

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):	TRU-422-15.59	PID:	118715
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:	2/2/2024	Prepared By:	Brian Ross
City, Township or Village Name(s):	City of Niles	ODOT Project Manager:	Len Blankenship

Project Description: Superstructure replacement on TRU- 422-1559 SFN 7807082 over Mosquito Creek.

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:
 Coordinates: 41°12'43.98"N, 80°45'28.24"W
 TRU 422 Exact limits TBD. Assuming SLM 15.53 to 15.61 (150' forward and rear of exp joints)

Project Initiation Package

ODOT DISCIPLINE INVOLVEMENT:		
<i>List name and phone number of individual(s) representing each discipline during the site visit and preparation of the Project Initiation Package. One individual may represent multiple disciplines.</i>		
DISCIPLINE	NAME	PHONE NUMBER
GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION	MIKE CRAVER	
LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION	JIM BRUNER	
DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERN	JOE PARTHEMER	
CRASH DATA	DAVE GRIFFITH	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	SEAN CARPENTER	330-786-2274
GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA	MATT CHANEY / KYLE KOPPES	
OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES	MATT CHANEY / KYLE KOPPES	
GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES	TOM POWELL	
PAVEMENT ISSUES	BRIAN ROSS	
STRUCTURAL ISSUES	BRIAN ROSS	
HYDRAULIC ISSUES	MIKE PALAGANO	
TSMO CONSIDERATIONS	AARON CONLEY	
TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES	MICHELLE CHANEY / AARON CONLEY	
UTILITY ISSUES	MATTHEW STEELE	330-786-4832
MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES	LEN BLANKENSHIP	330-786-4824
RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES	BRIAN HONAKER / TIM WARD	
CONSTRUCTION ISSUES	JOE ALFANO	
PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES	MATT CHANEY	
AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES	SEAN CARPENTER	330-786-2274
SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS	JIM BRUNER	
EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:		
<i>Indicate external agency involvement during identification of project issues affecting scope development. List the name and phone number of individual(s) representing each agency during the site visit.</i>		
AGENCY	NAME	PHONE NUMBER
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:	35 mph
Design Speed:	35 mph
Opening Year ADT (2029):	13,500
Design Year ADT (2049):	13,500
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	1%
Functional Classification:	3 – Principal Arterial Other
Locale (Rural or Urban):	Urban
National Highway System (NHS):	No

Project Initiation Package

LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION: Jim Bruner	
Briefly describe local planning studies, bike/ped long range plans, aesthetics, etc. that will be considered throughout project development:	
None.	

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS: Michelle Chaney, Jeron	
<i>List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.</i>	
Lighting on wood utility poles is maintained by the power company, it is not ODOT lighting. No concerns from Trumbull County Maintenance	

CRASH DATA:	
<i>Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years</i>	<i>(Yes/No)</i>
<i>Is the project area highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps</i>	<i>(Yes/No)</i>
<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.</i>	

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	
<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
Parkland, nature preserves and wildlife areas {4(f)/6(f)}	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no publicly owned parkland, nature preserves, wildlife areas, etc., were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, a minor amount of potential suitable wooded habitat (SWH) for the Federally listed Indiana Bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>), Northern Long-Eared Bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>) and Tricolored Bat (<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>) and State-listed Little Brown Bat (<i>Myotis lucifugus</i>) was identified within the project area. Additionally, a record for the State listed - Grove Sandwort (<i>Moehringia lateriflora</i>) was identified within the project area.

Project Initiation Package

Scenic River	Based on review of the ODOT, Transportation Information Mapping System (TIMS) conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no state or national scenic rivers were identified within 1,000 feet of the project area.
Existing wet areas/existing cattails/wetlands	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, a potential high-quality wetland was identified on the NW quadrant within the project area.
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, one (1) confirmed stream (Mosquito Creek) was identified within the project area and a second potential jurisdictional waterway was identified on the SW quadrant within the project area.
Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects)	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no known historic resources were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
Historic Bridge(s)	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no known historic bridges were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
National Historic Landmarks	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no known National Historic Landmarks were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
Archaeological Sites	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no known archaeological sites were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
Public Facilities	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no public facilities were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries)	Based on review of the available mapping conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no known Ohio Genealogical Society (OGS) cemeteries were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
Farmland	Based on review of ODOT's Transportation Information Mapping System conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, the project area is located within an urbanized area.
Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area	No known Watershed Specific NPDES Permit Area(s) were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.

Project Initiation Package

<p>Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns</p>	<p>This project does not add capacity, a new interchange or a new road on new alignment. Hence, this project will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of the existing facility or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions impacts relative to the No-Build Alternative. As such, FHWA has determined that this project will generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. Consequently, this project is exempt from analysis for MSATs.</p> <p>Trumbull County is not in a PM2.5 non-attainment or maintenance area. Therefore, a PM2.5 analysis is not required for this project.</p> <p>The State of Ohio is in attainment for CO at this time and no coordination or analysis is required.</p> <p>Trumbull County is in an Eight-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area that requires consideration of the regional effects on ozone from federally funded projects or projects of regional significance. As the proposed project is listed in the 2024-2027 STIP and the STIP project description matches the proposed activities, ozone is addressed for the proposed project.</p>
<p>Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials</p>	<p>Based on review of the Ohio Regulated Properties Search (ORPS) Tool conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no known landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, NPL, or industrial sites were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.</p>
<p>Sensitive environmental justice areas</p>	<p>Based on review of the ODOT, Transportation Information Mapping System (TIMS) conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, underserved populations were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.</p>
<p>Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains</p>	<p>Based on review of the ODOT Transportation Information Mapping System (TIMS) by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in October 2023, the project area is located within a designated Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone AE floodplain.</p>
<p>Lake Erie Coastal Management Area</p>	<p>Based on review of the ODOT, Transportation Information Mapping System (TIMS) conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, the project area is not located within a Lake Erie Coastal Management Area.</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers</p>	<p>Based on review of the OhioEPA, Drinking Water Source Protection Area electronic mapping system by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, the project is not within and/or adjacent to a Federally designated Sole Source Aquifer area.</p>
<p>Wellhead Protection Areas</p>	<p>Based on review of the OhioEPA, Drinking Water Source Protection Area electronic mapping system by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, the project area is not located within one (1) mile of a public water system well, intake or source water protection area.</p>

Project Initiation Package

Noise abatement issues	The proposed project is not a Type I project for noise, i.e. will not cause an increase in traffic volumes, will not substantially change the vehicle mix or speed, will not involve new roadways or substantially change the alignments or shielding effects of the existing roadway. Therefore, this project is deemed unrelated to increased traffic noise traffic. In accordance with the current ODOT Noise Manual, a traffic noise analysis is not required for this project.
Coordination with Conservancy Districts	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, the project area is not located within and/or adjacent to a Conservancy District.
Other environmental issues	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no other environmental issues were identified within the project area.

GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA:	
<i>Consider design speed, design functional classification, land use, and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project and potential for design exceptions. Note exceptions for low volume roadways.</i>	
Design Criteria	Location/Comments
Lane Width	Match existing
Shoulder Width	N/A, curbed section on each approach. Replace curb and gutter in full depth limits. Beyond the approach slabs, between the existing curb and guardrail it is paved with asphalt... The District should prescribe what we want to do here. – likely concrete these areas.
Horizontal Curve Radius	Match existing
Maximum Grade	Match existing
Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)	N/A
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:	
<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?	N/A, horizontal alignment should match existing
Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards?	N/A
Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards?	N/A

Project Initiation Package

OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES:	
<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
Is driver comfort an issue due to the vertical curvature or breaks in the grade?	No. Current vertical curvature is within standards. Match existing
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, the current sidewalk width is 4ft. There is at least 4ft from traveled way to parapet wall. Match existing bridge dimensions.
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.
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. 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?	No.
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified or truck aprons added to accommodate turning movements of large trucks?	No.
Does grading need to be upgraded? To what criteria (e.g., clear zone, safety, standard)? Consider potential right of way and other impacts when considering grading method.	No.
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 (ICE) Ohio Department of Transportation applicable?	N/A
Are there any other geometric issues? Describe.	No

Project Initiation Package

GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES: Thomas J Powell, PE	
<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)?	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? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A

PAVEMENT ISSUES: BRIAN ROSS	
<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?	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?	Replace as needed for roadway profile/geometry changes.
Has the site received repeated resurfacings in recent years?	No.
Does pavement deterioration appear to be caused by drainage or geotechnical problems?	No.
Are there any other pavement issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Replace as needed for roadway profile/geometry changes.

Project Initiation Package

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: BRIAN ROSS	
<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: 7807082	TRU- 422-1559
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? <i>Specify.</i>	The top flange of box beam members is obscured by an asphalt overlay. Current overlay is in poor condition. There is edge spalling on the deck underside/bottom flange of box beam 5 in spans 1 and 2 and box beam 14 in span 1. These locations appear to coincide with deterioration on the surface.
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/repared on the deck?	Delaminations or spalls to box beam members are not reliably repaired by patching. Only replacement can address these issues.
Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? <i>Specify type of overlay if known.</i>	Current asphalt overlay is to be replaced in 2024. Effectiveness of AC overlays has been inconsistent in the past for other non-composite box beam structures.
Does the bridge rail violate current standards?	Yes.
Is fatigue analysis required?	No.
Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? <i>Specify.</i>	No. No steel structural members
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?	Yes.
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.)? <i>Specify.</i>	Yes, partial and/or complete closure will be needed depending on replacement structure type.
Does the bridge need to accommodate future roadway lanes, bicycle lanes, a shared use path, shoulder, or railroad tracks?	Not at this time.
Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad?	N/A. RR is not present at this location.
Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.).	This structure features structurally separated concrete sidewalks and railings to allow over the side drainage through a slot opening. There is severe deterioration present in the right sidewalk and moderate deterioration on the left over the drainage opening. Based on performance of past repairs, the ability to address these issues is limited.

Project Initiation Package

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: BRIAN ROSS	
<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: 7807082	TRU- 422-1559
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.).	In addition to delaminations mentioned in the prior questions there is leakage evident in joints 2, 3, 4, and 6 throughout all 3 spans. Saturation was present in at the forward abutment in beams 12,13, and 14. No strands are directly exposed currently.
Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.).	The substructure (rated 6) shows occasional spalling in both the rear and forward abutments some with exposed reinforcement. One of the piles on the fwd pier appears tilted; This is an as built condition and does not need to be addressed.
Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.)	The channel (rated 7) is in good condition.
Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.)	Approach pavement is in fair condition. There are no sidewalk approaches to both the left and right sidewalk/railing structures.
Are there any other structure related issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Nothing else to add at this time.
HYDRAULIC ISSUES: Mike Palagano	
<i>Indicate if the following drainage issues are present or should be considered during project development. Side road and service road work should be considered in this assessment. Any available Culvert Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Comments
Does the existing drainage system appear to be appropriately sized and functioning properly? <i>Describe deficiencies.</i>	Unaware of any issues with overtopping. Storm sewers west of bridge appear okay.
Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets?	Don't see any issues in stream under bridge.
Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes?	Asphalt on bridge deck is distressed. Does not appear to be due to hydraulic issues. Waterproofing fabric can be observed from underneath.
Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)?	Curbing/sidewalk on structure is highly distressed. Runoff could potentially run through structure in spots. Curb/gutter in approach appears to be in good condition.
Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)?	Mosquito Creek. Potential wetlands. Zone AE floodplains. Superstructure replacement shouldn't require floodplain coordination. Low chord must match or be higher than existing elevation.
Will channel relocation be required?	Not required.
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	Unlikely this will exceed 1 acre of EDA/
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	No evidence of improper UD function.
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	Structure will most likely be closed with a detour or constructed part-width.
Are there any other hydraulic issues? <i>Describe.</i>	Unaware of any other issues.

Project Initiation Package

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: Aaron Conley	
<p>Briefly describe the opportunities for managing congestion or traffic issues using TSMO strategies or improvements. Consider opportunities to upgrade or install systems management and operations infrastructure: TSMO infrastructure includes communications equipment, travel time signs, signals, changeable message signs, traffic cameras, traffic signal systems, other remote field devices and data collection equipment, conduit and any supporting fiber optics. TOAST is the Traffic Operations Assessment System Tool. For additional TSMO information see http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Traffic/miscellaneous/Pages/TSMO.aspx</p>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
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?	None
Are there any local TSMO infrastructure recommendations in the project area? (ex. Include emergency or transit traffic signal pre-emption, dynamic message signs or signal coordination)	No
What MPO ITS architecture is already in place or planned? Consult the MPO ITS architecture plan, if applicable.	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?	None
Should this location have communications added or upgraded?	No
Will additional conduit be necessary for future infrastructure/communications? (ex. in barrier wall)	No
Will existing device power or communications drops be disrupted?	No
Does this project require a new traffic signal timing plan?	No
Are the current traffic signal(s) being upgraded to a system?	No
Are there alternative routes available/identified for incident management?	Unknown
Is this a Traffic Incident Management Note eligible project?	No
OTHER TSMO Considerations: None	

Project Initiation Package

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS: Aaron Conley	
<p>Briefly describe the opportunities for managing congestion or traffic issues using TSMO strategies or improvements. Consider opportunities to upgrade or install systems management and operations infrastructure: TSMO infrastructure includes communications equipment, travel time signs, signals, changeable message signs, traffic cameras, traffic signal systems, other remote field devices and data collection equipment, conduit and any supporting fiber optics. TOAST is the Traffic Operations Assessment System Tool. For additional TSMO information see http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Traffic/miscellaneous/Pages/TSMO.aspx</p>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments

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

UTILITY ISSUES:	
<p>Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</p>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Do existing utilities need to be relocated? <i>If so, please identify.</i>	Yes, Overhead Electric Possible Overhead Communication Lines

Project Initiation Package

UTILITY ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Level A?	No.
Are there existing utilities on an existing structure that need to be relocated?	No.
Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? <i>Specify.</i>	East side of structure, there are aerial power lines crossing forward abutment. Street lights on north side that will need relocated / energized from different location.
Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract?	No.
Are there any other utility issues? <i>Specify.</i>	If there is any widening for the new structure, this could interfere with water line, gas line and possible underground communication lines.

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES:	
<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?	Yes. If a US-422 closure were to occur the likely default/unsigned route would add traffic to North Road SE and SR-46. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Road SE – west of the site, to the north and south of US-422, has a 5 Ton Weight Limit and would route traffic through a residential area. Recommend maintaining traffic without a detour. <p>A full closure and detour of US-422 in this area does not seem feasible or realistic.</p>
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.)	The width of the existing bridge will limit the number of lanes maintainable during half-width bridge construction.
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:	
<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 nearby schools that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify names, location and school districts.	School routes likely affected by work on US-422: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warren City School District • Summit Academy Community School – Warren • Trumbull County Board of Developmental • John F. Kennedy Catholic School • Niles City School District
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. Niles City Fire Station and Howland Township Fire Station are in the area.
Are there significant traffic generators nearby that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? (e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.)	This area is a heavily traveled corridor with significant retail traffic. The Eastwood Mall is near to the site, work should be scheduled around special events held at the mall.
What is the width of the existing pavement? Will temporary pavement be needed to maintain the existing number of travel lanes?	Measuring the width using Google Earth shows 64' curb face to curb face. The existing number of traveled lanes cannot be maintained due to bridge width constraints. To maintain additional lanes would require overbuilding of the structure.
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.)	Considering the traffic volume of the area, left turn restrictions and right-in/right-out requirements should be implemented within the MOT workzone to promote traffic flow. Consider Qwick Kurb or similar to channelize lanes and separate traffic. Multiple business drives and intersecting streets will be affected by this restriction.
Are there sidewalks or paths within or leading to/from the work area that need to be closed?	Sidewalks do not exist at this location but well-worn footpaths leading to the structure are present. A pedestrian impact is expected although an official pedestrian detour is not available.
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?	If the new superstructure is built with a raised sidewalk similar to the existing structure, pedestrians may use the side of the bridge with traffic (opposite side of construction) during half-width construction.
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.	Unaware of any drainage issues within the work limits.
Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time?	Driveways can be maintained. Drive closures are not anticipated but the workzone design must be mindful of business accessibility. Drum placement will be used to define driveway entrance. Prohibiting left turns and requiring right-in/right-out movements should be implemented at driveways and streets within the MOT workzone to promote traffic flow. Consider Qwick Kurb or similar to channelize lanes and separate traffic. Multiple business drives and intersecting streets will be affected by this restriction.

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES:	
<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
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 staging areas are anticipated if using half-width construction.
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?	To maintain the existing number of lanes would require a significant overbuilding of the structure. If District wishes to maintain more than one lane per bound, then a decision requiring an overbuild of the structure should be reached. Overbuilding the structure for MOT seems unlikely.
Is there power available within or nearby the project location for temporary lighting and/or temporary signals?	Electrical power is available at the site.
Will there be a need for additional signal heads (drives and/or side roads) or temporary signal timing/coordination?	Additional signal heads are not anticipated but adjustment to the location of existing signal heads on span wires east and west of the site may be necessary.
Are there any Traffic Incident Management features, such as hydrants, pull-offs, turn-arounds, etc.?	No.
Are there issues that may limit the construction timeframe? (e.g., sporting or other significant regional events, work in streams, suitable wooded habitat, school, etc.). If yes, list them.	No.
Would this project potentially benefit from the application of innovative contracting method (e.g., A+B to open bridge to traffic before school starts, etc.)? If yes, which method?	No.
Will there be a need to restrict existing movements during construction? (e.g., no left turns, etc.)	Yes. Prohibiting left turns and requiring right-in/right-out movements should be implemented at driveways and streets within the MOT workzone limits to promote traffic flow. Consider Qwick Kurb or similar to channelize lanes and separate traffic. Multiple business drives and intersecting streets will be affected by this restriction.

Project Initiation Package

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES:	
<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
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 (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	N/A

RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES:	
<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?	If bridge is widened additional right of way may be needed.
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 at this time.
Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?	Temporary easement may be needed for access or grading.
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	Possibly. See utility issues.
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?	Yes. Work Agreements are for work that can be non-performed.
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Not at this time.

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES:	
<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?	
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.)?	

Project Initiation Package

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Issue	Location/Comments
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?	
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?	

Project Initiation Package

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:** 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
Are there visible signs of deterioration on sidewalks or missing sidewalks?	N/A. This is a superstructure replacement project. Adjacent roadway features are not to be considered.
Is there a minimum 4' clearance along sidewalks? (i.e. poles that obstruct the sidewalk)	N/A, no sidewalks within project limits except on bridge which will have a 4ft walk.
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 is permitted within project limits
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
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.	N/A. This is a superstructure replacement project. Adjacent roadway features are not to be considered.
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 <i>Identify Features tool</i> 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, no bicycle lanes are proposed on this project

Project Initiation Package

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES:	
<p>Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle facilities are present or should be considered for implementation during project development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian facilities: sidewalks, shared use paths, enhanced crossings, signs/signals, and lighting. • Bicycle facilities: bike lanes, improved shoulders, shared use paths, crossing treatments, signs/signals, and lighting. <p>Provide additional comments as needed. For additional bicycle and pedestrian data, see the TIMS Active Transportation Map Viewer: https://gis.dot.state.oh.us/tims/Map/ActiveTransportation and discuss with the District Bike & Ped Contact.</p>	
Issue	Location/Comments
What are the proposed sidewalk and shared use path widths (and buffer width)?	N/A, no sidewalk or shared use paths are proposed on this project
If bike/ped accommodations require additional ROW not planned for the project, can a future project provide this?	N/A, ROW will not be required for this project

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES:	
<p>Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</p>	
Issue	Location/Comments
Will an Individual US Army Corps of Engineers/ Environmental Protection Agency 404/401 permit be required?	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, one (1) confirmed stream (Mosquito Creek) was identified within the project area and a second potential jurisdictional waterway was identified on the SW quadrant within the project area. Additionally, a potential high-quality wetland was identified on the NW quadrant within the project area. These resources may be impacted depending on the project area, however, these impacts are unlikely to exceed the thresholds for an individual 404/401 permit.
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.)	Based on review of the USACE National Inventory of Dams mapping conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no levees, dams or other 408 civil works projects were identified within and/or adjacent to the project area.
Will a Coast Guard (Section 9) permit be required?	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no Section 9 waterways were identified within the project area, therefore, a Coast Guard permit will not be required.
Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? <i>Specify.</i>	Review by Eastgate Regional Council of Government, City of Niles and Trumbull County Engineer may be required.
Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required?	Based on review of the available mapping conducted by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no known historic resources, bridges, landmarks, OGS cemeteries or OAI sites were identified within the project area, therefore, coordination with the SHPO is not anticipated.

Project Initiation Package

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required?	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, no State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas were identified within the project area, therefore, coordination with ODNR involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas is not anticipated.
Is coordination with any other agency required?	Based on review of available information by ODOT, District 4 Environmental Section personnel in January 2024, a minor amount of potential suitable wooded habitat (SWH) for the Federally listed Indiana Bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>), Northern Long-Eared Bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>) and Tricolored Bat (<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>) and State-listed Little Brown Bat (<i>Myotis lucifugus</i>) was identified within the project area. Additionally, a record for the State listed - Grove Sandwort (<i>Moehringia lateriflora</i>) was identified within the project area. Coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and ODNR may be required if impacts occur to these species.

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	No
Work limits	No
Probable environmental document type	No
Project Path classification	Path 2
Schedule	No
Budget	\$3m as of 2/23/24.