



OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 02

317 E. POE RD. • BOWLING GREEN, OH 43402 • 419-353-8131

Environmental Document

for

OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab PID 99991

Environmental Document Level: D1

Approved: 9/28/2018

Prepared By: Libby Rushley

Lawhon AND Associates

E-mail: lrushley@lawhon-assoc.com

District Contact: Stacy Schimmoeller

Phone: 419-373-4319

E-mail: Stacy.Schimmoeller@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 11, 2015, and executed by FHWA and ODOT.

Table of Contents

Project Type.....	3
General Project Information.....	4
Purpose & Need.....	9
Alternatives.....	11
Air.....	13
Noise.....	15
ESA.....	16
Cultural Resources.....	17
Ecological.....	20
Other Resources.....	26
Section 4(f).....	28
Section 6(f).....	30
Community Impacts.....	31
Underserved Populations.....	32
Public Involvement.....	34
Permits.....	36
Environmental Commitments.....	38
Preparers and Approvals.....	41
Appendix.....	44



Approved: 9/28/2018

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 Level:	D1
PID:	99991
Project Name:	OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab
Project Sponsor:	DISTRICT 2 PRODUCTION
ODOT District:	2
Funding Source:	Federal
Private Funding:	No
Local Public Funding:	No
STIP Reference #:	SLI 32
The next phase of the proposed project is listed on the STIP	Yes
The current cost estimate is in line with existing federal procedures for Ohio STIP Amendments and Administration Modifications	Yes
Planning and Engineering:	\$1,077,074.00
Right of Way:	\$185,000.00
Construction:	\$4,294,000.00
Other:	\$0.00
An Interchange Modification/Justification/Operations Study (IMS/IJS/IOS) was completed	No

Project Description:

The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) is proposing to replace the existing historic State Route (SR) 51 (Toledo Street) bridge over the Portage River (Structure File Number 6201202) in the Village of Elmore and Harris Township, Ottawa County. The existing structure is a 3-span reinforced concrete arch bridge with spandrel walls and earth fill and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) #94000239. The replacement structure will be a 3-span prestressed concrete I-beam composite with reinforced concrete deck, reinforced concrete semi-integral abutments, and wall-type piers. The structure will have two 12' lanes, 4' shoulder on each side, 6' sidewalk on the east side (northbound), and 10' bike lane on the west side (southbound). The work will widen the structure and pavement to current design standards and improve pedestrian facilities.

In 2006 rehabilitation and replacement alternatives were investigated. Replacement was preferred based upon addressing all of the structural deficiencies and the nearly \$2M lower cost. However, due to the effect the replacement would have on the historic bridge, basic maintenance was recommended.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

From 2015-2017 the project was reinvestigated to rehabilitate the historic bridge; however the most recent bridge inspection revealed the structure/concrete in worse condition and the project was changed from a rehabilitation to a replacement. Some of the environmental studies were conducted and coordinated for that alternative and a public meeting was held. When the project changed in late 2017 to a replacement project, the environmental impacts changed. The reports were revised to reflect to new impacts and additional coordination was completed.

Permanent and temporary right-of-way is required for this project.

The bridge will be closed for approximately 6 months during construction. Local and official state detours will be posted.

No hazardous materials, no noise or air quality impacts, or impacts to underserved populations are associated with this project. There are temporary impacts to the Section 4(f) protected Harry Witty Memorial Park which are described in the Section 4(f) section. Minor stream and wetland impacts will occur and are described in the Ecological section. The replacement of the historic bridge constitutes an adverse effect and mitigation was determined through a Cultural Resources MOA which is described in the Cultural section.

The environmental document and associated studies are being approved using the Stage 1 Design. A copy of the plans are included in the project file.

- Project location maps can be found in the project file under General/Project Information

Limits of Proposed Work:	Over Portage River
Start (SLM):	1.26
End (SLM):	1.58
Total Work Length (Miles):	0.32
Roadway Character	

Roadway Character

Route Number: SR00051

Functional Classification:	Minor Arterial (Rural)
Current Average Daily Traffic:	7300
Current Average Daily Traffic Year:	2021
Design Year Average Daily Traffic:	7400
Design Average Daily Traffic Year:	2041
Daily Hourly Volume:	740
Truck %:	6
Setting:	Rural
Topography:	Level

Existing:

Proposed:



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

Design Speed (MPH):	50	50
Legal Speed (MPH):	25	25
Number of Lanes:	2	2
Type of Lanes:	through	through
Pavement Width (ft):	28	42
Shoulder Width (ft):	2	4
Median Width (ft):	0	0
Sidewalk Width (ft):	3.5	10

Sufficiency Rating: 049.6

General Rating: 4

Date Built: 07/01/1926

Bridge Location: 0.12 mi. South of SR105

40. Bridge Type: 153

Design Criteria For Bridges
Design Criteria for Bridges

SFN: 6201202

Sufficiency Rating: 049.6

General Rating: 4

Date Built: 07/01/1926

Bridge Location: 0.12 mi. South of SR105

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	153	155
Bridge Length (ft):	282	289
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	76	110
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	30	42
Shoulder Width(ft):	1	4
Under Clearance (ft):	10	10

Bridge Type Description:

The existing structure is a concrete filled spandrel arch bridge. The replacement structure will be a 3-span prestressed concrete I-beam composite with reinforced concrete deck, reinforced concrete semi-integral abutments and wall type piers.



Approved: 9/28/2018

Load Restrictions Description:

HL-93, Future Wearing Surface = 60
psf

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

Yes

If this bridge is a historic bridge, what type is it?

concrete filled spandrel arch

Remarks:

The structure was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1994. The structure will be replaced. See the Cultural Resources tab for more information on the Historic Structure and mitigation for the adverse effect this project will have on it.

41. Bridge Length (ft):	282
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
43. Max Span Length (ft):	76
44. Load Restrictions (TON):	150
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	30

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	No
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:

Construction will require closure of SR 51 for approximately 6 months. An official state route detour and a local detour will be provided.

A coordination meeting was held with officials in November 2017 in which the 6 month closure was discussed and agreed upon. (Project File, General, Maintenance of Traffic, Correspondence with Emergency and Public Services) Local emergency services and schools were also notified of the closure, asked for comments, and invited to the public meeting in the July 2018 letter. (Project File, Public Involvement, Project Information, Public Meeting Notification Project Area Mailing List)



Approved: 9/28/2018

Are there any Environmental Commitments? No

Right of Way and Utility Involvement

The project requires Permanent Right-of-Way Yes

The project requires Permanent Easement(s) Yes

The project requires Temporary Right-of-Way Yes

Number of parcels impacted by Permanent Right-of-Way: 7

Right of Way and Utility Involvement

Number of parcels impacted by Temporary Right-of-Way: 7

Approximate acreage of Permanent Right-of-Way needed: 0.808

Approximate acreage of Temporary Right-of-Way needed: 0.154

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:

Temporary and permanent right-of-way will be required for this project.

Utilities include:

Columbia Gas of Ohio, Toledo Edison, Village of Elmore, Frontier Communications, and Spectrum. (See Project file for coordination.)



Approved: 9/28/2018

Purpose & Need

Purpose & Need

Project History:

The project was initiated by the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) District 2 to improve this bridge across the Portage River since it is essential to the Village of Elmore and Harris Township in Ottawa County, Ohio as this structure is the only crossing of the river in the vicinity of the Village.

The existing historic OTT-51-0144 bridge was built in 1926 and is a three-span, reinforced concrete arch bridge with spandrel walls and earth fill. A study was performed in 2006 by Osborn Engineering Company that investigated alternatives to address the deteriorating bridge including rehabilitation and replacement alternatives. The study recommended the replacement alternative as the preferred alternative based upon the ability to address all of the structural deficiencies and the cost comparison of \$4.7M of rehabilitation and \$2.9M for replacement. However, due to the effect the replacement would have on the historic bridge, the overall bridge conditions (functionally and structurally sound) and the assertion that there was a feasible and prudent alternative to the replacement ODOT recommended that basic maintenance continue to be performed. ODOT District 2 would continue to evaluate the condition of the structure and maintenance needs.

The structure's condition was monitored by routine inspections per ODOT specifications. A rehabilitation study by DLZ was conducted in 2016 to investigate rehabilitation alternatives that would preserve the arch barrels, a character defining feature of the structure. Based on this study, the Office of Environmental Services (OES) coordinated an alternative with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that would remove the existing pavement, earth fill, and spandrel walls; widen all abutments and piers; and construct a new superstructure with arch-shaped precast fascia panels. On August 10, 2017, ODOT-OES issued a finding of No Adverse Effect for the undertaking in an Inter-Office Communication (IOC) to ODOT District 2. SHPO did not have any comments on this finding.

In August 2017, an assessment of the current condition of the bridge's concrete was conducted by ODOT District 2 as part of the design for the rehabilitation alternative. This assessment found more deterioration in the concrete piers than expected. On September 21, 2017, ODOT District 2 issued an IOC to ODOT OES which provided a brief comparison of rehabilitation and replacement alternatives reflecting the concrete conditions and selecting the replacement alternative as the preferred. A third Bridge Type Study was conducted in March 2018 by DLZ to identify the preferred bridge type for the complete replacement (haunched steel girder or prestressed concrete I-beam). This alternative was coordinated with the SHPO on October 3, 2018 as an Adverse Effect on the historic bridge. SHPO concurred with this finding on October 19, 2017.

Purpose Statement:

The purpose of the transportation improvement is to address facility deficiencies to maintain access and connectivity over the Portage River in Elmore, Ohio, and Harris Township in Ottawa County, Ohio.

Need Element(s):

The need for the project is facility deficiencies. The condition of the existing bridge was evaluated in accordance with state and federal guidelines. Based on regular inspections, bridges are assigned a general appraisal rating on a scale from 1 to 9, where 9 indicates excellent condition, 4 indicates poor condition, and 1 indicates imminent failure. Bridges are also given a sufficiency rating. The sufficiency rating is a general representation of the overall condition of the bridge. This rating ranges from 0 to 100, where a rating of 100 is entirely sufficient and 0 is considered deficient.

The most recent inspection was completed in June 2017. The current superstructure condition rating is 4 (poor). The current substructure condition rating is 5 (fair). The general appraisal of the bridge is 4 (poor). The sufficiency rating of the bridge is 48.9. A sufficiency rating of 50 is considered deficient. Deficiencies found during the inspection include: severely deteriorated railing, spalling sidewalk, severely spalling spandrel walls and arches with exposed reinforcing steel, and spalling substructure elements. The structure does not meet current safety standards for travel lane width, shoulder width, and crash tested bridge railings.

If these deficiencies are not addressed the structure could eventually be closed to all traffic, causing major transportation impacts to the Village of Elmore and the general travelling public.



Approved: 9/28/2018

Goals and Objectives:

A goal of the project is to increase multi-modal transportation by including bicycle facilities into any new bridge design.

Summary Statement:

In summary, the purpose of the transportation improvement is to address the facility deficiencies of the historic OTT-51-01.44 Bridge over the Portage River in Elmore, Ohio, in order to maintain access and connectivity within the Village of Elmore and Harris Township in Ottawa County, Ohio.

Logical Termini and Independent Utility:

The logical termini for the proposed project were established based on the existing facility deficiencies, identified in Bridge Inspection Reports, and a need to upgrade the bridge to current safety standards. These termini include Rice Street at the south end of the project, the Harris Street intersection and approximately 200 feet of Harris Street, the Luckey Avenue intersection and approximately 150 feet of Luckey Avenue, and State Route 105 at the north end of the project. The termini on the southern portion of the project are in the Village of Elmore and the termini on the northern portion are in Harris Township with the dividing line being the Portage River.

This project has independent utility since even if no additional improvements in the project area are made it will be necessary in order to correct a facility deficiency to maintain access and connectivity; and is not dependent on whether a bike lane is constructed to the north or to the south of the project.



Approved: 9/28/2018

Alternatives

Alternatives

Discuss No Build Alternative:

The No Build alternative involves only routine maintenance. It does not address the deficient structure, railings, or sidewalk. Deficiencies found during the inspection include: severely deteriorated railing, spalling sidewalk, severely spalling spandrel walls and arches with exposed reinforcing steel, and spalling substructure elements. The structure does not meet current safety standards for travel lane width, shoulder width, and crash tested bridge railings. The standard travel lane width is 12-feet, existing bridge 9-15-feet. The standard paved shoulder width is 4-feet, the existing bridge is 0.5-4.5 feet. The standard sidewalk width is 5-feet, the existing bridge is 3.5-feet on the east side and none on the west side. This alternative does not meet the project's Purpose & Need.

Multiple Bridge Type Studies (also called Feasibility Studies) have been done, and are included in the project file.

Was a Feasibility Study completed?

Yes

Date Feasibility Study was approved:

03/29/2018

Was an Alternative Evaluation Report (AER) completed?

No

Alternatives Considered

Name	Description	Reason Dismissed	Preferred Alternative
Rehabilitate bridge 2006	widen to meet current design standards for bridge & sidewalks	Allowed cantilever width which does not address sidewalk & bridge width deficiency nor does it meet 2018 standard, therefore was dismissed.	No
Replace bridge 2006	replace existing historic bridge with bridge that meets current design standards	Initially selected as preferred, but due to impacts to the historic bridge, this was dismissed and the bridge was monitored.	No
Rehabilitate bridge 1 2016	new 3-span prestressed concrete box beam superstructure over existing bridge	Selected as preferred design in 2016, however due to poorer than expected condition of concrete during next inspection, this alternative as dismissed.	No



Approved: 9/28/2018

Rehabilitate bridge 2 2016	new 3-span continuous steel beam superstructure over existing bridge	A steel superstructure requires raising bridge elevation which requires additional right-of-way impacts.	No
Replace bridge 1 2018	new 3-span haunched steel girder bridge	Steel is more susceptible to corrosion, requires temporary supports during erection of beams, and has no possibility for aesthetics.	No
Replace bridge 2 2018	new 3-span prestressed concrete I beam bridge	Not dismissed	Yes

Discuss Reasons Alternative Identified as Preferred was selected:

Multiple Bridge Type Studies (also called Feasibility Studies) have been done and are included in the project file.

A study was performed in 2006 by the Osborn Engineering Company that investigated alternatives to address the deteriorating bridge including rehabilitation and replacement alternatives. The study recommended the replacement alternative as the preferred alternative based upon the ability to address all of the structural deficiencies and the cost comparison of \$4.7M for rehabilitation and \$2.9 for replacement. However, due to the effect the replacement would have on the historic bridge, the overall bridge conditions (functional and structurally sound) and the assertion that there was a feasible and prudent alternative to replacement ODOT recommended that basic maintenance continue to be performed. ODOT District 2 would continue to evaluate the condition of the structure and maintenance needs.

The structure's condition was monitored by routine inspections per ODOT specifications. A rehabilitation study by DLZ was conducted in 2016 to investigate rehabilitation alternatives that would preserve the arch barrels, a character defining feature of the structure. Based on this study, the Office of Environmental Services (OES) coordinated an alternative with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that would remove the existing pavement, earth fill, and spandrel walls; widen all abutments and piers, and construct a new superstructure with arch-shaped precast fascia panels.

In August 2017, an assessment of the current condition of the bridge's concrete was conducted by ODOT District 2 as part of the design for the rehabilitation alternative. This assessment found more deterioration in the concrete piers than expected. On September 21, 2017 ODOT District 2 issued an IOC to ODOT-OES which provided a brief comparison of rehabilitation and replacement alternatives reflecting the concrete conditions and selecting the replacement alternative as the preferred. A third Bridge Type Study was conducted in March 2018 by DLZ to identify the preferred bridge type for the complete replacement. The prestressed concrete I-beam bridge design was selected as the preferred alternative. The cost difference between the two designs considered was within the margin of error. The preferred alternative design does not require temporary beam supports, is not prone to corrosion, and the precast concrete fascia panels would offer opportunities for aesthetic enhancements to the structure. The preferred alternative meets the project's Purpose and Need.

- *The Feasibility Studies/Bridge Type Studies may be found in the project file under General/Bridge Design*



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	No
The proposed project involves adding capacity, a new interchange, relocating thru lanes significantly closer to sensitive areas, or expanding an intermodal center	No
Design Year ADT is <140,000	Yes

Remarks:

This project does not add capacity, a new interchange, or a new road on new alignment. Hence, this project will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of the existing facility, or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions impacts relative to the no-build alternative. FHWA has determined that these types of projects will generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. Consequently, this effort is exempt from analysis for MSATs.

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 Ottawa County which is not a PM2.5 maintenance or non-attainment area, therefore no PM2.5 analysis is required.

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	No

Remarks:

Ottawa County is in not in an MPO area, so the project is not listed in a TIP; however, the project is listed in the Statewide TIP (State Line Item 32). The project is not located in an ozone maintenance or non-attainment area. No analysis is required.

Environmental Commitments



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab
Approved: 9/28/2018

Are there any environmental commitments?

No



Approved: 9/28/2018

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:

This project is not a Type 1 project for noise, i.e. does not add capacity, a new highway on new location, significantly change the horizontal or vertical alignment, or add an auxiliary land, therefore, a noise analysis is not required.

Environmental Commitments

Are there any environmental commitments? No



Approved: 9/28/2018

ESA

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

ESA

ESA Screening Report was completed by District Staff No

Date of ESA Screening IOC from OES: 07/18/2018

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

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

Site Name	Address	Phase 1 Required?	Phase 2 Required?	Plan Note Required?
Site 8	365 Rice Street	No	No	Yes
Site 12	409 Rice Street	No	No	Yes

Remarks:

Lawhon & Associates, Inc. conducted Regulated Materials Review (RMR) for the project corridor in July 2018 which was conducted in accordance with the Ohio Department of Transportation Office of Environmental Services (ODOT-OES) Guidance (2017). As a result of this review, two sites warranted a PCS Plan Note. ODOT District 2 issued an email dated July 18, 2018 stating agreement with the recommendation.

- The RMR can be found in the Project File under ESA/Reports
- Correspondence from OES can be found in the Project File under ESA/Project Information

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



Approved: 9/28/2018

Cultural Resources

Cultural Properties Present

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

A Section 106 Scoping Request was prepared by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. on July 3, 2017. The request for review provided mapping showing the project area and proposed improvements, a photographic log of the project area and a records check. The records check included a review of electronic data from the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OSHP) to identify properties within the project area listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), Ohio Archaeological Inventory (OAI) sites, Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) buildings and structures. One historic bridge (OTT 51 1.44), SFN 6201202 was identified in the project area. The bridge is listed on the NRHP 94000239. There is one recorded historic structure on the north side of Rice Street and one archaeological site OT0128 located 580 feet northeast of the project area.

The listed bridge is eligible under Criterion C for Engineering; it is one of the earliest bridges designed by architect David Henry Overman with the Ohio Highway Department, Beginning in the mid-1920s he introduced and refined the artistry in bridge design and construction. Gluss Brothers of Hamilton, Ohio were the bridge builders.

No significant archaeological resources will be affected by the proposed project. No further archaeological investigations are recommended.

Based upon the scope of work, literature search, and the Section 106 Request for Review, the bridge work has minimal potential to impact properties listed or eligible for the NRHP beyond the OTT 51 1.44 Elmore Bridge footprint.

- The RFR can be found in the project file under Cultural Resources/Project Information

Based on the letter or IOC you received from OES, is there an eligible or listed NRHP Historic Property in the Area of Potential Effects Pursuant to 36 CFR part 800?

Yes

OES/OSHPD Concurrence Date:

10/19/2017

Remarks:

ODOT OES provided an IOC dated August 10, 2017 addressing history/architecture and archaeological effects for the Elmore Bridge rehabilitation project. The IOC states that in accordance with Stipulation 4C of the Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Ohio Historical Society, State Historic Preservation Office, and the State of Ohio, Department of Transportation Regarding the Implementation of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in Ohio (Agreement No. 16734) executed on November 30, 2011, amended on June 7, 2016, and in accordance with 36 CFR Section 800.5(b), ODOT-OES has determined that the project will have "no adverse effect" to the National Register listed Elmore Bridge (aka SR 51 Bridge in Elmore over the Portage River).

This completes the Section 106 review by ODOT-OES and no further cultural resource investigations are required. SHPO was provided a 15-day comment period and no comments or objections were provided.

On September 21, 2017, the ODOT District 2 notified ODOT-OES via an IOC that the preferred alternative for the listed Elmore Bridge project is now the replacement of the structure. Subsequent structural analysis determined the rehabilitation alternative had too many unknowns and would only save a small portion of the existing arches.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

On October 3, 2017, in accordance with CFR 800.5(a)(1) ODOT-OES Cultural Resources Staff determined that the proposed bridge replacement project would result in an adverse effect upon the historic bridge due removal and are requesting concurrence on the following:

- The replacement of the National Register-listed Elmore Bridge (SFN 6201202) would constitute an adverse effect to a historic structure.
- No additional National Register-qualified history/architecture properties are located within the APE.
- No further archaeological studies are considered necessary due to the disturbed nature of the area of potential effect.

SHPO provided concurrence with this finding on October 19, 2017.

On April 4, 2018, in accordance with CFR 800.3(c)(4) and 800.11(e), documentation of the adverse effect was forwarded to the Advisory Council for Historic Preservation (ACHP) to determine their participation in resolving the adverse effects. On April 16, 2018, ACHP notified ODOT-OES of its decision not to participate in the consultation process.

In June & July 2018 ODOT-OES staff met with SHPO and the Consulting Parties to work through the Section 106 consultation process, address concerns, and develop the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA).

On August 14, 2018 an MOA was executed between SHPO and ODOT, with Carol Baker (Consulting Party) and the Village of Elmore as concurring parties for the Adverse Effect. Stipulations contained in the executed MOA are included as environmental commitments below.

This concludes the Section 106 Review process.

Please check all NRHP Eligible and/or Listed resources:

Bridge

What is the Section 106 effect determination in the OES letter or IOC?	Adverse Effect
Does this project have an Adverse Effect on Archaeological resources?	No
Does this project have an Adverse Effect on History/Architecture resources?	Yes

Archaeological Resource Adverse Effect

History/Architecture Adverse Effect

Date OSHPO Concurred with Adverse Effect determination:	10/19/2017
Date Documentation for Consultation was sent, including MOA and data recovery plan (if necessary)	
ACHP:	09/06/2018
OSHPO:	09/06/2018
FHWA:	
Did you contact any other Consulting Parties?	Yes
Consulting Parties	



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

Additional Party Name	Documentation Date:
Carol Baker	12/21/2016
Elmore Historical Society	05/24/2016

Date of Advisory Council on Historic Preservation response: 09/14/2018

Is Advisory Council on Historic Preservation participating? No

Date MOA was executed: 08/14/2018

Environmental Commitments

Are there any Environmental Commitments? Yes



Ecological

ESR

Has an ESR been completed? Yes

Date ESR was completed: 07/17/2018

Wetlands

Are Wetlands Present? Yes

Are Any Wetlands impacted? Yes

Has a Wetland Delineation been made? Yes

Has the wetland Jurisdictional Determination been made? No

Identified Wetlands

Wetland ID	ORAM Category	Type	Est Total Size (Acres)	Est Impact (Acres)
Wetland A	2	Non-Isolated	0.22	0.002
Wetland B	2	Non-Isolated	0.02	0.019
Wetland C	2	Non-Isolated	0.007	0.007
Wetland D	2	Non-Isolated	0.005	0.005
Wetland E	1	Non-Isolated	0.021	0.021
Wetland F	2	Non-Isolated	0.43	0.029

Est. Total Size (Acres) of for Project: 0.703

Est. Total Impacted (Acres) of for Project: 0.083

Total Acres of Non-Isolated Wetlands impacted: 0.083

Total Acres of Isolated Wetlands impacted: 0

Remarks:

A Level 1 Ecological Survey Report (ESR) dated July 17, 2018 was prepared by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. Based on the results of the investigations, six wetlands were identified within the proposed project area and all six will be impacted by the project (see the table above).

- Wetland A is a Modified Category 2 wetland abutting the Portage River
- Wetland B is a Modified Category 2 wetland abutting the Portage River
- Wetland C is a Modified Category 2 wetland abutting the Portage River
- Wetland D is a Modified Category 2 wetland abutting the Portage River
- Wetland E is a Category 1 wetland abutting the Portage River



Approved: 9/28/2018

- Wetland F is a Category 2 wetland abutting the Portage River

The 'Do Nothing' alternative would not satisfy the purpose and need of the project to address the deficient structure and would result in serious impacts to the traveling public and the general welfare of the economy of the area. Avoidance of the wetland locations will be performed to the maximum extent practicable. Wetland avoidance would result in unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems. Mitigation for wetland impacts will be performed per the requirements of the waterway permit.

- The Wetland Finding can be found in the project file under Ecological/Project Information
- The ESR can be found in the project file under Ecological/Reports

Streams & Rivers

	Present:	Impacted:
Streams and Rivers:	Yes	Yes
National Scenic River:	No	
State Scenic River:	No	
Sec 9:	No	
Sec 10:	No	

Impacted Streams and Rivers

Stream Name	Total Linear feet Impacted	QHEI	Aquatic Life Use Designation
Portage River	136	62	Warm Water Habitat (WWH)

Total Linear feet Impacted:

136

Remarks:

Based on the results of the Level 1 ESR investigations, one stream was identified in the proposed project area (see table above). The impacts are anticipated to consist of placement of fill materials within the stream channel of the river and placement of materials on the river banks to prepare for construction of the new bridge and removal of the existing bridge. The placement of fill material will likely consist of rock channel protection, and other various clean non-erodible fill materials necessary for the construction of temporary work pads, support abutments, and stream bank protection in the vicinity of construction activities.

- Portage River: flows to Lake Erie

Impacts to the stream will be permitted and mitigated per the requirements of 404/401 Clean Water Act (see the Permitting tab for more information).

Other Surface Waters



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

	Present:	Impacted:
Reservoirs:	No	
Lakes:	No	
Ponds:	No	
Storm Water Management Facility:	No	
Jurisdictional Ditch:	No	
Other (If selected please explain in remarks):	No	

Remarks:

Based on the results of the Level 1 ESR investigations, no other surface waters were identified within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area.

Terrestrial Habitat

	Present:	Impacted:
Terrestrial Habitat:	Yes	Yes
Unique or high Quality:	No	

Remarks:

Based on the results of the Level 1 ESR investigations, terrestrial habitat within the proposed project area consists of common mixed vegetation and trees and includes Marsh (wetland dominated by submergent, floating, and/or emergent vegetation), Developed, High Intensity (apartment complexes, rowhouses, and commercial/industrial), Floodplain Forest dominated by trees, Developed Open Space (mowed right-of-way, single family housing, parks, etc.), Developed, Medium Intensity (mixture of constructed materials and vegetation, most commonly single family units), and Open Water. A total of 3.6085 acres of terrestrial habitat will be impacted, of which 0.0654 acres is Floodplain Forest.

No unique or high quality terrestrial habitats occur within the proposed project area.

Threatened or Endangered Species

	Present:	Impacted:
Within the known range of a Federal Species?	Yes	No
Federal Species/habitat found within the project area?	Yes	Yes
Within the known range of a State Species?	Yes	No
State Species/habitat found within the project area?	Yes	No

Remarks:



Approved: 9/28/2018

The proposed project is within the known range of the following federally (F) listed threatened and endangered species. According to the ODNR Ohio Heritage Program (OHD) review, the project is within 1 mile of the known range of the following state (S) listed threatened and endangered species.

- Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalists*) - F
- Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) - F
- Kirkland's Warbler (*Dendroica kirklandii*) - F
- Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*) - F
- Rufa red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*) - F
- Eastern Massasauga (*Sistrurus catenatus*) - F
- Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid (*Plantanthera leucophaea*) - F
- Lakeside Daisy (*Hymenoxys herbacea*) - F
- Lake Erie Watersnake (*Nerodia sipedon insularum*) - F
- Western Banded Killifish (*Fundulus diaphanous menona*) - S

The project is also within the known range of the following federal and state listed species of concern:

- Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) - F
- Banding's Turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*) - S
- Cattle Egret (*Bubulcus ibis*) - S
- Common Tern (*Sterna hirundo*) - S
- Upland Sandpiper (*Bartramia longicauda*) - S
- Northern Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*) - S

For the Indiana bat, approximately 0.3059 acres of suitable wooded habitat (SWH) are expected to be impacted by this project. All 0.3059 acres of the SWH are within 100' of the road. Review of ODNR's NHD did not identify a capture within five (5) miles of the proposed project area. This project meets CC1-b and *may affect, not likely to adversely affect* this species.

For the Northern long-eared bat, suitable habitat similar to the Indiana bat was identified. This species also prefers man-made structures and caves. No caves were identified within the proposed project area and no man-made structures besides the bridge will be removed. This project meets CC1-b and *may affect, not likely to adversely affect* this species.

For the Kirkland's warbler, suitable stop-over habitat may exist within the wooded riparian corridor abutting the Portage River, as well as the wooded lot in the northeast portion of the study area. The proposed project area is 14.3 miles from Lake Erie, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.

For the Piping plover, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.

For the Rufa red knot, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.

For the Eastern Massasauga, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.

For the Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

For the Lakeside Daisy, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.

For the Lake Erie Watersnake, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.

For the Western Banded Killifish, suitable habitat exists within the project area and the ODNR NHD has records of this species within a mile of the project area. This project is not likely to affect this species or its habitat.

For the Bald Eagle, suitable foraging habitat was identified within the project area. Review of the NHD did not identify any known records near the project area. No nesting activity is reported within 0.5 miles of the project area. No impacts to this species or its habitat are anticipated.

For the Banding's turtle, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area, therefore no impacts are anticipated to this species or its habitat.

For the Cattle Egret, suitable habitat exists within the project area. Due to the transient nature of the species, it is *not likely to be impacted* by the project.

For the Common Tern, suitable habitat may exist within the project area. Due to the small size of the islands and the lack of beaches, the species is *not likely to be impacted* by the project.

For the Upland Sandpiper, suitable habitat may exist near the project area, however, no suitable habitat was identified within the project area. The species is *not likely to be impacted* by the project.

For the Northern Harrier, suitable foraging habitat may exist within the project area, however, no suitable nesting habitat was identified. The species is *not likely to be impacted* by the project.

On August 2, 2016 the bridge carrying SR 51 over the Portage River was inspected and no nesting birds or peregrine falcons were observed.

Agency Coordination

	Coordination Required:	Comments Received Date:
Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR):	Yes	08/27/2018
United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS):	Yes	08/16/2018
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA):	No	
United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE):	No	
ODNR State Scenic River:	No	
National Park Service (NPS) National Scenic River:	No	

Remarks:

Coordination under the February 29, 2016 Framework Programmatic Biological Opinion was submitted to USFWS on July 31, 2018.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

The USFWS concurred on August 16, 2018 that the project falls under the CC1-b category of impacts which *may affect, not likely to adversely affect* the Indiana bat and the Northern long-eared bat provided ODOT adheres to clearing any trees only between the dates of October 1 and March 31; minimizes tree removal, the project footprint, aquatic resource impacts, and forested upland habitat impacts. A plan note has been added.

A coordination email was sent to ODNR on July 31, 2018. ODNR concurred on **August 27, 2018** with tree cutting restrictions; and that a mussel survey is required prior to in-stream work. ODNR almost indicated that the Portage River is in the process of being designated as a River Trail, requiring 4(f) coordination. See Section 4(f) tab.

Coordination with ODNR and USFWS also occurred in 2017; however, changes to the project footprint required coordination to occur again in 2018. Both sets of coordination can be found in the project file.

Are there any environmental commitments?

Yes



Approved: 9/28/2018

Other Resources

Farmlands

Farmlands

The proposed project is located within an Urbanized Area No

The proposed project is located within a Non-Urbanized Area Yes

The proposed project involves new permanent right-of-way (ROW) Yes

The proposed project involves temporary ROW Yes

The proposed project is a type of action listed below and meets allowable ROW thresholds: Bridge replacement requiring ROW of three (3) acres or less to accommodate bridge piers, wingwalls, and/or approach work Widening requiring linear strip ROW of 10 acres or less per linear mile Intersection improvement requiring ROW of three (3) acres or less Yes

Undeveloped land being used for construction purposes is protected by a conservation easement No

Undeveloped land being used for temporary ROW will be returned to equal or greater productive capability upon completion of the proposed project Yes

Based on the scope and type of work, the proposed project is in compliance with the executed Farmland Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the FPPA, and 7 CFR 658. Completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (FCIR) Form is not warranted. No further coordination is required.

OES Concurrence Date

NRCS Approval Date

Land being used for the proposed project is part of an Agricultural District No

Remarks:

Based upon review of appropriate mapping, the proposed project is located in a non-urbanized area. Based on the scope and type of work, 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. Furthermore, right-of-way needed to facilitate construction activities is not from land designated as Agricultural District. Therefore, completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (FCIR) Form was not warranted and no further coordination is required.

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



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

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

Specify Source Water Protection Area

Wellhead Protection Area: Yes

Emergency Management Zone: No

Bellevue Castalia Karst Plain: No

Lake Erie: No

Ohio River: No

Other: No

Coordination with the Local Public Water Administrator is required Yes

	Present:	Impacted:
Residential Wells are present	Yes	No

Remarks:

The Ohio EPA Division of Drinking and Ground Waters mapping tool was used to identify the presence of drinking water resources within the project study area. The map indicates that the project lies within the Source Water Protection Area of Luckey Homestead Farms AMLC non community water system and the Source Water Protection Area of the Village of Elmore's drinking water protection area. There are no other public water system wells, intakes, non-transient, non-community Water Systems or transient non-community water systems within 1/4 mile of the project area. The project area does not lie over a Federally-designated sole source aquifer. A plan note will be added to protect the drinking water supplies.

On July 7, 2017, a letter was sent to the Village of Elmore Water Department to provide project information and to provide the Village an opportunity to comment on the drinking water protections to be included in the project plans. A response has not been received.

A search of the ODNR Division of Soil and Water Well Logs identified three residential drinking water wells located within 1/4mile of the project location. This project should have no impact on these drinking water resources.

- Drinking water source maps and local correspondence may be found in the project file at Other Resources/Drinking Water.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes



Approved: 9/28/2018

Section 4(f)

Section 4(f) Determination

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

Yes

Concurrence received from the OWJ

Yes

Were there multiple OWJs?

Yes

OWJs

Name	Date concurrence received
Village of Elmore	07/25/2018
Ohio Department of Natural Resource	09/25/2018

	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	Yes

Identified Section 4(f) Properties

Identified 4(f) Properties

Property Name	Type	Permanent ROW/Easement Acres	Temporary ROW/Easement Acres	4(f) finding	Date
Harry Witty Memorial Park	Publicly owned Park	0	0.147	Temporary No Use Exception - 774.13(d)	09/27/2018
OTT-51-1.44 Bridge over Portage River	Historic Site	0	0	Historic Bridge	08/14/2018
Portage River Water Trail	Publicly owned Recreational Facility and/or Area	0	0	Temporary No Use Exception - 774.13(d)	09/27/2018

Remarks:

Mapping and research identified three 4(f) recreational resources in the project area.

Harry Witty Memorial Park - is a 1-acre park owned and maintained by the Village of Elmore. The park facilities include a gazebo and benches. Approximately 0.147-acres of temporary right-of-way will be



Approved: 9/28/2018

required from the Park for slope work and access adjacent to the new bridge. The sidewalk from Toledo Street (SR 51) into the Park will be relocated to accommodate the slope from the new bridge. The gazebo will not be impacted.

On August 27, 2018 ODNR in responding to the ecological coordination indicated that the Portage River is in the process of being designated as a Water Trail. The process will likely be complete in early 2020. Since this project is scheduled for construction in 2020, the river will be considered a Section 4(f) resource at that time.

A Section 4(f)/6(f) Determination Request Form for Recreational Properties was prepared by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. and submitted on August 6, 2018. In correspondence dated September 27, 2018, ODOT-OES Policy Staff 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 associated with Harry Witty Memorial Park and the Portage River Water Trail will not constitute a use upon the protected recreational activities, features, or attributes.

- The DRF can be found in the project file under Section 4(f)/Reports
- Correspondence from ODOT-OES can be found in the project file under Section 4(f)/Coordination

The OTT 51 (Toledo Street) bridge over the Portage River is listed on the NRHP and the removal of the existing bridge will be an adverse affect. Measures to minimize harm have been incorporated into the project and are detailed in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) executed August 14, 2018 and as environmental commitments under Cultural Resources.

A Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation for Projects That Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges was prepared by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. and ODOT-OES Cultural Resources Staff. In correspondence dated August 14, 2018, in accordance with 23 CFR 774, ODOT OES has established that:

- The use of the Programmatic Evaluation is appropriate;
- The proposed measures to minimize harm are acceptable; and
- The assessment of impacts is appropriate.

All documentation related to coordination and correspondence activities associated with these findings can be found in the project file under Section 4(f)/Coordination and Section 4(f)/Reports.

Are there any environmental commitments?

Yes



Section 6(f)

Section 6(f) Determination

	Present:	Impacted:
6(f) Properties:	No	

Remarks:

The US Department of the Interior Land and Water Conservation Fund grant list at <https://www.lwcfc coalition.com/tools> was reviewed to determine if any LWC funds were used on properties within the project area. There are no Section 6(f) resources in the project area.

- The Section 6(f) grant list can be found in the project file under Section 6(f)/Project Information

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 proposed project is consistent with local plans, including the Harris Township Land Use Plan, readopted in 2014. The project is not expected to change development patterns in the area.

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

Remarks:

The project is not expected to result in any negative impacts to community cohesion. There may be temporary community connection impacts with the closure of the bridge during construction. These impacts will be resolved when the new bridge opens.

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

Remarks:

The proposed improvements will not result in a reasonably foreseeable secondary or cumulative impact. The proposed pedestrian and bike improvements and bridge aesthetics that are part of the project are expected to have positive impacts on the local community.

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:

Substantial impacts will not occur to health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, or public transportation facilities. Emergency services, schools, and the public were involved during the project development process and will also be notified of the closure associated with construction. A local detour will be provided, as well as, an official ODOT State Route detour. Residents and businesses near the project area will experience temporary impacts during construction; however, safety for the public utilizing this facility will be improved in the long run. See General/Maintenance of Traffic for more details.

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

Remarks:

There will be no residential, business, agricultural or institutional displacements as a result of the project.

Are there any Environmental Commitments? No



Underserved Populations

Underserved Populations

Identified Underserved Populations

Census Block Group #	% Minority	% Low Income
391230509004	6	15
391230509005	5	24

Are Underserved Populations located within and/or adjacent to the proposed project area? Yes

Are there any relocations? No

Will there be changes to access? No

Will the proposed project result in unanticipated additional impacts to any Underserved Populations? No

Were any concerns related to impacts on Environmental Justice Populations or any other unique factors that could result in a disproportionately high and adverse effect raised during public involvement? No

Were any concerns related to impacts on Title VI Populations or any other unique factors that could result in a disparate impact raised during Public Involvement? No

Were any concerns or any other unique factors that could result in an impact to any of the other Underserved Populations (Limited English Proficiency, Older Adults, or Individuals with Disabilities) raised during Public Involvement? No

Remarks:

According to the ODOT's Transportation Information Management System (TIMS), the UP population percentages are low in the project area. The Minority population ranges from 5 to 6 percent. The Low Income population ranges from 15 to 24 percent. The older adult population ranges from 24 to 14 percent and the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is zero percent population.

The proposed project will require closure of the bridge during construction, thereby requiring a detour of all pedestrian and vehicular traffic during construction. A detour to the North Coast Inland Trail bridge just upstream from the bridge to be replaced will be provided and signs installed appropriately to direct pedestrians. The detour is approximately 3,500 feet long. The new bridge will include a 6' sidewalk on the northbound side and a 10' bike lane on the southbound side which will improve the pedestrian accessibility after construction is complete.

Underserved Populations were involved as part of the public involvement process and offered the opportunity to comment on the project through the ODOT website/Facebook page, at public meetings, and were provided information on who to contact to express concerns. The public meeting invitation letters also included project information were sent to property owners, residents, and businesses within the proposed project area, as well as stakeholders, local governmental officials, and organizations, and were included within the Village of Elmore water utility bill. The public meeting invitation letters outlined the status of the



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

project, a project summary, ongoing environmental investigation activities, an invitation to the upcoming public meeting, and contact information. In addition, the public meetings were covered by the local print and television media. Flyers and letters requesting the flyer be hung up and announced during gathers were also sent to community venues, as shown in the project file. No comments have been received or issues raised concerning the project's impacts to Underserved Populations.

The proposed project will have no disproportionately high and adverse effects to minority or low-income populations or disparate impacts to a Title VI population based upon the table above, the attached mapping, and the answers to the questions above. No concerns related to impacts on Environmental Justice or Title VI populations were raised as a result of public involvement activities conducted as part of the proposed project. Therefore, in accordance with the protections of Executive Order 12898, FHWA Order 6640.23A and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, no further analysis is required.

The proposed project will have no substantial impacts to Limited English Proficiency, Older Adults, and Individuals with Disabilities Populations based upon the table above, the attached mapping, and the answers to the questions above. No concerns related to impacts on these Underserved Populations were raised as a result of public involvement activities conducted as part of the proposed project. Therefore, in accordance with the protections of the Age Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Discrimination Act of 1975, Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and Executive Order 13166, no further analysis is required.

Based on the above findings an Underserved Populations Impact Analysis Report is not required.

- Census mapping can be found in the project file under Underserved Populations/Project Information
- All Pubic Involvement documentation and correspondence can be found in the project file under Public Involvement/Project Information

Are there any Environmental Commitments?

No



Approved: 9/28/2018

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)

Property owner notification letters were sent on August 31, 2016 and May 18, 2017 to notify property owners of the project and the planned field work associated with the project. The letters included project information and the opportunity for the public to comment on the project. No comments were received.

A public meeting was held on October 27, 2016. A meeting announcement was sent to adjacent property owners. A meeting announcement was sent with the October Village of Elmore Water Department monthly bills. The meeting was held at the Elmore Community Center, 410 Clinton Street, Elmore, Ohio. The purpose of the meeting was to present the project and the alternatives considered for the rehabilitation of the bridge. Eighty-six people attended the public meeting representing the public, adjacent property owners, village and township officials, businesses, and the media.

Project meeting information and the opportunity to comment were posted on the ODOT District 2 website following the meeting.

The Public Involvement Plan was approved by ODOT District 2 on May 22, 2018.

A public meeting was held on August 22, 2018. A meeting announcement was sent July 27, 2018 to adjacent property owners. A meeting flyer was sent on July 27, 2018 to local police, fire departments, Village of Elmore, Harris Township, library, and local churches. A meeting announcement was sent with the August Village of Elmore Water Department monthly bills. Press releases were issued by ODOT on July 25, 2018 and August 20, 2018. The meeting was held at the Elmore Community Center, 410 Clinton Street, Elmore, Ohio. The purpose of the project was to present the change in the preferred alternative from rehabilitation to replacement with a closure. Seventy-five people attended the meeting representing the public, village and township officials, businesses, and the media.

Project meeting information and the opportunity to comment were posted on the ODOT District 2 website following the meeting.

Public Involvement materials can be found in the project file under Public Involvement/Project Information.

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

Is there any substantial environmental controversy on environmental grounds? No

Please summarize the Public Involvement responses received.



Approved: 9/28/2018

The comment period was from October 27-December 1, 2016. Sixteen written comments were received at and following the meeting. Comments included concern for including a bike path on the bridge; support for demolition of the bridge; relocate SR 51 to bypass Elmore with exit to village; old drainage tile concerns; mast arms for signals at Toledo & Rice Streets; speed limits; need more explanation of signals to control traffic on the one lane of traffic maintained on the bridge during construction; concern for Harris Street site distance; emergency access during construction; close Luckey Avenue permanently; overhanging utility lines; will bridge traffic be limited to local only during construction; snow removal issue; poor condition of another section of SR 51; business owner would like Harris Street to remain open during construction; build new bridge to the east; support for the project; and access to the Harris Township property.

ODOT responded to each comment on December 29, 2016 by letter or email. Responses included importance of connectivity to village, ODOT must follow the Section 106 review process, evaluating concerns related to the bike path on the bridge, will evaluate mast arms, speed limits set by code, explain the one lane traffic signals, investigating Harris Street site distance & if possible to keep it open during all of construction, discuss drainage with owner separately, explained timing of real estate, investigating overhanging utilities, bridge will be open to all traffic during construction, and ODOT will continue to meet with village and township regarding emergency access and other concerns. The drainage & snow removal issues will be referred to ODOT Maintenance. Other issues not directly related to project will be addressed separately.

The second comment period was from August 22-September 21, 2018. Twenty-one written comments were received at and following the meeting. Comments included preferences for various beam colors, concrete colors, pier patterns, and railing types; several see no need for the bike lane on the bridge; like lookouts prefer on both sides of the bridge; leave exhibits with local officials for display; concern for truck turning radii at Toledo & Rice Streets; complete construction by 2020/2021 school year; keep existing safety features at Rice & Toledo Streets; not like complete closure for construction is bad for village; build new bridge near the existing Trail bridge and use in combination for bikes, cars, & trucks; add reduce speed limit sign coming into village; barrier for bike lane an obstacle for farm equipment; and need (to keep) separate bike & pedestrian traffic from vehicular traffic. Several phone calls were received seeking general project information, which was provided.

ODOT responded to each comment on September 25, 2018. Responses included explanation that the bike lane is part of a goal to make Ohio's roadways bike and pedestrian friendly, bridges are often pinch points on roadways for bikes and pedestrians, ODOT's is working to include a bike lane where possible on new bridges; the Village of Elmore will make the final decision on the aesthetics; it is not possible to rehabilitate the existing bridge; the purpose of the overlooks is for the bike and pedestrian users to view the river without being a distraction; provided contact info for possible webcam; ODOT will double check the turning radii at the Rice and Toledo Streets intersection; construction is planned for the bridge to be open for the beginning of the 2020/2021 school year; will review speed limit signage; explained that the 12' travel lane and 4' shoulder meet ODOT's design standard for farm equipment; and confirmed that a low concrete barrier with railing is planned to separate the bike lane and the sidewalk from vehicular traffic.

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):

Nationwide Permit (NWP):

Section 404 Individual Permit:

Section 10 Permit:

Ohio EPA

Section 401 Water Quality Certification:

Level 1 General Isolated Wetland Permit:

Level 2 Individual Isolated Wetland Permit:

Level 3 individual Isolated Wetland Permit:

US Coast Guard

Section 9 Coordination:

Section 9 Bridge Permit:

ODNR

Shore Structure Permit :

Remarks:

The project proposes work below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of the Portage River and within wetlands; therefore a waterway permit is required. The Waterway Permit Determination and permitting process shall be started after the Stage 2 design has been completed. No work shall occur below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of the Portage River or within wetlands until the waterway permits have been received. Special Provisions will be provided once permits from the USACE and OEPA are obtained and attached to the plans. Mitigation for wetland and stream impacts will be performed per the requirements of the waterway permit.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes

Storm Water Permits



Approved: 9/28/2018

NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI): Yes

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

Remarks:

The proposed improvements will result in greater than one acre of earth-disturbing construction activities that require submittal of a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the OEPA requesting coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for storm water discharges. The NOI will be jointly completed by ODOT and the contractor prior to the start of construction, following the ODOT standard procedures.

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 09/17/2017

Remarks:

Based upon review of the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. on June 7, 2018, the proposed project is located in a regulated floodplain (FIRM Community Panel 39123C0206C).

Floodplain coordination was initiated on September 19, 2017, as shown in the project file.

ODOT Floodplain Statement of Findings was posted to the ODOT District 2 website on September 20, 2018. No comments have been received.

ODOT standard procedures shall be followed to complete the floodplain permitting process prior to plan package being submitted.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

Landfills

Is a 2713 Permit required? No

Remarks:

Based upon ESA studies conducted by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. there are no landfills located within the project area. No permit is required.

Are there any environmental commitments? No



Environmental Commitments

ESA

1) The Project Designer shall include a plan note for Petroleum Contaminated Soils (PCS) in the project plans for two sites: 365 Rice Street and 409 Rice Street.

Cultural Resources

1) ODOT District 2 Environmental Coordinator shall ensure that Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) forms will be completed or updated as warranted for all pre-1969 buildings along Rice Street between Toledo Street and Maple Street. The SHPO and consulting party shall be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the forms prior to approval.

2) ODOT District 2 Environmental Coordinator shall ensure: 1) that context and images for a commemorative plaque include information from the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Nomination Form Reference #94000239; 2) that the plaque design and location information are included in the final design plans; 3) that the SHPO and consulting party will be provided an opportunity to review the text, renderings, and plaque location prior to the design being finalized; and 4) that the plaque is created and installed according to the final design plans.

3) ODOT District 2 Environmental Coordinator shall ensure that the project team works with the public to identify aesthetic elements to be incorporated into the bridge design and that the elements are incorporated into the final design plans prior to plan package being submitted to Estimating.

4) ODOT District 2 Environmental Coordinator shall ensure that SHPO and the consulting party are provided an opportunity to the final bridge design plans prior to plan package being submitted to Estimating.

Ecological

1) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following note into the plans: The project is located within the known habitat ranges of the federally listed and protected Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat. No trees shall be removed under this project from April 1 through September 30. All necessary tree removal shall occur from October 1 through March 31. This requirement is necessary to avoid and minimize impacts to these species as required by the Endangered Species Act. For the purposes of this note, a tree is defined as a live, dying, or dead woody plant, with a trunk three inches or greater in diameter at a height of 4.5 feet above the ground surface, and with a minimum height of 13 feet.

2) The ODOT District 2 Environmental Coordinator shall ensure a mussel survey and, if necessary, a mussel relocation, shall occur at the project site in accordance with the current USFWS/ODNR Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol. No work shall occur below the Ordinary High Water Mark of the river until the mussel survey/relocation has been approved by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR).

3) The Project Designer shall incorporate a note such as the following into the plans: No in-stream work shall occur in the Portage River from March 15 to June 30 every year.

Other Resources - Drinking Water



Approved: 9/28/2018

1) The Project Designer shall incorporate a note such as the following into the plans: This project is located in or near public drinking water sources. In order to minimize the potential for a release in this sensitive area do not perform equipment fueling within the locations identified in the table below. If refueling of immobile equipment is necessary within these limits, provide secondary containment with enough capacity to completely contain and collect all potential liquid wastes in the event of a spill. Do not perform maintenance activities associated with any viscous material that has potential to contaminate the groundwater. All equipment or liquid containers shall be regularly checked for leaks prior to entering the restricted areas. Identify all areas of fuel storage, equipment maintenance and spill kits on the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan. All areas utilized by the Contractor not included within the table below and not in the project limits shall be assessed for potential groundwater contamination and be indicated on the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan or Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan. The Contractor shall immediately take steps to mitigate any event, such as a spill of fuels, oils, or chemicals. Any such spill or event shall be reported immediately to the emergency contact listed below for each drinking water source. If the spill is a reportable amount, the Contractor shall contact Ottawa County Emergency Management (419-734-6900) and Ohio EPA Environmental Response and Revitalization (419-373-3031 or 800-282-9378) for cleanup of the spill. Drinking Water Source Restricted Refueling and Maintenance Area Contact Information Village of Elmore SR-51 from SLM 1.34 to SLM 1.36 419-260-2570 Luckey Homestead Farms AMLC SR-51 from SLM 1.56 to SLM 1.71 419-862-2440

Section 4(f)

1) The Project Designer shall incorporate a note such as the following into the plans: Federally protected recreational properties are located within and adjacent to construction limits, including the Harry Witty Memorial Park shown on Right of Way Sheet XX and the Portage River Water Trail as shown on Sheet XX. The following measures to minimize harm to these recreational resources shall be adhered to: a. No staging and/or storage of construction equipment or materials shall occur outside the proposed construction limits within the recognized boundaries of the recreational properties; b. Access to all recreational properties outside construction limits shall be maintained at all times during construction; c. Advance notice shall be provided to the Project Engineer a minimum of 18 days prior to beginning construction. The Project Engineer shall notify the following state/local public agencies no later than 16 days prior to the start of construction: i. Ohio Department of Natural Resources - Thomas Arbour - Thomas.arbour@dnr.state.oh.us ii. Village of Elmore - Mayor Matt Damschroder - mdamschroder@villageelmore.com iii. ODOT District 2 Environmental Coordinator - Stacy Schimmoeller - Stacy.Schimmoeller@dot.ohio.gov (Notice shall be posted on their website 15 days prior to the start of work.) d. Advance notice shall be provided to the Project Engineer a minimum of 72 hours prior to any and all closures to Harry Witty Memorial Park and the Portage River so that XXX can be notified 48 hours prior to all closures. e. Notes specific to Harry Witty Memorial Park: i. The Contractor shall not impact the gazebo within Harry Witty Memorial Park and the gazebo shall be protected from damage; ii. Appropriate closure/detour signs shall be installed as shown on the Maintenance of Traffic plan (Sheets XX-XX) a minimum of 15 days prior to any and all park closures; iii. Prior to the start of construction activities, in order to protect the public and portions of the recreational resources outside the construction limits, temporary construction fencing shall be installed along the proposed construction limits between the construction and Harry Witty Memorial Park; f. Notes specific to the Portage River Water Trail: i. Advance notice shall be provided to ODOT (Project Engineer and Stacy Schimmoeller) and ODNR (Thomas Arbour): 1) 15 days prior to beginning construction; 2) a minimum of 4 days prior to start of causeway placement in the river so that the public can be notified 48 hours prior to any and all closures of the river to marine traffic.; 3) a minimum of 4 days prior to any and all closures of the river to marine traffic so that the public can be notified 48 hours prior to any and all closures of the river to marine traffic.; ii. Appropriate notices shall be installed both upstream and downstream of the construction zone as shown on the Marine Maintenance of Traffic plan (Sheets X-Y) a minimum of 48 hours prior to any and all partial and full river closures. iii. Should on-the-water law enforcement be needed, contact ODNR Division of Parks and Watercraft, Mr. Chad German at chad.german@dnr.state.oh.us or 419-350-7360.

2) The District 2 Environmental Coordinator shall coordinate the marine maintenance of traffic plan for appropriate portage locations and installation of signage and buoys in the water, with ODNR prior to plan package.

Permits - Waterway Permits



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

1) The ODOT District 2 Environmental Coordinator shall obtain all appropriate waterway permits prior to any work below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of the Portage River or within wetlands. The Waterway Permit Special Provisions shall be attached to the project plans and followed by the Contractor throughout construction. All impacts shall be mitigated appropriately.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab
Approved: 9/28/2018

Preparers and Approvals

Form Preparer:

Libby Rushley
Lawhon AND Associates
1441 King Avenue, Columbus OH 43212
lrushley@lawhon-assoc.com

Approvals & Electronic Signatures

Approved & Electronically Signed By:	Approval Date:
Stacy Schimmoeller (PROGRAM ADMIN 3)	9/28/2018



Appendix

Section 4(f)

Programmatic Evaluation - Historic Bridge (Part 2).pdf

Official with Jurisdiction Concurrence - Village of Elmore.pdf

Programmatic Evaluation - Historic Bridge (Part 1).pdf

Section 6(f)

LWCF Grant Listing.pdf

Section 4(f)

OES Cultural Resources 4(f) Determination_Historic.pdf

Determination Request Form for Recreational Properties.pdf

OES Recreational 4(f) Determination - Park Temporary No Use.pdf

Official with Jurisdiction Concurrence - ODNR.pdf

OES Recreational 4(f) Determination - ODNR Temporary No Use.pdf

General

Aerial Map.pdf

USGS Quadrangle Topographical Map.pdf

County Map.pdf

Correspondence Related to Utility Coordination.pdf

Correspondence with Emergency and Public Services.pdf

Purpose and Need

District Acceptance - Purpose and Need.pdf

Project Related OES Decision - Purpose and Need.pdf

Alternatives

OES Acceptance - Feasibility Study - Bridge Type Study.pdf

ESA

Project Related District Decision - ESA.pdf

Cultural Resources

ACHP Comments.pdf

ACHP Coordination.pdf

ACHP Response.pdf



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

Consulting Party Comment Response - Holth.pdf

Consulting Party Coordination - Historical Society.pdf

Executed MOA.pdf

Consulting Party Application - Baker.pdf

Consulting Party Request Acknowledgement - Baker.pdf

SHPO Concurrence.pdf

OES Section 106 Effect Determination.pdf

Feasible Alternatives Comparison- Rehab vs. Replacement.pdf

ACHP e106 Notification.pdf

Ecological

USFWS Comments - July 2017.pdf

ODNR Comments - August 2018.pdf

USFWS Comments - August 2018.pdf

Coordination with ODNR and USFWS - June 2017.pdf

ODNR Comments - July 2017.pdf

Coordination with ODNR and USFWS - July 2018.pdf

Wetland Finding.pdf

ODOT Disposition of Agency Comments.pdf

Other Resources

Community Water System Coordination.pdf

Prime Farmland Map.pdf

Underserved Populations

Census Mapping.pdf

Public Involvement

Public Comments Received 2018.pdf

Response to Public Comments 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Handouts 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Exhibits 2018.pdf

Response to Public Comments 2015.pdf

News Articles 2015.pdf

News Articles 2018.pdf

Notification Mailing List 2017.pdf



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 99991 OTT SR 51 1.44 Brdg Rehab

Approved: 9/28/2018

Public Meeting Notification 2016.pdf

Press Releases 2016.pdf

Press Releases 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Notification Mailing List 2016.pdf

Press Releases 2015.pdf

News Articles 2016.pdf

Public Meeting Comment Sheet 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Notification Project Area Mailing List 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Exhibits 2016.pdf

Public Meeting Sign In Sheet 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Flyer Mailing List 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Flyer 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Notification Utility Bill 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Notification Project Area 2018.pdf

Public Meeting Flyer Letter 2018.pdf

Public Comments Received 2016.pdf

Property Owner Notification Letter 2017.pdf

District Acceptance - Public Involvement Plan.pdf

Public Involvement Plan.docx

Property Owner Notification Letter 2016.pdf

Public Meeting Sign In Sheet 2016.pdf

Response to Public Comments 2016.pdf

Public Meeting Handouts 2016.pdf

Permits

Statement of Findings.pdf

FEMA FIRM.pdf

District Determination .pdf