

Project Initiation Package

Instructions

- The Project Initiation Package is intended to focus on critical issues that can be identified with existing information from secondary sources and/or identified during a site visit.
- Each specialty area of the Project Initiation Package should be completed by individuals who possess sufficient experience to enable them to correctly identify and evaluate issues arising from the field review.
- In the Location/Comments field provide information concerning potential impacts that is brief, but gives enough detail to allow an understanding of the issue(s).
- The scope of services document should account for any issues identified in the Project Initiation Package that have the potential to affect scope, schedule, and budget.
- A list of resources/subject areas that may need to be consulted for the secondary source review in order to complete this form can be found on this form, in the [PDP Manual](#) (in the Planning Phase, Preliminary Engineering Phase, and Environmental Engineering Phase chapters; and in Appendix C), and in some of the manuals on the [DRRC website](#).

Project Initiation Package Deliverables

Provide an expanded Study Area Map identifying project design, utility, right of way and environmental constraints identified through the Project Initiation Package. Tables, USGS and/or aerial mapping, photographs keyed to available project mapping, the plan to inform and involve the public, and other support material should also be submitted with the Project Initiation Package to illustrate specific problem areas.

General

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Date(s) of field review: | |
|---------------------------------|--|

| | | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Project Name (County, Route, Section): | MAH-170-4.35 | PID: | 103854 |
| Date Project Initiation Package Completed: | | Prepared By: | Douglas Yard |
| City, Township or Village Name(s): | New Middleton | ODOT Project Manager: | Ron Spano/Arthur G Noirot |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Project Description: | Pavement and curb replacement including drainage system upgrade and access management implementation. |
|-----------------------------|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| Project Limits/Study Area/General Location: | From E. Calla Rd. to 500' south of E. Middletown Rd. |
|--|--|

| ODOT DISCIPLINE INVOLVEMENT: | | |
|---|-------------------------|---------------------|
| <i>List name and phone number of individual(s) representing each discipline during the site visit and preparation of the Project Initiation Package. One individual may represent multiple disciplines.</i> | | |
| DISCIPLINE | NAME | PHONE NUMBER |
| District Highway Management representative | <i>Joseph Maslach</i> | <i>330-533-4351</i> |
| District Planning and Engineering representative | <i>John Picuri</i> | <i>330-786-4804</i> |
| District Environmental Coordinator | <i>Edward Deley Jr.</i> | <i>330-786-4930</i> |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Project Initiation Package

EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

Indicate external agency involvement during identification of project issues affecting scope development. List the name and phone number of individual(s) representing each agency during the site visit.

| AGENCY | NAME | PHONE NUMBER |
|------------------------|---|--------------|
| FHWA Engineer*** | | |
| Other (LPA, MPO, etc.) | Village of New Middletown: Mayor Harry Kale | 330-542-0165 |
| | | |

***** The FHWA Engineer should be invited on projects expected to require approval from Federal Highway Administration.**

GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Legal Speed: | 35mph, Part of project posted at 25mph |
| Design Speed: | 40mph |
| Opening Year ADT: | |
| Design Year ADT: | |
| Trucks (24 Hour B&C): | |
| Functional Classification: | Minor Arterial, Major Collector |
| Locale (Rural or Urban): | Urban |
| National Highway System (NHS): | No |

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS: Joseph Maslach

List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.

For the past 14 years after every resurfacing project the pavement starts to fail, the subbase that is made-up of brick continues to move do to the heavy truck traffic in this area. In past years with core samples it was found the subbase is in question. We suggest – recommend to perform the same treatment as what was performed on SR 170 & 617 in Petersburg approx.. 8 years ago – the total subbase removed – new subbase was installed – 8-10” of asphalt was installed with approx. 10-12” of a concrete top surface.

CRASH DATA: Dave Griffith

| | |
|---|----|
| Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years | No |
| Project is highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps | No |
| <i>Based on a spatial query (using GCAT or TIMS) of the three most recent years of crash data, briefly summarize crash history. Indicate any design features that may be contributing to the observed crash pattern that may be addressed by the project.</i> | |
| 2013-2015 crash data shows only 7 crashes occurring within the project limits. No significant crash frequencies or patterns exhibited in the CAMTool analysis | |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: Sean Carpenter

Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources will be affected by the proposed project. Include the location and any other pertinent information for resources that may be affected.

| Resource/Feature | Location/Comments |
|---|---|
| Parkland, nature preserves and wildlife areas {4(f)/6(f)} | No parkland, nature preserves or wildlife areas are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Scenic River | No state or national scenic rivers are located within 1,000 feet of the proposed bridge project. |

Project Initiation Package

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: Sean Carpenter | |
|--|--|
| <i>Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources will be affected by the proposed project. Include the location and any other pertinent information for resources that may be affected.</i> | |
| Resource/Feature | Location/Comments |
| Public Facilities | Multiple public facilities are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat | Based on review of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Database by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no known federally listed species are known within one (1) mile of the proposed project. Additionally, no known state listed animal or plant species are known within one (1) mile or ½ mile of the proposed project. |
| Existing wet areas /existing cattails/wetlands | Based on review of available wetland mapping and field reconnaissance survey of the project study area conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 18, 2017, no wetlands are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch | Based on review of available mapping and field reconnaissance survey of the proposed project conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 18, 2017, multiple streams, ditches, etc., were identified in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects) | Based on a review of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) Electronic Mapping by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no known historic resources (buildings, structures, objects, etc.,) are located in proximity to the proposed project, however, there a multiple buildings/structures >50 years located in proximity to the proposed project and will require further evaluation. |
| Historic Bridge(s) | Based on a review of the OHPO Electronic Mapping by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no known historic bridges are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| National Historic Landmarks | Based on a review of the OHPO Electronic Mapping by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no known National Historic Landmarks are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Archaeological Sites | Based on a review of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office Electronic Mapping by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no known Ohio Archaeological Inventory (OAI) sites are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries) | Based on a review of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) Electronic Mapping by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no known Ohio Genealogical Society (OGS) cemeteries are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Farmland | Based on a review of the available mapping and field reconnaissance survey of the proposed project conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 18, 2017, no active farmlands are located in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area | The proposed project is not within a Watershed Specific NPDES Permit Area. |

Project Initiation Package

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: Sean Carpenter | |
|--|---|
| <i>Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources will be affected by the proposed project. Include the location and any other pertinent information for resources that may be affected.</i> | |
| Resource/Feature | Location/Comments |
| Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns | <p>This project does not add capacity, a new interchange or a new road on new alignment. Hence, this project will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of the existing facility or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions impacts relative to the No-Build Alternative. As such, FHWA has determined that this project will generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. Consequently, this project is exempt from analysis for MSATs.</p> <p>Mahoning County is not in a PM2.5 non-attainment or maintenance area. Therefore, a PM2.5 analysis is not required for this project.</p> <p>The entire state of Ohio is in attainment for carbon monoxide, hence, no carbon monoxide analysis is required for this project.</p> <p>The proposed project is located in Mahoning County which is an ozone attainment area.</p> |
| Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials | Based on review of available environmental databases and field reconnaissance survey of the proposed project conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 18, 2017, multiple suspect commercial sites were identified in proximity to the proposed project and will require further evaluation. |
| Sensitive environmental justice areas | The proposed project will have no disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations. |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains | A review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) 39099C0335D and 39099C0360D effective November 18, 2009, by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel indicated the entire proposed project is located within a Zone X-Area of Minimal Flooding. Therefore, the proposed project will not impact any regulated flood plains or require coordination with the local flood plain administrator. |
| Lake Erie Coastal Management Area | The proposed bridge project is not within the Lake Erie Coastal Management Area. |
| Sole Source Aquifers | Based on review of the OhioEPA, Division of Drinking and Ground Waters, Source Water Assessment and Protection Program by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017. The proposed widening project is not within a Federally-designated Sole Source Aquifer area. |
| Wellhead Protection Areas | The Ohio EPA Drinking Water Source Protection Area maps were reviewed by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017. The proposed project is not within one (1) mile of a public water system well, intake or source water protection area. |

Project Initiation Package

| ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: Sean Carpenter | |
|---|--|
| <i>Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources will be affected by the proposed project. Include the location and any other pertinent information for resources that may be affected.</i> | |
| Resource/Feature | Location/Comments |
| Noise abatement issues | The project is not a Type I project for noise, i.e. will not cause an increase in traffic volumes, will not substantially change the vehicle mix or speed, will not involve new roadways or substantially change the alignments or shielding effects of the existing roadway. Therefore, this project is deemed unrelated to increased traffic noise traffic. In accordance with the ODOT 2013 Noise Manual, a traffic noise analysis is not required for this project. |
| Other environmental issues | Based on the field reconnaissance survey conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no other environmental issues were identified in proximity to the proposed project. |

| GEOMETRIC ISSUES: Dan Depto | |
|--|---|
| <i>Use the design speed, design functional classification and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project. Compare these requirements to crash data and impacts if deviations from standard are being considered.</i> | |
| Design Feature | Location/Comments |
| Lane Width | 11' min. |
| Graded Shoulder Width | 12' (6:1 or steeper foreslopes); 8' (6:1 or flatter foreslopes); 1-2' curbed shoulder |
| Bridge Width | N/A |
| Horizontal Alignment (including Excessive Deflections, Degree of Curve, Transition/Taper Rates, Intersection Angles, etc.) | As per Volume 1 of the Location and Design Manual. |
| Vertical Alignment (including grade breaks) | As per Volume 1 of the Location and Design Manual. |
| Grades | 7.0% max. ; 0.5% min (with curb) |
| Stopping Sight Distance | 305' |
| Pavement Cross Slopes | 0.016 (0.02 may be considered to improve drainage) |
| Superelevation (Maximum rate, transition, position) | As per Volume 1 of the Location and Design manual |
| Horizontal Clearance | 4.0' lateral clearance in curbed section. |
| Vertical Clearance | N/A |

| GEOMETRIC ISSUES: | |
|--|---|
| <i>Indicate if the following geometric issues are present or should be considered during project development. Consider work on the mainline as well as any side roads or service roads. Provide additional comments as needed.</i> | |
| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
| Does intersection sight distance need to be improved? | Possibly at Struthers Road. Consultant to verify the intersection site distance at all intersections. |
| Are there geometric issues that may affect traffic safety? <i>Describe.</i> | None apparent. Consultant to advise of any. |
| List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone. | None apparent. Consultant to advise if any. |
| Should existing access control be revised to improve safety? | Yes. 10344 Y-town –Pitt Road; Jim’s Village Motors; Potosino’s Mexican Grill; Carolina Cane Co.; Terry’s; ATV World; George’s Party Pak and vacant gas station at corner of SR 170/E. Middle town Road. |
| Are there any drive locations that will require special | Springfield Elementary School; New Middletown Fire Station; |

Project Initiation Package

| GEOMETRIC ISSUES: Dan Depto | |
|--|--|
| Use the design speed, design functional classification and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project. Compare these requirements to crash data and impacts if deviations from standard are being considered. | |
| attention during design (e.g., very steep grades, high volume commercial drives, drives close to bridges or intersections)? | Sunoco and Shell Gas Stations. |
| Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified to accommodate turning movements of large trucks? | Consultant to investigate and advise if any. |
| Does grading need to be upgraded? To what criteria (e.g., clear zone, safety, standard)? Consider potential right of way and other impacts when considering grading method. | Providing an uncurbed section will require a large footprint. Consider curbing the entire project. |
| <i>If constructing a new roadway, will it be a connection between two existing NHS Routes?</i> | (Yes/No) |
| Are there any other geometric issues? Describe | None Apparent. Consultant to advise if any. |

| GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES: Tom Powell | |
|---|--|
| Based on the information compiled during this study indicate whether or not the following geotechnical issues are present or should be further considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. | |
| Design Issues | Location/Comments |
| Is there evidence of soil drainage problems (e.g., wet or pumping subgrade, standing water, the presence of seeps, wetlands, swamps, bogs)? | N/A |
| Will construction be impacted based on the groundwater table? | N/A |
| Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)? | N/A |
| Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or rock)? | N/A |
| Is there evidence of unsuitable materials (e.g., presence of debris or man-made fills or waste pits containing these materials, indications from old soil borings)? | N/A |
| Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)? | N/A |
| Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines? Evidence of quarries? | None on the ODNR Mine Maps within the Project Limits |
| Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines? | None on the ODNR Mine Maps within the Project Limits |
| Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area? | N/A |
| Are there any other geotechnical issues? Specify. | N/A |

Project Initiation Package

PAVEMENT ISSUES: Doug Yard

Indicate if the following pavement issues are present or should be considered during project development. Side road and service road work should be considered in this assessment. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
|---|-------------------|
| Do dynaflect tests indicate the existing pavement is in poor condition? | N/A |
| Are joint repairs needed? | N/A |
| Are pressure relief joints needed? | N/A |
| Does curb need to be replaced due to deteriorated condition or lack of curb reveal? | YES |
| Has the site received repeated resurfacings in recent years? | YES |
| Does pavement deterioration appear to be caused by drainage or geotechnical problems? | YES |
| Are there any other pavement issues? <i>Specify.</i> | NO |

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: N/A

Indicate if the following structure issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. The Bridge Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide a separate table for each structure.

| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
|---|-------------------|
| Structure Number: | |
| Is it possible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box? | |
| Is the deck delaminated? <i>Specify.</i> | |
| Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the amount of delamination? | |
| Are there areas to be patched/repared on the deck? | |
| Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? <i>Specify type of overlay if known.</i> | |
| Does the bridge rail violate current standards? | |
| Is fatigue analysis required? | |
| Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? <i>Specify.</i> | |
| Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)? | |
| Is elimination of the deck joint possible? What modifications are necessary? | |
| Is it possible for the hinges to be removed to make the members continuous? | |
| Is there any evidence that the bridge does not meet hydraulic capacity? | |
| Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the bridge? | |
| Is Vandal Protection Fencing required in accordance with the BDM? | |
| Will the structure work require any special maintenance of traffic (e.g., closing of roadway for erection of beams, maintenance of waterway traffic, location of cut line, etc.)? <i>Specify.</i> | |
| Does the bridge need to accommodate future roadway lanes or railroad tracks? | |

Project Initiation Package

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: N/A

Indicate if the following structure issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. The Bridge Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide a separate table for each structure.

| Structure Number: | |
|--|-------------------|
| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
| Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad? | |
| Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.). | |
| Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.). | |
| Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.). | |
| Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.) | |
| Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.) | |
| Are there any other structure related issues? <i>Specify.</i> | |

HYDRAULIC ISSUES: **Dayna Mallas & Robert Rosen**

Indicate if the following drainage issues are present or should be considered during project development. Side road and service road work should be considered in this assessment. Any available Culvert Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Design Issue | Comments |
|--|--|
| Does the existing drainage system appear to be appropriately sized and functioning properly? <i>Describe deficiencies.</i> | To be determined. Consultant to video tape existing storm system and provide Inlet Spacing & Storm Sewer calculations. |
| Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets? | No. |
| Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes? | No. |
| Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)? | Yes. Propose new curb. |
| Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)? | Possibly. Investigate if the outfall elevation has enough depth available to provide positive flow for new storm system. |
| Will channel relocation be required? | Possibly. |
| Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities? | Yes. If EDA (Earth Disturbed Area) is greater than 1 acre, then BMP's required. Refer to Section 1115 of L&D Volume 2. |
| Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly? | Unknown. Consultant to determine. |
| Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations? | Possibly. |
| Are there any other hydraulic issues? <i>Describe.</i> | Possibly. |

TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES: **Lisa Bose, Joe DeFuria, Ken Greene**

Project Initiation Package

| Indicate if the following traffic control (signals, signing, pavement markings, etc.) issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. | |
|--|--|
| Design Issue | Comments |
| Are there any obvious deviations from requirements of the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD)? | No [lb] |
| Will coordination with Ohio Rail Development Commission (ORDC) be required (i.e. at-grade railroad crossings located within 400' of an intersection within the project area)? | N/A [lb] |
| Does this project affect or contain any ITS elements? | No [lb] |
| Will pavement widening affect pole locations? | Possible, if pavement is replaced and intersection radii improved [lb] |
| Will resurfacing affect signal height? | Possible, if pavement is replaced [lb] |
| Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)? | No [lb] |
| Are there any crashes that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of protected turn phase)? | |
| Are new or updated curb ramps needed? | If curb is re-established at intersection radii |
| Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity? | N/A |
| Does the controller need to be upgraded? | |
| Do proprietary materials need to be specified? | No [lb] |
| Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting? | No [lb] |
| Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present? | No [lb] |
| If traffic control at an intersection is being changed from stop control to signalization, does the stop condition road need to be upgraded to accommodate faster traffic? | |
| Are there any other traffic control issues? <i>Specify.</i> | ODOT signal at 630/Calla Rd: loop detector may need replaced. (kjg). |

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: Mike Simpkins

Briefly describe the maintenance of traffic and any constraints. A list of considerations has been provided below.

Maintenance of Traffic Considerations: Limits on traffic detour (including local alternate detours) due to load limits, bridge width restrictions, shoulder condition, emergency vehicle impact, temporary pavement requirements, speed limit during construction, pedestrian traffic, additional width at culverts, drive access, stopping sight distance, construction access, right of way acquisition, permitted lane closures, cross-overs, short duration road closures, temporary structure requirements, additional signal heads (drives and/or side roads), construction timeframe issues, innovative contracting, maintaining railroad traffic, turn movement restrictions

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC DESCRIPTION:

SR 170 shall be detoured for the reconstruction. The reconstruction shall be broken into multiple segments. New Middletown Road to Struthers road is segment 1. Struthers Road to Sycamore Drive would be segment 2. Sycamore Drive to E. Calla Road would be segment 3. Access to the properties must be maintained at all times. Segment 2, which involves the school, shall not be constructed while school is in session. Detour shall be SR 617 to SR 165 to SR 7 to US 224 to SR 170. Night work will be prohibited due to residential nature of the adjacent properties.

RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES: Tim Ward

Indicate if right of way or survey issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
|---|---|
| Will there be any work beyond the existing right of way limits? | Possible. Depending on grading behind proposed curbing. |
| Will relocation of residences be involved? | No. |
| Will relocation of businesses be involved? | No. |
| Will the project require modifying the access control to any properties? | If access management is being applied modifying access to some properties is possible. |
| Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)? | These are potential encroachments. Village of New Middletown sign. Clemente Funeral entrance/exit signs. Custom Carpentry Service sign. McQuaid's sign. Jim's Village Motor's |
| Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)? | Possible. Depending on grading needed beyond proposed curbing. |
| Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations? | Possible. Proposed drainage system design may cause utility relocation and the need for right of way. |
| Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns. | None at this time. |
| Are work agreements prohibited for any reason? | No. work agreements are for work that can be non-performed. |
| Are there any other right of way or survey issues? Specify. | None at this time. |

UTILITY ISSUES: Steven Sasala

Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
|--|--|
| Do existing utilities need to be relocated? <i>If so, please identify.</i> | Potentially yes. Depending on the width of the new lanes Utility poles will need moved back which include power and tele cables. |
| Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Level A? | Yes |
| Are there existing utilities on an existing structure that need to be relocated? | N/A |

Project Initiation Package

UTILITY ISSUES: Steven Sasala

Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
|--|--|
| Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? <i>Specify.</i> | N/A |
| Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract? | Undetermined at this time. The SUE investigation will confirm which utilities are in the project limits. |
| Are there any other utility issues? <i>Specify.</i> | N/A |

Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues: Christine Surma

Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
|--|-------------------|
| Does sidewalk need to be replaced or installed? | No |
| Does a bike lane need to be replaced or installed? | No |
| Is the project in the vicinity of a heavily traveled bicycle or pedestrian corridor? | No |
| Is the project located on a designated or proposed bike route? | No |
| Has a Safe Routes to School - School Travel Plan been completed within the project area? | No |

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES: Doug Yard

Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Design Issue | Location/Comments |
|---|-------------------|
| Will any of the construction activity take place over, under, or near railroad property? | No |
| Could material with long lead times for delivery have an impact on the construction schedule (e.g., strain poles, large box culverts, steel beams, etc.)? | No |
| Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)? | No |
| Are there any other project concerns? <i>Specify</i> | No |

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES: Sean Carpenter

Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

| Issue | Location/Comments |
|--|--|
| Will an individual Corps of Engineers/ Environmental Protection Agency 404/401 permit be required? | No. |
| Will a Coast Guard permit be required? | No Section 9 Waterways are in proximity to the proposed project. |
| Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? <i>Specify.</i> | Yes. Village of New Middletown. |

Project Initiation Package

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES: Sean Carpenter

Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

| | |
|--|--|
| Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required? | Based on a review of the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) Electronic Mapping by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel on April 21, 2017, no known historic resources (buildings, structures, objects, bridges, etc.,) are located in proximity to the proposed project, however, there a multiple buildings/structures >50 years located in proximity to the proposed project and will require further evaluation and potentially coordination with SHPO. |
| Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required? | No state scenic rivers, wildlife areas or recreational areas are located in proximity to the proposed bridge project. |
| Is coordination with any other agency required? | Potentially. |

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

Based on the responses to the above items, do any of the following need to be modified?

| Issue | Comments |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| Conceptual scope | |
| Work limits | |
| Probable environmental document type | |
| Project Path classification | |
| Schedule | |
| Budget | |