

L P A S C O P E O F S E R V I C E S F O R M

A. Project Identification

County-Route-Section (Project Name): JEF John Scott Connector Reconst

Project Sponsor / Maintenance Responsibility: City of Steubenville

☐ Local Let

☒ ODOT Let

PID (ODOT assigned): 126634

Scope Field Review: July 14, 2026

Scope Meeting: July 14, 2026

Proposed Sale Date: January 2029

State Fiscal Year: 2029

Highway Functional Classification: 04 – Minor Arterial

Federal Aid System (ODOT assigned): Yes

B. Design Standard

ODOT (applicable design standards and guidelines from L&D Manuals, Multimodal Design Guide, etc.)

C. Project Description

Rehabilitation and reconstruction of the four-lane John Scott Connector highway in the City of Steubenville. Project will include drainage assessment/upgrades as necessary to rectify undermining of the roadway, especially on the North/West side of the roadway. Environmental impacts per NEPA.

Prior studies / plan (identify):

John Scott Connector Rehabilitation and Reconstruction Study, 2020

Estimate Project Length:

(begin pavement to end pavement including bridge) 0.862 of a mile +/-

Work Length:

(including project length & approach work)

Approximately 1 mile

Alignment: ☒ Existing

☐ Relocated (explain)

Profile: ☒ Existing

☐ New (explain)

Logical Termini:

(w/ explanation)

Connecting US 22 to the east with SR 43, Sunset Boulevard.

D. Typical Sections

Existing	Pavement Width: 70'	☐ curb to curb	Graded Shoulder:	
		☒ edge to edge	Treated Shoulder:	Yes
	R/W Width: Varies <i>Varies</i>			
	Bridge Width: <i>None</i>	☐ f/f of rails, ☐ t/t of curbs, or ☐ t/t of parapets		

Existing	Yes	No	Comment / Type
Median	☐	☒	
Curbs	☒	☐	<i>Rosslyn Blvd to SR 43</i>
Curb ramps	☐	☒	
Sidewalks	☐	☒	Width: _____
Guardrail	☒	☐	<i>Not entire length</i>

Additional Things To Note About **Existing** Typical Section:

Proposed	Pavement Width: 70'	☐ curb to curb	Graded Shoulder:	
		☒ edge to edge	Treated Shoulder:	Yes
	R/W Width: Varies <i>Existing (Varies)</i>			
	Bridge Width: <i>None</i>	☐ f/f of rails, ☐ t/t of curbs, or ☐ t/t of parapets		

Proposed	Yes	No	Comment / Type
Median	☐	☒	
Curbs	☒	☐	<i>Rosslyn Blvd to SR 43</i>
Curb ramps (*)	☒	☐	<i>Only as needed if proposed sidewalk is constructed</i>
Sidewalks	☒	☐	Width: <i>6' possibly from SR 43 to Jim Woods Park entrance</i>
Guardrail	☒	☐	<i>Not entire length</i>

Note (*) – Curb ramps must be updated to current ADA standards.

Additional Things To Note About **Proposed** Typical Section:

Investigate the removal of one (1) downhill lane from Pugliese West Elementary to US 22. Full depth asphalt is to be considered in lieu of concrete where truck braking is not significant.

Supplemental Information: John Scott Connector

ADT (2029)	<u>11,800</u>	Design ADT (2041)	<u>12,400</u>
DHV (2041)	<u>1,240</u>	Certified Traffic	<u>N/A</u>
T24	<u>10%</u>	Legal Speed	<u>45 MPH</u>
Design Speed	<u>45 MPH</u>		
Comments: <u>Opening Year – 2029; Design Year - 2041</u>			

E. Right-of-Way

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Right-of-Way Plan:	☐	☒	
Approximate Number of Parcels:			<u>0, all work within existing State of Ohio or City R/W</u>
Known Relocations:	☐	☒	
Railroad Involvement:	☐	☒	
Railroad Name:			
Encroachments:	☐	☒	
Airway Highway Clearance:	☒	☐	<u>2 miles as the bird flies</u>
Airport Name:			<u>Jefferson County Air Park</u>
Comments:			

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

Caution: Environmental needs to be clear prior to the beginning of right of way acquisition.

F. Utilities

	Yes	No	Name of Company			
Aerial	Phone	☐	☒			
	Cablevision	☐	☒			
	Power	☐	☒			
Underground	Phone	☒	☐	<i>ATT</i>		
	Cablevision	☒	☐	<i>Comcast</i>		
	Power	☒	☐	<i>AEP</i>		
	Gas	☒	☐	<i>Columbia Gas of Ohio</i>		
	Pipelines:	☐	☒			
				<u>Private</u> <u>Public</u> <u>Name of Company</u>		
	Water	☒	☐	☐	☒	<i>City of Steubenville</i>
	Sanitary	☒	☐	☐	☒	<i>City of Steubenville</i>
	Storm	☒	☐	☐	☒	<i>City of Steubenville</i>
Other: <i>Likely underground Fiber on the North/West side of the roadway, multiple storm crossings</i>						
Comments: <i>Storm sewer crossings to be replaced as needed with the project</i>						

G. Structure Requirements – N/A

Existing Structure Information:	Structure type:	<i>N/A</i>		
	Bridge No.:		Structural File No.:	
	Sufficiency Rating:		General Appraisal:	
	Crossing:			
	Bridge Length:		Number of Spans:	
	Eligible for the National Historical Register:	☐ Yes ☐ No		

Proposed Structure Information:	New Structure: ☐ Yes ☐ No
	Rehabilitate Existing Bridge by: _____
	Structure Type: _____
	Beam Type: ☐ Concrete Box; ☐ Steel; ☐ n/a
	Structure Width: _____ Number of Spans: _____
	Local must have proposed structure's load rating on file Other Design Considerations / Explanation of Change in Line/Grade: _____
Guardrail Type: _____	

H. Design Exception(s) Required

☐ Yes Explain: *Low Speed (<50 MPH Design Speed) Roadway*
☒ No

I. Traffic Control

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Signing:	☒	☐	_____
Striping:	☒	☐	_____
Lighting:	☐	☒	_____
Signals:	☐	☒	_____
RPMs:	☒	☐	_____

J. Maintenance of Traffic

Type of MOT: ☐ Detour, ☒ Part Width, ☐ Daily Flagging

Remarks/Describe: *Part width construction; one lane to be maintained in each direction*

Will Pedestrian Traffic need to be maintained? *N/A*

Remarks/Describe: *No existing pedestrian facilities within the project limits*

K. Driveways

☒ Yes Type: *Entrance to city park and elementary school; residents on West end (concrete)*
☐ No

L. Project Funding

Project Cost Estimate: \$8,770,000.00

Quantity splits needed in plans to differentiate funding participation: ☐ Yes Comments: _____
☒ No

Coordination with Concurrent Projects Required: ☐ Yes Comments: _____
☒ No

Funding Source: *BHJ STBG (4TD7)* Federal Maximum: *\$765,000 (current max.)* Funding Split: *90/10*

Cost Estimates:

	Local Information			Federal Information			Total
	SAC	Total Local Funds	Percent Split	SAC	Total Federal Funds	Percent Split	
Preliminary Engineering	<i>LNTP</i>	<i>\$75,000.00</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>4TD7/BH11</i>	<i>\$675,000.00</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>\$750,000.00</i>
Detailed Design	<i>LNTP</i>	<i>\$10,000.00</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>4TD7/BH11</i>	<i>\$90,000.00</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>\$100,000.00</i>
Construction	<i>4BG7</i>	<i>\$7,200,000.00</i>	<i>100</i>				<i>\$7,200,000.00</i>
Construction Engineering	<i>4BG7</i>	<i>\$720,000.00</i>	<i>100</i>				<i>\$720,000.00</i>
Totals:		<i>\$8,005,000.00</i>			<i>\$765,000.00</i>		<i>\$8,770,000.00</i>

Additional remarks about funding:

Utilizing 90% Federal funds (BHJ STBG Planning) matched with 10% Local funds, including 10% TRC.

M. Cost Recovery

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

If the LPA does intend to recover Fringe and Overhead Costs, by what method do they intend to recover those costs?

- ☐ 1. Direct Labor only (no indirect cost recovery for fringe benefit or overhead costs)
- ☐ 2. Direct Labor plus indirect costs determined using the Federal De Minimis Indirect Cost Rate¹
- ☐ 3. Direct Labor plus Approved Fringe Benefit Costs (fringe benefits only)²
- ☐ 4. Direct Labor plus indirect costs determined using the approved applicable Cost Allocation Plan rate
- ☐ 5. No cost recovery of any LPA direct labor, fringe benefits, or overhead costs.

Does the LPA currently have a timekeeping system in place?	☐ Yes	☐ No
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

If so, does that system track both payroll and project hours concurrently?	☐ Yes	☐ No
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

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?	☐ Yes	☐ No
---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

(Tracking hours worked, without activities, on Federal projects is non-compliant. All activity hours must be shown)

Does the LPA ensure that timecards are signed by the employee?	☐ Yes	☐ No
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

N. Environmental – see Environmental (NEPA) Scope of Services

O. Roles/Responsibilities

Note: Consultants used for development of Construction plans, R/W plans, R/W acquisition/appraisals, and Construction inspection must be pre-qualified by ODOT.

Construction Plan Development:	ODOT Prequalified Consultant
Proposal/Specification Development:	ODOT
LPA Agreement:	ODOT/LPA
Form and Preliminary Legislation:	ODOT/LPA
Environmental Tasks:	ODOT Prequalified Consultant/ODOT (see Environmental SOS)
Advertising and Award of Contract:	ODOT
Construction Inspection:	ODOT
R/W Plan Development:	N/A
R/W Acquisition / Appraisals:	N/A
Utility Relocation:	Coordination and relocation by LPA/ODOT Prequalified Consultant (responsible for completion of the Utility Note for any relocations)

P. Field Review – held on July 14, 2026 with BHJ, City of Steubenville, and ODOT D11 personnel

Q. Commitment Dates

Milestone  	Date  	Completed	SFY (Qtr)
 Field Review	 07/14/2026		2027 (Q1)
 Initial Project Scope Complete	 07/28/2026		2027 (Q1)
 Stage 1 Plans - Submitted	 02/19/2027		2027 (Q3)
 Stage 2 Plans - Submitted	 10/29/2027		2028 (Q2)
 Environmental Document Approved	 11/19/2027		2028 (Q2)
 Stage 3 Plans - Submitted	 03/31/2028		2028 (Q3)
 District R/W Certification	 06/22/2028		2028 (Q4)
 Plan Package Submitted to C.O.	 07/01/2028		2029 (Q1)
 Sale	 10/01/2028		2029 (Q2)