

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.
- In some instances, resources/subject areas that may need to be consulted for the secondary source review are identified on this form.

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:	N/A
---------------------------------	-----

Project Name (County, Route, Section):	DEF-15/18-12.04/22.30	PID:	121294
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:		Prepared By:	District 1 Staff
City, Township or Village Name(s):	Noble Township	ODOT Project Manager:	Travis McKibben

Project Description:	Construction of a roundabout at the intersection of SR 15 and SR 18 in Defiance County.
-----------------------------	---

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:	Intersection of SR 15 and SR 18 in Defiance County. Limits to be determined by design consultant.
--	---

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
Review	Rob White - Capital Programs Administrator	419-999-6901
Review	Adam Francis - District Planning Engineer	419-999-6859
Review	Eric Scheckelhoff - District Design Engineer	419-999-6879
Highway Management Concerns	Rod Nuvevan - Highway Management Administrator	419-999-6891
Crash Data, MOT	Hailey Robey - District Traffic and Safety Engineer	419-999-6887
TSMO	Derrick Schierloh - District Traffic Operations Engineer	419-999-6857

Project Initiation Package

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
<i>Environmental Issues/Agency Coordination/Permit Issues</i>	<i>Nate Tessler - District Environmental Coordinator</i>	<i>419-999-6886</i>
<i>Geotechnical Issues</i>	<i>Kristopher Osterhage - District Geotechnical Engineer</i>	<i>419-999-6872</i>
<i>Pavement Issues</i>	<i>Mark Brunet - District Pavement Engineer</i>	<i>419-999-6852</i>
<i>Structural Issues</i>	<i>Mark Limbaugh - District Bridge and Culvert Engineer</i>	<i>419-999-6919</i>
<i>Hydraulic Issues</i>	<i>Dillon Flick - District Hydraulics Engineer</i>	<i>419-999-6871</i>
<i>Traffic Control</i>	<i>Derrick Schierloh - District Roadway Services Manager</i>	<i>419-999-6857</i>
<i>Right of Way</i>	<i>Shell Miller - District Real Estate Administrator</i>	<i>419-999-6876</i>
<i>Survey Issues</i>	<i>Sara Morrisey - District Survey Operations Manager</i>	<i>419-999-6921</i>
<i>Utility Issues</i>	<i>Matt Pickering - District Utility Relocation/ROW Permit Technician</i>	<i>419-549-6587</i>
<i>Pedestrian & Bicycle Issues</i>	<i>Hailey Robey - District Bikeway Coordinator</i>	<i>419-999-6887</i>
<i>General/External Agency Involvement/Existing Information</i>	<i>Justin Niese - Scoping Coordinator</i>	<i>419-789-1977</i>
<i>Geometric Design</i>	<i>Mark Mueller – District Geometric Design Engineer</i>	<i>419-999-6889</i>
<i>Miscellaneous Issues</i>	<i>Travis McKibben – Project Manager</i>	<i>419-999-6841</i>
<i>Construction Issues</i>	<i>Dan Niese – District Construction Engineer</i>	<i>419-999-6903</i>
EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:		
<i>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.</i>		
AGENCY	NAME	PHONE NUMBER
*** The FHWA Engineer should be invited on projects expected to require approval from Federal Highway Administration.		

GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION: <i>Hailey Robey</i>	
Legal Speed:	55 mph / Curve Advisory Speed: 30 mph
Design Speed:	60 mph
Opening Year ADT:	9,300
Design Year ADT:	10,000
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	8%
Functional Classification:	Major Collector
Locale (Rural or Urban):	Rural
National Highway System (NHS):	No

LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION: <i>Justin Niese</i>

Project Initiation Package

Briefly describe local planning studies, bike/ped long range plans, aesthetics, etc. that will be considered throughout project development:

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS: *Rod Nuvevan - Derrick Schierloh*

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

There is a high-pressure pipeline located just east of the intersection which will have to be accounted for in the design. The drainage is substandard in the entire area but especially on the east side. We may have to go outside traditional project limits to find a suitable outlet.

CRASH DATA: *Hailey Robey*

Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years (Yes/No)

Is the project area highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps (Yes/No)

Based on a spatial query (using GCAT or TIMS) of the three most recent years of crash data, briefly summarize crash history including pedestrian and bicycle crashes. Indicate any design features that may be contributing to the observed crash pattern that may be addressed by the project.

A 5-year period of crashes was analyzed from 2018-2022. There were 21 reported crashes. Of the 21, 10 were fixed object, 5 were rear end, 2 were sideswipe, 1 was head on, 1 was angle, 1 was overturning, and 1 was non-collision. These resulted in 4 serious injury crashes, 4 other injury crashes, and 13 property damage only crashes for a 38% injury rate. The proposed roundabout addresses the most prevalent crash type, fixed object. Lower entering and exiting speeds as well as better approach geometry is expected to reduce the occurrence of run off the road crashes.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: *Nate Tessler*

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)}	Yes – south of SR 18 is the 250-acre Thoreau Wildlife Reserve. This wildlife reserve is open to the public and subject to Section 4(f) protections. Impacts to this area should be avoided.
Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat	None likely adjacent to the roadway.
Scenic River	No.
Existing wet areas /existing cattails/wetlands	None likely.
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	No.
Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects)	None.
Historic Bridge(s)	None.
National Historic Landmarks	None.
Archaeological Sites	None likely.
Public Facilities	None.
Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries)	None.
Farmland	Present, but impacts are not significant.
Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area	None.
Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns	None.

Project Initiation Package

Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials	Northwestern quadrant of intersection (now vacant) was formerly the Defiance Transmission Shop. U.S. EPA identifies this site as a RCRA site that formerly housed/produced hazardous waste. Soil testing may be warranted during environmental studies.
Sensitive environmental justice areas	No impacts anticipated.
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains	None.
Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	None.
Sole Source Aquifers	None.
Wellhead Protection Areas	If any are present, coordination will occur during project development.
Noise abatement issues	None.
Coordination with Conservancy Districts	Land use southwest of intersection should be reviewed by Real Estate team.
Other environmental issues	Increased public involvement may be warranted at the discretion of the District. The initial plan is for a press release only.

GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA: <i>Mark Mueller</i>	
<i>Consider design speed, design functional classification, land use, and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project and potential for design exceptions. Note exceptions for low volume roadways.</i>	
Design Criteria	Location/Comments
Lane Width	12' due to trucks and agricultural equipment
Shoulder Width	10' graded width without barrier and foreslope steeper than 6:1 8' graded width without barrier and foreslope 6:1 or flatter
Horizontal Curve Radius	For 60 mph: 1207' Use curves as necessary to reduce speeds entering the roundabout per L&D 403.
Maximum Grade	5%
Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)	570'
Superelevation Rate	8% max. Refer to L&D 403.4.1 for superelevation on high-speed approaches to roundabouts.
Vertical Clearance	16.5'
Pavement Cross Slope	0.016
Design Loading Structural Capacity	N/A

OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES: <i>Mark Mueller</i>	
<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 Issues	Location/Comments
Does the horizontal alignment have an excessive deflection?	Yes, the SR-15 alignment has a curve that is signed with a 30 mph advisory sign.
Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards?	No, the intersections of SR-15/T-1583 and of SR-15/SR-18 are highly skewed
Is driver comfort an issue due to the vertical curvature or breaks in the grade?	No

Project Initiation Package

OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES: Mark Mueller	
<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 Issues	Location/Comments
Does the shoulder width on a structure allow for a minimum width of 4' from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier?	NA
Has a minimum width of 4' from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier?	NA
Does intersection sight distance need to be improved?	No
List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone.	Utility poles
Should existing access control be revised to improve safety?	Yes, access to Culligan Water should be defined.
Are there any drive locations that will require special attention during design (e.g., very steep grades, high volume commercial drives, drives close to bridges or intersections)?	Depending on the location of the roundabout, the drive for Culligan Water could be within the limits of the splitter island.
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified to improve pedestrian crossing safety?	NA. No existing pedestrian crossings.
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified or truck aprons added to accommodate turning movements of large trucks?	No
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.	The proposed grading should meet standard grading as a minimum.
Are new or updated curb ramps needed? Refer to the Curb Ramp Measuring Guide	No. There are currently no pedestrian facilities.
If constructing a new roadway, will it be a connection between two existing NHS Routes?	NA
If traffic control at an intersection is being changed from stop control to signalization, does the profile of the stop condition road need to be upgraded to accommodate faster traffic?	NA
<i>Are there any other geometric issues? Describe.</i>	No

Project Initiation Package

GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES: <i>Kristopher Osterhage</i>	
<i>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. Refer to Section 302.2 of the ODOT Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations for literature search resources.</i>	
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)?	No
Will construction be impacted based on the groundwater table?	No
Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)?	No
Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or rock)?	No
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)?	No
Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)?	No
Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines? Evidence of quarries?	No
Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines?	No
Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area?	No
Are there any other geotechnical issues? <i>Specify.</i>	No

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

Project Initiation Package

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: <i>Mark Limbaugh</i>	
<i>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.</i>	
Structure Number: N/A	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Is it possible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box?	N/A
Is the deck delaminated? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A
Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the Amount of delamination?	N/A
Are there areas to be patched/repared on the deck?	N/A
Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? <i>Specify type of overlay if known.</i>	N/A
Does the bridge rail violate current standards?	N/A
Is fatigue analysis required?	N/A
Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A
Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)?	N/A
Is elimination of the deck joint possible? What modifications are necessary?	N/A
Is it possible for the hinges to be removed to make the members continuous?	N/A
Is there any evidence that the bridge does not meet hydraulic capacity?	N/A
Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the bridge?	N/A
Is Vandal Protection Fencing required in accordance with the BDM?	N/A
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>	N/A
Does the bridge need to accommodate future roadway lanes, bicycle lanes, a shared use path, shoulder, or railroad tracks?	N/A
Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad?	N/A
Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.).	N/A
Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.).	N/A
Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.).	N/A
Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.)	N/A
Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.)	N/A

Project Initiation Package

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: <i>Mark Limbaugh</i>	
<i>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.</i>	
Structure Number: N/A	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Are there any other structure related issues? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A
HYDRAULIC ISSUES: <i>Dillon Flick</i>	
<i>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.</i>	
Design Issue	Comments
Does the existing drainage system appear to be appropriately sized and functioning properly? <i>Describe deficiencies.</i>	Yes
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)?	No
Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)?	Potentially
Will channel relocation be required?	No
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	Potentially
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	Yes
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	No
Are there any other hydraulic issues? <i>Describe.</i>	No

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: <i>Derrick Schierloh</i>	
Briefly describe the opportunities for managing congestion or traffic issues using TSMO strategies or improvements. Consider opportunities to upgrade or install systems management and operations infrastructure:	
<i>TSMO infrastructure</i> includes communications equipment, travel time signs, signals, changeable message signs, traffic cameras, traffic signal systems, other remote field devices and data collection equipment, conduit and any supporting fiber optics. TOAST is the Traffic Operations Assessment System Tool For additional TSMO information see http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Traffic/miscellaneous/Pages/TSMO.aspx	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Does the project area contain a Hot Spot identified in TOAST? If so, what is the TOAST ranking?	Yes; The area was submitted as a TOAST study on 1/2/2024. A score of 79.5% ranked this as the 92 nd of 333 urban, non-freeway segments. A feasibility study was completed and determined that a roundabout was the preferred alternative design.
Does the project area have an operations master plan (or has this site been discussed with the District TSMO Coordinator)?	The TSMO coordinator applied for funding for construction after the preferred alternative was determined.

Project Initiation Package

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: <i>Derrick Schierloh</i>	
<p>Briefly describe the opportunities for managing congestion or traffic issues using TSMO strategies or improvements. Consider opportunities to upgrade or install systems management and operations infrastructure: TSMO infrastructure includes communications equipment, travel time signs, signals, changeable message signs, traffic cameras, traffic signal systems, other remote field devices and data collection equipment, conduit and any supporting fiber optics. TOAST is the Traffic Operations Assessment System Tool For additional TSMO information see http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Traffic/miscellaneous/Pages/TSMO.aspx</p>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Would operations benefit from TMC coverage of the project area? (RWIS, travel time boards, cameras, communications)	No.
Are there opportunities for initiating or upgrading TSMO infrastructure?	No.
Does this project support any TSMO strategies such as (Smartlane, VSL, Coordinated traffic signals, etc.)	No.
Does this project require multi-jurisdictional coordination, agreements, funding, etc.?	TSMO and Safety both approved funding towards the project.
What existing TSMO infrastructure is in place? Will it need to be moved or maintained in place?	None.
Are there any local TSMO infrastructure recommendations in the project area? (ex. Include emergency or transit traffic signal pre-emption, dynamic message signs or signal coordination)	No.
What MPO ITS architecture is already in place or planned? Consult the MPO ITS architecture plan, if applicable.	None.
Categories of potential ITS for this study area/project include: Exempt, Low, or High risk? Ref: TEM, 1-pager for CFR 940.	N/A. Removal of overhead flasher and construction of a roundabout.
Could this project expand an existing device or communications system?	No.
What type of device communications and equipment exists?	There is an existing overhead flasher and highway lighting. No communications.
Should this location have communications added or upgraded?	No.
Will additional conduit be necessary for future infrastructure/communications? (ex. in barrier wall)	No.
Will existing device power or communications drops be disrupted?	Yes. The flasher is to be removed and the highway lighting reconfigured.
Does this project require a new traffic signal timing plan?	No.
Are the current traffic signal(s) being upgraded to a system?	No.
Are there alternative routes available/identified for incident management?	Utilize the planned detour.
Is this a Traffic Incident Management Note eligible project?	No.
OTHER TSMO Considerations:	

Project Initiation Package

TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES: <i>Derrick Schierloh</i>	
<i>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.</i>	
Design Issue	Comments
Are there any obvious deviations from requirements of the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD)?	No. Standard roundabout signing and striping required.
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)?	No.
Will pavement widening affect pole locations?	All highway lighting shall be reconfigured to coordinated with the roundabout construction.
Will resurfacing affect signal height?	N/A. Removing overhead flasher.
Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)?	R/W will be required for roundabout.
Are there any crashes that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of protected turn phase)?	Overhead flasher to be removed and roundabout will change traffic operations.
Do pedestrian signals and push buttons need to be installed or upgraded?	No.
Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity?	N/A.
Does the controller need to be upgraded?	N/A.
Do proprietary materials need to be specified?	No.
Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting?	Standard roundabout lighting required.
Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present?	No.
Are there any other traffic control issues? <i>Specify.</i>	No.

UTILITY ISSUES: <i>Matt Pickering</i>	
<i>Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Do existing utilities need to be relocated? <i>If so, please identify.</i>	Utility poles, joint users attached to poles, buried telecommunications and pedestals, and existing poles luminaries removed.
Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Level A?	No
Are there existing utilities on an existing structure that need to be relocated?	No
Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? <i>Specify.</i>	On the Northeast end of proposed roundabout 3 TC Energy Transmission pipelines cross under SR 15, these should be avoided, and the roundabout designed without disturbing within 30 feet of pipelines. Relocating transmission pipelines could take 3 years, following notification of final plans. Any work within their utility easement would have to be coordinated through TC Energy, and they would have a representative on the project.

Project Initiation Package

UTILITY ISSUES: Matt Pickering	
<i>Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract?	Did not see any walking the intersection.
Are there any other utility issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Three phase aerial power is passing through both routes, R/W purchasing will have to assure room for their relocations.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES: Hailey Robey	
<i>Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle facilities are present or should be considered for implementation during project development.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian facilities: sidewalks, shared use paths, enhanced crossings, signs/signals, and lighting. • Bicycle facilities: bike lanes, improved shoulders, shared use paths, crossing treatments, signs/signals, and lighting. 	
<i>Provide additional comments as needed. For additional Bicycle and Pedestrian data, see the TIMS Active Transportation Map Viewer: https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation and discuss with the District Bike & Ped Contact.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Are there visible signs of deterioration on sidewalks or missing sidewalks?	N/A
Is there a minimum 4' clearance along sidewalks? (i.e. poles that obstruct the sidewalk)	N/A
Are there visible signs of deterioration in bike lanes/shoulders or missing bike facilities?	N/A
Do crossings for bicyclists and/or pedestrians need to be improved or installed?	N/A
Is on-street parking set back 20 feet from the crosswalk (both marked and unmarked) at an intersection or set back 30 feet of the approach to any flashing beacon, stop sign or traffic control device? (See TEM 4511.68)	N/A
Is there evidence of the need for a midblock crossing? (i.e. pedestrian crashes, signalized intersection spacing exceeds 600 ft., presence of midblock transit stops or path, pedestrian generators and destinations). Refer to FHWA Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Intersections	N/A
Does the project area have an active transportation plan in place (or other multimodal plan such as a bicycle, pedestrian, school travel plan , or metropolitan transportation plan). Contact pertinent local public agencies for more information.	No
Is there existing bicycle or pedestrian usage along this corridor? (For statewide volume data visit ODOT's Non-Motorized Database System) Visible indicators of usage include counts, worn paths, transit stops, etc.	No
Is the project located on a designated or proposed bike route (local, regional, state, or US)?	No

Project Initiation Package

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES: Hailey Robey	
<p>Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle facilities are present or should be considered for implementation during project development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian facilities: sidewalks, shared use paths, enhanced crossings, signs/signals, and lighting. • Bicycle facilities: bike lanes, improved shoulders, shared use paths, crossing treatments, signs/signals, and lighting. <p>Provide additional comments as needed. For additional Bicycle and Pedestrian data, see the TIMS Active Transportation Map Viewer: https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation and discuss with the District Bike & Ped Contact.</p>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Are there visible signs of deterioration on sidewalks or missing sidewalks?	N/A
Is there a minimum 4' clearance along sidewalks? (i.e. poles that obstruct the sidewalk)	N/A
Are there visible signs of deterioration in bike lanes/shoulders or missing bike facilities?	N/A
Do crossings for bicyclists and/or pedestrians need to be improved or installed?	N/A
Is on-street parking set back 20 feet from the crosswalk (both marked and unmarked) at an intersection or set back 30 feet of the approach to any flashing beacon, stop sign or traffic control device? (See TEM 4511.68)	N/A
Is there evidence of the need for a midblock crossing? (i.e. pedestrian crashes, signalized intersection spacing exceeds 600 ft., presence of midblock transit stops or path, pedestrian generators and destinations). Refer to FHWA Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Intersections	N/A
Does the project area have an active transportation plan in place (or other multimodal plan such as a bicycle, pedestrian, school travel plan , or metropolitan transportation plan). Contact pertinent local public agencies for more information.	No
What is the Level of Traffic Stress (1-4)? (LTS 1 and 2 are considered comfortable for the mainstream adult population.) (See Level of Traffic Stress calculation tool . This data is pre-calculated for the State & US Bike Route System).	N/A
Does the project area have high Active Transportation Demand and high Active Transportation Need (Scores of 3 or 4)? (Use the Identify Features tool to select project area and view scores for Demand_ Mapping and Need_ Mapping. scores.)	No: Demand – 2 Need – 1
What are the proposed bicycle lane widths?	N/A
What are the proposed sidewalk and shared use path widths (and buffer width)?	N/A
If bike/ped accommodations require additional ROW not planned for the project, can a future project provide this?	N/A

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: <i>Hailey Robey</i>	
<i>Indicate if the following maintenance of traffic issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Are there bridge load limits within the work limits or in the nearby area that would limit the available signed official detour or unsigned local alternate routes?	Potential – DEF-15-6.60
Is the project located on the National Truck Network?	No
Are there overhead bridges with existing vertical clearance issues or that may become vertical clearance issues (e.g. shifting traffic to the shoulder, adding pavement without milling first, etc.)	No
Are there pinch points within the work area that would prevent the installation of temporary pavement for maintaining the existing number of lanes? If yes, identify the location and type of width restraints. (e.g., median wall, at grade bridge, overhead bridge piers, trees, historic markers, etc.)	No
Are there visible signs of pavement condition deterioration in the driving lanes? On the shoulders? If yes, identify location and estimated degree of deterioration and if further testing is needed.	No
Are there nearby schools that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify names, location, and school districts.	No
Are there nearby emergency services (e.g., hospital, fire, police, EMS, etc.) that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify locations and names.	Defiance County EMA Noble Township Fire Department <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Located approx. ½ mile east of intersection
Are there significant traffic generators nearby that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? (e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.)	No
What is the width of the existing pavement? Will temporary pavement be needed to maintain the existing number of travel lanes?	No – likely full closure
What geometric features exist within the work area and within the area of influence of the work area that may impact sight distances and/or flow of traffic? (e.g., horizontal/vertical curves, blind driveways, intersections, entrance/exit ramps, railroad crossings, etc.)	The skew of Stever Road, the geometry of SR 15/SR 18, the slip ramp, utility poles, horizontal curve of SR 15.
Are there sidewalks or paths within or leading to/from the work area that need to be closed?	No
If sidewalk/path needs to be closed, can users be detoured on the existing sidewalk system or will a temporary pedestrian and/or bicycle pathway need to be included in the plan?	N/A
Are transit stops present within the work area?	No

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: <i>Hailey Robey</i>	
<i>Indicate if the following maintenance of traffic issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Are there culverts within the work area that may need to be lengthened to accommodate temporary widening? If so, identify locations and culvert numbers.	No
Are there any known existing drainage issues within the work limits? If yes, special attention needs to be given to ensuring temporary drainage can be accomplished.	Not that I am aware of.
Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time?	Culligan may be impacted.
Is the project located in or nearby an area of regional significance with a potential to cause controversy or negative public feedback or political scrutiny?	Potential to receive negative comments on roundabout.
Is there enough width to provide safe construction access? If no, what other means of access can be provided?	Yes
Is there potential for the need to require right-of-way acquisition?	Yes – ROW will be needed.
Is there room in the median for the construction of crossover pavement within the project limits and beyond the project limits on either end? If yes, identify potential locations for crossover locations.	N/A
Are short duration road closures going to be required? (e.g., bridge demo, steel erection, overhead utility installation/removal, etc.). If yes, is there an opportunity for diversion of the traffic to other routes or to the ramps on a diamond interchange? Identify the potential diversion routes.	N/A
Will there be a need for temporary structures (full or partial) in order to maintain the existing number of lanes?	No
Is there power available within or nearby the project location for temporary lighting and/or temporary signals?	Yes – likely not needed.
Will there be a need for additional signal heads (drives and/or side roads) or temporary signal timing/coordination?	No
Are there any Traffic Incident Management features, such as hydrants, pull-offs, turn-arounds, etc.?	No
Are there issues that may limit the construction timeframe? (e.g., sporting or other significant regional events, work in streams, suitable wooded habitat, school, etc.). If yes, list them.	No

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: <i>Hailey Robey</i>	
<i>Indicate if the following maintenance of traffic issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Would this project potentially benefit from the application of innovative contracting method (e.g., A+B to open bridge to traffic before school starts, etc.)? If yes, which method?	No
Will there be a need to restrict existing movements during construction? (e.g., no left turns, etc.)	Likely full closure. No direct lefts post construction.
Is there an opportunity (or potential need) to implement any work zone ITS components? (e.g., work zone egress warning, queue detection and warning, CCTV, DDMS, etc.)	No
How big of an impact will the project have on queue lengths and congestion? If significant, a MOTEC or PIAC exception may be required per Traffic Management In Work Zones policy (21-008(P)).	Insignificant
Does this project require an MOTAA? All Path 4 & 5 projects along with Path 3 projects on Interstate/Interstate look-alikes need to have a Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives Analysis Completed.	No

RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES: <i>Shell Miller - Sara Morrisey</i>	
<i>Indicate if right of way or survey issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Will there be any work beyond the existing right of way limits?	Yes
Will relocation of residences be involved?	No
Will relocation of businesses be involved?	Potentially
Will the project require modifying the access control to any properties?	Potentially. Define drive access for Elite Water Source, LLC.
Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)?	None currently noticed
Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?	Potentially
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	Potentially
Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns.	Elite Water Source, LLC- Existing small acreage (0.73ac) business parcel at the NE corner. Project may impact current septic and/or well locations; septic/well replacement areas; and affect setbacks to existing structure due to Local ordinances and/or zoning. Impacts could precipitate a total take. Avoid R/W impacts as much as possible to limit above noted potential impacts. A Relocation Conceptual Study will be required if there are any R/W impacts to this parcel. This will be a separate study provided by others.

Project Initiation Package

RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES: Shell Miller - Sara Morrisey	
<i>Indicate if right of way or survey issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
	Thoreau Wildlife Reserve, Inc – Avoid any R/W impacts to the maximum extent. Property protected under Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966.
Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?	
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? <i>Specify.</i>	No issues. D1 ODOT <i>may (if able to work into the schedule prior to authorization)</i> do some preliminary CL Ref mon recovery for reference.

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES: Nate Tessler	
<i>Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Issue	Location/Comments
Will an Individual US Army Corps of Engineers/ Environmental Protection Agency 404/401 permit be required?	No.
Will a Section 408 Permission by the USACE be required for work within an USACE Civil Works project? Refer to the National Levee Database (army.mil) ; National Inventory of Dams (army.mil) ; Louisville District (arcgis.com) Consult with OES during planning to discuss Section 408 coordination	No.
Will a Coast Guard permit be required?	No.
Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? <i>Specify.</i>	No.
Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required?	Unlikely. An archaeological review of the area may occur in undeveloped areas within the project limits. Results of that review may be coordinated with SHPO.
Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required?	No.
Is coordination with any other agency required?	No.

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES: Dan Niese	
<i>Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
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 and/or project completion (e.g., strain poles, large box culverts, steel beams, etc.)?	Potentially, highway lighting items.
Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)?	No, existing highway lighting present.

Project Initiation Package

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES: <i>Dan Niese</i>	
<i>Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Issue	Location/Comments
Compare the Begin/End construction dates with the Scope of Work. Is the construction schedule reasonable?	Yes, with exception of procuring highway lighting items.
Examine the existing pavement condition and repair history. Calculate potential pavement repair quantities.	N/A
Note manhole lid elevations versus proposed paving thickness. Will manhole lids or valve boxes need adjusted after paving?	N/A
Is there a need for Echelon Paving?	No
Examine the rideability of the approach slab to the roadway/bridge joint.	N/A
Will the project have impacts to nearby residents/businesses? Will site access occur down steep side slopes or through properties adjacent to project site?	Culligan Water
Examine existing guardrail condition, height and length of need. What is the condition of the slopes behind guardrail? Will additional grading or fill be required for guardrail replacement?	N/A
Is more space or room needed for construction? Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.?	TBD
Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks?	Overhead utilities will be relocated.
Will there be instream work?	No
Will Temporary shoring/sheeting, cofferdams or work pads be required to complete the proposed work? Anticipated Permitting (see Agency Coordination/Permit Issues section above)	No
Will the road need to be detoured to complete construction? What are the possible detour routes?	Yes
Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor?	Within existing ROW.

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS: <i>Justin Niese</i>	
<i>Based on the responses to the above items, do any of the following need to be modified?</i>	
Issue	Comments
Conceptual scope	
Work limits	
Probable environmental document type	
Project Path classification	
Schedule	

Project Initiation Package

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS: *Justin Niese*

Budget	
--------	--