



# OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 04  
2088 SOUTH ARLINGTON RD. • AKRON, OH 44306 • 330-786-3100

## **Administrative Re-Evaluation** for **SUM SR 0008 01.75 PID 91710** Environmental Document Level: D3

**Approved: 11/14/2022**

**Prepared By: Matthew ODonnell**  
Gannett Fleming Engineers and Architects  
Phone: 614-794-9424  
E-mail: [modonnell@gfnet.com](mailto:modonnell@gfnet.com)

District Contact: Edward Deley  
Phone: 330-786-4930  
E-mail: [Edward.Deley@dot.ohio.gov](mailto:Edward.Deley@dot.ohio.gov)

*The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by ODOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 14, 2020, and executed by FHWA and ODOT.*

# Table of Contents

Re-evaluation Level.....	3
Project Type.....	4
General Project Information.....	5
Purpose & Need.....	12
Alternatives.....	14
Air.....	21
Noise.....	23
ESA.....	26
Cultural Resources.....	28
Ecological.....	30
Other Resources.....	31
Section 4(f).....	33
Section 6(f).....	35
Community Impacts.....	36
Underserved Populations.....	38
Public Involvement.....	40
Permits.....	41
Environmental Commitments.....	43
Preparers and Approvals.....	45
Appendix.....	49



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Re-evaluation Level

#### Explain why a re-evaluation is needed?

The environmental document (D3 CE) for this project, originally approved on August 31, 2016 and reevaluated on November 7, 2018, warrants reevaluation based on the passage of time and the need to review previous studies and coordination. The project scope has not changed.

All previous studies and coordination in each discipline were reviewed to determine if they needed to be reevaluated. No further studies or coordination were needed for the project.

The only discipline that required updated information was ecological resources due to multiple regulatory changes since 2018. The ecological resource regulatory changes pertained to changes in the definition of Waters of the United States, reviewing effect determinations for newly listed Federal and state threatened and endangered species and new records of these species. A discussion of the ecological resource regulatory changes and the proposed project can be found in the Project File/Ecological/Project Information subsection as Project Related OES Decision - Ecological.pdf.



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Project Type**

**Please check all of the following actions that apply (Must check at least one):**

(13) Actions described in 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28) that do not meet the constraints listed in 23 CFR 771.117(e).

(a) Project types that exceed thresholds in Appendix A

(b) Project types that exceed thresholds in Appendix B



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### General Project Information

#### Project, Cost Schedule and Work Limits

#### Project, Cost Schedule and Work Limits

Environmental Document Level:	D3
PID:	91710
Project Name:	SUM SR 0008 01.75
Project Sponsor:	DISTRICT 4-PLANNING
ODOT District:	4
Funding Source:	Federal
Private Funding:	No
Local Public Funding:	No
STIP Reference #:	2018stipID0137FDCO
The next phase of the proposed project is listed on the STIP	Yes
The current cost estimate is in line with existing federal procedures for Ohio STIP Amendments and Administration Modifications	Yes
Planning and Engineering:	\$9,550,054.86
Right of Way:	\$3,464,214.69
Construction:	\$154,624,350.00
Other:	\$0.00
An Interchange Modification/Justification/Operations Study (IMS/IJS/IOS) was completed	Yes
Date Completed:	08/24/2015

#### Project Description:

The proposed project involves the replacement of an existing 1,500'-long steel bridge (SUM-8-0199; Structure File Number 7700369) that carries State Route (SR) 8 over the Little Cuyahoga River Valley in the City of Akron, Summit County, Ohio. The high-level bridge was constructed in 1953 to provide a grade separation for the Akron Expressway (SR 8) as it crossed over the Little Cuyahoga River, five (5) railroad corridors, the Pennsylvania and Ohio Canal, and East North Street. Due to the height of the crossing and the span lengths required to clear the features below, the bridge was built as a large deck truss through the three (3) central spans, flanked by a three (3)-span continuous girder structure to the south and a two (2)-span continuous girder structure to the north.

The existing bridge is a vital component of the SR 8 corridor that serves as a main connection between Interstate Route (IR) 76 in downtown Akron, the Ohio Turnpike in Boston Heights, and the eastern Cleveland suburbs along IR 271. The



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

proposed project area is heavily traveled, carrying an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of 116,150 vehicles including 9,550 trucks, and is a critical link for commuters from the north to the governmental, medical, university, and commercial facilities in downtown Akron. The existing bridge has undergone numerous minor and major rehabilitations, and currently has a General Appraisal Inspection Rating of 6 (Fair).

The existing bridge will be replaced with parallel, six-span, steel I-girder bridges with composite concrete decks, supported on reinforced concrete abutments and geometrically aesthetic hammerhead piers. The proposed northbound bridge will be constructed along the existing alignment of SR 8 and have spans of 262', 300', 270', 280', 260', 196'. The proposed southbound bridge will be constructed along a parallel alignment, approximately 120' west of the northbound bridge, and have spans of 260', 333.5', 340', 240', 230', 196'. The proposed deck on each bridge will include four 12' traffic lanes with 14' shoulders on each side. Between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges, the SR-8 approach roadways will be upgraded by connecting the proposed, parallel roadways and auxiliary lanes into the existing freeway and interchange ramps.

Since approval of the D3-level document on August 31, 2016, project design has continued to progress with Stage 1 and right-of-way plans being completed and Stage 2 Design Plans currently being prepared. Investigations into potential bridge construction methods, including incremental bridge launching and conventional erections with cranes, showed that contractor access roads needed to be evaluated and then provided in the project plans for use by the contractor during construction. The environmental impacts of the proposed contractor access roads were assessed, which led to expansion of the original environmental study area. Additional environmental impacts are proposed within the expanded study area and within the original study area, therefore, updated studies, coordination, and public involvement have been completed. In summary, the proposed contractor access roads resulted in additional temporary and permanent right-of-way acquisition, including two residential relocations, additional stream and wetland impacts, a new temporary impact to Adams Park, increased permanent right-of-way needed from Lookout Park, and a more defined temporary impact to Freedom Trail.

Based on maintenance of traffic restrictions along SR 8 and temporary closures of the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchange ramps, East North Street, and Freedom Trail, short-term minor impacts to residents and community services are anticipated to occur during construction activities. Various public involvement activities have included this information in order to determine impacts and to obtain feedback from stakeholders, the public, and emergency and public services.

In regard to environmental impacts, the change in project scope will result in the disturbance of 330-linear feet of Class I streams, 0.55 acres of Category 1 wetlands, 0.69 acres of Category 2 or Modified Category 2 wetlands (for more details refer to Ecological Tab), and 0.20 acres of the Pennsylvania and Ohio Canal. In addition, a *de minimis* Section 4(f) impact of 0.23 acres will occur to Lookout Park, including temporary occupancy of 0.05 acres of Adams Park for construction access, and temporary closures of Freedom Trail for construction access (for more details, refer to Section 4(f) Tab).

Several utility relocations will be necessary, potentially including the partial relocation of First Energy Corporation's 138-kilovolt electric transmission line. Drainage improvements will include directing storm water into new storm sewers to reduce runoff from entering combined sewer systems. Noise barriers will be installed along SR-8 to mitigate impacts to Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs) in the southwest, southeast, northwest and northeast quadrants of the proposed project area.

Based on preliminary engineering, the proposed project will require 4.2 acres of permanent right-of-way (ROW) from 25 residential and business properties and one (1) church, and approximately eight (8) acres of temporary easements from nine (9) properties. Furthermore, the proposed project requires approximately 16.4 acres of permanent and temporary easements from the railroads and Freedom Trail, approximately 0.5 acres of permanent ROW from the City of Akron (including a strip take from Lookout Park), and approximately 1.7 acres of permanent and temporary ROW from the Akron Public Schools. These potential ROW takes would result in 5 residential owner relocations, seven tenant relocations, and 17 non-residential relocations (7 landlord parcels, 7 personal property moves, and 3 traditional non-residential relocations). The right-of-way and temporary easements required include the areas for the permanent construction of SR 8 and associated ramps, and the areas required for temporary construction access routes.



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

- Project location mapping and plans can be found in the Project File under *General/Project Information*

**Limits of Proposed Work:** SUM SR8 high level bridge over Cuyahoga River valley

**Start (SLM):** 1.75

**End (SLM):** 2.58

**Total Work Length (Miles):** 0.83

**Roadway Character**

**Route Number:** SR00059

**Functional Classification:**

**Current Average Daily Traffic:**

**Current Average Daily Traffic Year:**

**Design Year Average Daily Traffic:**

**Design Average Daily Traffic Year:**

**Daily Hourly Volume:**

**Truck %:**

**Setting:**

**Topography:**

	<b>Existing:</b>	<b>Proposed:</b>
Design Speed (MPH):		
Legal Speed (MPH):		
Number of Lanes:		
Type of Lanes:		
Pavement Width (ft):		
Shoulder Width (ft):		
Median Width (ft):		
Sidewalk Width (ft):		

**Route Number:** SR00008

**Functional Classification:**

Principal Arterial - Other  
Freeway/Expressway (Urban)



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

<b>Current Average Daily Traffic:</b>	121740
<b>Current Average Daily Traffic Year:</b>	2020
<b>Design Year Average Daily Traffic:</b>	132880
<b>Design Average Daily Traffic Year:</b>	2040
<b>Daily Hourly Volume:</b>	12240
<b>Truck %:</b>	9
<b>Setting:</b>	Urban
<b>Topography:</b>	Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	60	60
Legal Speed (MPH):	55	55
Number of Lanes:	6	8
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width (ft):	72.00	96.00
Shoulder Width (ft):	10.00	24.00
Median Width (ft):	20.00	20.00
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

<b>Sufficiency Rating:</b>	066.0
<b>General Rating:</b>	5
<b>Date Built:</b>	07/01/1953
<b>Bridge Location:</b>	0.47 MI N OF SR 18
<b>40. Bridge Type:</b>	309N

**Design Criteria For Bridges**  
**Design Criteria for Bridges**

SFN: 7700369

<b>Sufficiency Rating:</b>	066.0
<b>General Rating:</b>	5
<b>Date Built:</b>	07/01/1953
<b>Bridge Location:</b>	0.47 MI N OF SR 18

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	309N	322
Bridge Length (ft):	1583	1624



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

Number of Main Spans:	8	6
Max Span Length (ft):	360	340
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	N/A
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	80	152
Shoulder Width(ft):	1.75	14.00
Under Clearance (ft):	24.6	25.0

**Bridge Type Description:**

No changes to the project have occurred regarding the bridge type description since the D3 document was approved on 8/31/2016.

**Load Restrictions Description:**

No changes to the project have occurred regarding the load restrictions description since the D3 document was approved on 8/31/2016.

**Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?** Yes

**If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?** N/A

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project have occurred regarding the bridge structure type since the D3 document was approved on 8/31/2016.

**41. Bridge Length (ft):** 1583

**42. Number of Main Spans:** 8

**43. Max Span Length (ft):** 360

**44. Load Restrictions (TON):** 150

**45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):** 80

**Maintenance of Traffic During Construction**

**A roadway, bridge or ramp closure is required** Yes

**A temporary bridge or roadway is proposed** No

**A detour is required for the proposed project** Yes

**Access for local through traffic will be provided with appropriate signage** Yes

**Provisions for through-traffic dependent businesses will be incorporated into project design** Yes

**Provisions to accommodate any local special events or festivals will be incorporated into project design** No

**The proposed MOT substantially impacts sensitive environmental resources** No

**Substantial controversy is associated with the proposed MOT** No



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Coordination has been initiated and/or completed with local emergency services, schools, public institutions/facilities, etc.** Yes

**Remarks:**

No substantial changes to the project have occurred regarding maintenance of traffic since the D3 document was approved on 8/31/2016.

**Are there any Environmental Commitments?** No

**Right of Way and Utility Involvement**

**The project requires Permanent Right-of-Way** Yes

**The project requires Permanent Easement(s)** Yes

**The project requires Temporary Right-of-Way** Yes

**Right of Way and Utility Involvement**

**Number of parcels impacted by Permanent Right-of-Way:** 39

**Number of parcels impacted by Temporary Right-of-Way:** 21

**Approximate acreage of Permanent Right-of-Way needed:** 7.1

**Approximate acreage of Temporary Right-of-Way needed:** 21.9

**Electrical lines, gas lines, water lines, sewer lines, phone lines or other utilities exist in the project area** Yes

**Large scale transmission facilities are located within the project area** Yes

**Private utility easements are located within the project area** Yes

**The existing private utility easement will be impacted by the project** Yes

**Coordination with identified utilities has been initiated and/or completed** Yes

**Remarks:**



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

Based on preliminary engineering and Stage 1 plans, the proposed project is anticipated to acquire approximately 7.1 acres of permanent right-of-way (ROW) and approximately 21.9 acres of temporary ROW from a total of 60 residential, business, religious institution, educational institution, railroad and recreational parcels within the proposed project area.

The following is a list of known utilities within the proposed project area:

- AT&T
- AT&T Ohio
- CenturyLink/Involta
- City of Akron
- Dominion East Ohio Gas
- Level 3 Communications
- First Energy / Ohio Edison
- Sprint
- Time Warner Cable
- Verizon
- Windstream Business

An overhead 138-kilovolt (kV) electric transmission line, owned by FirstEnergy, runs parallel to the northern Akron Metro railroad track in a private easement. The line also passes beneath the first span of the existing bridge. Accommodations have been made in the plans to keep this utility in place during construction.

The City of Akron and ODOT tentatively have agreed to redirect a portion of the storm water that currently flows from the project area into combined sewers at each end of the project, into the drainage systems for SR-8. All runoff from the project area between Perkins Street and the new bridges is to be conveyed to the storm sewer trunk line running down the southern valley slope. A major portion of the runoff from the project area between Glenwood Avenue and the new bridges is to be conveyed to the trunk line which outlets to the natural drainage courses west of SR-8 flowing to the Little Cuyahoga River. This trunk line also will be designed to convey runoff within the existing SR-8 right-of-way that flows south from the high point near Tallmadge Avenue. Additionally, the runoff from a large area on the east side of SR-8, between Glenwood Avenue and the new bridges, currently flows into a combined sewer that crosses under SR-8 at a significant depth. A preliminary study was performed and it was determined that the combined sewer would be retained and a small area of runoff from SR-8 would outlet to the combined system.

To avoid conflicts with the substructures for the new bridges and because of the realignment of the entrance and exit ramps to Perkins Street, multiple water and sanitary sewer lines that are owned by the City of Akron will be relocated with the project.

The proposed bridge substructure locations have been established to avoid conflicts with the multiple fiber optic telecommunication lines that run parallel to the railroad tracks through the proposed project area.



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

## Purpose & Need

### Purpose & Need

#### Project History:

The original bridge was constructed in 1953 and has undergone numerous minor and major rehabilitations. In 1984 the bridge was given a General Appraisal Inspection Rating of 4 or "poor," which meant there were major deficiencies and it was in need of repair in order to continue functioning as designed. Subsequent rehabilitations have included deck replacement and overlays; parapet, railing and scupper repairs; joint replacement; substructure and bearing repairs; truss member strengthening; truss lateral bracing replacement; gusset plate strengthening; and stringer cover plate fatigue retrofits. These types of repairs are typical for truss bridges that were constructed in the 1950s, and they will continue to be required to maintain adequate bridge function. The bridge currently has a General Appraisal Inspection Rating of 6 or "fair".

An Existing and Future Conditions Report was completed in August 2012 that established a proposed project area and documented existing and future conditions. The proposed project area was defined as SR 8 between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges. This report assessed Infrastructure Planning, Community and Socio-Economic Conditions, Traffic Operations, Transportation Conditions, and Environmental Resources. The Existing and Future Conditions Report can be found in the Project File under Purpose and Need/Existing and Future Conditions.

A Planning Study completed in January 2013 provided recommendations for feasible alternatives to replace the existing bridge. The Planning Study can be found in the Project File under Purpose and Need/Project Information.

A Feasibility Study completed in May 2015 developed and assessed various feasible alternatives for replacing the existing bridge. The study included a recommendation for a preferred alternative of parallel replacement bridges and two preferred bridge types. The Feasibility Study can be found in the Project File under Alternatives/Reports.

An Interchange Operations Study (IOS) completed in August 2015 analyzed the benefits to future traffic flow and safety through the addition of an auxiliary lane in each direction of SR 8 between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges. The IOS can be found in the Project File under General/PDP.

An Alternatives Evaluation Report (AER) was completed in May 2016. As part of the AER, the preferred bridge alternatives and approach roadway improvements were analyzed to determine potential impacts to environmental resources, adjacent properties, and utilities. Previously established horizontal and vertical alignments, bridge span configurations, and proposed substructure locations were updated, and potential constructability and contractor access issues were evaluated. The AER also included life-cycle cost analyses for each bridge type, which compared the total present value of the estimated construction costs and long-term inspection and maintenance costs. The AER can be found in the Project File under Alternatives/Reports.

#### Purpose Statement:

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve a deficient structure, facility deficiencies and roadway geometrics to maintain connectivity along SR 8 between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges.

#### Need Element(s):



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### **Structure Deficiencies**

The existing deck truss is a non-redundant, fracture critical structure. Fracture critical refers to a structure whose configuration is such that a loss of one element - in this case one of the two, parallel trusses - would result in a collapse of the entire structure. The original bridge was constructed in 1953 and has undergone numerous minor and major rehabilitations. In 1984 the bridge was given a General Appraisal Inspection Rating of 4 or "poor," that is having major deficiencies and thus in need of repair in order to continue functioning as designed. Subsequent rehabilitations have included deck replacement and overlays; parapet, railing and scupper repairs; joint replacement; substructure and bearing repairs; truss member strengthening; truss lateral bracing replacement; gusset plate strengthening; and stringer cover plate fatigue retrofits. These types of repairs are typical for truss bridges that were constructed in the 1950s, and they will continue to be required to maintain adequate bridge function. The bridge currently has a General Appraisal Inspection Rating of 6 or "fair". Previous, recent inspections documented the following deficiencies in the bridge superstructure:

- Transverse cracking with efflorescence, spalling, and exposed reinforcing bars on the underside of the bridge deck
- Torn expansion joint material
- Minor section loss to beams and diaphragm at the hinge areas
- Section loss on floor beams
- Section loss on truss verticals
- Minor pitting and section loss of gusset plates
- Twisting of sway bracing with deformation at some connections
- Section loss at hanger supports

### **Roadway Geometrics**

The existing roadway within the proposed project area includes substandard acceleration and deceleration lane lengths between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges. The existing acceleration and deceleration lane lengths at the Perkins St and Glenwood Ave interchanges are shown in Table 1 below. Table 1 also shows the lengths needed to bring the ramps into compliance with current Location & Design (L&D) Manual standards.

	Perkins Street		Glenwood Avenue	
	Existing	L&D Criteria	Existing	L&D Criteria
Acceleration Length (Ft)	800	1,450 ±	800	1,450 ±
Deceleration Length (Ft)	420	800	550	800

### **Goals and Objectives:**

None

### **Summary Statement:**

The purpose of the proposed project is to improve a deficient structure, facility deficiencies, and roadway geometrics to maintain connectivity along SR 8 between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges. The needs are based on the existing critical condition of the bridge and substandard roadway geometrics.

### **Logical Termini and Independent Utility:**

The logical termini for the proposed project has been established as the Perkins Street interchange to the south (SLM 1.75) and the Glenwood Avenue interchange to the north (SLM 2.73). The logical termini was established based on the existing transportation problems, including close proximity of the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchange ramps, bridge replacement alternative alignments, and alternatives for maintaining traffic during construction. These termini limit the footprint of the project to the greatest extent possible while still allowing for the project to physically address the identified need elements.

No other improvements are necessary for this project to function, and therefore, independent utility is established for the proposed project.



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Alternatives

#### Alternatives

##### Discuss No Build Alternative:

The No-Build Alternative was eliminated from consideration in the alternatives analysis because it would not meet the Purpose and Need of this project to replace the deteriorating, fracture critical Bridge No. SUM-8-0199 to maintain a safe route of travel and to lengthen the substandard (per current ODOT design standards) acceleration and deceleration lane lengths between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges.

**Was a Feasibility Study completed?** Yes

**Date Feasibility Study was approved:** 07/10/2015

**Was an Alternative Evaluation Report (AER) completed?** Yes

**Date AER was approved:** 06/23/2016

#### Alternatives Considered

Name	Description	Reason Dismissed	Included in the AER	Preferred Alternative
------	-------------	------------------	---------------------	-----------------------



Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

Bridge Rehabilitation	Involves the rehabilitation, strengthening, and re-decking of the existing bridge, and widening the bridge to carry eight (8) traffic lanes with full shoulders.	Given its current condition and load capacity, rehabilitating, strengthening, and widening the existing bridge to carry 8 traffic lanes with full shoulders would be difficult, and would not be a prudent, cost-effective, long-term solution for improving a fracture-critical bridge that will carry over 130,000 vehicles per day in the design year of 2040. Neither would it meet the Purpose and Need of the project, which is to replace the existing Bridge No. SUM-8-0199 in order to maintain a safe route of travel on SR-8. Therefore, the Rehabilitation Alternative was eliminated from consideration in the alternatives analysis.	No	No
Roadway Alignment Alternative 1 - West Alignment	Because SR-8 is a major, urban expressway with a current ADT greater than 115,000, all 6 traffic lanes (3 NB and 3 SB) must be maintained during construction of the replacement bridge. However, since the current deck truss spans consist of 2 parallel truss lines, the existing structure is non-redundant and part-width	None	Yes	Yes



Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

<p>Roadway Alignment Alternative 1 - West Alignment</p>	<p>demolition is not possible. Therefore, separate replacement bridges will have to be built for each direction of travel, with one bridge located along the existing SR-8 alignment and the other on a parallel alignment that is offset to the east or west. Also, the parallel alignment will have to be offset a sufficient distance to allow for bridge widths that can carry 4 traffic lanes in each direction (3 through lanes and 1 auxiliary lane to connect the ramps between the Perkins Street and Glenwood Avenue interchanges). In the Feasibility Study, Roadway Alignment Alternative 1 comprised a West Alignment for SB SR-8 while NB SR-8 was maintained along the existing alignment.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
---	---	-------------	------------	------------



Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

<p>Roadway Alignment Alternative 2 - East Alignment</p>	<p>As part of the Feasibility Study, Roadway Alignment Alternative 2 was developed for comparison to Alignment Alternative 1. Alignment Alternative 2 comprised an East Alignment for northbound SR-8 while southbound SR-8 was maintained along the existing alignment. Roadway Alignment Alternative 2 complied with all design criteria and allowed the ramps to/from Perkins Street to meet all design standards, but resulted in more impacts to adjacent properties and environmental resources and also created a conflict between the northbound lanes and the eastern abutment of the Perkins Street overpass.</p>	<p>Roadway Alignment Alternative 2 - East Alignment resulted in more impacts to adjacent properties and environmental resources and also created a conflict between the northbound lanes and the eastern abutment of the Perkins Street overpass. To eliminate the conflict with the abutment, either the Perkins Street bridge would have to be replaced or a Design Exception obtained for a deficient horizontal alignment. Therefore, Roadway Alignment Alternative 2 was eliminated from further consideration in the Feasibility Study.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Bridge Replacement Alternative 1 - Steel I-Girder Bridge Type</p>	<p>In the Feasibility Study, a conceptual layout was developed for parallel, 6-span, steel I-girder bridges. Approximate substructure types and locations, foundation types, and structural element sizes were established. This bridge type was evaluated and recommended for</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>



Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

Bridge Replacement Alternative 1 - Steel I-Girder Bridge Type	further investigation in the AER based on its estimated construction and total life-cycle costs, aesthetics, capability for future widening, constructability and contractor access issues, and construction duration. In the AER, the bridge alignments, preliminary transverse sections and girder designs, preliminary substructure locations, and preliminary foundation types and dimensions were further refined. This enabled the approximate initial construction and total life-cycle costs, aesthetics, MOT constraints, overall impacts to adjacent properties, railroads, utilities, and environmental resources, constructability and contractor access issues, and construction duration to be determined to a greater level of detail.	None	Yes	Yes
---	---	------	-----	-----



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

<p>Bridge Replacement Alternative 2 - Prestressed Concrete I-Girder Bridge Type</p>	<p>As part of the Feasibility Study, a conceptual layout for Bridge Replacement Alternative 2 - Prestressed Concrete I-Girder Bridge was developed for comparison to Bridge Replacement Alternative 1. Approximate substructure types and locations, foundation types, and structural element sizes were established for parallel, 11-span, prestressed concrete I-girder bridges as part of the conceptual layout for this option.</p>	<p>Based on its estimated initial construction and total life-cycle costs, aesthetics (including the need for 10 piers), capability for future widening, overall impacts to adjacent properties, railroads, utilities, and environmental resources, numerous constructability and contractor access issues, and construction duration, Bridge Replacement Alternative 2 was eliminated from further consideration at the conclusion of the Feasibility Study.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Bridge Replacement Alternative 3 - Concrete Segmental Bridge Type</p>	<p>Parallel, five (5)-span, segmental, post-tensioned concrete structures. Approximate substructure types and locations, foundation types, and structural element sizes were established in the Feasibility Study. This bridge type was evaluated and recommended for further investigation in the AER based on its estimated construction and total life-cycle costs, aesthetics, capability for future widening, constructability and contractor</p>	<p>The AER concluded with a recommendation to eliminate Bridge Replacement Alternative 3 from further consideration, due to the longer duration and specialized construction methods and contractor capabilities required to build this bridge type, and because of the greater complexities involved with their future maintenance and inspection.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

<p>Bridge Replacement Alternative 3 - Concrete Segmental Bridge Type</p>	<p>access issues, and construction duration. In the AER, the bridge alignments, preliminary transverse sections and segmental box designs, substructure locations, and preliminary foundation types and dimensions were further refined. This enabled the approximate initial construction and total life-cycle costs, aesthetics, MOT constraints, overall impacts to adjacent properties, railroads, utilities, and environmental resources, constructability and contractor access issues, and construction duration to be determined to a greater level of detail.</p>	<p>The AER concluded with a recommendation to eliminate Bridge Replacement Alternative 3 from further consideration, due to the longer duration and specialized construction methods and contractor capabilities required to build this bridge type, and because of the greater complexities involved with their future maintenance and inspection.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>
--	--	---	------------	-----------

**Discuss Reasons Alternative Identified as Preferred was selected:**

Roadway Alignment Alternative 1 incorporates appropriate roadway and bridge design standards, results in fewer impacts to adjacent properties and environmental resources, and does not create a conflict between the northbound lanes and the eastern abutment of the Perkins Street overpass. Therefore, this alternative was recommended as the preferred in the Feasibility Study.

The AER concluded with a recommendation to advance Bridge Replacement Alternative 1 - Steel I-Girder Bridge as the preferred alternative for final design. Advantages of the Steel I-Girder Bridge include: 1) the number of qualified contractors that could bid on the project would be greater, resulting in a more competitive bid; 2) it has potential design details that could foster a value engineering assessment to possibly lower the construction cost; 3) it would have a shorter construction duration; and 4) it would allow for more traditional future maintenance and inspection methods. This alternative also will satisfy the Purpose and Need of the project through the construction of parallel replacement bridges that will maintain a safe route of travel on SR-8.

- The Existing and Future Conditions Report, the Feasibility Study and the AER can be found in the Project File under Alternatives/Reports



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Air

#### Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

<b>Sensitive Areas are located within approximately 500' of the proposed project area</b>	Yes
<b>The proposed project is listed as a C1 in ODOT's CE Guidance and/or falls under 40 CFR 93.126</b>	No
<b>The proposed project involves adding capacity, a new interchange, relocating thru lanes significantly closer to sensitive areas, or expanding an intermodal center</b>	No
<b>Design Year ADT is &lt;140,000</b>	Yes

#### Remarks:

In accordance with the *ODOT Technical Guidance for Analysis of Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT)*, the proposed project falls under the category of projects having low potential MSAT effects that are not expected to be associated with meaningful differences in emissions for project alternatives. Proposed widening associated with the project is an example of a "Minor Widening Project", that is defined as improving operation of a highway without adding substantial new capacity and for which the ultimate traffic level is predicted to be less than 140,000-150,000 ADT. The opening day (2020) ADT is 121,740 and the design year (2040) ADT is 132,880. The 2040 Build and No Build Alternatives are expected to have the same traffic volumes. For each alternative evaluated for the project, the amount of MSATs emitted would be proportional to the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. The VMT estimated for the Build Alternative is expected to be the same as the No Build Alternative.

Potential MSAT emissions increase would be offset somewhat by lower MSAT emission rates due to increased speeds as a result of capacity and operational improvements. According to USEPA's MOBILE6 emissions model, emissions of all of the priority MSATs, except for diesel particulate matter, decrease as speed increases. The extent to which these speed-related emissions decreases will offset VMT-related emissions increases cannot be reliably projected due to the inherent deficiencies of technical models. For each alternative in this CE, the amount of MSAT emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. For this project, projected VMT estimated for each of the Build Alternatives is the same as the No Build Alternative. This increase in VMT would lead to higher MSAT emissions for the preferred action alternative along the highway corridor, along with a corresponding decrease in MSAT emissions along the parallel routes.

The emissions increase is offset somewhat by lower MSAT emission rates due to increased speeds; according to EPA's MOVES2010b model, emissions of all of the priority MSAT decrease as speed increases. Because the estimated VMT under each of the Alternatives are the same, it is expected there would be no appreciable difference in overall MSAT emissions among the various alternatives. Regardless of the alternative chosen, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by over 80 percent between 2010 and 2050. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in nearly all cases.

The Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) reviewed the Qualitative MSAT Analysis Report prepared by Gannett Fleming, and provided approval on July 21, 2016.

- A copy of the report can be found in the Project File under *Air/Reports/Qualitative MSAT Analysis.pdf*
- A copy of the Ohio EPA approval can be found in the Project File under *Air/Coordination/OEPA Approval - Qualitative MSAT.pdf*



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5)

The proposed project is in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area	Yes
The proposed project falls under 40 CFR 93.126	No
Design Year ADT >125,000 and Design Year Diesel Truck Volume >10,000	Yes
Significant increase in diesel trucks between Design Year No Build and Design Year Build	No

#### Remarks:

Summit County is a designated nonattainment area for PM 2.5. Projects in nonattainment areas require coordination with the OEPA, USEPA, and FHWA to identify projects of air quality concern. On June 5, 2014, the OEPA provided concurrence that the proposed project is not a project of air quality concern and that a PM2.5 Hotspot Analysis is not required. The USEPA concurred on June 6, 2015. Approval from FHWA was received on February 18, 2016. No further coordination is required.

- PM2.5 Coordination and agency approval documentation can be found in the Project File under *Air/Coordination*

### Carbon (CO)

The State of Ohio is in attainment for CO at this time and no coordination or analysis is required

### Ozone

The proposed project is in an Ozone non-attainment or maintenance area	Yes
The proposed project is listed on the TIP	Yes

#### Remarks:

Summit County is in an Eight-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area that requires consideration of the regional effects on ozone from federally funded projects or projects of regional significance. As the proposed project is listed in the 2016-2019 STIP and the STIP project description matches the proposed activities, ozone is addressed for the proposed project.

### Environmental Commitments

Are there any environmental commitments? No



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Noise

#### Noise

Noise Sensitive Areas located within approximately 500' of the proposed project area	Yes
Noise Analysis conducted	Yes
ODOT Approval Date	03/28/2016
The proposed project is a Type I project	Yes
The proposed project constructs a roadway on new location	No
The proposed project significantly changes the existing roadway's horizontal or vertical alignment	No
The proposed project adds capacity (thru travel lanes)	No
The proposed project adds an auxiliary lane(s)	Yes
The proposed project negatively affects shielding of an existing roadway	No
The proposed project restripes existing pavement for an added thru lane or auxiliary lane	No
The proposed project adds or substantially alters an existing weigh station, rest stop, rideshare lot, or toll plaza	No
The proposed project causes a major change in vehicle mix	No
A design year noise impact was predicted	Yes
All noise attenuation measures were considered and are consistent with existing policy	Yes
Noise barriers proposed	Yes
The proposed project impacts identified NSAs	Yes

#### Impacted Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs)

NSA ID	Name	Address or Location	Qualify for barriers
NSA 1	NSA 1	Northwest Quadrant of Project Study Area	Yes
NSA 2	NSA 2	Northeast Quadrant of Project Study Area	Yes
NSA 3	NSA 3	Southwest Quadrant of Project Study Area	Yes
NSA 4	NSA 4	Southeast Quadrant of Project Study Area	Yes

Remarks:



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

A Noise Analysis prepared by Gannett Fleming was approved by the ODOT-OES Noise and Air Unit on March 28, 2016.

Noise abatement was evaluated for Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs) that meet ODOT and FHWA criteria for a Type I project. For analysis purposes, the proposed project area was divided into four NSAs. Noise measurements and concurrent traffic counts were conducted. Based on the evaluation of existing and future noise levels, noise impacts were determined to exist in NSAs 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Noise barriers were determined to be feasible and reasonable within NSAs 1, 2, 3 and 4. Various noise barrier options were considered and evaluated in terms of mitigation feature lengths, heights, costs and locations. This process resulted in the development of the following feasible and reasonable noise barriers along SR 8:

- NSA 1 Barrier - A 16.7 feet average height noise barrier along the west side of SR 8 southbound with a length of approximately 1,868 feet and an estimated cost of \$780,675
- NSA 2 Barrier - A 12.0 feet high noise barrier along the east side of SR 8 northbound with a length of approximately 1,170 feet and an estimated cost of \$351,125
- NSA 3 Barrier - A 9.9 feet average height noise barrier along the west side of SR 8 southbound with a length of 848 feet and an estimated cost of \$209,425
- NSA 4 Barrier - A 12.0 feet high noise barrier along the east side of SR 8 northbound with a length of approximately 950 feet and an estimated cost of \$284,625

Normal traffic growth results in changes to noise levels within the project area with predicted decreases in the design year when compared to existing noise levels in some locations and design year increases over existing noise levels in other locations. Such increases relate to perceptions of noise increase ranging from not discernable to barely discernable. The ODOT *Noise Abatement Criteria* (NAC) for specific land use activities requires mitigation efforts if the future noise level is predicted to exceed 66 dBA (A-weighted decibels) or if the project is predicted to cause a substantial increase (10 dBA) in the future compared to existing noise levels. With the implementation of the feasible and reasonable noise abatement measures identified in this report, the project-related noise levels are predicted to range from approximately 51 dBA to 62 dBA at analyzed sites within NSA 1, 47 dBA to 65 dBA at analyzed sites within NSA 2, 56 dBA to 65 dBA at analyzed sites within NSA 3 and 53 dBA to 65 dBA at analyzed sites within NSA 4.

ODOT is committed to construction of the feasible and reasonable noise abatement measures contingent upon the following conditions:

- Community input regarding desires and aesthetic considerations
- A noise reanalysis will need to be conducted if major design changes occur during the final design phase of the project

After approval of the Noise Analysis, Noise Public Involvement was initiated to determine whether property owners and residents of benefited properties within the NSAs desired noise wall barriers. In an effort to obtain feedback, letter surveys were distributed in March and June 2016, and in-person surveys were conducted in June 2016. Noise wall information was also presented at Public Meeting #2 on May 10, 2016 and comments were solicited from meeting attendees. The letters provided background information on the proposed project, an explanation for the survey, a schematic figure showing proposed wall locations for each NSA, and example figures will proposed wall textures and colors. Included with each letter and door-to-door handout was a postage-paid postcard with the following response options:

1. YES - A noise wall SHOULD be built
2. NO - A noise wall SHOULD NOT be built
3. NO OPINION
4. Texture preference (select ONE)
  - Concrete - Ashlar
  - Concrete - Dry Stack



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

- Concrete - Fieldstone

### 5. Color preference (select ONE)

- Tan
- Gray
- Taupe

The number of positive responses for noise wall barriers for NSA 1 and NSA 2 met or exceeded the 50 percent threshold required to support installation. Therefore, noise wall barriers for NSA 1 and NSA 2, in accordance with ODOT's Noise Policy are recommended for inclusion in the project plans. Due to the low number of survey replies received from property owners and tenants within NSA 3 and NSA 4, ODOT District 4 will continue efforts to obtain responses (via letter, email, phone call, or in-person visits) from at least 50 percent of those property owners and tenants. After this additional public involvement outreach is concluded, a final decision will be made for noise barriers for NSA 3 and NSA 4 into the project plan.

- The Noise Analysis Report can be found in the Project File under *Noise/Reports/Noise Analysis.pdf*
- Correspondence from the ODOT-OES Noise and Air Unit can be found in the Project File under *Noise/Coordination/OES Approval.pdf*
- The Noise Public Involvement Summary Report can be found in the Project File under *Noise/Reports/Noise Public Involvement Summary Report.pdf*

## Environmental Commitments

**Are there any environmental commitments? Yes**



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### ESA

#### ESA

Does the project require any Permanent ROW or Easement?: Yes

ESA Screening Report was completed by District Staff Yes

Date when It was completed 08/30/2013

Date of ESA Screening IOC from OES: 09/19/2013

Do any sites require a Phase 1 ESA, Phase 2 ESA, or plan note according to the IOC from OES? Yes

#### Sites that require Phase 1 ESA, Phase 2 ESA, or Plan Note

Site Name	Address	Phase 1 Required?	Phase 2 Required?	Plan Note Required?
Akron Public Schools Bus Facility	500 E. North Street	Yes	No	No
Ash Plumbing	451 E. North Street	Yes	No	No
G&K Trucking Company	415 E. North Street	Yes	No	No
Duane's Auto Body and Repair	475 E. North Street	Yes	No	No
PK Crushing	550 Dan Street	Yes	No	No
ABC Demolition/Harris Street Landfill	359 Harris Street	No	No	Yes

Date of Phase 1 ESA IOC from OES: 06/20/2016

#### Remarks:

Based on the addition of the proposed contractor access roads, the study area was expanded and additional impacts within the previous study area will occur. Although it was determined the previously completed ESA studies were still valid, the Regulated Materials Review (RMR) Form became necessary to investigate the properties not covered in the previous ESA reports, and confirm that no substantial changes had occurred on the properties covered in the previous ESA reports.

An RMR Form was prepared by Gannett Fleming in April 2018, which recommended a Phase I ESA for Site #3 - Triumph Towing (325 E. North Street) to delineate the location of a previously removed UST in relation to the proposed project right-of-way boundaries. In correspondence dated August 27, 2018, ODOT-OES determined a Phase I ESA was not necessary since new right-of-way was not being acquired from Site #3. However, if the project impact area should change and a right-of-way take from Site #3 becomes necessary, then a Phase I ESA would be required.

- The RMR Form can be found in the Project File under *ESA/Reports/Regulated Materials Review Form*
- The OES correspondence can be found in the Project File under *ESA/Coordination/OES Recommendations - RMR*



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

According to the IOC from OES does the project require any Environmental Commitments (plan notes and/or other coordination)?

Yes



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Cultural Resources

#### Cultural Properties Present

#### Please describe all of the efforts made to identify Historic Properties (including lit review, field investigation, etc.):

Previously, on December 7, 2015, ODOT-OES determined that the finding for the subject undertaking was "no historic properties affected." Subsequent to the December 7, 2015 Section 106 coordination for the subject undertaking, the project has changed in the following ways:

- Permanent right-of-way (R/W), 0.071 acres (approximately 3,000 square feet) in size, is needed from the Akron Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Center (SUM-3554- 13), which is located at 800 Dan Street (the parcel is approximately 3 acres in size). As stated above, the 2015 Section 106 coordination found this property to be eligible for the NRHP and established its historic boundary as its parcel. There will be no adverse effect on this property. In accordance with 23 CFR 774.17, ODOT Office of Environmental Services made a *de minimis* finding for Section 4(f) regarding the property at 800 Dan Street.
- Construction access roads and connection points have been added to the project footprint. New areas within the APE include both temporary and permanent R/W. None of the construction access roads are within the boundaries of a property or district listed on the NRHP.
- A paved trail connection between Freedom Trail and Perkins Street is proposed to provide a detour route for trail users during construction when Freedom Trail will be closed. Due to the trail detour route, the property at 110 N. Union Street, which was not evaluated in 2015, is now in the APE. Permanent R/W is being purchased from the property (110 N. Union Street) and deeded to Summit Metro Parks for a bike path (i.e. the detour). ODOT-OES finds that the property is not historically or architecturally significant and therefore is not eligible for the NRHP. No further investigations are warranted for this property.
- The house at 459 Blinn Street has been identified within the APE; the house is proposed to be acquired and demolished as part of the undertaking. ODOT-OES finds that the house is not historically or architecturally significant and therefore is not eligible for the NRHP. No further investigations are warranted for this property.
- Two (2) houses, which were found to not be eligible for the NRHP in the 2015 Report will need to be demolished as part of the subject undertaking. The addresses of these houses are 353 Harris Street and 369 Harris Street. ODOT-OES affirms that the 2015 determinations of eligibility for these houses are still valid.
- Three years have passed. Tables 2 and 3 in the June 2018 Section 106 Scoping Request Form indicate that no additional history/architecture properties in the APE, which were built 50 or more years ago, were not included in the 2015 Report (i.e. buildings built between 1965 and 1968).

#### Archaeology

Many of the newly identified access points will use existing streets alignments which will not involve any archaeological sites or require any additional archaeological investigations. An access road on new alignment just north of Bluff Street will cross an area previously disturbed by railway construction, an existing industrial driveway, and two industrial parking lots. Due to the disturbed nature of the corridor, no impacts to archaeological resources are expected and no further archaeological investigations are recommended. Another access road will be constructed on new alignment from Furnace Street eastward to the bridge construction site. This alignment will pass along a valley between two disturbed rail lines. Portions of this area have been disturbed by industrial development and a gravel access road. The proposed access road alignment also braids with the former alignment of the Pennsylvania and Ohio Canal. There is a low expectation that unrecorded archaeological sites will be impacted by the construction of the Furnace Street access road. Previous cultural resource coordination determined the P&O Canal in this area has lost integrity and it was previously determined the section of canal passing under SR-8 was not eligible for the NRHP. Based on the previous finding and the current physical condition of the area where the various access alignments will be constructed, it is unlikely that significant archaeological resources will be impacted. The project re-evaluation determined that no further archaeological investigations are needed with regards to the expanded APE for the SUM-8-1.75 Bridge Replacement Project.



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Is there an eligible or listed NRHP Historic Property in the Area of Potential Effects Pursuant to 36 CFR part 800?** Yes

**OES Approval/OSHPO Concurrence Date:** 10/01/2018

### Remarks:

In accordance with Stipulation V.(C)(3) of the *Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (Number 19319)* executed November 8, 2017, ODOT-OES has determined that the finding of "no adverse effect" applies to the proposed undertaking, based upon the following:

1. The minor amount of permanent right-of-way needed (0.071 acres) from the Akron Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Center (SUM-3554-13), located at 800 Dan Street, will not adversely affect the property, which has been determined eligible for the NRHP. No contributing features will be altered or diminished by the undertaking.
2. In accordance with 23 CFR 774.17, ODOT-OES made a *de minimis* finding for Section 4(f) regarding the property at 800 Dan Street.
3. No other NRHP-eligible or listed properties will be affected by this project.
4. Based on the previous finding and the current physical condition of the area where the various access road alignments will be constructed, it is unlikely that significant archaeological resources will be impacted. The project re-evaluation determined that no further archaeological investigations are needed with regards to the expanded APE for the subject undertaking.

On October 1, 2018, Ohio's State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred that the SUM-8-1.75 Bridge Replacement Project (PID: 91710) will not adversely affect the Akron Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center, 800 Dan Street, Akron (Ohio Historic Inventory #SUM-3554-13), which has been determined eligible for the NRHP. In accordance with 23 CFR 774, the undertaking will not alter the historic characteristics of the historic property. A copy of the correspondence documenting the concurrence by SHPO can be found here: [Project File/Cultural Resources/Coordination/SHPO Concurrence - Re-Evaluation.pdf](#)

This completes the Section 106 review and no further cultural resource investigations are required.

### Please check all NRHP Eligible and/or Listed resources:

Building

**What is the Section 106 effect determination in the OES Transmittal?** No Adverse Effect

**Archaeological Resource Adverse Effect**

**History/Architecture Adverse Effect**

**Tribal Consultation**

Since no Tribe was interested in this project based on their customized preferences, no further Tribal consultation was conducted

**Environmental Commitments**

**Are there any Environmental Commitments?** No



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Ecological**

Has an Approved and/or Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination been made by the USACE? Yes

Est. Total Size (Acres) of for Project: 1.48

Est. Total Impacted (Acres) of for Project: 1.24

Total Acres of Non-Isolated Wetlands impacted: 1.21

Total Acres of Isolated Wetlands impacted: 0.03

Est. Total Size (Acres) of for Project: 1.48

Est. Total Impacted (Acres) of for Project: 1.24

Total Acres of Non-Isolated Wetlands impacted: 1.21

Total Acres of Isolated Wetlands impacted: 0.03

Total Linear feet Impacted: 330

Total Linear feet Impacted: 330

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



### Other Resources

#### Farmlands

#### Farmlands

The proposed project is located within an Urbanized Area Yes

The proposed project is located in an area that is in or committed to urban development or water storage and is therefore not subject to the Farmland Policy Protection Act (FPPA) in accordance with 7 CFR 658. No further coordination is required.

FCIR Required Completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Form is required and coordination with USDA & NRCS is required.

#### Remarks:

Based upon review of appropriate mapping, the proposed project is located in an urbanized area. Furthermore, the proposed project is located in an area zoned for non-agricultural purposes and is not located in an agricultural district. Therefore, the proposed project meets the terms and conditions of the *Memorandum of Understanding between the Natural Resource Conservation Service and the Ohio Department of Transportation for Projects Involving Farmlands (Agreement No. 19552)*, executed on March 15, 2016. No further coordination is required for the proposed project.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

#### Drinking Water

The proposed project is wholly or partially located within the USEPA designated boundaries of a Sole Source Aquifer No

	Present:	Impacted:
The proposed project is wholly or partially located within the OEPA designated boundaries of a Source Water Protection Area	No	

Coordination with the Local Public Water Administrator is required No

	Present:	Impacted:
Residential Wells are present	No	

#### Remarks:



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

Review of mapping provided by the OEPA Division of Drinking and Ground Waters did not identify drinking water resources within or adjacent to the proposed project area. Based on OEPA mapping, drinking water source protection areas or public water system wells or intakes are not located partially or wholly within the proposed project area. In addition, the proposed project area is not within the boundaries of a federally-designated sole source aquifer. Based on ODNR mapping, residential water wells are not located within or adjacent to the proposed project area.

- Secondary source mapping can be found in the Project File under *Other Resources/Drinking Water*

**Are there any environmental commitments? No**



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Section 4(f)**

**Section 4(f) Determination**

Section 4(f) properties are within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area Yes

Concurrence received from the OWJ Yes

Were there multiple OWJs? Yes

Name	Date concurrence received
City of Akron (Lookout Park)	08/23/2018
City of Akron (Adams Park)	09/05/2018
Summit Metro Parks (Freedom Trail)	09/14/2018
State Historic Preservation Office (Akron Naval & Marine Corps Reserve Center; SUM-3554-13)	10/01/2018

	Present:	Impacted:
Publicly owned Park(s):	Yes	Yes
Publicly owned recreation facility(ies) and/or area(s):	Yes	Yes
Wildlife and Waterfowl refuge(s):	No	
Historic Site(s):	Yes	Yes

**Identified Section 4(f) Properties**

**Identified 4(f) Properties**

Property Name	Type	Permanent ROW/Easement Acres	Temporary ROW/Easement Acres	4(f) finding	Date
Lookout Park	Publicly owned Park	0.23	0.0	De Minimis	09/26/2018
Adams Park	Publicly owned Park	0.0	0.05	Temporary No Use Exception - 774.13(d)	09/26/2018
Freedom Trail	Publicly owned Recreational Facility and/or Area	0.0	2.3	Temporary No Use Exception - 774.13(d)	09/26/2018
Akron Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center (SUM-3554-13)	Historic Site	0.071	0.0	De Minimis	10/01/2018



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Remarks:

Due to advances in project design, a change in project scope has occurred to accommodate a proposed contractor access road for bridge construction and other design details. The change in scope resulted in additional impacts to Section 4(f) properties within the original study area.

#### **Lookout Park**

Grading of SR 8 and the installation of a noise wall will require the additional acquisition of approximately 0.07 acre from the east boundary of Lookout Park along SR 8. The amount of land within Lookout Park proposed to be acquired has increased from 0.16 acre to 0.23 acre from the previous *de minimis* determination. Based on information provided in the 2018 *Section 4(f)/6(f) Determination Request Form for Recreational Properties*, the ODOT-OES Policy Section determined the original *de minimis* impact is still valid in accordance with 23 CFR 774. The determination was made based on the proposed scope of work and concurrence received from the Official with Jurisdiction (OWJ) in regard to the assessment of impacts that are included in the Determination Request Form (DRF).

#### **Adams Park**

The small neighborhood park is maintained by the City of Akron and is located within a residential neighborhood at 293 N Adams Street. Amenities include an asphalt basketball court (half court), playground equipment, bike rack, picnic table, bench and mown open grassy areas. No impact to Adams Park was previously proposed, therefore no coordination was conducted. Based on the change in scope, approximately 0.05 acres of land from the park will be temporarily occupied to construct the contractor access road. The area to be impacted includes the paved connector path between Adams Park and Freedom Trail. Trail access will be maintained by temporarily relocating the paved connector path to the east of the temporary contractor access route and separating the two with a barrier. The temporary contractor access road will be required for two separate periods during the anticipated four-year construction schedule. Based on information provided in the DRF, the ODOT-OES Policy Section determined the temporary occupancy of land will not constitute a "use" in accordance with 23 CFR 774.13(d). The determination was made based on the proposed scope of work and concurrence received from the OWJ in regard to the assessment of impacts that are included in the DRF.

#### **Freedom Trail**

Previous coordination involved a temporary closure and detour of Freedom Trail and an exception to the requirement for Section 4(f) approval in accordance with 23 CFR 774.13(d). Based on the change in scope, construction of the contractor access road to build the new bridges and remove the existing bridge will result in two separate six-month closures of the trail and other short-term (up to 30 day) closures or restrictions, as needed. Based on information provided in the DRF, the ODOT-OES Policy Section determined the original temporary occupancy determination is still valid in accordance with 23 CFR 774.13(d). Furthermore, the proposed project will not permanently interfere with or adversely impact protected recreational activities, features, or attributes.

#### **Akron Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center**

Further plan development indicated that 0.071 acre of permanent right-of-way was needed from this site for drainage purposes. In email correspondence dated October 1, 2018, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred that the proposed project will not adversely affect the Akron Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center (Ohio Historic Inventory #SUM-3554-13), which has been determined eligible for the NRHP. In accordance with 23 CFR 774, the undertaking will not alter the historic characteristics of the historic property.

- **Correspondence from ODOT-OES Policy can be found in the Project File under Section 4(f)/Coordination**
- **The DRF can be found in the Project File under Section 4(f)/Reports**
- **Correspondence from the ODOT-OES Cultural Resources Section can be found in the Project File under Section 4(f)/Coordination**

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Section 6(f)**

**Section 6(f) Determination**

**Section 6(f) Determination**

	<b>Present:</b>	<b>Impacted:</b>
6(f) Properties:	No	

**Remarks:**

Based on a review of Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grant listings by ODOT District 4 environmental staff, there are no Section 6(f) properties were identified within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area. No further coordination is required.

- The LWCF grant listings for Summit County can be found in the Project File under *Section 6(f)/Project Information/LWCF Grant Listing.pdf*

**Are there any environmental commitments? No**



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Community Impacts

#### Community Impacts

**Will the proposed action comply with the local/regional development patterns for the area?** Yes

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project scope that would impact local/regional development patterns have occurred since the D3 environmental document was originally approved on 8/31/2016.

**Will the proposed action result in substantial negative impacts to community cohesion?** No

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project scope that would result in substantial negative impacts to community cohesion have occurred since the D3 environmental document was originally approved on 8/31/2016.

**Will the proposed action result in indirect or cumulative impacts?** No

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project scope that would result in indirect or cumulative impacts have occurred since the D3 environmental document was originally approved on 8/31/2016.

**Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts on health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle facilities?** No

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project scope that would result in substantial impacts on health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, have occurred since the D3 environmental document was originally approved on 8/31/2016.

**Will the proposed action displace residents, businesses, institutions or farms?** Yes

Number of Displacements

**Residences:** 12



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

<b>Businesses:</b>	17
<b>Institutions:</b>	0
<b>Farms:</b>	0
<b>Remarks:</b>	

Due to advances in project design, a change in project scope has occurred to accommodate proposed contractor access roads for bridge construction and other design details. This change in scope led to expansion of and additional impacts within the original study area. Two additional residential relocations are needed for a construction of a contractor access road.

An updated Relocation Assistance Program (RAP) Conceptual Study was completed for the project in May 2018. The conceptual study concluded there is an adequate supply of commercial and residential sites available for the properties being displaced by the project. It is not anticipated that any of these relocations will be complex, considering the nature of their personal property and availability of suitable replacement sites in the area.

Based on the Stage 1 preliminary engineering and plans, there will be a total of five (5) residential owner-occupied relocations, seven (7) residential tenant relocations, and seventeen (17) non-residential relocations (seven (7) landlord parcels, seven (7) personal property moves and three (3) traditional non-residential relocations). There will be a total of seventeen (17) structure takes.

- **The RAP Conceptual Study can be found in the Project File under *General/Right-of-Way and Utility Involvement/Relocation Conceptual Study***

**Are there any Environmental Commitments? No**



### Underserved Populations

#### Underserved Populations

#### Identified Underserved Populations

Census Block Group #	% Minority	% Low Income	% Older Adults	% Limited English Proficiency (LEP)
391535022004	38	58		
391535011001	68	67		
391535089004	72	83		

- Are Underserved Populations located within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area? Yes
- Are there any relocations? Yes
- Are there residential relocation(s)? Yes
- Is Housing of Last Resort anticipated? No
- Are there business relocations? Yes
- Will any businesses primarily serving an Underserved Population be relocated as part of the proposed project? No
- Will there be any job loss for an Underserved Population as a result of the business relocation? No
- Will there be changes to access? Yes
- Will access to shopping, bus stops, schools, jobs, recreational resources, community centers, etc. be diminished or completely restricted on a permanent basis for an Underserved Population? No
- Will man-made dividers such as an overpass, bridge, 4-lane or greater roadway or railroad negatively impact the extent to which a community feels connected or cohesive for an Underserved Population? No
- Will access to or use of the transportation improvement be denied to any Underserved Populations (for reasons such as cost to use, ability to access, etc.)? No
- Will the proposed project result in unanticipated additional impacts to any Underserved Populations? No
- Were any concerns related to impacts on Environmental Justice Populations or any other unique factors that could result in a disproportionately high and adverse effect raised during public involvement? No
- Were any concerns related to impacts on Title VI Populations or any other unique factors that could result in a disparate impact raised during Public Involvement? No



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Were any concerns or any other unique factors that could result in an impact to any of the other Underserved Populations (Limited English Proficiency, Older Adults, or Individuals with Disabilities) raised during Public Involvement?**

No

### Remarks:

Due to advances in project design, a change in project scope has occurred to accommodate a proposed contractor access road for bridge construction and other design details. As a result, two additional residential relocations will occur due to construction of the contractor access road.

The proposed project area includes portions of three census block groups that contain minority, low-income, and limited English proficiency populations, and Older Adults. In accordance with ODOT's Underserved Populations Guidance (revised January 2018), an Underserved Populations Impact Analysis Report (UPIAR) was prepared by EMH&T, Inc. in June 2018 to determine whether or not disproportionately high and adverse effects would occur to Environmental Justice Populations and disparate impacts to Title VI Populations. The June 2018 UPIAR was prepared as a supplement to the July 2016 Environmental Justice Analysis Report (EJAR) prepared by Gannett Fleming.

Based on the results of the analysis and review of the UPIAR by the ODOT-OES Policy Staff, the proposed project will not result in disproportionately high and adverse effects upon Environmental Justice Populations and no disparate impacts to Title VI Populations that are severe or greater in magnitude, due to the following reasons:

1. Limited overall impact of the proposed project.
2. The Relocation Assistance Program (RAP) Conceptual Study, prepared by O.R. Colan Associates in May 2018, indicated sufficient replacement housing is available within and adjacent to the proposed project area.
3. The May 2018 RAP Conceptual Study also indicated sufficient options are available for relocating the affected businesses to properties within or directly adjacent to the project area.
4. The project will have little to no impact on the community as no community centers, churches, schools, hospitals, or other non-profit organizations will be permanently impacted.
5. No permanent change in access to SR-8 or the local roadway network.
6. No permanent change in pedestrian access to known recreational facilities or business and commercial establishments.
7. No permanent change in access to public transportation.
8. Reasonable vehicle and pedestrian detours will be provided during temporary closures of East North Street and the Freedom Trail.
9. No anticipated air quality impacts.
10. Noise impacts will be mitigated by construction of noise barrier walls.
11. No Underserved Populations issues were raised as part of the public involvement process.

**Are there any Environmental Commitments? No**



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Public Involvement

#### Public Involvement

**Please provide a summary of the Public Involvement activities that have been conducted for this project. (For example press releases, letters to affected property owners and residents, meetings, special purpose meetings, newspaper articles, etc)**

Project funding was obtained for detailed design, which resulted in media interest from two publications: Cleveland.com (10/31/16) and Akron Beacon Journal (11/01/16).

Since previous public involvement efforts in 2015-2016, the public were provided a project update and an opportunity to comment in Summer 2018. All of these efforts included a project update and summary of what has changed since the previous public involvement efforts in 2015-2016. They also included specific updates focused on project design, impact of construction access roads, project effects on Lookout Park, Adams Park and Freedom Trail, noise walls, maintenance of traffic, and aesthetics. The 2018 public involvement activities involved the four primary items described below.

A news release was issued and posted to the ODOT District 4 web page on July 30, 2018. News articles based on the news release were published in the following media outlets: Akron Beacon Journal (07/30/18), Cleveland.com (07/30/18), Akron Community Blog and Falls News Press/MyTown NFO (08/02/18).

Letters to property owners/residents affected by new right of way acquisition from access roads. One set of letters, dated July 27, 2018, were sent to property owners and residents affected by temporary or permanent right-of-way acquisition from access roads. Another set of letters, dated August 2, 2018, were sent to property owners and residents on Harris Street whose property will be acquired in its entirety as part of the project for construction of an access road.

Two stakeholder meetings occurred on January 17, 2018 and August 7, 2018 to discuss the project overall and specific aesthetic items, including the scenic overlook under the bridges behind Freedom Trail.

Letters to residents near Lookout Park, dated July 27, 2018. The letter was an updated version of a April 2016 letter sent to the same residents concerning Section 4(f) and describing impacts to Lookout Park.

See *Project File/Public Involvement* for these items.

**Was Public Involvement conducted in compliance with Title VI requirements?**

Yes

**Is there any substantial environmental controversy on environmental grounds?**

No

**Please summarize the Public Involvement responses received.**

Seven public comments were received by email from the 2018 public outreach efforts. Comments focused on these primary topics: use of suicide-deterrent fencing on proposed bridges and suicides from the existing bridge, fencing materials and potential rusting and maintaining traffic with multiple projects in the area. A response to each public comment was sent by email. See *Project File/Public Involvement* for comments received and responses to comments.

**Are there any Environmental Commitments? Yes**



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Permits

#### Waterway Permits

<b>Are Waterway Permits required?</b>	Yes
<b>Is the Waterway Permits Determination Complete?</b>	No
Army Corps of Engineers	
<b>Regional General Permit (RGP):</b>	No
<b>Nationwide Permit (NWP):</b>	No
<b>Section 404 Individual Permit:</b>	No
<b>Section 10 Permit:</b>	No
Ohio EPA	
<b>Section 401 Water Quality Certification:</b>	No
<b>Level 1 General Isolated Wetland Permit:</b>	No
<b>Level 2 Individual Isolated Wetland Permit:</b>	No
<b>Level 3 individual Isolated Wetland Permit:</b>	No
US Coast Guard	
<b>Section 9 Coordination:</b>	No
<b>Section 9 Bridge Permit:</b>	No
ODNR	
<b>Shore Structure Permit :</b>	No

#### Remarks:

In correspondence dated June 21, 2016, the ODOT-OES Waterway Permit Unit (WPU) provided a preliminary determination that a Regional General Permit (RGP) B will likely be required for the proposed project, based on temporary impacts (50 linear feet) to Stream 2. Based on the change in scope, additional stream and wetland impacts are now anticipated due to construction of the contractor access roads, therefore, an updated Permit Determination Request will be submitted to the ODOT-OES WPU Staff during detailed design.

**Are there any environmental commitments? Yes**

#### Storm Water Permits

<b>NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI):</b>	Yes
--	-----



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Watershed Specific NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI):**

No

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project scope that would impact Storm Water and any associated permits have occurred since the D3 environmental document was originally approved on 8/31/2016.

**Are there any environmental commitments? No**

**Floodplains**

**The proposed project involves encroachment within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA)**

Yes

**EO 11988/NFIP Coordination and Documentation Completed**

Yes

**NFIP Local Floodplain Coordinator Notification Date**

07/08/2016

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project scope that would impact existing floodplains have occurred since the D3 environmental document was originally approved on 8/31/2016.

**Are there any environmental commitments? No**

**Landfills**

**Is a 2713 Permit required?**

Yes

**Remarks:**

No changes to the project scope that would impact existing or known landfills have occurred since the D3 environmental document was originally approved on 8/31/2016.

**Are there any environmental commitments? No**



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

### Environmental Commitments

#### Noise

- 1) Due to the low number of survey replies received from property owners and tenants within NSA 3 and NSA 4, ODOT District 4 will continue efforts to obtain responses (via letter, email, phone call, or in-person visits) from at least 50 percent of those property owners and tenants. After this additional public involvement outreach is concluded, a final decision will be made for noise barriers for NSA 3 and NSA 4 based upon public response.
- 2) ODOT is committed to construction of the feasible and reasonable noise abatement measures contingent upon the following conditions: (1) Community input regarding desires and aesthetic considerations; and (2) A noise reanalysis will need to be conducted if major design changes occur during the final design phase of the project.

#### ESA

- 1) ABC Demolition/Harris Street Landfill (359 Harris Street) - A plan note shall be added that describes the location of the former ABC Demolition/Harris Street Landfill (359 Harris Street) property and will specify that all reasonable and feasible options are to be employed to minimize impact (grading, excavation, etc.) to this property.
- 2) A plan note will be required for the contractor to properly manage hazardous waste materials containing lead at the former ABC Demolition/Harris Street Landfill (359 Harris Street).

#### Ecological

- 1) A plan note will be developed to restrict in-water work in the Little Cuyahoga River from April 15 to June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat.

#### Section 4(f)

- 1) The Project Designer shall incorporate the known boundaries Lookout Park, the Freedom Trail, and Adams Park within the project area in the plans and label them accordingly.
- 2) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall coordinate the construction schedule with ODOT (ODOT Project Engineer), the City of Akron (Director of Public Service), and Summit Metro Parks (Chief of Planning and Development) 30 days prior to the start of construction activities.
- 3) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall install temporary construction fencing along the known boundaries of Lookout Park, Freedom Trail, and Adams Park, within the project construction limits prior to the start of construction activities to protect the public and to minimize impacts to the properties.
- 4) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall maintain access to Lookout Park and Adams Park at all times during construction activities, except for the time needed to complete certain construction activities that would compromise safety of the users of Lookout Park.
- 5) The Project Designer shall incorporate the boundary of the temporary paved connector path between Adams Park and Freedom Trail into the plans and label accordingly.



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

- 6) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: Following the end of the first and second closure periods, the Contractor shall remove the temporary paved connector path (haul road), restore the original paved connector path between Adams Park and Freedom Trail, and restore the surrounding area to a condition that matches existing.
- 7) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall limit the temporary occupancy of Adams Park and Freedom Trail to two (2) non-consecutive six (6) month periods. A temporary paved connector path to be used as a haul road for construction purposes will be built within Adams Park, including a temporary path to the east of the Haul Road that will connect to Freedom Trail.
- 8) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: Prior to the start of construction activities, the Contractor shall install appropriate signage to alert users of Lookout Park, Freedom Trail, and Adams Park, of construction activities, any access restriction or closures, and to direct users to secondary access points.
- 9) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall not store or stage construction equipment or materials within the known boundaries of Lookout Park, Freedom Trail, and Adams Park, outside of the proposed construction limits, with the exception of area(s) identified by the Official with Jurisdiction to facilitate the storage and staging of equipment.
- 10) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall maintain public access to Freedom Trail from Adams Park via the temporary path located to the east of the haul road and install a barrier to separate the two paths.

### Public Involvement

- 1) As the project advances through detailed design and during construction activities, ODOT will provide project status updates, design changes, etc., as appropriate, to identified stakeholders and the public.
- 2) Additional public involvement activities will be conducted during the final design phase to present the proposed aesthetic design treatments for respective bridge elements.
- 3) The project designer and ODOT will work with the Summit County MetroParks as project design progresses to incorporate aesthetics and meet their specifications to the size of the overlook area.

### Permits - Waterway Permits

- 1) ODOT will obtain and adhere to all appropriate waterway permits prior to any work below the ordinary high water mark of any waterway [and all Special Provisions for waterway permits] will be included in the project plans.
- 2) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor is not authorized to place any fill or work within any waterway below the ordinary high water mark or within wetland boundaries until the permit(s) are obtained.

### Permits - Storm Water Permits

- 1) A CO-PERMITTEE NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI) WILL BE PREPARED AND PROVIDED TO THE CONTRACTOR BY ODOT PERSONNEL AT THE PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPLETING THE CO-PERMITTEE NOI FOR COVERAGE UNDER OHIO EPA STORMWATER CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PERMIT AND SUBMITTING TO OHIO EPA FOR APPROVAL, ALONG WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN (SWPPP), BEFORE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY CAN TAKE PLACE. SPECIFICATIONS SET FORTH IN THE MOST CURRENT VERSION OF ODOT'S "CONSTRUCTION AND MATERIAL SPECIFICATIONS, LOCATION AND DESIGN MANUAL AND STANDARD DRAWINGS" SHALL BE USED TO ENSURE ADEQUATE EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL, ALONG WITH ADDITIONAL PROTECTIVE MEASURES TO AVOID IMPACTS TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES, STREAMS AND WETLANDS FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES.



**Administrative Re-evaluation**

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

**Preparers and Approvals**

**Form Preparer:**

Matthew ODonnell  
Gannett Fleming Engineers and Architects  
2500 Corporate Exchange Drive, Suite 230, Columbus OH 43231  
614-794-9424  
modonnell@gfnet.com

**Supporting Form Preparer(s):**

Laura Beese  
Robert Lang

**Approvals & Electronic Signatures**

<b>Approved &amp; Electronically Signed By:</b>	<b>Approval Date:</b>
Edward Deley (PROGRAM ADMIN 3)	11/14/2022



## **Appendix**

### **General**

Basic Location Map 2.pdf

Basic Location Map.pdf

Construction Phases Drawing.pdf

Final Right of Way Plans.pdf

Office of Roadway Engineering Approval - IOS.pdf

Project Study Area Map.pdf

USGS Quadrangle Topographical Map.pdf

### **Alternatives**

District Approval - Alternatives Evaluation Report.pdf

District Approval - Feasibility Study.pdf

### **Air**

Coordination with OEPA USEPA FHWA-PM2.5.pdf

FHWA Approval - PM2.5.pdf

OEPA Approval - Qualitative MSAT.pdf

OEPA Concurrence - PM2.5.pdf

USEPA Approval - PM2.5.pdf

### **Noise**

OES Approval - Noise Analysis.pdf

### **ESA**

OES Recommendations - Phase I.pdf

OES Recommendations - RMR.pdf

OES Recommendations - Screening Addendum.pdf

OES Recommendations - Screening.pdf

### **Cultural Resources**

OES Determination of Effect.pdf

OES Section 106 Effect Determination - Attachments.pdf

OES Section 106 Effect Determination - Re-Evaluation.pdf

Project Related OES Decision - Cultural Resources.pdf



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

SHPO Concurrence - Re-Evaluation.pdf

### **Ecological**

Coordination with ODNR and USFWS.pdf

Coordination with ODNR-OEPA-USFWS-USACE.pdf

ODNR Comments - August 2018.pdf

ODNR Comments.pdf

ODOT Disposition of Agency Comments.pdf

OEPA Comments.pdf

USFWS Comments - August 2018.pdf

USFWS Comments.pdf

Wetland Finding.pdf

### **Other Resources**

Water Source Protection Area Map.pdf

Well Water Location Mapping.pdf

### **Section 4(f)**

OES Cultural Resources 4(f) Determination - Re-Evaluation.pdf

OES Cultural Resources 4(f) Determination.pdf

OES Recreational 4(f) Determination - Re-Evaluation 2.pdf

OES Recreational 4(f) Determination - Re-Evaluation.pdf

OES Recreational 4(f) Determination.pdf

OES Recreational Determination - Exception.pdf

OES Recreational Determination - de minimis.pdf

Property Owner Notification - Lookout Park de minimis.pdf

Property Owner Notification Mailing List - Lookout Park.pdf

### **Environmental Justice**

OES Approval - EJ Analysis Report.pdf

### **Underserved Populations**

OES Approval - Underserved Populations Impact Analysis.pdf

### **Public Involvement**

News Article - 07-30-18 - Akron Beacon.pdf

News Article - 07-30-18 - Cleveland.pdf

News Article - 08-02-18 - Falls News Press.pdf



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

News Article - June 2015 (Cleveland.com).pdf  
News Article - Project Funding.pdf  
News Article - Project Funding\_2.pdf  
News Article Cleveland.com 2022.pdf  
News Article.pdf  
Press Release - July 2018.pdf  
Press Release - June 2015.pdf  
Press Release - October 2022.pdf  
Press Release Email July 2018.pdf  
Property Owner Notification Letter - Lookout Park Area.pdf  
Property Owner Notification Letter - New ROW Partial Take.pdf  
Property Owner Notification Letter - New ROW Total Take.pdf  
Public Comment Response for Alternatives.pdf  
Public Comments Received - July 2015.pdf  
Public Comments Received and Responses to Comments 2018.pdf  
Public Comments Received.pdf  
Public Involvement Plan.pdf  
Public Meeting Exhibits - July 2015.pdf  
Public Meeting Exhibits.pdf  
Public Meeting Flyer.pdf  
Public Meeting Handouts - July 2015.pdf  
Public Meeting Handouts.pdf  
Public Meeting Notification - Email.pdf  
Public Meeting Notification - June 2015.pdf  
Public Meeting Notification - May 2016 (Social Media).pdf  
Public Meeting Notification - Property Owners.pdf  
Public Meeting Notification.pdf  
Public Meeting Sign In Sheet - July 2015.pdf  
Public Meeting Sign In Sheet - Open Mic.pdf  
Public Meeting Sign In Sheet.pdf  
Public Notification Mailing List - 2018 Outreach.pdf  
Response to Public Comments - Summary.pdf



## Administrative Re-evaluation

PID 91710 SUM SR 0008 01.75

Approved: 11/14/2022

Response to Public Comments email.pdf

Responses to Public Comments letter.pdf

SR 8 Bridge Replacement Project Renderings 2022.pdf

Stakeholder Comments - Aesthetics Surveys August 2018.pdf

Stakeholder Comments - Aesthetics Surveys January 2018.pdf

Stakeholder Contact List.pdf

Stakeholder Meeting - Handout.pdf

Stakeholder Meeting Minutes or Notes - January 2018.pdf

Stakeholder Meeting Minutes or Notes.pdf

Stakeholder Meeting Presentation August 2018.pdf

Stakeholder Meeting Presentation January 2018.pdf

Stakeholder Notification Email-Aesthetics Survey and Handout.pdf

### **Permits**

Correspondence with Local Floodplain Administrator.pdf

FEMA FIRM.pdf

Floodplain Impacts.pdf

OEPA Director's Authorization Approval Letter.pdf