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.
- A list of resources/subject areas that may need to be consulted for the secondary source review in order to complete this form can be found on this form, in the <u>PDP Manual</u> (in the Planning Phase, Preliminary Engineering Phase, and Environmental Engineering Phase chapters; and in Appendix C), and in some of the manuals on the <u>DRRC website</u>.

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

Project Name (County, Route, Section):	LAK-91-4.23/4.49	PID:	105187
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:	08-20-2020	Prepared By:	Chris Ondash
City, Township or Village Name(s):	Eastlake & Willoughby	ODOT Project Manager:	George Dai

Project Description:

Replace the decks of the S.O.M. Center Road (SR-91) bridges over the Lakeland Boulevard and CSX & NS Railroads in the City of Eastlake. Work includes substructure repairs, steel repairs, and partial steel painting.

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location:

From a point about .4 miles north of US 20 on SR-91 to a point where SR-91 passes over SR-2.

ODOT DISCIPLINE INVOLVEMENT:

List name and phone number of individual(s) representing each discipline during the site visit and preparation of the Project Initiation Package. One individual may represent multiple disciplines.

DISCIPLINE	NAME	PHONE NUMBER
District Highway Management representative	Dave Paponetti	216.584.2190
District Planning and Engineering	Eric Kallio, Engineering	216-584-2121
representative	Gary Benesh, Planning	216-584-2108
District Environmental Coordinator	Tom Sorge	216.584.2086

Indicate external agency involvement du and phone number of individual(s) repres		
AGENCY	NAME	PHONE NUMBER
FHWA Engineer***		
Other (LPA, MPO, etc.)		

Administration.

GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION: SR-91	
Legal Speed:	Posted 50 mph
Design Speed:	55 mph
Opening Year ADT:	32330 (2022)
Design Year ADT:	37180 (2052)
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	650 (2022)
Functional Classification:	Principal Arterial
Locale (Rural or Urban):	Urban
National Highway System (NHS):	YES

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS:

List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.

CRASH DATA:	
Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years	(Yes/No)
Project is highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps	(Yes/No)
Based on a spatial query (using GCAT or TIMS) of the three most recent years of cr	ash data, briefly summarize crash
history. Indicate any design features that may be contributing to the observed cra	sh pattern that may be addressed by
the project.	
Requested.	

ENVIRO	NMENTAL	ISSUES:

Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources will be affected by the proposed 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	Indiana Bat, piper Plover
Scenic River	NO
Existing wet areas /existing cattails/wetlands	NO
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	N/A
Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects)	NO

the location and any other pertinent information for resources that may be affected.		
Resource/Feature	Location/Comments	
Historic Bridge(s)	NO	
National Historic Landmarks	NO	
Archaeological Sites	NO	
Public Facilities	NO	
Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries)	NO	
Farmland	NO	
Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area	City of Euclid-Frontal Lake Erie	
Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns	The project site is located within Non-Attainment areas for PM 2. and Ozone 8-hour.	
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	N/A	
Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	NO	
Sole Source Aquifers	NO	
Wellhead Protection Areas	NO	
Noise abatement issues	NO	
Other environmental issues	NO	

Use the design speed, design functional classification and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project.

Design Criteria	Location/Comments
Lane Width	ОК
Shoulder Width	ОК
Horizontal Curve Radius	SFN 4305167 = 1d 15'
Maximum Grade	ОК
Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)	OK
Superelevation Rate	N/A
Vertical Clearance	N/A
Pavement Cross Slope	N/A
Design Loading Structural Capacity	SFN 4305167 = CF-400-57 SFN 4305191 = CF-400-57

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

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
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?	NO.
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?	N/A
List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone.	N/A
Should existing access control be revised to improve safety?	N/A
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)?	ΝΟ
Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified 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.	N/A
Are new or updated curb ramps needed? Refer to the Curb Ramp Inventory Form	N/A
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 there any other geometric issues? Describe.	N/A

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	NO
of seeps, wetlands, swamps, bogs)?	
Will construction be impacted based on the	NO
groundwater table?	

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 any embankment or foundation	There was embankment problem on the rear approach left side of
problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag,	4305167 back in 2006 which was repaired 2008 and has not been a
foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence	problem since. Has not been a problem since 2010. See appendix A
of channel migrations)?	
Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or	There was a slope settlement problem to SFN 4305167 which was
rock)?	corrected with PID 5759 in 1993.
Is there evidence of unsuitable materials (e.g.,	NO
presence of debris or man-made fills or waste pits	
containing these materials, indications from old soil	
borings)?	
Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of	NO
exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)?	
Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned	NO
surface mines? Evidence of quarries?	
Is there information pertaining to the existence of	NO
underground mines?	
Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study	NO
area?	
Are there any other geotechnical issues? Specify.	NO

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?	N/A
Are joint repairs needed?	N/A
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?	N/A
Does pavement deterioration appear to be caused by drainage or geotechnical problems?	N/A
Are there any other pavement issues? Specify.	N/A

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: 4305167 LAK-91-4.23 & 4305191	
LAK-91-4.49	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Is it possible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box?	NO

STRUCTURAL ISSUES:	
	or should be considered during project development. Provide
	n reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide a separate
table for each structure.	
Structure Number: 4305167 LAK-91-4.23 & 4305191	
LAK-91-4.49	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Is the deck delaminated? Specify.	N/A Deck to be replaced
Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the amount of delamination?	N/A Deck to be replaced
Are there areas to be patched/repaired on the deck?	N/A Deck to be replaced
Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? Specify	N/A Deck to be replaced
type of overlay if known.	
Does the bridge rail violate current standards?	N/A Deck to be replaced
Is fatigue analysis required?	Follow design manual
Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or	Follow design manual
replaced? Specify.	ronow design manual
Is there any evidence of substructure movement	NO
(e.g., settlement, rotation)?	
Is elimination of the deck joint possible? What	Not for SFN 4305167. Follow design manual for SFN 4305191
modifications are necessary?	Not for STN 4505107. Tonow design manual for STN 4505171
Is it possible for the hinges to be removed to make	N/A
the members continuous?	
Is there any evidence that the bridge does not meet	N/A
hydraulic capacity?	
Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the	NO.
bridge?	
Is Vandal Protection Fencing required in accordance	Yes for SFN 4305191. No for SFN 4305167.
with the BDM?	
Will the structure work require any special	NO
maintenance of traffic (e.g., closing of roadway for	
erection of beams, maintenance of waterway traffic,	
location of cut line, etc.)? Specify.	
Does the bridge need to accommodate future	NO
roadway lanes or railroad tracks?	
Will temporary shoring be required next to the	N/A
railroad?	
Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb,	All items to be replaced with deck.
sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage,	
expansion joints, etc.).	
Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure	See inspection comments.
(alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices,	
etc.).	
Describe any issues with the bridge substructure	See inspection comments.
(abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.).	
Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment,	None
erosion, etc.)	
Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e.	None
pavement, guardrail, etc.)	
Are there any other structure related issues? Specify.	

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
Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets?	NO
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)?	N/A
Will channel relocation be required?	N/A
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	NO
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	YES
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	NO
Are there any other hydraulic issues? Describe.	NO

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 Analysis 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	NO
TOAST? If so, what is the TOAST ranking?	
Does the project area have an operations master	N/A
plan (or has this site been discussed with the District	
TSMO Coordinator)?	
Would operations benefit from TMC coverage of the	NO
project area? (RWIS, travel time boards, cameras,	
communications)	
Are there opportunities for initiating or upgrading	N/A
TSMO infrastructure?	

TSMO CONSIDERATIONS:	
Briefly describe the opportunities for managing conge	estion or traffic issues using TSMO strategies or improvements.
Consider opportunities to upgrade or install systems i	
TSMO infrastructure includes communications equipm	nent, travel time signs, signals, changeable message signs, traffic
cameras, traffic signal systems, other remote field devi	ices and data collection equipment, conduit and any supporting fiber
optics.	
TOAST is the Traffic Operations Analysis System Tool	
For additional TSMO information see	
http://www.dot.state.oh.us/Divisions/Operations/Traf	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Does this project support any TSMO strategies such	N/A
as (Smartlane, VSL, Coordinated traffic signals, etc.)	
	NO
Does this project require multi-jurisdictional	
coordination, agreements, funding, etc.?	
What existing TSMO infrastructure is in place? Will it	N/A
need to be moved or maintained in place?	
Are there any local TSMO infrastructure	N/A
recommendations in the project area? (ex. Include	
emergency or transit traffic signal pre-emption,	
dynamic message signs or signal coordination)	
What MPO ITS architecture is already in place or	N/A
planned? Consult the MPO ITS architecture plan, if	·
applicable.	
Categories of potential ITS for this study area/project	N/A
include: Exempt, Low, or High risk? Ref: TEM, 1-	
pager for 940.	
Could this project expand an existing device or	NO
communications system?	
What type of device communications and equipment	N/A
exists?	
Should this location have communications added or	N/A
upgraded?	
Will additional conduit be necessary for future	N/A
infrastructure/communications? (ex. in barrier wall)	
Will existing device power or communications drops	NO
be disrupted?	
Does this project require a new traffic signal timing	N/A
plan?	
Are the current traffic signal(s) being upgraded to a	N/A
system?	
Are there alternative routes available/identified for	NO
incident management?	
OTHER TSMO Considerations:	1

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)?	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?	NO
Will resurfacing affect signal height?	NO
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)?	NO
Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity?	N/A
Does the controller need to be upgraded?	N/A
Do proprietary materials need to be specified?	N/A
Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting?	NO
Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present?	NO
Are there any other traffic control issues? Specify.	NO

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,	Does not appear to be.
please identify.	
Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility	SUE B
Engineering (SUE) Level A?	
Are there existing utilities on an existing structure	Should be able to work around communications cable clamped to
that need to be relocated?	bottom flange of SFN 4305191. See appendix B
Are there any specific utility requirements or	NO
concerns? Specify.	
Are there water or sanitary lines that will be	NO
relocated as part of the ODOT contract?	
Are there any other utility issues? Specify.	NO.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE ISSUES: Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.	
Does sidewalk need to be replaced or installed?	NO
Does a bike lane need to be replaced or installed?	NO
Is the project in the vicinity of a heavily traveled bicycle or pedestrian corridor?	There is a bike/pedestrian path north of Curtis Blvd.
Is the project located on a designated or proposed bike route?	The project is not located along a designated or proposed bike route.
Has a Safe Routes to School - School Travel Plan been completed within the project area?	NO

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	N/A
in the nearby area that would limit the available	
signed official detour or unsigned local alternate	
routes?	
Is the project located on the National Truck	NO
Network?	
Are there overhead bridges with existing vertical	NO
clearance issues or that may become vertical	
clearance issues (e.g. shifting traffic to the shoulder,	
adding pavement without milling first, etc.)	
Are there pinch points within the work area that that	NO
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.)	
Are there visible signs of pavement condition	NO
deterioration in the driving lanes? On the shoulders?	
If yes, identify location and estimated degree of	
deterioration and if further testing is needed.	
Are there nearby schools that may be adversely	NO
impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify	
names, location and school districts.	
Are there nearby emergency services (e.g., hospital,	There is a hospital on US 20 east of SR-90. SR-91 is the only RR
fire, police, EMS, etc.) that may be adversely	grade separation between Worden Rd. and Vine street.
impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify	
locations and names.	
Are there significant traffic generators nearby that	NO
may be adversely impacted by the proposed work?	
(e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.)	
What is the width of the existing pavement? Will	NO
temporary pavement be needed to maintain the	
existing number of travel lanes?	

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
What geometric features exist within the work area	None
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.)	
Are there sidewalks and/or pedestrians within or	NO
leading to/from the work area?	
Are there culverts within the work area that may	NO
need to be lengthened to accommodate temporary	
widening? If so, identify locations and culvert	
numbers.	
Are there any known existing drainage issues within	NO
the work limits? If yes, special attention needs to be	
given to ensuring temporary drainage can be	
accomplished.	
Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely	NO
impacted or need to be closed for any amount of	
time?	
Is the project located in or nearby an area of regional	NO
significance with a potential to cause controversy or	
negative public feedback or political scrutiny?	
Is there enough width to provide safe construction	YES
access? If no, what other means of access can be	
provided?	
Is there potential for the need to require right-of-	NO
way acquisition?	
Is there room in the median for the construction of	YES
crossover pavement within the project limits and	
beyond the project limits on either end? If yes,	
identify potential locations for crossover locations.	
Are short duration road closures going to be	NO
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.	
Will there be a need for temporary structures (full or	NO
partial) in order to maintain the existing number of	
lanes?	
Is there power available within or nearby the project	YES
location for temporary lighting and/or temporary	
signals?	
Will there be a need for additional signal heads	NO
(drives and/or side roads)?	
Are there issues that may limit the construction	NO
timeframe? (e.g., sporting or other significant	
regional events, work in streams, suitable wooded	
-	
habitat, school, etc.). If yes, list them.	

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	
Would this project potentially benefit from the	No	
application of innovative contracting method (e.g.,		
A+B to open bridge to traffic before school starts,		
etc.)? If yes, which method?		
Will there be a need to restrict existing movements	Possibly restrict the double right turn from the SR-2 EB ramp.	
during construction? (e.g., no left turns, etc.)		
Is there an opportunity (or potential need) to	NO	
implement any work zone ITS components? (e.g.,		
work zone egress warning, queue detection and		
warning, CCTV, DDMS, etc.)		
How big of an impact will the project have on queue	NO	
lengths and congestion? If significant, a MOTEC or		
PIAC exception may be required per Traffic		
Management In Work Zones policy (21-008(P).		
Does this project require an MOTAA? All Path 4 & 5	NO	
projects along with Path 3 projects on		
Interstate/Interstate look-alikes need to have a		
Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives Analysis		
Completed.		

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 for construction access around the RR.
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)?	YES, construction access at the RR
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	NO
Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns.	NO
Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?	NO
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? Specify.	NO

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 Corps of Engineers/ Environmental		

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES:		
Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.		
Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor	NO	
required? Specify.		
Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)	N/A	
coordination for work involving historic bridges or		
historic properties required?		
Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State	NO	
Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State		
Recreational Areas required?		
Is coordination with any other agency required?	NO	

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES:

Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.

Design 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 (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
Are there any other project concerns? Specify	NO

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		

Appendix A:

LAK-091-0423 SFN 4305167 SR 91 over NSC, CSX Railroad



Start-left Embankment.jpg



LAK-091-0423 SFN 4305167 SR91 over NSC/CSX railroad north of SR 20



Start-left embankment failure .jpg



Appendix B:

