



Table of Contents

Central Region Meeting Summary– 22 July, 2013	<u>2</u>
Statewide Passenger Meeting Summary– 22 July, 2013	<u>6</u>
Northeast Region Meeting Summary– 23 July, 2013.....	<u>8</u>
Southeast Region Meeting Summary– 25 July, 2013.....	<u>11</u>
Northwest Region Meeting Summary– 30 July, 2013.....	<u>17</u>
Southwest Region Meeting Summary– 31 July, 2013.....	<u>20</u>
Statewide Rail Meeting Summary– 31 July, 2013	<u>23</u>
Summary of the Regional Profile Content Comments.....	<u>26</u>
Summary of Additional SIP's.....	<u>28</u>



ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

CENTRAL REGION

JULY 22, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Maria Schaper, MORPC

Nick Gill, MORPC

Chuck Dyer, ODOT Planning

Ty Thompson, ODOT District 5

Thom Slack, ODOT District 6

Scott Phinney, ODOT Planning

Sandie Mapel, LCATS

Dave Slatzer, ODOT District 5

Susan Daniels, Lawhon & Associates

Derek Troyer, ODOT Safety

Lisa Patt-McDaniel, OCCA

Andrew Shepler, ODOT Planning

1. Welcome

The meeting began with a welcome from Scott Phinney and Introductions. Scott then described the purpose of the meeting and what input ODOT is looking to get from participants. Scott mentioned that we are not ready to discuss final plan recommendations as staff is still working on developing them.

2. Regional Profiles

After an introduction to the meeting, Scott described the content of the regional profile. Chuck Dyer mentioned that the profile only discusses infrastructure on the Access Ohio Strategic Transportation System (STS). Scott mentioned that while the profile only discusses the STS, that does not mean that that is the only infrastructure that ODOT cares about. Scott mentioned that the regional profile is still a draft and is not ready for final release. The Total State Freight Flow is statewide but the hope is to replace it with regional figures.

Scott opened it up to comments on what changes should be made to the regional profile. A question was presented about the congestion map and how it was created, specifically why 33 in Fairfield County was not congested. Scott explained that the map was created using the travel demand model but ODOT is beginning to work with real time data sources such as INRIX.

A question was brought up about how to include projects that are not under construction when the plan is completed. Are those projects take into consideration in the 2040 forecasted congestion map. It was mentioned that the labels on the congestion map are confusing. The orange color (Expected Congestion) could actually be more congested than the red (already congested) in the future if the already congested areas are fixed between now and 2040.

It was brought up that it might be helpful to show transit service areas. It would be helpful to provide data on intracity transit services.

The highway lane miles are only centerline miles but are labeled as lane miles. The group would prefer that lane miles and not centerline miles are presented. Also, there is a scale problem with the safety

information, it should be per hundred million vehicle miles traveled rather than million vehicle miles traveled.

It was suggested that congestion should be shown as a percentage of lane miles that are congested rather than using V/C ratio.

On the economic profile, it was mentioned that retail isn't really considered an industry. Retail supports whatever population you have in a region because it is a population based measure. Perhaps it is covering logistic and distribution for retail. There was a question about whether we are looking at full time employees or does it include part time employees. Maybe Full Time Equivalents should be used to determine the top 5 industries. Top five employment categories might be a better term than top 5 industries. Scott mentioned that the main purpose of the document is to provide background on the system to determine needs. It was mentioned that the number of employees should be presented by industry/employment category and also percentage of state employment.

A question was brought up about transit needs and how transit needs were determined in areas where there is no current transit service. To maintain existing service is different from transit needs in 2040. Scott mentioned that we saw transit as a big hole which is why ODOT is embarking on a statewide transit needs study. Maybe label as more of a transit profile rather than transit needs. It was suggested that we consider doing an addendum to Access Ohio once the transit needs study is completed. It was suggested that we annually report out on our performance measures.

For demographics it was suggested that Environmental Justice population percentages be presented (low income and minority populations).

3. Strategic Investment Priorities Methodology

Scott explained the methodology for how ODOT determined the Regional Strategic Investment Priorities presented in the regional profile. Scott asked participants to pull out a spreadsheet showing the data for the facilities. A red box indicates that a facility has exceeded a threshold and is presented as a Regional Strategic Investment Priority. The question for the group is did we capture the most important needs.

4. Strategic Investment Priorities & Surveys

Chuck mentioned that he wanted to go through each of the Regional Strategic Investment Priorities individually and have a discussion on each. A question was brought up about what projects are coded into the 2040 network and that information needs to be clear. Scott had the members of the group pull out the SIP Survey and mentioned that members will be asked to fill it out and it will be collected at the end of the meeting. A definition of if dirt has not been turned, we assumed that it has not been done and it is up for discussion as a need.

It was brought up that we need to make it clear that while a segment was discussed as a need, that improvements may only cover portions of the segment. The terminology was questioned for investment priorities but rather it was mentioned that we are really identifying problem areas and not necessary areas of investment. It was suggested that the language explaining the regional strategic investment priorities could be improved and include mention of alternative solutions. Strategic Priority Needs was suggested as a new term.

A) I-71 (I-270 to I-270)

It was mentioned that I-71 is important but can't necessarily be fixed. The cost for expansion would be significant.

B) I-70 (I-270 to I-270)

It was brought up that the first interchange after I-270 was still a consideration (for example, Brice). Maybe using the urban area boundary is better than I-270. Based upon congestion shown, I-70 east of I-270 is important but is being lost in the overall segment because it goes from I-270 to I-77.

C) US 23/SR 15 (I-270 to US 42)

It was questioned why SR 15 is mentioned and it is because the corridor becomes SR 15 near Findlay.

D) US 42 (I-70 to I-71)

US 42 was mentioned as an important truck route.

E) I-270 (Entire Loop)

F) I-670 (I-70 to US 23)

It was mentioned that the segment should be I-70 to I-270 rather than US 23

G) SR 31 (US 33 to US 68)

SR 31 was mentioned as an important truck route.

H) Port Columbus

I) Ohio State University Airport

Rickenbacker was mentioned as more important than the Ohio State University Airport. Although it was mentioned that OSU Airport does have significant traffic and economic importance. A question was brought up as to how close other things came to making the list. A question is whether Rickenbacker is a problem that needs to be listed. Rickenbacker is critical, but it doesn't have any major needs. But what happens if a need arises but they weren't listed as a strategic investment priority? The answer is that the SIPs are only one piece of information to consider, it doesn't mean that projects won't occur elsewhere.

J) Norfolk Southern (Columbus to Portsmouth)

For rail and aviation, connectivity was mentioned as more important than something like passive rail grade crossings. More information is needed on connectivity. The information we have about rail and aviation does not really show us what is or is not a SIP.

K) Norfolk Southern (Dayton to Columbus)

L) Short Line Railroads

M) Central Ohio Transit Authority Operating Budget

It was mentioned that the regional profile does not provide all the background necessary. The primary corridors are more important than the SIPs. If there is a need on any corridor we want to fix it whether it

is a SIP or not. It could be mentioned that the SIPs are a subset of the major corridors and not take precedence over the corridors.

5. Additional Investment Priorities

I-70 east of I-270 was agreed as an addition.

US 33 from I-70 to the Lancaster Bypass and US 33 from I-270 to US 42 were suggested as additions as well. However, there is an issue with segmentation that may not show these as needs.



**ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
STATEWIDE PASSENGER
JULY 22, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY**

Participants:

Scott Phinney, ODOT Statewide Planning
Chuck Dyer, ODOT Statewide Planning
Drew Hurst, ODOT Statewide Planning
Susan Daniels, Lawhon and Associates
Alison D. Goebel, Greater Ohio Policy Center
(on behalf of Lavea Brachman)

Kate Moening, Safe Routes to School National Partnership
Marianne Freed, ODOT Transit
Rhonda Romano, Rails to Trails Conservancy
Julie Walcoff, ODOT Bike and Pedestrian Coordinator

Welcome

Scott Phinney began the meeting with a welcome and the attendees introduced themselves. Many participants expressed interest in the multimodal aspects of the plan.

Regional Profiles

The five regional profiles were then discussed, with regional geographies based upon the JobsOhio regions, with the Cincinnati and Dayton regions combined. These five regional profiles described transportation infrastructure and related demographic data for each region. Several attendees liked the general format and graphic design of the regional profiles.

Public transit was a major focus area of this discussion. After Chuck Dyer explained that Access Ohio contains needs only for existing local transit agencies across the state, several participants suggested improvements. One suggested improvement for the transit section included determining geographic areas needing improved transit service, and conducting a more in-depth analysis of intercity transit. Another proposed change was adding additional demographic information that indicate transit propensity, including number of people with disabilities. It was also mentioned that the upcoming ODOT Transit Study will analyze areas where transit services are needed, and determine which transit agencies are doing a good job serving their local areas. It was also requested that it be emphasized that the percentages on the transit needs is the percent of the state's transit needs only - not the percentage of entire transportation funding needs.

The bikeway sections of the regional profiles also were thoroughly discussed. Multiple participants noted that the percentage of bikeways in the central region appeared to be too low (note: ODOT reviewed this, and this number will be updated to a higher, more accurate figure in future regional profiles). It was also proposed that the term “National Bike Routes” be replaced with “US Bike Routes” to match AASHTO.

The group also proposed several additional items that could be added or adjusted on the regional profiles, such as including a web link to a map of all of the statewide transit agencies’ websites on the electronic versions of the regional profiles. Another suggestion was to reduce the lineweights and reduce the size of several of the labels on the maps to make them easier to read. Bike safety hotspots and crash data were other suggested additions to better illustrate bike safety needs. It was also suggested that general trends should be discussed to show what could change in the region over the life of the plan.

Strategic Investment Priorities

Next the Strategic Transportation System (STS) and the methodology for the Strategic Investment Priorities (SIP) were discussed. The factors that were used to determine the SIPs were discussed, and it was emphasized that the SIPs were not ranked in any particular order.

The group then considered the general breakdown of the SIPs by mode. One participant pointed out that, of the 62 draft SIPs across the state, only three involve bikes; it was then suggested to consult with bicycle and pedestrian experts in each region to refine the SIPs for this transportation mode, and it was also mentioned that improved bicycle and pedestrian counts could make it easier to determine bicycle and pedestrian priorities in the future. One participant also mentioned that improved bicycle data collection could be a valuable tool in developing policy SIPs.

The group also felt that the public transit SIPs miss out on a large portion of the state. For example, the southeastern part of the state had no transit SIPs because the SIP development relied only on existing conditions. There are currently parts of this region with no transit service, but this was not shown as a need due to the methodology.

Plan Recommendations and Conclusions

Specific SIPs were not discussed, since the participants represent statewide organizations and interests. The meeting then concluded with a brief description of additional investment priorities and plan recommendations, but these were not discussed in detail due to time constraints.



ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
NORTHEAST REGION
JULY 23, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Kathleen Rodi, Eastgate

Dan Moeglin, City of Canton

Mike Schafrath, ODOT District 3

Randy Lane, NOACA

Robert Brown, City of Cleveland

Sara Walton, ODOT Planning

Scott Phinney, ODOT Planning

Sarah Miller, ERPC

Michael Kubek, ODOT District 12

Jason Segedy, AMATS

Tony Paglia, Youngstown Chamber of Commerce

Mary Murray, ERPC

Nicole Grohe, ERPC

Chuck Dyer, ODOT Planning

Susan Daniels, Lawhon & Associates

Welcome & Introduction (Scott)

- Scott opens the meeting explaining the purpose of the meeting is to discuss the regional profiles and the strategic investment profiles.

Regional Profiles (Scott)

- Page 1 is the STS map for the region, the STS is considered the backbone of the transportation system. We divided the state into regions according to the JobsOhio regions, with the exception of the southwest region where we combined the Dayton and Cincinnati into one region.
- Page 2 and 3 – the purpose of these pages are to provide context for the back page of the regional profile where the needs are summarized. These two pages contain the corridor analysis summary which captures the conditions of the STS system in the region. The 2040 congestion map which shows congestion after all projects in the TRAC program are built. The transit box explains the transit needs in the region compared to the rest of the state. We weren't completely satisfied with the transit part of Access Ohio so ODOT is launching a separate transit study to identify the appropriate type and level of service for each area of Ohio. The demographic and economic trends information is 2010 data. The data in the freight flow information is a place holder at this point in time. This table will be setup the way it's presented here, but the data will change for the final flyer. We are still in the process of aggregating the freight flow data to the regional level.
 - Comments on the first three pages of the flyer
 - Capture shale impact on the transportation system in the economic section
 - More interstate shields on maps- some are missing

- Youngstown experiencing a boom from software development and technologies
- Add two columns in the economic and demographic section that lists the projected 2040 data and then explain the resulting trend
- Move labels on congestion map so you can better see congestion
- Add percent of people with a bachelor's degree to demographic section
- Corridor analysis contains good data, but not very helpful from a planning perspective, doesn't accurately capture where the region is with advancing particular modes. The region focuses a portion of its resources off the STS system.
- Extensive discussion about how to appropriately represent the bike network in the regional profile, ODOT briefly reviewed its approach with developing bike corridors in conjunction with AASHTO's national bike route system. There are new routes in Akron area that parallel I-77, ODOT should consider including them in the bike corridor analysis.
- These maps would be helpful if you could view them online so you zoom in
- Consider including national average information in the economic and demographic area so we could compare ourselves to the nation, this may give good context
- The fortune 500 information is great, but it leaves off Cleveland Clinic which is a huge economic generator for the region, it's a little awkward because the healthcare field is recognized as a large employment sector, but no companies listed are connected to the healthcare field
- It would be interesting if you could capture unemployment
- STS map layers need to be reordered so national is on top
- I-77 south of Canton should be a national corridor

SIPs (Chuck)

- Explains the process ODOT went through to develop the SIPs. The results are a reflection of the limits of the data. Discussed general data that was used for each mode. Each SIP was discussed individually. It was explained that ODOT was open to adding SIPs to the list, as long some of the existing SIPs were removed. If there are SIP additions, there needs to be data to back up the addition, a reason why it should be added.
 - Comments made during the SIP discussion
 - ODOT should add west leg of I-77/I-76 should be added (Central Interchange), it was the 4th highest crash area in the state
 - ODOT should add I-80/I-76 in Youngstown, 2nd highest truck traffic in the state
 - ODOT should add I-480, it's the most congested, however there are some planned projects that should help. After those projects there may not be any additional improvements that would relieve congestion.
 - ODOT should consider adding I-271 (Rt 8 to I-90)
 - Consider adding map with safety hot spots

- Pull in MPO projects to evaluate if proposed projects line with analysis
- Identify needs per region for pavement and bridge maintenance and then identify money left over for safety and congestion projects
- Divide SIPs into two lists based on national and statewide corridor designation
- Economic impact of airports is important, but not a SIP
- Improving access to commercial airports could be a priority of the department, but not the airport itself
- Bridges seem to be missing from SIPs and regional profiles
- Never heard of the route the bike SIP is on
- Towpath and Ohio to Erie trail discussed as possible SIPs, completing these trails is important to the region
- Explain which agencies are county wide
- Add SR4 in Erie County because of truck traffic and congestion
- Cleveland Hopkins Airport – Access from I-71 southbound to airport

Other comments received after the meeting

- Add NS railroad to Youngstown
- OTP SR 193
- US 30 east of Canton is more important to the region than US 250
- Add towpath from Cleveland to Dover/New Philadelphia
- US BR 40 should go through Canton to Tow Path Trail
- For transit SIPs identify projected needs based on population shifts, specifically look at Lorain County
- Add I-480 full length to the SIP list
- Add IR 271 (SR 8 to I-90) to the SIP list
- Add significant bridge and highway maintenance projects
- For bike SIPs focus on regional and statewide facilities, i.e. Tow Path trail, Ohio to Erie, and regional lakefront facility planning
- Add Port of Cleveland to SIP list



ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
SOUTHEAST REGION
JULY 25, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDEES:

Bret Allphin, Buckeye Hills	John Barnhouse (for Roxanne Kane), ODOT District 11
Misty Casto, Buckeye Hills	Susan Daniels, Lawhon & Associates
Eric Davis (for Debra Fought), ODOT District 10	Randy Durst, WWW
Chuck Dyer, ODOT Central Office	Max Francis, ODOT District 9
Scott Phinney, ODOT Central Office	Vince Rapp, ODOT Central Office
Lantz Repp, HOC-ATH-Perry	Scott Thompson, ODOT District 9
Ty Thompson, ODOT District 5	Jeannette Wierzbicki, OMEGA
Bethany Wild (for Saleem Salameh), KYOVA	

MEETING PURPOSE:

The purpose of the meeting was for ODOT to acquire feedback from stakeholders in southeast Ohio before preparing a draft of the final Access Ohio 2040 long range transportation plan. Specifically, ODOT was seeking feedback on a data driven list of identified transportation infrastructure priorities/ needs in SE Ohio, known as Strategic Investment Priorities (SIPs). In focusing on needs, the intent was not to obtain a list of projects but rather generalize the transportation issues that are affecting SE Ohio currently and into the future.

REGIONAL PROFILES:

The draft southeast Ohio regional profile that was prepared for Access Ohio was discussed. The state was split into 5 regions, based on the Jobs Ohio regions, for the purposes of the regional profiles. The regional profile summarized the backbone of the transportation infrastructure in southeast Ohio. All modes of transportation were considered in a push by ODOT to analyze Ohio's transportation system as a whole rather than focusing only on the highway network. The regional profile for southeast Ohio contains the following:

Strategic Transportation System Map

The front page of the southeast Ohio regional profile showed the "backbone" of the transportation infrastructure in the region. This backbone is also known as the "Strategic Transportation System" (STS) in southeast Ohio and it consists of roadways, rail lines,

waterways/ ports, transit facilities and bike routes. The STS was determined based on several existing factors.

- a. **Volume:** The STS contains transportation facilities that *carry the highest volumes* for their respective modes.
- b. **Classification:** Transportation facilities with a *national or statewide designation* were included in the STS.
- c. **Connectivity:** The STS includes transportation facilities that *connect urbanized areas* with populations exceeding 50,000.

Corridor Analysis Summary

The transportation facilities that are included in the STS are also called corridors throughout Access Ohio. The corridor analysis summary section of the regional profile only focuses on statistics from the STS in southeast Ohio, not all transportation facilities in southeast Ohio. Also, the statewide comparison numbers are only statistics for the STS throughout the state.

Existing Conditions

The regional profile highlighted existing demographics, freight flows, and economic activity. (The freight flows have not been determined for each region yet).

Forecasted Congestion Map

The forecasted congestion map, in the middle pages of the regional profile, was based on projections from the statewide travel demand model. The model takes into account all projects that are expected to occur. This includes all projects on the TRAC list and all projects on the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Transit Needs

Totals in the transit needs section are based on the budget that would be needed for transit agencies in southeast Ohio to maintain their current level of transit services to 2040. Transit services, such as human services transit and intercity bus, are not considered in the transit needs section due to lack of data. Because of these issues the transit needs section does not accurately portray the proportion of Ohio transit needs that exists in the southeast Ohio region.

A customer preference survey conducted by ODOT showed that transit was the number two transportation issue in Ohio, behind the road network. In southeast Ohio transit was seen as just as important as it was in Cleveland, where a robust transit system exists.

ODOT has determined that there is a need for improved transit services throughout the state, but has no way of quantifying this need at the moment and does not know the exact locations that have needs. ODOT is expediting a transit needs study and is currently in the scoping process. As a part of the transit needs study, the consultant will meet with all transit agencies,

MPOs and RTPOs throughout the state to discuss regional transit needs. Once the transit needs have been established, this information will be added to Access Ohio 2040.

COMMENTS/ QUESTIONS ABOUT REGIONAL PROFILES:

- Does the congestion map take into account future projects?... because Nelsonville and Portsmouth are projected to be congested in 2040 and both bypasses will be finished?

The model that was used to develop the map does take into account projects that are expected to occur. The statewide model outputs provide planning level traffic projections for the region as a whole. Pinpointing exact volumes at specific locations is not the intent of the statewide model; therefore, planning level projections may need to be adjusted to reflect localized conditions.

Analysis that was performed after the meeting shows that the statewide model projects there to be no congestion in the Nelsonville area in 2016, as would be expected after the completion of the bypass. The 2040 congestion that is illustrated in the map is a result of expected growth in the Nelsonville area between 2016 and 2040.

- Are there plans to widen US 33 from Athens to Pomeroy due to the increase in truck traffic that will likely result from the completion of the Nelsonville bypass?

Currently the statewide model is not projecting congestion on this stretch of US 33 even after the completion of the Nelsonville bypass. It would make sense that truck traffic will increase but we will have to wait to see if this is the case.

- Does the statewide model take into account shale activity?

It is difficult to project shale industry growth because of the erratic nature of the industry. Wells often open and are used for a short period of time and it is hard to predict where new wells will open and how long they will operate. ODOT will try to incorporate fixed shale locations such as the emerging processing plants into the model, but has not as of yet.

It was suggested that ODOT look at where MarkWest wells are being placed because these will be heavy traffic generators.

- Has ODOT considered the impact that shale will have on rail and ports?

Since rail is privately owned that is not something ODOT gets involved with.

- A suggestion was made to highlight growing industries in the region in addition to looking at those industries that are currently the largest. The following were discussed as having future implications to the transportation network in the region:

- **GROWING SHALE INDUSTRY**- several concerns were raised about the ability of the road network to deal with shale industry expansion. There are some small stretches of road that are highly utilized by trucks that are not included in the STS and likely

don't have the metrics to be included in the STS but are vital to the region as a whole. Some examples include:

- SR 78 from Ohio River to I-77 (through Woodsfield and Caldwell in Monroe and Noble Counties)
- SR 78 from I-77 to SR 37 (through McConnellsville in Morgan County)
- SR 37 from SR 78 into Perry County
- US 22 from Ohio River to I-77 (through Steubenville/ Weirton, Cadiz and Cambridge)
- US 22 from I-77 to I-70 (through Cambridge and onto Zanesville)
- SR 9 from Salem in Columbiana County to I-70 (through Salem, Carrollton and Cadiz)
- SR 43 from US 22 to US 30/ I-77 (through Carrollton into Canton)
- **NORFOLK SOUTHERN RAIL EXPANSION/ PRICHARD INTERMODAL FACILITY IN WV-** Discussion focused around the investments that are being made along the Ohio River and it appears as though KY and WV far exceed Ohio in investments along the river. Stakeholders wonder whether the lack of railroad and port investments in Ohio is due to the road infrastructure in the area. There are some height constraints on roadways that prevent the easy movement of goods through southeastern Ohio.
- **PANAMA CANAL IMPROVEMENTS** - evidence to suggest that the Panama Canal will have an impact on the Ohio River is inconclusive.
- **PLANS TO EXPAND DOCKS AND CRANES AT SOUTH POINT**

STRATEGIC INVESTMENT PRIORITIES (SIPs):

SIPs are a list of critical transportation needs that will likely need to be addressed by 2040. SIPs are intended to guide ODOTs discretionary funding priorities for programs such as major new, major bridge, major rehab and safety. ODOT will continue to maintain the entire transportation system to the same standards that are maintained today; but will focus future discretionary decisions around the SIPs.

ODOT used a metric based approach to highlight the following 8 SIPs in the southeast region of Ohio. A survey was taken by meeting participants and each of the SIPs were rated on a 5 point scale, with 1 indicating strong disagreement with the SIP and 5 indicating strong agreement with the SIP.

A. SR 32 (US 23 to WV Border)	4.2
B. State Bike Route 47	2.7
C. National Bike Route 50	3.0
D. Marine-70 Greenup Locks and Dam	4.1
E. Marine-70 Hannibal Locks and Dam	3.8
F. Marine-70 New Cumberland Locks and Dam	3.8
G. Ohio Southern Railroad	4.2

ODOT had the following takeaways regarding SIPs due to feedback from the southeast Ohio regional Access Ohio meeting. In general, stakeholders in southeast Ohio agree that SIPs for the region should be based on the following:

Transportation infrastructure that supports development along the Ohio River: There was concern that neighboring states are putting a greater emphasis on investing in ports and supporting infrastructure around ports. There was also general consensus that the road network around the Ohio River is inadequate to support increased port activity. There are several height restrictions on both the rail and highway network. The stakeholder group agrees that the locks and dams along the Ohio River are a major resource for the region and preserving them should be a priority.

Short line railroad infrastructure: Many Southeast Ohio businesses and communities are relying significantly more on rail to be successful. Improving short line rail access will also be beneficial as the oil and gas industry continues to grow.

Truck routes that support emerging industries: The shale industry is rapidly growing. In addition to wells that sporadically emerge and are hard to plan for, several large processing plants are being built. ODOT should ensure that the current infrastructure will be able to support the emerging shale processing plants, and the industry as a whole. A few noted examples of highly utilized truck routes are:

- SR 78 from Ohio River to I-77 (in Monroe and Noble Counties)
- SR 78 from I-77 to SR 37 (in Noble and Morgan Counties)
- SR 37 from SR 78 into Perry County
- US 22 from Ohio River to I-77 (through Steubenville/ Weirton, Cadiz and Cambridge)
- US 22 from I-77 to I-70 (through Cambridge and onto Zanesville)
- SR 9 from Salem in Columbiana County to I-70 (through Salem, Carrollton and Cadiz)
- SR 43 from US 22 to US 30/ I-77 (through Carrollton into Canton)

Addressing transit needs: There is consensus among all stakeholders that transit needs in Southeast Ohio far outweigh current service. This is also supported by the customer preference survey, which showed that transit is the number 2 transportation priority throughout the state behind roadways. Relying on local entities to solve the transit shortfall, as has been done in the past, is troublesome because the locals don't have the resources to supply additional transit and are not allowed to use transit fare as matching funds.

Less focus on bike infrastructure: While biking is an important mode of transportation, the rural nature of southeast Ohio, combined with the topography, makes biking unsafe and an unpopular mode choice. Focusing limited resources on biking should not be a priority in the region; although designating bike routes for future roadway design enhancements is a worthwhile activity.

COMMENTS/ QUESTIONS ABOUT SIPs:

- Several stakeholders felt that the proposed SIP list did not touch on the most important issues in the region. For example, there is a large transit need in the region and yet there were no transit SIPs. Similarly, the shale industry is booming in the region and will continue to into the future but no SIPs addressed any shale industry issues.
- A takeaway from Access Ohio may be to set up a database and a standardized system for collecting data. There are many modes of transportation for which ODOT has little available data. This may become a multi-agency statewide effort.
- There are many vertical pinch points in the region. One of these is on US 250, where a rail line runs over the road.
- Slides along SR 7 have significant regional implications as they slow down truck traffic. Being proactive about addressing these slides could be a policy SIP.
- Airports are important to the region for economic development purposes. Not only are there no airports in the southeast region STS, there are also no airport related SIPs.



ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
NORTHWEST REGION
JULY 30, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Dennis Miller, MVPO

Lisa Householder, TMACOG

Roger Streiffert, TMACOG

Susan Daniels, Lawhon & Associates

Joe Cappel, Port of Toledo

Scott Phinney, ODOT Planning

Dan Kaseman, ODOT District 1

Mike Gramza, ODOT District 2

Warren Henry, TMACOG

Diane Reamer-Evans, TMACOG

Chuck Dyer, ODOT Planning

Andrew Shepler, ODOT Planning

1. Welcome

The meeting began with a welcome from Scott Phinney and Introductions. Scott then described the purpose of the meeting and what input ODOT is looking to get from participants.

2. Regional Profiles

After an introduction to the meeting, Scott described the content of the regional profile and the Access Ohio Strategic Transportation System (AOSTS). Chuck Dyer mentioned that the profile only discusses infrastructure on the Access Ohio Strategic Transportation System (AOSTS). Scott mentioned that while the profile only discusses the AOSTS, that does not mean that that is the only infrastructure that ODOT cares about. Chuck pointed out that the AOSTS also looks at infrastructure that ODOT does not own or maintain. Scott mentioned that we saw transit as a big hole which is why ODOT is embarking on a statewide transit needs study.

The Total State Freight Flow is statewide but the hope is to replace it with regional figures. Scott opened it up to comments on what changes should be made to the regional profile.

It was brought up that Anderson's is a Fortune 500 company. As of 2013 it was a Fortune 500 Company but was not in 2012 which is the year that is presented in the profile.

Questions were brought up about the 2040 congestion map. It was brought up by Scott that some may find the legend confusing, specifically already congested vs. expected congestion. Something that is already congested could have a project fix the congestion and be better than places that are listed as expected congestion. Scott brought up the suggestion from the central meeting that perhaps only projects that have not been awarded should not be included on the map. Multiple members of the groups like that suggestion.

Scott mentioned that the purpose of the profile is to serve as an education piece about the region as well as provide context for the SIPs.

3. Strategic Investment Priorities Methodology

Scott explained the methodology for how ODOT determined the Regional Strategic Investment Priorities presented in the regional profile. Scott asked participants to pull out a spreadsheet showing the data for the facilities. A red box indicates that a facility has exceeded a threshold and is presented as a Regional Strategic Investment Priority. The question for the group is did we capture the most important needs.

4. Strategic Investment Priorities & Surveys

Chuck mentioned that he wanted to go through each of the Regional Strategic Investment Priorities individually and have a discussion on each. Chuck asked the group to pull out their regional survey to fill out during the meeting.

A) I-75 (SR 15 to I-475)

Chuck mentioned that this was going to be an important corridor for freight and is projected to see a significant increase in traffic, especially trucks. There was agreement that it should stay. It was suggested that it should be to the Michigan line rather than just I-475.

B) US 20 (I-75 to I-80)

Chuck mentioned that US 20, SR 2 and SR 31 were all flagged for safety reasons. A question was presented about how the corridors were segmented. Chuck mentioned that we ultimately decided to break the corridors into segments that people could easily understand.

US-20 was questioned as a priority by multiple members.

C) SR 2 (I-280 to US 250)

The group was fairly neutral about SR 2. This is used a large amount as a bypass to the turnpike. It is mainly a recreational route with large traffic to the islands and Cedar Point. It was agreed that there could be a safety issue, but not a congestion issue.

D) SR 31 (US 33 to US 68)

The data was questions for SR 31, specifically it was mentioned that there isn't a major safety issue in Hardin County. However, it was mentioned that this is an important route to connect Northwest and Central Ohio, specifically because of the congestion on US 23 and SR 315 between Delaware and Columbus. This highlights how important improvements to US 23 would be rather than the importance of improvements to SR 31.

E) I-475 (MI State Border to I-75)

It was pointed out that I-475 only goes up to US 23, not the Michigan state border but the corridor to the border is important. It was agreed this was a priority corridor.

F) Marine-90 (Port of Toledo)

It was mentioned that there is a backlog in dredging, but there are other factors. For example, dock walls needing to be fixed. Ports don't really have the cash flow for major capital improvements so they are looking to other sources to fix these issues. To get this information ODOT would need to talk to the ports. Other items are indoor storage spaces that are deteriorating, on dock rail/road access, shipyards, and material handling equipment. Dredging is just one aspect of a port.

G) Norfolk Southern (Bellevue to Marion)

This corridor was flagged because of safety issues. It was pointed out that the counties on the profile do not match where the rail line is.

H) CSX Railroad (Findlay to PA Border)

I) Short Line Railroads

A question was brought up as to why passenger rail did not make the list. It was mentioned that it did make the AOSTS but that we do not have the data to determine needs.

J) Toledo Area Regional Transit Authority Operating Budget

5. Additional Investment Priorities

After going through all the SIPs, the meeting was opened up to other places that were missed. One suggestion was the overlap area of US 23 and US 30 as well as the overlap area of SR 68 and SR 15.

A second suggestion was the Vickers rail crossing between CSX and NS. Another pinch point is the track over the Maumee River. It was questioned whether we looked at choke points but ODOT does not have the data.

It was mentioned that access to economic development sites was potentially missing from the data.

Another suggestion was dealing with US 23 between Columbus and Delaware.



ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
SOUTHWEST REGION
JULY 31, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY

Participants:

Scott Phinney, ODOT Statewide Planning,
Drew Hurst, ODOT Statewide Planning,
Brian Martin, MVRPC,
Bob Koehler, OKI Regional Council of Governments,
Matt Parrill, ODOT District 7,
Wes Dodds, LUC RPC,
Joe Vogel, ODOT District 8,
Fred Vogel, ODOT Jobs and Commerce,
Mark Donaghy, OPTA/ GDRTA; Catalina Landivar, Hamilton County Planning

Chuck Dyer, ODOT Statewide Planning,
Susan Daniels, Lawhon and Associates,
Ana Ramirez, MVRPC,
Scott Schmid, Clark County-Springfield TCC,
Jenny Snapp, LUC RPC,
Tom Ewing, Cincinnati USA Regional Chamber,
Melissa Taylor, ODOT Jobs and Commerce,

Welcome

Scott Phinney began the meeting with a welcome and the attendees introduced themselves. The purpose of this meeting was to obtain input from stakeholders regarding issues across all transportation modes in the southwestern part of the state prior to developing a draft Access Ohio 2040 plan in Fall 2013.

Regional Profiles

The southwest regional profile was then discussed, with regional geographies based upon the JobsOhio regions, with the Cincinnati and Dayton regions combined. These five regional profiles described transportation infrastructure and related demographic data for each region. A couple attendees mentioned that parts of the maps are hard to read, and the color scheme could differ more between the congestion map and the strategic transportation system map. Some attendees were a bit confused by the transit needs numbers, but were interested in the upcoming ODOT Transit Study. More background detail was suggested for the congestion maps so that readers would know what assumptions were used in developing the forecasted congestion.

The group also proposed several additional items that could be added or adjusted on the regional profiles, such as including additional major employers like Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. A couple Fortune 500 companies that recently moved into the Cincinnati area also should be added.

Strategic Investment Priorities Methodology

Next the Strategic Transportation System (STS) and the methodology for the Strategic Investment Priorities (SIP) were discussed. The factors that were used to determine the SIPs were discussed, and it was emphasized that the SIPs were not ranked in any particular order. It was suggested that the system preservation thresholds such as pavement and bridge condition be revised to show roadways that will soon fall below the threshold, rather than those currently below the threshold.

Strategic Investment Priorities and Survey

The group then considered each individual SIP within the region, and participants filled out surveys indicating their agreement or disagreement with each SIP. All participants strongly agreed that Interstate 75 between the Ohio River and I-70 was a regional priority. Other highway SIPs with most strongly agreeing included Interstate 71 in the Cincinnati area between the Ohio River and Interstate 275, and Interstate 74 between the Indiana state line and I-75.

Other highway SIPs were somewhat popular, but revisions and modifications were suggested. For example, US 68 between I-70 in Clark County and SR 31 in Hardin County was included on the draft SIP list because of above-average crash rates. Several participants felt that US 68 segment is far too long, and there are parts of this segment that do not have high crash rates. Further review was suggested for this segment, and it was also proposed that this segment be revised for the different roadway types along this segment. For example, the proposed SIP on I-70 includes Preble and Montgomery counties, but excluded the section in Clark County that currently is the only segment with only two lanes in each direction between Columbus and the Dayton area. Many felt that the Preble County portion of this highway did not warrant inclusion on the SIP list due to lower traffic volumes than the counties to the east. State Route 49 and US 35 between I-70 and I-75 in the western part of the Dayton area was the least preferred SIP overall, with an average preference of neutral. A couple potential additional highway SIPs were also briefly discussed, including SR 126 (Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway) and the Eastern Corridor in the Cincinnati area. Further analysis will be conducted to develop a revised SIP list that could include these areas.

Most participants agreed with the railroad SIPs, and many also agreed that Meldahl Lock and Dam should be included on the SIP list. It was also noted that the Port of Cincinnati prefers to seek funding through private sources, and the government's main role should be to provide access to port facilities.

Most attendees were less concerned about the specific airport SIP on the proposed list; some felt that the number of commercial nonstop flights at major airports should be considered due to their impact on economic development.

Both public transit SIPs were also very popular, with all attendees agreeing or strongly agreeing with their inclusion on the SIP list.

Plan Recommendations, Additional Investment Priorities, and Conclusions

The meeting then concluded with a brief discussion of additional investment priorities and plan recommendations. One proposed recommendation for the draft plan was to consider the system impacts of different facilities, to show how the different modes interact with each other. These topics will be covered in further detail in a statewide meeting this fall with the introduction of the draft plan.

- Include the Ohio River crossing in the limits of I-75 corridor
- I-70 should also include Clark County
- Shorten US68 segment – perhaps only include the high crash locations in Champaign and Logan.
- Current item G on the southwest profile is for US 35. Group felt that the portion of US 35 from I-75 to I-675 is more important.
- Connection needed from Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway to I-75 north



ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
STATEWIDE RAIL
JULY 31, 2013 MEETING SUMMARY

ATTENDEES:

Matt Dietrich, Ohio Rail Development Commission
Bill Harris, Norfolk Southern
Dave Moore, ODOT Central Office
Suzann Rhodes, CDMSmith

Chuck Dyer, ODOT Central Office
Mark Locker, ODOT Central Office
Scott Phinney, ODOT Central Office

MEETING PURPOSE:

The purpose of the meeting was for ODOT to review the AO40 Planning process with railroad stakeholders and secure comments on the process and documentation, to date.

MEETING OVERVIEW:

ODOT provided a broad overview of the AO40 planning process, describing the identification of critical statewide transportation corridors, for each transportation mode. The modal corridors were categorized as **National, Statewide Primary, Statewide Secondary, or Local** based on the following criterion:

- d. Volume
- e. Classification
- f. Connectivity

The respective modal National, Statewide Primary, and Statewide Secondary corridors were combined and mapped to depict Ohio's multimodal **Strategic Transportation System** of critical transportation infrastructure. It was noted that the STS maps also identify major statewide intermodal transportation facilities.

ODOT also reviewed the AO40 Regional Profiles and associated geography and the detailed corridor analysis used to develop the lists of regional transportation needs identified on each profile.

MEETING COMMENTS AND TAKEAWAYS:

Initial discussion focused on the mixture of public and private owner infrastructure within the state, the differing “market based” decision making process private entities use to advance infrastructure improvements, regulatory restrictions associated with financing private infrastructure improvement with public funding, and conversely, opportunities to advance public/private partnership infrastructure improvements.

Rail stakeholders conveyed the importance of advancing railroad improvements to promote economic development.

It was noted that the STS map reflects existing conditions, does not reflect future trends, and importantly, the STS system does not exclude modal infrastructure to the non-STs network.

Meeting attendees agreed to investigate adding a 2nd category to the STS rail network to identify rail lines that carry container freight.

Discussing acknowledged that ODOT’s has limited access to modal transportation networks, whereas ODOT has robust highway system databases. Much of the rail system data used in AO40 is safety and crash information.

The comment was made that railroads are a safe mode and a cheaper mode to move freight in Ohio. It is in the interest of Ohio to consider investing in a mode that has a better safety record and has lower cost.

Responding to inquiry about how ODOT can optimally assist Ohio rail transport, stakeholders discussed the “capital intensive” nature of rail service. Fiscal assistance for rail infrastructure and equipment capital expenses, potentially via CMAQ funding was noted.

Funding opportunities for rail grade crossing locations was also discussed. Meeting attendees agreed that ODOT should explore securing grade crossing pavement conditions data. Linking the pavement condition data with crash and truck traffic volume data would assist in prioritizing locations for the ORDC’s Grade Crossing Program.

Rail Stakeholders acknowledged the importance rail plays in Ohio and was happy to see that rail was being analyzed as part of the corridor analysis.

Questions arose regarding the State of the System Summary document. Stakeholders presented the perspective that the SOS trend information appeared to reflect “what is trending in ODOT”, rather than statewide or national trends. Questions were posed regarding the total increase in freight volumes through 2040 and the representation that 98% of future freight volumes will be carried by truck. Stakeholders also asked how the stated increase in the CAFE standards, with associated decreases in fuel purchases, comported with the AO40 increased revenue assumptions.

RAIL STAKEHOLDERS AO40 REGIONAL SUMMARIES COMMENTS:

1. The rail industry is interested in any policy ODOT can advance that would increase intermodal business.
2. Make sure all railroads selected have proper connectivity within the STS map
3. Columbus to Portsmouth Line preservation
4. Southeastern Ohio Profile consistency with another regional profile - NS not there should be for safety



ACCESS OHIO 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REGIONAL PROFILES
JULY 22 - 31, 2013

Cover

- The map on the front cover needs to be better quality and needs to be labeled clearly so the reader understands that it includes only the Strategic Transportation System (STS). Route labels are missing on some routes.
- Where route classifications overlap, the highest category route needs to be on top.
- Cities/towns appear to be labeled arbitrarily; should label all towns over a certain population.

Inside-left

- The statistics on the inside of the regional profile are labeled as “Corridor Analysis Summary.” Not all facilities are really “corridors”, so this is confusing. It is also not clear that the data is for the STS only. Suggest changing the title on the left side to “Strategic Transportation System Summary.”
- The description in the first paragraph on the left side will be confusing to anyone who has not participated in the AO40 analysis. It talks about corridor segmenting, but the data below is aggregated and not by segment. Suggest deleting this paragraph entirely and letting the statistics stand alone.
- Bike: Suggest adding safety statistics for bikes. The general public doesn’t know what a “lane mile” is. Mays just want to use “miles”.
- Highway: Public doesn’t know what a lane mile is. Suggest just using miles. Safety statistics are in 100 MVMT. Congestion measure isn’t useful as aggregated. Suggest using % of system at V/C of 0.9 or worse.

Inside-center

- Legend of congestion map is confusing. It says “already congested”. Does that mean it is today or will be in 2040 or both? It would be more useful to show levels of congestion in these colors with red being highest level of congestion.
- Labels on map block the information that is trying to be conveyed.
- Cities over a certain size should be labeled.
- Consider re-doing the congestion map showing 2040 congestion with only the existing system plus projects that already have construction funding in current 4-year STIP. Some projects that are assumed to be constructed aren’t programmed for another 10-15 years. If the map shows those areas as not congested (because the project is assumed to be built), the public may wonder why we are spending money there. The map needs to show the public what the problems will be if we don’t direct the funding to the right areas. One suggestion was to show

the location of assumed improvements on top of the congestion map. Another suggestion was to just use existing congestion, not projected.

- Transit needs table should show the numbers of systems in each category in the region. There should be a note that says a transit study is on-going.

Inside-right

- For demographics, it is more important to understand trends than to compare the region with the state. Suggest comparing the region today to the region 10 years ago to show trends and with 10 years from now (or longer) if the data is available.
- May be more important to show % college instead of % high school.
- Economic profile should say top employment sectors, not top industries. Fortune 500 companies headquartered in the region is good information, but it would also be good to list the top 5 employers.
- Freight flow shown is in 1,000 tons, not tons. Update to region values.

Back

- Regional Strategic Investment Priorities – This terminology was a concern to some attendees; others did not have a reaction to it. Perhaps change the terminology to refer to “strategic needs” or provide a more clear explanation in the paragraph under the title. (Make sure a lay person can understand what it is saying.)
- Verify that all letters on mapped in the right location. Perhaps use leaders to move the letters out of the way when they are blocking each other.



Central Region

- Interstate 70 from I-270 to SR 79
- US 33 from I-70 to Lancaster Bypass
- US 33 from I-270 to SR 42

Northeast Region

- I-76/I-77 west leg of Central Interchange in Akron – safety
- I-76/I-80 in Youngstown – trucks
- I-480 – congestion
- I-271 from SR 8 to I-90 – congestion and safety
- Cleveland Hopkins Airport – access from I-71 southbound to airport
- Towpath Trail (Harvard Road to the lake)/Ohio-to-Erie path
- SR 4 through Sandusky – trucks and tourism traffic

Southeast Region

- Transit needs in southeast Ohio - underserved populations
- Encourage/support port development on Ohio side of the river
- Muskingum River locks – tourism and recreation
- Slide issues along river (such as SR 7)
- Jefferson County and Guernsey County airports – runway lengths inadequate for corporate jets.

Northwest Region

- US23/US30 overlap section
- SR68/US15 near Findlay
- NS/CSX junction at Vickers (NS has priority which holds up CSX north-south)
- Capacity issues for freight/passenger rail over Maumee River
- Improve access from regionally important facilities (distribution centers in Williams County and in Henry County) to freeways/turnpike

Note: The northwest region also emphasized that I-270/I-23/SR315 in central Ohio has a substantial impact travel routes to northwest Ohio, putting a larger burden on alternatives to US 23.

Southwest Region

- Include the Ohio River crossing in the limits of I-75 corridor
- I-70 should also include Clark County
- Shorten US68 segment – perhaps only include the high crash locations in Champaign and Logan.
- Current item G on the southwest profile is for US 35. Group felt that the portion of US 35 from I-75 to I-675 is more important.
- Connection needed from Ronald Reagan Cross County Highway to I-75 north