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:	11/20/2025

Project Name (County, Route, Section):	BRO-50-2.839	**PID:**	
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:		**Prepared By:**	Jonas Smith
City, Township or Village Name(s):		**ODOT Project Manager:**	Chris Pridemore

Project Description: Installation of a 5-leg peanut shaped roundabout at the intersection of US 50 and SR 131.

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location: Approximately +/- 750’ from the midpoint of the intersection on each leg.

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 (no response)*	*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 (no response)*	*740-774-9017*
District TSMO Coordinator	*Jonas Smith*	*740-774-8864*
District Geotechnical representative	*Matt Hurst*	*740-774-8898*
District Roadway representative	*Corey Cottrell (no response)*	*740-774-8828*

EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

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**
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
Design Speed:	65
Opening Year ADT:	3271
Design Year ADT:	3810
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	311
Functional Classification:	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:
No local planning studies are expected at this time.

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS:
List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.
None received.

CRASH DATA:	
Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years	***(Yes/No) Yes***
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.

In the past 3 years there have been 15 crashes at the intersection. 12 of the 15 were left turn/angle crashes, with 6 of the crashes resulting in injuries. 2 of the 6 injury crashes were serious injury crashes. The 5-leg configuration and heavy skews of the side streets are likely contributing factors to the crash trends. The roundabout project should address the crash patterns.

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	Maybe – Depends on project limits (tree cutting restrictions)
Scenic River	No
Existing wet areas/existing cattails/wetlands	Maybe – Depends on project limits
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	Maybe – Depends on project limits
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	Maybe – Depends on project limits (6 USTs removed in 1994)
Sensitive environmental justice areas	No
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains	No
Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	No
Sole Source Aquifers	No
Wellhead Protection Areas	No
Noise abatement issues	Maybe – Depends on project limits
Coordination with Conservancy Districts	No
Other environmental issues	No

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?	Yes
Will relocation of residences be involved?	The residence on the northwest corner of the SR131/Vera Cruz intersection could need relocation
Will relocation of businesses be involved?	The business on the northeast corner of the US50/Vera Cruz intersection could need relocation
Will the project require modifying the access control to any properties?	Based on current info no properties should see major changes in access.
Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)?	None known at this time.
Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?	Most likely to work on drives.
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	Possibly, but will know more when plans are developed.
Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns.	After talking with PO at the northwest corner of the SR131/Vera Cruz intersection during the site visit he requests that his pear tree in the front of his house not be damaged. He also requested that the new roadway not come any closer to his house.
Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?	Would want to use temporary parcels
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? *Specify*.	Not at this time

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.*	Ex. 2'x2' box culvert under US 50 appears to be poor condition. It also drains to a catch basin, which then outlets to a ~30" plastic pipe off R/W. Ex. Catch Basin grate in front of garage on SR 131 appears to be covered with vegetation and not fully functioning. Ex. 7'x4' box culvert has pavement extending almost to the ends of the box and does not have ex. guardrail.

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*.	It appears that Duke aerial lines and poles, Charter/Spectrum aerial lines, TDS Telecom (both aerial and underground), and Western Water Company facilities may be in conflict and could require relocation.
Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Level A?	I'm leaning toward no; however, it could be a viable option if funding is available.
Are there existing utilities on an existing structure that need to be relocated?	Yes, there is a Duke secondary line serving the ODOT flashing light that may need to be relocated.
Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? *Specify*.	The Western Water Company line may be in conflict and could require relocation.

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**
Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract?	Not that I'm aware of.
Are there any other utility issues? *Specify.*	The Duke poles are double circuit, which could increase the complexity and time required for relocation.

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 (US 50)	**Location/Comments**	
Lane Width	12 ft	(11 ft SR 131 and Vera Cruz)
Shoulder Width (Treated)	8 ft	(4 ft SR 131 and Vera Cruz)
Horizontal Curve Radius	4^0 45'	
Maximum Grade	3%	
Stopping Sight Distance (Horizontal and Crest Vertical Curves)	570 ft	
Superelevation Rate	0.080	
Vertical Clearance	16 ft	
Pavement Cross Slope	0.016	
Design Loading Structural Capacity	--	

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?	At the intersections, yes. Resolved with proposed RAB.
Do the Intersection Angles or Crossroad Alignment meet design standards?	See above.
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?	N/A
Has a minimum width of 4' from the edge of the traveled way to the face of any barrier?	N/A
Does intersection sight distance need to be improved?	Yes. Vertical alignment on SR 131 south leg needs improved.
List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone.	N/A
Should existing access control be revised to improve safety?	Yes.

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**
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)?	Yes.
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?	Yes – via RAB design.
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.	Yes. See design criteria.
Are new or updated curb ramps needed? Refer to the Curb Ramp Measuring Guide	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 multiple intersection control types being considered? Is an Intersection Control Evaluation (Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) | Ohio Department of Transportation) applicable?	See safety study.
Are there any other geometric issues? Describe.	N/A

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?	Possibly

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.	
Are there any other pavement issues? *Specify.*	*District preference for full-depth RAB pavement design is:*

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 road grading generally slopes up to the south and west, but the surrounding land is relatively flat and at low spots there is evidence of previously standing water where thicker vegetation has grown.
Will construction be impacted based on the groundwater table?	Construction of the roundabout could be impacted by a perched water table depending on the time of year.
Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)?	There is no evidence of significant embankment issues on site. Depending on geotechnical testing, shrink-swell could be an issue for subgrade soils and stabilization may be needed.
Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or rock)?	Given the general slope of the site and drainage, it is unlikely that slope stability would be a concern during construction.
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 evidence of unsuitable materials from person-made debris or waste pits present. However, soil classification and testing is warranted.
Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)?	There is no evidence of exposed rock strata. Based on historical borings, rock is not anticipated to be within subgrade, potentially on the order of 10-20 feet and is anticipated to be Shale/Claystone.
Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines? Evidence of quarries?	Per search of the ODNR Mine Database, there is not evidence of active, reclaimed, or abandoned surface mines in the vicinity.
Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines?	No evidence.
Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area?	No evidence.
Are there any other geotechnical issues? *Specify.*	Given the high probability that soil is Type 4A or 6A, soils that could have higher fines content and have the potential for freeze-thaw and shrink-swell, along with the lack of historical geotechnical borings in the immediate vicinity, it is a probability that subgrade stabilization will be required. The poorly draining soils in the low areas are also of potential concern. Keeping drainage from impacting the roundabout will likely be a critical part of design. The maintenance of current drainage or improvement including the existing culverts in the area should be carefully considered.

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?	Ex. 7'x4' box culvert likely could be replaced with a similar structure type.
Is the deck delaminated? *Specify.*	N/A
Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the Amount of delamination?	N/A
Are there areas to be patched/repaired on the deck?	N/A
Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? *Specify type of overlay if known.*	N/A
Does the bridge rail violate current standards?	N/A
Is fatigue analysis required?	N/A
Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? *Specify.*	N/A
Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)?	N/A
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?	Ex. 7'x4' box culvert does not have any evidence of not meeting hydraulic capacity, but all drainage structures will need to be sized per L&D Vol. 2.
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.*	No
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?	No
Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.).	N/A
Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.).	N/A
Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.).	N/A
Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.)	No known issues.

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**
Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.)	Ex. 7'x4' box culvert has pavement extending almost to the ends of the box and does not have ex. guardrail.
Are there any other structure related issues? *Specify.*	No known issues.
Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets?	No known issues.
Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes?	Yes. Overtop the ex. 2'x2' box culvert on US 50 there is a sink hole at the edge of pavement.
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)?	There are multiple National Wetland Inventory in the project vicinity as well as a stream.
Will channel relocation be required?	Channel realignment is possible, full relocation is unlikely.
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	Post construction BMPs will likely be required per L&D Vol. 2.
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	No known issues.
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	All drainage work will need to be accounted for in maintenance of traffic plans.
Are there any other hydraulic issues? *Describe.*	No other issues are 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

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
What existing TSMO infrastructure is in place? Will it need to be moved or maintained in place?	An overhead flasher exists at the intersection but should be removed with the project.
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.	None
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?	N/A
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?	Possibly, local detours exist.
Is this a Traffic Incident Management Note eligible project?	No

OTHER TSMO Considerations:

None

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?	Yes, however, poles will be removed.
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)?	N/A
Do pedestrian signals and push buttons need to be installed or upgraded?	No
Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity?	N/A
Does the controller need to be upgraded?	No
Do proprietary materials need to be specified?	No
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

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?	No
Is the project located on the National Truck Network?	No
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

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 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.	Yes, but generally consistent.
Are there nearby schools that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? If yes, identify names, location and school districts.	Yes, Fayetteville School District (all grades) is 2.2 miles east.
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, Fayetteville Fire Dept is 2.0 miles east.
Are there significant traffic generators nearby that may be adversely impacted by the proposed work? (e.g., industries, factories, sports arenas, etc.)	N/A
What is the width of the existing pavement? Will temporary pavement be needed to maintain the existing number of travel lanes?	24 feet or less – possibly need pavement widening.
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.)	N/A
Are there sidewalks or paths within or leading to/from the work area that need to be closed?	N/A
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?	N/A
Are there culverts within the work area that may need to be lengthened to accommodate temporary widening? If so, identify locations and culvert numbers.	Expecting replacement of existing box culverts.
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.	See geotechnical section.
Will personal and/or business driveways be adversely impacted or need to be closed for any amount of time?	Likely, yes.

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**
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?	N/A
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?	Yes
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.	Yes
Will there be a need for temporary structures (full or partial) in order to maintain the existing number of lanes?	N/A
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?	N/A
Are there any Traffic Incident Management features, such as hydrants, pull-offs, turn-arounds, etc.?	Yes
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.	N/A
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?	Possibly, if we consider closures.
Will there be a need to restrict existing movements during construction? (e.g., no left turns, etc.)	Yes
Is there an opportunity (or potential need) to implement any work zone ITS components? (e.g., work zone egress warning, queue detection and warning, CCTV, DDMS, etc.)	N/A

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**
How big of an impact will the project have on queue lengths and congestion? If significant, a MOT Policy Exception Request may be required per Traffic Management in Work Zones Policy (21-008(P)) and Standard Procedure (123-001(SP)).	N/A
Does this project require an MOTAA? All Path 4 & 5 projects along with Path 3 projects on Interstate/Interstate look-alikes need to have a Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives Analysis Completed. Refer to TEM Section 630-5	N/A

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?	N/A
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.)?	Light poles
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 (conservative)
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?	N/A
Examine the rideability of the approach slab to the roadway/bridge joint.	N/A
Will the project have impacts to nearby residents/businesses? Will site access occur down steep side slopes or through properties adjacent to project site?	Yes
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?	Yes
Is more space or room needed for construction? Is Temporary or Permanent R/W required for utility relocations, construction of structures, drainage ditches, etc.?	Yes

CONSTRUCTION ISSUES:	
Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.	
Issue	**Location/Comments**
Is there enough clearance to overhead utility lines for cranes and concrete pump trucks?	No
Will there be instream work?	Yes – culvert replacements
Will Temporary shoring/sheeting, cofferdams or work pads be required to complete the proposed work? Anticipated Permitting (see Agency Coordination/Permit Issues section above)	No
Will the road need to be detoured to complete construction? What are the possible detour routes?	Possibly – using SR 286, US 68, SR 133
Where are the potential staging areas for the contractor?	South side of US 50

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)*; *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.)	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	Safety study and PE design provided for RAB.

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:	
Work limits	Needs ROW acquisition
Probable environmental document type	C2
Project Path classification	Path 2
Schedule	FY 2029 construction
Budget	$4M