

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):	SUM SR 0059 12.41	PID:	118709
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:		Prepared By:	Brian Ross
City, Township or Village Name(s):	City of Stow	ODOT Project Manager:	Paul Frey

Project Description: Superstructure replacement of SUM-59-1244 SFN 7702019 over Fish Creek.

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:
 Coordinates: 41.1542777778, -81.3965194444
 SUM SR 59 Exact limits TBD. Assuming SLM 12.69 to 12.74 (note: current roadway inventory log points are off from recent LRS update – Revise at a later date)



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	RICK O'NEILL	
CRASH DATA	DAVE GRIFFITH	
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	ROB LANG	
GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA	MATT CHANEY / KYLE KOPPES	
OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES	MATT CHANEY / KYLE KOPPES	
GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES	TOM POWELL	
PAVEMENT ISSUES	NICK CHANEY/ BRIAN ROSS	
STRUCTURAL ISSUES	NICK CHANEY/ BRIAN ROSS	
HYDRAULIC ISSUES	MIKE PALAGANO / JORDAN BOEHM	
TSMO CONSIDERATIONS	AARON CONLEY	
TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES	MICHELLE CHANEY / AARON CONLEY	
UTILITY ISSUES	MATT STEELE	
MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES	LEN BLANKENSHIP	
RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES	BRIAN HONAKER / TIM WARD	
CONSTRUCTION ISSUES	JON DUDT	
PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES	MATT CHANEY	
AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES	BRIAN PECK	
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: Michael Craver	
Legal Speed:	35
Design Speed:	35
Opening Year ADT:	18,500
Design Year ADT:	18,500
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	4%
Functional Classification:	3 – Principal Arterial Other
Locale (Rural or Urban):	Urban
National Highway System (NHS):	Yes

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:	
N/A	

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS:	
<i>List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.</i>	
No comments-Jeron Hollis	

CRASH DATA: David Griffith	
<i>Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years</i>	(Yes/No) NO
<i>Is the project area highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps</i>	(Yes/No) NO
<i>Based on a spatial query (using GCAT or TIMS) of the three most recent years of crash data, briefly summarize crash history including pedestrian and bicycle crashes. Indicate any design features that may be contributing to the observed crash pattern that may be addressed by the project.</i>	
2019-2023 crash data query shows no mitigable crash patterns within project area	

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)}	
Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat	
Scenic River	
Existing wet areas/existing cattails/wetlands	
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	
Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects)	
Historic Bridge(s)	
National Historic Landmarks	
Archaeological Sites	
Public Facilities	
Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries)	
Farmland	
Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area	

Project Initiation Package

Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns	
Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials	
Sensitive environmental justice areas	
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains	
Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	
Sole Source Aquifers	
Wellhead Protection Areas	
Noise abatement issues	
Coordination with Conservancy Districts	
Other environmental issues	

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 in full depth limits.
Horizontal Curve Radius	N/A – no horizontal curve
Maximum Grade	Match existing
Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)	Match existing vertical curve
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
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 5ft. There is at least 4ft from traveled way to parapet wall. Match existing bridge dimensions. Intent to meet minimum 5ft requirement per the BDM.

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
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. Verify that guardrail placement doesn't create a sight distance issue with adjacent driveways. Consider using MGS Type B Anchor Assemblies near driveways.
List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone.	Nothing is apparent
Should existing access control be revised to improve safety?	No
Are there any drive locations that will require special attention during design (e.g., very steep grades, high volume commercial drives, drives close to bridges or intersections)?	No. But if a driveway apron is within the full depth limits, replace apron as necessary.
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified to improve pedestrian crossing safety?	N/A
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified or truck aprons added to accommodate turning movements of large trucks?	N/A
Does grading need to be upgraded? To what criteria (e.g., clear zone, safety, standard)? Consider potential right of way and other impacts when considering grading method.	No
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. But, the project should replace the entire runs of guardrail on all approaches.

Project Initiation Package

GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES:	
<i>Based on the information compiled during this study indicate whether or not the following geotechnical issues are present or should be further considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. Refer to Section 302.2 of the ODOT Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations for literature search resources.</i>	
Design Issues	Location/Comments
Is there evidence of soil drainage problems (e.g., wet or pumping subgrade, standing water, the presence of seeps, wetlands, swamps, bogs)?	NA
Will construction be impacted based on the groundwater table?	NA
Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)?	NA
Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or rock)?	NA
Is there evidence of unsuitable materials (e.g., presence of debris or man-made fills or waste pits containing these materials, indications from old soil borings)?	NA
Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)?	NA
Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines? Evidence of quarries?	NA
Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines?	NA
Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area?	NA
Are there any other geotechnical issues? <i>Specify.</i>	NA

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?	No.
Has the site received repeated resurfacings in recent years?	No.
Does pavement deterioration appear to be caused by drainage or geotechnical problems?	No.
Are there any other pavement issues? <i>Specify.</i>	No..

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: 7702019	SUM-59-1244
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. Delamination and spalling is seen in the underside of boxbeams 5, 8, 9, 12, and 13. Strands are exposed and broken in beams 8 and 9. All spalls have had sealer applied to them.
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 in 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>	Wearing surface is to be repaved 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?	New railings shall meet current standards.
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, either complete closure or partial closure of SR 59 will be required to replace the superstructure.
Does the bridge need to accommodate future roadway lanes, bicycle lanes, a shared use path, shoulder, or railroad tracks?	No.
Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad?	N/A No RR present.
Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.).	The top flange of box beam members is obscured by an asphalt overlay. No outstanding issues with other components of the structure (railing sidewalk etc.)
Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.).	In addition to defects noted in prior questions heavy leakage is evident in the center joint and left most joint. Exposed strands have rusted through epoxy urethane coating.
Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.).	Abutments have been patched and sealed in a past project. Minor isolated cracks are present.

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: 7702019	SUM-59-1244
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.)	No issues to note. Channel is in good condition (Rated 7)
Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.)	Approach slabs have been paved over.
Are there any other structure related issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Steel box girder utility duct is rusty.
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>	Evidence of ponding on bridge deck at sidewalk. This should be corrected with new superstructure. Substructure has a cored sewer outlet into wall; there appears to be evidence of flow through a joint/3' crack in the wall near here. Perhaps this could be sealed, although this is in zone AE floodplains.
Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets?	Streambed appears to be okay. Potential bank erosion at FR.
Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes?	Doesn't appear to be.
Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)?	Other than ponding issues near sidewalk on deck, appears to be okay
Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)?	Fish Creek, Zone AE floodplains w/ floodway.
Will channel relocation be required?	No
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	Most likely not.
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	Don't see evidence of improper UD function.
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	Detour will be needed for superstructure replacement.
Are there any other hydraulic issues? <i>Describe.</i>	Floodplain coordination will not be required as long as no work changes the alignment, grade, or hydraulic capacity of the structure.

Project Initiation Package

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS:	
<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?	Yes (SSUMSR00059**C_07.826_12.666_F, Overall State Rank: #3193) (SSUMSR00059**C_07.826_12.666_R, Overall State Rank: #3193)
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?	No
Is this a Traffic Incident Management Note eligible project?	No

Project Initiation Package

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS:	
<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
OTHER TSMO Considerations: None	

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>	

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
Do existing utilities need to be relocated? <i>If so, please identify.</i>	No
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?	There is a communication duct bank under the structure spanning the stream. The line does not need relocated for superstructure work.
Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? <i>Specify.</i>	Protect communication duct bank during construction.
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>	No.

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?	<p>Bridge load limits are not expected to be a problem for traffic following the official signed detour route.</p> <p>Multiple unsigned local routes can be identified. Fairchild Avenue is expected to see increased traffic by motorists that may ignore the official detour route. Truck restrictions apply to residential routes that are likely to see cut-through traffic.</p> <p>The anticipated phasing of this project is to implement an EB detour for Phase 1 while maintaining WB traffic across the structure. During Phase 1, a single lane closure on the structure is expected due to the available working width and the location of existing box beams. Phase 2 work will maintain two lanes of traffic (one lane in each direction). Anticipated work duration is 60 days. Official detour route is SR 91/ SR261/ SR 43.</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 prevents the addition of temporary pavement for use during MOT.

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 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. Pavement in this area appears to be new.
Are there nearby schools that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify names, location and school districts.	Stow-Monroe Falls City Schools 4350 Allen Road Stow, OH 44224 330.689.5445
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.	Stow Fire Department - Fire station 3800 Darrow Rd Stow, OH 44224 (330) 689-5800 Kent Fire Department (if joint response is anticipated) 320 S Depeyster St Kent, OH 44240 (330) 676-7393 Stow Police Department - Police department 3800 Darrow Rd Stow, OH 44224 (330) 689-5700
Are there significant traffic generators nearby that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? (e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.)	No.
What is the width of the existing pavement? Will temporary pavement be needed to maintain the existing number of travel lanes?	48'
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.)	Fishcreek Road is close to the work area. MOT phasing on SR 59 should consider impacts to Fishcreek Road.
Are there sidewalks or paths within or leading to/from the work area that need to be closed?	Yes. Pedestrian detour signage will be necessary,
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?	The existing sidewalk system will support a pedestrian detour.
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.	Culvert extensions are not expected for MOT purposes.

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 any known existing drainage issues within the work limits? If yes, special attention needs to be given to ensuring temporary drainage can be accomplished.	No.
Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time?	A personal driveway near the NE corner of the bridge (House #4591) will require effort to maintain during construction. Access at all other drives may be easily maintained.
Is the project located in or nearby an area of regional significance with a potential to cause controversy or negative public feedback or political scrutiny?	No.
Is there enough width to provide safe construction access? If no, what other means of access can be provided?	Yes.
Is there potential for the need to require right-of-way acquisition?	R/W acquisition is not anticipated for MOT purposes.
Is there room in the median for the construction of crossover pavement within the project limits and beyond the project limits on either end? If yes, identify potential locations for crossover locations.	N/A.
Are short duration road closures going to be required? (e.g., bridge demo, steel erection, overhead utility installation/removal, etc.). If yes, is there an opportunity for diversion of the traffic to other routes or to the ramps on a diamond interchange? Identify the potential diversion routes.	N/A.
Will there be a need for temporary structures (full or partial) in order to maintain the existing number of lanes?	No.
Is there power available within or nearby the project location for temporary lighting and/or temporary signals?	Power is available.
Will there be a need for additional signal heads (drives and/or side roads) or temporary signal timing/coordination?	No.
Are there any Traffic Incident Management features, such as hydrants, pull-offs, turn-arounds, etc.?	No.
Are there issues that may limit the construction timeframe? (e.g., sporting or other significant regional events, work in streams, suitable wooded habitat, school, etc.). If yes, list them.	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.

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
Will there be a need to restrict existing movements during construction? (e.g., no left turns, etc.)	Turning movements may be maintained. MOT striping extending away from the site must consider the Fishcreek Road / SR 59 intersection. It is expected that the dual-left SB lanes from Fishcreek Road may need to be reduced to a single lane when maintaining bidirectional traffic during part width phasing.
Is there an opportunity (or potential need) to implement any work zone ITS components? (e.g., work zone egress warning, queue detection and warning, CCTV, DDMS, etc.)	No.
How big of an impact will the project have on queue lengths and congestion? If significant, a MOT Policy Exception Request may be required per Traffic Management in Work Zones Policy (21-008(P)) and Standard Procedure (123-001(SP)).	N/A.
Does this project require an MOTAA? All Path 4 & 5 projects along with Path 3 projects on Interstate/Interstate look-alikes need to have a Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives Analysis Completed. Refer to TEM Section 630-5	No.

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?	Possibly for grading and/or utility relocation and/or room for construction
Will relocation of residences be involved?	No
Will relocation of businesses be involved?	No
Will the project require modifying the access control to any properties?	No
Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)?	None
Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?	Possibly for grading
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	Possibly
Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns.	None known
Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?	No
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? <i>Specify.</i>	No

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?	No

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
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.)?	No
Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)?	No
Compare the Begin/End construction dates with the Scope of Work. Is the construction schedule reasonable?	A single season project should be sufficient unless phasing is desired. Need more info, box beams or slab bridge, etc.
Examine the existing pavement condition and repair history. Calculate potential pavement repair quantities.	Resurfaced in 2024, roadway outside of limits is in good condition.
Note manhole lid elevations versus proposed paving thickness. Will manhole lids or valve boxes need adjusted after paving?	Basins at the FWD and Rear approach may need adjusted to grade
Is there a need for Echelon Paving?	No
Examine the rideability of the approach slab to the roadway/bridge joint.	Acceptable
Will the project have impacts to nearby residents/businesses? Will site access occur down steep side slopes or through properties adjacent to project site?	Residential drive at FWD right approach
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?	All rail should be replaced, most is Type 5
Is more space or room needed for construction? Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.?	May be able to utilize alley arms, or move poles ~10-15' left
Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks?	Yes other than LT power lines
Will there be instream work?	Maybe
Will Temporary shoring/sheeting, cofferdams or work pads be required to complete the proposed work? Anticipated Permitting (see Agency Coordination/Permit Issues section above)	Yes
Will the road need to be detoured to complete construction? What are the possible detour routes?	Yes
Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor?	None immediately available other than the roadway.

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
Are there visible signs of deterioration on sidewalks or missing sidewalks?	No, but the project should replace the sidewalk within the full depth limits.
Is there a minimum 4' clearance along sidewalks? (i.e. poles that obstruct the sidewalk)	Yes.
Are there visible sign of deterioration in bike lanes/shoulders or missing bike facilities?	No.
Do crossings for bicyclists and/or pedestrians need to be improved or installed?	No.
Is on-street parking set back 20 feet from the crosswalk (both marked and unmarked) at an intersection or set back 30 feet of the approach to any flashing beacon, stop sign or traffic control device? (See ORC 4511.68)	N/A
Is there evidence of the need for a midblock crossing? (i.e. pedestrian crashes, signalized intersection spacing exceeds 600 ft., presence of midblock transit stops or path, pedestrian generators and destinations). Refer to FHWA Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Intersections	N/A
Does the project area have an active transportation plan in place (or other multimodal plan such as a bicycle, pedestrian, school travel plan , or metropolitan transportation plan). Contact pertinent local public agencies for more information.	No.
Is there existing bicycle or pedestrian usage along this corridor? (For statewide volume data visit ODOT's Non-Motorized Database System .) Visible indicators of usage include counts, worn paths, transit stops, etc.	Yes, but this is a structure replacement project. This project does not need to address any bike/ped issues other than sidewalk replacement within full depth limits.
Is the project located on a designated or proposed bike route (local, regional, state or US)?	No.
What is the Level of Traffic Stress (1-4)? (LTS 1 and 2 are considered comfortable for the mainstream adult population.) (See Level of Traffic Stress calculation tool . This data is pre-calculated for the State & US Bike Route System .)	N/A
Does the project area have high Active Transportation Demand and high Active Transportation Need (Scores of 3 or 4)? (Use the Identify Features tool to select project area and view scores for Demand_ Mapping and Need_ Mapping. scores.)	Demand Mapping = 3 Need Mapping = 4 Nothing needs addressed with this.
What are the proposed bicycle lane widths?	N/A, no bike lanes are proposed.

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)?	Sidewalk replacements should match existing widths.
If bike/ped accommodations require additional ROW not planned for the project, can a future project provide this?	Yes.

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?	
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.)	
Will a Coast Guard (Section 9) permit be required?	
Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? <i>Specify.</i>	
Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required?	
Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required?	
Is coordination with any other agency required?	

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS: Jim Bruner	
<p>Based on the responses to the above items, do any of the following need to be modified?</p>	
Issue	Comments
Conceptual scope	None
Work limits	MOT coordination with the City of Stow on SR 59
Probable environmental document type	C2
Project Path classification	Path 2

Project Initiation Package

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS: Jim Bruner	
Schedule	CO FY2027 Q1 no conflicts with other ODOT projects
Budget	District Allocation/No Issues