree to enter into a cooperative agreement to submit an application to the Ohio Public Works Commission for the Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Project, and

Resolved, further agree to the following:

1. Carroll, Allen and Salem Townships agree to provide a percentage of the total project costs based upon the Engineer’s Estimates for their individual road projects. The preliminary ratio of cost sharing is:

   Carroll Township: $232,374 or 41%
   Allen Township: $127,035 or 22%
   Salem Township: $207,577 or 37%

2. All participants agree that the proportions listed above are preliminary and subject to change based upon the final construction costs of each road in the application. It is further agreed that any loan funding received through this application will be split among the townships according to the percentage of final construction costs for this project.

3. Carroll, Allen and Salem Townships will be responsible for cost overages for only their roads.

4. Carroll, Allen and Salem Townships agree to pay their portion of the costs as invoiced by the County Engineer.

5. Allen Township and Salem Township agree to submit their loan payments, if any, to Carroll Township a minimum of 30 days prior to the Ohio Public Works loan repayment due date.

OPWC Joint Resolution – Group 2
6. Carroll Township agrees to submit loan payments to the Ohio Public Works Commission on behalf of all parties by the due date.

7. Carroll Township, Allen Township and Salem Township authorize the following:

Section 1: Carroll Township to serve as lead applicant
Section 2: Jordan Moore, Carroll Township Trustee, is hereby authorized and directed to apply to the OPWC for funds for the above described project.
Section 3: Jordan Moore, Carroll Township Trustee, is further authorized to enter into any agreements as may be necessary and appropriate for obtaining this financial assistance.

The resolution was duly adopted this 21st day of August, 2018.

Carroll Township:

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

Sandra Shearon

Allen Township:

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

Scott Everhardt

Salem Township:

[Signatures]

[Signatures]

Richard Ahke

Todd Winke

I, Tina Gyde, Fiscal Officer of Carroll Township, Ottawa County, Ohio, hereby do certify that the above Joint Board entered into this agreement this 21st day of August 2018 in a special meeting as stated.

Tina Gyde
Carroll Township Fiscal Officer
I, Tina Gyde, Fiscal Officer of Carroll Township, hereby certify that Carroll Township will have the amount of $97,126 in the Gas Tax Fund and that this amount will be used to pay the local share for the Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Project when it is required.

Tina Gyde  
Carroll Township Fiscal Officer  
8.21.18

| James Meek | Sandra Shearon | Jordan Moore | Tina Gyde |
| Trustee    | Trustee       | Trustee     | Fiscal Officer |
| 419-707-0445 | 419-898-0936 | 419-346-0029 | 419-265-0848 |
OPWC ROUND 33 LOAN MATCHING FUNDS

I, Sonia Eischen, Fiscal Officer of Allen Township, hereby certify that Allen Township will have the amount of $53,097 in the MVL, Gas Tax and/or Road and Bridge funds and that this amount will be used to pay the local share for the Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Project when it is required.

Sonia Eischen  
Allen Township Fiscal Officer  
8-21-2018  
Date
Salem Township
Ottawa County, Ohio

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Inspector
Ronald Buehler
Officer
Richard Lenke
Todd Winke

Matt Chasteen, Zoning
Susan Perrin, Fiscal
P.O. Box 417
Oak Harbor, OH 43449

I, Susan Perrin, Fiscal Officer of Salem Township, hereby certify that Salem Township will collect the amount of $20,136 in the Road & Bridge Fund and that this amount will be used to repay the Ohio Public Works Commission SCIP or RLP loan requested for the Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Project over a term of ten years.

Salem Township will submit loan payments to Carroll Township, the lead applicant for this application, thirty days prior to the Ohio Public Works due date. Carroll Township will submit payments to the Ohio Public Works Commission on our behalf.

Susan Perrin
Salem Township Fiscal Officer

08-23-18
Date
I, Tina Gyde, Fiscal Officer of Carroll Township, hereby certify that Carroll Township will collect the amount of $55,000 in the Gas Tax Fund and that this amount will be used to repay the Ohio Public Works Commission SCIP or RLP loan requested for the Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Project over a term of ten years.

Carroll Township will collect loan payments from Allen Township and Salem Township, co-applicants for this application, thirty days prior to the Ohio Public Works due date. Carroll Township will submit payments to the Ohio Public Works Commission on the behalf of all three townships.

Tina Gyde  
Carroll Township Fiscal Officer

Date 8.21.18
OPWC ROUND 33 LOAN REPAYMENT FUNDS

I, Sonia Eischen, Fiscal Officer of Allen Township, hereby certify that Allen Township will collect the amount of $12,323 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 Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Project over a term of ten years.

Allen Township will submit loan payments to Carroll Township, the lead applicant for this application, thirty days prior to the Ohio Public Works due date. Carroll Township will submit payments to the Ohio Public Works Commission on our behalf.

Sonia Eischen  
Allen Township Fiscal Officer

Date  
8-31-2018
Salem Township
Ottawa County, Ohio

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Ronald Buehler
Richard Lenke
Todd Winke

Matt Chasteen, Zoning Inspector
Susan Perrin, Fiscal Officer
P.O. Box 417
Oak Harbor, OH 43449

I, Susan Perrin, Fiscal Officer of Salem Township, hereby certify that Salem Township will have the amount of $86,762 in the Road & Bridge Fund and that this amount will be used to pay the local share for the Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing Project when it is required.

__________________________
Susan Perrin
Salem Township Fiscal Officer

__________________________
Date
08-23-18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>PAVEMENT REPAIR</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td>$3,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>#67 MIX</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
<td>$50,688.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>TONS</td>
<td>CHOOSE COAT</td>
<td>$52.00</td>
<td>$4,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>13084</td>
<td>GALS</td>
<td>CM-150, BITUMINOUS MATERIAL</td>
<td>$3.40</td>
<td>$44,486.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>TONS</td>
<td>0.75&quot; ASPHALT CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE (SCRATCH), TYPE 1</td>
<td>$82.00</td>
<td>$6,888.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>RAILROAD CROSSING SYMBOL</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.05</td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>CONTRACT BOND</td>
<td>$1,698.00</td>
<td>$1,698.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal - Martin-Williston Road** $114,880.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>16198</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>PAVEMENT PLANING</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$29,157.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>PAVEMENT REPAIR</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td>$37,570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>GALS</td>
<td>TACK COAT (SCRATCH)</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$2,552.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>GALS</td>
<td>TACK COAT (SURFACE)</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
<td>$1,351.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>BERM STONE</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$4,818.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>0.75&quot; ASPHALT CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE (SCRATCH), TYPE 1</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$47,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>1.25&quot; ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE, TYPE 1, PG64-</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$78,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>1.5&quot; ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE, TYPE 1, PG64-</td>
<td>$70.00</td>
<td>$1,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>MILE</td>
<td>CENTERLINE, TYPE 1</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
<td>$882.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.05</td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>CONTRACT BOND</td>
<td>$3,113.00</td>
<td>$3,113.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal - Leutz Road** $210,643.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>PAVEMENT REMOVED</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>AGGREGATE BASE</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>$3,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>ASHPALT CONCRETE BASE</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>$8,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>12292</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>PAVEMENT PLANING</td>
<td>$1.90</td>
<td>$23,355.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>PAVEMENT REPAIR</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
<td>$20,160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>GALS</td>
<td>TACK COAT (SCRATCH)</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>$1,983.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>GALS</td>
<td>TACK COAT (SURFACE)</td>
<td>$2.15</td>
<td>$1,058.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>0.75&quot; ASPHALT CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE, TYPE 1</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>$37,962.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>0.75&quot; ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE. TYPE 1. PG64-22</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>$75,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>ASPHALT CONCRETE SURFACE COURSE, TYPE 1, PG64-22 (Drives)</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>$1,702.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>LUMP</td>
<td>CONTRACT BOND</td>
<td>$2,780.00</td>
<td>$2,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Toussaint-Portage Road</strong></td>
<td><strong>$108,100.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td><strong>$513,623.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>**$ - **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PERMITS, LEGAL, ADVERTISING</td>
<td>$2,001.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONTINGENCIES</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$51,362.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$566,986.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Estimate was Prepared by:

Ronald P. Lajti, Jr., P.E., P.S.
Ottawa County Engineer
Project Life will be 12 years
## ROAD RESURFACING 2019 - COST ESTIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>BITUMINOUS MATERIAL</th>
<th>AGGREGATE, MATERIAL OR PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARTIN WILLISTON ROAD FROM SR 579 TO NORTH TOWNSHIP/COUNTY LINE</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTICE TO BIDDERS:**

**DRIVEWAY APRONS AND MAILBOX APPROACHES SHALL BE MILLED AND PAVED UP TO 6 FEET FROM THE EDGE OF PAVEMENT. ESTIMATE INCLUDES MILLING OF ABUTTING JOINTS AT ALL ASPHALT & CONCRETE DRIVES. THIS WILL NOT BE A SEPARATELY PAID ITEM. THERE ARE A TOTAL OF 50 DRIVES. QUANTITIES ON ESTIMATE WERE COMPUTED AS FOLLOWS:**

**TOTAL LENGTH** | **WIDTH** | **SY** | **300** | **300**

**THERE ARE 5 CONCRETE DRIVES THAT ARE PAVED UP TO THE CURRENT EDGE OF PAVEMENT. IN ORDER TO**: **AVOID COLD MIXING OVER THESE DRIVES THE LINE ITEM "253 - PAVEMENT REPAIR - DRIVES" HAS BEEN INCLUDED. THIS ITEM INCLUDES THE SAW CUTTING, REMOVAL OF CONCRETE AND THE BACKFILLING WITH 4" OF HOT MIX PRIOR TO COLD MIXING THE NEWLY PAVED APRONS. THESE APRONS SHALL BE 4" IN WIDTH. CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE CARE TO MINIMIZE DAMAGE TO ADJACENT YARDS/PROPERTY. THIS ITEM INCLUDES ALL EQUIPMENT, LABOR AND MATERIALS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE WORK:**

**TOTAL LENGTH** | **WIDTH** | **SY** | **160** | **4** | **71.1**

**ESTIMATE ALSO TO INCLUDE THE MILLING OF ABUTTING JOINTS AT ALL INVOLVED INTERSECTIONS. JOINTS SHALL BE THE FULL WIDTH OF PAVEMENT, 10 FEET IN LENGTH IN INTERSECTIONS, AND AT A DEPTH EQUAL TO THE DEPTH OF PROPOSED ASPHALT OVERLAYMENT. QUANTITIES FOR DRIVES WILL BE LUMPED TOGETHER WITH ROADWAY QUANTITIES IN PROPOSAL. THEY ARE SHOWN SEPARATELY IN THIS ESTIMATE SHEET FOR QUANTITY CLARITY.**

**DRAG COAT LISTED ABOVE SHALL BE MIXED IN A PUGMILL AT THE CONTRACTOR'S SITE. INSPECTOR SHALL BE NOTIFIED OF DATE, TIME, AND LOCATION 48 HOUR IN ADVANCE OF MIXING. MATERIAL IS TO BE PLACED WITH A CONVENTIONAL PAVER WITH A 3/10 PER FOOT CROSS SLOPE.**

**448 SURFACE TYPE 1, SCRATCH COURSE LISTED ABOVE WILL BE LAYED IN VARIOUS LOCATIONS TO CORRECT SEVERE CROSS-SECTIONAL SLOPE ISSUES. THE ESTIMATED AMOUNT ABOVE IS FOR ESTIMATING PURPOSES ONLY AND THE ENTIRE QUANTITY IS NOT GUARANTEED. EXACT LOCATIONS WILL BE MARKED OUT ON SITE BY THE ENGINEER AT THE TIME OF CONSTRUCTION. ESTIMATE INCLUDES 3500 LF OF FULL WIDTH SCRATCH COURSE WITH AN AVERAGE THICKNESS OF 7/8."**

**PAVEMENT IS ON AN AVERAGE OF 18.5" IN WIDTH. 19.5" WAS USED FOR MATERIAL PADDING DUE TO INCONSISTENCIES IN THE CROSS-SECTIONAL SLOPE OF THE EXISTING PAVEMENT. FINISH PAVEMENT WIDTH WILL VARY SLIGHTLY.**

**TRAFFIC SHALL BE MAINTAINED.**

SEE OTTAWA COUNTY SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR COLD MIX AND HOT MIX.
# ROAD RESURFACING 2019 - COST ESTIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>BITUMINOUS MATERIAL</th>
<th>AGGREGATE, MATERIAL OR PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEUTZ ROAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROLL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENZMAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>WIDTH</th>
<th>SQ YDS</th>
<th>KINDS</th>
<th>APPLIED RATE</th>
<th>TOTAL GALLONS</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>APPLIED COST</th>
<th>STONE SIZE</th>
<th>TACKS PER SQ YD</th>
<th>TOTAL TONS</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>APPLIED COST</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEUTZ ROAD</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16168</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>$ 1.80</td>
<td>$ 29,156</td>
<td>$ 29,156</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>$ 254</td>
<td>$ 254</td>
<td>$ 254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>700.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>406.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 70.0</td>
<td>$ 13,222</td>
<td>$ 13,222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1022.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 102.2</td>
<td>$ 24,355</td>
<td>$ 24,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16168</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1214.8</td>
<td>$ 2.10</td>
<td>$ 2,551.15</td>
<td>$ 2,551.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,360.61</td>
<td>$ 1,360.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16168</td>
<td>Tack</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>647.91</td>
<td>$ 2.10</td>
<td>$ 1,360.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,360.61</td>
<td>$ 1,360.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEUTZ ROAD</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16168</td>
<td>PG64-22</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>$ 70.0</td>
<td>$ 1,166.7</td>
<td>$ 1,166.7</td>
<td>$ 1,166.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16168</td>
<td>PG64-22</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1124.86</td>
<td>$ 70.0</td>
<td>$ 78,739.2</td>
<td>$ 78,739.2</td>
<td>$ 78,739.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALEM</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>7680</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16168</td>
<td>PG64-22</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>674.91</td>
<td>$ 70.0</td>
<td>$ 47,243.52</td>
<td>$ 47,243.52</td>
<td>$ 47,243.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARROLL</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>15760</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2626.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>218.9</td>
<td>$ 22.0</td>
<td>$ 4,815.58</td>
<td>$ 4,815.58</td>
<td>$ 4,815.58</td>
<td>BERM STONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENZMAN</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 882.00</td>
<td>$ 882.00</td>
<td>$ 882.00</td>
<td>CENTER LINE, 4&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 4,000.00</td>
<td>$ 4,000.00</td>
<td>$ 4,000.00</td>
<td>MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC</td>
<td>$ 3,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 210,382.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ROAD TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTICE TO BIDDERS:**

- **ESTIMATE TO INCLUDE MILLING OF ABUTTING JOINTS AT ALL INVOLVED INTERSECTIONS. JOINTS SHALL BE THE FULL WIDTH OF PAVEMENT, 12 FEET IN LENGTH, AND AT A DEPTH EQUAL TO THE DEPTH OF PROPOSED ASPHALT OVERLAYMENT.**

- **DRIVEWAY APRONS AND MAILBOX APPROACHES SHALL BE MILLED AND PAVED UP TO 4 FEET FROM THE EDGE OF PAVEMENT. ESTIMATE INCLUDES MILLING OF ABUTTING JOINTS AT ALL ASPHALT & CONCRETE DRIVES, THIS WILL NOT BE A SEPARATELY PAID ITEM.**

**TOTAL LENGTH** | **WIDTH** | **SY**
---|---|---
460 | 4 | 200

- **QUANTITIES FOR DRIVEWAYS WILL BE LUMPED TOGETHER WITH ROADWAY QUANTITIES IN PROPOSAL. THEY ARE SHOWN SEPARATELY IN THIS ESTIMATE SHEET FOR QUANTITY CLARITY.**

- **ROAD WIDTH VARIES SLIGHTLY, 18.5' IS THE AVERAGE WIDTH, 18' IS THE MINIMUM WIDTH.**

- **QUANTITIES ON PROPOSAL ARE SLIGHTLY HIGHER THAN ON COST ESTIMATE DUE TO ROUNDING.**

- **TRAFFIC SHALL BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION.**

- **TOWNSHIP TO RETAIN ALL OR A PORTION OF GRINDINGS PRODUCED DURING MILLING OPERATIONS. CONTRACTOR TO PROVIDE TRANSPORTATION TO A DESTINATION IN THE TOWNSHIP THAT WILL BE DETERMINED ONCE OPERATIONS ARE UNDERWAY. CONTRACTOR WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY GRINDINGS THE TOWNSHIP DOES NOT CLAIM.**

- **SEE SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT.**

- **THE EXACT QUANTITY AND LOCATION OF BASE REPAIR NEEDED WILL BE DETERMINED ON SITE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.**
# Road Resurfacing 2019 - Cost Estimate

| Road Name | Miles | Length (ft) | Width (ft) | Sq Yds | Kinds | Applied Rate | Total Gallons | Unit Cost | Applied Cost | Stone Size | Lbs Per Sq Ft | Total Quarts | Total Tons | Unit Cost | Applied Cost | Total Cost | Remarks |
|-----------|-------|-------------|------------|--------|-------|--------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|------------|-------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------------|---------|
| TOUSSAINT PORTAGE ROAD FROM S.R. 183 TO SALEM-CARROLL ROAD | 0.000 | 2000.0 | 888.9 | 301 | 12 | 140.0 | $ 50.00 | $ 7,000.00 | $ 7,000.00 | PAVEMENT REMOVED |
| | 0.000 | 632.0 | 420.0 | 301 | 6 | 70.0 | $ 65.00 | $ 3,850.00 | $ 3,850.00 | 304 - AGGREGATE BASE |
| | 0.000 | 632.0 | 420.0 | 301 | 6 | 70.0 | $ 120.00 | $ 6,400.00 | $ 6,400.00 | 301 - ASPHALT CONCRETE BASE |
| | 0.0000 | 2200.0 | 888.9 | 301 | 4.5 | 111.1 | $ 180.00 | $ 20,000.00 | $ 20,000.00 | 263 - PAVEMENT REPAIR |
| | 1.13 | 5982 | 18.5 | 12262 | | | $ 1.90 | $ 23,355.22 | $ 23,355.22 | 254 - PAVEMENT PLANING (ROADWAY) |
| | 1.13 | 5982 | 18.5 | 12262 | Tack | 0.075 | 921.92 | $ 2.15 | $ 1,982.12 | | |
| | 1.13 | 5982 | 18.5 | 12262 | Tack | 0.040 | 491.09 | $ 2.15 | $ 1,057.13 | | |
| | 1.13 | 5982 | 18.5 | 12262 | PG64-22 | 448-1 | 2.00 | 22.22 | $ 74.00 | $ 1,644.44 | 448 SURFACE TYPE 1 (DRIVES) |
| | 1.13 | 5982 | 18.5 | 12262 | PG64-22 | 448-1 | 1.50 | 1024.36 | $ 74.00 | $ 75,802.04 | 1.5" 448 SURFACE TYPE 1 (SURFACE) |
| | 1.13 | 5982 | 18.5 | 12262 | PG64-22 | 448-2 | 0.75 | 512.18 | $ 74.00 | $ 37,901.02 | 0.75" 441 INTERMEDIATE TYPE 1 |

**Notice to Bidders:**

- **Estimate to Include Milling of Abutting Joints at All Involved Intersections.** Joints shall be the full width of pavement, 12 feet in length, and at a depth equal to the depth of proposed asphalt overlayment.

- Driveway aprons and mailbox approaches shall be milled and paved up to 6 feet from the edge of pavement. Estimate includes milling of abutting joints at all asphalt & concrete drives, this will not be a separately paid item.

- Quantities for drives will be lumped together with roadway quantities in proposal. They are shown separate in this estimate sheet for quantity clarity.

- Road width varies slightly, 18.5' is the average width. 16' is the minimum width.

- Quantities on proposal are slightly higher than on cost estimate due to rounding.

- Township to retain all or a portion of grindings produced during milling operations. Contractor to provide transportation to a destination in the township that will be determined once operations are underway. Contractor will be responsible for any grindings the township does not claim.

- See supplemental specifications for asphalt concrete pavement.
Pavement Condition Rating (PCR) Scale

PCR

Condition

100

Very Good

90

Good

75

Fair

65

Fair to Poor

55

Poor

40

Very Poor

0
## Flexible Pavement Condition Rating Form

**Date:** 8/7/2018  
**Rated By:** VPS

### Distress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distress</th>
<th>Distress Weight</th>
<th>Severity WT.</th>
<th>Extent WT.</th>
<th>Deduct Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raveling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potholes/Debonding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack Sealing Deficiency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Track Cracking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block and Transverse Cracking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Joint Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Deduct =** 33.75  
**Sum of Structural Deduct (Bold) =** 14.45  
**100 - Total Deduct = PCR =** 66.25

---

**Notes:**  
The roadway has a large number of potholes, most are patched. Some are beyond patch repair. There are a few areas where the edge of the road is crumbling. There is a fair amount of random crack. There is a fair amount of random cracks. The township may have tried to fix some of the edge problems with tar and chip patches.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRESS</th>
<th>DISTRESS WEIGHT</th>
<th>SEVERITY WT.</th>
<th>EXTENT WT.</th>
<th>DEDUCT POINTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raveling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potholes/Debonding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack Sealing Deficiency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Track Cracking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block and Transverse Cracking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Joint Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEDUCT POINTS = DISTRESS WEIGHT x SEVERITY WT. x EXTENT WT.**

**NOTES:**

The main problem lies with the edges of the roadway. The edges are cracked severely and settling for almost the whole length. There are a large number of transverse cracks. This road has been crack sealed well but it has deteriorated beyond routine maintenance. The worst problems with settling are near the intersection at Salem-Carroll Rd, the road drops several inches in the outside of the lane. At the intersection of Bier Rd, the same problem described above is also occurring, it is not as severe though.
# Flexible Pavement Condition Rating Form

**Road Name:** TOUSSAINT-PORTAGE RD  
**Log Mile:** SALEM-CARROLL RD  
**To:** SR-163  
**Date:** 8/7/2018  
**Rated By:** VPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distress</th>
<th>Distress Weight</th>
<th>Severity WT.</th>
<th>Extent WT.</th>
<th>Deduct Points***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raveling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.3 0.6 1 0.5 0.8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8 0.8 1 - 0.6 0.9 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6 1 0.5 0.8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potholes/Debonding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7 1 - 0.5 0.8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack Sealing Deficiency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1 E 0.5 0.8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutting</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7 1 - 0.6 0.8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7 1 0.5 0.8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8 1 - 0.5 0.8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheel Track Cracking</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7 1 0.5 0.7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block and Transverse Cracking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7 1 0.5 0.7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal Joint Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7 1 0.5 0.7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edge Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7 1 0.5 0.7 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Cracking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7 1 0.5 0.7 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sum of Structural Deduct (Bold) =** 14.7  
**100 - Total Deduct =** PCR = 65

---

**Notes:**  
When I was rating this road, I started Salem-Carrall Rd. When I got to the NFS Double Track I noticed the rating was at 74. This is worth noting because the stretch of road from the Double Track to SR-163 is in worse shape, especially where the LaCarpe Creek runs parallel. The northern section has a fair amount of random cracking and block cracking. The edges are not terrible, but they are not in the best shape where the ditch slope is at an extreme angle. Along the LaCarpe Creek, the eastern edge of the road is in extreme disrepair. This section is by far much worse than the rest of the road and requires a solution beyond that of pavement repair. A chip seal may be a possible solution for the stretch of road north of the Double Track and the stretch of road south of where the LaCarpe runs parallel.
### Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint-Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing

Traffic Counts - Actual and Estimated  
Ottawa County - Issue I 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Road Number</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>ADT actual</th>
<th>ADT 2038 est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Williston</td>
<td>TR #7</td>
<td>SR 579</td>
<td>County Line</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leutz</td>
<td>TR #101</td>
<td>Genzman</td>
<td>Salem-Carroll</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toussaint-Portage</td>
<td>TR #92</td>
<td>SR 163</td>
<td>Salem-Carroll</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1030</strong></td>
<td><strong>1257</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates are based on actual 2018 traffic counts.
MetroCount Traffic Executive
Vehicle Counts (Virtual Day)

VirtVehicletCount-110 -- English (ENU)

Datasets:
Attribute: Martin-Williston
Direction: 5 - South bound A>B, North bound B=A, Lane: 2
Survey Duration: 0:00 Friday, June 8, 2018 => 12:33 Thursday, June 14, 2018,
Zone: ALL-TR7-3.10.EC0 (Plus)
Identifier: DH68A3TH MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
Algorithm: Factory default axle (v5.02)
Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

Profile:
Filter time: 0:00 Friday, June 8, 2018 => 12:33 Thursday, June 14, 2018 (6.52303)
Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range: 5 - 100 mph.
Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-15
Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 300 ft
Name: Default Profile
Scheme: Vehicle classification (Scheme F)
Units: Non metric (ft, mi, ft/s, mph, lb, ton)
In profile: Vehicles = 3112 / 3115 (99.90%)

* Virtual Day - Total=487, 15 minute drops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0000</th>
<th>0100</th>
<th>0200</th>
<th>0300</th>
<th>0400</th>
<th>0500</th>
<th>0600</th>
<th>0700</th>
<th>0800</th>
<th>0900</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1100</th>
<th>1200</th>
<th>1300</th>
<th>1400</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2100</th>
<th>2200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AM Peak 1130 - 1230 (37), AM PHF=0.79  PM Peak 1615 - 1715 (44), PM PHF=0.83

Numbers have been rounded to the nearest integer.
MetroCount Traffic Executive
Vehicle Counts (Virtual Day)

DataSets:
Site: [003] CAR-TR101-0.06
Attribute: LEUTZ
Direction: 5 - South bound A>B, North bound B>A. Lane: 0
Survey Duration: 14:00 Thursday, June 28, 2018 => 10:49 Thursday, July 5, 2018,
Zone:
File: CAR-TR101-0.06.EC0 (Plus)
Identifier: DH578K2B MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
Algorithm: Factory default axle (v5.02)
Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

Profile:
Filter time: 14:00 Thursday, June 28, 2018 => 10:49 Thursday, July 5, 2018 (6.86777)
Included classes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
Speed range: 5 - 100 mph.
Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 300 ft
Name: Default Profile
Scheme: Vehicle classification (Scheme F)
Units: Non metric (ft, mi, ft/s, mph, lb, ton)
In profile: Vehicles = 1069 / 1069 (100.00%)

Virtual Day - Total=158, 15 minute drops

|   | 0000 | 0100 | 0200 | 0300 | 0400 | 0500 | 0600 | 0700 | 0800 | 0900 | 1000 | 1100 | 1200 | 1300 | 1400 | 1500 | 1600 | 1700 | 1800 | 1900 | 2000 | 2100 | 2200 |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 2300 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

AM Peak 1115 - 1215 (11), AM PHF=0.85  PM Peak 1445 - 1545 (15), PM PHF=0.85

Numbers have been rounded to the nearest integer.
**MetroCount Traffic Executive**

**Vehicle Counts (Virtual Day)**

**VirtVehicleCount-111 -- English (ENU)**

**Datasets:**
- Site: [001] SAL-TR92-0.77
- Attribute: TOUSSAINT PORTAGE
- Direction: 7 - North bound A>B, South bound B>A, Lane: 0
- Survey Duration: 14:00 Thursday, June 28, 2018 => 11:06 Thursday, July 5, 2018,
- Zone:
- File: SAL-TR92-0.77.EC0 (Plus)
- Identifier: DH68A3TH MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04
- Algorithm: Factory default axle (v5.02)
- Data type: Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

**Profile:**
- Filter time: 14:00 Thursday, June 28, 2018 => 11:06 Thursday, July 5, 2018 (6.87919)
- Included classes: 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
- Speed range: 5 - 100 mph.
- Direction: North, East, South, West (bound), P = North, Lane = 0-16
- Separation: Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 300 ft
- Name: Default Profile
- Scheme: Vehicle classification (Scheme F)
- Units: Non metric (ft, mi, ft/s, mph, lb, ton)
- In profile: Vehicles = 2629 / 2629 (100.00%)

* Virtual Day - Total=385, 15 minute drops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0800</th>
<th>0900</th>
<th>1000</th>
<th>1100</th>
<th>1200</th>
<th>1300</th>
<th>1400</th>
<th>1500</th>
<th>1600</th>
<th>1700</th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2100</th>
<th>2200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3300</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AM Peak 1000 - 1100 (25), AM PHF=0.89  PM Peak 1715 - 1815 (31), PM PHF=0.79

Numbers have been rounded to the nearest integer.
## Ottawa County

### County Engineering Department

**County and Township Road System**

**Construction Project and Log Record**

### Location

Begin at C.R. 98 thence north to S.R. 2

DDOT mileage confirmed April 2008

### Year Built

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Width Type Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1½' 484 PG64-22 Hot mix w/2' bers</td>
<td>$31,594.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Symbols for Road Types

- Primitive
- Undeveloped
- Graded and Drained
- Soil-Surfaced
- Gravel or Stone
- Bit. Surface-Treated
- Mixed Bituminous
- Bituminous Penetration

### Remarks

...
OTTAWA COUNTY
COUNTY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
COUNTY AND TOWNSHIP ROAD SYSTEM
CONSTRUCTION PROJECT AND LOG RECORD

LOCATION: Begin at SR 163 thence north to SR 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR BUILT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF WORK</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>WIDTH TYPE LENGTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>135 lb drag NC-308</td>
<td>$14,375.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>single seal HC300 80/50 #8</td>
<td>$2,160.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>MC-5000 seals 30 lbs #9</td>
<td>$1,241.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>100 lb drag 126 gal CB/CE</td>
<td>$24,119.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>single seal 0.50 gal CB/CE 30 lbs #8</td>
<td>$22,046.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>seal 0.50 gal RS-2 25 lbs #8</td>
<td>$27,192.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>single seal 0.50 gal RS-2 25 lbs #8</td>
<td>$11,595.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>135 lb drag 135 gal CS-2 12 lbs #5 stone</td>
<td>$96,508.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>single seal 30 lbs 6&quot; 0.50 gal HWS-90</td>
<td>$19,311.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2 1/2&quot; hot mix AC-20 + 24&quot; berms</td>
<td>$137,397.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SYMBOLS FOR ROAD TYPES:
- PRIMITIVE
- UNEARTHEENED
- GRADED AND GRAINED
- SOIL-SURFACED
- GRANULAR
- BITUMINOUS TREATED
- BITUMINOUS PENETRATION
- CONCRETE
- BLOCK
- BRICK

REMARKS:
- Re-Done by contractor
- Repaved E-bound side 1995
- Milling donated

Balance = $14,595.60
### Year Built - Description of Work - Cost - Width Type Length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Width Type Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3' Hot mix PG64-22, Bern by Twp.</td>
<td>$50,379.20</td>
<td>16' Solen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1/4&quot; Hot mix 404 w/Fabric &amp; 2' berns</td>
<td>$116,051.50</td>
<td>20' Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Slurry Seal-Type II-(15lbs)</td>
<td>$20,061.04</td>
<td>20' Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pavement Planing 1.5', 2' 448 Surface Type 1 PG64-22</td>
<td>$230,971.89</td>
<td>19' Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Pavement Planing 2', 2' 448 Surface Type 1 PG64-22, base repair as needed</td>
<td>$163,172.02</td>
<td>17' Carroll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTTAWA COUNTY**

**COUNTY ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT**

**COUNTY AND TOWNSHIP ROAD SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION PROJECT AND LOG RECORD**

**LOCATION**

DOT mileage as of April 2008

**Road No.** T-92

**Road Name** Toussaint-Portage

**Section** 0.00-5.83

**Net Length** 4.95 (4.69+0.26) (Carroll)

**R/W Width**

**Date Estab.**
## Ottawa County
### County Engineering Department

**COUNTY AND TOWNSHIP ROAD SYSTEM**
**CONSTRUCTION PROJECT AND LOG RECORD**

### Card of

#### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1&quot; dreg MC-800 ECES #67 #100</td>
<td>$6,980.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>0.65gal MC-800 ICWbs #67 J'</td>
<td>$4,248.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>135lb drag MC-800</td>
<td>$5,672.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>single seal 0.40gal MC-3000 30lbs #9</td>
<td>$2,198.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>135lb drag w/#67 1.10gal CBAE</td>
<td>$3,056.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>single seal 0.40gal MC-3000 30lbs #8</td>
<td>$2,688.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>single seal 0.60gal CBAE 30lbs #9</td>
<td>$2,419.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>HC-3000 single seal 30lbs #9</td>
<td>$2,413.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>single seal 30lbs #9 0.69gal RS-2</td>
<td>$1,052.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>100lb drag 1.20gal CBAE</td>
<td>$10,168.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Symbols for Road Types**
- Primitive
- Unimproved
- Graded and Grubbed
- Soil-Surfaced
- Gravel or Stone
- Drt. Surface-Treated
- Mixed Bituminous
- Bit. Conc. or Sheet Asphalt
- Concrete
- Brick
- Block

**Remarks**

---

**Road No.** T-92  
**Road Name** Toussaint-Portage  
**Section** 0.0-5.80  
**Net Length** 5.80  
**R/W Width**  
**Date Estab.**  
**Scale 1" = 1 mile**
DISTRICT 5
CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
QUESTIONNAIRE
ROUND 33

Name of Applicant: Carroll Township 
Project Title: Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint-Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing

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= 100%, replacement B= __%, 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= ___0___%

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Critical:</th>
<th>Resurfacing, Restoration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (4R) of a Major Access Road.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical:</td>
<td>Resurfacing, Restoration and Rehabilitation (3R) of a Major Access Road.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major:</td>
<td>Resurfacing, Restoration, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction (4R) of a Minor Access Road.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate:</td>
<td>Resurfacing, Restoration and Rehabilitation (3R) of a Minor Access Road.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal:</td>
<td>Preventative Maintenance of a Major Access Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact:</td>
<td>Preventative Maintenance of a Minor Access Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 width, SSD, etc.).
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.

(Submittals without supporting documentation will receive 0 Points for this question.)
Extremely Critical ___, Critical **X**_, 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 = $291,985
B.) Total Project Cost = $555,986

RATIO OF LOCAL FUNDS DIVIDED by TOTAL PROJECT COSTS (A/B)= 51 %

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 LTIP Funds, as a percentage of the total project cost.

Grants ___% Gifts ___%, Contributions ___%

Other ___% (explain)______________ , Total ___%

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 X 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? 1,030 ADT (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, traffic 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

Permissive license fee

- 4504.02 or 4504.06
- 4504.15 or 4504.17
- 4504.16 or 4504.171
- 4504.172
- 4504.18

Special property taxes

- 5555.48
- 5555.49
Municipal Income Tax _________
County Sales Tax _________
Others ____________________

(DO NOT INCLUDE SCHOOL TAXES)

SPECIFIC PROJECT AREA INFORMATION.
Median household income ____________________________

Monthly utility rate:  Water _____________
Sewer ________________
Other ________________

List any special user fees or assessment (be specific)
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

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

Date: September 7, 2018
Signature: [Signature]
Title: Jordan Moore, Carroll Township Trustee
Address: 11080 W Toussaint East Road, Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449
Phone: (419) 346-0029
FAX: (419) 898-0366
Email: jbmoore.moorefarms@gmail.com
TO: Ohio Public Works  
FROM: Ronald P. Lajti, Jr., P.E., P.S., Ottawa County Engineer  
DATE: September 7, 2018  
SUBJECT: Martin-Williston TR #7, Leutz TR #101 & Toussaint-Portage TR #92 Roads Resurfacing

Carroll Township, in cooperation with Allen and Salem Townships, is submitting an application for funding for the above referenced project. Within the small government section of questions the petitioner is asked to define the status of the plans for this project. The scope of services for this project, road resurfacing, does not require a set of construction plans.

Respectfully Submitted

Ronald P. Lajti, Jr., P.E., P.S.  
Ottawa County Engineer
September 5, 2018

Carroll Township Trustees
Allen Township Trustees
Salem Township Trustees

Dear Trustees:

We are submitting this letter of support in your efforts to receive funding from the Ohio Public Works Commission for the following Road Resurfacing projects located at:

Martin-Williston Road TR #7
Leutz Road TR #101
Toussaint-Portage Road TR #92

The integrity of these roads is very important to our community that allows safe transportation for school buses, ambulance & fire vehicles as well as regular vehicular traffic. Maintaining these roads to allow safe travels for all is a common goal.

We ask that OPWC consider this as a high priority request and grant your application.

Sincerely,

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
OTTAWA COUNTY, OHIO

Mark E. Coppeler, President
James M. Sass
Mark W. Stahl
Allen Township Trustees  
Carroll Township Trustees  
Salem Township Trustees  

Dear Trustees,

I am submitting this letter as support of your efforts to make Allen, Carroll, and Salem Townships very safe communities and a great place to raise a family.

It is my understanding that you are currently attempting to receive funding from outside grant sources to assist in your highway paving projects throughout Allen, Carroll, and Salem Townships. Without those grant opportunities, all three townships would be unable to commit to making the roadways within your township as safe as you would with the funding.

Your three townships together are key farming communities within Ottawa County. As township trustees, it is obvious that you are doing everything that you can to keep the residents of your respective townships safe, at home, at work, on their farms, and in their cars.

As Sheriff of Ottawa County, I am honored to write this letter of support in your efforts to maintain the high quality of safety within Allen, Carroll, and Salem Townships. Through the established partnerships that you have in place in your townships, the residents should take great pride in their community and also have a peace of mind that their township trustees are attempting to keep their community safe.

Sincerely,

Stephen J. Levorchick,
Sheriff of Ottawa County
LETTER OF SUPPORT
ALLEN TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES
AUGUST 22, 2018

This letter is in response to the Allen Township, Ottawa County, Trustees’ request for funding through the OPWC grant to resurface the following roads in Allen Township:

Martin-Williston Road between State Route 579 and the Lucas County Line

The Allen-Clay Joint Fire District provides fire and EMS service to all of Allen Township. As such we often use these roads and know that they require attention to make them safer for our citizens as well as provide safe and rapid emergency vehicle access to any emergencies that occur to the residents that live on the named roads.

We ask that you give high consideration to this request and ultimately fund it.

Thank you!

Michael T. Musolf
District Fire Chief
August 22, 2018

Allen Township Trustees

As discussed, this letter supports your efforts to apply and receive additional grants/funding to improve our township roads. Specifically, the Trustees seek funding for:

Repaving of Martin Williston Road #7 for SR579 North to the Lucas County Line

As Superintendent of the Genoa Area Local Schools, I can confirm the need to repair, resurface and improve the roads within the community and school district. Our bus drivers, students and staff drive these roads daily and the need to resurface, widen and repair the roads is imperative to all our student’s safety. We appreciate your efforts for the safety and well-being of all children who ride or drive the township roads on a daily basis. Thank you.

Regards,

Michael G. Ferguson
Superintendent
Genoa Area Local Schools
LETTER OF SUPPORT
CARROLL TOWNSHIP TRUSTEES
AUGUST 20, 2018

This letter is in response to the Carroll Township, Ottawa County, Trustees’ request for funding through OPWC grant to resurface the following road in Carroll Township:

One and a half (1.5) miles of Luetz Rd. from Genzman Rd. to Salem Carroll Rd.

The Carroll Township Emergency Medical & Fire Service provides EMS and fire service to all of Carroll Township. As such we often use this road and know that it requires attention to make it safer for our citizens as well as provide safe and rapid emergency vehicle access to any emergencies that occur to the residents that live on named road.

We ask that you give high consideration to this request and ultimately fund it.

THANK YOU!

John Brough
Fire Chief

Kathy Bowyer
EMS Chief
August 15, 2018

Carroll Township Trustees
11080 W. Toussaint East Rd.
Oak Harbor, Ohio 43449

Dear Trustees,

I am writing this letter to support your efforts to make Carroll Township as safe as possible for our residents. Carroll Township is a great community to raise a family.

I recently heard that you were attempting to receive funding from a grant to assist in paving of our township roads. In my travels one of the first items I notice is the conditions of roads, streets, or alleys. Good updated roadways are a sign of priority that a local government puts the safety of their residents. Updated roads usually disperse water off of them quickly, making any evasive driving more functional.

Carroll Township has a large influx of tourism, due to the many areas. First and foremost would be access to Lake Erie. This leads to our population expanding in the summer to over three times what we have in the winter. Clean updated roads lead to not only protecting our permanent residents but also those choosing Carroll Township for their summer fun.

As Chief of Police for Carroll Township, I am honored to write this letter in support of your efforts to maintain the high quality of safety within our township. Part of this safety is the condition of our roadways. Carroll Township residents should take great pride in their community and your efforts to their continued safety.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert W. Paulsen
Chief of Police
August 21, 2018

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing this letter in strong support of Salem Township’s efforts to complete a critical road project in the township. The project involves a re-surface and base repair to Toussaint-Portage Road.

As Superintendent of our school district, I can testify that Toussaint-Portage Road is one of our major arteries through Salem Township. It is a critical piece of infrastructure that our school busses utilize. This project will enhance the safety and stability of this road, which will add to the safety and well-being of our students.

Thank you for your consideration of this project. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Guy L. Parmigian
Superintendent
To whom it may concern,

This letter of support is being written for Salem Township trustees

Portage Fire District covers Salem Township fire protection, and responds to all emergencies within the township.

It is my belief that Improving Toussaint Portage Rd will make for a quicker, and safer response of our equipment and personnel. Making the township a safer place to work and live.

As Fire Chief, I support Salem Township in their request for a grant, and ask that you strongly consider this grant in their favor.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Mike Almendinger, Chief
Portage Fire District
August 24, 2018

To Whom it may concern:

Our funeral home often uses Toussaint-Portage Road in Salem Township, Ottawa County, to bring funeral processions to Salem Township Union Cemetery, as it is one of the main access roads to the cemetery. The road has been deteriorating for several years, resulting in a bumpy and uneven surface, making a less than comfortable ride for those in funeral processions.

This letter is to offer our support to the Salem Township trustees in the efforts to obtain assistance in repairing and bringing Toussaint-Portage Road from S.R. 163 to Salem-Carroll Road up to date.

If you would like further comment or clarification, please contact me at any of the address or phone numbers above. I can also be reached via email at jcrosser@crosserfuneralhome.com.

Sincerely,

John D. Crosser, Funeral Director
Crosser Funeral Homes & Cremation Service
August 27, 2018

To Whom It May Concern:

As Chief of the Mid County Joint Ambulance District, I am writing to express my full support for Salem Township, Carroll Township and Allen Township’s grant application to resurface Toussaint Portage Road, aka Township Road 92 between State Route 163 and Salem Carroll Road. This resurfacing project would improve the safety of all who use this road including our emergency vehicles. Improvements to this road would also lower costs on repairs and maintenance to our ambulances.

We have a very positive working relationship with the Trustees of Salem, Carroll and Allen Township and appreciate the opportunity to support their efforts to improve the safety of our community and service areas. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further information.

Sincerely,

Chad Magrum
Chief
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>&quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>WEIGHT FACTOR</th>
<th>CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>&quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>PRIORITY FACTORS</th>
<th>&quot;A&quot; x &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Repair or Replace) vs. (New or Expansion)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%+</td>
<td>Repair or Replacement</td>
<td>20%+</td>
<td>40%+</td>
<td>60%+ Repair or Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Existing Physical Condition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Health and/or Public Safety Concerns</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of Local Share (Local funds are funds derived from the applicant's budget or a loan to be paid back through the applicant's budget, assessments, rates or tax revenues)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6%+</td>
<td>12%+</td>
<td>20%+</td>
<td>30%+</td>
<td>40%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OTHER FUNDING SOURCES (Excluding Issue II Funds) (Grants and other revenues not contributed or collected through taxes by the applicant, including Gifts, Contributions, etc. – must submit copy of award or status letter)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%+</td>
<td>10%+</td>
<td>20%+</td>
<td>30%+</td>
<td>40%+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>&quot;A&quot;</th>
<th>WEIGHT FACTOR</th>
<th>CRITERIA TO BE CONSIDERED</th>
<th>&quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>PRIORITY FACTORS</th>
<th>&quot;A&quot; x &quot;B&quot;</th>
<th>Priority Factors</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GPW 12 Grant and Loan Funding Requested. Please refer to Item 6 on Questionnaire for Clarification.</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>$100,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>$250,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>$750,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>$1,500,000 to $1,999,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Will the Proposed Project Create Permanent jobs or retain jobs that would otherwise be permanently lost (Written Documentation Required)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6+ jobs</td>
<td>7+ jobs</td>
<td>15+ jobs</td>
<td>25+ jobs</td>
<td>50+ jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Benefits to Existing Users such as households, Equivalent dwelling units, traffic Counts, etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6+</td>
<td>100+</td>
<td>350+</td>
<td>500+</td>
<td>750+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUBTOTAL RANKING POINTS (MAX = 115)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0+</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>15 +</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>50+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>COUNTY PRIORITY POINTS (25 - 99)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>DISCRETIONARY POINTS (BY DISTRICT ONLY) (MAX = 12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTAL RANKING POINTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></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 submittal.