

RED FLAG SUMMARY

(Form Revised April 2005)

The purpose of this Red Flag Summary is to identify concerns that could cause revisions to the anticipated design and construction scope of work, the proposed project development schedule, the estimated project budget, or the potential impacts of the project on the surrounding area.

Date Red Flag Summary Completed: _10/2010 preliminary__

District: _7__

Project Name (County, Route and Section): _____Springfield Downtown Street Conversion Study_____

City, Township or Village Names(s): _____Springfield_____

PID: _____None__

Prepared by: _____Bryan Newell, Amy Kramb_____

ODOT Project Manager: _____None_____

GENERAL PROJECT PLANNING INFORMATION:

Project Description:

The Clark County-Springfield Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) in conjunction with the City of Springfield and the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) in the fall of 2010 began a feasibility study to convert several downtown Springfield streets from one-way to two-way traffic operation.

The TCC, the City and ODOT envisioned the study resulting in an outline of transportation concerns, impacts and trade-offs, livability and walkability issues, potential economic benefits, and costs related to converting downtown streets from one-way to two-way traffic operation. In addition, the study would solicit public participation and document all public involvement efforts.

The **Springfield Downtown Street Conversion Study** explores the feasibility study of converting several downtown streets from one-way to two-way traffic operation. The goal is to further the economic competitiveness and mobility throughout downtown Springfield by recommending a street system that improves multimodal interaction, way finding, walkability, and quality of life, while maintaining acceptable parking and traffic operations.

Project Limits/General Location

The study area for the Springfield Downtown Streets Conversion Study is generally described as Main and High Streets from Yellow Springs Street to Spring Street, Fountain Avenue from High Street to Columbia Street and Limestone Street from High Street to North Street.

Structures:

Bridge Number _____ Structure File Number _____

Bridge Number _____ Structure File Number _____

Bridge Number _____ Structure File Number _____

Estimated Cost: _____ N/A _____

Funding Source(s):

Federal

State

Local _____

Private _____

Are funding splits required? Yes No

Specify: _____

Anticipated quarter and Fiscal Year of project award: _____

Project Sponsor: _____

Is local legislation required? Yes No

Is FHWA oversight required? Yes No

Is project location on the congestion/safety list? Yes No

Problem identified by (*indicate document date*):

District Work Plan _____

Congestion Study _____

Safety Study _____

Major New _____

MPO TIP _____

MPO LRP _____

Access Ohio _____

Other _____ MPO-Feasibility Study _____

Are there any other projects in the area (ODOT, local or utility) that might conflict with the project (e.g., a local project on the proposed detour route for the ODOT project, a resurfacing project a year after a pavement marking project)? Yes **No** Specify: _____

Are there growth or land use changes in the area surrounding the project that could have an impact on project scope? Yes **No** Specify: _____

Are there any known public involvement issues? Yes **No** Specify: _____

Purpose and Need (Must be a separate document for Major Projects):

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this project is to provide transportation infrastructure that supports community growth and development as identified by the City of Springfield and others, such as, the Center City Association, the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce, and the Community Improvement Corporation of Springfield.

EXISTING INFORMATION:

Check all information that was reviewed for the Red Flag Summary. Not all information is available or necessary for every project. The scope of the Red Flag Summary should be commensurate with the nature of the proposed project.

- G Legal Speed ___35___
- G Design Speed ___35___
- G Traffic Data: **24 hour data not developed yet**
 - Opening Year ADT: _____
 - Design Year ADT: _____
 - Design Hourly Volume: _____
 - Directional Distribution: _____
 - Trucks (24 Hour B&C): _____

(Traffic data does not need to be certified for the Red Flag Summary.)
- G Turning movement traffic counts - **YES**
- G Functional Classification:
 - G Interstate, freeway
 - G **Arterial**
 - G Collector
 - G Local
- G Locale:
 - G Rural
 - G **Urban**
- G National Highway System (NHS):
 - G NHS Routes: _____
 - G non-NHS Routes: _____
- G (3R) Project?
 - G Yes
 - G **No**
- G Aerial mapping

- G Ohio Utility Protection Service (OUPS) Markings
- G United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic mapping
- G Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood plain study mapping
- G Natural Resources Conservation Services (NRCS) mapping
- G County map(s)
- G Airport locations within 4 miles of project _____
- G Tax maps
- G Property deeds
- G Pavement marking log
- G Original construction plans _____
- G Existing right of way plans _____
- G Bridge inspection reports
- G Bridge Load Ratings
- G Pile Driving Logs
- G Recorded vertical clearances for overpasses and underpasses
- G Old Soil borings
- G Old Geologic reports
- G Pavement Cores
- G Dynaflect Testing
- G Deck Cores
- G Maintenance history
- G Pavement Condition Ratings (PCR's)
- G County Manager concerns
- G **Traffic Studies, Highway Safety Program (HSP) Studies**
- G Previous Maintenance of Traffic concerns on roadway
- G **Accident History**/Accident Reports
- G Past project construction diaries
- G Permitted Lane Closure Map
- G **Property owner contacts**
- G National Register of Historic Places
- G Other: _____

EXISTING GEOTECHNICAL INFORMATION:

Identify all geotechnical references found. It is assumed, based on the project type, that not all reference materials listed herein will be applicable for use during the Red Flag Study. This study should provide a comprehensive review of all existing information available for the project area and should be supplemented with a complete field reconnaissance.

Review of information from ODOT:

- G Original construction plans including plan views, profiles, and cross-sections
- G Construction diaries and inspection reports for original construction
- G Compile information on changes to the plans during construction activities (e.g., slope, spring drains)
- G Interview people knowledgeable with the previous projects
- G Maintenance records
- G Boring log on file with the Office of Geotechnical Engineering
- G History and occurrence of landslides
- G History and occurrence of rockfalls
- G Other_____

Review of information from ODNR:

From the Division of Geological Survey

- G Boring logs on file
- G Measured geologic sections
- G Bedrock Geologic Maps
- G Bedrock Topography Maps
- G Bedrock Structure Maps
- G Geologic Map of Ohio
- G Quaternary Geology of Ohio
- G Known and Probable Karst in Ohio
- G Bulletins
- G Information Circulars
- G Report of Investigations
- G Location and information on underground mines
- G Location and characteristics of karst features
- G Landslide maps
- G Other_____

From the Division of Mineral Resource Management

- G Applications and permits files for surface mines (coal & industrial mineral)
- G Active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines
- G Abandoned Mine Land (AML) sites
- G Emergency Projects
- G Other_____

From the Division of Soil & Water

- G Water well logs
- G Soil Surveys
- G Ohio Wetland Inventory Maps
- G National Wetland Inventory Maps
- G Presence of lake bed sediments, organic soils or peat deposits
- G Other _____

Other Sources:

- G Aerial photographs
- G Satellite imagery
- G USGS quadrangles
- G USGS publications and files
- G City and County Engineers
- G Academia with engineering or geology programs
- G USGS Open File Map Series #78-1057 "Landslides and Related Features"
- G Other _____

SITE VISIT:

A site visit is required for ALL projects.

The site visit shall consist of visual inspection of the entire project area including the ditch lines, cut slopes, stream banks, bridge foundations, pavement, rock/soil slopes, etc.

Date(s) of site visit: 9 14 -2010 - -

ODOT DISCIPLINE INVOLVEMENT:

List name and phone number of individual(s) representing each discipline during the site visit and preparation of the Red Flag Summary. One individual may represent multiple disciplines. Check box if individual attended the site visit.

- G District Project Manager _____
- G Geometrics _____
- G Hydraulics _____
- G Pavements _____
- G Geotechnical _____
- G General Roadway _____
- G Structures _____

- G Traffic Control _____
- G Signals _____
- G Maintenance of Traffic _____
- G Right of Way/Real Estate _____
- G Utilities _____
- G Survey _____
- G Environmental _____
- G Highway Management _____
- G Central Office Program Manager _____
- G ODOT County Manager** _____
- G District Production Administrator** _____
- G District Planning and Programming Administrator** _____

** The County Manager, Production Administrator and Planning/Programming Administrator (or qualified representative) must attend the site visit.

EXTERNAL AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

Indicate external agency involvement during identification of red flags. List the name and phone number of individual(s) representing each agency during the site visit. Check box if individual attended the field review.

- G Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) _____
- G County Engineer _____
- G City Engineer _____
- G Other local public agency _____
- G Federal Emergency Management Agency FEMA _____
- G U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) _____
- G U.S. Coast Guard _____
- G Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) _____
- G Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) _____
- G Railroad/Railway Company _____
- G State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) _____
- G Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) _____ Scott Schmid _____
- G Utility Companies: _____ (Power)
- _____ (Telephone)
- _____ (Water)
- _____ (Gas)

_____	_____	(Sanitary)
_____	_____	(Cable)
_____	_____	
_____	_____	

G Other

ODOT COUNTY MANAGER CONCERNS:

List any comments/requests from the ODOT County Manager.

ACCIDENT DATA:

Summarize accident history. Indicate any design features that should be revised to increase safety.

No accident history of note: None of the intersections in the study area are on the City's hot Spot list

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:

Make a preliminary determination on whether the following resources will be affected by the proposed project.

Potential Involvement	Resource	Comments
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Parkland, nature preserves and wildlife areas	In the study area, there is a public square with green space, seating, and a fountain located adjacent to City Hall in the block bounded by Main Street, S. Fountain Avenue, High Street, and S. Limestone Street. Also in the study area is a public open space with a monument dedicated to service personnel such as firefighters and police officers. The passive green space does not include

		<p>benches. Impacts to public parks within the study area must be considered for Section 4(f) purposes.</p> <p>There is a public space immediately adjacent to the study area. It is a landscaped median on S. Fountain Avenue between High Street and the railroad tracks. The area contains a fountain, street trees, shrubs, and numerous benches.</p> <p>The National Trails Park and Recreation District Master Plans identifies Veteran’s Park north of the study area on the north bank of Buck Creek along Cliff Park Drive between Wittenberg Avenue and N. Plum Street.</p> <p>The alternatives development for this project should consider and address any secondary/cumulative impacts to parking and vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle connectivity to these adjacent parks and public spaces.</p>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Cemetery	Confirmed by site visit and a review of area maps.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Scenic River	Confirmed by reviewing the ODNR State Scenic River mapping available on-line http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/tabid/985/Default.aspx (accessed 12/6/2010).
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Public Facilities	<p>For the following public facilities within the study area, the project should consider direct and indirect impacts, such as, but not limited to, parking and access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Springfield City Area Transit facility – South side of W. High Street between S. Fountain Avenue and S. Center Street • Clark County Juvenile Center – 101 E. Columbia Street • Clark County Courthouse – 101 N. Limestone Street • Clark County Offices (Auditor, Recorder, Treasurer, etc.) – 31 N. Limestone Street • City of Springfield Offices – 76 E. High Street • US Post Office – 150 N. Limestone Street • Ohio Valley Medical Center – 100 W. Main Street • Elderly United C.A.R.E. – 50 W. High Street • Interfaith Hospitality Network – 501 W. High Street

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Salvation Army – 15 S. Plum Street • Clark State Community College (Brickman Center) – southeast corner of Limestone and High Streets <p>The Springfield Regional Medical Center is under construction north of the study area on the south side of Buck Creek between S. Yellow Springs Street and N. Wittenberg Avenue. The 254-bed hospital plans to open in late 2011. This project should consider secondary/cumulative impacts to ambulance routes and to vehicular, bike and pedestrian connections from the study area.</p> <p>The National Trails Park and Recreation District plans to construct a Family Ice Arena immediately adjacent to the study area at the formal Memorial Hall site bounded by Main Street, N. Lowry Street, E. Columbia Street, and Memorial Place. The project should consider secondary/cumulative impacts to parking and vehicular, bike and pedestrian connections from the study area to the Ice Rink.</p> <p>Clark State Community College’s downtown campus is immediately adjacent to the study area, south of High Street between S. Limestone Street and Spring Street. This project should consider direct impacts to access and parking for the college. The project should consider secondary/cumulative impacts to vehicular, bike and pedestrian connections from the study area to the campus.</p> <p>The Clark County Public Library is located at 201 S. Fountain Avenue south of the study area. The project should consider secondary/cumulative impacts to vehicular, bike and pedestrian connections from the study area to the library.</p> <p>The Clark County Historical Society is located at 117 S. Fountain Avenue south of the study area. The project should consider secondary/cumulative impacts to vehicular, bike and pedestrian connections from the study area to the historical society.</p>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Threatened and Endangered Species and/or habitat (e.g., Indiana bat trees, etc.	No state and/or Federally listed species are known to be within the project study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Existing wetlands	Verified by site visit and review of mapping including aerials, and the USGS Springfield, Ohio (1966, photorevised 1981) topographic quadrangle.

Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Existing wet areas	Verified by site visit and review of mapping including aerials, and the USGS Springfield, Ohio (1966, photorevised 1981) topographic quadrangle.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Streams, rivers and watercourses	Buck Creek is north of the study area and will not be impacted by the project.
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Historic Building(s)	<p>The Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) on-line Geographic Information System (GIS) database identifies numerous properties within the study area as previously recorded on Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) forms.</p> <p>The following properties within or immediately adjacent to the study area are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lagonda Club Building – NW Corner of High and Spring Streets (Ref. #75001342) • Warder Public Library – SW Corner of High and Spring Streets (Ref.#76001381) • St. Raphael Church – SE Corner of High and Spring Streets (Ref. #76001381) • Shawnee Hotel – NW Corner of Main and Limestone Streets (Ref. #85003044) • Tecumseh Building – 34 W. High Street (Ref. #00001555) • Masonic Temple – 125 W. High Street (Ref.#08001195) • Municipal Building – S. Fountain Avenue between High and Washington Streets (Ref. #73001394) <p>The following properties within the study area have been Determined Eligible For the NRHP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crowell-Collier Building (CLA-01160-01) • US Post Office (CLA-0137-01) <p>There are numerous other buildings within the study area that have Ohio Historic Inventory forms but have not been evaluated for NRHP eligibility. An assessment of eligibility will likely be necessary once an Area of Potential Effect is identified.</p>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Historic Bridge(s)	Confirmed by viewing ODOT's historic bridge inventory on-line at http://www.buckeyeassets.org (accessed 12/7/2010).
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Farmland	Verified by site visit and review of mapping including aerials, and the USGS Springfield, Ohio (1966, photorevised 1981) topographic quadrangle.

Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Landfill(s)	Verified by site visit and area maps.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Total Maximum Daily Load (TDML) Streams	No watercourses within the study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ODOT MS4 Phase 2 Regulated Areas	The City of Springfield is an ODOT MS4 Outfall Regulated Area (see mapping at http://www.dot.state.oh.us/stormwater/mapping/Pages/default.aspx).
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Evidence of hazardous materials	<p>A search of the Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Regulations (BUSTR) Underground Storage Tank (UST) database on April 23, 2011 failed to identify any active or removed USTs within the study area.</p> <p>A search of the US EPA Envirofacts database on April 23, 2011 failed to identify any facilities within the study area reporting hazardous waste activities, reporting toxic releases, reporting the production or release of air pollutants, requiring permits to discharge into waters of the US, or being regulated by the US EPA for radiation or radioactivity.</p> <p>As of April 23, 2011, the US EPA reports no National Priority List within the City of Springfield. As of April 23, 2011, the US EPA CERCLIS database does not identify any Superfund sites within the study area.</p>
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Sensitive environmental justice areas	The study area is commercial in nature and generally lacks residential areas. There are approximately ten residences that fall within the western boundary of the study area along High Street in the vicinity of Plum Street and Yellow Springs Street.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplains	There are no floodplains within the study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Lake Erie Coastal Management Area	The study area is in Clark County.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Sole Source Aquifers	The Greater Miami is a Sole Source Aquifer, but there are no waterways associated with this Sole Source Aquifer within the study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Wellhead Protection Areas	Review of Clark County and City of Springfield mapping failed to identify the study area as within a wellhead protection area.
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/>	Other environmental issues: Churches, bike trails	The Buck Creek Trail follows Buck Creek from Plum Street through Veteran's Park then along Warder Street to N. Limestone Street. This dedicated trail portion of Buck Creek is outside the study area. However, there is a portion of the Buck Creek Trail which shares the right-of-way and routes along Limestone Street and Fountain Avenue to connect with the Little Miami Scenic Trail. A trail map is available at: http://www.ntprd.org/images/trails.gif

		<p>A portion of the Simon Kenton Trail, which joins the Buck Creek Trail, follows the railroad tracks south of the study area near the Clark County Historical Center (Heritage Center).</p> <p>There are numerous churches within and immediately adjacent to the study area, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Lutheran – 30 S. Wittenberg Avenue • Central United Methodist – 102 W. High Street • Salvation Army – 15 S. Plum Street • St. Raphael – 225 E. High Street • High Street United Methodist- 230 E. High Street • Covenant Presbyterian Church – 201 N. Limestone Street <p>Private schools within the study area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Springfield Christian School – 311 W. High Street • Eagle & Dove Academy – 102 W. High Street <p>Social clubs within the study area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Union Club – 139 W. High Street • Fraternal Order of Eagles AERIE 397 – 125 W. Main Street • Masonic Temple – 125 W. High Street • Machinists Club – 104 S. Wittenberg Avenue
--	--	--

GEOMETRIC ISSUES:

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 accident data and impacts if deviations are being considered.

Design Exception Required?	Design Feature	Preliminary Comments Regarding Justification	References*
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Lane Width (including curve widening)		LDV1: 301.1.1
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Graded Shoulder Width		LDV1: 301.2.3

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Bridge Width		LDV1: 302.1
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Structural Capacity		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Horizontal Alignment (including Excessive Deflections, Degree of Curve, Lack of Spirals, Transition/Taper Rates and Intersection Angles)		LDV1: 202, 401.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Vertical Alignment (including grade breaks)		LDV1: 203
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Grades		LDV1: 203.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Stopping Sight Distance		LDV1: 201.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Pavement Cross Slopes		LDV1: 301.1.5
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Superelevation (Maximum rate, transition, position)		LDV1: 202.4
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Horizontal Clearance		LDV1: 301.2.5
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Vertical Clearance		LDV1: 302.1

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 Issue	Comments	References*
GYes G No	Does the existing horizontal alignment need to be		LDV1:202

G Possible G Not Applicable	modified?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the existing vertical alignment need to be modified?		LDV1:203
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does stopping sight distance need to be increased?		LDV:201.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does intersection sight distance need to be increased?		LDV1: 201.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any hazards in the clear zone? <i>Specify treatment.</i>		LDV1: 600.2, 601
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does existing guardrail need to be replaced (e.g., too low, poor condition)?		LDV1: 602, 603
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the area for guardrail anchor assemblies insufficient? (E-98 or B-98)?		LDV1: 602, 603
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the number of turn lanes appear to be inadequate?	Switching traffic flow may require turn lanes in different locations	LDV1: 401.7, 402
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the number of through lanes appear to be inadequate?		LDV1: 401.7
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are changes to access control required?	Need to institute access management	LDV1: 800, 801, 802
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	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)?	Parcels with multiple drives for functionality and drives that entering left turn traffic may block through traffic on mainline.	LDV1: 803, 804, 805
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are new mailbox turnouts required?		LDV1: 803.1

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there any evidence of accidents due to substandard vertical clearance on overpass structures?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will an interchange be added or modified?		LDV1: 403, 404
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do the existing intersection radius returns need to be modified to accommodate larger truck turning movements?	Will be explored in future phases	LDV1: 401.5
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does grading need to be upgraded? To what criteria (e.g., clear zone, safety, standard)?		LDV1: 307
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any other geometric issues? <i>Describe</i>	Curb reveals non-existent in some locations causing water to pool on sidewalk and street	

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. Provide additional comments as needed.

	Design Issue	Comments	References*
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Based on visual evidence (height of debris, erosion or other markings left from high water) and approximate drainage areas, does the existing drainage system (culverts, storm sewers and/or ditches) appear to be inappropriately sized and not functioning properly? <i>Describe deficiencies.</i>	Pooling water in some curb areas but not due to capacity issue.	LDV2: 1003 - 1006
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there evidence of alignment or flow velocity problems (e.g., scour, bank erosions, silting) at culvert entrances or exits?		LDV2: 1107
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there sinkholes or other deterioration in the pavement that would indicate separations in the existing pipes?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Should guardrail over culverts be eliminated with clear zone grading?		LDV1: 307.2

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Should the existing culverts be replaced?		LDV2: 1105
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Should the existing culverts be extended?		LDV2: 1105
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will a new alignment concentrate flow (in culverts) that is currently overland flow?		LDV2: 1105
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will the maximum height of cover (100') be exceeded for any culvert?		LDV2: 1008
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will bankfull design be used for any culverts?		LDV2: 1105.3.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Could materials with long lead times (e.g., large boxes) have an impact on construction schedule?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the existing drainage system have an odor that might indicate that it includes septic connections?		LDV2: LD-30 Form 1111.1
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the exposed curb height in existing gutters inadequate to contain flow (include height of proposed resurfacing)?		LDV2: 1103
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do the existing inlets or catch basins need to be raised to meet proposed grade?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the project in a FEMA flood zone?		LDV2: 1005
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the project affect a wetland or waterway (e.g., stream, river, jurisdictional ditch)?		LDV2: 1001.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the existing and/or proposed channel alignment incompatible with the existing/proposed structure?		

G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will channel relocation be required?		LDV2: 1102.2.4
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) requirements apply?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will post construction flow requirements be required?		LDV2: 1115.1 1115.2
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there evidence of existing field tiles?		LDV2: 1002.3.6, 1108
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are underdrain outlets not functioning properly?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will a new storm sewer outfall be required?		LDV2: 1104
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is ditch cleanout required?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the drainage work warrant any special maintenance of traffic considerations?		TEM: PART 6
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any other hydraulic issues? <i>Describe.</i>		

GEOTECHNICAL ISSUES:

“Geotechnical Red Flag” features may include, but are not limited to, known or suspected geologic hazards (e.g., organic soils, karst, rockfalls, landslides, surface and underground mines, poor subgrade conditions, or difficulty in correcting existing surface or subsurface drainage problems).

GEOLOGY

Provide a brief geologic description of the project area

Provide a description of the hydrogeologic setting

Describe the characteristics of the soils

Describe the characteristics of the rock

ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION PLAN OBSERVATIONS

Provide a bulleted list of all pertinent features found during the plan and specification review

Include findings from previous geotechnical reports or investigations

If general alignment or corridor is known, develop profiles to graphically present subsurface conditions (e.g., soil, rock, groundwater)

Describe soil classifications and problem conditions

Describe bedrock and problem conditions

DISTRICT NOTATIONS

Provide synopsis of information compiled through the District and County Garages

Include construction issues and maintenance problems

FIELD REVIEW

Summarize the findings from a complete field reconnaissance

Provide bulleted items with references to locations

Include conditions of embankments, soil & rock cut slopes, surface water erosion, ground water seeps or springs, settlements, surface deformation, abnormal pavement cracking, etc.

SUMMARY OF 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.

	Design Issues	Comments	References*
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there evidence of soil drainage problems (e.g., wet or pumping subgrade, standing water, the presence of seeps, wetlands, swamps, bogs)?		SSI: 2.1, 2.2
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there evidence of any embankment or foundation problems (e.g., differential settlement, sag, foundation failures, slope failures, scours, evidence of channel migrations)?		SSI: 2.1, 2.2

G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there evidence of any landslides?		SSI: 2.1, 2.2
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	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)?		SSI: 2.1, 2.2
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there evidence of rock strata (e.g., presence of exposed bedrock, rock on the old borings)?		SSI: 2.1
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there evidence of active, reclaimed or abandoned surface mines?		SSI: 2.1, 2.2, AUM
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there information pertaining to the existence of underground mines?		SSI: 2.1, 2.2, AUM
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are soil borings needed for pavement design, foundations (bridge, headwall, retaining wall, noise wall) or slopes?		SSI: 2.1, 2.2
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does an undercut appear to be needed?		SSI: 5.3.2.1
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Should the Office of Geotechnical Engineering be contacted to evaluate the project site?		SSI: 1.3
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any other geotechnical issues? <i>Specify.</i>		

Provide a list of bulleted items referencing additional areas of concern or special notation.

--

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	Comments	References*
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are pavement cores needed to determine the existing pavement buildup and/or condition?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the proposed pavement buildup unknown? (For pavement preservation projects, pavement treatment, including pavement type & thickness should be specified in the design scope of services)		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do dynaflect tests indicate the existing pavement is in poor condition?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the proposed pavement buildup need to be approved by the Pavement Selection Committee?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are joint repairs needed?		

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are pressure relief joints needed?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are pavement repairs needed?	Maintenance issue not reason for project	
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the maintenance of traffic scheme require additional permanent or temporary pavement?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does curb need to be replaced due to deteriorated condition or lack of curb reveal?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does sidewalk need to be replaced or installed?		LDV1: 306.2

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are new curb ramps needed?		LDV1: 306.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do truncated domes need to be installed?		LDV1: 306.3.5
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there any work on side roads, service roads or ramps?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any special drive treatments or preferences (e.g., concrete for all drive aprons, curved aprons, etc.)?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Has the site received repeated resurfacings in recent years?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does pavement deterioration appear to be caused by drainage or geotechnical problems?	Drainage in some areas. Broken edge of pavement	
GYes G No G Possible	Are there any other pavement issues? <i>Specify.</i>		

G Not Applicable			

STRUCTURAL ISSUES: (Not Applicable)

Indicate if the following structure issues are present or should be considered during project development. Provide additional comments as needed. Provide a separate table for each structure.

Structure:	Design Issue	Comments	References*
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is it impossible for the structure to be replaced with a prefabricated box culvert or 3-sided box?		BDM: 201
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the bridge (including foundation) violate current design live loading?		BDM: 301.4, 301.4.1, 301.4.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Was the existing structure not built according to plan?		BDM: 206, 401.1, 610.1
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is deck coring needed?		BDM: 412
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the deck delaminated? <i>Specify.</i>		BDM: 412
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is non-destructive testing needed to determine the amount of delamination?		BDM: 412
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the bridge deck in poor condition?		BDM: 412
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does a deck condition survey (Bridge Design Manual, Section 412) need to be performed?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there areas to be patched or repaired on the deck?		BDM: 403.1, 404.3

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the bridge a poor candidate for an overlay? <i>Specify type of overlay if known.</i>		BDM: 404.1, 404.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the bridge rail violate current standards?		BDM: 209.2, 304, 410
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is a fatigue analysis required?		BDM: 402.2, 402.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Should all fatigue prone details be retrofitted or replaced? <i>Specify.</i>		BDM: 402.2, 402.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the abutment (including backwall, beam seats, brestwall, wingwall, etc.) in poor condition? <i>Specify location and level of deterioration.</i>		BDM: 403.1
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there any evidence of substructure movement (e.g., settlement, rotation)?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are the piers in poor condition? <i>Specify measures to be taken.</i>		BDM: 303.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there any evidence of existing beam deterioration/section loss, strands exposed, shear joints leaking or longitudinal cracks?		BDM: 402.1
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are the bearings in poor condition?		BDM: 411
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is elimination of the deck joint impossible? What modifications are necessary?		BDM: 205.8, 205.9, 406
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are new approach slabs needed?		BDM: 209.5
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is it impossible for the hinges to be removed to make the members continuous?		BDM: 402.8

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does existing vertical and horizontal clearance violate design standards?		BDM: 207.1, 207.3, 209.8
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the bridge on a curve, skew or superelevation transition?		BDM: 207.5, 209.1
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there any evidence that the bridge does not meet hydraulic capacity?		BDM: 202.5, 203
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there existing sidewalks on or adjacent to the bridge?		BDM: 209.11
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	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>		BDM: 208, 409, 304.3.5
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the structure in a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood plain?		BDM: 203
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there any erosion in the existing channel?		BDM: 203.3

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the foundation exposed due to scour?		BDM: 203.3, 409.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will there be more than 25' of channel relocation?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do no opportunities exist to construct the bridge faster (e.g., precast walls, segmental construction)?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is there any railroad involvement?		BDM: 209.8

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the bridge need to accommodate future additional roadway lanes or railroad tracks?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will temporary shoring be required next to the railroad?		BDM: 208.3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Could materials with long lead times for delivery (e.g., steel beams) have an impact on the construction schedule?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any problems with existing retaining walls?		BDM: 204.9
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any other structures issues? <i>Specify.</i>		

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	References*
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do the existing signs need to be replaced due to poor condition?	Some will need to be replaced due to traffic flow change	TEM: 260
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any obvious deviations from requirements of the Ohio Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (OMUTCD)?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is a particular type of pavement marking desired (e.g., paint, epoxy, thermoplastic)?		TEM: 320
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will pavement planing affect loop detectors?		TEM: 450-10.7 420-5
GYes G No	Will pavement widening affect pole locations?	Traffic flow change will	TEM: 450-6

G Possible G Not Applicable			
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will resurfacing effect signal height?		TEM: 450-7
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does it appear that any traffic control items will fall outside the existing right of way limits (e.g., large signs, strain poles)?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any special pedestrian considerations?		TEM: 404
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any accidents that can be related to existing signal deficiencies (e.g., timing, lack of turn lanes)?		TEM: 402-3.5
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do turn lane lengths appear to have insufficient storage capacity?	Have no defined lengths. Will be updated per traffic flow change needs	LDV1: 401.7
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does the controller need to be upgraded?		TEM: 460
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do proprietary materials need to be specified?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Should signs or signal installations be supplemented with lighting?		TEM: 408
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are any TODS signs present?		TEM: 207-3
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Could material with long lead times for delivery have an impact on the construction schedule (e.g., strain poles)?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	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?		

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Are there any other traffic control issues? <i>Specify.</i>	Switching traffic flow, will need new signs, signals, striping, etc...	
--	---	--	--

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	Comments	References*
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Is a traffic detour prohibited for any reason?	Detours will be block by block similar to resurfacing or signal installation project	TEM: 602-6
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Is the local alternate detour route in poor condition? Are there any load limits or bridge width restrictions?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Will the detour route have a detrimental impact on emergency vehicles, school buses or other sensitive traffic?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Are there any load limits on the proposed detour route?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Does the project fall outside the permitted lane closure map?		TEM: 630-4
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Is existing bridge width insufficient to maintain traffic?		TEM: 640-2
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Will temporary pavement be required?		TEM: 640-2, 640-11

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Should temporary pavement be retained after project completion?		TEM: 640-11
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible	Will the speed limit be lowered by more than 10 mph during construction?		TEM: 640-18

G Not Applicable			
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the existing shoulder condition insufficient to support traffic during construction?		TEM: 640-5
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does pedestrian traffic need to be maintained?	Work will happen in front of downtown businesses.	TEM: 64-25
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will additional width be required on culverts or bridges to maintain traffic?		TEM: 640-2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will a temporary structure/runaround be required?		TEM: 640-11
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will a cross over be utilized?		TEM: 640-11
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will the road need to be closed for short durations (e.g., 15 minutes for beam erection)?		TEM: 640-8
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will drive access be limited at any time?		TEM: 640-10
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will construction prohibit trucks from making turning movements at any time?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will portable concrete barrier wall obstruct stopping sight distance?		LDV1-201.2
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will additional signal heads be needed for drives and/or side roads?		TEM: 605-13

GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any issues regarding access to the work site?		TEM: 640-9
GYes G No	Are there any issues regarding construction		TEM: 606-3

G Possible G Not Applicable	timeframes (e.g., time of day, time limits)?		640-14
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is the opportunity for innovative contracting not possible <i>Specify</i> .		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there specific requirements for maintaining railroad traffic?		TEM: 606-19
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does it appear that the maintenance of traffic will require additional right of way?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any other maintenance of traffic issues? <i>Specify</i> .		

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	Comments	References*
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will there be any work beyond the existing right of way limits?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will major real estate relocation acquisition be involved?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will relocation of residences be involved?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will relocation of businesses be involved?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Does access control need to be revised?		
G Yes G No G Possible	Are there any obvious encroachments?	Basements of some buildings extend under the sidewalk in some locations	

G Not Applicable			
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will it be difficult or impossible to determine the number of involved property owners? If not how many are involved?	Unknown at this point in process	
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will temporary parcels be needed (e.g., for drive work)?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will right of way need to be acquired for an agency other than ODOT (e.g., county, city)? <i>Specify.</i>		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will additional right of way be needed for utility relocations?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will right of way need to be acquired for storm sewer outfalls?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do property owners need to be contacted for the locations of underground items such as leach fields, septic systems or field tiles that might be effected by the proposed take?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any mineral rights considerations?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any specific property owner concerns?	Access and site circulation, basements	
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will right of way acquisition from a railroad/railway be involved?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are work agreements prohibited for any reason?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are the centerline of right of Way and centerline of construction different?		

G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will right of way be acquired for wetland or stream mitigation?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any other right of way or survey issues? <i>Specify.</i>	None known at this time	

UTILITY ISSUES:

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

	Design Issue	Comments	References*
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Do existing utilities need to be relocated?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is it impossible to minimize utility conflicts? (e.g., by careful placement of storm sewer and underdrains)?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Would the project benefit from subsurface utility engineering (SUE)?	New signal pole foundations will have to be located. SUE may assist in this.	
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there existing utilities on an existing structure that need to be relocated?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any specific utility requirements or concerns? <i>Specify.</i>		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there facilities that require a large lead time to relocate?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Is additional right of way needed to accommodate utility relocations?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there water or sanitary lines that will be relocated as part of the ODOT contract?		
G Yes G No	Are there any other utility issues? <i>Specify.</i>	None known at this time	

G Possible			
G Not Applicable			

PERMIT ISSUES:

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

Potential Involvement	Design Issue	Comments
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Will an individual Corps of Engineers/Environmental Protection Agency 404/401 permit be required?	No watercourses or wetlands are within the study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does it appear that the project can be constructed under a nationwide 404/401 permit? If so, which permit and what specific requirements apply?	No watercourses or wetlands are within the study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Will a Coast Guard permit be required?	No watercourses or wetlands are within the study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Is review by a local public agency or project sponsor required?	The City of Springfield will be involved throughout the project.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Is Airway/Highway clearance analysis required?	
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Is Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) approval required?	There are no floodplains within the study area.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Is railroad/railway coordination required?	There are no railroad crossings within the study area.
Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Is State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) coordination for work involving historic bridges or historic properties required?	There are historic properties within the study area. Upon selection of an alternative, a determination of effect must be made.
Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Is coordination with ODNR for work involving State Scenic Rivers, State Wildlife Areas or State Recreational Areas required?	There are no State Scenic Rivers, Wildlife Areas or Recreational Areas in the study area.

Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Possible <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	Is coordination with any other agency required?	
---	---	--

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES:

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

	Design Issue	Comments	References*
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will a value engineering study be required due to project cost (total cost greater than \$20 million) or project complexity?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Will warranties be used?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there aesthetic concerns? <i>Specify.</i>	Streetscape will be part of the project	
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any concerns relating to noise walls?		
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there no areas available within the existing right of way for portable plans or waste and borrow sites?		
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there specific concerns related to pedestrian access?	Downtown businesses will need ped access maintained	LDV1: 306
G Yes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Any concerns related to landscaping?	Some will need to be removed/added	
GYes G No G Possible G Not Applicable	Are there any concerns related to existing or proposed lighting (e.g., light trespass, river navigation, airway clearance)?		
GYes G No	Are there any other concerns? <i>Specify</i>	None known at this time	

G Possible G Not Applicable			
--------------------------------	--	--	--

RED FLAG MAPPING:

Is a map showing locations of red flag areas attached? Yes No
(A map showing locations of red flag areas is mandatory for Major Projects.)

GEOTECHNICAL DELIVERABLES:

*Include copies of plan views, geologic cross-sections, existing boring logs, and soil and rock testing data. This information should be augmented with data from ODOT's archived files of previous projects in the area. Additional information on soil survey data, glacial deposits, bedrock topography, bedrock structure, and aquifer mapping, etc. should be compiled as a GIS workspace. Both digital ortho-quarter quadrangles and U.S.G.S. quadrangles should be available for base mapping. Copies of the reference maps and ArcView files should be provided. **(This information is mandatory for Major Projects)***

SCOPE, SCHEDULE AND BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS:

Based on the responses to the red flag questions, do any of the following need to be modified?

	Issue	Comments	References*
GYes <input type="checkbox"/> No G Possible G Not Applicable	Conceptual scope?		
GYes <input type="checkbox"/> No G Possible G Not Applicable	Work limits?		LDV3-1303.7
GYes <input type="checkbox"/> No G Possible G Not Applicable	Probable environmental document type?		
GYes <input type="checkbox"/> No G Possible G Not Applicable	Major/Minor/Minimal classification?	Should be a Minor project	
GYes <input type="checkbox"/> No G Possible G Not Applicable	Schedule?	Not established yet	
GYes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Budget?	Not established yet	

G Possible			
G Not Applicable			

*Abbreviations: AUM = Manual for Abandoned Underground Mine Inventory and Risk Assessment
 BDM = Bridge Design Manual
 LDV1 = Location and Design Manual, Volume 1
 LDV2 = Location and Design Manual, Volume 2
 LDV3 = Location and Design Manual, Volume 3
 SSI = Specifications for Subsurface Investigations
 TEM = Traffic Engineering Manual
 EPM = Environmental Process Manual