**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):** | *WYA US 23 3.47* | **PID:** | *121424* |
| **Date Project Initiation Package Completed:** |  | **Prepared By:** | *District SME’s* |
| **City, Township or Village Name(s):** | *Pitt Township* | **ODOT Project Manager:** | *Morgan Gerdeman* |

#

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Description:**

|  |
| --- |
| Build a new interchange at the intersection of US 23 and SR 294 |
|  |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:** US 23 and SR 294 in Wyandot County |

| **ODOT DISCIPLINE INVOLVEMENT:** |
| --- |
| ***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.***  |
| **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 Nuveman - 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* |
| *Environmental Issues/Agency Coordination/Permit Issues* | *Nate Tessler - District Environmental CoordinatorEmily Randall* | *419-999-6886**419-999-6888* |
| *Geotechnical Issues* | *Kristopher Osterhage - District Geotechnical Engineer* | *419-999-6872* |
| *Pavement Issues* | *Mark Brunet - District Pavement Engineer* | *419-999-6852* |
| *Structural Issues* | *Mark Limbaugh - District Bridge and Culvert Engineer* | *419-999-6919* |
| *Hydraulic Issues* | *Dillon Flick - District Hydraulics Engineer*  | *419-999-6871* |
| *Traffic Control* | *Derrick Schierloh - District Traffic Operations Engineer* | *419-999-6893* |
| *Right of Way* | *Shell Miller - District Real Estate Administrator* | *419-999-6876* |
| *Survey Issues* | *Sara Morrisey - District Survey Operations Manager* | *419-999-6921* |
| *Utility Issues* | *Matt Pickering - District Utility Relocation/ROW Permit Technician* | *419-549-6587* |
| *Pedestrian & Bicycle Issues* | *Hailey Robey - District Bikeway Coordinator* | *419-999-6887* |
| *General/External Agency Involvement/Existing Information* | *Justin Niese - Scoping Coordinator* | *419-789-1977* |
| *Geometric Design* | *Mark Mueller – District Geometric Design Engineer* | *419-999-6889* |
| *Miscellaneous Issues* | *Morgan Gerdeman – Project Manager* | *419-999-6869* |
| *Construction Issues* | *Dan Niese – District Construction Engineer* | *419-999-6903* |
| **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** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **\*\*\* The FHWA Engineer should be invited on projects expected to require approval from Federal Highway Administration.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION:** ***Hailey Robey*** |
| Legal Speed:  | 65 mph |
| Design Speed: | 70 mph |
| Opening Year ADT: | 18,500 |
| Design Year ADT: | 22,000 |
| Trucks (24 Hour B&C): | 13% |
| Functional Classification: | Principal Arterial Other |
| Locale (Rural or Urban): | Rural |
| National Highway System (NHS):  | Yes |

|  |
| --- |
| **LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION: *Justin Niese*** |
| **Briefly describe local planning studies, bike/ped long range plans, aesthetics, etc. that will be considered throughout project development: Not at this time.** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS: *Rod Nuveman*** |
| **List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.** |
| Try to get 4:1 slopes whenever possible with 3:1 minimum to reduce future slip potential. Investigate top of ramp lighting to match our recent lighting upgrades at rural interchanges.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **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.**  |
| There were 4 total crashes from 2020-2022. Of the 4 crashes, 2 were angle, 1 was right turn, and 1 was left turn. There was 1 injury crash for a 25% injury rate. The proposed interchange will eliminate crossing movements at the at-grade intersection, likely reducing the severity and occurrence of crashes.   |
| **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: *Nate Tessler – Emily Randall*** |
| ***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 |
| Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat | Preliminary NHDatabase review showed no Listed species. Eco Survey needed to review for endangered bat habitat. |
| Scenic River | No |
| Existing wet areas /existing cattails/wetlands | Some low-quality (Cat. 1) wetlands may exist throughout the project area. If footprint extends SW of intersection, there are potential pond/wetland impacts expected. |
| Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch  | Unnamed trib. to Little Sandusky River south of SR 294. Likely originates at culvert on west side of US 23. Little Sandusky River is west of the intersection along SR 294 (likely outside of project footprint, unless bridge replacement will occur). |
| Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects) | No |
| Historic Bridge(s) | No |
| National Historic Landmarks | No |
| Archaeological Sites | Possible review required if new r/w needed, some records in farm fields around the intersection. |
| Public Facilities | No |
| Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries) | No |
| Farmland | Possibly, if buying R/W, but no issues as long as impacts are below 3 acres. |
| Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area | No |
| Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns  | Yes – will need a qualitative MSAT Analysis. ODOT-OES has offered assistance. |
| Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials | No |
| Sensitive environmental justice areas | No |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains | Possibly, depending on how close impacts will come to the Little Sandusky River. |
| Lake Erie Coastal Management Area | No |
| Sole Source Aquifers  | No |
| Wellhead Protection Areas  | Little Sandusky River is a Corridor Management Zone |
| Noise abatement issues | Possibly at NW quad. May be moving road closer to residence. Abatement may not be feasible. |
| Coordination with Conservancy Districts | No |
| Other environmental issues | Need to petition Wyandot County Commissioners to close at-grade intersection(s). Elevated public involvement warranted due to past project history (PID: 109362). ODOT will host public meeting. |

| **GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA: Mark Mueller** |
| --- |
| **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.** |
| **Design Criteria** | **Location/Comments** |
| Lane Width  | US-23: 12’ SR-294.: 11’ Ramps: 16’ |
| Shoulder Width | US-23: 4’ paved inside, 10’ paved outside SR-294: 4’Ramp: 3’ paved LT, 6’ paved RT |
| Horizontal Curve Radius | N/A for US-23 and SR-294Design ramp curvature based on L&D section 503  |
| Maximum Grade | US-23: N/A SR-294: 5% |
| Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)  | US-23: 820’ SR-294: 570’ |
| Superelevation Rate | 0.08 |
| Vertical Clearance | 16.5’ |
| Pavement Cross Slope | 0.016 |
| Design Loading Structural Capacity | HL-93 + future wearing surface |

| **OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES: *Mark Mueller*** |
| --- |
| ***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.*** |
| Design Issues | Location/Comments |
| Does the horizontal alignment have an excessive deflection? | No |
| Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards? | Yes |
| Is driver comfort an issue due to the vertical curvature or breaks in the grade? | No |
| 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? | Yes |
| Has a minimum width of 4’ from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier? | Yes |
| Does intersection sight distance need to be improved? | No |
| List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone. | Nothing apparent. |
| Should existing access control be revised to improve safety? | No |
| 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)? | Yes. The drives on SR-294 west of US-23 will be need to be tied in to the new SR-294 profile. |
| Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified to improve pedestrian crossing safety? | N/A |
| 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. | Use 3:1 maximum fill slopes along SR-294.Use guardrail where fill heights are greater than 16 feet. |
| Are new or updated curb ramps needed? Refer to the [Curb Ramp Measuring Guide](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/working/engineering/roadway/ada/ada-compliant-curb-ramp-measuring-guide) | No |
| If constructing a new roadway, will it be a connection between two existing NHS Routes? | N/A |
| 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? | N/A |
| Are there any other geometric issues? Describe. | **The horizontal and/or vertical profile for T-127 will need to adjusted to tie into the new profile for SR-294.** |
|  |  |

| **GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES: *Kristopher Osterhage*** |
| --- |
| ***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.*** |
| 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? *Specify.* | No |

| **PAVEMENT ISSUES: *Mark Brunet*** |
| --- |
| ***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? | 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? | N/A |
| 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? Specify. | N/A |

| **STRUCTURAL ISSUES: *Mark Limbaugh*** |
| --- |
| ***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: 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? *Specify.* | N/A |
| Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the Amount of delamination? | N/A |
| Are there areas to be patched/repaired on the deck? | N/A |
| Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? *Specify type of overlay if known.* | 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? *Specify.* | 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.)? *Specify.* | 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.) | WYA-00294-1135 (SFN 8803900) is ~1075’ west of R edge of US23. Built ’67. WS/Deck/Super/Sub are all rated 6 of 9; Load rating 141% Ohio Legal.  |
| Are there any other structure related issues? *Specify.* | Depending on new US23 overpass profile & touchdown points, may need to replace structure or overlay + redo rail |
| **HYDRAULIC ISSUES: Dillon Flick** |
| **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? Describe deficiencies. | 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)? | N/A |
| Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)? | No |
| Will channel relocation be required? | No |
| Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities? | No |
| 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? Describe. | No |

| **TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: Derrick Schierloh** |
| --- |
| **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> |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Does the project area contain a Hot Spot identified in TOAST? If so, what is the TOAST ranking? | The segment does not show as a TOAST hot spot. |
| Does the project area have an operations master plan (or has this site been discussed with the District TSMO Coordinator)? | The TSMO Coordinator has discussed the site and the location is part of the Districtwide access management plan. |
| 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.? | Yes; local jurisdiction will need to be included for traffic control sign coordination. |
| 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 |
| Could this project expand an existing device or communications system? | No. |
| What type of device communications and equipment exists? | None. |
| 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? | No. |
| 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:** |
|  |

| **TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES: Derrick Schierloh** |
| --- |
| **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. |
| 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? | There are power poles that could be affected by overpass layout. |
| Will resurfacing affect signal height? | N/A |
| Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)? | No. |
| Are there any crashes that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of protected turn phase)? | N/A |
|  Do pedestrian signals and push buttons need to be installed or upgraded? | N/A |
| Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity? | N/A; RCUT design will reconfigure turn lanes and remove from the center of the intersection. |
| 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? | No. |
| Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present? | No. |
| Are there any other traffic control issues? Specify. | All existing conflicting mainline US-30 traffic control signs will need to be removed in conjunction with the RCUT. |

| **UTILITY ISSUES: Matt Pickering** |
| --- |
| **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? If so, please identify. | No above ground facilities, or underground markers at the intersection.  |
| 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? Specify. | No. |
| Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract? | No. |
| Are there any other utility issues? Specify. | No.  |

| **PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES: Hailey Robey** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following** **pedestrian and bicycle facilities are present or should be considered for implementation during project development.** * **Pedestrian facilities: si**dewalks, shared use paths, enhanced crossings, signs/signals, and lighting.
* **Bicycle facilities:** bike lanes, improved shoulders, shared use paths, crossing treatments, signs/signals, and lighting.

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**](https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation) **and discuss with the** [**District Bike & Ped Contact**](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/odot/programs/active%2Btransportation/resources/district-bike-ped-contacts)**.** |
| **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](https://transportation.wv.gov/highways/training/TrainingDocuments/Guide-for-Improving-Pedestrian-Safety-at-Uncontrolled-Crossing-Locations.pdf) | No |
| Does the project area have an active transportation plan in place (or other multimodal plan such as a bicycle, pedestrian, [school travel plan](https://www.dot.state.oh.us/ActiveTransportation/Pages/STP.aspx), 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*](https://odot.ms2soft.com/tdms.ui/nmds/dashboard?loc=odot)*)*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](https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation?center=-81.03339878067777,40.479409876620835&level=8&visiblelayers=Boundaries:-1%7CAT%20Demand%20and%20Need%20Analysis:-1%7CProjects:-1%7CADA%20Assets:-1%7CRoadway%20Information:-1%7CState%20and%20US%20Bike%20Route%20System:1))? | 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.](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/odot/programs/highway%2Bsafety/highway-safety-resources/08-crash-trends-resources) This data is pre-calculated for the [State & US Bike Route System](https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation?center=-81.03339878067777,40.479409876620835&level=8&visiblelayers=Boundaries:-1%7CAT%20Demand%20and%20Need%20Analysis:-1%7CProjects:-1%7CADA%20Assets:-1%7CRoadway%20Information:-1%7CState%20and%20US%20Bike%20Route%20System:5)).  | N/A |
| Does the project area have high [Active Transportation Demand](https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation?center=-82.37467560672589,40.594296208357626&level=8&visiblelayers=Boundaries:-1%7CAT%20Demand%20and%20Need%20Analysis:0%7CProjects:-1%7CADA%20Assets:-1%7CRoadway%20Information:-1%7CState%20and%20US%20Bike%20Route%20System:-1) and high [Active Transportation Need](https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation?center=-82.37467560672589,40.594296208357626&level=8&visiblelayers=Boundaries:-1%7CAT%20Demand%20and%20Need%20Analysis:1%7CProjects:-1%7CADA%20Assets:-1%7CRoadway%20Information:-1%7CState%20and%20US%20Bike%20Route%20System:-1) (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 – 1Need - 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 |

| MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: *Hailey Robey* |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following maintenance of traffic issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.** |
| **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? | Traffic on US 23 to be maintained. |
| Is the project located on the National Truck Network? | Yes |
| 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. | Harpster Fire Department |
| 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? | US 23 approx. 12’ – No |
| 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.) | Intersection of TR 127 with SR 294 and drives on the west side of SR 294. |
| 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 |
| 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. | No |
| Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time? | No |
| 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? | No |
| 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 |
| 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. | Not needed. |
| 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. | No |
| 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? | N/A |
| 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 |
| 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.) | The interchange will restrict at-grade crossing movements. |
| 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: Shell Miller - Sara Morrisey** |
| --- |
| **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? | Yes |
| 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?  | Potentially |
| Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)? | No |
| Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)? | Potentially |
| Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations? | No |
| Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns. | We are not aware of any concerns. |
| Are work agreements prohibited for any reason? | No |
| Are there any other right of way or survey issues? Specify. | No |

| **AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES: Nate Tessler – Emily Randall** |
| --- |
| **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 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)](https://levees.sec.usace.army.mil/#/); [National Inventory of Dams (army.mil)](https://nid.sec.usace.army.mil/#/); [Louisville District (arcgis.com)](https://lrl.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=013d0ce926a54caab629667d15ed8df2) 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? Specify. | Closure of at-grade intersection(s) requires petitioning the Wyandot County Commissioners. |
| Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required? | No |
| 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? | Eco impacts may be coordinated with ODNR and USFWS. Waterway impacts may be coordinated with USACE. |

| **CONSTRUCTION ISSUES: Dan Niese** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.**  |
| **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.)? | Possibly – Beams, Lighting items |
| Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)? | No |
| Compare the Begin/End construction dates with the Scope of Work. Is the construction schedule reasonable? | TBD |
| 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? | Residents |
| 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? | No existing guardrail present. |
| Is more space or room needed for construction?Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.? | Potentially |
| Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks? | Overhead lines to the north will need looked at. |
| 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? | SR 294 detoured. US 23 will have lane closures. Look at night time closure of US 23 to set beams. |
| Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor? | Within existing ROW. |

| **SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS: Justin Niese** |
| --- |
| **Based on the responses to the above items, do any of the following need to be modified?** |
| **Issue** | **Comments** |
| Conceptual scope | Not at this time. |
| Work limits | Not at this time. |
| Probable environmental document type | Not at this time. |
| Project Path classification | Not at this time. |
| Schedule | Not at this time. |
| Budget | Not at this time. |