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:	TBD

Project Name (County, Route, Section):	STA SR 0093 04.32	**PID:**	119348
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:		**Prepared By:**	Brian Ross
City, Township or Village Name(s):	Village of Brewster	**ODOT Project Manager:**	Cameron Gatian

Project Description:
Superstructure replacement of STA-93-0432 SFN 7604831 over Sugar Creek.

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:
Coordinates: 40.700375, -81.598447
STA SR 93 Exact limits TBD. Assuming SLM 4.29 to 4.35 (~100ft upstation and downstation of expansion joints)

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**
GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION	*MIKE CRAVER*	
LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION	*JIM BRUNER*	
DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERN	*BRIAN HOOVER*	
CRASH DATA	*DAVE GRIFFITH*	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	*BRIAN PECK*	
GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA	*MATT CHANEY / KYLE KOPPES*	
OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES	*MATT CHANEY / KYLE KOPPES*	
GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES	*TOM POWELL*	
PAVEMENT ISSUES	*BRIAN ROSS*	330-786-2254
STRUCTURAL ISSUES	*BRIAN ROSS*	330-786-2254
HYDRAULIC ISSUES	*MIKE PALAGANO / JORDAN BOEHM*	330-786-4851
TSMO CONSIDERATIONS	*AARON CONLEY*	
TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES	*MICHELLE CHANEY / DAWN ROXBERRY*	
UTILITY ISSUES	*MATTHEW STEELE*	330-786-4832
MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES	*LEN BLANKENSHIP*	
RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES	*BRIAN HONAKER / TIM WARD*	
CONSTRUCTION ISSUES	*JOHN ROBERTS*	
PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES	*MATT CHANEY*	
AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES	*BRIAN PECK*	330-786-4931
SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS	*JIM BRUNER*	
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.)		
***** The FHWA Engineer should be invited on projects expected to require approval from Federal Highway Administration.**		

GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION: Mike Craver	
Legal Speed:	55
Design Speed:	60
Opening Year ADT (2029):	3,300
Design Year ADT (2049):	3,600
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	21%
Functional Classification:	4 – Minor Arterial
Locale (Rural or Urban):	Urban
National Highway System (NHS):	No

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

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS:
List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.
No comments

CRASH DATA:	
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.	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:

Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources are present within the project area. Is it possible that they will be affected by the 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)}	**Present; publicly owned lands east and west of the project.**
Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat	**Present**
Scenic River	**Not Applicable**
Existing wet areas/existing cattails/wetlands	**Present; likely Category 3 wetlands complex**
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	**Present; Sugar Creek**
Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects)	**Unlikely**
Historic Bridge(s)	**Not Applicable**
National Historic Landmarks	**Not Applicable**
Archaeological Sites	**Unlikely**
Public Facilities	**Unlikely**
Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries)	**Not Applicable**
Farmland	**Not Applicable**
Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area	**USACE Flowage Easement Area (Muskingum Watershed)**

Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns	**Not Applicable**
Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials	**Not Applicable**
Sensitive environmental justice areas	**Unlikely**
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains	**Present; mapped Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA).**
Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	**Not Applicable**
Sole Source Aquifers	**Not Applicable**
Wellhead Protection Areas	**Not Applicable**
Noise abatement issues	**Not Applicable**
Coordination with Conservancy Districts	**Unlikely**
Other environmental issues	**Sugar Creek; known Freshwater Mussel area**

GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA:

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	Match existing
Shoulder Width	Match existing in full depth limits.
Horizontal Curve Radius	N/A – no horizontal curve
Maximum Grade	Match existing
Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)	Match existing vertical curve if present
Superelevation Rate	N/A
Vertical Clearance	N/A
Pavement Cross Slope	Meet existing at begin and end of full depth replacement. Transition pavement cross slope to match bridge deck cross slopes.
Design Loading Structural Capacity	

OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES:

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?	N/A, horizontal alignment should match existing
Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards?	N/A
Is driver comfort an issue due to the vertical curvature or breaks in the grade?	No. Match existing vertical curve if present
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, match existing bridge width.
Has a minimum width of 4’ from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier?	Yes, match existing bridge width. Ensure all guardrail is set back a minimum of 4ft from the edge line.

OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES:	
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 intersection sight distance need to be improved?	No. Verify that guardrail placement doesn't create a sight distance issue with adjacent driveways. Consider using MGS Type B Anchor Assemblies near driveways.
List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone.	Nothing is 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)?	No. But if a driveway apron is within the full depth limits, replace apron as necessary.
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?	N/A
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.	No. This is just a superstructure replacement, we will not want to purchase R/W for slope work.
Are new or updated curb ramps needed? Refer to the 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 multiple intersection control types being considered? Is an Intersection Control Evaluation (Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) | Ohio Department of Transportation) applicable?	N/A
Are there any other geometric issues? Describe.	No. But, the project should replace the entire runs of guardrail on all approaches. The existing guardrail is Type 5, upgrade to MGS.

GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES:	
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)?	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?	N/A
Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines?	N/A
Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area?	N/A
Are there any other geotechnical issues? *Specify.*	N/A

PAVEMENT ISSUES: **BRIAN ROSS**	
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?	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? *Specify.*	No.

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: BRIAN ROSS	
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: 7604831	**STA-93-0432**
Design Issue	**Location/Comments**
Is it possible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box?	No.
Is the deck delaminated? *Specify.*	The topside of the concrete deck is obscured by an asphalt overlay. Approximately 300SF of delamination/ spalling is present in both spans in the deck underside with higher severity spalls seen in span 1.
Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the Amount of delamination?	Underside can be sounded for possible additional locations.
Are there areas to be patched/repaired on the deck?	Approximately 25% of the deck floor is rated as condition state 3. Repairs are not sensible in comparison to a deck or superstructure replacement.
Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? *Specify type of overlay if known.*	Structure received an asphalt overlay in 2020. Additional overlays will not address or significantly reduce continued deterioration of the deck.
Does the bridge rail violate current standards?	New railings shall meet current standards.
Is fatigue analysis required?	If beams are to be reused a remaining fatigue life analysis is not required per BDM 404.1.2.4. SR93 is a Minor Arterial with less than 500 ADTT
Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? *Specify.*	If beams are to be reused retrofits will only be required if fatigue cracks have been identified in the beam splices at the center pier per BDM 404.1.2.4.
Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)?	None observed at this time.
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?	No evidence of overtopping.
Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the bridge?	No.
Is Vandal Protection Fencing required in accordance with the BDM?	No.
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.*	Yes, complete closure of SR 93 will be required to replace the superstructure.
Does the bridge need to accommodate future roadway lanes, bicycle lanes, a shared use path, shoulder, or railroad tracks?	No.
Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad?	N/A No RR present.
Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.).	The topside of the concrete deck is obscured by an asphalt overlay. The expansion joints have been paved over and the asphalt is breaking up. In addition to the delaminations noted in prior questions there is moderate saturation, efflorescence, and

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: BRIAN ROSS	
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: 7604831	**STA-93-0432**
Design Issue	**Location/Comments**
	rust staining throughout the deck floor covering approximately 1100SF of deck area. The deck has a condition rating of 5.
Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.).	Existing structural steel exhibits minor section loss (painted over) in the bottom web/flange interface at the beam ends. Existing PCS is near end of life - A new PCS will be required if existing steel is re-used. The 2023 BR100 load rating report indicated that flexural stress in the exterior beam controls the HS20 loading. Inventory rating factor is 0.87, operating is 1.46 and current % legal loading is at 135%.
Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.).	Abutments have been patched and sealed in a past project. Minor isolated cracks remain in the abutments and pier caps. Substructure is in satisfactory condition (rated 6)
Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.)	Minor debris present on the channel embankment. Channel is in good condition (Rated 7)
Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.)	Approach slabs have been paved over.
Are there any other structure related issues? *Specify.*	There is deterioration with spalling and delamination present in the forward and rear backwalls.
HYDRAULIC ISSUES: Mike Palagano	
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.*	This vicinity has been closed at least once due to high water in February 2022, not sure if SR 93 or US 62 or both. This was potentially due to frozen ground and ~12" of snow melting plus rains. Many other locations around the District had high water closures at the same time. This is the only occurrence I am aware of, so this was potentially an out-of-the-ordinary issue not related to hydraulic capacity design of bridge.
Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets?	One side appears to have potential scour/erosion of slope near piers.
Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes?	Pavement near deck joints show some minor cracking.
Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)?	No curbing in this area. Bridge deck has over-the-side drainage.
Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)?	Sugar Creek. Structure is located in Zone A floodplains.
Will channel relocation be required?	No, if work is just to superstructure.
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	Only if EDA > 1 acre. This is unlikely.
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	Unaware of improper UD function.

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: BRIAN ROSS	
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: 7604831	**STA-93-0432**
Design Issue	**Location/Comments**
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	Nothing specifically for drainage. Structure is just south of village of Brewster and appears to be a main access point to the village.
Are there any other hydraulic issues? *Describe.*	Unaware of any other hydraulic issues.

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS:	
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?	
Does the project area have an operations master plan (or has this site been discussed with the District TSMO Coordinator)?	
Would operations benefit from TMC coverage of the project area? (RWIS, travel time boards, cameras, communications)	
Are there opportunities for initiating or upgrading TSMO infrastructure?	
Does this project support any TSMO strategies such as (Smartlane, VSL, Coordinated traffic signals, etc.)	
Does this project require multi-jurisdictional coordination, agreements, funding, etc.?	
What existing TSMO infrastructure is in place? Will it need to be moved or maintained in place?	
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)	
What MPO ITS architecture is already in place or planned? Consult the MPO ITS architecture plan, if applicable.	
Categories of potential ITS for this study area/project include: Exempt, Low, or High risk? Ref: TEM, 1-pager for CFR 940.	
Could this project expand an existing device or communications system?	
What type of device communications and equipment exists?	
Should this location have communications added or upgraded?	
Will additional conduit be necessary for future infrastructure/communications? (ex. in barrier wall)	

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS:	
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**
Will existing device power or communications drops be disrupted?	
Does this project require a new traffic signal timing plan?	
Are the current traffic signal(s) being upgraded to a system?	
Are there alternative routes available/identified for incident management?	
Is this a Traffic Incident Management Note eligible project?	
OTHER TSMO Considerations:	

TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES:	
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)?	
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)?	
Will pavement widening affect pole locations?	
Will resurfacing affect signal height?	
Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)?	
Are there any crashes that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of protected turn phase)?	
Do pedestrian signals and push buttons need to be installed or upgraded?	
Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity?	
Does the controller need to be upgraded?	
Do proprietary materials need to be specified?	
Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting?	

TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES:	
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 any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present?	
Are there any other traffic control issues? *Specify.*	

UTILITY ISSUES:	
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*.	Probably not unless replacing beams or widening structure. If so, electric lines might need to be deenergized or shifted away from structure
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*.	Depending on equipment used power lines will need a minimum of 10' clearance from equipment and work
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

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES:	
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?	Weight limits are not expected to be an issue on the signed, official detour route (SR-93/US-62/SR-21/US-30/SR-241/SR-93). Weight limits are not expected to be an issue on the likely local detour (SR-93/US-62/Mt Eaton St SW/7th Street/SR-93).
Is the project located on the National Truck Network?	Yes. SR-93 is listed as part of the National Truck Network.
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 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.)	Not applicable. The expected Maintenance of Traffic will require the closure/detour of SR-93.

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES:	
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 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.	Yes. The Fairless Local School District is near to this location. Detoured traffic will be routed past Fairless Elementary School, Fairless Middle School, and Fairless High School.
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.	The Brewster Police Department and the Village of Brewster Fire Department will be affected by the closure/detour of SR-93.
Are there significant traffic generators nearby that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? (e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.)	The Brewster Cheese Company is within 0.5 miles of the site. The detour will impact truck traffic to/from the company.
What is the width of the existing pavement? Will temporary pavement be needed to maintain the existing number of travel lanes?	Beyond the bridge approaches, the width of the existing pavement is 24' plus 2' shoulders. Maintaining the travel lanes at the bridge site is not anticipated. The expected Maintenance of Traffic will require the closure/detour of SR-93.
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.)	No.
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?	Not Applicable.
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 driveways will be impacted by work at the bridge site.
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?	Safe construction access and project staging may be provided within the limits of the closure.

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES:	
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**
Is there potential for the need to require right-of-way acquisition?	Right-of-Way acquisition is not expected to be required for Maintenance of Traffic issues.
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 Applicable.
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?	Power is available at nearby utility lines but is not anticipated for Maintenance of Traffic purposes.
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.	Considering that the Fairless Local School District will see increased traffic due to the detour route, construction outside of the school year would be desirable.
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.)	Traffic will be detoured during project 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 MOT Policy Exception Request may be required per Traffic Management in Work Zones Policy (21-008(P)) and Standard Procedure (123-001(SP)).	Not Applicable.
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. Refer to TEM Section 630-5	No.

RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES:	
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?	Possibly
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?	No
Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)?	None
Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?	Most likely, for grading and room for construction
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	Possibly, on the east side for overhead utilities/poles
Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns.	No
Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?	No
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? *Specify.*	No

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES:	
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?	
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.)?	
Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)?	
Compare the Begin/End construction dates with the Scope of Work. Is the construction schedule reasonable?	
Examine the existing pavement condition and repair history. Calculate potential pavement repair quantities.	
Note manhole lid elevations versus proposed paving thickness. Will manhole lids or valve boxes need adjusted after paving?	
Is there a need for Echelon Paving?	
Examine the rideability of the approach slab to the roadway/bridge joint.	
Will the project have impacts to nearby residents/businesses? Will site access occur down steep side slopes or through properties adjacent to project site?	

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES:

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

Issue	Location/Comments
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?	
Is more space or room needed for construction? Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.?	
Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks?	
Will there be instream work?	
Will Temporary shoring/sheeting, cofferdams or work pads be required to complete the proposed work? Anticipated Permitting (see Agency Coordination/Permit Issues section above)	
Will the road need to be detoured to complete construction? What are the possible detour routes?	
Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor?	

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES:

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 and discuss with the District Bike & Ped Contact.

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 sign 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 ORC 4511.68)	N/A

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES:

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 and discuss with the District Bike & Ped Contact.

Issue	Location/Comments
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
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.)	N/A
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

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES:

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

Issue	Location/Comments

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES:	
Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.	
Will an Individual US Army Corps of Engineers/ Environmental Protection Agency 404/401 permit be required?	**Unlikely**
Will a Section 408 Permission be required for work within an USACE Civil Works (dams, levees, locks, navigation channel, etc.)? Refer to the *National Levee Database (army.mil)*; *National Inventory of Dams (army.mil)*; *Louisville District (arcgis.com)* Not all projects are found within these directories. Consult with OES during planning to discuss Section 408 coordination. (Note, Section 9 or Section 10 permit will most likely trigger Section 408 coordination.)	**Unlikely**
Will a Coast Guard (Section 9) permit be required?	**Not Applicable**
Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? *Specify*.	**Possible**
Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required?	**Not Applicable**
Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required?	**Not Applicable**
Is coordination with any other agency required?	**Possible; USACE Flowage Easement; Village of Brewster Public Lands; ODNR Freshwater Mussel relocation**

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	