

Project Initiation Package: WAR-63-0.00/3.25

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. **[A comprehensive secondary source initial compilation is provided in the Scoping Study Report¹ completed for the WAR-63 corridor]**
- 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. **[Draft PIP content provided herein based on Scoping Study work and reviews; ODOT update for priority segment may be required]**
- 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). **[Draft PIP content provided herein based on Scoping Study work and reviews; ODOT update for priority segment may be required]**
- 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. **[Draft PIP content provided herein based on Scoping Study work and reviews; ODOT update for priority segment may be required]**
- 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 [PDP Manual](#) (in the Planning Phase, Preliminary Engineering Phase, and Environmental Engineering Phase chapters; and in Appendix C), and in some of the manuals on the [DRRC website](#).

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. **[Study Area mapping and other information relating to project planning and preliminary design, alternatives, utility, right of way and environmental constraints, as well as Tables, USGS and/or aerial mapping, photographs keyed to available project mapping, and recommendations related to a plan to inform and involve the public, is found in the WAR-63 Corridor Scoping Study Report]**

General

Date(s) of field review:	Several by the WCTID team, during preparation of the project Scoping Study document, some involving ODOT; updates for priority segment suggested for specific features and controlling issues as required.
---------------------------------	--

Project Name (County, Route, Section):	WAR-63-0.00/3.25 ²	PID:	
Date Project Initiation Package Completed:	April 2017 (draft)	Prepared By:	Warren County TID for ODOT
City, Township or Village Name(s):	Unincorporated Turtlecreek Township; City of Monroe	ODOT Project Manager:	Jennifer Elston

Project Description: Improvement of a priority capacity and safety segment in a predominately 2-lane section of SR 63 between a multi-lane section at the west end in the City of Monroe near an existing interchange with I-75, and a signalized intersection with SR 741. Multi-lane rural section anticipated with preferred and other alternatives per recommendations of Scoping Study report (April 2017; page 64)

Project Limits/Study Area/General Location: Project will extend from just west of an at-grade rail crossing in the City of Monroe to just past a signalized intersection with SR 741, about 3.5 miles in total length. No major improvements to the SR 741 intersection will occur, pending other long-range needs to be identified by other actions underway, including a traffic impact study related to the Otterbein development, and other major land use and traffic generation issues in this section of the WAR-63 corridor.

¹ Scoping Study: State Route 63 Between Union Road and Neil Armstrong Way/SR 123 (WAR-63-0.00/6.33), Warren County, Ohio (Warren County Transportation Improvement District, April 2017 Final Report)

² Approximate for priority segment, depending on terminal treatments and limits; confirm with ODOT team.

Project Initiation Package: WAR-63-0.00/3.25

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	[to be updated]	[to be updated]
District Planning and Engineering representative	[to be updated]	[to be updated]
District Environmental Coordinator	[to be updated]	[to be updated]

EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:		
<i>Indicate external agency involvement during identification of project issues affecting scope development. List the name and phone number of individual(s) representing each agency during the site visit.</i>		
AGENCY	NAME	PHONE NUMBER
Warren County TID	Neil Tunison, WCTID Secretary and Warren County Engineer	(513) 695-3301
Warren County Engineer's Office	Dave Mick, Assistant Warren County Engineer	(513) 695-3308
Warren County Regional Planning Commission	Stan Williams, Executive Director	(513) 695-1223
City of Monroe	Bill Brock, City Manager	(513) 539-7374
Ohio Department of Administrative Services	[to be updated]	[to be updated]
Texas Eastern Gas	[to be updated]	[to be updated]
Miami Valley Gaming	[to be updated]	[to be updated]

GENERAL EXISTING INFORMATION:	
Legal Speed:	50 and 55
Design Speed:	55
Opening Year ADT:	17,000 (per ODOT SHIFT tool estimate reported for Year 2015) ³
Design Year ADT:	20,000 (per ODOT SHIFT tool estimates; Year 2040) ⁴
Trucks (24 Hour B&C):	1,268 (7.9% of actual for 2015)
Functional Classification:	Primary Arterial
Locale (Rural or Urban):	Rural (urban transition at west terminus)
National Highway System (NHS):	No

DISTRICT HIGHWAY MANAGEMENT STAFF CONCERNS:
<i>List any comments/requests from the District Highway Management Staff.</i>
[to be updated]

CRASH DATA:	
<i>Has a Safety Study been completed in the project area within past three years</i>	<i>(Yes/No) [to be checked/updated]</i>
<i>Project is highlighted on the Safety Integrated Project Maps</i>	<i>(Yes/No) [to be checked/updated]</i>
<i>Based on a spatial query (using GCAT or TIMS) of the three most recent years of crash data, briefly summarize crash history. Indicate any design features that may be contributing to the observed crash pattern that may be addressed by the project.</i>	
3-year Crash Data is summarized and presented in WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.	

³ For unincorporated township segment west of SR 741, as reported in Scoping Study Report for WAR-63; for western terminus of project in Monroe, 2015 ADT is about 20% higher than rest of project segment at 19,267.

⁴ This should be viewed as the low end of the range of possible design year traffic volume in this segment of WAR-63; if the 34-year average traffic growth rate dating from 1982 continues, the Year 2040 volume will be about 45,000, *excluding* any new growth, development and traffic generation in the corridor; see Scoping Study Report - Appendix E. Sensitivity to future traffic forecast ranges, should be considered in alternatives development and evaluation.

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	
<i>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.</i>	
Resource/Feature	Location/Comments⁵
Parkland, nature preserves and wildlife areas {4(f)/6(f)}	None
Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat	Six listed species; follow up required
Scenic River	N/A
Existing wet areas /existing cattails/wetlands	Minimal potential; no high-quality resources
Stream/river/waterway/jurisdictional ditch	3 existing culvert intermittent stream crossings
Historic Resources (buildings, structures, objects)	No NR-listed resources; occurrence/eligibility survey required
Historic Bridge(s)	None
National Historic Landmarks	None
Archaeological Sites	No NR-listed resources; occurrence/eligibility survey required
Public Facilities	Lebanon and Warren Correctional Institutions
Cemetery (modern and historic cemeteries)	Otterbein-Shaker Cemetery
Farmland	Predominant
Watershed Specific (i.e. Darby or Olentangy) NPDES Permit Area	N/A
Air Quality non-attainment area or concerns	Non-attainment area for ozone
Landfill, Superfund, CERCLIS, RCRA, NPL, or industrial site(s), and/or evidence of hazardous materials	ESA screening for 5 sites
Sensitive environmental justice areas	Yes
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains	Yes
Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	N/A
Sole Source Aquifers	Yes
Wellhead Protection Areas	Yes
Noise abatement issues	Probably not
Other environmental issues	Aesthetics; land use; stormwater; utilities/gas transmission pipeline

GEOMETRIC ISSUES:	
<i>Use the design speed, design functional classification and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project. Compare these requirements to crash data and impacts if deviations from standard are being considered.</i>	
Design Feature	Location/Comments
Lane Width	12'
Graded Shoulder Width	10'
Bridge Width	N/A
Horizontal Alignment (including Excessive Deflections, Degree of Curve, Transition/Taper Rates, Intersection Angles, etc.)	Generally tangent condition
Vertical Alignment (including grade breaks)	[to be updated]
Grades	[to be updated]
Stopping Sight Distance	[to be updated]
Pavement Cross Slopes	[to be updated]

⁵ See WAR-63 Scoping Study Report for locations and discussion of Environmental Issues

GEOMETRIC ISSUES:	
<i>Use the design speed, design functional classification and available traffic data to make a preliminary determination as to the geometric standards for the project. Compare these requirements to crash data and impacts if deviations from standard are being considered.</i>	
Superelevation (Maximum rate, transition, position)	[to be updated]
Horizontal Clearance	[to be updated]
Vertical Clearance	[to be updated]
GEOMETRIC ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following geometric issues are present or should be considered during project development. Consider work on the mainline as well as any side roads or service roads. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments ⁶
Does intersection sight distance need to be improved?	Yes
Are there geometric issues that may affect traffic safety? <i>Describe.</i>	Yes
List unprotected hazards that appear to be in the clear zone.	Several; most critical: gas transmission valving station
Should existing access control be revised to improve safety?	Yes
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 accommodate turning movements of large trucks?	Possibly
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
<i>If constructing a new roadway, will it be a connection between two existing NHS Routes?</i>	(Yes/No)
Are there any other geometric issues? <i>Describe</i>	See WAR-63 Scoping Study Report

GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES	
<i>Based on the information compiled during this study indicate whether or not the following geotechnical issues are present or should be further considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issues	Location/Comments
Is there evidence of soil drainage problems (e.g., wet or pumping subgrade, standing water, the presence of seeps, wetlands, swamps, bogs)?	Some, in Shaker Creek area
Will construction be impacted based on the groundwater table?	Potentially, in Shaker Creek area
Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)?	Some, in Shaker Creek area

⁶ See WAR-63 Scoping Study Report for location and comments on general geometric issues

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.	
Is there evidence of any slope instability (soil or rock)?	Some, in Shaker Creek area
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)?	Potentially, in Shaker Creek area
Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)?	In some cut sections, close to surface
Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines? Evidence of quarries?	None
Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines?	None
Is there Acid Mine Drainage present within the study area?	No
Are there any other geotechnical issues? <i>Specify.</i>	

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?	[to be updated by ODOT]
Are joint repairs needed?	[to be updated by ODOT]
Are pressure relief joints needed?	[to be updated by ODOT]
Does curb need to be replaced due to deteriorated condition or lack of curb reveal?	[to be updated by ODOT]
Has the site received repeated resurfacings in recent years?	[to be updated by ODOT]
Does pavement deterioration appear to be caused by drainage or geotechnical problems?	[to be updated by ODOT]
Are there any other pavement issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Yes; see WAR-63 Scoping Study Report

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:	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Is it possible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box?	N/A (culverts only)
Is the deck delaminated? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A (culverts only)
Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the amount of delamination?	N/A (culverts only)
Are there areas to be patched/repared on the deck?	N/A (culverts only)

STRUCTURAL ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following structure issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. The Bridge Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide a separate table for each structure.</i>	
Structure Number:	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? <i>Specify type of overlay if known.</i>	N/A (culverts only)
Does the bridge rail violate current standards?	N/A (culverts only)
Is fatigue analysis required?	N/A (culverts only)
Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A (culverts only)
Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)?	N/A (culverts only)
Is elimination of the deck joint possible? What modifications are necessary?	N/A (culverts only)
Is it possible for the hinges to be removed to make the members continuous?	N/A (culverts only)
Is there any evidence that the bridge does not meet hydraulic capacity?	N/A (culverts only)
Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the bridge?	N/A (culverts only)
Is Vandal Protection Fencing required in accordance with the BDM?	N/A (culverts only)
Will the structure work require any special maintenance of traffic (e.g., closing of roadway for erection of beams, maintenance of waterway traffic, location of cut line, etc.)? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A (culverts only)
Does the bridge need to accommodate future roadway lanes or railroad tracks?	N/A (culverts only)
Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad?	N/A (culverts only)
Describe any issues with the bridge deck (curb, sidewalk, railing, surface, median, drainage, expansion joints, etc.).	N/A (culverts only)
Describe any issues with the bridge superstructure (alignment, beams/girders/slab, bearing devices, etc.).	N/A (culverts only)
Describe any issues with the bridge substructure (abutments, piers, backwalls, wingwalls, scour, etc.).	N/A (culverts only)
Describe any issues with the channel (i.e. alignment, erosion, etc.)	N/A (culverts only)
Describe any issues with the bridge approaches (i.e. pavement, guardrail, etc.)	N/A (culverts only)
Are there any other structure related issues? <i>Specify.</i>	N/A (culverts only)

HYDRAULIC ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following drainage issues are present or should be considered during project development. Side road and service road work should be considered in this assessment. Any available Culvert Inspection reports should be evaluated and attached. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Comments
Does the existing drainage system appear to be appropriately sized and functioning properly? <i>Describe deficiencies.</i>	Generally yes
Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert inlets or outlets?	Not major
Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes?	Not visible
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; WOTUS three locations
Will channel relocation be required?	Probably not
Will post construction BMPs be required that could impact R/W or utilities?	Probably
Are existing underdrain outlets functioning properly?	N/A
Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?	Probably not beyond general construction
Are there any other hydraulic issues? <i>Describe.</i>	

TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES:	
<i>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.</i>	
Design Issue	Comments
Are there any obvious deviations from requirements of the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD)?	Some (conditions); see WAR-63 Scoping Study Report
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)?	Yes
Does this project affect or contain any ITS elements?	No
Will pavement widening affect pole locations?	Yes
Will resurfacing affect signal height?	Probably not
Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)?	Probably not
Are there any crashes that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of protected turn phase)?	Yes
Are new or updated curb ramps needed?	N/A
Do turn lane lengths appear to have sufficient storage capacity?	No
Does the controller need to be upgraded?	Probably, in next phase of corridor work

TRAFFIC CONTROL ISSUES:	
<i>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.</i>	
Design Issue	Comments
Do proprietary materials need to be specified?	No
Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting?	Probably not
Are any Tourist Oriented Directional Signs (TODS) or LOGO signs present?	Yes; local features
If traffic control at an intersection is being changed from stop control to signalization, does the stop condition road need to be upgraded to accommodate faster traffic?	N/A
Are there any other traffic control issues? <i>Specify.</i>	[to be updated]

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC ISSUES:
<i>Briefly describe the maintenance of traffic and any constraints. A list of considerations has been provided below.</i>
Maintenance of Traffic Considerations: Limits on traffic detour (including local alternate detours) due to load limits, bridge width restrictions, shoulder condition, emergency vehicle impact, temporary pavement requirements, speed limit during construction, pedestrian traffic, additional width at culverts, drive access, stopping sight distance, construction access, right of way acquisition, permitted lane closures, cross-overs, short duration road closures, temporary structure requirements, additional signal heads (drives and/or side roads), construction timeframe issues, innovative contracting, maintaining railroad traffic, turn movement restrictions
MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC DESCRIPTION:
[to be updated]

RIGHT OF WAY/SURVEY ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if right of way or survey issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Will there be any work beyond the existing right of way limits?	Yes
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?	Yes – formal access management is a priority requirement
Identify significant right of way encroachments (i.e. large commercial business signs, etc.)?	[to be updated]
Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?	[to be updated]
Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?	[to be updated]
Are there any specific property owner concerns? If so, list property owners and concerns.	[to be updated]
Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?	[to be updated]
Are there any other right of way or survey issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Long-term ROW preservation coordinated with access management

UTILITY ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following utility issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Do existing utilities need to be relocated? <i>If so, please identify.</i>	Yes; overhead electric; possible gas and water
Would the project benefit from Subsurface Utility Engineering (SUE) Level A?	Probably
Are there existing utilities on an existing structure that need to be relocated?	N/A
Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? <i>Specify.</i>	High pressure gas transmission; drinking water/wellhead/well field protection
Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract?	Probably
Are there any other utility issues? <i>Specify.</i>	[to be updated]

Pedestrian and Bicycle Issues:	
<i>Indicate if the following pedestrian and bicycle issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Does sidewalk need to be replaced or installed?	No
Does a bike lane need to be replaced or installed?	Not in roadway section
Is the project in the vicinity of a heavily traveled bicycle or pedestrian corridor?	No
Is the project located on a designated or proposed bike route?	Off-ROW; being developed by WCEO
Has a Safe Routes to School - School Travel Plan been completed within the project area?	[to be updated]; school bus transport is an issue (see WAR-63 Scoping Study Report]

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Design Issue	Location/Comments
Will any of the construction activity take place over, under, or near railroad property?	Yes
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.)?	Probably not
Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)?	Coordinate with LCI/WCI prison properties
Are there any other project concerns? <i>Specify</i>	[to be updated]

AGENCY COORDINATION/PERMIT ISSUES:	
<i>Indicate if the following permit issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed.</i>	
Issue	Location/Comments
Will an individual Corps of Engineers/ Environmental Protection Agency 404/401 permit be required?	No for this segment
Will a Coast Guard permit be required?	No
Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required? <i>Specify.</i>	Yes; Warren County Engineers Office and Warren County Transportation Improvement District
Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required?	Possibly
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?	[to be updated]

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:	
<i>Based on the responses to the above items, do any of the following need to be modified?</i>	
Issue	Comments
Conceptual scope	[to be updated] – Conceptual Scope narrative attached below
Work limits	[to be updated]
Probable environmental document type	[to be updated]
Project Path classification	[to be updated]
Schedule	[to be updated]
Budget	[to be updated]

CONCEPTUAL SCOPE

The WAR-63 Scoping Study Report establishes the conceptual scope of the improvements required for this segment. It does this by providing problem identification, assessing existing conditions, developing purpose and need of transportation improvements, establishing criteria for evaluating improvement strategies and concept design alternatives, identifying a preferred improvement strategy and concept design, assessing feasibility and environmental framework, and identifying key elements required for successful implementation and effectively addressing purpose and need.

Purpose and Need of Project to Be Addressed in Design and Delivery

The Project must respond to these items of Transportation Need:

- Degradation in Level of Service
- Increasing Travel Demand
- Emerging Safety Issues
- Changes in Roadway Conditions and Driver Expectations
- Increasing Trip Type and Mode Conflicts
- Current and Evolving Access Management Problems

See additional narrative for the above Transportation Need items in the WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.

The project must demonstrate that the designed and delivered improvement meets these identified items of Transportation Purpose and performance outcome:

- Maintain Effective Connectivity
- Improve Safety and Reduce Crash Risk
- Effectively Accommodate Different Trip Types and Modes
- Provide a Balanced Transportation Solution for Land Use and Environmental Context Issues

See additional narrative for the above Transportation Purpose items in the WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.

Other Goals and Objectives to be considered in project design and delivery include:

- Support for adopted land use and community plans
- Facilitation of economic development efforts
- Forwarding local stormwater and water resource management objectives
- Linking corridor improvement actions to local greenspace programs and aesthetic objectives

See additional narrative for the above Transportation Goals and Objectives items in the WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.

All of these elements of Need, Purpose and Goals and Objectives may require confirmation and refinement with stakeholders and citizens.

Alternatives

A preferred improvement strategy was identified in the Scoping process as best able to meet the long term need of the WAR-63 corridor. This preferred concept consists of a four lane rural section with a grass median, access control, and turn lanes as the baseline and starting point for developing alternatives for the Project Initiation Package, with the west segment (WAR-63-0.00/3.25) the priority.

The basis for identification of this as the Preferred Strategy is outlined in the WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.

Other alternatives, including No-Build, will need to be considered and evaluated for ability to meet Purpose and Need and impact consequences, as required by environmental processes. Staging options, or interim improvements, may also be considered. This might include a “narrowed” 3 or 5-lane section for initial construction, but with right-of-way and layout for needed future capacity and performance requirements aligning with the preferred concept. Purpose and need elements must be accounted for throughout.

Design and location alternatives within the preferred four-lane grass median strategy that should be evaluated include centerline location (hold existing, shift north, shift south) with specific consideration to impacts, constructability and maintenance of traffic, as well as vertical profile options (with specific regard to best practical design goals as well as impacts). Alternatives regarding access management will also need to be accounted for.

Special Requirements and Considerations For All Alternatives

1) ROW and Corridor Preservation

In order to account for expected future land use conditions, protection of right-of-way and corridor preservation is critical. Coordination with Department of Administrative Services to secure frontage rights from the future owners of the LCI property during sale is necessary in order to preserve the opportunity to provide a functional east-west corridor and access to I-75 under future scenarios, even if interim (lower first cost) build alternatives are selected. This is discussed further in the WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.

2) Project Financing

Corridor Preservation is linked to project financing. The fair market value of donated right of way can be used as local match in project funding. Additionally, while the base condition of traffic growth, as forecast by the SHIFT tool, should be the responsibility of the facility owner (ODOT), additional traffic growth beyond baseline resulting from conversion of land use, or other investments pertaining to aesthetic and environmental upgrades, may be borne all or in part by the community in the form of TIFs, or other special assessment districts or mechanisms. The least life cycle cost pathway for this scenario for all stakeholders (including ODOT) involves corridor preservation and planning for future capacity. This is discussed further in the WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.

3) Adopted Access Management Plan

Access Management requirements for this segment are important, and are discussed and illustrated in the WAR-63 Scoping Study Report.