

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:	TBD
--------------------------	-----

Project Name (County, Route, Section):	POR-14-9.35	PID:	123828
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:	10/2/2025	Prepared By:	Jonas Rizzi
City, Township or Village Name(s):	Ravenna Township	ODOT Project Manager:	Karla Bohmer

Project Description:

Long-term safety improvements at the intersections of POR SR 14 at Cleveland Rd (CR 171), POR SR 14 at Infirmary Rd (CR 164), and Infirmary Rd at Lovers Ln (CR 163)

Safety Study: [POR-14 Safety Study with Appendix.pdf](#)

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:

Intersections of POR SR 14 at Cleveland Rd, POR SR 14 at Infirmary Rd, and Infirmary Rd at Lovers Ln ([Google Maps](#))

Project Initiation Package



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
District Highway Management representative	Mark Griffiths	330-786-2281
District Planning and Engineering representative	Lauren Phillis Laura Beese	330-786-4841 330-786-4848
District Environmental Coordinator	Brian Peck	330-786-4931
District Construction Representative	Joe Schrecengost	330-603-0393
Geometrics	Kyle Koppes Matt Chaney	330-786-2253 330-786-4838
Geotechnical	Tom Powell	330-786-4834
Pavements / Structures	Nicholas Chaney	330-786-4858
Hydraulics	Mike Palagano Jordan Boehm	330-786-4851 614-752-0207
TSMO	Aaron Conley	330-786-4850
Traffic Control	Aaron Conley Michelle Chaney	330-786-4850 330-786-2267
Utilities	Peter Dinh	330-786-3132
MOT	Len Blankenship	330-786-4824
Right of Way / Survey	Tim Ward Brian Honaker	330-786-4844 330-786-4813
Pedestrian / Bicycle	Matt Chaney	330-786-4838

Project Initiation Package

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

EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT: N/A

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: Michael Craver

	SR-14	Infirmary Rd (CR-164)	Cleveland Rd (CR-171)	Lovers Ln (CR-163)
Legal Speed:	55	45	35	40
Design Speed:	60	50	40	45
Opening Year ADT:	14,920	8,060	3,180	2,400
Design Year ADT:	14,920	8,060	3,180	2,400
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	6%	5%	3%	3%
Functional Classification:	3 – Principal Arterial Other	5 – Major Collector	4 – Minor Arterial	7 - Local
Locale (Rural or Urban):	Rural	Rural	Rural	Rural
National Highway System (NHS):	Yes	No	No	No

LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION: Jim Bruner

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

Safety study mentioned above.

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS: Paul Ensinger / Mark Griffiths / Jeron Hollis

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

No comments from HMA

Project Initiation Package

CRASH DATA: Jonas Rizzi	
<i>Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years</i>	<i>(Yes/No) Yes</i>
<i>Is the project area highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps</i>	<i>(Yes/No) No</i>
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.	
Crash data was obtained from the March 2025 EMH&T Safety Study. For the years 2019-2023 there were a total of 87 crashes. Of the 87 crashes, 32 (37%) were injury crashes and 55 (63%) were property damage only crashes.	
SR 14 at Cleveland Rd: A total of 26 crashes from 2019-2023. Of the 26 crashes, there were 13 (50%) angle, 8 rear end, 3 fixed-object, 1 sideswipe, and 1 head on. Failure to yield was the highest contributing factor, accounting for 31% of crashes. SR 14 at Infirmary Rd: A total of 55 crashes from 2019-2023. Of the 55 crashes, there were 35 (64%) rear end, 7 angle, 7 fixed-object, 4 left-turn, 1 sideswipe, and 1 backing. Of the 11 angle and left turn crashes, 7 resulted in injuries. Infirmary Rd at Lovers Ln: A total of 6 crashes from 2019-2023. Of the 6 crashes, 4 (67%) were angle, and 2 were rear end. 3 (50%) of the crashes resulted in injuries. The long-term safety improvements at these intersections will address the rear end and angle crash patterns. For more details, refer to the POR-14 Safety Study with Appendix.pdf	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: Brian Peck	
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)}	None
Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat	Likely (suitable wooded habitat and listed animal and plant species)
Scenic River	None
Existing wet areas/existing cattails/wetlands	Likely (Remnant Bog; Category 3 Wetlands Impacts)
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	Likely (Eckert Ditch)
Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects)	Unlikely
Historic Bridge(s)	None
National Historic Landmarks	None
Archaeological Sites	Possible
Public Facilities	None
Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries)	None
Farmland	Possible
Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area	None
Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns	Non-attainment area or concern
Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials	None
Sensitive environmental justice areas	None
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains	None

Project Initiation Package

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES: Brian Peck	
<i>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.</i>	
Resource/Feature	Location/Comments
Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	None
Sole Source Aquifers	Inland Surface Water Corridor Management Zone
Wellhead Protection Areas	None
Noise abatement issues	Unlikely
Coordination with Conservancy Districts	Unlikely
Other environmental issues	Yes

RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES: Tim Ward / Brian Honaker	
<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. Preliminary Roundabout Exhibit shows construction limits outside existing R/W
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 at proposed Roundabout.
Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)?	None identified at this time.
Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?	Potential for grading and seeding may require temporary R/W.
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	Possibly.
Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns.	None at this time.
Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?	No. Work Agreements should not be used.
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? Specify.	Not at this time.

HYDRAULIC ISSUES: Mike Palagano / Jordan Boehm	
<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? Describe deficiencies.	Unaware of any deficiencies, ponding, or capacity issues.
Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets?	None observed.
Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes?	None observed.
Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)?	Do not see evidence of inadequate curb height.

Project Initiation Package

HYDRAULIC ISSUES: Mike Palagano / Jordan Boehm	
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.	
Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)?	Most likely wetlands, possibly a stream or ditch.
Will channel relocation be required?	Only where new embankment for cul-de-sac or roundabout would interfere.
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	Vegetated BMPs will be used, but this is not expected to impact RW or utilities.
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	No evidence of improper underdrain function.
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	New conduit installation will follow MOT for other roadway construction.
Are there any other hydraulic issues? <i>Describe.</i>	Unaware of any other issues.

UTILITY ISSUES: Peter Dinh	
Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Do existing utilities need to be relocated? <i>If so, please identify.</i>	Yes, at least power
Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Level A?	TBD. At least level B
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>	Overhead Power clearances. High voltage power on south side of road
Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract?	TBD
Are there any other utility issues? <i>Specify.</i>	TBD

GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA (Refer to Section 105 of the LDM, Volume 1): Kyle Koppes / Matt Chaney	
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 at tie-in locations; Proposed sections in roundabout footprint to follow L&D Vol. 1, Sect. 400
Shoulder Width	Within curb limits, no shoulder; Outside curb limits follow L&D Vol. 1 Sect. 300
Horizontal Curve Radius	Per L&D Vol. 1 Sect. 200
Maximum Grade	Per L&D Vol. 1 Sect. 200
Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)	Per L&D Vol. 1 Sect. 200 and 400
Superelevation Rate	N/A
Vertical Clearance	N/A
Pavement Cross Slope	Standard 1.56% on traveled lanes; 2% on circulatory lane and truck apron; also see L&D Vol. 1
Design Loading Structural Capacity	N/A

Project Initiation Package

OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES: Kyle Koppes / Matt Chaney	
<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?	No
Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards?	They appear to
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?	N/A
Has a minimum width of 4' from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier?	Any proposed replacement or new installation of barrier shall maintain a minimum of 4' offset.
Does intersection sight distance need to be improved?	No
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
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified to improve pedestrian crossing safety?	No pedestrians are anticipated
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified or truck aprons added to accommodate turning movements of large trucks?	No, being a roundabout truck turning movements should be provided and verified.
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.	Grading on both the NE & NW quadrants may require extensive fills.
Are new or updated curb ramps needed? Refer to the Curb Ramp Measuring Guide	No pedestrians are anticipated
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 (ICE) Ohio Department of Transportation applicable?	N/A

Project Initiation Package

OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES: Kyle Koppes / Matt Chaney	
<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
Are there any other geometric issues? Describe.	No. However, District 4 has published a roundabout preference guideline. Please review this document and follow our preferences when designing. D04 Roundabout Preferences.pdf RAB Outside Truck Apron Curbing - 20250311.pdf

PAVEMENT ISSUES: Nicholas Chaney	
<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. Dynaflect testing is not necessary.
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?	This portion of SR 14 was paved in 2018 and is programmed for resurfacing again in 2028 under PID 113039. Resurfacings are in line with typical year ranges.
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

GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES: Tom Powell	
<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)?	NA
Will construction be impacted based on the groundwater table?	NA
Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)?	NA
Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or rock)?	NA
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)?	NA
Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)?	NA
Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines? Evidence of quarries?	NA
Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines?	NA
Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area?	NA
Are there any other geotechnical issues? <i>Specify.</i>	NA

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: Nicholas Chaney	
<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(s):	Location/Comments
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

Project Initiation Package

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: Nicholas Chaney	
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(s):	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
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.)	N/A
Are there any other structure related issues? Specify.	N/A

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: Aaron Conley	
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?	SPORSR00014**C_07.819_13.122 - Score 61.5% Statewide Rankings: #757

Project Initiation Package

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: Aaron Conley	
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 have an operations master plan (or has this site been discussed with the District TSMO Coordinator)?	No
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.?	No
What existing TSMO infrastructure is in place? Will it need to be moved or maintained in place?	No
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.	Unknown
Categories of potential ITS for this study area/project include: Exempt, Low, or High risk? Ref: TEM, 1-pager for CFR 940.	Exempt
Could this project expand an existing device or communications system?	No
What type of device communications and equipment exists?	Traffic Signal, Signal Cabinet, Flasher on advanced warning sign
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
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?	No
Is this a Traffic Incident Management Note eligible project?	Unknown
OTHER TSMO Considerations:	

Project Initiation Package

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: Aaron Conley	
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
None	

TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES: Aaron Conley / Michelle Chaney	
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?	Yes – Signal will be removed
Will resurfacing affect signal height?	No
Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)?	Unknown
Are there any crashes that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of protected turn phase)?	Yes – Refer to safety study
Do pedestrian signals and push buttons need to be installed or upgraded?	No ped features anticipated.
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?	N/A
Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present?	No
Are there any other traffic control issues? <i>Specify.</i>	No Michelle Chaney comments: Lighting to be conventional on AT-bases, per TEM, usually 8 only for traditional RAB. D4 Traffic may want to salvage items within project limits, TBD.

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: Len Blankenship	
<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?	Bridge load limits along official detour routes will not be an issue. County roads with posted load restrictions will experience increased traffic when detours are posted for roundabout construction. The PIP indicates work at three locations. The phasing of the work at the SR-14/Infirmary roundabout, the Infirmary Road widening, and the SR-14/Cleveland Road reconfiguration will need to be considered when evaluating MOT. Emergency services access should also be considered when developing the overall MOT scheme. Due to the traffic volume of SR-14, it would be desirable to maintain SR-14 during roundabout construction although efforts to constantly maintain SR-14 may prove impractical or too costly. The consultant shall consider the roundabout alignment, profile, construction phasing, budget, etc. to provide a suitable MOT recommendation for construction of the roundabout. The closure of SR-14 is likely, and effort should be made to ensure that the closure duration is minimized. The Consultant is requested to provide recommendations for the SR-14 detour. District anticipates that Infirmary Road approaching the roundabout will be closed for the duration of the roundabout construction. The Infirmary Road detour will likely follow SR-303, SR-44, and Lover's Lane due to load restrictions of the intersecting County roads.
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 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.)	Yes. The ditches on the north and south of SR-14 limit the ability to place temporary pavement. Temporary widening could be accomplished with grading if necessary.
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

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: Len Blankenship	
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 nearby schools that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify names, location and school districts.	West Park Elementary School – 1071 Jones Ave Ravenna High School - 6589 N Chestnut St Ravenna School District - 534 Summit Street, Ravenna, Ohio 44266 330.296.9679 Maplewood Career Center - 7075 State Route 88, Ravenna, Ohio 44266, 330.296.2892 Ravenna Christian School - 6401 OH-14, Ravenna, OH 44266, 330.297.9310 Bio-Med Science Academy - 653 Enterprise Pkwy, Ravenna, OH 44266, 330.235.9442
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.	UH Portage Medical Center - 6847 N Chestnut St, Ravenna, OH 44266, 330.297.0811 Ravenna Fire Department - 214 S Park Way, Ravenna, OH 44266, 330.297.5738 ext. 2 Ravenna Police Department - 220 S Park Way, Ravenna, OH 44266, 330.296.6486
Are there significant traffic generators nearby that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? (e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.)	Yes. This is a busy location with a significant number of area businesses.
What is the width of the existing pavement? Will temporary pavement be needed to maintain the existing number of travel lanes?	Record plans indicate that SR-14 pavement is 38' wide through the intersection. To gain additional space for traffic, the existing shoulders could be replaced with temporary pavement and additional pavement added to widen.
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.)	N/A
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.	N/A
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

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: Len Blankenship	
<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
Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time?	Driveways will not be impacted by the proposed work.
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?	Yes. The SR-14/Infirmary Road intersection carries a significant amount of traffic. Any closure of SR-14 will create a negative reaction.
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?	R/W acquisition is not anticipated for MOT purposes.
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?	The intersection is currently signalized. Power is available.
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.	Ideally, this work would be scheduled during the summer months to minimize any impact to local schools.
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.)	Yes. Detours during construction are anticipated.
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.

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: Len Blankenship	
<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
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)).	N/A
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

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES: Joe Schrecengost	
<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.)?	Unlikely unless light poles are an issue. If standard light poles are used, there should not be an issue.
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?	Currently only showing 2 months for construction duration. This will need adjusted as design progresses. Should only be a one season project.
Examine the existing pavement condition and repair history. Calculate potential pavement repair quantities.	N/A, most likely will have full depth construction
Note manhole lid elevations versus proposed paving thickness. Will manhole lids or valve boxes need adjusted after paving?	N/A, Full Depth construction
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 and Businesses will be affected. Biggest stakeholder will be hospital nearby as ambulances use Lovers lane to get to the emergency department. All other access should be from roadway. SR14 is extremely busy in this stretch and disruptions will be impactful.
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, Full Reconstruction and alignment
Is more space or room needed for construction? Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.?	What is shown on PIP seems to be adequate. R/W will need to be looked at once final design location of roundabout/cul de sac is defined.

Project Initiation Package

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES: Joe Schrecengost	
<i>Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Issue	Location/Comments
Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks?	No cranes or pump trucks anticipated
Will there be instream work?	Not anticipated
Will Temporary shoring/sheeting, cofferdams or work pads be required to complete the proposed work? Anticipated Permitting (see Agency Coordination/Permit Issues section above)	Do not anticipate needing these.
Will the road need to be detoured to complete construction? What are the possible detour routes?	The road will need detoured. Infirmary can be detoured to Lake Rockwell Road. SR14 would need detoured SR303 to SR44
Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor?	Most likely in the R/W in the SE/SW corners of intersection or within road closure.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES: Matt Chaney	
<i>Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle facilities are present or should be considered for implementation during project development.</i>	
• 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>	
Issue	Location/Comments
Are there visible signs of deterioration on sidewalks or missing sidewalks?	No
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?	No
Do crossings for bicyclists and/or pedestrians need to be improved or installed?	No
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
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	No

Project Initiation Package

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES: Matt Chaney

Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle facilities are present or should be considered for implementation during project development.

- **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.

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
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.)	No
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: Brian Peck

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?	Possible

Project Initiation Package

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES: Brian Peck	
<i>Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
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.)	None
Will a Coast Guard (Section 9) permit be required?	Unlikely
Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? <i>Specify.</i>	Yes – USACE, USFWS, OPEA, ODNR
Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required?	Possible
Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required?	Unlikely
Is coordination with any other agency required?	Unlikely

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS: Jim Bruner	
<i>Based on the responses to the above items, do any of the following need to be modified?</i>	
Issue	Comments
Conceptual scope	Not at this time. 9/25/25
Work limits	Not at this time. 9/25/25
Probable environmental document type	C2 as of 9/25/25
Project Path classification	Path 2 as of 9/25/25
Schedule	Not at this time. 9/25/25
Budget	\$5.1m Safety funded as of 9/25/25