OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

Environmental Document

for

MAH IR 0680 00.00 PID 113321

Environmental Document Level: D1

Approved: 2/28/2025

Prepared By: Rachel Pohnan

ms consultants

Phone: 330-258-9920

E-mail: rpohnan@msconsultants.com

District Contact: Edward Deley

Phone: 330-786-4930

E-mail: 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

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

General Project Information

Project, Cost Schedule and Work Limits

Environmental Document Levels:	D1
PIDs:	121474, 113321
Project Name:	MAH IR 0680 00.00
Project Sponsor:	DISTRICT 4-PLANNING
ODOT District:	4
Funding Source:	Federal
The next phase of the proposed project is listed on the STIP	Yes

Ellis STIP Details

Phase	Current STIP Reference
ENV	On Previous STIP
RW	
CO	113321: 24-27 STIP
DD	113321: 24-27 STIP

An Interchange Modification/Justification/Operations Study (IMS/IJS/IOS) was completed	Yes
Date Completed:	12/26/2023

Project Description:

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) proposes to rehabilitate two sections (Phase I: PID 121474/Phase 2: PID 113321) of Interstate Route (IR) 680 from the IR 80/IR 680/State Route (SR) 11 interchange to just past the South Avenue interchange. Project length is approximately 7.3 miles through Austintown Township and the city of Youngstown. No additional travel lanes or new entrance ramps or exit ramps are proposed to be constructed. The project proposes to replace the full-depth asphalt pavement along the IR 680 mainline in both directions and on multiple entrance ramps and exit ramps. The project also proposes to replace the decks on the IR 680 bridges over Mill Creek/Mill Creek Park, repair the bridge decks and railings on the bridges over Meridian Road, and make minor repairs to several other bridges in project area. The project will also replace concrete barriers, guardrails, signs, pavement markings, lighting and right-of-way line fences throughout the project area. The project will make storm water drainage improvements and construct a new paved median turnaround east of the IR 80/IR 680/SR 11 interchange for maintenance/emergency vehicles. The project also proposes the permanent closure of the entrance ramp from Mahoning Avenue eastbound to IR 680 southbound. Based on the public involvement activities conducted for the project, ODOT is investigating potential turn radius improvements at the Mahoning Avenue/Glenwood Avenue intersection to accommodate commercial truck movements from businesses along Mahoning Avenue entering onto IR 680, as well as new sign installations to help drivers navigate this alternate route. The existing two-way left turn lane at the Glenwood Avenue/High Street intersection is also being investigated to convert to a left turn lane with potential signal upgrade.
Moreover, the project proposes to remove the bridge No. MAH-680-1.24/Structure File Number (SFN) 5006422 carrying Lanterman Road (CR184) over IR 680 in Austintown Township, Mahoning County. Additional improvements include the construction of two cul-de-sacs on both sides of IR 680. Lanterman Road will also be resurfaced on both sides of IR 680 between Four Mile Run Road and Riblett Road once the bridge is removed and the cul-de-sacs are constructed. This work was added to this project from MAH-680-1.24; PID 108519; and will be constructed as part of Phase 2. This work also has independent utility and was evaluated as a separate, standalone federal action under PID 108519.
The environmental document and associated studies, as applicable, were approved using the Stage 2 Design plans for the project. A copy of the Stage 2 Design plans for the project is included in the Project File/General/Project Information subsection as *Stage 2 Design.pdf*.

Limits of Proposed Work:	Pavement Replacement of IR 680 from 4.58 to 7.31, US 62 Ramp from 0.45 to 0.64 & Pavement Replacement of IR 680 from 0.00 to 4.00, SR 711 Ramp from 0.00 to 0.37.
Start (SLM):	0.00
End (SLM):	7.37
Total Work Length (Miles):	7.37

Roadway Character

Route Number: SR00193

Functional Classification:	Principal Arterial - Other Freeway/Expressway (Urban)
Current Average Daily Traffic:	17500
Current Average Daily Traffic Year:	2026
Design Year Average Daily Traffic:	18500
Design Average Daily Traffic Year:	2046
Daily Hourly Volume:	2000
Truck %:	4

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	50	50
Legal Speed (MPH):	50	50
Number of Lanes:	4	4
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width (ft):	4	4
Median Width (ft):	4	4
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Route Number: SR00711

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial - Other Freeway/Expressway (Urban)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 24500

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 25000

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2046

Daily Hourly Volume: 3100

Truck %: 7

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	50	50
Legal Speed (MPH):	50	50
Number of Lanes:	4	4
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width (ft):	8	8
Median Width (ft):	3	3
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Route Number: RA50078

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial - Interstate (Urban)

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Current Average Daily Traffic: 750

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 750

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Daily Hourly Volume: 90

Truck %: 2

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	N/A	N/A
Legal Speed (MPH):	N/A	N/A
Number of Lanes:	1	1
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	Ramp
Pavement Width (ft):	16	16
Shoulder Width (ft):	6	6
Median Width (ft):	N/A	N/A
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Route Number: US00062

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial - Other Freeway/Expressway (Urban)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 18000

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 18500

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2046

Daily Hourly Volume: 2200

Truck %: 4

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	55	55
Legal Speed (MPH):	55	55
Number of Lanes:	4	4

Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width (ft):	8	8
Median Width (ft):	16	16
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Route Number: CR00184

Functional Classification: Local (Rural)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 400

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 400

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2046

Daily Hourly Volume: 40

Truck %: 3

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Design Speed (MPH):	25	25
Legal Speed (MPH):	25	25
Number of Lanes:	2	2
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width (ft):	20	20
Shoulder Width (ft):	0	0
Median Width (ft):	0	0
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Route Number: IR00680

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial - Interstate (Urban)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 48500

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 48500

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2046

Daily Hourly Volume: 4800

Truck %: 6

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	50	50
Legal Speed (MPH):	50	50
Number of Lanes:	6	6
Type of Lanes:	Through	Through
Pavement Width (ft):	72	72
Shoulder Width (ft):	10	10
Median Width (ft):	3	3
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Route Number: RA50079

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial - Interstate (Urban)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 2900

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 2900

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2046

Daily Hourly Volume: 300

Truck %: 4

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	N/A	N/A
Legal Speed (MPH):	N/A	N/A
Number of Lanes:	1	1
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	Ramp
Pavement Width (ft):	16	16
Shoulder Width (ft):	8	8
Median Width (ft):	N/A	N/A
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Route Number: RA50077

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial - Interstate (Urban)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 3400

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2026

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 3400

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2046

Daily Hourly Volume: 450

Truck %: 4

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Design Speed (MPH):	N/A	N/A
Legal Speed (MPH):	N/A	N/A
Number of Lanes:	1	1
Type of Lanes:	Ramp	Ramp
Pavement Width (ft):	16	16
Shoulder Width (ft):	6	6
Median Width (ft):	N/A	N/A
Sidewalk Width (ft):	N/A	N/A

Sufficiency Rating: 095.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.02 MI E OF SR 62D

40. Bridge Type: 402N

Sufficiency Rating: 094.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.28 MI W OF US 62/SR 7

40. Bridge Type: 402N

Sufficiency Rating: 092.3

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1972

Bridge Location:	0.44 MI S OF US 62
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	090.2
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1965
Bridge Location:	0.09 MI E OF SR 11
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	088.5
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.07 MI E OF IR 80
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	091.3
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.33 MI E OF IR 80
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	091.3
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.40 MI E OF IR 80
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	087.6
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.47 MI E OF IR 80
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	087.0
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	1.23 MI E OF IR 80

40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	083.2
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.96 MI W OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	201N
Sufficiency Rating:	089.0
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.96 MI W OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	201N
Sufficiency Rating:	085.8
General Rating:	8
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.30 MI E OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	093.7
General Rating:	8
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.31 MI S OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	093.7
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.31 MI S OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	095.7
General Rating:	8
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.42 MI E OF SR 711

40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	088.5
General Rating:	8
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.42 MI E OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	076.2
General Rating:	8
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	0.94 MI E OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	076.2
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	1.05 MI E OF SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	094.6
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	1.34 MI E OF SR 7
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	093.4
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	0.11 MI W OF SR 193
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	092.6
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1961
Bridge Location:	0.28 MI S OF SR 193
40. Bridge Type:	402N

Sufficiency Rating:	056.1
General Rating:	5
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	0.33 MI S OF SR 193
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	092.6
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	0.45 MI E OF SR 193
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	084.2
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	0.68 MI S OF SR 193
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	081.9
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	1.17 MI S OF SR 193
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	075.6
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	0.38 MI W OF US 62
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	079.7
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1970
Bridge Location:	JCT OF IR 680 AND US 62
40. Bridge Type:	402N

Sufficiency Rating:	090.5
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	JCT OF IR 680 AND US 62
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	090.9
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	1.97 MI E OF SR 193
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	084.9
General Rating:	8
Date Built:	07/01/1962
Bridge Location:	0.26 MI S OF US 62
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	082.6
General Rating:	8
Date Built:	07/01/1963
Bridge Location:	0.32 MI S OF US 62
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	076.8
General Rating:	7
Date Built:	07/01/1973
Bridge Location:	0.62 MI S OF US 62
40. Bridge Type:	402N
Sufficiency Rating:	087.2
General Rating:	6
Date Built:	07/01/1967
Bridge Location:	JCT OF IR 680 AND SR 711
40. Bridge Type:	402N

Design Criteria For Bridges

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

SFN: 5007208

Sufficiency Rating: 095.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.02 MI E OF SR 62D

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	206.8	206.8
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	63.8	63.8
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	16	16

Bridge Type Description: USR 62 bridge over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5001986

Sufficiency Rating: 094.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.28 MI W OF US 62/SR 7

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	132	132
Number of Main Spans:	2	2
Max Span Length (ft):	77.5	77.5
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	68	68

Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	15.5	15.5

Bridge Type Description: Market St. over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5003350

Sufficiency Rating: 092.3

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1972

Bridge Location: 0.44 MI S OF US 62

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	132	132
Number of Main Spans:	2	2
Max Span Length (ft):	71	71
Load Restrictions (TON):	105	105
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	66	66
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	15	15

Bridge Type Description: South Ave over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006279

Sufficiency Rating: 090.2

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1965

Bridge Location: 0.09 MI E OF SR 11

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	297	297
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	116	116
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	51.8	51.8
Shoulder Width(ft):	10	10
Under Clearance (ft):	17	17

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 WB over SR 11 NB

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006309

Sufficiency Rating: 088.5

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.07 MI E OF IR 80

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	193	193
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	71	71
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	39.7	39.7
Shoulder Width(ft):	10	10
Under Clearance (ft):	16.5	16.5

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 EB over SR 11 NB ramp

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006333

Sufficiency Rating: 091.3

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.33 MI E OF IR 80

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	229	229
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	93	93
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	38	38
Shoulder Width(ft):	12	12
Under Clearance (ft):	0	0

Bridge Type Description:

IR 680 WB over Mahoning Valley Sanitary District water main

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006368

Sufficiency Rating: 091.3

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.40 MI E OF IR 80

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	217.7	217.7
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	88	88
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	47.3	47.3
Shoulder Width(ft):	8	8
Under Clearance (ft):	0	0

Bridge Type Description:

IR 680 EB over Mahoning Valley Sanitary District water main

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006392

Sufficiency Rating: 087.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.47 MI E OF IR 80

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	300	300
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	86.8	86.8
Load Restrictions (TON):	120	120
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	32	32
Shoulder Width(ft):	5	5
Under Clearance (ft):	16.1	16.1

Bridge Type Description: N Four Mile Run Rd over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006422

Sufficiency Rating: 087.0

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 1.23 MI E OF IR 80

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	n/a
Bridge Length (ft):	341	n/a
Number of Main Spans:	4	n/a
Max Span Length (ft):	99	n/a
Load Restrictions (TON):	140	n/a
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	26	n/a
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	n/a
Under Clearance (ft):	14.5	n/a

Bridge Type Description: This bridge will be closed to traffic and removed.

Load Restrictions Description: n/a

Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project? No

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

Remarks:

This bridge will be closed to traffic and removed.

SFN: 5006457

Sufficiency Rating: 083.2

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.96 MI W OF SR 711

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	201N	201N
Bridge Length (ft):	148	148

Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	41	41
Load Restrictions (TON):	130	130
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width(ft):	10	10
Under Clearance (ft):	16	16

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 WB over N Meridian Rd

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have deck and railing repairs only.

SFN: 5006481

Sufficiency Rating: 089.0

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.96 MI W OF SR 711

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	201N	201N
Bridge Length (ft):	148	148
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	41	41
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40.1	40.1
Shoulder Width(ft):	10	10
Under Clearance (ft):	16	16

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 EB over N Meridian Rd

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have deck and railing repairs only.

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

SFN: 5006511

Sufficiency Rating: 085.8

General Rating: 8

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.30 MI E OF SR 711

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	324	324
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	107	107
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	28	28
Shoulder Width(ft):	2	2
Under Clearance (ft):	17.1	17.1

Bridge Type Description: Vestal Rd over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006600

Sufficiency Rating: 093.7

General Rating: 8

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.31 MI S OF SR 711

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	135	135
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	50	50
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	39.6	39.6

Shoulder Width(ft):	12	12
Under Clearance (ft):	15	15

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 NB over Cherry Hill Ave

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006635

Sufficiency Rating: 093.7

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.31 MI S OF SR 711

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	125	125
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	50	50
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	39.6	39.6
Shoulder Width(ft):	12	12
Under Clearance (ft):	15	15

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 SB over Cherry Hill Ave

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006694

Sufficiency Rating: 095.7

General Rating: 8

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.42 MI E OF SR 711

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	187	187
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	70	70
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	45.5	45.5
Shoulder Width(ft):	8	8
Under Clearance (ft):	31.2	31.2

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 NB over railroad tracks

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006724

Sufficiency Rating: 088.5

General Rating: 8

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.42 MI E OF SR 711

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	187	187
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	70	70
Load Restrictions (TON):	145	145
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	49	49
Shoulder Width(ft):	8	8
Under Clearance (ft):	23	23

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 SB over railroad tracks

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006759

Sufficiency Rating: 076.2

General Rating: 8

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 0.94 MI E OF SR 711

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	186	186
Number of Main Spans:	2	2
Max Span Length (ft):	93	93
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	30	30
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	15.5	15.5

Bridge Type Description: N Belle Vista Ave over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006783

Sufficiency Rating: 076.2

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: 1.05 MI E OF SR 711

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	268.6	268.6
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	75.3	75.3
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	27	27
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	15.5	15.5

Bridge Type Description: Wellington Ave over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006813

Sufficiency Rating: 094.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 1.34 MI E OF SR 7

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	212	212
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	64	64
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	15.5	15.5

Bridge Type Description: Steel St over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Remarks:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006848

Sufficiency Rating: 093.4

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.11 MI W OF SR 193

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	260	260
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	75.5	75.5
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	27	27
Shoulder Width(ft):	8	8
Under Clearance (ft):	15.8	15.8

Bridge Type Description: Silliman St ramp over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006864

Sufficiency Rating: 092.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1961

Bridge Location: 0.28 MI S OF SR 193

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	269.6	269.6
Number of Main Spans:	10	10
Max Span Length (ft):	81	81

Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	34.9	34.9
Shoulder Width(ft):	5	5
Under Clearance (ft):	16	16

Bridge Type Description: Mahoning Ave over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006872

Sufficiency Rating: 056.1

General Rating: 5

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.33 MI S OF SR 193

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	597	599
Number of Main Spans:	6	6
Max Span Length (ft):	106	106
Load Restrictions (TON):	115	115
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	94	94
Shoulder Width(ft):	2	6
Under Clearance (ft):	33.4	36.5

Bridge Type Description:

IR 680 over Price Road, Mill Creek and Mill Creek Park

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

A complete deck replacement is proposed resulting in a six-span continuous steel girder bridge with new composite reinforced

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

SFN: 5006902

Sufficiency Rating: 092.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.45 MI E OF SR 193

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	185	185
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	67	67
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width(ft):	6	6
Under Clearance (ft):	14.6	14.6

Bridge Type Description: Glennwood Ave over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006937

Sufficiency Rating: 084.2

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.68 MI S OF SR 193

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	162	162
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	60	60
Load Restrictions (TON):	115	115
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	98.8	98.8
Shoulder Width(ft):	12	12

Under Clearance (ft):	14.5	14.5

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 over Edwards St

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5006961

Sufficiency Rating: 081.9

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 1.17 MI S OF SR 193

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	180	180
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	70	70
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	86.8	86.8
Shoulder Width(ft):	12	12
Under Clearance (ft):	14.7	14.7

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 over Oak Hill Ave

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5007089

Sufficiency Rating: 075.6

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Bridge Location: 0.38 MI W OF US 62

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	151	151
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	53	53
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48	48
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	16.5	16.5

Bridge Type Description: W Woodland Ave over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5007119

Sufficiency Rating: 079.7

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1970

Bridge Location: JCT OF IR 680 AND US 62

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	450	450
Number of Main Spans:	6	6
Max Span Length (ft):	81	81
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	27	27
Shoulder Width(ft):	10	10
Under Clearance (ft):	15.5	15.5

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 ramp to USR 62 over IR 680 and USR 62

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5007143

Sufficiency Rating: 090.5

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: JCT OF IR 680 AND US 62

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	210.9	210.9
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	79.4	79.4
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	84	84
Shoulder Width(ft):	10	10
Under Clearance (ft):	14.8	14.8

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 over USR 62

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5007178

Sufficiency Rating: 090.9

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 1.97 MI E OF SR 193

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N

Bridge Length (ft):	411	411
Number of Main Spans:	7	7
Max Span Length (ft):	70	70
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	29.8	29.8
Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	14.5	14.5

Bridge Type Description: Wayne Ave over IR 680 and USR 62

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5007232

Sufficiency Rating: 084.9

General Rating: 8

Date Built: 07/01/1962

Bridge Location: 0.26 MI S OF US 62

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	131.5	131.5
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	55.4	55.4
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	112	112
Shoulder Width(ft):	12	12
Under Clearance (ft):	15	15

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 over E Delason Ave/Bellview Ave

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5007267

Sufficiency Rating: 082.6

General Rating: 8

Date Built: 07/01/1963

Bridge Location: 0.32 MI S OF US 62

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	136.7	136.7
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	56.5	56.5
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	130	130
Shoulder Width(ft):	10	10
Under Clearance (ft):	15	15

Bridge Type Description: IR 680 over railroad tracks

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5007291

Sufficiency Rating: 076.8

General Rating: 7

Date Built: 07/01/1973

Bridge Location: 0.62 MI S OF US 62

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	252	252
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	78	78
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40	40

Shoulder Width(ft):	N/A	N/A
Under Clearance (ft):	14.7	14.7

Bridge Type Description: Gibson St over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

SFN: 5008166

Sufficiency Rating: 087.2

General Rating: 6

Date Built: 07/01/1967

Bridge Location: JCT OF IR 680 AND SR 711

	Existing:	**Proposed:**
Bridge Type:	402N	402N
Bridge Length (ft):	241	241
Number of Main Spans:	4	4
Max Span Length (ft):	77	77
Load Restrictions (TON):	115	115
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48.6	48.6
Shoulder Width(ft):	5	5
Under Clearance (ft):	14.7	14.7

Bridge Type Description: SR 711 over IR 680

Load Restrictions Description: No load restrictions.

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:

This bridge is proposed to have minor repairs only.

41. Bridge Length (ft): 206.8

41. Bridge Length (ft): 132

41. Bridge Length (ft): 132

41. Bridge Length (ft):	297
41. Bridge Length (ft):	193
41. Bridge Length (ft):	229
41. Bridge Length (ft):	217.7
41. Bridge Length (ft):	300
41. Bridge Length (ft):	341
41. Bridge Length (ft):	148
41. Bridge Length (ft):	148
41. Bridge Length (ft):	324
41. Bridge Length (ft):	135
41. Bridge Length (ft):	125
41. Bridge Length (ft):	187
41. Bridge Length (ft):	187
41. Bridge Length (ft):	186
41. Bridge Length (ft):	268.6
41. Bridge Length (ft):	212
41. Bridge Length (ft):	260
41. Bridge Length (ft):	269.6
41. Bridge Length (ft):	597
41. Bridge Length (ft):	185
41. Bridge Length (ft):	162
41. Bridge Length (ft):	180
41. Bridge Length (ft):	151
41. Bridge Length (ft):	450
41. Bridge Length (ft):	210.9
41. Bridge Length (ft):	411
41. Bridge Length (ft):	131.5
41. Bridge Length (ft):	136.7
41. Bridge Length (ft):	252
41. Bridge Length (ft):	241

42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	2
42. Number of Main Spans:	2
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	2
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	10
42. Number of Main Spans:	6
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	6
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	7
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	3

42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
43. Max Span Length (ft):	63.8
43. Max Span Length (ft):	77.5
43. Max Span Length (ft):	71
43. Max Span Length (ft):	116
43. Max Span Length (ft):	71
43. Max Span Length (ft):	93
43. Max Span Length (ft):	88
43. Max Span Length (ft):	86.8
43. Max Span Length (ft):	99
43. Max Span Length (ft):	41
43. Max Span Length (ft):	41
43. Max Span Length (ft):	107
43. Max Span Length (ft):	50
43. Max Span Length (ft):	50
43. Max Span Length (ft):	70
43. Max Span Length (ft):	70
43. Max Span Length (ft):	93
43. Max Span Length (ft):	75.3
43. Max Span Length (ft):	64
43. Max Span Length (ft):	75.5
43. Max Span Length (ft):	81
43. Max Span Length (ft):	106
43. Max Span Length (ft):	67
43. Max Span Length (ft):	60
43. Max Span Length (ft):	70
43. Max Span Length (ft):	53
43. Max Span Length (ft):	81
43. Max Span Length (ft):	79.4

43. Max Span Length (ft):	70
43. Max Span Length (ft):	55.4
43. Max Span Length (ft):	56.5
43. Max Span Length (ft):	78
43. Max Span Length (ft):	77
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	105
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	120
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	140
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	130
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	145
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	115
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	115
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150

44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	115
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	68
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	66
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	51.8
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	39.7
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	38
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	47.3
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	32
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	26
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40.1
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	28
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	39.6
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	39.6
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	45.5
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	49
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	30
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	27
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	27
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	34.9
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	94
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48

45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	98.8
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	86.8
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	27
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	84
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	29.8
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	112
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	130
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	40
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	48.6

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	Yes
The proposed MOT substantially impacts sensitive environmental resources	No
Substantial controversy is associated with the proposed MOT	No
Coordination has been initiated and/or completed with local emergency services, schools, public institutions/facilities, etc.	Yes

Remarks:

Lane closures and ramp closures will be required at various times during project construction. Detour routes have been developed and were included in the public involvement information used for the virtual public meeting. In the southern section (Phase I: PID 121474) IR 680 northbound between the USR 62 interchange and the SR 193 interchange will be closed in 2026-2027 with traffic detoured around downtown Youngstown using USR 62, USR 422, and SR 193. In the northern section (Phase 2: PID 113321) the ramp from SR 11 northbound to IR 680 southbound will be closed from 2028-2029. SR 11 ramp traffic will be detoured to IR 80 to USR 422 to SR 193. In both sections there will be ramp closures ranging from 2 weeks to the full construction period depending on the involved work. Detour routes will be posted for all ramp closures.

During public involvement, no concerns were expressed about the lane closures, ramp closures and detour routes. Emergency services providers, schools, public institutions and major employers were all notified of the virtual public meeting and invited to submit comments on all aspects of the project including detour routes.

Are there any Environmental Commitments?	No

Right of Way and Utility Involvement

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

The project requires Permanent Right-of-Way	No
The project requires Permanent Easement(s)	No
The project requires Temporary Right-of-Way	Yes
Number of parcels impacted by Permanent Right-of-Way:	0
Number of parcels impacted by Temporary Right-of-Way:	1
Approximate acreage of Permanent Right-of-Way needed:	0
Approximate acreage of Temporary Right-of-Way needed:	0.039
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	No
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:

To facilitate the proposed improvements, 0.0393 acre of temporary right-of-way will be acquired from one (1) parcel. Total property takes, structure takes or relocations are not proposed to construct the project. See the right-of-way plans for the project in the Project File/General/Project Information subsection as *Right-of-Way Plan Sheets.pdf*.

Utilities have been identified within the project area and coordination has been initiated with the following entities:

- Dominion Energy Ohio (Electric)
- Enbridge Gas Ohio (Formerly Dominion Energy Ohio) (Gas)
- AT&T (Telecommunication)
- Charter Communications (Spectrum/Time Warner) (Telecommunication)
- Sanitary Engineering Department of Mahoning County (Sewer)
- Mahoning Valley Sanitary District (Sewer)
- City of Youngstown Water (Water)
- MCI (Verizon) (Telecommunications)
- Lumen Communications (Telecommunication)
- ODOT 4 Utility Coordinator (Utilities)
- ODOT 4 Traffic Office (Traffic)
- Ohio Edison (Transmission) (Electric)
- Ohio Edison (Distribution) (Electric)
- Level 3 Communications (Telecommunication)
- Involta LLC (South Shore) (Telecommunication)
- Armstrong Group of Companies (Telecommunication)

Coordination and correspondence will continue throughout the detailed design process as construction plans are finalized for the project.

Purpose & Need

Purpose & Need

Project History:

Interstate Route (IR) 680 through this project area was constructed in the early 1960s. Multiple minor rehabilitation and repairs were performed at specific locations in the 1970s and 1990s, however, major rehabilitation of the pavement has not been conducted in the entire project area.

The IR 680 Major Rehabilitation Feasibility Study was initially prepared in July 2022 and revised in April 2024. The Feasibility Study documented the alternatives considered for the various aspects of the rehabilitation project, including the Mill Creek Bridge (MAH-680-0475) rehabilitation and maintenance of traffic alternatives for pavement rehabilitation in the 7.3-mile-long corridor.

In August 2023, the MAH-680-0.00 Interchange Modification Study was completed for the project area. That study analyzed the proposed removal of the Mahoning Avenue to IR 680 southbound entrance ramp being a redundant entrance point to the nearby High Street/Marshall Street/IR 680 interchange. The study concluded the removal of the Mahoning Avenue entrance ramp removes a conflict point and eliminates a substandard merge condition on IR 680 southbound. Moreover, the ramp removal provides a positive safety impact to the IR 680 corridor and was recommended to be moved forward to design and construction.

Purpose Statement:

The purpose of this project is to rehabilitate IR 680 from the IR 80/SR 11 interchange to just past the South Avenue interchange. This 7.3-mile-long major rehabilitation project is intended to address deficient pavement on the mainline and ramps, deteriorated structure conditions, geometric deficiencies and deteriorated/substandard drainage structures at multiple locations in the project area.

Need Element(s):

The project needs include substantively deteriorated asphalt pavement along the IR 680 mainline and interchange ramps, deteriorated structure conditions on the bridges, and deteriorated/substandard drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails and fences throughout the project area. An additional need is the unacceptable conflict point on IR 680 southbound created by the proximity of the Mahoning Avenue/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp to the SR 193/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp and the IR 680 southbound/High Street exit ramp.

Goals and Objectives:

No longer required.

Summary Statement:

No longer required.

Logical Termini and Independent Utility:

The project starts at the IR 80/IR 680/SR 11 interchange and ends just past the South Avenue interchange. These termini cover the highway sections with the identified substantively deficient pavement, deteriorated structure conditions, geometric deficiencies, and deteriorated/substandard drainage structures. This proposed transportation improvement does not depend on any other transportation improvement to meet the established purpose and need. Therefore, independent utility is established for this transportation improvement.

Alternatives

Alternatives

Discuss No Build Alternative:

With the No-Build alternative, improvements would not be made to the substantively deteriorated asphalt pavement on the IR 680 mainline and interchange ramps, deteriorated structure conditions on the bridges, and deteriorated/substandard drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails and fences throughout the project area. Additionally, the unacceptable conflict point on IR 680 southbound created by the proximity of the Mahoning Avenue/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp to the SR 193/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp and the IR 680 southbound/High Street exit ramp would remain. This alternative has been dismissed because it does not meet the Purpose and Need for the project.

Was a Feasibility Study completed? Yes

Date Feasibility Study was approved: 01/28/2025

Was an Alternative Evaluation Report (AER) completed? No

Alternatives Considered

Name	Description	Reason Dismissed	Preferred Alternative
Full Build	I-680 would be reconstructed to meet all current standards and all geometric deficiencies will be eliminated. This would include correcting all substandard curves, ramp merges and diverges, and provide full median and shoulder widths.	This alternative would require the acquisition of large amounts of additional right-of-way and would have substantially greater environmental impacts with minimal additional benefit. Therefore, this alternative does not meet the project's Purpose and Need.	No

Performance Based Practical Design (PBPD) as described in the Feasibly Study	This alternative would reconstruct the I-680 pavement while making targeted improvements at locations where safety data indicates that existing substandard roadway geometry is contributing to abnormally high crash patterns. Additionally, if other geometric upgrades can be made for minimal added cost, and without additional right-of-way, they will be included.	This alternative does not address the unacceptable conflict point created by the proximity of the Mahoning Avenue/I-680 southbound entrance ramp to the SR 193/I-680 southbound entrance ramp and the I-680 southbound/High Street exit ramp. Therefore, this alternative does not meet the project's Purpose and Need.	No

Performance Based Practical Design (PBPD) with Mahoning Ave Ramp Closure	This alternative would reconstruct the deteriorated pavements on the I-680 mainline and interchange ramps, make targeted geometric improvements, and address the deteriorated structure conditions on the bridges. It will also address the deteriorated/substandard drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails, and fences throughout project area. The unacceptable conflict point on I-680 southbound created by the proximity of the Mahoning Avenue/I-680 southbound entrance ramp to the SR 193/I-680 southbound entrance ramp and the I-680 southbound/High Street exit ramp would also be addressed.	n/a	Yes

No Build	With this alternative no improvements would be made to the deteriorated asphalt pavement on the I-680 mainline and interchange ramps, deteriorated structure conditions on the bridges, and deteriorated/substandard drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails, and fences throughout project area. Additionally, the unacceptable conflict point on I-680 southbound created by the proximity of the Mahoning Avenue/I-680 southbound entrance ramp to the SR 193/I-680 southbound entrance ramp and the I-680 southbound/High Street exit ramp would remain.	Does not meet the project's Purpose and Need.	No

Discuss Reasons Alternative Identified as Preferred was selected:

ODOT District 4 Traffic Engineer, Dawn Roxberry, indicated in an email dated January 28, 2025, that the ODOT Office of Roadway Engineering is no longer required to approve the Feasibility Study as per the updated ODOT Location & Design Manual, Volume 1, Section 550.2. See email correspondence dated January 28, 2025, in the Project File/Alternatives/Coordination subsection.
The Performance Based Practical Design (PBPD) with Mahoning Ave Ramp Closure alternative meets the project's Purpose and Need because it would reconstruct the substantively deteriorated pavements along the IR 680 mainline and interchange ramps, address the deteriorated structure conditions on the bridges and address the deteriorated/substandard drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails and fences throughout the project area. The unacceptable conflict point on IR 680 southbound created by the proximity of the Mahoning Avenue/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp to the SR 193/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp and the IR 680 southbound/High Street exit ramp would also be addressed. This alternative is also consistent with the recommendation of the FHWA-approved 2023 Interchange Modification Study.

Air

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

Sensitive Areas are located within approximately 500' of the proposed project area Yes

The proposed project is listed as a C1 in ODOT's CE Guidance and/or falls under 40 CFR 93.126 Yes

Remarks:

The proposed closure of the Mahoning Avenue ramp falls under 40 CFR 93.126 under 'Projects that correct, improve, or eliminate hazardous locations or features. In addition, the project intent is to rehabilitate IR 680, while not adding capacity to IR 680 or an intersecting interchanges. Therefore, an MSAT analysis is not required for the project. Concurrence was received from the Office of Environmental Services (OES) Air and Noise Coordinator on 7/26/2022. See the ODOT-OES correspondence, dated 7/26/2022, for the project in the Project File/Air/Coordination subsection as OES Approval - No Air Analysis Required.pdf.

Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5)

The proposed project is in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area No

Remarks:

The project is located in Mahoning County, a PM 2.5 Attainment Area. Therefore, a PM2.5 analysis is not required for the project.

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 No

The proposed project is listed on the TIP Yes

Remarks:

Mahoning County is not within an ozone maintenance or non-attainment area. Mahoning County is located within a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), the Eastgate Regional Council of Governments (Eastgate). The project is listed in the Eastgate Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 - FY 2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The project is also listed in the ODOT Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 - FY 2027 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Eastgate was notified that since the Eastgate region is a 1997 Ozone standard maintenance area, with 2009 and 2018 (MOBILE based) budgets, and the region is also a 2008 Ozone standard attainment area, effective July 20th, 2013, the 1997 Ozone standard was revoked for conformity purposes. Accordingly, the Eastgate TIP no longer needs to demonstrate transportation conformity. Therefore, the project does not require ozone studies or agency coordination.

Greenhouse Gas

A Quantitative Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Analysis is required No

Remarks:

A Quantitative Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Analysis is not required for this project.

Environmental Commitments

Are there any environmental commitments? No

Noise

Noise

Noise Sensitive Areas located within approximately 500' of the proposed project area	Yes
Noise Analysis conducted	No
The proposed project is a Type I project	No
The proposed project is a Type II project	No

Remarks:

The proposed project follows the 'no' path through the ODOT Noise Manual Appendix A flow chart, reaching the conclusion no noise analysis is needed. Per coordination with the OES Air and Noise Coordinator on 7/26/2022, the project does not qualify as a Type I project for noise (i.e., not adding capacity, not moving thru travel lanes equal to or greater than 50% closer to noise sensitive areas) and a noise analysis is not required for the project under 23 CFR 772. See the ODOT-OES correspondence, dated 7/26/2022, for the project in the Project File/Noise/Coordination subsection as OES Approval - No Analysis Required.pdf.

Environmental Commitments

Are there any environmental commitments? No

RMR

Does the project require any Permanent ROW or Easement? No

Does the project require any temporary ROW? Yes

RMR Screening was completed by District Staff: No

Remarks:

A Regulated Materials Review (RMR) Screening was completed on 11/24/2024 and revised on 1/28/2025 and examined 42 properties within or abutting the proposed construction limits. None of the properties required further investigation. Based on review of the Screening, the OES RMR staff determined in email correspondence dated 2/21/2025 that no special material management or further RMR work was warranted. However, RM-019, Jenkins Vacant Property at 1380 Mahoning Avenue warrants a PCS Plan Note. Additionally, if the plans change and additional ROW and/or deep excavation is needed further RMR may be required. The RMR Screening Form, RMR Regulatory File Review Forms, and select plan sheets can be found in the project file under RMR/Project Information and RMR/Reports. ODOT Office of Environmental Services (OES) email correspondence/coordination can be found in the project file under RMR/Coordination

Landfills

Is a Rule 513 Authorization required? No

Remarks:

No known landfills are located within the project area. A former slag landfill (RM-026) is located adjacent to the project area, however there will be no deep excavation on this parcel and there will be no temporary or permanent right-of-way acquired from this parcel. Therefore, no further coordination is warranted for the project.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

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

Cultural Resources

Cultural Properties Present

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

Based on a review of SHPO GIS Mapping and record check, a Section 106 Scoping Request Checklist was completed for the project and submitted to ODOT-OES on July 17, 2024. All maintenance activities will be limited to the existing right-of-way and no permanent right-of-way acquisition is anticipated. The project will not involve any buildings and no relocations will be required. The literature search concluded there are no inventoried buildings (OHI), no known archaeological sites (OAI), and generally no listed or eligible historic properties found in the area of potential effects (APE).
One bridge maintenance location (MAH-680-4.75; SFN: 5006872) spans Mill Creek Park and the Mill Creek Park Historic District (NR # 05000178). The project will require temporary right-of-way to provide limited access during construction efforts. The current IR 680-4.75 bridge that carries the interstate highway over the valley is a non-contributing element of the Mill Creek Park Historic District nomination. Actual construction activities will not involve or change the park's existing condition. TIMS mapping indicates that none of the other bridges are historic nor are they considered eligible for the National Register based on the Ohio DOT Historic Bridge Inventory (accepted April 28, 2010). Highway maintenance including the rehabilitation of non-historic and non-contributing bridges even those within a NR historic district where no new permanent right-of-way is required are construction activities which are exempt from further cultural resource consideration by the 6/29/23 Cultural Resource PA (Agreement 38503).
See the cultural resources documentation for the project in the Project File/Cultural Resources/Project Information subsection.

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: 08/07/2024

Remarks:

In accordance with Stipulation V(C)(1) and Appendix B of the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement executed on November 8, 2017 (Agreement No. 19319), amended on July 11, 2019, ODOT-OES has determined that the proposed project is a type of undertaking that has 'minimal potential to cause effects' to historic properties and is not a part of a larger undertaking. No cultural resources eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places will be affected by the undertaking.

See the cultural resources documentation for the project in the Project File/Cultural Resources/Project Information subsection.

Please check all NRHP Eligible and/or Listed resources:

Historic District

What is the Section 106 effect determination in the OES Transmittal? Minimal Potential to Cause Effect Appendix B

Documentation Date

Participating

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

Ecological

ESR

ESR Name:	ESR Type:	Coordination Complete Date:
MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II	Level 1	11/7/2024

Wetlands

ESR Name:	Wetland ID:	Hydrologic connection:	Wetland category:	Estimated total size (ac.):	Total estimated impact area by alternative (ac.):
MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II	Wetland AA	Adjacent	Modified Category 2	0.32	0.02
	Wetland O	Adjacent	Modified Category 2	0.77	0
	Wetland P	Adjacent	Category 1	0.04	0
	Wetland Q	Adjacent	Modified Category 2	0.08	0
	Wetland R	Adjacent	Modified Category 2	0.07	0
	Wetland S	Adjacent	Modified Category 2	0.27	0.001
	Wetland T	Adjacent	Modified Category 2	0.12	0
	Wetland U	Adjacent	Category 1	0.08	0.01
	Wetland V	Adjacent	Category 2	0.3	0
	Wetland W	Adjacent	Category 2	1.14	0
	Wetland X	Adjacent	Category 2	0.03	0.006

Has an Approved and/or Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination been made by the USACE? No

Total impact to all wetlands (ac.): 0.037

Total acres of non-isolated wetlands impacted: 0.037

Total acres of isolated wetlands impacted: 0

In accordance with Executive Order 11990 - USDOT Order 5660.1A, this Wetland Finding has been prepared to document that wetlands have been avoided to the extent possible to minimize the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands, and to document that there are no practicable alternatives to avoid construction in wetlands.

An analysis of the 'Do Nothing' alternative indicates that it is not practicable because (check all that apply):

It Would Not Correct Existing Condition and Maintenance Problems.

An analysis of improvements that avoid all wetland impacts indicates that they are not practicable because (check all that apply):

They Will Substantially Increase Project Costs.

They Will Not Meet the Identified Needs of the Project.

Include justification supporting the decisions noted above:

The No Build alternative does not meet the project's Purpose & Need to improve deteriorated and deficient/substandard drainage structures. The project footprint has been reduced to the maximum extent practicable. Implementation of additional measures to further reduce the impact footprint is not feasible or warranted based on: the purpose and need of the project and the limited available space; the location of the aquatic resources relative to the project location; and the overall minor impacts of the project as currently designed.

All practicable measures have been considered and incorporated into the project design to avoid, minimize, wetland impacts. The wetland impact minimization measures that will be followed for the project are documented in the environmental commitments for the project. Wetland mitigation for unavoidable impacts will be provided if required by the Clean Water Act or Ohio isolated wetland law, as regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers and Ohio EPA regulations (33 CFR parts 325 and 332 and 40 CFR part 230, and OAC 3745-01-54), and (ORC 6111.027). No practicable alternatives exist for the proposed construction in wetlands, and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the wetlands that may result from such use.

Remarks:
In accordance with Executive Order 11990 USDOT Order 5660.1A, this Wetland Finding has been prepared to document that wetlands have been avoided to the extent possible to minimize the long-term and short-term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands, and to document that there are no practical alternatives to avoid construction in wetlands. An analysis of the "No Build" alternative indicated that it is not practicable because it would not address deficient pavement on the mainline and ramps, deteriorated structure conditions, geometric deficiencies, and deteriorated/substandard drainage structures at multiple locations in the project area. An analysis of improvements that avoid all wetland impacts indicates improvements are not practicable because they will not meet the identified needs of the project. The impacts to the wetlands are necessary and unavoidable due to the project purpose and need. All practicable measures have been considered and incorporated into the project design to avoid and/or minimize wetland impacts. Wetland mitigation for unavoidable impacts will be provided if required by the Clean Water Act or Ohio isolated wetland law, as regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers and Ohio EPA regulations (33 CFR parts 325 and 332 and 40 CFR part 230, and OAC 3745-01-54) and (ORC 6111.027). No practicable alternatives exist for the proposed construction in wetlands, and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the wetlands that may result from such use.

Streams & Rivers

ESR Name:	Stream Name:	National or Scenic Rivers or NRI Streams:	Ohio EPA Aquatic Life Use Designation:	Antidegradation Designation:	Total Impact Length(ft.):
MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II	UNT 1	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	0
	UNT 2	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	7
	UNT 3	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	0
	UNT 3A	No	Class I	General High Quality Water	0
	UNT 4	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	0
	UNT 5	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	12
	UNT 6	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	53
	UNT 7	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	441
	UNT 8	No	Class II	General High Quality Water	348
	Fourmile Run	No	WWH	General High Quality Water	472
	Mill Creek	No	WWH	General High Quality Water	0

Total impact length (ft.) to perennial streams: 1314

Total impact length (ft.) to intermittent streams: 19

Total impact length (ft.) to ephemeral streams: 0

Remarks:
Based on the results of the Level 1 ESRs, 11 streams were identified within the study area (see above). However, only six streams (UNT 2, UNT 5-8, and Fourmile Run) are anticipated to be impacted. A total of 1,333 linear feet between multiple locations will be impacted by the project. Avoiding these streams would likely require additional right-of-way or substantial re-design of the highway. No practicable alternative exists for the proposed construction in these streams, and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the streams that may result from such use.

Other Surface Waters / Ditches

ESR Name:	Ditch Id:	Total Impact Area(ac.):

Total impact to all ditches (ac): 0

Other Surface Waters / Other Water Bodies

ESR Name:	Water Body Id:	Hydrologic Connection:	Type:	Designated Function:	Total Impact

Remarks:
Based on the results of the Level 1 ESR, no potentially jurisdictional ditches were observed within the project area. Based on the results of the Level 1 ESR, no other jurisdictional water bodies were observed within the project area.

Terrestrial Habitats

ESR Name:	Vegetative Communities and Land Cover found within the project study area:	Degree of man induced ecological disturbance:	Unique, rare, or high quality:	Within Project Study Area(s) (ac.):	Alternative Impacts (ac.):
MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II	Developed, Low Intensity (DL) - Includes Areas with a Mixture of constructed Materials and Vegetation. Impervious Surfaces Account for 20-49% of Total Cover. These Areas Most Commonly Include Single-Family Housing Units.	High Disturbance (Dominated by Widespread Taxa Not Typical of a Particular Community)	No	72.67	54.08
	Developed, High Intensity (DH) - Includes Highly Developed Areas Where People Reside or Work in High Numbers. Examples Include Apartment Complexes, Row Houses and Commercial/Industrial. Impervious Surfaces Account for 80 to100% of the Total Cover.	High Disturbance (Dominated by Widespread Taxa Not Typical of a Particular Community)	No	137.89	112.373

	Developed, Medium Intensity (DM) - Includes Areas with a Mixture of Constructed Materials and Vegetation. Impervious Surfaces Account for 50-79% of the Total Cover. These areas most commonly include single-family housing units.	High Disturbance (Dominated by Widespread Taxa Not Typical of a Particular Community)	No	64.94	46.56
	Scrub/Shrub - SS - (True Shrubs, and Young Trees in an Early Successional Stage)	High Disturbance (Dominated by Widespread Taxa Not Typical of a Particular Community)	No	8.79	6.78
	Open Water - All Areas of Open Water, Generally with Less Than 25% Cover of Vegetation or Soil.	High Disturbance (Dominated by Widespread Taxa Not Typical of a Particular Community)	No	2.46	0.02
	Marsh - MA - (Wetland Dominated by Submergent, Floating, and/or Emergent Vegetation)	High Disturbance (Dominated by Widespread Taxa Not Typical of a Particular Community)	No	1.34	0.037
	Upland Forest - UF - (Uplands Dominated by Trees)	High Disturbance (Dominated by Widespread Taxa Not Typical of a Particular Community)	No	85.66	58.66

Remarks:
Based on the results of the Level 1 ESR , no unique or high-quality terrestrial habitats were identified within the proposed project study area. The proposed project is in an urban setting dominated by paved roadway and maintained right-of-way. Impacts will occur to the developed low intensity (54.08 acres), developed high intensity (112.373 acres), developed medium intensity (46.56 acres), scrub/shrub (6.78 acres), open water (0.02 acre), marsh (0.037 acre) and upland forest (58.66 acre) areas.

Threatened or Endangered Species / Federally Listed Species

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Indiana Bat	Myotis sodalis	Endangered

ESR Name: MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II

Effect Determination: May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:
A Bat Field Habitat Assessment Checklist was completed 8/18/2022, 58.66 acres of Suitable Wooded Habitat (SWH) was identified within the tree removal limits. SWH impacts within 100 feet of the edge of pavement total 56.86 ac., and 1.57 ac SWH between 100 and 300 feet from the edge of pavement, and

0.23 of SWH located within 50 feet of a perennial stream. No PRMTs outside 100 feet from EOP will be impacted. No caves, or abandoned mines that provide cool, humid, stable conditions for hibernation were observed in the project area. According to information reported in the Bat Buffer Request response, this project is not located within a bat buffer, the request was completed by Lindsey Korfel on 1-30-2024. All tree removal will occur between October 1 and March 31 to protect these species during their summer roosting period.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Northern Long-eared Bat	Myotis septentrionalis	Endangered

ESR Name: MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II

Effect Determination: May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:
A Bat Field Habitat Assessment Checklist was completed 8/18/2022, 58.66 acres of Suitable Wooded Habitat (SWH) was identified within the tree removal limits. SWH impacts within 100 feet of the edge of pavement total 56.86 ac., and 1.57 ac SWH between 100 and 300 feet from the edge of pavement, and 0.23 of SWH located within 50 feet of a perennial stream. No PRMTs outside 100 feet from EOP will be impacted. No caves, or abandoned mines that provide cool, humid, stable conditions for hibernation were observed in the project area. According to information reported in the Bat Buffer Request response, this project is not located within a bat buffer, the request was completed by Lindsey Korfel on 1-30-2024. All tree removal will occur between October 1 and March 31 to protect these species during their summer roosting period.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Bald Eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Species of Concern

ESR Name: MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II

Effect Determination: No Effect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:
No Bald Eagles or nests were observed during the field survey. Suitable habitat for the Bald Eagle includes mature forested area next to open water for hunting and foraging. There was no suitable habitat for the Bald Eagle observed within the study area. As a result, this project is anticipated to have no impact on the Bald Eagle. According to information reported in the Bald Eagle nest request response, this project is not located within 0.5 Miles of any known Bald Eagle nest, the request was completed by Lindsey Korfel on 1-30-2024.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Eastern Massasauga	Sistrurus catenatus	Threatened

ESR Name: MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II

Effect Determination: No Effect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:
During the field survey conducted by ms consultants it was observed that there was not potential suitable

habitat for the Eastern Massasauga within the study limits. From the ODNR Natural Heritage Database Request conducted on 02/27/2024 no records of the Eastern Massasauga were identified within a 1-mile radius of the project study area. Due to the minimal impacts and lack of potential habitat, it is anticipated that the Eastern Massasauga will not be impacted by the project.

Species Common Name:	Species Scientific Name:	Listing Status:
Tricolored Bat	Perimyotis subflavus	Proposed Endangered

ESR Name: MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II

Effect Determination: May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:
A Bat Field Habitat Assessment Checklist was completed 8/18/2022, 58.66 acres of Suitable Wooded Habitat (SWH) was identified within the tree removal limits. SWH impacts within 100 feet of the edge of pavement total 56.86 ac., and 1.57 ac SWH between 100 and 300 feet from the edge of pavement , and 0.23 of SWH located within 50 feet of a perennial stream. One (1) potential bat trees within 100 ft of EOP will also be removed. No PRMTs outside 100 feet from EOP will be impacted. No caves, or abandoned mines that provide cool, humid, stable conditions for hibernation were observed in the project area. According to information reported in the Bat Buffer Request response, this project is not located within a bat buffer, the request was completed by Lindsey Korfel on 1-30-2024. No ODNR records were found within 1 mile of the project location. Tree removal will only occur between October 1 and March 31 when this species would not be present. All of the pertinent AMMs listed in the OHPBO for Indiana bat and Northern long-eared bat will be followed, which will also protect this species from take. This project May Affect this species but is not going to jeopardize the continued existence of the species. Per the 11/15/2022 letter from USFWS outlining conferencing requirements for this species, this project does not need to be submitted for individual conferencing.

Threatened or Endangered Species / State Listed Species:

No state listed species or suitable habitats are impacted by this project location.

ESR Name: MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II

Species Common Name: little brown bat

Species Scientific Name: Myotis lucifugus

Listing Status: Endangered

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: Yes

Effect Determination: Yes

Discussion Including impacts to Suitable Habitat:
Approximately 58.66 acres of trees are located within the construction limits of the project. No caves, or abandoned mines that provide cool, humid, stable conditions for hibernation were observed in the project area. An ODNR Database Geospatial search represented that no bat records within a one (1) mile range of the project area. All tree removal will occur between October 1 and March 31 when the species would not be present.

Species Common Name: northern harrier

Species Scientific Name: Circus cyaneus

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: American bittern

Species Scientific Name: Botaurus lentiginosus

Listing Status: Endangered

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No

Species Common Name: sandhill crane

Species Scientific Name: Grus canadensis

Listing Status: Threatened

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No

Species Common Name: least bittern

Species Scientific Name: Ixobrychus exilis

Listing Status: Not Provided - No impact to this species

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No Impact

Species Common Name: black-crowned night-heron

Species Scientific Name: Nycticorax nycticorax

Listing Status: Threatened

The species or its suitable habitat will be impacted by this project: No

Effect Determination: No

Remarks:

The project is located within the known range of the Federal-Listed Endangered Indiana bat, the Federal-Listed Threatened Northern-long eared bat and the Federal Proposed Endangered Tricolored bat. USFWS concurred with the May Effect, Not Likely To Adversely Affect determination on these species by the project. Approximately 58.66 acres of Suitable Wooded Habitat (SWH) exists within the tree removal limits of the project. SWH impacts within 100 feet of the edge of pavement total 56.86 ac., and 1.57 ac SWH between 100 and 300 feet from the edge of pavement, and 0.23 of SWH located within 50 feet of a perennial stream. None of the proposed bridges to be rehabbed contained evidence of bats. All tree removal will occur between October 1 and March 31 when species would not be present. One (1) Potential Maternity Roost Tree (PMRT) within 100 ft of EOP will be removed. No PMRTs outside 100 feet from EOP will be impacted.

Agency Coordination

Project Coordination:

Project locations for which no agencies are listed are considered ecologically exempt or non-notifying.

The ODNR and USFWS conditions outlined in the Ecological MOA apply to all projects that are not considered ecologically exempt. These conditions have been evaluated for the project locations listed below.

ESR Name:	Agency:	Submitted for Coordination Date:	Coordination Complete Date:	Were project specific comments received?
MAH IR 0680 0.00 Phase I and II	USFWS	10/24/2024	11/07/2024	No

Additional Coordination Considerations:

Are other ecological coordination requirements applicable?: Yes

Details regarding the additional coordination efforts are provided in the Remarks box below.

National scenic river: No

State scenic river: No

Individual Coastal Consistency: No

Jurisdictional Determination: No

Project specific Biological Assessment Verification: No

Mussel survey: No

Other: No

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Remarks:
A mussel reconnaissance survey fieldwork was conducted on August 18, 2022. Mill Creek was visually surveyed for approximately 200 ft upstream and 400 ft downstream of the work at the work limits of the bridge over Mill Creek. One (1) Mucket (Ortmanniana ligamentina) weathered shell was observed. Substrates were viewed for evidence of shells, shell fragments, or live mussels. Mill Creek will not be impacted by the project. All other impacted streams have stream drainage areas that are less than 5 square miles and are too small to support mussel populations. No further mussel work is required. A search of the Natural Heritage Database was conducted on February 27, 2024. Comments received from ODNR indicated no records of rare or endangered species within a one-mile radius of the MAH-680-0.00 (PID 113321) project area. The USFWS concurred with ODOT's effect determinations on federally listed species on November 7, 2024. The project was evaluated and coordinated in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement Between the Ohio Department of Transportation, the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for Interagency Coordination for Projects Which Require Consultation under the Endangered Species Act, Impact State Listed Species, and/or Modify Jurisdictional Waters 2016 (Ecological MOA). In accordance with Section IID (Comments and Environmental Commitments) of the Ecological MOA, ODOT has evaluated whether the conditions in the agreement are applicable, appropriate, and/or feasible. An analysis of the conditions outlined in the Ecological MOA and whether they will, or will not, be applied to the project generated additional environmental commitments. Additionally, ODOT standard practices will be adhered to, where applicable, during the project. Appropriate environmental commitments were generated for the project based on the recommendations received.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes

Other Resources

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 zoned for non-agricultural purposes and is not 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 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	Yes	No

Remarks:

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

The Ohio EPA's Source Water Assessment and Protection (SWAP) Program mapping was reviewed to determine if public water systems, Source Water Protection Areas or other drinking water resources are located within or adjacent to the project study area. Based on the Ohio EPA's online Source Water Protection Areas map, public water systems, Drinking Water Source Protection Areas or other drinking water resources are not located within the project study area. The Mahoning Valley Sanitary District (OH7801811) source water area watershed and the Hollywood Gaming & Mvrc (OH5055013) source water protection area (groundwater) are located adjacent to the project area to the west. However, no impacts are anticipated to either the watershed or protection area in this area. Furthermore, the project study area is not located over a federally-designated sole source aquifer. A review of the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) Division of Water Resources online records indicated one (1) residential water well located within the project study area south of the IR 680 southbound ramp to State Route 711. There is no indication that this well is still in place as it was likely impacted by the construction of IR 680. Therefore, the project will not impact known drinking water resources.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

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? No

Date concurrence received:

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

Identified Section 4(f) Properties

Identified 4(f) Properties

Property Name	Type	Permanent ROW/Easement Acres	Temporary ROW/Easement Acres	4(f) finding	Date
Mill Creek Park	Publicly owned Park	0	0.039	Temporary No Use Exception - 774.13(d)	11/05/2024

Remarks:

Based on review of available mapping and field investigations, it was determined Mill Creek Park is the only Section 4(f) property impacted by this project. The park consists of recreation opportunities for all activities including hiking, biking, fishing, golf, tennis, volleyball, picnicking, cross country skiing, sledding, etc. The park is also the home to many facilities including the Ford Nature Center, Fellows Riverside Gardens, DD Velma Davis Education and Visitor Center, Judge Leo P. Morley Performing Arts Pavilion, Mill Creek Golf Course, Volney Rogers Field, Walter H. Scholl Recreation Area, and the James L. Wick, Jr. Recreation Area. A minor amount of temporary (0.0393 acres) right-of-way will be required at the east end of the bridges over Price Road/Mill Creek/Mill Creek Park for construction access and to stabilize the eroded slope under the bridge with rock channel protection. This temporary right-of-way will involve Mill Creek Park property that is not accessible by the public or part of any designated active use area. No other publicly owned parks, recreation areas, or wildlife or waterfowl refuges were identified within the proposed project area.

Additionally, Mill Creek Park is a National Register Historic District and is approximately 2,900+ acres. The Mill Creek Park Historic District includes numerous contributing elements that are shown and discussed on the National Register nomination form, however, there are no contributing elements within the APE. The temporary right-of-way being acquired from Mill Creek Park will not impact the Mill Creek Park Historic District.
A Section 4(f)/6(f) Determination Request Form for Recreational Properties (DRF) was submitted to ODOT-OES Policy Staff on October 7, 2024, and resubmitted on October 31, 2024. Based upon review of the DRF it was determined the proposed project can be processed as an exception to the requirement for Section 4(f) approval. In accordance with 23 CFR 774.13(d), the temporary occupancy of land and/or access will not constitute a use upon the protected recreational activities, features, or attributes associated with Mill Creek Park. The determination was made based on the proposed scope of work and concurrence received from the Official with Jurisdiction (OWJ) regarding the assessment of impacts that are included in the DRF.
See applicable Section 4(f) correspondence and reports for the project in the Project File/Section 4(f)/Coordination and Reports subsections.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes

Section 6(f)

Section 6(f) Determination

Section 6(f) Determination

	Present:	Impacted:
6(f) Properties:	Yes	No

Identified 6(f) Properties

Property Name	Permanent ROW/Easement Acres	Temporary ROW/Easement Acres	6(f) finding	Date
Mill Creek Metro Park - Bear's Den Picnic Area	0	0	No Impact	04/22/2024
Mill Creek Metro Park - Lanterman Falls	0	0	No Impact	04/22/2024

Remarks:

A review of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Mahoning County Grant Listings of properties that received Section 6(f) funds was completed for the project. This review revealed Mill Creek Park has received two different grants from the LWCF. Lanterman's Mill Covered Bridge and the Bear's Den Picnic Area have both received grant funding in the 1980's. In 1988, the Youngstown Township Park District received a LWCF grant, 39-01090, for the Bear's Den Picnic Area. Additionally, in 1989, the Youngstown Township Park District received a LWCF grant, 39-01112, for Lanterman's Mill Covered Bridge. Both LWCF investment sites are located 1+ mile from the proposed work and both facilities' Section 6(f) boundaries are outside of the project area. Therefore, impacts to Section 6(f) properties will not occur and further coordination is not warranted for the project.

See the LWCF Mahoning County Grant Listings in the Project File/Section 6(f)/Project Information/LWCF Grant Listing.pdf.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

Community Impacts

Community Impacts

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

Remarks:

The project involves only full-depth pavement replacement, existing bridge repair/rehabilitation and replacement of deteriorated drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails, and fences throughout project area. It does not change local or regional access, except at the existing Mahoning Avenue/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp. At that location, traffic previously using the entrance ramp will be rerouted along Mahoning Avenue to Edwards Street, then to High Street, and enter IR 680 southbound from the High Street entrance ramp. The additional travel distance is 0.7 mile (about 2 minutes) and will not substantively alter local/regional development patterns.

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

Remarks:

The project involves only full-depth pavement replacement, existing bridge repair/rehabilitation and replacement of deteriorated drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails, and fences throughout project area. It does not change local or regional access, except at the existing Mahoning Avenue/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp. At that location traffic previously using the entrance ramp will be rerouted along Mahoning Avenue to Edwards Street, then to High Street, and enter IR 680 southbound from the High Street entrance ramp. The additional travel distance is 0.7 mile (about 2 minutes) and will not result in substantial negative impacts to community cohesion.

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

Remarks:

The project involves only full-depth pavement replacement, existing bridge repair/rehabilitation and replacement of deteriorated drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails, and fences throughout project area. It does not change local or regional access, except at the existing Mahoning Avenue/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp. At that location traffic previously using the entrance ramp will be rerouted along Mahoning Avenue to Edwards Street, then to High Street, and enter IR 680 southbound from the High Street entrance ramp. The additional travel distance is 0.7 mile (about 2 minutes) and will not result in any foreseeable indirect or cumulative impacts.

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:

The proposed project does not change local or regional access, except at the existing Mahoning Avenue/IR 680 southbound entrance ramp. At that location traffic previously using the entrance ramp will be rerouted along Mahoning Avenue to Edwards Street, then to High Street, and enter IR 680 southbound from the High Street entrance ramp. The additional travel distance is 0.7 mile (about 2 minutes) and will not result in substantial impacts on health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Will the proposed action displace residents, businesses, institutions or farms? No

Remarks:

The project involves only full-depth pavement replacement, existing bridge repair/rehabilitation and replacement of deteriorated drainage structures, signs, lighting, barriers, guardrails, and fences throughout project area. The proposed action does not require the acquisition of new permanent right-of-way and will not displace residents, businesses, institutions or farms.

Will the proposed project result in impacts to Underrepresented Populations (Limited English Proficiency, Older Adults, or Adults with Disabilities) raised during Public Involvement? No

Remarks:

The proposed project will not result in impacts to Underrepresented Populations (Limited English Proficiency, Older Adults, or Adults with Disabilities) and no concerns about these groups were raised during the public involvement activities conducted for the project.

Are there any Environmental Commitments? No

Environmental Justice

Environmental Justice

Identified Environmental Justice Populations

Census Block Group #	% Minority	% Low Income

Are Environmental Justice Populations located within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area?

Remarks:

Are there any Environmental Commitments?

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)

A Public Engagement Plan (PEP) was created at the start of the project to provide a detailed account of all public involvement activities to be conducted for the project.

On December 11, 2024, virtual public open house notification letters were mailed to over 1,000 property owners, stakeholders including commercial businesses along Mahoning Avenue, the local school district, and emergency services to inform them of the virtual public open house meeting to be conducted from December 26, 2024-January 27, 2025. Comment forms were included with the virtual public open house notification letters. A press release was issued by ODOT that was then used for online news articles for WFMJ, WKBN (two articles), and Eastgate. ODOT also advertised the meeting on ODOT's Facebook and X social media accounts.
December 26, 2024 - January 27, 2025, Virtual Public Open House: The recorded narrated presentation providing details on the project was shared on the PublicInput.com project website for the public to view and comment on. The presentation included details on the project overview, purpose and need, alternatives considered, closures and detours, environmental considerations, right-of-way needs, and the project funding and schedule. The presentation also included information on how to submit comments and the opportunity to submit comments directly on the PublicInput.com page. The Lanterman Road Bridge Removal Response to Comments as well as the Interchange Modification Study and Feasibility Study were posted to the website for download. A total of 2,780 views were recorded on the PublicInput.com webpage. The 75 public comments received were included in a comment disposition table and addressed by the project team. Comments from the public were accepted throughout the PDP, however, the comment period for the virtual public open house closed on January 27, 2025.
All public involvement documentation for the project is in the Project File/Public Involvement/Project Information subsection.

Is there any substantial environmental controversy on environmental grounds? No

Please summarize the Public Involvement responses received.

A total of 75 comments were received between December 26, 2024, and January 27, 2025, for the proposed project regarding the virtual public open house, virtual website, news releases and news articles.

Fifty-four of the received comments were concerns about the closure of Mahoning Avenue ramp to IR 680 southbound and how it would affect west side commercial businesses as well as increased traffic to other local ramps including at Oakwood Avenue. Six of the received comments were concerns about the Lanterman Road bridge removal and how it would impact emergency service response times and future development. Eight of the commenters made suggestions for other ramps to close instead of Mahoning Avenue. Additional received comments included concerns about the impacts to Mill Creek Park/Fellows Riverside Gardens, concerns over rerouting through neighborhoods that are not deemed safe by the commenters instead of using the Mahoning Avenue ramp, truck traffic not being able to make turns on the alternative route suggested, and the availability of detour information.

Based on the public involvement activities conducted for the project, ODOT is investigating potential turn radius improvements at the Mahoning Avenue/Glenwood Avenue intersection to accommodate commercial truck movements from businesses along Mahoning Avenue entering onto IR 680, as well as new sign installations to help drivers navigate this alternate route. The existing two-way left turn lane at the Glenwood Avenue/High Street intersection is also being investigated to convert to a left turn lane with potential signal upgrade.

The Public Response to Comments Summary Document was posted to publicinput.com/MAH-680 as well as on the ODOT project webpage. Commenters who submitted their comment via email were notified by ODOT environmental staff on how to access the response to comments via email.

See the public comments and responses to comments for the project in the Project File/Public Involvement/Project Information subsection.

Are there any Environmental Commitments? No

Permits

Waterway Permits

Are Waterway Permits required? Yes

Is the Waterway Permits Determination Complete? No

Army Corps of Engineers

Regional General Permit (RGP): Yes

Nationwide Permit (NWP): No

Section 404 Individual Permit: No

Section 10 Permit: No

Ohio EPA

Section 401 Water Quality Certification: No

Level 1 General Isolated Wetland Permit: No

Level 2 Individual Isolated Wetland Permit: No

Level 3 individual Isolated Wetland Permit: No

US Coast Guard

Section 9 Coordination: No

Section 9 Bridge Permit: No

ODNR

Shore Structure Permit : No

Remarks:

Based on the results of the Level 1 ESR, four wetlands, Wetland AA, S, U and X, and six streams, UNT 2, UNT 5-8 and Fourmile Run, were identified within the project construction limits. Based on the quantity of impacts, the project will meet the criteria for RGP B - Maintenance. An environmental commitment has been added to the project to ensure ODOT will obtain all necessary waterway permit(s) prior to impacting the waterways or wetlands.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes

Storm Water Permits

NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI): Yes

Watershed Specific NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI): No

Remarks:

Disturbed acreage is above 1.0 acre and a NPDES Construction General Permit (NOI) will be required for stormwater for the project.

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	02/18/2025

Remarks:

ODOT District 4 Environmental Section personnel reviewed the FEMA FIRM mapping for the project study area and determined the maintenance activities at the following locations will be performed within a designated Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) Zone A floodplain:

- Bridge deck replacement, approach slab replacement, substructure patching and sealing, and concrete slope protection at structure MAH-680-4.886 (SFN 5006872) over Mill Creek;
- Rock channel protection installation at culvert MAH-680-1.195/Culvert File Number (CFN) 1822845) over Fourmile Run; and
- Rock channel protection installation and ditch erosion protection at culvert MAH-RA50078-0.21/CFN 1987028 near the Mahoning River.

The work being performed within the Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA) are considered maintenance that will not change the alignment, grade or hydraulic capacity of each stream, floodway, or structure and, therefore, is exempt from the normal permit process required for work encroaching on a SFHA. Floodplain coordination is not required for the project; however, a letter was sent to the local floodplain administrators as a courtesy notification of the project and proposed maintenance activities within the designated SFHA. See the floodplains documentation for the project in the Project File/Permits/Floodplains subsection.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Environmental Commitments

RMR -

1) A Petroleum Contaminated Soil (PCS) Plan Note is required for RM-019, Jenkins Vacant Property at 1380 Mahoning Avenue. The Project Designer shall include the final PCS Plan Note into the Stage 3 Plans.

Ecological

1) The project is located within the known habitat ranges of federally listed and protected Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat. The Contractor shall not remove trees under this project from April 1 through September 30. All necessary tree removal shall occur from October 1 through March 31. The Contractor shall demarcate clearing limits to avoid any unauthorized tree clearing. This requirement is necessary to avoid and minimize impacts to these species as required by the Endangered Species Act. For the purpose of this note, a tree is defined as a live, dying, or dead or woody plant, with a trunk three inches or greater in diameter at a height of 4.5 feet above ground surface, and with a minimum of 13 feet.

2) The Contractor shall not place any temporary or permanent fill within the jurisdictional boundaries of Mill Creek. If debris enters the waterway during construction, the Contractor shall remove the debris immediately utilizing equipment staged outside the jurisdictional boundary.

3) The Contractor shall not work below the ordinary high-water mark of UNT 2, UNT 5, UNT 6, UNT 7, UNT 8 and/or Fourmile Run, or install, modify or remove any existing instream fills during the ODNR instream work restriction period of March 15-June 30.

Section 4(f)

1) The project designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: If required, the closure of Price Road will be no more than a few hours on any given day and access to Mill Creek Park and its amenities shall be maintained at all times during construction activities via flagging operations and/or a signed detour route.

2) The project designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The contractor shall install temporary construction fencing along proposed construction limits prior to the start of construction activities to protect the Section 4(f) property and the public.

3) The project designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: Appropriate signage shall be installed to alert users of Mill Creek Park of construction activities, access restrictions or closures, and to direct users to secondary access points via the approved detour routes.

4) The project designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall not store or stage construction equipment or materials within the Mill Creek Park boundary, outside of proposed construction limits, except for area(s) approved by the Official with Jurisdiction specifically for storage and staging of equipment per CMS 107.10.

5) The project designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall be required to closely coordinate the construction schedule with ODOT and Mill Creek Park prior to the start of construction activities.

6) The project designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The Contractor shall only restrict public access to Mill Creek Park for no more than 30 days to complete construction activities that could compromise public safety. Access to Mill Creek Park shall remain open to the public at all other times throughout construction.

Permits - Waterway Permits

1) ODOT will obtain all appropriate waterway permits prior to any work within the jurisdictional boundary of any waterway, including wetlands, and all Waterway Permit Special Provisions will be noted under Special Provisions in the plans and adhered to during construction.

Permits - Storm Water Permits

1) ODOT will submit a Notice of Intent for the NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater prior to construction and all Stormwater Special Provisions will be noted under Special Provisions in the plans and adhered to during construction.

Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 113321 MAH IR 0680 00.00
Approved: 2/28/2025

Preparers and Approvals

Form Preparer:

Rachel Pohnan
ms consultants
140 South Main St Suite 140, Akron OH 44308
330-258-9920
rpohnan@msconsultants.com

Supporting Form Preparer(s):

Matthew Chaney
Sean Carpenter
Barrett Evans
David Galloway
Mark Fedosick

Approvals & Electronic Signatures

Approved & Electronically Signed By:	Approval Date:
Edward Deley (PROGRAM ADMIN 3)	2/28/2025

Appendix

General

Aerial Map.pdf

County Map.pdf

FHWA Approval - IMS.pdf

USGS Quadrangle Topographical Map.pdf

Alternatives

District Correspondence - Feasibility Study.pdf

Feasibility Study Appendices A and B.pdf

Feasibility Study Appendices C and D.pdf

Feasibility Study Appendices E F G H I.pdf

Feasibility Study.pdf

Air

OES Approval - No Air Analysis Required.pdf

Noise

OES Approval - No Analysis Required.pdf

RMR

OES Review - Screening.pdf

Regulated Materials Review Form-Revised 1-28-25.pdf

Cultural Resources

Aerial Photos.pdf

Minimal Potential to Cause Effect - Appendix B

Records Check Mill Creek Park NRHP Listing.pdf

Records Check NRHP Mill Creek Park Map.pdf

Records Check.pdf

Section 106 Resource Overview Map.pdf

Ecological

ODNR Scenic River MOA Conditions

USFWS/ODNR Ecological MOA Conditions

Other Resources

Census Bureau Urbanized Area Map.pdf

Water Source Protection Area Map.pdf

Section 4(f)

Determination Request Form for Recreational Properties.pdf

OES Recreational 4(f) Determination.pdf

Public Involvement

News Article - WKBN 2.pdf

ODOT Project Webpage.pdf

Public Involvement Plan.docx

Public Involvement Plan.pdf

Virtual Open House - News Article - Eastgate.pdf

Virtual Open House - News Article - WFMJ.pdf

Virtual Open House - News Article - WKBN.pdf

Virtual Open House Press Release.pdf

Virtual Public Open House Comment Sheet.pdf

Virtual Public Open House Comments Received.pdf

Virtual Public Open House Mailing List.pdf

Virtual Public Open House Notification Letter.pdf

Virtual Public Open House ODOT Facebook Notification.pdf

Virtual Public Open House ODOT Twitter Notification.pdf

Virtual Public Open House Presentation Recording.mp4

Virtual Public Open House Presentation.pdf

Virtual Public Open House PublicInput Webpage.pdf

Permits

District Determination - No Floodplain Impacts.pdf

FEMA FIRM.pdf

ODOT Form LD-53.pdf