

**ALL-75**  
**STAKEHOLDER MEETING**  
**Lima Allen County Regional Planning Commission**  
**July 14, 2005**  
**5:00 to 7:00 pm**

The second stakeholder meeting was held on July 14, 2005. The purposes of this meeting were to present to the stakeholders the conceptual alternatives that have been identified and assessed for the Allen 75 project and to obtain stakeholder comments on the conceptual alternatives. A total of 20 people attended the meeting.

Kirk Slusher, Ohio Department of Transportation (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

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 asked the stakeholders for their questions, ideas and comments regarding the conceptual alternatives. 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:

- Access to hotels and motels will need to be maintained and/or improved for tourism.
- Improved signage will need to be an element of the I-75 improvements.
- ODOT's safety "hot spot" list identifies the SR 309/117 corridor. Eliminating the SR 309 interchange would improve the safety of this corridor.
- The businesses will be concerned if interchanges are removed.
- Bike lanes and pedestrian access should be considered for all alternatives.
- Safety and accidents on local roads and I-75 were discussed. ODOT's "hot spot" list includes portions of I-75 due to inclement weather conditions. Guard rails collisions occur on occasion along the curve areas of I-75.
- Will the 70 mile per hour design speed of the alternatives take into account summer and winter conditions?
- Rumble strips were requested along I-75.
- Do any of the alternatives have multiple on ramps for the interchanges as there are in Dayton at the I-75/35 interchange?