Wasson Way Ph 8 PID 113603

Feasibility Study

Cincinnati DOTE Draft Review

May 10, 2024

Below are DOTE’s comments/notes on the draft copy of this Feasibility Study, in no order of importance.

Overall, the City staff reviewing this document feel these are really good documents, and we appreciate the work Stantec has done, and the help from D8 staff to get us to this point in the project. They detail quite well the history and background of the evaluation of the connection in the study.

Feasibility Study, document no. 1 (42-page PDF)

1. Would it be beneficial to add a copy of the “Shared Use Path Alternates” map in the smaller 42-page PDF, to help this document to be read separately, without the 324-page Attachment PDF needed to reference the project locations/alignments? Specifically asking for the map shown on Attachment pages 30-31 or same as shown 128-129, to be included.
2. On page 11, 4.1.1 No Build Alternative, 2nd paragraph, please remove sentence referring to sharrows. It’s true that the road does not include sharrows. However, the presence, or lack thereof, does not impact safety or influence inexperienced riders’ use of a road like Wooster.
3. Section 4.2 comparison of the different alternatives for segment 1 (pages 14/42 and 15/42): Alternative A is said to have a length of 3250 ft, while alternative C is listed as 2900 ft. (Per google maps these two numbers should be flipped (Alternate A being shorter).
4. Also, if this is presented to an outside audience, maybe one should mention that there is an additional 2400 ft of travel distance to be added to the length of alternative C in order to get to the beginning point of Alternative A). The different alternative starting points are discussed on page (33/42 and could be referenced here).

Appendix, document no. 2 (324-page PDF)

1. Anything before Appendix C: several pages have headings such as “presented at the 9/7 meeting), but it may be helpful to add a year (is 5/22) May 2022 meeting or May 22nd of a certain year? (see for example pages 17/324 compared to 18/324)
2. Cost estimates for bridge work (page 124/324) and other locations appear generally very low.
3. (Page 132/324) costs for bridge work are even lower and do not match the previous numbers (page 124/324)
4. (page 134/324) costs listed here do not match the one outlined on page 124/324.
5. (Page 146/324). Has an alternative 3 been studied to see if the reduced trail loads allow for the removal of the sway braces and accordingly a wider trail on the bridge without fill?
6. On the trail profiles, would it be possible to add Ohio River flood elevations by frequency, 100-year/0.01 chance? Not sure what the level of difficulty would be, without needing to do any project/location specific hydrologic/hydrologic analysis. Not looking for Duck Creek flow elevations, just Ohio River backwater. It would be good to see if maybe additional money could be spent in construction/RW to lower maintenance costs and increase days open to traffic.
   1. One location for example was P10/13 Segment 3 Alt B Sta 476+ to 481+, on page 65/324 in the Appendix PDF. The low point of the trail shown is cheaper and matched the ex topography, but raising it there may be better in regards to the aforementioned elevation related qualities.
7. In general, it is good to see 30% contingency, and ODOT’s inflation calculations in the cost estimates. Some notes on costs beyond those listed above for the bridges:
   1. In the Alt 2-C Cost Estimate, will it only cost $113,000 to extend a 12’x12’ box culvert by 54 LF? While we haven’t had any recent work of this type to compare pricing, it seems like it is a difficult work location. But again we don’t do much work of this type.
   2. For Alt 2-B, please add cost for Concrete Barrier, length of need to be enough to separate the trail from car/trucks on the Wooster bridge, bridge approach, and roundabout at a minimum, with preferring to have the barrier extend NE from the roundabout, along Wooster to under the former RR bridge and Claire yard driveway.