**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: | 6/12/2025 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Name (County, Route, Section):** | ROS-50-32.76 | **PID:** | 122985 |
| **Date Project Initiation Package Completed:** | 8/04/2025 | **Prepared By:** | Josh Zickafoose |
| **City, Township or Village Name(s):** | Liberty Township | **ODOT Project Manager:** | Josh Zickafoose |

#

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Description:** Replacement of Bridge No. ROS-50-3276 over Walnut Creek and the necessary roadway approach work along US 50. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:** Approximately +/- 250’ East and West from the bridge along US 50. |

| **ODOT DISCIPLINE INVOLVEMENT:** |
| --- |
| ***List name and phone number of individual(s) representing each discipline during the site visit and preparation of the Project Initiation Package. One individual may represent multiple disciplines.***  |
| **DISCIPLINE** | **NAME** | **PHONE NUMBER** |
| District Planning representative  | *Max Francis* | *740-774-8977* |
| District Engineering representative | *Josh Zickafoose* | *740-774-9056* |
| District Environmental Coordinator | *Brandon Beck* | *740-774-8976* |
| District Utility Coordinator | *Rodney Cockrell* | *740-774-9055* |
| District Highway Management representative | *Arik Adams* | *740-774-9017* |
| District TSMO Coordinator | *Jonas Smith* | *740-774-8864* |
| District Geotechnical representative | *Matt Hurst* | *740-774-8898* |
| District Roadway representative | *Corey Cottrell* | *740-774-8828* |
|  |  |  |
| **EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:** |
| ***Indicate external agency involvement during identification of project issues affecting scope development. List the name and phone number of individual(s) representing each agency during the site visit.*** |
| **AGENCY** | **NAME** | **PHONE NUMBER** |
| FHWA Engineer\*\*\* |  |  |
| Other (LPA, MPO, etc.) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **\*\*\* The FHWA Engineer should be invited on projects expected to require approval from Federal Highway Administration.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION:** |
| Legal Speed:  | 55 MPH |
| Design Speed: | 60 MPH |
| Opening Year ADT: | 7,100 |
| Design Year ADT: | 7,300 |
| Trucks (24 Hour B&C): | 9% |
| Functional Classification: | 04 Minor Arterial |
| Locale (Rural or Urban): | Rural |
| National Highway System (NHS):  | No |

|  |
| --- |
| **LOCAL PLANNING COORDINATION:** |
| **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:** |
| **List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.** |
| No comments or requests provided from Arik Adams. |

|  |
| --- |
| **CRASH DATA:** |
| **Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years** | **(Yes/No)** No |
| **Is the project area highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps** | **(Yes/No)** No |
| **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.**  |
| There was crash involving a driver going left-of-center and striking another vehicle. No crash patterns have been identified. |

| **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| ***Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources are present within the project area. Is it possible that they will be affected by the project. Include the location and any other pertinent information for resources that may be affected.*** |
| **Resource/Feature** | **Location/Comments** |
| Parkland, nature preserves and wildlife areas {4(f)/6(f)} | No |
| Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat | Tree cutting restrictions |
| Scenic River | No |
| Existing wet areas/existing cattails/wetlands | Maybe – Depends on Right of Way take |
| Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch  | Yes – Walnut Creek (Group 1 mussel stream and EWH) |
| Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects) | No |
| Historic Bridge(s) | No |
| National Historic Landmarks | No |
| Archaeological Sites | No |
| Public Facilities | No |
| Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries) | No |
| Farmland | Maybe – Depends on Right of Way take |
| Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area | No |
| Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns  | No |
| Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials | No |
| Sensitive environmental justice areas | No |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains | Yes |
| Lake Erie Coastal Management Area | No |
| Sole Source Aquifers  | No |
| Wellhead Protection Areas  | No |
| Noise abatement issues | Maybe – Depends on Right of Way take |
| Coordination with Conservancy Districts | No |
| Other environmental issues | Mussel Recon scheduled for September 2025. In-stream work restrictions.  |

| **RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if right of way or survey issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.** |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Will there be any work beyond the existing right of way limits? | Possibly |
| 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 |
| 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? Specify. | None known |

| **HYDRAULIC ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following drainage issues are present or should be considered during project development. Side road and service road work should be considered in this assessment. Any available Culvert Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide additional comments as needed.** |
| **Design Issue** | **Comments** |
| Does the existing drainage system appear to be appropriately sized and functioning properly? Describe deficiencies. | Yes |

| **UTILITY ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.** |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Do existing utilities need to be relocated? If so, please identify. | Possibly AEP, Charter, GLO Fiber, and Ross County Water  |
| 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? Specify. | Ross County Water may be on their own easement. |
| Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract? | No |
| Are there any other utility issues? Specify. | None Known |

| **GEOMETRIC DESIGN CONTROLLING CRITERIA (Refer to Section 105 of the LDM, Volume 1):** |
| --- |
| **Consider design speed, design functional classification, land use, and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project and potential for design exceptions. Note exceptions for low volume roadways.** |
| **Design Criteria** | **Location/Comments** |
| Lane Width  | 12’ |
| Shoulder Width | 8’ treated & 13’ graded |
| Horizontal Curve Radius | N/A |
| Maximum Grade | N/A |
| Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)  | Not restricted |
| Superelevation Rate | N/A |
| Vertical Clearance | N/A |
| Pavement Cross Slope | 0.016, normal crown |
| Design Loading Structural Capacity | HL-93 and FWS 60 PSF |

| **OTHER GEOMETRIC DESIGN ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| ***Indicate if the following geometric issues are present or should be considered during project development. Consider work on the mainline as well as any side roads or service roads. Provide additional comments as needed.*** |
| Design Issues | Location/Comments |
| Does the horizontal alignment have an excessive deflection? | No |
| Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards? | N/A |
| Is driver comfort an issue due to the vertical curvature or breaks in the grade? | No |
| Does the shoulder width on a structure allow for a minimum width of 4’ from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier? | Yes |
| Has a minimum width of 4’ from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier? | Yes |
| Does intersection sight distance need to be improved? | No |
| List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone. | None |
| 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)? | Field drive +/-250ft to the East of the bridge. |
| 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. | Standard grading is anticipated |
| Are new or updated curb ramps needed? Refer to the [Curb Ramp Measuring Guide](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/working/engineering/roadway/ada/ada-compliant-curb-ramp-measuring-guide) | No |
| If constructing a new roadway, will it be a connection between two existing NHS Routes? | 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 ([Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) | Ohio Department of Transportation](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/programs/Highway%20Safety/highway-safety-manual-guidance/intersectioncontrolevaluation)) applicable?  | No |
| Are there any other geometric issues? Describe. | None known |

| **PAVEMENT ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| ***Indicate if the following pavement issues are present or should be considered during project development. Side road and service road work should be considered in this assessment. Provide additional comments as needed.*** |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Do dynaflect tests indicate the existing pavement is in poor condition? | No |
| Are joint repairs needed? | No |
| Are pressure relief joints needed? | N/A |
| Does curb need to be replaced due to deteriorated condition or lack of curb reveal? | N/A |
| 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? Specify. | None known |

| **GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| ***Based on the information compiled during this study indicate whether or not the following geotechnical issues are present or should be further considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. Refer to Section 302.2 of the ODOT Specifications for Geotechnical Explorations for literature search resources.*** |
| Design Issues | Location/Comments |
| Is there evidence of soil drainage problems (e.g., wet or pumping subgrade, standing water, the presence of seeps, wetlands, swamps, bogs)? | The project is adjacent to Walnut Creek and road work would be elevated but adjacent to a Zone A floodplain. Native soils present are more granular with some silt. Based on a review of historical boring logs, there is potential for wet/pumping subgrade. Additionally, given the proximity to the creek, there is the potential for wetlands to be in the vicinity of project area as well as buried organic layers, but there is no direct evidence for this being a significant concern based on historical records or site condition. |
| Will construction be impacted based on the groundwater table? | The high-water mark of the creek certainly has the potential to impact construction, especially considering substructure of bridge. |
| Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)?  | Based on desktop review, it does appear that there has been channel migration since the 1990s. This includes a large deposition of sand to the north that would be erodible during flood. |
| Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or rock)? | The bridge is indicated as scour stable per the most updated Bridge Inventory and Appraisal Report. Additionally, the abutments and foundations are rated in “fair” condition. Existing fill slope is vegetated and appears stable. There are two Tier 1 (lowest geohazard rated) landslides within about a quarter of a mile on the bridge so there is nothing of significant concern in the vicinity. Note, the native granular soil does have potential for slope instability as evidenced by recent landslides/erosion that are in the more general area. This would be influenced by flooding or rapidly changing water table. |
| 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)? | There is no direct evidence of unsuitable materials. Historical borings/profile have no indication of presence of human-made fills/waste pits or debris. Very likely there will be reworked and some imported fill from the original construction and rehabilitation in the 1980s particular near to abutments. One of the soil borings in the geotechnical exploration should be able to confirm the assumption that there is not significant deleterious material underlying or in the vicinity of the planned bridge. |
| Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)? | There is no exposed bedrock in the area. Borings indicate mostly granular soil to significant depth (>60’ from surface). |
| Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines? Evidence of quarries? | There are no AUMIRA sites chronicled by ODOT in the vicinity. Per ODNR there are two surface mines in a two-to-three-mile radius including topsoil and limestone surface mines. There is no evidence based on review and knowledge of area of AUMIRA or other features. |
| Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines? | No underground mining is in the ODNR database. |
| Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area? | There is no evidence based on review of the ODNR database for this. |
| Are there any other geotechnical issues? *Specify.* | None that currently stand out. As previously noted, there is the potential for erosion and slope instability with the native soil. Additionally, given the meandering stream, protection of embankment should be a design consideration.  |

| **STRUCTURAL ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| ***Indicate if the following structure issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. The Bridge Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide a separate table for each structure.*** |
| **Structure Number(s):** |  |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Is it possible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box? | No |
| Is the deck delaminated? *Specify.* | Full Bridge Replacement |
| Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the Amount of delamination? | Full Bridge Replacement |
| Are there areas to be patched/repaired on the deck? | Full Bridge Replacement |
| Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? *Specify type of overlay if known.* | Yes |
| Does the bridge rail violate current standards? | Yes |
| Is fatigue analysis required? | No |
| Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? *Specify.* | Full Bridge Replacement |
| Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)? | No |
| Is elimination of the deck joint possible? What modifications are necessary? | Full Bridge Replacement |
| 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? | Possibly. Original plans show meeting “3 to 5 yr HW by 2.8ft”. Reeds growing around abutment.  |
| Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the bridge? | No |
| 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.)? *Specify.* | Part width construction anticipated. Possible recreational water traffic on Walnut Creek. |
| 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 |
| Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.). | The expansion joints are leaking |
| Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.). | The beams and bearings are rusted |
| Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.). | Delamination and spalling present on concrete substructures |
| Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.) | Point bar at the left rear of bridge |
| Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.) | None |
| Are there any other structure related issues? *Specify.* | The beams and bearings are rusted |
| Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets? | Point bar at the left rear of bridge |
| Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes? | No |
| Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)? | N/A |
| Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)? | Yes, Walnut Creek.  |
| Will channel relocation be required? | Unlikely |
| Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities? | No |
| Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly? | Unknown |
| Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations? | No |
| Are there any other hydraulic issues? Describe. | None known |

| **TSMO CONSIDERATIONS:** |
| --- |
| **Briefly describe the opportunities for managing congestion or traffic issues using TSMO strategies or improvements. Consider opportunities to upgrade or install systems management and operations infrastructure:****TSMO infrastructure** includes communications equipment, travel time signs, signals, changeable message signs, traffic cameras, traffic signal systems, other remote field devices and data collection equipment, conduit and any supporting fiber optics. **TOAST** is the Traffic Operations Assessment System Tool. **For additional TSMO information see** <http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Traffic/miscellaneous/Pages/TSMO.aspx> |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Does the project area contain a Hot Spot identified in TOAST? If so, what is the TOAST ranking? | No |
| Does the project area have an operations master plan (or has this site been discussed with the District TSMO Coordinator)? | No |
| Would operations benefit from TMC coverage of the project area? (RWIS, travel time boards, cameras, communications) | No |
| Are there opportunities for initiating or upgrading TSMO infrastructure? | No |
| Does this project support any TSMO strategies such as (Smartlane, VSL, Coordinated traffic signals, etc.) | No |
| Does this project require multi-jurisdictional coordination, agreements, funding, etc.? | No |
| What existing TSMO infrastructure is in place? Will it need to be moved or maintained in place? | N/A |
| 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. | N/A |
| Categories of potential ITS for this study area/project include: Exempt, Low, or High risk? Ref: TEM, 1-pager for CFR 940. | N/A |
| 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) | N/A |
| 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? | N/A |
| Are there alternative routes available/identified for incident management? | No |
| Is this a Traffic Incident Management Note eligible project? | No |
| **OTHER TSMO Considerations:** |
| None known |

| **TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following traffic control (signals, signing, pavement markings, etc.) issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.**  |
| **Design Issue** | **Comments** |
| Are there any obvious deviations from requirements of the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices ([OMUTCD](https://www.dot.state.oh.us/roadway/omutcd/Pages/default.aspx))? | No |
| Will coordination with Ohio Rail Development Commission (ORDC) be required (i.e. at-grade railroad crossings located within 400' of an intersection within the project area)?  | No |
| Will pavement widening affect pole locations? | N/A |
| Will resurfacing affect signal height? | N/A |
| Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)? | No |
| Are there any crashes that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of protected turn phase)? | N/A |
|  Do pedestrian signals and push buttons need to be installed or upgraded? | N/A |
| Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity? | N/A |
| Does the controller need to be upgraded? | N/A |
| Do proprietary materials need to be specified? | N/A |
| Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting? | N/A |
| Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present? | No |
| Are there any other traffic control issues? Specify. | None known |

| MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES: |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following maintenance of traffic issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.** |
| **Design Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Are there bridge load limits within the work limits or in the nearby area that would limit the available signed official detour or unsigned local alternate routes? | None known. Part width anticipated. |
| 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.) | None known |
| 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.) | No |
| Are there visible signs of pavement condition deterioration in the driving lanes? On the shoulders? If yes, identify location and estimated degree of deterioration and if further testing is needed. | No |
| Are there nearby schools that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify names, location and school districts. | Yes, Southeastern Local School District2003 Lancaster Rd., Chillicothe, OH 45601Part-width construction anticipated |
| 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, Liberty Township Fire and Rescue34568 US 50, Londonderry, OH 45647Part-width construction anticipated |
| 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? | +/- 28’. Temporary pavement is likely needed |
| 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.) | None |
| Are there sidewalks or paths within or leading to/from the work area that need to be closed? | No |
| If sidewalk/path needs to be closed, can users be detoured on the existing sidewalk system or will a temporary pedestrian and/or bicycle pathway need to be included in the plan? | N/A |
| Are transit stops present within the work area? | No |
| Are there culverts within the work area that may need to be lengthened to accommodate temporary widening? If so, identify locations and culvert numbers. | 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. | No |
| Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time? | No |
| 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? | Possibly |
| 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. | Possibly while setting superstructure members |
| Will there be a need for temporary structures (full or partial) in order to maintain the existing number of lanes? | No |
| Is there power available within or nearby the project location for temporary lighting and/or temporary signals? | Yes |
| Will there be a need for additional signal heads (drives and/or side roads) or temporary signal timing/coordination? | Possibly 1 additional for field drive depending on the length of work zone |
| 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. | In-stream work and tree cutting restrictions |
| 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? | Unlikely since it will be part-width construction |
| Will there be a need to restrict existing movements during construction? (e.g., no left turns, etc.) | No |
| 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](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/about-us/policies-and-procedures/policies/21-008-p) (21-008(P)) and Standard Procedure (123-001(SP)). | Minor |
| Does this project require an MOTAA? All Path 4 & 5 projects along with Path 3 projects on Interstate/Interstate look-alikes need to have a Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives Analysis Completed. Refer to [TEM Section 630-5](https://www.transportation.ohio.gov/working/engineering/roadway/manuals-standards/tem/06) | No |

| **CONSTRUCTION ISSUES:** |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.**  |
| **Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Will any of the construction activity take place over, under, or near railroad property?  | No |
| Could material with long lead times for delivery have an impact on the construction schedule and/or project completion (e.g., strain poles, large box culverts, steel beams, etc.)? | Beams |
| Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)? | N/A |
| Compare the Begin/End construction dates with the Scope of Work. Is the construction schedule reasonable? | Yes |
| Examine the existing pavement condition and repair history. Calculate potential pavement repair quantities. | N/A |
| Note manhole lid elevations versus proposed paving thickness. Will manhole lids or valve boxes need adjusted after paving? | N/A |
| Is there a need for Echelon Paving? | No |
| Examine the rideability of the approach slab to the roadway/bridge joint. | Full Bridge Replacement |
| Will the project have impacts to nearby residents/businesses? Will site access occur down steep side slopes or through properties adjacent to project site? | Project is +/-3 miles from Londonderry. Site access is available on each corner of the structure. |
| 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? | Guardrail on each corner of the structure will be completely be replaced. Exact limits will be determined during design.  |
| Is more space or room needed for construction?Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.? | Possibly |
| Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks? | Overhead utilities to the North may need relocated |
| Will there be instream work? | Yes |
| 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? | No |
| Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor? | Areas adjacent to the bridge or behind the portable concrete barrier on the pavement |

| **AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES:**  |
| --- |
| **Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.** |
| **Issue** | **Location/Comments** |
| Will an Individual US Army Corps of Engineers/ Environmental Protection Agency 404/401 permit be required? | No |
| Will a Section 408 Permission be required for work within an USACE Civil Works (dams, levees, locks, navigation channel, etc.)? Refer to the [National Levee Database (army.mil)](https://levees.sec.usace.army.mil/#/); [National Inventory of Dams (army.mil)](https://nid.sec.usace.army.mil/#/); [Louisville District (arcgis.com)](https://lrl.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=013d0ce926a54caab629667d15ed8df2) Not all projects are found within these directories. Consult with OES during planning to discuss Section 408 coordination. (Note, Section 9 or Section 10 permit will most likely trigger Section 408 coordination.) | No |
| Will a Coast Guard (Section 9) permit be required? | No |
| Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? Specify. | No |
| Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required? | No |
| Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required? | No |
| Is coordination with any other agency required? | Tribal |

| **SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:** |
| --- |
| **Based on the responses to the above items, do any of the following need to be modified?** |
| **Issue** | **Comments** |
| Conceptual scope |  |
| Work limits |  |
| Probable environmental document type |  |
| Project Path classification |  |
| Schedule |  |
| Budget |  |