

**ALL-75
STAKEHOLDER MEETING
Bath Township House
Lima, Ohio
August 4, 2005
5:00 to 7:00 pm**

A third stakeholder meeting was held on August 4, 2005, to present the conceptual alternatives to stakeholders. The format and content of the meeting was the same as the stakeholder meeting held on July 14, 2005. Because very few stakeholders attended the July 2005 meeting, the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) held a second meeting about the conceptual alternatives. A total of 35 people attended the meeting.

Kirk Slusher (ODOT) opened the meeting. He began the meeting with an overview of the Allen 75 study and project activities that have been completed since the stakeholder meeting in February 2005. Project activities included:

- Existing and Future Conditions Report
- Purpose and Need Statement
- Red Flag Summary

The deteriorating pavement conditions on I-75 within the study area were discussed. Traffic volumes are increasing and causing the pavement to deteriorate at a faster rate than normal. The bridges along I-75 are also in need of repair.

As a result of the February stakeholder meeting, ODOT expanded the study area to include SR 65, the railroad corridor, SR 117 and Fourth Street. The expanded study area provided a wider range of options for providing access to I-75. Goals and measures of project success based on input from stakeholders were developed for the project. K. Slusher presented these goals and measures, which can be categorized as follows:

1. Safety/Traffic
2. Community Impacts
3. Economic Development
4. Environmental
5. Constructability/Fiscal Constraint
6. Maintenance

The five goals of the purpose and need were reviewed and discussed.

1. Improve pavement and bridge conditions on I-75.
2. Improve safety by upgrading to current state and federal design standards
3. Provide sufficient capacity for future traffic
4. Assure appropriate access to sustain existing and future economic growth
5. Minimize impacts to social, economic and environmental resources

The conceptual alternatives developed for the project were discussed. K. Slusher explained that suggestions from the February 2005 stakeholders meeting were used in the development of the conceptual alternatives. A variety of modal options, a no build alternative, and 13 highway build alternatives were conceptually developed and analyzed. K. Slusher explained the elements and components of each alternative.

The evaluation and analysis of the conceptual alternatives were discussed. A two step comparative analysis was developed to identify alternatives for further study. The first step of the analysis evaluated the alternatives based on the purpose and need goals. The ability of each alternative to address the individual goals was determined. In step two of the analysis, the ability of the alternatives to address 14 evaluation criteria based on goals and measures of success, community economic strategic goals, and construction costs was assessed.

In step one, the freight rail, mass transit, transportation demand management, transportation system management, and highway build alternatives 4 and 5 were eliminated from further consideration. In step two, 11 Highway Build alternatives were evaluated using ratings of high, medium and low. The step two analysis eliminated Highway Build alternatives 2, 3, 6, and 7. Seven Highway Build alternatives (8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14) were recommended for further study and development. K. Slusher explained the seven individual alternatives and the various elements and options associated with each alternative (i.e. service roads, collector distributor roads, and improvements to local roads).

Following the presentation, K. Slusher explained that the conceptual alternatives are based on brainstormed ideas. He asked the stakeholders for their questions, ideas and comments regarding the conceptual alternatives. K. Slusher stressed that ODOT wanted to hear other alternative ideas that could be considered. He also stressed that the stakeholders should review the information provided in the handouts and submit their comments to ODOT. The following questions and concerns were raised by the stakeholders:

Q: What is the tentative design and construction schedule for the project?

A: The Preferred Alternative will be selected in late 2006; design will begin in 2007; right-of-way acquisition will begin in late 2008; and construction will begin in 2010.

Q: Are there other studies that could tie into this study?

A: The I-75 section in Findlay is on ODOT's 25 year plan. This section will be studied after the Lima section.

Q: What is driving the project?

A: The project is being driven by poor pavement conditions and not traffic capacity. Reconstruction of I-75 will be built to accommodate 2032 traffic volumes.

Q: Will a concrete barrier or a grass median be built between the six lanes?

A: A barrier will be built between the north and south bound lanes. Inside and outside shoulders will be 12 feet wide.

Q: Will aesthetics be a factor in the design?

A: Aesthetics are a factor in the design of the I-75 improvements. ODOT has funds reserved for aesthetics. ODOT would like Lima to present ideas for aesthetic options that could be included in the design.

Q: Will landscaping be an aesthetic factor considered by ODOT?

A: Typically ODOT does not plant landscaping due to maintenance issues. ODOT will work with communities to include landscaping in a highway project if communities will maintain the landscaping.

Q: How will the curve on I-75 be affected by the improvements?

A: The curve on I-75 will be reconstructed to be shallower and meet current design standards. Three lanes north and three lanes south will continue through the curve to Cridersville. Cable rails will be installed through this area for safety.

Q: Will trucks be limited to the right two lanes?

A: The answer to this question is unknown at this time.

Q: Has any consideration be given to improving Brynmawr or Sugar streets?

A: No.

Q: Will the improvements on SR117 include more than two lanes?

A: Three lanes are being considered for the SR 117 improvements. One lane will be a turn lane.

Q: Can components on Alternative 12 be applied to Alternative 13?

A: Yes, please provide suggestions.

Q: Could an interchange be added south of SR 81 for Alternative 12?

A: This would be difficult to implement due to the location of SR 81 and the residential and commercial development along I-75.

Q: How will the curve at Hanthorn be improved?

A: The curve will be shallower.