**LPA SCOPE OF SERVICES FORM**

1. **Project Identification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| County | KNO | Route | US36/CR20 | Section | 03.29/03.66 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project sponsor / Maintenance responsibility: | Village of Centerburg |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Local Let |  | ODOT Let | X |
| Scope field review: | 09/11/25 | Scope meeting: | 09/11/25 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Highway Functional Classification | Minor Arterial/Local |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PID | 124368 |  |  |
| Fiscal Year | FY28 | Proposed Sale Date | Q2 FY28 |

**B. Design Standard**

|  |
| --- |
| AASHTO/ODOT |

**C. Project Description**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Description of Proposed Improvements: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Pedestrian and signal improvements along US 36 (Main St.) and CR 20 (Clayton St.) in the Village of Centerburg. |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Prior studies / plan (identify): | Abbreviate Safety Study, Strategic Plan |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Estimated Project Length: (begin pavement to end pavement including bridge) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Work Length: (including project length & approach work) |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alignment: | Existing | X | Relocated |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Profile: | Existing | X | New |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Logical Termini:(w/explanation) | Main St, Preston St to Clayton St and along N Clayton St to HOOT trail |

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**D. Typical Sections**

**Existing:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Width: | Pavement |  | Graded Shoulder |  | Treated Shoulder |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R/W |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bridge: | face to face of rails |  | or toe to toe of parapets |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Curbs | Yes |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Curb ramps | Yes |  | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sidewalks | Yes |  | No |  | Comment |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Guardrail | Yes |  | No |  | Type |  |

**Proposed:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Width: | Pavement |  | Graded Shoulder |  | Treated Shoulder |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Bridge |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Median: | Yes |  | No | X | Type |  |
| Curbs: | Yes | X | No |  | Type | Various |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Curb ramps: | Yes | X | No |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sidewalks | Yes | X | No |  | Comment | 5’ min, ADA – 8’ wide to HOOT |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Guardrail | Yes |  | No | X | Type |  |

**Supplemental Information**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ADT |  | Design ADT |  |
| DHV |  | Certified Traffic |  |
| T24 |  |  |  |
| Design Speed |  | Legal Speed |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comments: |  |

**E. Right-of-Way**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Right-of-Way Plan: | Yes |  | No | X |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Approximate Number of Parcels: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Known relocations: | Yes |  | No | X |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Railroad Involvement: | Yes |  | No | X |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Railroad Name: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Encroachments: | Various – will need permitted or removed |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Airway Highway Clearance: | Yes |  | No | X | Remarks |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Airport Name |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comments: |  |

Note: Provide a footprint of proposed and existing right of way limits as soon as available to District Env. Coordinator and District Real Estate Administrator.

Caution: Environmental needs to be clear prior to the beginning of right of way acquisition. A Local, utilizing their own monies, assumes many risks by proceeding with acquisition prior to environmental being cleared. These risks include purchasing r/w that may never be used for the project and purchasing a site that contains the need for a hazardous waste cleanup.

**F. Utilities**

Aerial:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phone | Yes | X | No |  | Name of Company |  |
| Cablevision | Yes | X | No |  | Name of Company | Brightspeed |
| Power | Yes | X | No |  | Name of Company | AEP |

Buried:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phone | Yes |  | No |  | Name of Company |  |
| Cablevision | Yes |  | No |  | Name of Company |  |
| Power | Yes |  | No |  | Name of Company |  |
| Gas | Yes | X | No |  | Name of Company |  |
| Pipelines: | Yes |  | No |  | Name of Company |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Water | Yes | X | No |  | Private |  | Public | X |
| Sanitary Sewer | Yes | X | No |  | Private |  | Public | X |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Storm Sewer | Yes | X | No |  | Private |  | Public | X |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Other |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comments | ***Village/Consultant responsible for Utility Coordination (Draft Ut Note at St 3)*** |

1. **~~Structure Requirements~~**

**~~Existing Structure information:~~**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ~~Structure type:~~ |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~Sufficiency Rating:~~ |  | ~~General Appraisal~~ |  | ~~Bridge No.~~ |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~Structure File No.~~ |  | ~~Crossing~~ |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ~~Bridge length:~~ |  |
| ~~Number of Spans~~ |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~Eligible for the National Historical Register~~ | ~~Yes~~ |  | ~~No~~ |  |

**~~Proposed Structure:~~**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~New Structure:~~ | ~~Yes~~ |  | ~~No~~ |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ~~Rehabilitate Existing Bridge~~ | ~~By:~~ |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~Structure width:~~ |  | ~~Structure type:~~ |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ~~Number of spans:~~ |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ~~Beam Type:~~ | ~~Concrete Box~~ |  | ~~Steel~~ |  |

|  |
| --- |
| ~~Other Design Considerations / Explanation of Change in Line/Grade:~~ |
|  |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ~~Guardrail Type:~~ |  |

**H. Design Exception(s) required**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes |  | No |  | Explain | None Anticipated  |

**I. Traffic Control**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Signing: | Yes | X | No |  | Remarks |  |
| Striping: | Yes | X | No |  | Remarks |  |
| Lighting: | Yes |  | No |  | Remarks | RRFB, already new Ped Lighting |
| Signals: | Yes | X | No |  | Remarks | Mast arms, coordination, Audible Ped |
| RPM’s: | Yes |  | No | X | Remarks |  |

1. **Geotechnical**

Is geotechnical design necessary (Y/N)? If so, fully utilize historic geotechnical information; perform subsurface exploration in accordance with the Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations; and perform geotechnical design in accordance with the Geotechnical Design Manual.

1. **Maintenance of Traffic**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Detour |  | Part Width | Flagging as needed |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Remarks: |  |

**L. Driveways**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | X | No |  | Type | Various, access management changes by Village? |

**M. Project Funding**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Cost Estimate | SEE ELLIS/TAP Application |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quantity splits needed in plans to differentiate funding participation: | Yes |  | No | X |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comments: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Coordination with Concurrent Projects Required: | Yes |  | No |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comments: | None anticipated |

Cost Estimates:

 Total Federal Funds/Percent Split Total Local Funds/Percent Split

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RIGHT OF WAY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTILITIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONSTRUCTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONST ENGINEERING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**N. Cost Recovery**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Does the LPA intend to recover any Direct Labor Costs associated with this project? | Yes |  | No | X |
| Does the LPA intend to recover any Fringe and Overhead Costs associated with this project? | Yes |  | No | X |

|  |
| --- |
| What Cost Recovery method does the LPA intend to utilize?[ ]  1. No cost recovery of LPA’s project direct labor, fringe benefits, or overhead costs.[ ]  2. Direct Labor plus indirect costs determined using the Federal De Minimis Indirect Cost Rate[[1]](#footnote-1)[ ]  3. Direct Labor plus Approved Fringe Benefit Costs (fringe benefits only)[[2]](#footnote-2), plus indirect costs calculated using the Federal 10% De Minimis Indirect Cost Rate.[ ]  4. Direct labor, plus fringe benefits costs calculated using the LPA’s ODOT approved Fringe Benefits Rate, plus indirect costs calculated using the LPA’s ODOT approved Indirect Cost Rate. |
| Does the LPA currently have a timekeeping system in place? | Yes |  | No | X |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| If so, does that system track both payroll and project hours concurrently? | Yes |  | No | X |
| If different systems, how does the LPA reconcile project hours to payroll? |
| How often are payroll records prepared? |
| For employees working on multiple activities, does the LPA track daily time by activity/project on the time sheets?***(only tracking hours worked on Federal projects is non-compliant. All activity hours must be shown)*** | Yes |  | No | X |
| Does the LPA ensure that timecards are signed by the employee? | Yes |  | No | X |

**O. Environmental**

|  |
| --- |
| **Scope of the Proposed Action /Involvement with Resources:****These are actions and/or items the District Environmental Staff deems necessary to address as part of the LPA project environmental documentation. This form is not all inclusive, and more items may be required upon initiation of agency coordination and field studies.** |
|  | **Not required** | **Required** | **Responsibility** | **Due Date** |
| **Tentative CE Level \_\_C2\_\_\_\_** |  |  |  |  |
| **Purpose and Need Statement** |  |  |  |  |
| **Section 106 Scoping Request Form** |  |  |  |  |
| **Cultural Resource Phase 1** |  |  |  |  |
| **Cultural Resource Phase II** |  |  |  |  |
| **Cultural Resource Mitigation** |  |  |  |  |
| **Cultural Resource Section 4(f)** |  |  |  |  |
| **Data Recover Plan-Documentation for Consultation** |  |  |  |  |
| **Section 4(f)/6(f)-Park/Recreation** |  |  |  |  |
| **Recreational Boating** |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 1 Ecological Survey Report** |  |  |  |  |
| **Level 2 Ecological Survey Report** |  |  |  |  |
| **Wetland Survey** |  |  |  |  |
| **Section 9/Section 10 Stream** |  |  |  |  |
| **404 NWP-Army Corps of Engineers** |  |  |  |  |
| **404 PCN-Army Corps of Engineers** |  |  |  |  |
| **404 Individual Permit-Army Corps of Engineers** |  |  |  |  |
| **401 OEPA Certification Application** |  |  |  |  |
| **Coast Guard Coordination** |  |  |  |  |
| **ODNR Coastal Zone** |  |  |  |  |
| **Scenic River** |  |  |  |  |
| **Farmland Screening or FCIR** |  |  |  |  |
| **Public Involvement** |  |  |  |  |
| **Public Meeting** |  |  |  |  |
| **RMR Screening** |  |  |  |  |
| **RMR Assessment/Investigation** |  |  |  |  |
| **Drinking Water Resources** |  |  |  |  |
| **Flood Plain/Flood Way** |  |  |  |  |
| **Underserved Populations** |  |  |  |  |
| **Noise Study** |  |  |  |  |
| **Air Quality Analysis** |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Asbestos Inspection Required: | Yes |  | No | X |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Comment: |  |
|  |  |

Any Known Environmental Concerns (ex. historic properties on National Register, wetlands,

underground storage tanks, stream relocation):

|  |
| --- |
| ODOT to handle Environmental Document on behalf of the project except for the below items: |
|  |
| Village/Consultant responsible for the following: |
| * Property Owner Notification Letters (PONLs) – copies to be provided to ODOT
 |
| * Any desired Public Involvement (PI)
 |
|  |
| Any desired Tree Clearing ahead of Construction needs to be done in compliance with Bat Tree |
| Requirements (Oct 1 – March 31) |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

**P. Roles / Responsibilities**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Construction plan development: | ODOT Prequalified Consultant |
| Proposal/Specification Development: | ODOT |
| LPA Agreement: | ODOT |
| Form and preliminary legislation: | ODOT |
| Advertising and award of contract: | ODOT |
| Construction inspection: | ODOT |
| R/W plan development: | ODOT Prequalified Consultant |
| R/W acquisition / appraisals: | ODOT Prequalified Consultant |
| Utility Coordination / Relocation: | LPA |
|  |  |

**Q. Field Review**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date: | 09/11/25 |

REPRESENTATIVES PRESENT:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Company | Phone | E-mail |
| Teri Wise | Centerburg |  |  |
| Alex Gowans | Centerburg |  |  |
| Steve Miller | ODOT |  |  |
| Josh Otworth | ODOT |  |  |
| Ben Boyer | ODOT |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **R. COMMITMENT DATES** | **ODOT-let** |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ACTIVITY** | **DUE DATE** |
| **Authorization to Proceed** | **Q2/Q3 FY26** |
| **Stage 1 Review** |  |
| **Stage 2 Review** |  |
| **Stage 3 Review** |  |
| **R/W Plans Approved/Not Required** |  |
| **Bid document & tracings to District** |  |
| **R/W and Utility Clearance** |  |
| **Environmental Clearance** |  |
| **Plan Package to C. O.** | **Q1 FY28** |
| **Award Date** | **Q2 FY28** |

**Other due dates of interest:**

**County to submit plans, proposal, estimate (PS&E) to the District**

**County certifies R/W and utility clearance to the District**

**County submits bid results to District**

**Schedule Explanation: Authorization to Proceed Start Date is the date that the District submits the programming package to Central Office. Finish Date for said activity is when a state job number has been established. Start Date for Environmental Clearance is normally the same as the date the project has been programmed. Start Date for Stage 2 Review is the date of submission to the District of the preliminary R/W plans. Finished date for said activity is when comments are returned to the LPA. Start Date for R/W Plan Approved is when the District has received final R/W plans and associated documents. Finish Date for said activity is when the District has approved said plans and associated documents. Start Date for R/W and Utility Clearance is the date that the LPA is authorized to begin acquisition. Finish date for said activity is when the District certifies clearance to FHWA. The LPA should certify R/W and Utility Clearance to the District one month before the R/W and Utility Clearance Finish Date. Start Date for Plan Package to C. O. is the date that the PS&E package leaves the District and the finish date is the day it is logged in at Central Office. One should allow forty-five days from Plan Package to C.O. for PS&E approval and project advertising before the Sale Date. Advertising needs to be three weeks minimum and cannot start until PS&E approval is obtained. Start date for the Award Date is the Sale Date of the project. And the Finish Date for the Award Date is the date the project was awarded. Summary of bid tabs and the identity of the awarded contractor shall be submitted to ODOT no later than one week after the award.**

**Project Schedule Approval: Signature Date**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Environmental Coordinator** |  |  |
| **Real Estate Admin.** |  |  |
| **Program Manager** |  |  |
| **Project Manager** |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. The De Minimis Indirect Cost Rate is 10 percent of modified total direct costs (MTDC) per 2 CFR §200.414. Regardless of whether the LPA prepares a CAP or uses the 10-percent de minimis rate, LPAs are required to maintain Federally-compliant time-tracking systems. Accordingly, LPAs are permitted to bill for labor costs and associated indirect costs only if such costs are accumulated, tracked, and allocated in accordance with such systems. Before an LPA is eligible to elect the de minimis rate on any project, the LPA’s time-tracking system and methods for tracking other project costs must be reviewed and approved by the ODOT Office of External Audits. To obtain this approval, LPAs will be required to complete an Internal Control Questionnaire (ICQ), and LPAs with compliant time-tracking systems will be granted approval (be prequalified) to apply the de minimis rate. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Annually, the LPA shall submit an updated rate for review and approval by the ODOT Office of External Audits. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)