



OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

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

Environmental Document

for

SUM 76/77 Central Interchange PID 101402

Environmental Document Level: D1

Approved: 1/30/2019

Prepared By: Libby Rushley

Lawhon AND Associates

E-mail: lrushley@lawhon-assoc.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 11, 2015, and executed by FHWA and ODOT.

Table of Contents

Project Type.....	3
General Project Information.....	4
Purpose & Need.....	17
Alternatives.....	23
Air.....	25
Noise.....	27
ESA.....	30
Cultural Resources.....	31
Ecological.....	34
Other Resources.....	37
Section 4(f).....	39
Section 6(f).....	40
Community Impacts.....	41
Underserved Populations.....	43
Public Involvement.....	45
Permits.....	47
Environmental Commitments.....	49
Preparers and Approvals.....	50
Appendix.....	53



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:	101402
Project Name:	SUM 76/77 Central Interchange
Project Sponsor:	DISTRICT 4-PLANNING
ODOT District:	4
Funding Source:	Federal
Private Funding:	No
Local Public Funding:	No
STIP Reference #:	2018stipID0159FDDD/2018stipID0159FDRW/2018stipID0159FDCO and is fiscally constrained.

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:	\$7,083,778.60
Right of Way:	\$250,000.00
Construction:	\$57,250,000.00
Other:	\$0.00

An Interchange Modification/Justification/Operations Study (IMS/IJS/IOS) was completed Yes

Date Completed: 01/04/2018

Project Description:

The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) proposes to improve the Interstate Route (IR) 76/IR 77/State Route (SR) 8 interchange in the city of Akron, Summit County. This system interchange is locally known as the Central Interchange. Proposed improvements include:

- Permanent removal of the existing left exit ramp and bridge that conveys traffic from IR 76 eastbound to SR 8 northbound;
- Construct a new left exit ramp and bridge on a new alignment to convey traffic from IR 76 eastbound to SR 8 northbound;
- Widen the existing IR 76 eastbound bridge over Brown Street;



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

- Permanent removal of the existing left exit ramp and bridge that conveys traffic from IR 76 westbound to IR 77 southbound;
- Construct a new left exit ramp and bridge on a new alignment to convey traffic from IR 76 westbound to IR 77 southbound;
- Widen the existing IR 76 westbound bridge over Inman Street;
- Modify the existing right exit ramp and bridge that conveys traffic from IR 76 westbound to SR 8 northbound;
- Permanent closure of the existing IR 76 westbound exit ramp to Inman Street;
- Permanent closure of the existing IR 77 southbound exit ramp to Lovers Lane;
- Permanent removal of the existing Lafollette Street bridge over IR 77;
- Construct a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge over IR 77 between Lafollette Street and Kipling Street;
- Convert existing Coventry Street between Lafollette Street and Kipling Street to a pedestrian/bicycle trail;
- Replace the existing pavement along IR 76 between King Street and east of the existing pedestrian bridge over IR 76;
- Replace the existing pavement along IR 77 between Lovers Lane and IR 76;
- Replace the existing pavement along SR 8 between IR 76 and Beacon Street;
- Assign two through lanes, one left exit lane and one right exit lane in each direction along IR 76;
- Construct multiple noise walls at various noise sensitive areas; and
- Install new retaining walls, lighting, guardrail, storm sewer/drainage features, signage and pavement markings.

This project was separated from the 2014 Akron Beltway Planning Study. It is the first project resulting from this study due to the deteriorated, deficient bridge conditions along the existing left exits in the interchange. These improvements do not preclude future improvements to the Central Interchange.

IR 76 and IR 77 are functionally classified as Interstates, SR 8 as Freeway/Expressway and Lafollette Street as Local in the project study area.

Minor amount of temporary and permanent rights-of-way are required to construct the project.

The project will include appropriate maintenance of traffic measures to minimize traffic disruptions during project construction. Ramp closures and detours will be necessary to connect the proposed new ramps with the existing highways. Various lane closures will also occur along IR 76, IR 77 and SR 8 throughout construction of the project. Final maintenance of traffic (MOT) plans for the project will be developed during the Stage 3 design phase. Various public involvement activities that were conducted for the project included this maintenance of traffic information to determine impacts and obtain feedback from stakeholders, the public and emergency/public services. Local emergency/public services and community notifications of the proposed ramp/lane closures, detours and other maintenance of traffic measures to be implemented for the project shall be performed in accordance with ODOT Traffic Engineering Manual Notes 642-58 Notification of Traffic Restrictions and 642-8 Item 614, Maintaining Traffic (Notice of Closure Sign), as applicable.

Relocations of existing utilities within the project study area will be necessary to construct the project. These utility relocations will occur within the existing highway/street rights-of-way. Coordination with affected utility owners is ongoing for the project.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange
Approved: 1/30/2019

The project will not impact any environmentally sensitive resources within the project study area.

Two public involvement meetings were conducted, in compliance with Title VI requirements, for the project. Comments received as a result of these public involvement meetings pertained to the proposed noise walls, the proposed permanent closures of the existing IR 76/IR 77 exit ramps to Inman Street/Lovers Lane, the proposed permanent removal of the existing Lafollette Street bridge over IR 77, SR 8 traffic congestion, ramp configurations, traffic movements, local street congestion/impacts, the proposed pedestrian/bicycle trail and the project construction schedule. The received public comments were summarized and responses to comments were posted to the ODOT District 4 website. Moreover, the received public comments did not identify any substantial environmental controversy on environmental grounds with construction of the project.

The environmental document and associated studies, as applicable, were approved using the Stage 1 Design plans for the project. A copy of the Stage 1 Design plans for the project is included in the Project File/General/Project Information subsection as Stage 1 Design.pdf.

The estimated total project cost specified in Ellis is less than the total project cost specified in the Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS) Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 - FY 2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Project location maps of the project are in the Project File/General/Project Information subsection.

Limits of Proposed Work:	SUM Central Interchange IR-76, IR-77
Start (SLM):	11.31
End (SLM):	11.78
Total Work Length (Miles):	0.47

Roadway Character

Roadway Character

Route Number: IR00077

Functional Classification:	Principal Arterial - Interstate (Urban)
Current Average Daily Traffic:	135920
Current Average Daily Traffic Year:	2020
Design Year Average Daily Traffic:	153200
Design Average Daily Traffic Year:	2040
Daily Hourly Volume:	14800
Truck %:	8
Setting:	Urban



Environmental Document Level: D1
 PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

Topography:

Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	60	60
Legal Speed (MPH):	55	55
Number of Lanes:	8	8
Type of Lanes:	through/ramp	through/ramp
Pavement Width (ft):	132	132
Shoulder Width (ft):	8	8
Median Width (ft):	7	7
Sidewalk Width (ft):	n/a	n/a

Route Number: SR00008

Functional Classification:

Principal Arterial - Other
 Freeway/Expressway (Urban)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 123390

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2020

Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 135300

Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2040

Daily Hourly Volume: 13520

Truck %: 7

Setting: Urban

Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	60	60
Legal Speed (MPH):	55	55
Number of Lanes:	6	6
Type of Lanes:	through/ramp	through/ramp
Pavement Width (ft):	112	112
Shoulder Width (ft):	8	8
Median Width (ft):	5	5
Sidewalk Width (ft):	n/a	n/a

Route Number: IR00076

Functional Classification:

Principal Arterial - Interstate (Urban)

Current Average Daily Traffic: 120890



Environmental Document Level: D1
 PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

Current Average Daily Traffic Year: 2020
Design Year Average Daily Traffic: 124010
Design Average Daily Traffic Year: 2040
Daily Hourly Volume: 10710
Truck %: 12
Setting: Urban
Topography: Level

	Existing:	Proposed:
Design Speed (MPH):	60	60
Legal Speed (MPH):	55	55
Number of Lanes:	8	8
Type of Lanes:	through/ramp	through/ramp
Pavement Width (ft):	132	132
Shoulder Width (ft):	8	8
Median Width (ft):	7	7
Sidewalk Width (ft):	n/a	n/a

Sufficiency Rating: 095.9
General Rating: 7
Date Built: 07/01/1958
Bridge Location: 0.20 MI S OF IR 76
40. Bridge Type: 322
Sufficiency Rating: 081.0
General Rating: 8
Date Built: 07/01/1961
Bridge Location: 0.26 MI W OF SR 8
40. Bridge Type: 322
Sufficiency Rating: 074.8
General Rating: 5
Date Built: 07/01/1960
Bridge Location: 0.06 MI W OF SR 8
40. Bridge Type: 112



Sufficiency Rating: 072.6
General Rating: 5
Date Built: 07/01/1959
Bridge Location: 0.15 MI E OF IR 77
40. Bridge Type: 112
Sufficiency Rating: 083.7
General Rating: 7
Date Built: 07/01/1955
Bridge Location: 0.26 MI E OF SR 8
40. Bridge Type: 321

Design Criteria For Bridges
Design Criteria for Bridges

SFN: 7702949

Sufficiency Rating: 095.9
General Rating: 7
Date Built: 07/01/1958
Bridge Location: 0.20 MI S OF IR 76

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	322	tbd
Bridge Length (ft):	223	248
Number of Main Spans:	4	2
Max Span Length (ft):	60	132
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	n/a
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	44	14
Shoulder Width(ft):	n/a	n/a
Under Clearance (ft):	n/a	n/a

Bridge Type Description:

The existing four-span continuous rolled steel beam bridge with reinforced concrete deck on concrete piers and abutments structure that carries Lafollette Street over IR 77 will be permanently removed by the project. A proposed new prefabricated steel truss (ASTM A709 [M] Grade 50, Galvanized) with reinforced concrete substructures bike/pedestrian bridge will be constructed approximately 1500 feet south of the existing Lafollette Street bridge over IR 77.

Load Restrictions Description:



AASHTO Pedestrian Live Load (0.09 KSF) or HI5-44 Truck.

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 permanently removed as part of the project. A proposed new bike/pedestrian only bridge will be constructed approximately 1500 feet south of the existing bridge location.

SFN: 7703031

Sufficiency Rating: 081.0

General Rating: 8

Date Built: 07/01/1961

Bridge Location: 0.26 MI W OF SR 8

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	322	322
Bridge Length (ft):	157	157
Number of Main Spans:	3	3
Max Span Length (ft):	66	66
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	137	89
Shoulder Width(ft):	2	2
Under Clearance (ft):	18.5	18.5

Bridge Type Description:

3-span continuous steel beams with composite reinforced concrete deck, semi-integral stub type abutments and reinforced concrete cap-and-column piers.

Load Restrictions Description:

HS-20 Case I and Alternative Military Loading with future wearing surface (FWS) of 0.030 KSF (existing beams) & 0.060 KSF (new beams).

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 structure will be rehabilitated/widened as part of the project.



Environmental Document Level: D1
 PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange
 Approved: 1/30/2019

SFN: 7705972

Sufficiency Rating: 074.8
General Rating: 5
Date Built: 07/01/1960
Bridge Location: 0.06 MI W OF SR 8

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	112	tbd
Bridge Length (ft):	240	634
Number of Main Spans:	5	5
Max Span Length (ft):	52	137
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	34.30	60
Shoulder Width(ft):	2	2
Under Clearance (ft):	14.8	16

Bridge Type Description:

5-span continuous curved steel plate girder with composite reinforced concrete deck, cast-in-place wall type abutments on piles, and reinforced concrete cap-and-column piers on drilled shafts.

Load Restrictions Description:

HL93 and future wearing surface (FWS) of 0.060 KSF.

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:

The existing Ramp N structure will be permanently removed as part of the project.

SFN: 7706065

Sufficiency Rating: 072.6
General Rating: 5
Date Built: 07/01/1959
Bridge Location: 0.15 MI E OF IR 77

Existing:

Proposed:



Bridge Type:	112	tbd
Bridge Length (ft):	134	848
Number of Main Spans:	3	7
Max Span Length (ft):	51	156
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	34.30	30
Shoulder Width(ft):	2	2
Under Clearance (ft):	15	18.6

Bridge Type Description:

3-span (unit 1), 4-span (unit 2) continuous curved steel plate girder with reinforced concrete deck, cast-in-place wall type abutments on piles and reinforced concrete piers on drilled shafts.

Load Restrictions Description:

HL 93 (future wearing surface (FWS) of 0.060 KSF).

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:

The existing Ramp R structure will be permanently removed as part of the project.

SFN: 7706154

Sufficiency Rating:

083.7

General Rating:

7

Date Built:

07/01/1955

Bridge Location:

0.26 MI E OF SR 8

	Existing:	Proposed:
Bridge Type:	321	321
Bridge Length (ft):	58	58
Number of Main Spans:	1	1
Max Span Length (ft):	52	52
Load Restrictions (TON):	150	150
Curb to Curb Width (ft):	55	55
Shoulder Width(ft):	2	2
Under Clearance (ft):	14.8	14.8



Approved: 1/30/2019

Bridge Type Description:

Simple span steel beam (ASTM A709M Grade 50W, Unpainted) composite superstructure with reinforced concrete deck with semi-integral abutments.

Load Restrictions Description:

HS25 Case I and Alternative Military Loading with a future wearing surface loading of 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? n/a

Remarks:

This structure will be rehabilitated/widened as part of the project.

41. Bridge Length (ft):	223
41. Bridge Length (ft):	157
41. Bridge Length (ft):	240
41. Bridge Length (ft):	134
41. Bridge Length (ft):	58
42. Number of Main Spans:	4
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	5
42. Number of Main Spans:	3
42. Number of Main Spans:	1
43. Max Span Length (ft):	60
43. Max Span Length (ft):	66
43. Max Span Length (ft):	52
43. Max Span Length (ft):	51
43. Max Span Length (ft):	52
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



45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	44
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	137
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	34.30
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	34.30
45. Curb to Curb Width (ft):	55

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	No
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:

The project will include appropriate maintenance of traffic measures to minimize traffic disruptions during project construction. Temporary ramp closures and detours will be necessary to connect the proposed new ramps with the existing highways. Various temporary lane closures will also occur along IR 76, IR 77 and SR 8 throughout construction of the project. Final maintenance of traffic (MOT) plans for the project will be developed during the Stage 3 design phase. Public involvement activities that were conducted for the project included this maintenance of traffic information to determine impacts and obtain feedback from stakeholders, the public and emergency/public services. The Akron emergency/public services attended and participated in the various public involvement activities conducted for the project. Local emergency/public services and community notifications of the proposed temporary ramp/lane closures, detours and other maintenance of traffic measures to be implemented for the project shall be performed in accordance with ODOT Traffic Engineering Manual Notes 642-58 Notification of Traffic Restrictions and 642-8 Item 614, Maintaining Traffic (Notice of Closure Sign), as applicable.

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



Approved: 1/30/2019

Number of parcels impacted by Permanent Right-of-Way: 1

Right of Way and Utility Involvement

Number of parcels impacted by Temporary Right-of-Way: 5

Approximate acreage of Permanent Right-of-Way needed: 0.016

Approximate acreage of Temporary Right-of-Way needed: 0.175

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:

Minor amount of temporary or permanent right-of-way is required to construct this project.

Utilities in the project area include:

- Akron Energy Systems
- AT&T Ohio
- AT&T Long Distance
- Cargill Salt
- Crown Castle
- Dominion East Ohio
- First Energy
- Frontier Communications
- Involta
- Century Link
- Lighttower & Fibertech
- Medina County Fiber Network
- Mobilitie
- Quest/Century Link
- Windstream KDL
- Spectrum
- Verizon Communications
- XO Communications
- ZAYO Group
- City of Akron Communications, Bureau of Water Supply, Bureau of Water Reclamation, Traffic Engineering
- Summit County Engineer's Office



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

- Summit County Department of Environmental Services

The various utilities have been contacted and have received copies of the Stage 1 Design plans. Several sets of correspondence were sent to the utilities and responses received in February and March 2018. Relocations of existing utilities within the project area will be necessary to construct the project. These utility relocations will occur within the existing highway/street rights-of-way. Coordination with affected utility owners is ongoing during project design and will continue throughout project construction.

A table that specifies the various utility correspondence for the project can be found in the Project File/General/Right-of-Way and Utility Involvement subsection.



Purpose & Need

Purpose & Need

Project History:

The project area is located in the city of Akron, Summit County, Ohio. The project study area includes the Akron Beltway's Central Interchange, a system interchange between I-76, I-77 and State Route (SR) 8 within a heavily urbanized part of the city.

The I-76 corridor, including the Central Interchange, was the subject of several studies since 2002.

The studies, conducted by Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS) documented congestion and safety problems at the Central Interchange. Preliminary engineering for improvements to the Central Interchange began in the autumn of 2005, however, construction of the improvements was not completed due to lack of funding. See Project File for the I-76/AMATS MIS Final Report and the Summit I-76 Reconstruction and Upgrade Strategic Plan.

In 2014, study of the Akron Beltway was started with the goal of identifying "right-sized" solutions to the congestion and safety problems associated with the box shaped freeway network that is comprised of Interstate Routes 76, 77 and 277. The Summary of Substandard Conditions, prepared in 2014 for the Akron Beltway study, determined that two bridges associated with the left-hand exit ramps at the Central Interchange are Functionally Obsolete.

Purpose Statement:

The purpose of the transportation improvement is to improve facility deficiencies, mobility, roadway geometrics, and safety at the Central Interchange.

Need Element(s):

Primary Need Element

Bridge Conditions:

Two bridges are associated with the existing left-hand exit ramps from westbound I-76 to southbound I-77 (Ramp N) and eastbound I-76 to northbound SR 8 (Ramp R).

Bridge Number S.F.N.	Bridge Location	Year Built Last Rehab.	Min. Vertical Clearance	Deck Summary	Super- Structure Summary	Sub- Structure Summary	General Appraisal	Sufficiency Rating (%)	Fun Ob
SUM-00076-1148R 7705972	RAMP N (WB I-76 TO SB I-77) OVER EB I-76 & RAMP TO SB I-77	1960 1989	15.07'	5	5	6	5	74.8	



SUM-00076-1165L 7706065	RAMP R (EB I-76 TO NB SR 8) OVER WB I-76	1959 1988	15.09'	5	5	5	5	72.6	
----------------------------	--	--------------	--------	---	---	---	---	------	--

Summary Rating	Condition Description
9	Excellent
8	Very Good
7	Good
6	Satisfactory
5	Fair
4	Poor
3	Serious
2	Critical
1	Imminent Failure
0	Failed

ODOT conducts annual systematic inspection of bridges. Based upon these inspections, structures are assigned a general appraisal rating on a scale of 0 to 9, where 9 indicates excellent (new) condition and 0 indicates failed (closed to traffic) condition. Sub-portions of the bridge, such as the deck, superstructure and substructure, are inspected and also given a summary rating on the same scale from 0 to 9.

The bridges at the Central Interchange were last inspected in 2017. The inspections showed the Superstructure Summary Rating for the Ramp N and Ramp R bridges was 5 (Fair). The General Appraisal Rating for these bridges was also 5 (Fair). ODOT uses the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Sufficiency Rating System to give highway bridges a sufficiency rating. The sufficiency rating is a measure of the ability of a bridge to remain in service. This rating is a computed numerical value used to determine eligibility of a bridge for federal funding. It ranges from 0 to 100%. The formula includes factors for structural condition, geometric functionality and traffic considerations. According to the FHWA system, a rating of 100% is considered entirely sufficient (usually new), bridges that have a sufficiency rating of 80% or less are designated as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete and considered for rehabilitation. Bridges with a rating of 50% or less are designated as structurally deficient or functionally obsolete and considered for replacement. The 2017 sufficiency ratings for the Ramp N and Ramp R bridges were less than 80% and the bridges are functionally obsolete.

The superstructure ratings of 5 (Fair) and sufficiency rating less than 80% for the Ramp N and Ramp R bridges at the Central Interchange is due to severe spalling on the underside of these concrete slab bridges. Because permanent maintenance efforts could only seal the spalled areas, a good permanent repair that could improve the condition ratings is not available. Note underdeck patches could fail and present a hazard to traffic beneath the bridge.

In addition, the minimum vertical clearance for bridges over major freeway routes is 16 feet according to ODOT criteria. The vertical clearances associated with the Central Interchange Ramp N and Ramp R bridges is almost one foot (1') less than the minimum 16 feet.

Ramp Geometrics:

As shown in the following table, both the existing left-hand exit ramps have deceleration lanes with substandard deceleration length:

Ramp	Ramp Description	Existing Deceleration Lane Length (feet)	Desired Deceleration Lane Length (feet)*
N	WB I-76 to SB I-77	700	800



Environmental Document Level: D1
 PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

R	EB I-76 to NB SR-8	790	800
---	--------------------	-----	-----

* ODOT Location and Design Manual, Volume 1

Note: deceleration length standards do not apply to drop lanes leading to exit ramps.

As shown in the following table, both the existing left-hand exit ramps have substandard inside shoulders:

Ramp	Ramp Description	Existing Inside Shoulder Width (feet)	Desired Inside Shoulder Width (feet)*
N	WB I-76 to SB I-77	3	4
R	EB I-76 to NB SR-8	3	4

* ODOT Location and Design Manual, Volume 1

As shown in the following table, the existing left-hand exit ramps have substandard horizontal geometry:

Ramp	Ramp Description	Number of Substandard Horizontal Curves	Existing Speed of Horizontal Curves (MPH)	Desired Speed of Horizontal Curves (MPH)*
N	WB I-76 to SB I-77	3	32, 42, 43	45 - 50
R	EB I-76 to NB SR-8	2	26, 42	45 - 50

* ODOT Location and Design Manual, Volume 1

As shown in the following table, the existing left-hand exit ramps have substandard vertical geometry:

Ramp	Ramp Description	Number of Substandard Vertical Curves	Existing Speed of Vertical Curves (MPH)	Desired Speed of Vertical Curves (MPH)*
N	WB I-76 to SB I-77	2	25, 39	45 - 50
R	EB I-76 to NB SR-8	2	38, 39	45 - 50

* ODOT Location and Design Manual, Volume 1

The combination of the substandard conditions, as noted above, contribute to safety issues associated with existing left-hand exits within the Central Interchange.

Safety:

A comprehensive safety review, completed in 2015, of the entire Akron Beltway identified the Central Interchange as the "worst" performing area on the entire beltway system. Furthermore, multiple sections of I-76, near the Central Interchange, have been listed on ODOT's Safety Priority List since 2009. The section of I-76 through



Central Interchange currently ranks #42 on ODOT's Safety Priority List of urban freeway sections. The Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS) crash report, based on 2014 data, states the Central Interchange has six of the highest ranking freeway sections within the AMATS area.

More specifically, crash data was obtained from ODOT's GIS Crash Analysis Tool (GCAT) for the calendar years of 2009 to 2011. Years 2009 - 2011 were chosen for these analyses due to multiple construction projects in the study area between 2012 and the present that could skew the crash statistics. From 2009 to 2011, a total of 300 crashes occurred within the Central Interchange. These crashes included 141 rear-end, 90 fixed object, 48 sideswipe-passing, 2 parked vehicle and 1 overturning crash. 66% of all crashes occurred in daylight and 34% occurred on dry pavement. 70% of the crashes were property damage only and 29% of the crashes were fatal crashes with one (1) fatal crash.

The large number of rear-end crashes (47%) within the Central Interchange points to a traffic congestion problem. Along an uncongested highway, rear-end crashes are less common as traffic should not be slowing down. However, traffic congestion typically leads to rear-end crashes. The fixed object crashes (30%) occurring within the Central Interchange occurred at the left-hand exit ramps that are geometrically sub-standard and have curves that are designed for 25-30 miles per hour below the posted 55 mph speed limit of I-76. The sub-standard curves contribute to fixed object crashes at the left-hand exits.

The Interchange Safety Analysis Tool - Enhanced (ISATe) is a predictive model based upon the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Highway Safety Manual* for freeways and interchanges.

ISATe can predict the safety performance of interchanges, including mainline sections, ramp sections and terminal intersections. ISATe employs virtually all geometric variables (excluding vertical alignment) and traffic variables in predicting crash frequency, types and severity based on the relationship between various geometric elements and average crash frequency. In general, when Expected Crash frequency (average anticipated crash frequency) as compared to similar sites in the United States) is less than Predicted Crash frequency (existing crash history), the facility may not need improvements. However, when Expected Crash frequency is greater than Predicted Crash frequency, the facility may benefit from improvements.

For the Central Interchange, ISATe calculated the year 2015 Predicted Crash frequency and the year 2015 Expected Crash frequencies for multiple freeway mainline and ramp sections. The freeway sections associated with the eastbound left-hand exit ramps from Westbound I-76 to Southbound I-77 and Eastbound I-76 to Northbound SR 8 had the greatest difference between Expected Crash frequency and Predicted crash frequency, indicating those sections may benefit from improvements.

Operations:

Currently, the sections of both eastbound and westbound I-76 approaching the Central Interchange experience traffic congestion during both AM and PM peak hours.

Level-of-Service (LOS) is a qualitative description of traffic flow on a roadway. LOS is represented by the letters A through F with LOS A being the best and LOS F being the worst. For the interstate highway system, LOS is determined by the density of traffic on the highway that is expressed as passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mile/hour).

For an urban area such as this, LOS D (>26-35 pc/mile/lane) is typically considered acceptable operation. LOS E (>35-45 pc/mile/lane) and LOS F (>45 pc/mile/lane) are considered unacceptable because they represent substantial congestion and delay.

Highway Capacity Software was used to analyze the existing Central Interchange. Shown below are the sections of I-76 approaching the interchange and associated with the left-hand exit ramps. All sections of I-76 approaching the existing left-hand exit ramps are operating at unacceptable LOS (Year 2015) or will operate at unacceptable LOS by the Design Year (Year 2040).

	2015 AM Peak Hour LOS/Density	2015 PM Peak Hour LOS/Density	2040 AM Peak Hour LOS/Density	2040 PM Peak Hour LOS/Density



Environmental Document Level: D1
 PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

	(pc/mile/lane)	(pc/mile/lane)	(pc/mile/lane)*	(pc/mile/lane)*
Eastbound sections				
EB 76 from Main Street On-ramp to 77 SB Off-ramp*	C/20.4	D/29.3	D/30.2	F/46.4
EB 76 from 77 SB Off-ramp to Ramp R (off-ramp to SR 8 NB)	D/28.2	E/37.5	D/29.2	E/37.2
Ramp R Diverge	C/26.4	D/34.5	C/27.4	D/34.3
EB 76 from Ramp R Diverge to On-ramp from 77 NB/SR8 SB	B/15.8	D/28.1	C/18.1	D/30.5
Ramp R (to SR8 NB)	C/24.9**	B/17.1**	C/22.7**	B/12.1**
Westbound sections				
WB 76 from Fuller On-ramp to Inman Off-ramp	D/32.0	C/23.0	E/36.2	C/25.3
WB 76 from Inman Off-ramp to SR8 NB Off-ramp	E/38.4	D/28.0	E/42.9	D/30.1
WB 76 from SR8 NB Off-ramp to Ramp N (off-ramp to I-77 SB)	F/57.7	D/30.3	F/72.5	D/32.0
Ramp N Diverge	E/42.8	D/28.6	F/45.7	D/30.2
WB 76 from Ramp N Diverge to On-ramp from 77 NB/SR8 SB	D/33.4	B/15.6	E/35.2	B/16.1
Ramp N (off-ramp to I-77 SB)	C/24.2**	D/29.6**	D/27.0**	D/31.8**

*2040 data assumes completion of Main/Broadway interchange improvements

**Actual densities likely to be higher. Highway Capacity Software has a minimum free-flow speed of 55mph, which is considerably higher than the actual speed of the existing left-hand exit ramps.

The unacceptable LOS, as noted above, contributes to substantial traffic congestion and delay associated with existing left-hand exits within the Central Interchange.

Secondary Need Elements

Interchange Spacing:

The AASHTO *Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, commonly referred to as the "Green Book" the ODOT Location and Design (L&D) Manual contain research, criteria and practices for highway and interchange geometric design. Numerous standards are instituted for highways and interchanges to achieve an acceptable design. A critical factor is the recommendation that highway interchanges should be at least 1.0 mile apart to



for adequate acceleration/deceleration lanes along ramps and adequate merging/weaving sections between terminals. The I-76 Inman Street exit ramp is located 0.2 mile east of the westbound I-76 exit ramp to SR 8 and 0.3 mile from the westbound I-76 entrance ramp from Fuller Street. The I-77 Lovers Lane ramp is located 0.3 mile from the westbound I-76 exit ramp/southbound I-77 mainline ramp to southbound I-77 and 0.42 mile from the southbound I-77 exit ramp to Archwood Avenue. Both the I-76 Inman Street and I-77 Lovers Lane exit ramps do not meet current interchange spacing requirements and are partial interchanges (1/4 of a full interchange) with no returning traffic movement, meaning traffic that exits the highway has no direct access to return to the highway. Partial interchanges are not approved by FHWA.

Goals and Objectives:

Not applicable.

Summary Statement:

The purpose of the transportation improvement is to address the functionally obsolete bridges within the Central Interchange prior to further deterioration. The 2017 sufficiency ratings for the bridges on ramps from Westbound I-76 to Southbound I-77 (Ramp N) and Eastbound I-76 to Northbound SR 8 (Ramp R) were less than 80%. Therefore, both bridges are functionally obsolete. The sufficiency ratings for the bridges are due to severe spalling on the underside of these concrete slab bridges. Because maintenance efforts could only seal the spalled areas, a good permanent repair that could improve the condition ratings is not available.

Logical Termini and Independent Utility:

The logical termini for the project on I-76 are from the bridges over Brown Street to the bridges over Arlington Street, a distance of about 1 mile. The logical termini for the project on I-77/SR 8 are from the Lovers Lane bridge over I-77 to the Johnston Street bridge over SR 8, a distance of about 0.7 mile. These termini encompass the functionally obsolete bridges associated with the ramps at the Central Interchange.

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:

The No Build Alternative would only include routine maintenance of the highway and bridges within the IR 76/IR 77/SR 8 interchange area. This alternative would not change the existing highway ramp configurations or traffic operations. This alternative does not address the structurally deficient bridges, deficient ramp geometrics or safety. The No Build Alternative does not satisfy the project Purpose and Need.

Was a Feasibility Study completed?

Yes

Date Feasibility Study was approved:

11/30/2017

Was an Alternative Evaluation Report (AER) completed?

No

Alternatives Considered

Name	Description	Reason Dismissed	Preferred Alternative
NEA3	Modify the left exits and retain the left exit ramps as drop lanes, restripe westbound IR 76 pavement from northbound SR 8 ramp to southbound IR 77 ramp, avoids impacts to Johnston Street bridge, relocated SB ramp conflicts with Lafollette Bridge, permanently remove the existing Lovers Lane and Inman Street exit ramps and the existing Lafollette Bridge.	not dismissed	Yes



NEB3	Reconfigure left exits to right exits with fly-over ramps, refinement tightens ramp with only small ROW impacts near Lumiere and Crosier Streets, minimizes traffic impacts during construction with most work offline, Johnston Bridge will be reconstructed and permanently remove Lovers Lane and Inman Street exit ramps.	Substantially higher cost for fly-over bridges and more retaining walls than NEA3.	No
------	---	--	----

Discuss Reasons Alternative Identified as Preferred was selected:

A series of design workshops were conducted between ODOT District 4, ODOT Central Office Design and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for the project. Alternatives were developed, analyses completed, and results considered and eliminated during these workshops.

All alternatives included the closure of the two partial interchanges, the IR 76 westbound exit ramp to Inman Street and the IR 77 southbound exit ramp to Lovers Lane.

The NEA3 alternative, estimated cost of \$40 million, provides operational improvements and reduces need for design exceptions while the NEB3 alternative, estimated cost of \$83 million, has higher costs due to fly-over ramps and more retaining walls than NEA3.

NEA3 was selected as the preferred alternative, keeping the left exit ramps while changing to drop lanes to reduce traffic congestion. This alternative was selected over NEB3 based on the costs and fewer right-of-way impacts. This alternative does not preclude other future capacity related improvements that may also be developed through the Akron Beltway Planning Study for the Central Interchange and/or the Akron Beltway.

The Feasibility Study can be found in the Project File/Alternatives/Reports and Project Information subsection.

Feasibility Study acceptance correspondence from ODOT District 4 is in the Project File/Alternatives/Coordination subsection.



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. This project only modifies the alignment of two existing exit ramps. Hence, the project will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volume, 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. As such, FHWA has determined that this project will generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. Consequently, the project is exempt from MSAT analysis.

Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM2.5)

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

Remarks:

In correspondence, dated March 8, 2018, the ODOT-OES Noise and Air Quality Unit initiated PM 2.5 Project Level Conformity Determination coordination with Ohio EPA, USEPA and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The coordination requested concurrence that the proposed project is not a project of air quality concern, met the statutory requirements of the Clean Air Act and is exempt from PM 2.5 Hotspot Analysis. In FHWA correspondence, dated April 6, 2018, FHWA, Ohio EPA and USEPA provided concurrence that the project is not of air quality concern. Therefore, no additional analysis or further coordination concerning PM 2.5 is necessary for the project.

See PM 2.5 agency coordination and concurrence for the project in the Project File/Air/Coordination subsection.

Carbon (CO)

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

Ozone

The proposed project is in an Ozone non-attainment or maintenance area	Yes
---	-----



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

The proposed project is listed on the TIP

Yes

Remarks:

Summit County is in an ozone maintenance area. The project is included in the Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS) Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 - FY 2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as exempt from air quality analysis. The project design concept and scope have not substantively changed since the project inclusion on the MPO TIP per 40 CFR 93.115. Therefore, ozone is addressed for the 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	Yes
ODOT Approval Date	08/29/2017
The proposed project is a Type I project	Yes
The proposed project constructs a roadway on new location	No
The proposed project significantly changes the existing roadway's horizontal or vertical alignment	Yes
The proposed project adds capacity (thru travel lanes)	No
The proposed project adds an auxiliary lane(s)	No
The proposed project negatively affects shielding of an existing roadway	No
The proposed project restripes existing pavement for an added thru lane or auxiliary lane	No
The proposed project adds or substantially alters an existing weigh station, rest stop, rideshare lot, or toll plaza	No
The proposed project causes a major change in vehicle mix	No
A design year noise impact was predicted	Yes
All noise attenuation measures were considered and are consistent with existing policy	Yes
Noise barriers proposed	Yes
The proposed project impacts identified NSAs	Yes

Impacted Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs)

NSA ID	Name	Address or Location	Qualify for barriers
1	NSA 1	west approach, north side of I-76	Yes
2	NSA 2	northwest quadrant of interchange, along Johnston Street	No
3	NSA 3	northeast quadrant of interchange west of Inman Street	Yes
4	NSA 4	east approach, north side of I-76	Yes
5	NSA 5	west approach, south side of I-76	Yes
6	NSA 6	southeast quadrant of interchange	Yes



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

7	NSA 7	east approach, south side of I-76	No
8	NSA 8	south approach, west side of I-77	Yes
9	NSA 9	south approach, east side of I-77	Yes

Remarks:

Noise Analysis:

A noise analysis report, dated August 2017, was prepared by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. Nine noise sensitive areas (NSAs) were evaluated within the project area. Opening Year 2020 and Design Year 2040 noise levels for the No Build and Build alternatives were modeled using the FHWA Traffic Noise (TNM) Version 2.5. The results of the analysis indicated eight of the nine areas will have traffic noise impacts approaching (within 1 dB) or exceeding the Level B or C Noise Abatement Criteria of 67 dBA and none of the NSAs will have increases of 10 dBA under the Design Year Build alternative.

Noise abatement measures, including noise walls, were evaluated for the impacted receptors. A noise barrier must be of sufficient length and height to break the line of sight between the receptor and the highway. Under the ODOT Highway Traffic Noise Analysis Manual, noise levels must be reduced by a minimum of 5 dB at any sensitive receptor site for that site to be considered a benefited receptor. The construction of a noise barrier is considered feasible mitigation if a 5 dB noise reduction is achievable. The construction of a noise barrier is considered reasonable mitigation if the construction cost is less than \$35,000 per benefited receptor.

It was determined that noise wall construction would be feasible and reasonable for NSAs 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9. A noise wall was not found to be feasible or reasonable for NSA 2 and NSA 7. Upon review of the noise analysis report, ODOT OES accepted the report recommendations in an email dated August 29, 2017.

In January 2019, the design of the recommended noise wall for NSA 5 was revisited. Further plan development revealed that some of the recommended noise wall for NSA 5 would be constructed on an existing geogrid reinforced embankment, which is not feasible since drilling associated with installing the drilled shafts would destroy the geogrid material and damage the integrity of the slope. A supplemental noise analysis resulted in the proposed noise wall being shortened to end at the I-76/77 over Brown Street. See Project File > Noise > Noise Analysis - Revisions to Recommended Noise Wall NSA 5.pdf.

Noise Public Involvement:

Noise walls will only be constructed if the property owners and/or residents of the impacts/benefited properties convey a desire for this type of noise abatement. At least 50% of the impacted/benefited property owners/residents in each of the seven recommended barrier zones would need to desire the recommended noise walls for them to proceed into design and construction.

Various methods were employed to contact sufficient benefitting dwelling owners/residents for a recommendation on each noise wall. On March 6, 2018, LAI personnel attended the public involvement meeting, greeted attendees, determined if attendees were a benefitting owner or resident, explained process and distributed noise wall ballots. Six noise wall ballots were returned at the public involvement meeting. On March 28, 2018, letters were sent to each of the benefitting dwellings for each recommended noise wall. 33 noise wall ballots were returned as a result of the March 28, 2018, letter. On April 5, 2018, LAI personnel went door-to-door canvassing dwellings with unreturned noise wall ballots. 108 ballots were completed during the canvassing. Door hangers were also left at those dwellings where no one answered the door. Additional hangers were left on April 26, May 9, and June 6, 2018. A total of 16 noise wall ballots were returned as a result of those additional contact attempts. A web survey was posted on June 12, 2018, and resulted in one completed noise wall ballot. Due to the returned ballots being less than 50% for NSAs 1 and 5, another letter was sent on June 28, 2018, to those who did not vote requesting response.



The noise wall ballot results are as follows:

NSA	Benefitted Dwellings	Returned Ballots	Ballots with Yes Vote	Percent Yes Votes
1	90	70	50	55.6%
3	62	32	32	51.6%
4	2	2	2	100%
6	142	86	73	51.4%
8	44	27	24	54.5%
9	42	24	22	52.4%

For NSA 5, sufficient votes were not returned to meet the 50% respondents threshold required by ODOT's policy. Therefore, ODOT will continue to contact property owners/renters in this NSA in an attempt to acquire greater than 50% of votes to desire the recommended noise wall. Based on the results of the noise wall voting, the recommended noise walls in NSA 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, and 9 will proceed into detailed design and construction as part of the project.

Environmental Commitments

Are there any environmental commitments?

Yes



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: 07/23/2018

Do any sites require a Phase 1 ESA, Phase 2 ESA, or plan note according to the IOC from OES? No

Remarks:

Lawhon & Associates, Inc. completed a Regulated Materials Review Form for the project on November 29, 2017, and revised it on June 22, 2018. The RMR was conducted in accordance with the Ohio Department of Transportation Office of Environmental Services (ODOT-OES) Guidance (2017). As a result of this RMR, a Phase 1 ESA was recommended for three parcels. In an email correspondence, dated July 23, 2018, ODOT District 4 stated, while the RMR Guidance Flowchart may have recommended a Phase I ESA on parcels within existing right-of-way, the risk from these parcels did not warrant further action. See the Regulated Materials Review Form for the project in the Project File/ESA/Reports subsection. See the ODOT District 4 email correspondence, dated July 23, 2018, for the project in the Project File/ESA/Coordination subsection.

According to the IOC from OES does the project require any Environmental Commitments (plan notes and/or other coordination)? No



Cultural Resources

Cultural Properties Present

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

A Cultural Resources Red Flag Summary was prepared by Gray & Pape, Inc. on December 8, 2005, for project SUM 76 9.00 PID 77270. The review of secondary sources, preparation of the historic context, and field verification were part of the Red Flag Summary. The summary did not identify any properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and seven properties pre-1955. It was determined that further study was warranted on these seven properties. A Phase 1 History/Architecture Survey was prepared by Gray & Pape, Inc. dated October 3, 2006. Thirty-three previously recorded resources were identified within the APE during the literature review and none were listed on the NRHP. 807 architectural resources were identified in the APE during the field review and three were previously recommended as potentially eligible for listing on NHRP. Four resources were recommended for further Phase II study: Margaret Park Montessori School, Church of the Good Shepherd, Akron Brewing Company, and Tasty Pure Food Company. On December 20, 2006 SHPO responded in agreement with the Phase 1 report recommendation for Phase II study on the four resources. SHPO also recommended Phase II study on 556 Beacon Street, The Sacks Electric Building, St. Mary's Catholic Church, Ohio & Erie Canal segment, The Waterworks Building, and Concordia Evangelical Lutheran Church. The Red Flag Summary is in the Project File/Cultural Resources/Project Information subsection.

The Phase 1 Survey is in the Project File/Cultural Resources/Reports subsection.

A Section 106 Scoping Request was prepared by ODOT District 4 Environmental Section personnel during April 2016. The request provided mapping showing the project area and proposed improvements, a photographic log of the project study area and a records check. The records check included a review of electronic data from the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (OSHPO) to identify properties within the project study area listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), Ohio Archaeological Inventory (OAI) sites and Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) buildings and structures. Based upon the 2014 Historic Bridge Inventory, the involved bridges were determined to not be eligible for the NRHP. The Interstate Highway System itself is generally exempt from further consideration based upon the SAFETEA-LU Act of 2005 Section 607.

ODOT OES provided an IOC, dated April 18, 2016, indicating that another Phase 1 History/Architecture survey was recommended to address the revised APE and new right-of-way.

A Phase I History/Architecture Survey was completed for the project by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. on December 4, 2017. Twelve (12) historic era bridges were identified within the project construction limits. Twenty additional resources were identified within the APE, however, outside of the project construction limits. The 12 bridges were determined by ODOT to be standard type Interstate structures. Eighteen of the twenty resources beyond the project construction limits were determined 'Not Eligible' in the previous survey. The remaining 2 newly historic resources were determined 'Not Eligible.' The study found no resources eligible for listing on the NRHP are within the APE. No further cultural resource investigations are recommended for the project.

The project will not impact any known or inventoried architectural or archaeological resources. No further cultural resource investigations are recommended for the project.

The Section 106 Scoping Request (Request for Review) for the project is in the Project File/Cultural Resources/Project Information subsection.

The Phase 1 Survey for the project is in the Project File/Cultural/Reports subsection.



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

No

OES Approval/OSHPO Concurrence Date:

01/02/2018

Remarks:

In an IOC, dated January 2, 2018, ODOT-OES stated, in accordance with Stipulation V(C)(2) of the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (Agreement No. 19319), executed November 8, 2017, ODOT-OES has determined that the finding of 'No Historic Properties Affected' applies to the proposed undertaking, based on the following:

- The project limits for the undertaking are limited to previously disturbed urban areas. No further archaeological investigations are warranted.
- No National Register of Historic Places-eligible or listed properties will be affected by this project.
- No further cultural resources investigations are warranted.

SHPO was provided a 15-day comment period concerning the Section 106 Coordination for the project. No SHPO comments were received by ODOT OES for the project. This completes the Section 106 review and no further cultural resource investigations are required for the project.

Tribal coordination was conducted for the project in accordance with the MOA. On January 10, 2018, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma responded stating they have no objection to the project and are not currently aware of existing documentation directly linking a specific Miami cultural or historic site to the project site. However, as this site is within the aboriginal homelands of the Miami Tribe, if any human remains or Native American cultural items falling under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) or archaeological evidence is discovered during any phase of this project, the Miami Tribe requests immediate consultation with the entity of jurisdiction for the location of discovery. Contact Diane Hunter, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, at 918-541-8966 or dhunter@miamination.com to initiate consultation.

See the ODOT OES Section 106 Coordination correspondence, dated January 2, 2018, for the project in the Project File/Cultural Resources/Coordination subsection.

See the tribal coordination correspondence, dated January 10, 2018, for the project in the Project File/ Cultural Resources/Coordination subsection.

Subsequent to this Section 106 coordination for the project, it was determined that grading work for the project will require permanent right-of-way from one modern property. In an IOC, dated June 11, 2018, ODOT-OES stated, in accordance with Stipulation V(C)(2) of the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement (Agreement No. 19319), executed November 8, 2017, ODOT-OES determined the finding of 'No Historic Properties Affected' still applies to the proposed undertaking, based upon the following:



- The project limits for the undertaking are limited to previously disturbed urban areas. No further archaeological investigations are warranted.
- No National Register-eligible or listed properties will be affected by this project.

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

No additional project coordination is required with the SHPO or tribes.

See ODOT OES Section 106 Re-evaluation correspondence, dated June 11, 2018, for the project in the Project File/Cultural Resources/Coordination subsection.

What is the Section 106 effect determination in the OES Transmittal? No Historic Properties Affected

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

Has an ESR been completed? No

Wetlands

Are Wetlands Present? No

Remarks:

Review of waterway resource mapping and field review of the project study area on April 4, 2016, by Lawhon & Associates, Inc., determined wetlands are not located in the project study area. The project will not impact any wetlands.

Streams & Rivers

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

Remarks:

Review of waterway resource mapping and field review of the project study area on April 4, 2016, by Lawhon & Associates, Inc., determined streams, rivers and watercourses are not located in the project study area. The project will not impact any streams, rivers and watercourses.

Other Surface Waters

	Present:	Impacted:
Reservoirs:	No	
Lakes:	No	
Ponds:	No	
Storm Water Management Facility:	No	
Jurisdictional Ditch:	No	



Approved: 1/30/2019

Other (If selected please explain in remarks):	No	
--	----	--

Remarks:

Review of waterway resource mapping and field review of the project study area on April 4, 2016, by Lawhon & Associates, Inc., determined other surface waters are not located in the project study area. The project will not impact any other surface waters.

Terrestrial Habitat

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

Remarks:

Review of resource mapping and field review of the project study area on April 4, 2016, by Lawhon & Associates, Inc., determined unique or high quality terrestrial habitats are not located in the project study area. The project will not impact any unique or high quality terrestrial habitats.

Threatened or Endangered Species

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

Remarks:

Review of resource mapping and field review of the project study area on August 3, 2017, by ODOT District 4 Environmental Section personnel determined threatened or endangered species and their habitats are not located in the project study area. The project will not impact any threatened/endangered species or their habitats.

Agency Coordination

	Coordination Required:	Comments Received Date:
Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR):	No	



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS):	No	
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:

ODOT District 4 Environmental Section personnel confirmed the project will not impact any ecological resources. Therefore, ecological resource agency coordination is not required for the project.

See the Ecologically Exempt Project Documentation Form completed for the project by ODOT District 4 Environmental Section personnel on August 3, 2017, in the Project File/Ecological/Reports subsection.

Are there any environmental commitments?

No



Other Resources

Farmlands

Farmlands

The proposed project is located within an Urbanized Area Yes

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

Remarks:

Based upon review of appropriate mapping, the project is in an urbanized area zoned for non-agricultural purposes and is not in an agricultural district. Therefore, the project satisfies the terms and conditions of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Ohio Department of Transportation for Projects Involving Farmlands (Agreement No. 19552), executed on March 15, 2016, and completion of the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form is not required for the project. No further farmland 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	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 public water system wells, intakes, drinking water source protection areas, non-



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

transient, non-community water systems or transient non-community water systems are not within 1/2 mile of the project study area. The project area does not lie over a Federally-designated sole source aquifer.

See the water source protection area map for the project in the Project File/Other Resources/Drinking Water subsection.

A search of the ODNR Division of Soil and Water Well Logs identified one residential drinking water well located in proximity to the project. The project will not impact this drinking water well.

See the well log data for the project in the Project File/Other Resources/Drinking Water subsection.

The project will not impact any 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

No

Identified Section 4(f) Properties

Remarks:

Review of available maps and property ownership records by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. did not identify any public parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or historic sites within the project study area. The Archbishop Hoban High School, a private Catholic school, has various athletic facilities located north of IR 76 and east of Inman Street, adjacent to the project study area. These athletic facilities are not public-owned facilities. The former Goodrich Middle School property, located east of IR 77/Coventry Street and south of Lafollette Street, adjacent to the project study area, is owned by the city of Akron. This former middle school property does not serve any recreational functions of the city of Akron.

A future pedestrian/bike trail, known as the Rubber City Heritage Trail, may traverse within/along the project study area. However, this future pedestrian/bike trail currently has no dedicated funding nor an established trail alignment to construct it. As part of its future alignment, it may use the proposed new pedestrian/bicycle bridge to be constructed over IR 77 between Lafollette Street and Kipling Street as part of the project. The Ohio & Erie Canalway Coalition, a private, non-profit organization working to develop the Rubber City Heritage Trail to connect with the Ohio & Erie Canal Towpath Trail, was consulted about the proposed new pedestrian/bicycle bridge over IR 77 to be constructed as part of the project.

On January 2, 2018, ODOT-OES determined the finding of 'No Historic Properties Affected' applies to the proposed undertaking. Furthermore, on June 11, 2018, ODOT-OES determined the finding of 'No Historic Properties Affected' still applies to the proposed undertaking.

Based upon the above information, Section 4(f) properties do not exist within the project study area.

The project will not impact any Section 4(f) properties.

Are there any environmental commitments?

No



Section 6(f)

Section 6(f) Determination

	Present:	Impacted:
6(f) Properties:	No	

Remarks:

Research of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Coalition website <https://www.lwcfcoalition.com/tools> did not identify any parks or recreation areas within the project study area that received Section 6(f) funds.

See the LWCF Grant Listing for Summit County in the Project File/Section 6(f)/Project Information subsection.

The project will not impact any Section 6(f) properties.

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 is consistent with local plans and is not expected to change development patterns in the area. This project is listed in the Transportation Outlook 2040, the long-range regional transportation plan for Summit County, Portage County and part of Wayne County, as prepared by the Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS), the metropolitan planning organization for Summit County, Portage County and part of Wayne County. Moreover, the project is also listed in the AMATS Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 - FY 2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

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

Remarks:

The project will not result in any substantive negative impacts to community cohesion within the project study area. Furthermore, community cohesion impacts are not expected with the proposed permanent removal of the existing Lafollette Street bridge over IR 77 as part of the project because the project also proposes to construct a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge over IR 77 between Lafollette Street and Kipling Street.

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

Remarks:

Reasonably foreseeable secondary or cumulative impacts are not expected from the project, including the proposed permanent closure of the existing IR 76 westbound exit ramp to Inman Street, the proposed permanent closure of the existing IR 77 southbound exit ramp to Lovers Lane and the proposed permanent removal of the existing Lafollette Street bridge over IR 77.

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 project, including the proposed permanent closure of the existing IR 76 westbound exit ramp to Inman Street, the proposed permanent closure of the existing IR 77 southbound exit ramp to Lovers Lane and the proposed permanent removal of the existing Lafollette Street bridge over IR 77, will not result in substantive impacts to health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation or pedestrian/bicycle facilities.

The various utilities within the project study area were contacted and received copies of the Stage 1 Design plans. Several sets of correspondence were sent to the utilities and responses received in February and March 2018. Relocations of existing utilities within the project area will be necessary to construct the project. These utility relocations will occur within the existing highway/street rights-of-way. Coordination with affected utility owners is ongoing during project design and will continue throughout project construction.

The project will include appropriate maintenance of traffic measures to minimize traffic disruptions during project construction. Temporary ramp closures and detours will be necessary to connect the proposed new ramps with the existing highways. Various temporary lane closures will also occur along IR 76, IR 77 and SR 8 throughout construction of the project. Final maintenance of traffic (MOT) plans for the project will be developed during the Stage 3 design phase. Public involvement activities that were



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

conducted for the project included this maintenance of traffic information to determine impacts and obtain feedback from stakeholders, the public and emergency/public services. The Akron emergency/public services attended and participated in the various public involvement activities conducted for the project. Local emergency/public services and community notifications of the proposed temporary ramp/lane closures, detours and other maintenance of traffic measures to be implemented for the project shall be performed in accordance with ODOT Traffic Engineering Manual Notes 642-58 Notification of Traffic Restrictions and 642-8 Item 614, Maintaining Traffic (Notice of Closure Sign), as applicable.

In addition, the project will also construct a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge over IR 77 between Lafollette Street and Kipling Street as part of the proposed improvements.

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

No

Remarks:

The project will not displace any residents, businesses, institutions or farms.

Are there any Environmental Commitments?

No



Underserved Populations

Underserved Populations

Identified Underserved Populations

Census Block Group #	% Minority	% Low Income
391535041001	22	88
391535042001	24	94
391535042002	32	66
391535046001	57	67
391535046004	76	67
391535032001	75	52
391535042003	51	62
391535032001	62	69

- 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?** Yes
- Will access to shopping, bus stops, schools, jobs, recreational resources, community centers, etc. be diminished or completely restricted on a permanent basis for an Underserved Population?** No
- Will man-made dividers such as an overpass, bridge, 4-lane or greater roadway or railroad negatively impact the extent to which a community feels connected or cohesive for an Underserved Population?** No
- Will access to or use of the transportation improvement be denied to any Underserved Populations (for reasons such as cost to use, ability to access, etc.)?** No
- Will the proposed project result in unanticipated additional impacts to any Underserved Populations?** No
- Were any concerns related to impacts on Environmental Justice Populations or any other unique factors that could result in a disproportionately high and adverse effect raised during public involvement?** No
- Were any concerns related to impacts on Title VI Populations or any other unique factors that could result in a disparate impact raised during Public Involvement?** No
- 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:

Based on the proposed permanent closure of the existing IR 76 westbound exit ramp to Inman Street, the proposed permanent closure of the existing IR 77 southbound exit ramp to Lovers Lane and the proposed permanent removal of the existing Lafollette Street bridge over IR 77 with the accompanying proposed construction of a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge over IR 77 between Lafollette Street and Kipling Street, an



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

Underserved Populations Impact Analysis Report (UPIAR) was completed for the project by Lawhon & Associates, Inc. during June 2018. The analysis concluded that the project will not have any impacts to Underserved Populations greater than the general population. On July 3, 2018, ODOT-OES stated the report is in compliance with the ODOT-Underserved Populations Guidance (revised January 2018) and approved the UPIAR for the project. The project will not result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on any Environmental Justice population or disparate impacts on any Title VI population. Therefore, no further coordination is required for the project.

Informal coordination was conducted with Akron Metropolitan Housing Authority to provide project information and the opportunity to comment on the project primarily as it related to underserved populations. The agency had no comments related to the project.

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 for the 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 for the project.

The proposed project will have no substantive impacts to Limited English Proficiency Populations, Older Adults and Individuals with Disabilities 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 for the 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 for the project.

See the UPIAR for the project in the Project File/Underserved Populations/Reports subsection.

See the ODOT-OES UPIAR Approval IOC, dated July 3, 2018, for the project in the Project File/Underserved Populations/Coordination subsection.

Are there any Environmental Commitments?

No



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 letters related to field survey work were sent on April 4, 2017, for this project.

An invitation letter was sent to potential stakeholders on October 3, 2016, announcing the October 19, 2016, Stakeholders Meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to present the project and gather input from the Stakeholders. Stakeholders representing Archbishop Hogan High School, AMATS, city of Akron, Akron City Schools, Akron Fire Department, Akron Police Department, Akron City Council, ODOT and project consultants attended the meeting. Stakeholders provided comments on Inman Street closure, keeping LaFollette Street bridge, school in project area is closed and the project schedule.

A Public Involvement Meeting was conducted on October 27, 2016, from 5-7 pm at the Glover Community Learning Center, 935 Hammel Street, Akron. Meeting announcements were sent to an extensive list of community residents on October 12, 2016. ODOT District 4 issued a press release on October 13, 2016, announcing the meeting. Meeting announcements were also posted on ODOT social media sites. On October 14, 2016, the Akron Beacon Journal posted a news article on the online page about the project and the meeting. Seventy-five people, primarily residents, attended the meeting.

A second Stakeholder meeting was conducted for the project on December 6, 2017. Invitation letters were sent to previously identified stakeholders on November 22, 2017. Several agencies were identified as possible links to the neighborhoods in the project study area. East Akron Neighborhood Development Corporation, Truly Reaching You Ministries and six churches were invited to the December 2017 Stakeholder Meeting. No one from these agencies or churches attended the December 2017 Stakeholder Meeting. Stakeholders representing the City of Akron Police and Fire Departments, Akron Metropolitan Area Transportation Study, Alcon Tool, ODOT, and project consultants attended the meeting. Following a presentation by the project team the attendees provided comments and asked questions, which were addressed during the meeting, on the removal of the LaFollette Street vehicle bridge over IR 77 and replacing it with a new bike/pedestrian only bridge.

A second Public Involvement Meeting was conducted on March 6, 2018, from 5:00 pm - 7:00 pm at the Glover Community Learning Center, 935 Hammel Street, Akron. Letters announcing this meeting were sent to over 200 residents, public officials and agencies on February 16, 2018. Meeting announcement flyers were also posted at various locations around the project study area on February 22, 2018. Locations included eight grocery stores, six churches and various other businesses. ODOT District 4 issued a press release on February 20, 2018, announcing the Public Involvement Meeting. A Public Involvement Meeting announcement was posted on the ODOT District 4 website. Paid advertisements were also published in the Akron Beacon Journal on February 18 and March 4, 2018. 107 people attended the meeting representing residents, local churches, AMATS (MPO), city/township officials, business owners and Channel 19 news station reporters.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange

Approved: 1/30/2019

See the public involvement materials for the project in the Project File/Public Involvement/Project Information subsection.

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.

One written comment was received from Bishop Hogan High School following the October 19, 2016, stakeholder meeting. ODOT's written response was included with responses to the comments received at the public meeting.

Thirteen written comments were received during and after the October 27, 2016, public involvement meeting conducted for the project. The comments included questions about noise walls, not closing Lovers Lane, Lovers Lane/Inman Avenue closures affecting Hoban High School, keep Lafollette bridge open, traffic congestion on SR 8 and ramp configurations. ODOT provided written responses to these comments by letter on December 23, 2016. A summary of the received comments and responses to comments was also posted to the ODOT District 4 website on January 4, 2017.

Twenty-eight written comments were received during and after the March 6, 2018, public involvement meeting. Comments included need for two lane ramps, project schedule, like removing Lafollette bridge, SR 8 traffic congestion, visual affects of noise walls, concern for lanes shut down during construction but no work being done, two lanes at US 224, no left hand exits, ODOT coordinate with GPS mapping providers during construction, weaving now and future, not close Kipling or Coventry Drive, relocate Coventry onto former school property, keep Lafollette bridge, concern for problem youth using proposed Lafollette bridge to enter neighborhood, INVEST analysis should be conducted, long construction time line, Crosier traffic congestion, trail from Kipling to Coventry and Berkhardt will be impacted by other closures. ODOT provided written responses to these comments on April 17, 2018.

See the received comments, responses to comments and related documentation for both public involvement meetings conducted 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? No

ODNR

Shore Structure Permit : No

Remarks:

Based on review of waterway resource mapping and field review of the project study area on April 4, 2016, by Lawhon & Associates, Inc., wetlands, streams, rivers and watercourses are not located in the project study area. The project will not impact any wetlands, streams, rivers and watercourses. Therefore, the project does not require any waterway permits.

Are there any environmental commitments? No

Storm Water Permits

NPDES Construction General Permit for Stormwater (NOI): Yes

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

Remarks:

Construction of the project will require a total disturbance of approximately 37 acres of earthen area. Consequently, as more than one acre of land will be disturbed to construct the project, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit for Stormwater is required for the project and a Notice of Intent (NOI) will be submitted to Ohio EPA requesting NPDES coverage for this project.

Are there any environmental commitments? Yes

Floodplains

The proposed project involves encroachment within a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) No

Remarks:

Based upon review of the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Community Panels 39153C0184F, 39153C0195F, 39153C0203F and 39153C0211F by Lawhon & Associates, Inc., on February 21, 2018, the project is not located within any regulated floodplains. The project will not impact any floodplains. Therefore, the project does not require any floodplain permits.

See the FEMA FIRM mapping for the project in the Project File/Permits/Floodplains subsection.

Are there any environmental commitments? No



Landfills

Is a 2713 Permit required?

No

Remarks:

Based on the regulated materials review activities conducted for the project, former/existing landfills do not exist within the project study area. The project will not impact any former/existing landfills. Therefore, the project does not require an Ohio EPA Rule 2713 Permit.

Are there any environmental commitments?

No



Environmental Commitments

Noise

- 1) The Project Designer shall incorporate the following into the plans: Seven barriers and the preferred textures and colors are proposed for NSA 1 - Ashlar Gray; NSA 3 - Ashlar Gray; NSA 4 None; NSA 6 - Drystack Tan; NSA 8 - Drystack Tan; and NSA 9 - Drystack Tan.
- 2) ODOT will continue to pursue votes to obtain over 50% respondents for the proposed NSA 5 noise wall and provide details to Project Designer.

Permits - Storm Water Permits

- 1) ODOT shall prepare and submit the NOI to the OEPA and shall be responsible for obtaining the NPDES permit prior to the start of construction activities. The permit special provisions shall be adhered to and included in the project plans.



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange
Approved: 1/30/2019

Preparers and Approvals

Form Preparer:

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

Supporting Form Preparer(s):

Robert Lang
Thomas Powell
Lori Keyser

Approvals & Electronic Signatures

Approved & Electronically Signed By:	Approval Date:
Edward Deley (PROGRAM ADMIN 3)	1/30/2019



Appendix

General

Aerial Map.pdf
County Map.pdf
STIP Listing.pdf
TIP Listing.pdf
USGS Quadrangle Topographical Map.pdf

Air

Conformity Determination Approval - PM 2.5.pdf
Coordination with OEPA-USEPA-FHWA - PM 2.5.pdf
Coordination with OEPA-USEPA-FHWA - PM 2.5_Clarification.pdf

Noise

OES Approval - Noise Analysis.pdf

ESA

RMR Approval.pdf

Cultural Resources

OES Scoping Guidance - History Architecture.pdf
OES Section 106 Effect Determination - Re-Evaluation.pdf
OES Section 106 Effect Determination.pdf
SHPO Response - PID 77270.pdf

Ecological

Ecological Review Form - Ecologically Exempt Project.pdf

Other Resources

Water Source Protection Area Map.pdf
Well Log Data.pdf

Section 6(f)

LWCF Grant Listing.pdf

Underserved Populations

Census Mapping.pdf
OES Approval - Underserved Populations Impact Analysis.pdf



Public Involvement

District 4 Website Postings - Screen Shots.pdf
News Article.pdf
Press Release 2-20-18.pdf
Press Release.pdf
Public Comments Received.pdf
Public Meeting Comment Sheet.pdf
Public Meeting Exhibits 3-6-18.pdf
Public Meeting Exhibits.pdf
Public Meeting Handouts 3-6-18.pdf
Public Meeting Handouts.pdf
Public Meeting Notification - First Advertisement.PDF
Public Meeting Notification - Second Advertisement .PDF
Public Meeting Notification 2-8-2018.pdf
Public Meeting Notification.pdf
Public Meeting Notification-Social Media.pdf
Public Meeting Sign In Sheet 3-6-18.pdf
Public Meeting Sign In Sheet.pdf
Public Meeting UP Flyer Posted 2-27-18.pdf
Response to Public Comments - Letters.pdf
Response to Public Comments - Web.pdf
Response to Public Comments 2018.pdf
Stakeholder Comments.pdf
Stakeholder Contact List 2016.pdf
Stakeholder Contact List 2017.pdf
Stakeholder Email Comments Responses.pdf
Stakeholder Handout.pdf
Stakeholder Meeting Minutes or Notes 10-19-16.pdf
Stakeholder Meeting Minutes or Notes 12-6-17.pdf
Stakeholder Meeting Sign In Sheet 10-19-16.pdf
Stakeholder Notification 12-6-2017 Meeting.pdf
Stakeholder Notification Letter 10-19-2016.pdf



Environmental Document Level: D1
PID 101402 SUM 76/77 Central Interchange
Approved: 1/30/2019

Website Posting Comments Responses.pdf

Permits

FEMA FIRM.pdf