**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: | 2/27/2024 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Name (County, Route, Section):** | POR-224-16.09 | **PID:** | 120675 |
| **Date Project Initiation Package Completed:** | January 22, 2024 | **Prepared By:** | Conley, Aaron R |
| **City, Township or Village Name(s):** | Atwater/Deerfield Twp | **ODOT Project Manager:** | Paul Frey |

#

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Description:**Construct single lane roundabout at the intersection of US 224 and SR 225/Alliance Rd (CR 125)Safey Study: 20230912 POR US 224 & SR 225 Safety Study w Appendix.pdf |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:** Intersection of US 224 and SR 225/Alliance Rd ([Google Maps](https://www.google.com/maps/%4041.0246645%2C-81.0986197%2C455m/data%3D%213m1%211e3?entry=ttu)) |

| **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  | *Paul Ensinger / Mark Griffiths / Jeron Hollis* |  |
| District Planning and Engineering representative | *Lauren Phillis / Laura Beese* |  |
| District Environmental Coordinator | *Brian Peck* |  |
| Geometrics | *K. Koppes* |  |
| Geotech | *T. Powell* |  |
| Pavements / Structure | *N. Chaney / B. Ross* | *330-786-4858* |
| Traffic Control | *Mi. Chaney / B. Mocarski / A. Conley* |  |
| Utilities | *M. Steele* | *330-786-4832* |
| MOT | *L. Blankenship* | *330-786-4824* |
| Right of Way | *T. Ward / B. Honaker* |  |
| Drainage | *M. Palagano* | *330-786-4851* |
| **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** |
| Legal Speed:  | US-224: 55mph | SR-225: 55mph | Alliance Rd: 55mph |
| Design Speed: | US-224: 60mph | SR-225: 60mph | Alliance Rd: 60mph |
| Opening Year ADT: | US-224: 7,380 | SR-225: 6,670 | Alliance Rd: 1,170 |
| Design Year ADT: | US-224: 8,110 | SR-225: 7,330 | Alliance Rd: 1,300 |
| Trucks (24 Hour B&C): | US-224: 10% | SR-225: 9% | Alliance Rd: 5% |
| Functional Classification: | US-224: Minor Arterial | SR-225: Minor Arterial | Alliance Rd: Local |
| Locale (Rural or Urban): | US-224: Rural | SR-225: Rural | Alliance Rd: Rural |
| National Highway System (NHS):  | US-224: No | SR-225: No | Alliance Rd: 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:**  |
| 2020 ODOT HSIP Rural Intersection list location was ranked #8 and ranked #1 on the AMATS High Crash Intersection by Community list (2018-2020). |

|  |
| --- |
| **DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS: *Michelle Chaney*** |
| **List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.** |
| Lighting to be installed on AT breakaway bases. No items need salvaged from flasher removal. Power service to be ground mounted per SCD HL-42.20, run conduit from PS to first PB. Install PB on either side of conduit under the road. Power can be 120/240v. Replace all signs within the limits of the project. |

|  |
| --- |
| **CRASH DATA: Dave Griffith** |
| **Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years** | **(Yes/No) YES** |
| **Is the project area highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps** | **(Yes/No) YES** |
| **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.**  |
| Refer to the Safety Study completed for this intersection dated September 12,2023.This intersection currently ranks #9 Rural Intersection STW on the 2021 HSIP list. |
| **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 | Possible Suitable Wooded Habitat |
| Scenic River | None |
| Existing wet areas/existing cattails/wetlands | Likely |
| Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch  | Likely |
| Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects) | Unlikely |
| Historic Bridge(s) | None |
| National Historic Landmarks | None |
| Archaeological Sites | Unlikely |
| Public Facilities | None |
| Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries) | None |
| Farmland |  |
| Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area | None |
| Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns  | None |
| Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials | Superfund/CERCLIS (SE Quadrant) and active and former landfills (SW and NW Quadrants) are present. Any right-of-way acquisition will require Chief Legal coordination/approval. |
| Sensitive environmental justice areas | Unlikely |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains | None |
| Lake Erie Coastal Management Area | None |
| Sole Source Aquifers  | None |
| Wellhead Protection Areas  | Unlikely |
| Noise abatement issues | Unlikely |
| Coordination with Conservancy Districts | Unlikely |
| Other environmental issues | Any work proposed inside the known limits or within 300 feet of a solid waste or hazardous waste facility (landfill) requires an authorization from OEPA under OAC 3745-513 (“Rule 513”). |

| **GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA: 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; anticipate farm equipment |
| Shoulder Width | Within curb limits, no shoulder; outside curb limits follow L&D vol. 1 sect. 300 |
| Horizontal Curve Radius | N/A |
| Maximum Grade | N/A |
| Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)  | Per L&D vol. 1 sect 201 and 400 |
| Superelevation Rate | N/A |
| Vertical Clearance | N/A |
| Pavement Cross Slope | Standard 1.56% on traveled lanes; also see L&D vol. 1 |
| Design Loading Structural Capacity | N/A |

| **OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES: Kyle Koppes / Matt Chaney** |
| --- |
| ***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 |
| 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? | Not likely |
| 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? | N/A |
| Does intersection sight distance need to be improved? | No, however roundabout design will need to include performance checks on ISD |
| List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone. | No |
| Should existing access control be revised to improve safety? | Yes, access to drives will need maintained, refer to study layout |
| 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, access to drives will need maintained, refer to study layout |
| Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified to improve pedestrian crossing safety? | No ped traffic anticipated |
| Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified or truck aprons added to accommodate turning movements of large trucks? | Being the design of a roundabout, it is expected that truck turning templates be used for truck traffic as part of the performance checks |
| 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 |
| 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? | **(Yes/No) Not a new road** |
| 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](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/programs/Highway%20Safety/highway-safety-manual-guidance/intersectioncontrolevaluation)) applicable?  | No |
| Are there any other geometric issues? Describe. | This intersection sees larger volumes of truck traffic and occasional farm equipment; refer to L&D Vol 1, sect. 400. |

| **GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES:  *Thomas J Powell, PE*** |
| --- |
| ***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)? | 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? *Specify.* | NA |

| **PAVEMENT ISSUES: Nicholas Chaney**  |
| --- |
| ***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. Dynaflect tests have not been performed and are not anticipated either. |
| Are joint repairs needed? | No. |
| Are pressure relief joints needed? | No. Pressure relief joints are not applicable. |
| Does curb need to be replaced due to deteriorated condition or lack of curb reveal? | No curb present. |
| Has the site received repeated resurfacings in recent years? | Yes. The last resurfacing project was performed in 2020/2021. The next resurfacing is projected to be until 2029. |
| Does pavement deterioration appear to be caused by drainage or geotechnical problems?  | No. |
| Are there any other pavement issues? Specify. | No. |

| **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:** |  |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Is it possible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box? | NA |
| Is the deck delaminated? *Specify.* | NA |
| Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the Amount of delamination? | NA |
| Are there areas to be patched/repaired on the deck? | NA |
| Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? *Specify type of overlay if known.* | NA |
| Does the bridge rail violate current standards? | NA |
| Is fatigue analysis required? | NA |
| Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? *Specify.* | NA |
| Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)? | NA |
| Is elimination of the deck joint possible? What modifications are necessary? | NA |
| Is it possible for the hinges to be removed to make the members continuous? | NA |
| Is there any evidence that the bridge does not meet hydraulic capacity? | NA |
| Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the bridge? | NA |
| Is Vandal Protection Fencing required in accordance with the BDM?  | NA |
| 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.* | NA |
| Does the bridge need to accommodate future roadway lanes, bicycle lanes, a shared use path, shoulder, or railroad tracks? | NA |
| Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad? | NA |
| Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.). | NA |
| Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.). | NA |
| Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.). | NA |
| Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.) | NA |
| Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.) | NA |
| Are there any other structure related issues? *Specify.* | NA |
| **HYDRAULIC ISSUES: Mike Palagano, P.E.** |
| **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. | Minor ponding observed in Deerfield Skating parking lot on NE corner and bus lot on NW corner. Overall site conditions are flat, but unaware of any flooding issues. It doesn’t appear that storm sewers are currently present. Any subsurface drainage encountered is likely to be very old. |
| Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets? | Culverts present on west leg and south leg not close to intersection. POR-224-1589 (CFN 1848378) is small concrete box. Photos show it just under capacity, standing water, low velocity. Minor spalling on headwalls. No GA available.POR-225-0245 (CFN 1823973) is small concrete box, sediment buildup observed. Cracking observed in pavement over top. GA=7. |
| Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes? | See comments on POR-225-0245. |
| Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)? | No existing curb or gutters. This would get added with roundabout, most likely. Would have to outlet along south leg into stream. |
| Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)? | Potential wetlands and stream near culvert locations. |
| Will channel relocation be required? | Conceptual plan shown south leg full depth pavement beginning near culvert location on 225. Will not need to widen at this point most likely, can do without extending culvert. No relocation expected. |
| Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities? | Most likely. If storm sewers are used, can use manufactured system. This is a rural location however; filter strips/biofilter should be investigated first. |
| Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly? | Unaware of underdrain presence here. |
| Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations? | Storm sewer installation should be done before full depth pavement installation. Phase in a way to allow construction from downstream up. |
| Are there any other hydraulic issues? Describe. | This is a flat location. If storm sewers are used, ensure adequate cover. |

| **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? | No |
| 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? | Overhead Flasher – Removed |
| 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. | Exempt |
| 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? | N/A |
| 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? | No |
| **OTHER TSMO Considerations: None** |
|  |

| **TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES: NAME Michelle Chaney Rebecca Mocarski** |
| --- |
| **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](https://www.dot.state.oh.us/roadway/omutcd/Pages/default.aspx))? | 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 no traffic control poles – only utility poles that will be impacted |
| Will resurfacing affect signal height? | N/A – Flasher removal required. |
| Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)? | N/A |
| 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? | No. |
| Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity? | N/A |
| Does the controller need to be upgraded? | N/A |
| Do proprietary materials need to be specified? | No. |
| Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting? | Roundabout lighting installed per ODOT TEM. |
| Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present? | No |
| Are there any other traffic control issues? Specify. | Lighting to be installed on AT breakaway bases. |

| **UTILITY ISSUES: Matthew Steele** |
| --- |
| **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. | Utility Poles and associated attachments. |
| Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Level A? | SUE Level B is being performed prior to Stage 1 plans.. |
| Are there existing utilities on an existing structure that need to be relocated? | N/A |
| Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? Specify. | Cell tower in NE Quad. |
| Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract? | Neither utility appear in the area. Will know more after SUE Level B is performed. |
| Are there any other utility issues? Specify. | Cell tower in NE Quad of the intersection.Gas / Oil wells to the north and west. Will know more after SUE Level B is performed. |

| 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 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? | The official detour route (if used) is not limited by bridge load limits.Roads likely to see traffic due to any unsigned route are Virginia Road and Porter Road. Both roads have weight limits and truck traffic restrictions.  |
| Is the project located on the National Truck Network? | No. |
| Are there overhead bridges with existing vertical clearance issues or that may become vertical clearance issues (e.g. shifting traffic to the shoulder, adding pavement without milling first, etc.) | No. |
| Are there pinch points within the work area that 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 location of existing utility poles will limit the ability to place temporary pavement. Utility pole relocation must be completed prior to any temporary MOT widening. |
| 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. | Waterloo Local School District – 330.947.2664Southeast Local School District – 330.654.5841 |
| 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. | Yes. Deerfield Township Fire Department – 330.584.2515Atwater Township Fire Department – 330.947.2323 |
| Are there significant traffic generators nearby that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? (e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.) | Deerfield AG Services is a local business located east of the project site with truck traffic that should be considered with any potential project detour.  |
| What is the width of the existing pavement? Will temporary pavement be needed to maintain the existing number of travel lanes? | The US-224 pavement width measures 24’. The suitability of the shoulders for MOT purposes is unknown. If maintaining traffic through the intersection using phased construction, temporary pavement is anticipated.  |
| 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. | Culverts are present on the west leg and the south leg but are not close to the intersection. MOT measures are expected to avoid these culverts. |
| 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. | Ponding observed at parking lots on the north side of US-224. No storm sewers are present. No driveway culverts observed. The placement of any temporary pavement will cause a need for temporary drainage management. |
| Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time? | Three residential driveways may be impacted by this work. Two businesses are impacted by this work: Paul’s Equipment - 330.947.1147 Deerfield Skating Center - 330.947.2208 |
| 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 may be provided with proper project phasing or constructing the improvements under closure/detour. |
| Is there potential for the need to require right-of-way acquisition? | The need for Right-of-Way acquisition is dependent on the finalized location of the roundabout and the selected MOT methods. |
| Is there room in the median for the construction of crossover pavement within the project limits and beyond the project limits on either end? If yes, identify potential locations for crossover locations. | N/A |
| Are short duration road closures going to be required? (e.g., bridge demo, steel erection, overhead utility installation/removal, etc.). If yes, is there an opportunity for diversion of the traffic to other routes or to the ramps on a diamond interchange? Identify the potential diversion routes. | N/A |
| Will there be a need for temporary structures (full or partial) in order to maintain the existing number of lanes? | No |
| Is there power available within or nearby the project location for temporary lighting and/or temporary signals? | Yes. |
| 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. | The local school schedule should be considered due to school bus routes. The Portage County Fair should be considered due to traffic generation. |
| 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 patterns routed through this area will require SR-224 and the south leg of the intersection (SR-225) to be maintained during construction. This location is also used as an alternative for I-76 when traffic must be routed from the interstate. Therefore, it is essential that traffic movements be maintained through this intersection.Evaluate the roundabout location and construction phasing to accommodate traffic movements during construction. Advise District of the most feasible option.* Determine if two lanes of SR-224 and SR-225 may be maintained during construction.
* Evaluate any Right-of -Way, utility, and drainage impacts due to MOT measures.
* Determine if the intersection could be maintained via signalized closure to control a single lane through the work area using temporary signals at each leg of the intersection.
* It is acceptable to close and detour the north leg of the intersection (Alliance Road).

District will consider alternative MOT schemes provided that the traffic patterns described above may be maintained during construction. Please advise if an alternative MOT method is recommended. |
| 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.) | N/A |
| 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](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/about-us/policies-and-procedures/policies/21-008-p) (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](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/working/engineering/roadway/manuals-standards/tem/06) | N/A |

| **RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES: Tim Ward** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if right of way or survey issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.** |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Will there be any work beyond the existing right of way limits? | Yes. Schematic shows proposed right of way beyond existing right of way. |
| 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. proposed driveways are being constructed at the existing driveway locations.  |
| Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)? | None found at this time. |
| Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)? | Yes. Temporary easements will be used to construct driveways and to grade and seed. |
| Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations? | Yes. See utility issues |
| Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns. | No. |
| Are work agreements prohibited for any reason? | Yes. Work agreements are for work that can be non-performed.  |
| Are there any other right of way or survey issues? Specify. | Superfund/CERCLIS site (SE Quadrant) and active and former landfills (SW and NW Quadrant) are present. Any acquisition proposed at a solid waste or hazardous waste facility (landfill) requires an authorization from OEPA under OAC 3745-513 (“Rule 513”) and Chief Legal Counsel. |

| **CONSTRUCTION ISSUES: Joe Schrecengost** |
| --- |
| **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?  | N/A |
| 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, Only possible issue could be light poles if not readily available |
| Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)? | Unlikely |
| Compare the Begin/End construction dates with the Scope of Work. Is the construction schedule reasonable? | Currently show a begin date of 8/2/27 and end date of 9/2/27. Will likely need to increase the duration to approximately 90 days depending on the full scope of the project. (end date adjusted to 12/1/2028 by Jim Bruner on 1/19/24) |
| Examine the existing pavement condition and repair history. Calculate potential pavement repair quantities. | N/A assuming project area will be all full depth construction. |
| Note manhole lid elevations versus proposed paving thickness. Will manhole lids or valve boxes need adjusted after paving? | N/A due to Full Depth Construction. |
| Is there a need for Echelon Paving? | Not Needed for this project. |
| 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? | Roller Rink on NE Corner and Used Bus Lot on NW Corner. It is not anticipated access will occur down steep slopes or through adjacent properties. |
| 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? | Existing guardrail and slopes seem to be in good condition. No additional grading will be needed for replacement unless relocated. Guardrail on the south leg may be affected due to roadway realignment |
| Is more space or room needed for construction?Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.? | Permanent R/W will be needed due to the realignment of the road and roundabout. What is proposed in the conceptual drawing appears to be adequate. |
| Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks? | Unlikely cranes or concrete pumps will be needed |
| Will there be instream work? | Unlikely. |
| Will Temporary shoring/sheeting, cofferdams or work pads be required to complete the proposed work? Anticipated Permitting (see Agency Coordination/Permit Issues section above) | Unlikely this will be needed. |
| Will the road need to be detoured to complete construction? What are the possible detour routes? | Likely detour of SR225 and at least one lane of SR224 at a time, possible detour routes include SR183 and SR14. Construction would be most easily completed within a full closure if allowable. |
| Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor? | Most Likely will use SE/SW corner of the intersection for laydown area outside the R/W with property owner permission. |

| **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: 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)**.** |
| **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, sidewalks are not required on this project |
| 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, no on street parking in this location |
| 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 |
| What are the proposed bicycle lane widths? | N/A, no bikes are to be installed as part of project |
| What are the proposed sidewalk and shared use path widths (and buffer width)? | N/A, no sidewalks are to be installed as part of project |
| If bike/ped accommodations require additional ROW not planned for the project, can a future project provide this? | No, future ped/bike accommodations are unlikely at this location |

| **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? | 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)](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) 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.) | Not Applicable |
| Will a Coast Guard (Section 9) permit be required? | Not Applicable |
| Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? Specify. | Unlikely |
| Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required? | Unlikely |
| 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? | * OEPA under OAC 3745-513 (“Rule 513”) and NPDES Permitting
* USEPA (CERCLIS)
* Chief Legal Council (Real Estate Acquisition)
* USACE (NWP #14 - Preconstruction Notification)
 |

| **SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS: Jim Bruner** |
| --- |
| **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 | D1 due to multiple hazardous waste sites in the vicinity. |
| Project Path classification | Path 2, could increase to Path 3 due to R/W takes with additional environmental/Chief Legal coordination due to the nearby superfund site. |
| Schedule | Initial Ellis milestones show FY 2028 Q1 award and 16 month construction duration 8/2/27 to 12/1/28. PID 103275 FY 2024 Sign project, PID 116081 FY 2025 Crack Sealing project, FY 2027 resurfacings on US 224 PID 101056 Atwood Center and west, PID 116747 Deerfield circle east and SR 14 south, no other nearby projects shown in Ellis at this time. |
| Budget | $4,678,400 in Safety Funds at 100% have been awarded to the project and currently split as follows:PE Env $777,200PE DD $137,200RW $97,900CC $3,666,100Any costs in excess of this will be covered by District Allocation unless other funds are secured. |