



OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 03
906 CLARK AVE. • ASHLAND, OH 44805 • 419-281-0513

Environmental Document

for

LOR IR 0090 10.76 PID 107714

Environmental Document Level: D1

Approved: 2/27/2024

Prepared By: Stacy Schimmoeller

TRC (use this one)

Phone: 419-701-8188

E-mail: SSchimmoeller@trccompanies.com

District Contact: Levi Wingler

Phone: 419-207-7171

E-mail: Levi.Wingler@dot.ohio.gov

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by ODOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 14, 2020, and executed by FHWA and ODOT.

Table of Contents

Project Type.....	3
General Project Information.....	4
Purpose & Need.....	26
Alternatives.....	28
Air.....	31
Noise.....	33
RMR.....	35
Cultural Resources.....	36
Ecological.....	38
Other Resources.....	53
Section 4(f).....	55
Section 6(f).....	56
Community Impacts.....	57
Environmental Justice.....	59
Public Involvement.....	60
Permits.....	61
Environmental Commitments.....	63
Preparers and Approvals.....	65
Appendix.....	67



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Project Type

Please check all of the following actions that apply (Must check at least one):

(13) Actions described in 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28) that do not meet the constraints listed in 23 CFR 771.117(e).

(a) Project types that exceed thresholds in Appendix A

(b) Project types that exceed thresholds in Appendix B



General Project Information

Project, Cost Schedule and Work Limits

Environmental Document Level: D1
 PID: 107714
 Project Name: LOR IR 0090 10.76
 Project Sponsor: ODOT SPONSORING AGENCY
 ODOT District: 3
 Funding Source: Federal
 The next phase of the proposed project is listed on the STIP Yes

Ellis STIP Details

Phase	Current STIP Reference
ENV	107714: 24-27 STIP
CO	107714: 24-27 STIP
DD	107714: 24-27 STIP

An Interchange Modification/Justification/Operations Study (IMS/IJS/IOS) was completed No

Project Description:

The LOR-90-10.76 (PID 107714) project is a major rehabilitation of I-90 including complete pavement replacement and adding one lane in each direction towards the inside median from the merge/diverge with State Route 2 (SR 2) to the State Route 611 (SR 611) interchange. The project will include placement of noise walls along existing roadway within ODOT right-of-way. During the project, 33 culverts will be repaired (no replacement), all within existing ODOT right-of-way, as well. This project is located in Elyria Township, the City of Elyria, Sheffield Village, and the City of Avon, Lorain County, Ohio. The project limits on I-90 will be from the Ohio Turnpike Toll Booth to the west to the existing 6-lane section at the SR 611 interchange to the east, a distance of roughly eight (8) miles. The section of I-90 between the Ohio Turnpike Toll Booth to SR 2 will be repaved but will remain a 4-lane roadway. The project will also involve some bridge work (resurfacing) and full replacement of the existing right-of-way fence.

Limits of Proposed Work: LOR IR 90 10.76 - 13.17, 13.57 - 18.61
 Start (SLM): 10.76
 End (SLM): 18.61
 Total Work Length (Miles): 7.45

Roadway Character

Route Number: IR00090

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial - Interstate (Urban)



Current Average Daily Traffic: 26457
Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2020
Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 31210
Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2045
Daily Hourly Volume: 2669
Truck %: 14
Setting: Urban
Topography: Rolling

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	65	65
Legal Speed (MPH):	65	65
Number of Lanes:	4	6
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width (ft):	12	12
Shoulder Width (ft):	12	12
Median Width (ft):	12	12
Sidewalk Width (ft):	0	0

Sufficiency Rating: 090.9
General Rating: 9
Date Built: 07/01/1967
Bridge Location: .48 MILES EAST OF SR 2
40. Bridge Type: 402N
Sufficiency Rating: 091.7
General Rating: 7
Date Built: 07/01/1974
Bridge Location: 2.09 MI EAST OF ERIE CO
40. Bridge Type: 402N
Sufficiency Rating: 095.6
General Rating: 7
Date Built: 07/01/1974
Bridge Location: 2.09 MI EAST OF ERIE CO



40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	090.9
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	.48 MILES EAST OF SR 2
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	087.7
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	08/01/2009
Bridge Location:	.60 MILES EAST OF SR 2
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	087.7
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	08/01/2009
Bridge Location:	.60 MILES EAST OF SR 2
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	092.4
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	02/28/2013
Bridge Location:	1.06 MILES EAST OF SR 57
40. Bridge Type:	602N
Sufficiency Rating:	094.4
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	03/28/2013
Bridge Location:	1.06 MILES EAST OF SR 57
40. Bridge Type:	602N
Sufficiency Rating:	094.0
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	02/28/2013
Bridge Location:	1.23 MILES EAST OF SR 57
40. Bridge Type:	402N



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Sufficiency Rating:	091.5
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	03/28/2013
Bridge Location:	1.23 MILES EAST OF SR 57
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	076.7
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1970
Bridge Location:	.93 MILES EAST OF SR 254
40. Bridge Type:	319N
Sufficiency Rating:	095.4
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1970
Bridge Location:	1.61 MILES EAST OF SR 301
40. Bridge Type:	201N
Sufficiency Rating:	076.7
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1970
Bridge Location:	1.15 MILES EAST OF SR 301
40. Bridge Type:	319N
Sufficiency Rating:	093.5
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1970
Bridge Location:	1.61 MILES EAST OF SR 301
40. Bridge Type:	201N
Sufficiency Rating:	091.1
General Rating:	9
Date Built:	11/14/2017
Bridge Location:	1.24 M East of SR2
40. Bridge Type:	602N



Sufficiency Rating: 091.5

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 11/07/2018

Bridge Location: 1.24 Mile E. of SR 2

40. Bridge Type: 602N

Sufficiency Rating: 090.1

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 11/14/2017

Bridge Location: .95 Miles East of SR 57

40. Bridge Type: 502N

Sufficiency Rating: 095.6

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 08/27/2018

Bridge Location: .35 Miles E. of SR 57

40. Bridge Type: 502N

Design Criteria For Bridges

SFN: 4704355

Sufficiency Rating: 090.9

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: .48 MILES EAST OF SR 2

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	166.60	166.60
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	68.50	68.50
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60	60
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	15.7	15.7

Bridge Type Description: Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description: None



Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?

Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704371

Sufficiency Rating:

091.7

General Rating:

7

Date Built:

07/01/1974

Bridge Location:

2.09 MI EAST OF ERIE CO

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	122	122
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	50	50
Load Restrictions (TON):	110	110
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40.50	40.50
Shoulder Width(ft):	1.5	1.5
Under Clearance (ft):	14.5	14.5

Bridge Type Description:

Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck

Load Restrictions Description:

None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?

Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Replacement
- Abutment Repair
- Pier Repair
- Substructure Sealing
- Approach Slab Replacement
- Protective Coating

SFN: 4704398



Sufficiency Rating: 095.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1974

Bridge Location: 2.09 MI EAST OF ERIE CO

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	129	139
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	51	51
Load Restrictions (TON):	110	110
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40	40
Shoulder Width(ft):	4	4
Under Clearance (ft):	20	20

Bridge Type Description: Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Replacement
- Abutment Repair
- Pier Repair
- Substructure Sealing
- Approach Slab Replacement
- Protective Coating

SFN: 4704444

Sufficiency Rating: 090.9

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: .48 MILES EAST OF SR 2

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	163	163
Number of Main Spans:	3	3



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Max Span Length (ft):	67	67
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60	60
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	16.3	16.3

Bridge Type Description:

Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck

Load Restrictions Description:

None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?

Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704487

Sufficiency Rating:

087.7

General Rating:

9

Date Built:

08/01/2009

Bridge Location:

.60 MILES EAST OF SR 2

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	145	145
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	57	57
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60	60
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	23	23

Bridge Type Description:

Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description:

None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?

Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

N/A



Remarks:

- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704517

Sufficiency Rating: 087.7

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 08/01/2009

Bridge Location: .60 MILES EAST OF SR 2

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	420N
Bridge Length (ft):	145	145
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	57	57
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60	60
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	23	23

Bridge Type Description:

Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704665

Sufficiency Rating: 092.4

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 02/28/2013

Bridge Location: 1.06 MILES EAST OF SR 57

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	602N	602N



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Bridge Length (ft):	363	363
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	140	140
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	64	64
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	45	45

Bridge Type Description:

Prestressed concrete beam bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description:

None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?

Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Patching - Concrete
- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704703

Sufficiency Rating:

094.4

General Rating:

9

Date Built:

03/28/2013

Bridge Location:

1.06 MILES EAST OF SR 57

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	602N	602N
Bridge Length (ft):	363	363
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	140	140
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	64	34
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	45	45

Bridge Type Description:

Prestressed concrete beam bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description:

None



Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704738

Sufficiency Rating: 094.0

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 02/28/2013

Bridge Location: 1.23 MILES EAST OF SR 57

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	151.50	151.50
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	64	64
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	62	62
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	17.2	17.2

Bridge Type Description:

Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704754

Sufficiency Rating: 091.5

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 03/28/2013



Bridge Location:

1.23 MILES EAST OF SR 57

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	179	179
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	73.50	73.50
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	62	62
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	25	25

Bridge Type Description:

Steel bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description:

None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?

Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

N/A

Remarks:

- Deck Sealing - Gravity Fed Resin
- Railing Repair

SFN: 4704800

Sufficiency Rating:

076.7

General Rating:

6

Date Built:

07/01/1970

Bridge Location:

.93 MILES EAST OF SR 254

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	319N	319N
Bridge Length (ft):	28	28
Number of Main Spans:	1	1
Max Span Length (ft):	20.20	20.20
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	0	0
Shoulder Width(ft):	0	0
Under Clearance (ft):	0	0

Bridge Type Description:



286 foot long pipe arch culvert

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

Culvert Invert Repair

SFN: 4704959

Sufficiency Rating: 095.4

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1970

Bridge Location: 1.61 MILES EAST OF SR 301

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	201N	201N
Bridge Length (ft):	105	105
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	40	40
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	87	87
Shoulder Width(ft):	3.5	3.5
Under Clearance (ft):	0	0

Bridge Type Description: Slab bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

Deck Sealing - Silane SRS

SFN: 4704967

Sufficiency Rating: 076.7

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1970

Bridge Location: 1.15 MILES EAST OF SR 301



	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	319N	319N
Bridge Length (ft):	12	12
Number of Main Spans:	1	1
Max Span Length (ft):	12	12
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	0	0
Shoulder Width(ft):	0	0
Under Clearance (ft):	0	0

Bridge Type Description: 230 foot long circular pipe culvert

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

Culvert Invert Repair

SFN: 4704983

Sufficiency Rating: 093.5

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1970

Bridge Location: 1.61 MILES EAST OF SR 301

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	201N	201N
Bridge Length (ft):	105	105
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	40	40
Load Restrictions (TON):	110	110
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	72.50	72.5
Shoulder Width(ft):	3	3
Under Clearance (ft):	0	0

Bridge Type Description:

Slab bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description: None



Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

Deck Sealing - Silane SRS

SFN: 4710000

Sufficiency Rating: 091.1

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 11/14/2017

Bridge Location: 1.24 M East of SR2

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	602N	602N
Bridge Length (ft):	182	182
Number of Main Spans:	2	2
Max Span Length (ft):	88.50	88.5
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60	60
Shoulder Width(ft):	63.4	63.4
Under Clearance (ft):	17.2	17.2

Bridge Type Description:

Prestressed concrete beam bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

Deck Sealing - Silane SRS

SFN: 4710001

Sufficiency Rating: 091.5

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 11/07/2018

Bridge Location: 1.24 Mile E. of SR 2

Existing:

Proposed:



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Bridge Type:	602N	602N
Bridge Length (ft):	182	182
Number of Main Spans:	2	2
Max Span Length (ft):	88.50	88.50
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60	60
Shoulder Width(ft):	3.4	3.4
Under Clearance (ft):	17.4	17.4

Bridge Type Description:

Prestressed concrete beam bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description:

None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?

No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

N/A

Remarks:

Deck Sealing - Silane SRS

SFN: 4710002

Sufficiency Rating:

090.1

General Rating:

9

Date Built:

11/14/2017

Bridge Location:

.95 Miles East of SR 57

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	502N	502N
Bridge Length (ft):	98	98
Number of Main Spans:	1	1
Max Span Length (ft):	93.50	93.50
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	68	68
Shoulder Width(ft):	3.4	3.4
Under Clearance (ft):	19.9	19.9

Bridge Type Description:

Prestressed concrete beam bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description:

None



Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

Deck Sealing - Silane SRS

SFN: 4710003

Sufficiency Rating: 095.6

General Rating: 9

Date Built: 08/27/2018

Bridge Location: .35 Miles E. of SR 57

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	502N	502N
Bridge Length (ft):	98.10	98.10
Number of Main Spans:	1	1
Max Span Length (ft):	93.50	93.50
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	70	70
Shoulder Width(ft):	3.3	3.3
Under Clearance (ft):	15.9	15.9

Bridge Type Description:

Prestressed concrete beam bridge with cast in place concrete deck.

Load Restrictions Description: None

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it? N/A

Remarks:

Deck Sealing - Silane SRS

41. Bridge Length (ft): 166.60

41. Bridge Length (ft): 122

41. Bridge Length (ft): 129

41. Bridge Length (ft): 163

41. Bridge Length (ft): 145

41. Bridge Length (ft): 145

41. Bridge Length (ft): 363



41. Bridge Length (ft):	363
41. Bridge Length (ft):	151.50
41. Bridge Length (ft):	179
41. Bridge Length (ft):	28
41. Bridge Length (ft):	105
41. Bridge Length (ft):	12
41. Bridge Length (ft):	105
41. Bridge Length (ft):	182
41. Bridge Length (ft):	182
41. Bridge Length (ft):	98
41. Bridge Length (ft):	98.10
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	1
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	1
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	2
42. Number of Main Spans:	2
42. Number of Main Spans:	1
42. Number of Main Spans:	1
43. Max Span Length (ft):	68.50



44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40.50
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	64
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	64
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	62
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	62
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	0
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	87
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	0
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	72.50
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	60
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	68
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	70
Maintenance of Traffic During Construction	
A roadway, bridge or ramp closure is required	Yes
A temporary bridge or roadway is proposed	No
A detour is required for the proposed project	Yes
Access for local through traffic will be provided with appropriate signage	Yes
Provisions for through-traffic dependent businesses will be incorporated into project design	Yes
Provisions to accommodate any local special events or festivals will be incorporated into project design	Yes



The proposed MOT substantially impacts sensitive environmental resources	No
Substantial controversy is associated with the proposed MOT	No
Coordination has been initiated and/or completed with local emergency services, schools, public institutions/facilities, etc.	Yes

Remarks:

Vehicular Traffic:

There will be lane restrictions along SR 2 and IR 90, as well as the interchange ramps at SR 254. However, two lanes in each direction on IR 90/SR 2 will be maintained. A detour for the IR 90 westbound connector to the Ohio Turnpike will be utilized while work is being performed on SR 2 eastbound under the IR 90 connector ramp. This detour will utilize SR 57 southbound to the Ohio Turnpike. Murray Ridge Road will also be detoured during the reconstruction of SR 2 over Murray Ridge Road to avoid conflict with motorists using Murray Ridge Road. The proposed detour is SR 113 to West Ridge Road to Middle Ridge Road to North Ridge Road to Lake Avenue. Ramp traffic will be maintained at all times except for limited short-term closures and detours.

Pedestrian Traffic:

There will be no impact to pedestrian traffic during construction activities; therefore, pedestrian detours will not be required.

Special Events or Festivals:

No special events or festivals are known to occur within the Project study area and no events have been mentioned in public meetings or coordination with local officials.

Coordination:

Coordination with local emergency services and public facilities/services is included in the Project File and included invitation to the public meeting, and a pre-public meeting specifically with these entities (see Public Involvement files in Project File). No MOT or access concerns have been received from local emergency or public services/facilities (including schools). On-going coordination, as needed, will continue during the project development process. Approximately 30 days prior to the start of construction activities, the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) District 3 Public Information Officer (PIO) will notify and coordinate with local emergency and public services (including schools). Parts 642-8 and 642-58 of the Traffic Engineering Manual shall be placed in the plans by ODOT to ensure compliance with federal notification requirements.

Are there any Environmental Commitments?	Yes
--	-----

Right of Way and Utility Involvement

The project requires Permanent Right-of-Way	No
The project requires Permanent Easement(s)	No
The project requires Temporary Right-of-Way	No
Number of parcels impacted by Permanent Right-of-Way:	0
Number of parcels impacted by Temporary Right-of-Way:	0
Approximate acreage of Permanent Right-of-Way needed:	0
Approximate acreage of Temporary Right-of-Way needed:	0
Electrical lines, gas lines, water lines, sewer lines, phone lines or other utilities exist in the project area	Yes
Large scale transmission facilities are located within the project area	Yes
Private utility easements are located within the project area	No
Coordination with identified utilities has been initiated and/or completed	No



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Please explain why utility coordination has not been initiated and/or completed

This Design Build Contract will have the utility coordination completed during project design by the design build contractor.

Remarks:

Right of Way:

The proposed Project will not require any permanent or temporary right-of-way. No residences, businesses, institutions, or farms will be relocated for the Project.

Utility Coordination:

Locations of the underground utilities were obtained from utility owners as required by Section 153.64 Ohio Revised Code (ORC). Below are all utility owners with assets within the Project construction limits:

- Columbia Gas of Ohio
- Ohio Edison Company
- Ohio Edison Transmission
- Brightspeed (formerly CenturyLink and Lumen)
- Windstream
- Charter Communications
- Village of Sheffield
- Rural Lorain County Water Authority
- Park View Federal Savings Bank (owner of the 4" private sanitary force main under I-90 on the west side of Gulf Road)
- City of Elyria (water)
- City of North Ridgeville
- MCI Metro (subsidiary of Verizon)
- Cleveland Electric Illuminating (CEI)

The Design Build Contractor shall coordinate with utilities throughout each stage of design. Coordination will continue through construction for the Project.



Purpose & Need

Purpose & Need

Project History:

This Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) LOR-90-10.76 project (PID 107714) is located on Interstate (I)-90 in the Elyria Township, the City of Elyria, the Village of Sheffield, and the City of Avon, Lorain County, Ohio for approximately eight miles from the Ohio Turnpike Toll Booth through the Ohio State Route (SR) 2 interchange.

The Traffic Operations Assessment Systems Tool (TOAST) was used to investigate I-90 between SR 2 from mile 11.93 to SR 611 at mile 18.82, which includes the study area and was identified as the highest need freeway segment in District 3. A Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSMO) Study was then completed on the area and submitted to ODOT District 3 on October 25, 2021. The study was focused on reducing peak hour crashes and related congestion. A review of crashes from 2017-2020 indicated an over representation of rear end, side swipe, and fixed object crashes that indicated safety risks due to congestion. Congestion was identified as both a crash cause as well as an effect of high traffic volumes per lane and long incident clearance times, compared to other facilities within ODOT's system.

The previous study can be found in the Project File under General.

Purpose Statement:

The project is primarily needed to address mobility/congestion and facility deficiencies including higher roadway noise, pavement deterioration, and culvert disrepair.

Need Element(s):

The primary needs of this project are to address mobility/congestion and facility deficiencies as discussed in more detail below:

Mobility/Congestion

- Average Daily Traffic Volumes (ADT) In 2020, this section of I-90 carried 67,810 vehicles per day. It is projected that in 2025, there would be 69,000 vehicles per day, and in 2045 there would be 73,740 vehicles per day on this 2-lane divided highway.
- Traffic Operation Assessment Systems Tool (TOAST) This section of I-90 scores between 34.8% and 44.3% where the higher the percent, the better the route is performing.
- Crash data from 2017 to 2020 shows this segment of roadway had 571 crashes with a majority of rear end, side swipe, and fixed object crashes. These crash types are typical of roadways with high congestion.

Facility Deficiencies

- Pavement Deterioration: Roadway pavement condition ratings for the LOR-90-10.76 project area are 66, 69, 70, 73, and 76 for the majority of the project area. Two small pavement sections that make up less than a quarter of the project have 92 and 99 pavement condition ratings.
- Culvert Disrepair: A total of 33 existing culverts within the LOR-90-10.76 project footprint are in poor condition.

Goals and Objectives:

n/a

Summary Statement:

The project is primarily needed to address mobility/congestion and facility deficiencies including pavement deterioration and culvert disrepair.

Logical Termini and Independent Utility:



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

The transportation improvement limits are defined by the need to integrate improvements with logical termini into the existing freeway system. The logical termini on I-90 are the Ohio Turnpike Toll Booth on the western end and the SR 2 interchange on the eastern end.

The proposed LOR-90-10.76 project is not dependent on planned transportation improvements to meet the established purpose and need. The proposed project will address existing transportation needs independent of planned roadway projects. Therefore, independent utility is established for this proposed transportation improvement.



Alternatives

Alternatives

Discuss No Build Alternative:

Alternative D is the no build or no action alternative, which would only include maintenance to the existing roadway. No construction is proposed with this alternative which would therefore, not meet the purpose and need for the Project which includes mobility/congestion and facility deficiencies.

Was a Feasibility Study completed?

Yes

Date Feasibility Study was approved:

01/04/2024

Was an Alternative Evaluation Report (AER) completed?

No

Alternatives Considered

Name	Description	Reason Dismissed	Preferred Alternative
Alternative A	Proposes to add a third lane on the inside of the existing lanes of I-90, into the median area.	N/A	Yes



Alternative B	Proposes to add a lane on the outside of the existing lanes of I-90, to widen the roadway towards the right-of-way fence.	Alternative B would require culvert extensions, embankment work for adding a lane to the outside of the existing ROW, and moving existing signage. This alternative would have the greatest amount of environmental impacts due to the extensive amount of construction required. Alternative B also has a higher chance of geotechnical issues, due to use of land that is the existing ditch area and the adjacent land where the new ditch would be constructed.	No
Alternative C	Proposes to use the existing outside shoulder of I-90, as an additional through lane during times of peak traffic, which is also called Hard Shoulder Running.	Alternative C would be less efficient to construct due to the existing limited amount of pavement. Based on this, each side of the highway would need to be built separately using a contraflow method of maintaining traffic which would require more traffic slowdowns and construction would last longer. This alternative also requires additional maintenance each day to clear the shoulder of debris and disabled vehicles, adding to the overall cost of this alternative.	No



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Alternative D	Proposes no build or no action, which would only include maintenance to the existing roadway.	No construction is proposed with this alternative which would therefore not add capacity. This does not meet the purpose and need for the Project, therefore, this alternative was dismissed.	No
---------------	---	---	----

Discuss Reasons Alternative Identified as Preferred was selected:

Alternative A would not require additional ROW by adding a third lane in each direction within the existing median. Alternative A allows added capacity and addresses higher roadway noise, pavement deterioration, and culvert disrepair, which meets the Project's purpose and need. This alternative also has the most benefit and the least environmental impacts when compared to the other proposed alternatives.



Air

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

Sensitive Areas are located within approximately 500' of the proposed project area	Yes
The proposed project is listed as a C1 in ODOT's CE Guidance and/or falls under 40 CFR 93.126	No
The proposed project involves adding capacity, a new interchange, relocating thru lanes significantly closer to sensitive areas, or expanding an intermodal center	Yes
Design Year ADT is <140,000	No
Qualitative MSAT prepared	Yes
OES Concurrence Date	03/21/2023
OEPA Approval Date	03/23/2023

Remarks:

A *Qualitative Analysis of Mobile Source Air Toxics* (MSAT) was prepared by ODOT OES in March 2023. Ohio EPA concurred with the findings of the report on March 23, 2023, that this is not a project with substantial construction related MSAT emissions that are likely to occur over an extended building period or a post-construction scenario where the NEPA analysis indicates potentially meaningful MSAT levels. The MSAT report and correspondence with OEPA is included in the Project File > Air.

Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5)

The proposed project is in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area	Yes
The proposed project falls under 40 CFR 93.126	No
Design Year ADT >125,000 and Design Year Diesel Truck Volume >10,000	No
Significant increase in diesel trucks between Design Year No Build and Design Year Build	No

Remarks:

The proposed project is located in Lorain County that has been designated as being in nonattainment or maintenance for PM2.5. The project is not exempt, however, it is not considered to be of air quality concern based on an interagency review of project data (submitted by OES to USEPA and FHWA April 17, 2023 and August 14, 2023) and information according to 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1)(i-v) and Appendix B of the December 10 EPA Guidance (EPA-420-B-10-040) entitled "Transportation Conformity Guidance for Quantitative Hot-spot Analyses in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas." The PM2.5 Information Coordination Package, FHWA comments, and FHWA Approval of PM 2.5 can be found in the Project File > Air > Coordination and Project Information.

Carbon (CO)

The State of Ohio is in attainment for CO at this time and no coordination or analysis is required



Ozone

The proposed project is in an Ozone non-attainment or maintenance area Yes

The proposed project is listed on the TIP Yes

Remarks:

Lorain County is listed on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and is in a Non-Attainment or maintenance area, therefore ozone is addressed. No further analysis for Ozone is required. Ref ID: 107714: 24-27 STIP.

Greenhouse Gas

A Quantitative Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Analysis is required No

Remarks:

For each alternative in this LOR-90-10.76 project, the amount of GHGs emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. The VMT estimated for each of the Build Alternatives may be slightly higher than that for the No Build Alternative for each analysis year, because the additional capacity may increase the efficiency of the roadway and attract rerouted trips from elsewhere in the transportation network. An increase in VMT may lead to higher GHG emissions for the preferred action alternative compared to the no-build alternative along the highway corridor, along with a corresponding decrease in GHG emissions along the parallel routes. The emissions increase may be offset somewhat by lower GHG emission rates due to increased speeds; according to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) MOVES3 model, emissions of GHG emissions decrease as speed increases (up to 60 miles per hour). Because the estimated VMT under each of the Alternatives are nearly the same, it is expected there would be no appreciable difference in overall GHG emissions among the various alternatives. Also, regardless of the alternative chosen, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of fuel efficiency improvements and electrification policies that are projected to reduce annual statewide GHG emissions from on-road sources by nearly 76 percent between 2020 and 2060. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that GHG emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in nearly all cases.

Environmental Commitments

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Noise

Noise

Noise Sensitive Areas located within approximately 500' of the proposed project area	Yes
Noise Analysis conducted	Yes
ODOT Approval Date	04/11/2023
The proposed project is a Type I project	Yes
The proposed project constructs a roadway on new location	No
The proposed project significantly changes the existing roadway's horizontal or vertical alignment	No
The proposed project adds capacity (thru travel lanes)	Yes
The proposed project adds an auxiliary lane(s)	No
The proposed project negatively affects shielding of an existing roadway	No
The proposed project restripes existing pavement for an added thru lane or auxiliary lane	No
The proposed project adds or substantially alters an existing weigh station, rest stop, rideshare lot, or toll plaza	No
The proposed project causes a major change in vehicle mix	No
A design year noise impact was predicted	Yes
All noise attenuation measures were considered and are consistent with existing policy	Yes
Noise barriers proposed	Yes
The proposed project impacts identified NSAs	Yes

Impacted Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs)

NSA ID	Name	Address or Location	Qualify for barriers
A	NSA A	Near the Ohio Turnpike Toll Booth and follows I-90.	Yes
B	NSA B	The merge/diverge of I-90 and SR 2.	No
D	NSA D	I-90 where the highway crosses Lake Avenue in Elyria Township.	No
F	NSA F	Follows I-90 in the City of Elyria and includes the bridges over the Black River and Ford Road.	Yes



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

G	NSA G	Follows I-90 south of the SR 611 interchange in the Village of Sheffield and City of Avon.	Yes
---	-------	--	-----

Remarks:

On April 10, 2023, a Noise Analysis Report was prepared by EnviroScience and submitted to ODOT. On April 11, 2023, ODOT returned correspondence and approved the subject noise analysis and the recommendation of noise walls. ODOT stated that no further noise analysis is required. OES Approval can be found in the Project File under Noise > Coordination > OES Approval - Noise Analysis.

ODOT conducted noise public involvement to determine the desired color and texture of the noise wall prior to commencing noise wall construction plan preparation. The results of the noise PI were summarized into the *Noise Public Involvement Summary Report* which was approved by OES August 22, 2023 (found in the Project File under Noise). It determined that Noise Sensitive Areas (NSA) A, E, and F preferred the gray colored Ashlar Stone texture. NSA G preferred gray colored Dry Stack texture. The highway side of all the noise wall is proposed for red colored brick texture which will match the color and texture of the existing noise wall along EB IR90 between SR 611 and SR 83.

Additional noise information and coordination can be found in the Project File > Noise.

Environmental Commitments

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

RMR

Does the project require any Permanent ROW or Easement?	No
Does the project require any temporary ROW?	No
RMR Screening was completed by District Staff:	No

Remarks:

A Regulated Materials Review (RMR) was prepared by TRC and submitted to ODOT on December 22, 2023. Based on the results of the screening, ODOT-OES Staff in correspondence dated January 8, 2024, stated the Project does not warrant further RMR or special material management.

Two oil and gas wells are located within the right of way of the project; however are noted by ODNR as being plugged and abandoned. Information on these wells can be found in the Project File > RMR > Project Information.

Landfills

Is a Rule 513 Authorization required?	No
--	----

Remarks:

ODOT-OES Staff correspondence dated January 8, 2024, noted that The Milan Steel (US Steel Corp.) landfill is located approximately 1.5 miles west of the Project area and does not pose a threat to the Project, therefore, no further assessment or investigation is necessary.

Are there any environmental commitments?	No
---	----

According to the IOC from OES does the project require any Environmental Commitments (plan notes and/or other coordination)?	Yes
---	-----



Cultural Resources

Cultural Properties Present

Please describe all of the efforts made to identify Historic Properties (including lit review, field investigation, etc.):

TRC conducted a literature and archives review to develop a Cultural Resources Desktop Review of the proposed alternatives. A Section 106 Scoping Request Form (SFR) was prepared and submitted by ODOT on May 9, 2023. The literature search determined there are no inventoried buildings (OHI) or known archaeological sites (OAI) which will be impacted by construction. Furthermore, no listed or eligible historic properties are found in the project area or area of potential effects (APE). Culvert maintenance activities for this project are exempt from further cultural resource consideration by the 11/8/17 Cultural Resource PA (Agreement 19319). Maintenance will be performed on 25 interstate bridges which are not considered eligible for the National Register based on the Ohio DOT Historic Bridge Inventory (accepted April 28, 2010). Due to the previous disturbance and the absence of recorded resources, no further cultural resource survey was conducted.

Is there an eligible or listed NRHP Historic Property in the Area of Potential Effects Pursuant to 36 CFR part 800? No

OES Approval/OSHPO Concurrence Date: 05/10/2023

Remarks:

It has been determined the proposed LOR-90-10.76 interstate widening and safety improvement project is exempt from further cultural resource consideration by the 11/8/17 Cultural Resource PA (Agreement 19319). In this case, no new permanent right-of-way from a historic property will be acquired and no contributing element of an historic district will be removed or altered by construction. Approval was received on May 10, 2023, and determined that the proposed project is exempt from further cultural resource consideration by the 11/8/17 Cultural Resource PA (Agreement 19319).

What is the Section 106 effect determination in the OES Transmittal? Minimal Potential to Cause Effect Appendix B

Documentation Date

Participating

Archaeological Resource Adverse Effect

History/Architecture Adverse Effect

Tribal Consultation

Since no Tribe was interested in this project based on their customized preferences, no further Tribal consultation was conducted

Environmental Commitments



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Are there any Environmental Commitments? No



Ecological

ESR

ESR Name:	ESR Type:	Coordination Complete Date:
LOR-90-10.76	Level 1	2/2/2024

Wetlands

ESR Name:	Wetland ID:	Hydrologic connection:	Wetland category:	Estimated total size (ac.):	Total estimated impact area by alternative (ac.):
LOR-90-10.76	01	Adjacent	Category 1	8.0	1.514
	02	Adjacent	Category 1	5.0	1.441
	03	Adjacent	Category 1	3.0	0.490
	04	Adjacent	Category 1	2.0	0.812
	05	Adjacent	Category 1	0.50	0.293
	06	Isolated	Category 1	0.30	0.201
	07	Adjacent	Category 1	0.20	0.152
	08	Adjacent	Category 1	0.08	0.075
	09	Adjacent	Category 1	0.009	0.009
	10	Adjacent	Category 1	0.004	0.004
	11	Adjacent	Category 1	0.04	0.035
	12	Adjacent	Category 1	0.10	0.094
	13	Adjacent	Category 2	0.203	0.203
	14	Adjacent	Category 2	0.20	0.148
	15	Adjacent	Category 1	0.50	0.118
	16	Adjacent	Category 1	2.0	1.478
	17	Adjacent	Category 1	0.20	0.190
	18	Adjacent	Category 1	1.5	0.396
	19	Adjacent	Category 1	0.05	0.039
	20	Adjacent	Category 2	6.0	0.641
	21	Adjacent	Category 1	0.60	0.579
	22	Adjacent	Category 1	8.0	0.594
	23	Adjacent	Category 1	0.50	0.029
	24	Adjacent	Category 1	0.15	0.109
	25	Adjacent	Category 1	2.0	1.449
	26	Adjacent	Category 1	0.022	0.022
	27	Adjacent	Category 1	0.027	0.027
	28	Adjacent	Category 1	0.018	0.018
	29	Adjacent	Category 1	0.082	0.082
	30	Adjacent	Category 1	0.20	0.157
	31	Adjacent	Category 1	1.0	0.422
	32	Adjacent	Category 1	1.20	0.643



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Has an Approved and/or Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination been made by the USACE? No

Total impact to all wetlands (ac.): 12.464

Total acres of non-isolated wetlands impacted: 12.263

Total acres of isolated wetlands impacted: 0.201

In accordance with Executive Order 11990 - USDOT Order 5660.1A, this Wetland Finding has been prepared to document that wetlands have been avoided to the extent possible to minimize the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands, and to document that there are no practicable alternatives to avoid construction in wetlands.

An analysis of the 'Do Nothing' alternative indicates that it is not practicable because (check all that apply):

It Would Not Correct Existing or Projected Capacity Deficiencies.

It Would Not Correct Safety Hazards.

It Would Not Correct Existing Condition and Maintenance Problems.

An analysis of improvements that avoid all wetland impacts indicates that they are not practicable because (check all that apply):

They Will Substantially Increase Project Costs.

They Will Result in Unique Engineering, Traffic, Maintenance, or Safety Problems.

They Will Not Meet the Identified Needs of the Project.

Include justification supporting the decisions noted above:

Wetland impacts are proposed as part of the project to add a standard width third lane in each direction. The impacts are due to roadway widening and grading and will be minimized as much as possible. Unique engineering to avoid the wetlands would substantially increase the construction cost.

All practicable measures have been considered and incorporated into the project design to avoid, minimize, wetland impacts. The wetland impact minimization measures that will be followed for the project are documented in the environmental commitments for the project. Wetland mitigation for unavoidable impacts will be provided if required by the Clean Water Act or Ohio isolated wetland law, as regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers and Ohio EPA regulations (33 CFR parts 325 and 332 and 40 CFR part 230, and OAC 3745-01-54), and (ORC 6111.027). No practicable alternatives exist for the proposed construction in wetlands, and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the wetlands that may result from such use.

Remarks:

The overall Project footprint will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable during design of the project. Implementation of additional measures to further reduce the impact footprint is not feasible or warranted based on: the purpose and need of the Project; the limited available space within the existing



right-of-way; the location of the aquatic resource relative to the Project location; and the overall minor impacts of the Project expected once designed.

Streams & Rivers

ESR Name:	Stream Name:	National or Scenic Rivers or NRI Streams:	Ohio EPA Aquatic Life Use Designation:	Antidegradation Designation:	Total Impact Length(ft.):
LOR-90-10.76	01 Martin Run	No	WWH	General High Quality Water	97
	02	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	60
	03	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	142
	04	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	66
	05	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	28
	06	No	MWH	General High Quality Water	361
	07	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	65
	08	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	290
	09	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	195
	10 Black River	No	WWH	General High Quality Water	0
	11	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	307
	12	No	Ephemeral Stream (Class I)	General High Quality Water	2212
	13	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	141



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

	14	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	56
	15	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	173
	16	No	Ephemeral Stream (Class I)	General High Quality Water	40
	17	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	40
	18 Walker Ditch	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	150
	19 French Creek	No	MWH	General High Quality Water	0
	20	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	65
	21	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	79
	22 Kline Ditch	No	MWH	General High Quality Water	70
	23 Jungbluth Ditch	No	MWH	General High Quality Water	135
	24	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	796
	25	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	4103
	26	No	Ephemeral Stream (Class I)	General High Quality Water	153
	27	No	Ephemeral Stream (Class I)	General High Quality Water	33
	28	No	Ephemeral Stream (Class I)	General High Quality Water	59
	29	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	40
	30	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	666



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

	31	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	88
	32	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	187
	33	No	Ephemeral Stream (Class I)	General High Quality Water	122
	34	No	Small Drainage Warmwater (Class II)	General High Quality Water	107

Total impact length (ft.) to perennial streams: 9704

Total impact length (ft.) to intermittent streams: 767

Total impact length (ft.) to ephemeral streams: 655

Remarks:

The overall Project footprint will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable during design of the project. Implementation of additional measures to further reduce the impact footprint is not feasible or warranted based on: the purpose and need of the Project; the limited available space within the existing right-of-way; the location of the aquatic resource relative to the Project location; and the overall minor impacts of the Project expected once designed.

Other Surface Waters / Ditches

ESR Name:	Ditch Id:	Total Impact Area(ac.):
-----------	-----------	-------------------------

Total impact to all ditches (ac): 0

Other Surface Waters / Other Water Bodies

ESR Name:	Water Body Id:	Hydrologic Connection:	Type:	Designated Function:	Total Impact
-----------	----------------	------------------------	-------	----------------------	--------------

Remarks:

N/A



Terrestrial Habitats

ESR Name:	Vegetative Communities and Land Cover found within the project study area:	Degree of man induced ecological disturbance:	Unique, rare, or high quality:	Within Project Study Area(s) (ac.):	Alternative Impacts (ac.):
LOR-90-10.76	Developed, High Intensity (DH) - Includes Highly Developed Areas Where People Reside or Work in High Numbers. Examples Include Apartment Complexes, Row Houses and Commercial/Industrial. Impervious Surfaces Account for 80 to100% of the Total Cover.	Extreme Disturbance/Ruderal Community (Dominated by Opportunistic Invaders or Native Highly Tolerant Taxa)	No	137.38	137.38
	Developed Open Space - DS - (Mown Right-of-Way, Large-Lot Single-Family Housing Units, Parks, Golf Courses, and Vegetation Planted in Developed Settings for Recreation, Erosion control, or Aesthetic Purposes)	Extreme Disturbance/Ruderal Community (Dominated by Opportunistic Invaders or Native Highly Tolerant Taxa)	No	201.21	201.21
	Upland Forest - UF - (Uplands Dominated by Trees)	Intermediate Disturbance (Dominated by Plants that Typify a Stable Phase of a Native Community that Persists Under Some Disturbance)	No	49.11	49.11
	Scrub/Shrub - SS - (True Shrubs, and Young Trees in an Early Successional Stage)	Intermediate Disturbance (Dominated by Plants that Typify a Stable Phase of a Native Community that Persists Under Some Disturbance)	No	19.49	19.49
	Marsh - MA - (Wetland Dominated by Submergent, Floating, and/or Emergent Vegetation)	Extreme Disturbance/Ruderal Community (Dominated by Opportunistic Invaders or Native Highly Tolerant Taxa)	No	6.06	6.06
	Open Water - All Areas of Open Water, Generally with Less Than 25% Cover of Vegetation or Soil.	Extreme Disturbance/Ruderal Community (Dominated by Opportunistic Invaders or Native Highly Tolerant Taxa)	No	1.76	1.76



	Forested Swamp - FS - (Wetland Dominated by Trees)	Intermediate Disturbance (Dominated by Plants that Typify a Stable Phase of a Native Community that Persists Under Some Disturbance)	No	3.18	3.18
	Shrub Swamp - SH - (Wetland Dominated by True Shrubs, and Young Trees in an Early Successional Stage)	Intermediate Disturbance (Dominated by Plants that Typify a Stable Phase of a Native Community that Persists Under Some Disturbance)	No	3.23	3.23

Remarks:

The overall Project footprint will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable during design of the project. Implementation of additional measures to further reduce the impact footprint is not feasible or warranted based on: the purpose and need of the Project; the limited available space within the existing right-of-way; the location of the aquatic resource relative to the Project location; and the overall minor impacts of the Project expected once designed.

Threatened or Endangered Species / Federally Listed Species

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Indiana Bat	Myotis sodalis	Endangered

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Effect Determination: May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

During the field study SWH was identified within the Project Study Area. Figure 6 SWH shows the location of the 45.14-acres of SWH within 100-feet of the edge of pavement and an additional 6.09-acres of SWH outside of the 100-foot edge of pavement. This figure has been uploaded to the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF. The August 23, 2023 Bat Buffer request response from FWS indicates the Project Study Area is not located within a Bat Buffer. This project is a design build and will require tree cutting. As such this project is anticipated to impact all of the SWH within the Project Study Area. A photographic log showing representative photos of potential roost trees and as well as existing conditions can be found in the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF . Tree removal will only occur between October 1 and March 31 when the species would not be present. 51.23ac of SWH will be impacted for this project. This project exceeds the thresholds by removing 6.09 ac of SWH further than 100ft from the edge of pavement. Of this 3.65ac is also within 50ft of a perennial stream. This project is CC3b, May Affect, and is Likely to Adversely Affect the Indiana bat and Northern long-eared bat. Per the 2016 OHPBO (rev. 12/17), 10.66 acres of credit will be deducted from the SCCC2 pooled mitigation site. 45.14ac of SWH impacts within 100ft from EOP = 45.14ac * NA = 0 6.09ac of SWH impact from 100-300ft from EOP= 6.09ac * 1.75 = 10.66ac Total deducted from SCCC2 pooled mitigation site = 10.66ac However, this is a design build project and SWH is being cut for ROW fence repair. Not all of the SWH here will be impacted as this ESR was written as worst case scenario.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
----------------------	--------------------------	-----------------



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Northern Long-eared Bat	Myotis septentrionalis	Endangered
-------------------------	------------------------	------------

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Effect Determination: May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

During the field study SWH was identified within the Project Study Area. Figure 6 SWH shows the location of the 45.14-acres of SWH within 100-feet of the edge of pavement and an additional 6.09-acres of SWH outside of the 100-foot edge of pavement. This figure has been uploaded to the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF. The August 23, 2023 Bat Buffer request response from FWS indicates the Project Study Area is not located within a Bat Buffer. This project is a design build and will require tree cutting. As such this project is anticipated to impact all of the SWH within the Project Study Area. A photographic log showing representative photos of potential roost trees and as well as existing conditions can be found in the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF . Tree removal will only occur between October 1 and March 31 when the species would not be present. 51.23ac of SWH will be impacted for this project. This project exceeds the thresholds by removing 6.09 ac of SWH further than 100ft from the edge of pavement. Of this 3.65ac is also within 50ft of a perennial stream. This project is CC3b, May Affect, and is Likely to Adversely Affect the Indiana bat and Northern long-eared bat. Per the 2016 OHPBO (rev. 12/17), 10.66 acres of credit will be deducted from the SCCC2 pooled mitigation site. 45.14ac of SWH impacts within 100ft from EOP = 45.14ac * NA = 0 6.09ac of SWH impact from 100-300ft from EOP= 6.09ac * 1.75 = 10.66ac Total deducted from SCCC2 pooled mitigation site = 10.66a c However, this is a design build project and SWH is being cut for ROW fence repair. Not all of the SWH here will be impacted as this ESR was written as worst case scenario.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Bald Eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Species of Concern

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Effect Determination: No Effect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

No suitable habitat for Bald Eagles (i.e., mature forested areas) was observed within the LOR-90 Project Study area. The August 23, 2023 records review response from the FWS indicated that the Project Study Area is not within a know Bald Eagle nest buffer. During the course of the typical field investigation there was no sightings of Bald Eagles and no nests were observed. As a result, this Project is not anticipated to have an impact on the Bald Eagle.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Piping Plover	Charadrius melodus	Endangered

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Effect Determination: No Effect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

The northeastern project terminus is located approximately 2.7-miles (straight-line distance) from the shores of Lake Erie. Critical habitat for this species has not been identified in Lorain County (LOR-90-10.76 project location) and no suitable habitat was observed within the Project Study Area for the Piping Plover. As a result, this project is not anticipated to impact this species or its habitat.



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Round Hickorynut	Obovaria subrotunda	Threatened

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Effect Determination: No Effect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

Within the LOR-90-10.76 Project Study Area, two resources, Stream 10 Black River and Stream 19 French Creek have the potential to offer habitat (i.e., over 5-square mile watershed) to the Round Hickorynut mussel. No work will be performed within the Black River and French Creek. The remaining streams within the Project Study Area do not offer suitable habitat for this mussel species. Therefore, this Project is not anticipated to have an impact on the Round Hickorynut mussel.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Rufa Red Knot	Calidris canutus rufa	Threatened

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Effect Determination: No Effect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

No suitable habitat was observed for the Rufa Red Knot within the Project Study Area and the northeastern project terminus is located approximately 2.7-miles (straight-line distance) from the shores of Lake Erie. As a result, this Project is not anticipated to have an impact on this species or its habitat.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Tricolored Bat	Perimyotis subflavus	Proposed Endangered

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Effect Determination: May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

During the field study suitable habitat for the tricolored bat was identified within the Project Study Area. Figure 6 shows the location of the 45.14-acres of suitable habitat within 100-feet of the edge of pavement and an additional 6.09-acres of suitable habitat outside of the 100-foot edge of pavement. This figure has been uploaded to the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF. The August 23, 2023 Bat Buffer request response from FWS indicates the Project Study Area is not located within a Bat Buffer and ODNR has no Tricolor bat record within 1 mile of the project area. This project is a design build and will require tree cutting. As such this project is anticipated to impact all of the suitable tricolored bat habitat within the Project Study Area. A photographic log showing representative photos of potential roost trees and as well as existing conditions can be found in the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF. Tree removal will only occur between October 1 and March 31 when the species would not be present. All of the pertinent AMMs listed in the OHPBO for Indiana bat and Northern long-eared bat will be followed, which will also protect this species from take. This project May Affect this species but is not going to jeopardize the continued existence of the species. Per the 11/15/2022 letter from USFWS outlining conferencing requirements for this species, this project does not need to be submitted for individual conferencing.



Threatened or Endangered Species / State Listed Species:

No state listed species or suitable habitats are impacted by this project location.

ESR Name: LOR-90-10.76

Species Common Name: Round-leaved Dogwood

Species Scientific Name: *Cornus rugosa*

Listing Status: Threatened

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: Yes

Effect Determination: Yes

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

Suitable habitat, including upland mixed deciduous woods and scrub/shrub communities were observed within the LOR-90-10.76 Project Area; however, a species specific plant survey was not conducted. The ODNR record locations identified within the LOR-90-10.76 Project Area for Round-leaved Dogwood is located within the Lorain County Metro Parks' Black River Reservation - Bur Oak Picnic Area. Both the eastbound and westbound lanes currently span (bridge) the Reservation Picnic Area. This Design Build project will not impact below the existing bridges over the Black River, nor within the Black River Reservation, therefore impacts to this species are not likely.

Species Common Name: Canada Buffalo-berry

Species Scientific Name: *Shepherdia canadensis*

Listing Status: Threatened

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: Yes

Effect Determination: Yes

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

Suitable habitat, including forest edges and riverbanks were observed within the LOR-90-10.76 Project Area; however, a species specific plant survey was not conducted. The ODNR record locations identified within the LOR-90-10.76 Project Area for Canada Buffalo-berry is located within the Lorain County Metro Parks' Black River Reservation - Bur Oak Picnic Area. Both the eastbound and westbound lanes currently span (bridge) the Reservation Picnic Area. This Design Build project will not impact below the existing bridges over the Black River, nor within the Black River Reservation, therefore impacts are not likely to this species.

Species Common Name: Tower Mustard

Species Scientific Name: *Turritis glabra*

Listing Status: Potentially Threatened

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: Yes

Effect Determination: Yes

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

The developed open space community within the LOR-90-10.76 project limits offers little habitat for the potentially



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

state threatened perennial Tower Mustard plant. A plant specific survey was not conducted regarding the Tower Mustard. The 201.21-acres of developed open space within the LOR-90-10.76 project limits consists of a seasonally mowed plant community, which is dominated by herbaceous ruderal species. The developed open space community is mostly located within the median of Interstate 90, within the median of the entrance and exit ramps, and along the shoulder of the existing westbound and eastbound lanes. This Project is a design-build, but there is no work proposed on the bridge carrying I-90 across the Black River or within the Black River Reservation which would have the highest chance of harboring this species.

Species Common Name: Little brown bat

Species Scientific Name: *Myotis lucifugus*

Listing Status: Endangered

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: Yes

Effect Determination: Yes

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

Figure 8 shows the location of the 51.23 acres of wooded habitat within the study area. This figure has been uploaded to the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF. The August 23, 2023 Bat Buffer request response from FWS indicates the Project Study Area is not located within a Bat Buffer. This project is a design build and will require tree cutting. As such this project is anticipated to impact all of the wooded habitat within the Project Study Area. A photographic log showing representative photos of potential roost trees and as well as existing conditions can be found in the Project File/Ecological/ESR/Appendices.PDF. Tree removal will only occur between October 1 and March 31 when the species would not be present.

Species Common Name: Blanding's turtle

Species Scientific Name: *Emydoidea blandingii*

Listing Status: Endangered

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: Yes

Effect Determination: Yes

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

Blanding's turtle habitat includes wetlands, which are anticipated to be impacted by the project. Blanding's turtles are essentially aquatic; however, the wetlands within the project area are not documented as being connected to ground water, therefore, are expected to be dry at different times throughout the year. The lack of water makes the wetland unusable for foraging Blanding's turtles. The wetlands proposed to be impacted by the project are also low quality (Category 1 wetlands) along an urban roadway. Based on the items discussed and that the work is expected to occur while the turtles are mobile (not hibernating), impacts are not likely to the Blanding's turtle.

Species Common Name: Sandhill crane

Species Scientific Name: *Grus canadensis*

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: Spotted turtle



Species Scientific Name: *Clemmys guttata*

Listing Status: Threatened

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: Yes

Effect Determination: Yes

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:

There is no record within 1 mile of the project area. Spotted turtle habitat includes wetlands, which are anticipated to be impacted by the project. Spotted turtles are essentially aquatic; however, the wetlands within the project area are not documented as being connected to ground water, therefore, are expected to be dry at different times throughout the year. This was confirmed by later site visits in Nov by OES. The lack of water makes the wetland unusable for foraging spotted turtles. The wetlands proposed to be impacted by the project are also low quality (Category 1 wetlands) along an urban roadway with lighter amounts of vegetation and occasional mowing. The portions of streams that will be impacted are already impacted by the culverts already present that will be repaired. Based on the items discussed and that the work is expected to occur while the turtles are mobile (not hibernating), impacts are not likely to the spotted turtle.

Species Common Name: Upland sandpiper

Species Scientific Name: *Bartramia longicauda*

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: Northern harrier

Species Scientific Name: *Circus hudsonius*

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: American bittern

Species Scientific Name: *Botaurus lentiginosus*

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: Trumpeter swan

Species Scientific Name: *Cygnus buccinator*

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: Lark sparrow

Species Scientific Name: Chondestes grammacus

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: Least bittern

Species Scientific Name: Ixobrychus exilis

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: Black-crowned night-heron

Species Scientific Name: Nycticorax nycticorax

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Remarks:

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) have completed a review of the project and provided comments. Based on comments concerning listed bat species, all tree clearing will be performed in the winter, between October 1 and March 31 when bats are not using trees. The USFWS noted that the project is likely to adversely affect Federally Listed Species and will require formal consultation which shall be completed prior to the start of construction.

Agency Coordination

Project Coordination:

Project locations for which no agencies are listed are considered ecologically exempt or non-notifying.



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

The ODNR and USFWS conditions outlined in the Ecological MOA apply to all projects that are not considered ecologically exempt. These conditions have been evaluated for the project locations listed below.

ESR Name:	Agency:	Submitted for Coordination Date:	Coordination Complete Date:	Were project specific comments received?
LOR-90-10.76	ODNR		01/22/2024	No
	USFWS	12/21/2023	01/23/2024	Yes

Additional Coordination Considerations:

Are other ecological coordination requirements applicable?: Yes

Details regarding the additional coordination efforts are provided in the Remarks box below.

National scenic river: No

State scenic river: No

Individual Coastal Consistency: No

Jurisdictional Determination: Yes

Project specific Biological Assessment Verification: No

Mussel survey: No

Other: No

Remarks:

This project was non-notifying for ODNR, therefore no comments were received. USFWS commented that clearing of SWH shall only occur between October 1 and March 31 and that 10.66 acres of credits will be subtracted from the acreage credit available at the Sunday Creek Coal Company 2 Bat Conservation Area due to: 45.14 acres of SWH will be removed during the bats' inactive winter season within 100 feet from the edge of pavement, for which impacts are expected to be insignificant or discountable; 6.09 acres of SWH will be removed during the bats' inactive winter season between 100 and 300 feet from the edge of pavement and acreage will be replaced at a ratio of 1.75:1; and 0 acres of SWH will be removed during the bats' inactive winter season beyond 300 feet from the edge of pavement. Agency coordination can be found in the Project File > Ecological > Coordination Based on the project being designed after the project will be sold, impacts are not known at this time. In order to provide the worst case scenario, each ecological resource was shown to be fully impacted within the ecological survey; however, the impacts will be minimized during design. A jurisdictional determination was initiated based on the potential that some wetlands within the project area could be isolated. Comments from Ohio EPA from the jurisdictional determination are included in the Project File > Ecological > Coordination. Comments from the



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

USACE have not been received at the writing of this document.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Other Resources

Farmlands

The proposed project is located within an Urbanized Area No

The proposed project is located within a Non-Urbanized Area Yes

The proposed project involves new permanent right-of-way (ROW) No

The proposed project involves temporary ROW No

The proposed project is a type of action listed below and meets allowable ROW thresholds: Yes
Bridge replacement requiring ROW of three (3) acres or less to accommodate bridge piers, wingwalls, and/or approach work
Widening requiring linear strip ROW of 10 acres or less per linear mile
Intersection improvement requiring ROW of three (3) acres or less

Based on the scope and type of work, the proposed project is in compliance with the executed Farmland Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the FPPA, and 7 CFR 658. Completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (FCIR) Form is not warranted. No further coordination is required.

FCIR Required Completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Form is required and coordination with USDA & NRCS is required.

Remarks:

Based upon review of appropriate mapping, the proposed Project is mainly located within an urbanized area zoned for non-agricultural purposes. A portion of the Project is located in a non-urbanized area or agricultural district. Based on the questions above, the proposed Project meets the terms and conditions of the *Memorandum of Understanding between the Natural Resource Conservation Service and the Ohio Department of Transportation for Projects Involving Farmlands (Agreement No. 19552)*, executed on March 15, 2016. No further coordination is required. Mapping can be found in the Project File under Other Resources/Farmlands.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

Drinking Water

The proposed project is wholly or partially located within the USEPA designated boundaries of a Sole Source Aquifer No

	Present:	Impacted:
The proposed project is wholly or partially located within the OEPA designated boundaries of a Source Water Protection Area	No	

Coordination with the Local Public Water Administrator is required No

	Present:	Impacted:
Residential Wells are present	Yes	No



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Remarks:

The Ohio EPA Division of Drinking and Ground Waters mapping was reviewed. No sole source aquifers or drinking water source protection areas for community or non-community were identified within and/or adjacent to the proposed Project area.

ODNR mapping and well logs were reviewed within the proposed Project area. Two (2) drinking water wells (126864 and 47675) were identified within the Project Area, however, based on current use of the locations as a roadway, they are presumed inactive. Should remnants of a well be encountered during construction, proper sealing and coordination will be performed.

Mapping can be found in the Project File under Other Resources > Drinking Water.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Section 4(f)

Section 4(f) Determination

Section 4(f) properties are within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area Yes

Concurrence received from the OWJ No

Why concurrence was not received There are no impacts proposed to any 4(f) resources.

	Present:	Impacted:
Publicly owned Park(s):	Yes	No
Publicly owned recreation facility(ies) and/or area(s):	Yes	No
Wildlife and Waterfowl refuge(s):	No	
Historic Site(s):	No	

Identified Section 4(f) Properties

Identified 4(f) Properties

Property Name	Type	Permanent ROW/Easement Acres	Temporary ROW/Easement Acres	4(f) finding	Date
Black River Reservation	Publicly owned Park	0	0	Present; Not Impacted	01/17/2024
Black River Bikeway/Bridge way Trail through Black River Reservation	Publicly owned Recreational Facility and/or Area	0	0	Present; Not Impacted	01/17/2024

Remarks:

As proposed, the Project will not have any impacts to Section 4(f) properties as work is fully within existing ODOT right of way.

The Lake Erie Crushers Minor League Baseball facility which is owned by the City of Avon is located adjacent to the project to the west just south of SR 611; however, since it functions primarily for commercial purposes and is fenced off, i.e., not open to the public, it is not considered a 4(f) property. Mapping can be found in Project Files under Section 4(f) > Project Information.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Section 6(f)

Section 6(f) Determination

Section 6(f) Determination

	Present:	Impacted:
6(f) Properties:	Yes	No

Identified 6(f) Properties

Property Name	Permanent ROW/Easement Acres	Temporary ROW/Easement Acres	6(f) finding	Date
Black River Reservation	0	0	No Impact	01/17/2024

Remarks:

Based on a review of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) list, one 6(f) property, the Black River Reservation, was identified adjacent to the proposed Project area. As proposed, the Project will have no impact on 6(f) properties as there is no work outside existing ODOT right of way. Mapping and a list of 6(f) properties within Lorain County can be found in Project Files under Section 6(f) > Project Information.

Are there any environmental commitments? No



Community Impacts

Community Impacts

Will the proposed action comply with the local/regional development patterns for the area? Yes

Remarks:

The proposed Project will comply with local/regional development patterns for the area established in planning studies or transportation plans developed by Lorain County Planning and Zoning, Lorain County Community Alliance, NOACA, Elyria, Sheffield and Avon including the NOACA Planning and Programming Packet (January 2024) and the NOACA Strategic Plan: Going Forward, Together (January 2015). No concerns were voiced during coordination with local agencies nor during public involvement.

Will the proposed action result in substantial negative impacts to community cohesion? No

Remarks:

The proposed Project is not anticipated to result in substantial negative impacts to community cohesiveness and no issues were raised during public involvement activities. The project may include positive results to community cohesion by decreasing congestion on IR90.

Will the proposed action result in indirect or cumulative impacts? No

Remarks:

Indirect and cumulative impacts of the proposed Project are expected to be minimal, because construction activities involve improvements to existing facilities within existing right-of-way. The project may include positive indirect and cumulative impacts by decreasing congestion on IR90.

Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts on health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle facilities? No

Remarks:

The proposed Project does not anticipate to having substantial negative impacts to health & education facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation, pedestrian, & bicycle facilities. The upgrade of existing design elements will benefit vehicular traffic, including emergency services and schools that use the corridor. During construction of the proposed Project, the potential exists for negative impacts on health & education facilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation. However, this is temporary during construction & can be minimized with early & ongoing communication & coordination with nearby facilities, services, institutions, & Lorain County Transit Greater concerning start & end dates of construction, partial closures, & detours. This has been made an environmental commitment.

Will the proposed action displace residents, businesses, institutions or farms? No

Remarks:

The proposed Project will not require any permanent or temporary right-of-way. No residences, businesses, institutions, or farms will be relocated.



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Will the proposed project result in impacts to Underrepresented Populations (Limited English Proficiency, Older Adults, or Adults with Disabilities) raised during Public Involvement?

No

Remarks:

As part of public involvement activities, outreach was conducted to engage Underrepresented Populations and obtain feedback/concerns associated with the proposed Project. No comments were received from Underrepresented Populations nor were concerns on any impacts to Underrepresented Populations brought up.

Are there any Environmental Commitments? Yes



Environmental Justice

Environmental Justice

Identified Environmental Justice Populations

Census Block Group #	% Minority	% Low Income
390930703001	0	15
390930702001	11	40
390930703002	27	14
390930702002	24	24
390930703004	34	60
390930701014	19	14
390930701023	29	38
390930281001	16	11
390930132003	20	9
390930132002	6	9

Are Environmental Justice Populations located within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area? Yes

Are there any relocations? No

Will there be changes to access? No

Will the proposed project result in unanticipated additional impacts to any Environmental Justice Populations? No

Were any concerns related to impacts on Environmental Justice Populations or any other unique factors that could result in a disproportionately high and adverse effect raised during public involvement? No

Remarks:

Based on data obtained using USEPA's EJSCREEN, a high percentage of minority and low-income populations were identified within or adjacent to the proposed Project. However, impacts to EJ populations are not anticipated due to the nature of work and activities being limited to the existing right-of-way of I-90. The Census mapping can be found in the Project File under Environmental Justice > Project Information > Census Mapping.

Are there any Environmental Commitments? No



Public Involvement

Public Involvement

Please provide a summary of the Public Involvement activities that have been conducted for this project. (For example press releases, letters to affected property owners and residents, meetings, special purpose meetings, newspaper articles, etc)

A virtual Stakeholder Meeting was held on March 4, 2022, to present information on the subject Project and encourage local involvement. Property Owner Notification Letters were sent on July 28, 2023, which included a Project Fact Sheet, a Public Comment Form, and a link to the Project's webpage. All public comments on the proposed Project received by August 28, 2023, were documented and responded to by ODOT staff.

Items prepared for public involvement or used during the Stakeholder meeting can be found in the Project File > Public Involvement > Project Information and include the following:

- Property Owner Notification Letter and Attachments
- Stakeholder Meeting Invite
- Stakeholder Meeting Presentation
- ODOT Website Release
- Public Comments Received.
- Response to Public Comments

Is there any substantial environmental controversy on environmental grounds?

No

Please summarize the Public Involvement responses received.

A total of 30 public comments were received by the conclusion of the public comment period on August 28, 2023. The following is a general overview of comments received:

- Support for the Project and proposed noise barriers from multiple residents.
- One comment was concerned about drainage in the Jungbluth Ditch during construction.
- One question asked about the height of the noise wall.

Comments and responses to comments are in the Project File > Public Involvement > Project Information > Public Comments Received.

Please see the Noise tab and Noise section of the Project File for more information on noise public involvement and noise walls.

Are there any Environmental Commitments? No



Permits

Waterway Permits

Are Waterway Permits required?	Yes
Is the Waterway Permits Determination Complete?	No
Army Corps of Engineers	
Regional General Permit (RGP):	No
Nationwide Permit (NWP):	No
Section 404 Individual Permit:	Yes
Section 10 Permit:	No
Ohio EPA	
Section 401 Water Quality Certification:	Yes
Level 1 General Isolated Wetland Permit:	No
Level 2 Individual Isolated Wetland Permit:	No
Level 3 individual Isolated Wetland Permit:	No
US Coast Guard	
Section 9 Coordination:	No
Section 9 Bridge Permit:	No
ODNR	
Shore Structure Permit :	No

Remarks:

TRC performed field reviews on July 31, August 1-4, 7-11, and 14-15, 2023 in which 32 wetlands and 34 streams were delineated. Overall worst-case impacts include 12.464 acres of wetlands and 11,126 linear feet of streams, which will be minimized as the project design is completed by the Design Build Contractor.

Due to the amount and magnitude of waterway impacts with the worst-case scenario, it is expected that an Individual 404 from the USACE and Individual 401 from the OEPA would be necessary; however, an OES Waterway Permits Unit (WPU) Permit Determination will be completed which will confirm waterway permitting requirements after impacts are minimized and Stage 2 design has been completed by the Design Build Contractor. All waterway permits must be obtained prior to the start of construction activities within waters of the U.S.

The USACE performed JD field reviews on May 3 and May 12, 2023 and the delineation was confirmed by the USACE in Preliminary JD correspondence dated August 23, 2024. Coordination with the USACE can be found in the Project File under Ecological/Coordination.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Storm Water Permits

NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI): Yes

Watershed Specific NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI): No

Remarks:

The proposed project will require soil excavation and earth disturbance activities in excess of one acre. The specifications set forth in the most current version of ODOT's Construction and Material Specifications, Location and Design Manual and Standard Drawings will be used to ensure adequate erosion and sediment controls are implemented during construction. Any disturbed areas will be seeded by the contractor. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan will be prepared, and a Notice of Intent will be submitted by the contractor to the OEPA.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

Floodplains

The proposed project involves encroachment within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Yes

EO 11988/NFIP Coordination and Documentation Completed No

NFIP Local Floodplain Coordinator Notification Date

Remarks:

Areas within the Project have Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) Zone A or AE present which are shown in the map in the Project File > Permits > Floodplains.

No impacts are anticipated to the floodplain associated within the Black River, as no work is proposed in this area. Floodplain coordination and permitting will be handled by the District 3 and the Design Build Contractor.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Environmental Commitments

General Project Information

- 1) The Design Build Contractor shall coordinate with utility companies during each stage of Project design.

Air

- 1) This project will minimize emissions while under construction by having the project traffic plans include detours and strategic construction timing (like night work) to continue moving traffic through the area and reduce backups to the traveling public to the extent possible. ODOT will seek to set up active construction areas, staging areas, and material transfer sites in a way that reduces standing wait times for equipment.

Noise

- 1) ODOT will not perform construction involving the use of power-operated equipment from [9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.] without the prior permission of the Project Engineer, including, but not limited to: front loaders, backhoes, dozers, tractors, scrapers, graders, pavers, roller compactors, slip form equipment, pavement planing equipment, dump trucks, concrete mixers, concrete pumps, cranes, compressors, generators, pumps, pile drivers, jack hammers, rock drills, pneumatic tools, saws, and vibrators.
- 2) The Designer Build Contractor will design and incorporate project specific noise wall designs, including the results of public involvement, into the plans in accordance with and approval from ODOT's Office of Environmental Services.
- 3) ODOT will ensure the noise walls were installed per plan.
- 4) ODOT will have a conference call with the noise wall designer prior to commencing noise wall construction. Design Build Contractor will provide all staged noise wall construction plans to the Office of Environmental Services for review and approval a minimum of 30 days prior to finalizing each staged review plan set.

RMR -

- 1) The Contractor must submit the OEPA Demolition/Renovation Form to the OEPA within 10 business days prior to demolition.

Ecological

- 1) Ensure impacts to the federally listed and protected Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat and the State listed and protected little brown bat and tricolored bat are avoided and minimized. Do not remove trees from April 1 through September 30. Perform all necessary tree removal from October 1 through March 31. Demarcate clearing limits in the field to avoid any unauthorized tree clearing. For the purposes of this note, a tree is defined as a live, dying, or dead woody plant, with a trunk three inches or greater in diameter at a height of 4.5 feet above the ground surface, and with a minimum height of 13 feet.
- 2) ODOT will subtract 10.66 acres of credits from the acreage credit available at the Sunday Creek Coal Company 2 Bat Conservation Area as mitigation for due to 6.09 acres of SWH being removed between 100 and 300 feet from the edge of pavement.
- 3) ODOT-OES will complete a plant survey for round-leaved dogwood (*Cornus rugosa*), Canada buffalo-berry (*Shepherdia canadensis*) and tower mustard (*Turritis glabra*) prior to earth disturbing activities.



Other Resources - Drinking Water

- 1) Should remnants of a drinking water well be encountered during construction, proper sealing and coordination will be performed by the Design Build Contractor.

Section 4(f)

- 1) The Design Build Contractor will incorporate the known boundary of the Black River Reservation and the Black River Bikeway/Bridgeway Trail within the project area in the plans and label it accordingly. No work shall be completed within the Black River Reservation on the Black River Bikeway/Bridgeway Trail by the Design Build Contractor.
- 2) The Design Build Contractor shall maintain safe public access to the Black River Reservation and Black River Bikeway/Bridgeway Trail at all times throughout construction activities.

Community Impacts

- 1) The Design Build Contractor and ODOT will continue early and ongoing communication and coordination with nearby public facilities, services, institutions, & Lorain County Transit Greater concerning start & end dates of construction, partial closures, & detours.

Permits - Waterway Permits

- 1) ODOT will obtain all appropriate waterway permits and mitigation prior to any work within the jurisdictional boundary of any waterway, including wetlands, and all Waterway Permit Special Provisions will be included in the plans and adhered to throughout construction.
- 2) Do not perform any work within the jurisdictional boundaries of any waterway, including wetlands, until ODOT obtains the necessary waterway permit(s). Work includes the placement of any temporary or permanent fills.
- 3) Aquatic resources adjacent to the project will be indicated on the plans, and the Contractor shall demarcate all aquatic resources in the field per SS 832 and the Waterway Permits Special Provisions. Areas marked for avoidance will not be impacted. In riparian areas, only the minimum amount of vegetated buffer necessary for work will be removed. Temporary and permanent fill materials will consist of suitable materials (excluding broken asphalt) free from toxic contaminants in other than trace quantities. Chromated Copper Arsenate and other pressure treated lumber shall not be used in structures placed within aquatic resources. An oil spill kit shall be located within 150 feet on any equipment working in an aquatic resource and shall be maintained for the life of the project.

Permits - Floodplains

- 1) ODOT will self-permit the floodplain permit or documentation of exemption prior to the start of construction.



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Preparers and Approvals

Form Preparer:

Stacy Schimmoeller
TRC (use this one)
1382 West Ninth Street, Suite 400, Cleveland OH 44113
419-701-8188
SSchimmoeller@trccompanies.com

Supporting Form Preparer(s):

Jenna Slabe

Approvals & Electronic Signatures

Approved & Electronically Signed By:	Approval Date:
Donald Rostofer (ADM OFF 2)	2/27/2024



Appendix

ESA

Asbestos Mapping.pdf

Project Related OES Decision - ESA.pdf

General

Aerial Map.pdf

County Map.pdf

USGS Quadrangle Topographical Map.pdf

Alternatives

Feasibility Study.pdf

Air

Coordination with OEPA - Qualitative MSAT.pdf

FHWA Approval - PM2.5.pdf

FHWA Comments - PM 2.5.pdf

PM 2.5 Information Coordination Package.pdf

Qualitative MSAT Analysis.pdf

Noise

Noise Study Area Mapping.pdf

OES Approval - Noise Analysis.pdf

OES Approval - Noise Public Involvement Summary Report.pdf

Cultural Resources

Minimal Potential to Cause Effect - Appendix B

Records Check.pdf

Ecological

Appendices LOR-90-10.76.pdf

Coordination to USFWS - Consultation Form email.pdf

Coordination with ODNR - ESR coordination email.pdf

ODNR Comments

ODNR Scenic River MOA Conditions

USFWS/ODNR Ecological MOA Conditions



Environmental Document Level: D1

PID 107714 LOR IR 0090 10.76

Approved: 2/27/2024

Other Resources

Sole Source Aquifer Mapping.pdf

Water Source Protection Area and Wells Map.pdf

Well Log Data.pdf

Section 4(f)

Section 4(f) Map.pdf

Section 6(f)

Section 6(f) Map.pdf

Environmental Justice

Census Mapping.pdf

Public Involvement

ODOT Website Release - Project Card Posting.pdf

Property Owner Notification Letter Attachments.pdf

Property Owner Notification Letter Mailing List.pdf

Property Owner Notification Letter.pdf

Public Comments Received.pdf

Response to Public Comments.pdf

Stakeholder Attendance List, 3-4-2022.pdf

Stakeholder Meeting Invite - Online Meeting.pdf

Stakeholder Presentation, 3-4-2022.pdf

Permits

FEMA FIRM.pdf