

**MAH-7/626 Intersection Realignment  
Public Involvement Meeting  
May 7, 2009**

**Summary of Public Comments and Responses to Comments**

**PID # 78300  
MAH-7-6.05**

**September 2, 2009**

An open house public involvement meeting was conducted on May 7, 2009, from 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm at the Beaver Township Administration Building located at 11999 South Avenue (SR 164). Environmental studies and displays showing crashes and the preferred alternative were on display. Representatives from the Ohio Department of Transportation, CT Consultants, the project consultant, and the Eastgate Regional Council of Governments were available to discuss the proposed project, right-of-way acquisition process, environmental considerations and address questions regarding this proposed transportation improvement.

Public officials were invited to attend the public involvement meeting by direct letter. The general public was informed of the meeting by news release in the local newspaper, the Youngstown Vindicator, and through coverage on local television and radio stations resulting from a news release issued by ODOT District 4 on April 29, 2009.

Approximately 60 people attended the open house public involvement meeting. An informational handout was provided to all attendees along with a comment form for written comments. Oral comments and questions were addressed by representatives from the Ohio Department of Transportation, CT Consultants and Eastgate Regional Council of Governments. Forty-one (41) written comments were received before and during the public involvement meeting and during the public comment period that concluded on June 7, 2009.

The following is a summary of the forty-one (41) received written comments and responses to the comments.

No.	Comment	Response
<b>Beaver Township Fire Department (letter) 5-5-2009</b>		
1	<p>The Beaver Township Fire Department opposes the proposed project for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed plan does nothing to address the problem of large vehicles traveling north on SR-7 needing to turn right onto Western Reserve Road.</li> <li>2. The proposed site for the new access to SR-7 will be placed in an already congested area of Market Street, especially during the peak early morning and late afternoon traffic flow. Vehicles turning south from Western Reserve Road will be required to almost immediately move into the inside lane to be able to enter the proposed left-turn lane allowing them access to Woodworth Road, a well traveled route for motorists wishing to circumvent North Lima while heading for communities to the south. Their representatives believe this will translate into increased traffic congestion and traffic accidents in the area of this already heavily traveled intersection.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Less than 100 large vehicles make this northbound right turn movement each day. The proposed new curb radius will be designed to accommodate tractor-trailers and other large vehicles as they typically require a 40' curb radius. Current project design proposes a 50' curb radius to negotiate a right turn onto eastbound Western Reserve Road.</li> <li>2. This is not anticipated to be a problem since vehicles exiting Western Reserve Road will have a green light and will be free to choose either lane.</li> </ol>
<b>Ran D. Williams (letter) 5-8-2009</b>		
2	<p>Mr. Ran D. Williams opposes the proposed project for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. He feels none of the accidents could be attributed to the present arrangements of roads. He believes accidents were caused by careless drivers and not by the presence of SR-626. He feels that changing the traffic light to include a left turn on green arrow would only would stop the angle accidents and the State Highway Patrol should monitor the intersection for "Tailgaters."</li> <li>2. He feels that we are so focused on "ramming this project through", that we do not want to recognize the cause of the problem being the dumping of I-680 traffic onto Western Reserve Road. If the interchange at I-680 and SR 164 were to be completed, there would be no need for the 626 project.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Virtually all crashes are caused by driver error. Engineering solutions seek to reduce the opportunity for driver error.</li> <li>2. The southbound direction has the most left turn crashes; however, it also already has a left turn arrow.</li> <li>3. The IR 680 / Western Reserve Road interchange is currently under study. As part of that study, a new interchange at IR 680 and SR 164 is being investigated. Initial discussions with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal agency with approval authority on new interchanges along the interstate system, indicate that a new interchange is not likely to be approved due to the proximity to the IR 680/Ohio Turnpike interchange. Even if approved, a new interchange is likely to be costly and many years from completion.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
<b>G.B.P Properties, LLC (letter) 5-18-2009</b>		
3	<p>G.B.P Properties, LLC is in favor of the project.</p> <p>As property and business owners, with property adjacent to the proposed relocation of Woodworth Road, and having to drive through the current intersection of Western Reserve, Market and Woodworth roads several times a day and they feel that relocating the road is an excellent idea. They own two businesses that are located in that area of North Lima. It's their opinion that reconstructing the intersection would benefit them and their employees.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p>
<b>D.P. Beckley (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
4	<p>D.P. Beckley opposes the project. D.P. Beckley feels that there is not enough back-up on SR 626 to warrant that much cost. They are also concerned about people making a left onto and out of the new alignment.</p>	<p>1. Project will reduce traffic back-ups on all approaches to the intersection, both currently and in the future. It is also expected to reduce crashes at this intersection.</p> <p>2. Currently, approximately 135 left turns from SR 626 to SR 7 southbound occur each day. This number of turn movements is a very low volume of traffic, similar to many driveways or side streets in the area that operate without difficulty. Traffic analyses determined this turning movement will experience minimal delay.</p>
<b>Nancy Kissel (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
5	<p>Ms. Nancy Kissel opposes the project. She feels that there is too much traffic on Market Street to allow for the realignment of Woodworth Road. She has a drive that enters Market Street ½ miles south of the intersection. She feels that traffic will back up causing traffic jams and people will take more chances resulting in more accidents. She feels that we should focus on another project.</p>	<p>1. This project will reduce traffic back-ups on SR 7 (Market St). Traffic analyses indicate minimal delay (a good level of Service) at the proposed new SR 7 / SR 626 intersection.</p>
<b>Beaver Township Trustees (letter) 5-18-2009</b>		
6	<p>The Beaver Township Trustees oppose the proposed project.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p>
<b>Mona Rango (letter) 5-14-2009</b>		
7	<p>Ms. Mona Rango opposes the project. She feels that the re-routing of SR 626 would bring the realignment too close to her residence. She feels there would be unnecessary tree removal on the adjoining property where the realignment would occur. She is concerned that there is no proposed buffer between the roadway and her residence. She feels that the proposal would result in two intersections on Market Street approximately 500 feet apart which would cause people to turn in and out of the Sheetz's without coming from the light at the current 626. She states "this would pose an</p>	<p>1. Comment regarding residence will be forwarded to project design consultant to consider during detailed final design for the project.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
	increased traffic hazard with an increased risk of accidents.”	
<b>Cortland Savings and Banking Company (letter) 5-21-2009</b>		
8	<p>Cortland Savings and Banking Company opposes the project. The bank feels that the current traffic problem is primarily from the increased utilization and resultant congestion associated with the design of Western Reserve Road, which does not have a turning lane to facilitate southbound traffic entering SR-7. The bank fears that the result of this project would hinder their business growth, as growth in retail banking is based on customer convenience, and customer convenience is directly tied to the ease of ingress/egress, which was a major consideration in their decision to invest in this location. It's the bank's opinion that this proposal would also encourage northbound traffic traveling SR 626 to drive through the Bank's parking lot to access Western Reserve Road in an effort to save time. This in itself will create an unanticipated dangerous situation as it would detour traffic into the Bank's parking lot as a cut-through from SR 626 to Western Reserve Road. In essence, this proposal not only would not cure a problem that doesn't exist with SR-626 intersection. But would in fact create an additional safety risk to our customers and travelers along Western Reserve Road, as well as undermine the long-term success of our newest branch office and other surrounding businesses. The project in its present form will create a hardship for bank customers exiting bank property and attempting to make a left turn onto Western Reserve Road, increasing the congestion problem with westbound vehicle traffic and creating public safety issues. Without the proposed realignment project, these bank customers would have exited onto SR-626 and proceeded through the intersection and in a westerly direction along Western Reserve Road. It's their opinion, that the proposed changes will negatively impact customer convenience and safety, adversely affecting our long term viability. Accordingly, the Bank requests that another public hearing be held shortly to provide additional consideration and testimony before making a final decision. The May 7, 2009, meeting did not fully allow for the consideration, as formal presentations were not permitted. They believe that the problems rest with increased traffic flow along Western Reserve Road, and highlight the need for southbound turning lanes for westbound traffic on Western Reserve Road.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A westbound left turn lane and left turn arrow from Western Reserve Road to SR 7 southbound already exist.</li> <li>2. Design will discourage cut through traffic. This movement would only occur with northbound SR 626 to eastbound Western Reserve Road traffic, a very low turn movement volume. Additionally, decreased traffic congestion will reduce driver frustration that leads to cut-through movements.</li> <li>3. The project will reduce traffic congestion and back-ups on all approaches. Thus, while access to westbound Western Reserve Road will not be as easy as it is now, shorter traffic back-ups on Western Reserve Road will allow for reasonable access to the west.</li> <li>4. Widening only Western Reserve Road cannot achieve an acceptable Level of Service at the intersection in the future. The relocation of SR 626 is necessary to substantively reduce traffic congestion at this intersection both now and in the future.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
<b>James E. Butler (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
9	Mr. James Butler feels that with the SR 626 realignment there will be more accidents than occur now.	1. It is expected that the project will reduce traffic congestion and decrease crashes.
<b>Anthony and Barbara Sobota (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
10	Mr. and Mrs. Sobota have lived in this area and have used this intersection for 40 years. They feel the construction money would be more useful at the junction of I-680 and Western Reserve Road. They feel that a small expenditure which would alleviate congestion and greatly improve safety would be a left turn signal for those turning south from Western Reserve to South Avenue. There is already existing hardware for a north turn.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As part of a separate, independent project, improvements are proposed at the IR 680 and Western Reserve Road interchange. A westbound right turn lane to the northbound IR 680 and a continuous eastbound right turn lane to SR 164 southbound is proposed to be built in 2011.</li> <li>2. Insufficient left turn movements exist to justify a left turn arrow for the Western Reserve Road to South Avenue movement. While turn arrows make individual movements easier, they increase overall delay and traffic congestion at intersections.</li> </ol>
<b>The Nail Garden (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
11	The Nail Garden opposes the project. They've been in business for 30 years and feel traffic congestion on Woodworth is only bad when something is happening on Western Reserve Road. Most problems are occurring from people pulling in and out of Sheetz's. They feel that this project is not fair to the businesses and homeowners. Traffic will be cutting through Rita's and the Bank's parking lot. Their representatives want to know "where the money is going to come from for upkeep since Woodworth Road will no longer be a State Route?"	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted.</li> <li>2. The cul-de-sac section of SR 626 will become a local road to be maintained by the County or Township.</li> <li>3. It would not be advantageous for traffic to cut-through either parking lot.</li> </ol>
<b>David K. Brown (email) 5-18-2009</b>		
12	<p>Mr. David Brown opposes the project. Having studied the informational handout, he says he cannot argue with the statistical points of long traffic light queues and the large number of rear end collisions at the intersection. However, he feels that the reasons for those events, having lived on Woodworth Road (SR -626) for over two decades, are due to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The primary cause of the congestion is not so much the fifth leg at the intersection but instead rests with very high volumes of traffic on the two-lane CR-32 (Western</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Observations and comments noted.</li> </ol> <p>Regarding the possible problems:</p>

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>Reserve Road).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. At the intersection where CR-32 expands to an anemic three lanes, there is little room for maneuvering.</li> <li>3. Because there is no right turn lane on CR-32 westbound, traffic slows to a crawl when people turn right at that point.</li> <li>4. Speed is excessive on CR-32 with vehicles often running through red lights at the intersection.</li> <li>5. Westbound traffic is often “surprised” when they realize that traffic is stopped in the intersection due to left turns being made into the north driveway of the Sheetz’s gas station, cutting across eastbound traffic.</li> <li>6. Due to it only being two lanes, the light cycle for CR-32 is often as long or longer than the cycle for SR-7</li> <li>7. The traffic light cycle for SR-626 is minimal.</li> </ol> <p>Relocating SR-626 to a new point on SR-7 will create the following problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With no traffic light of its own, left turns onto SR-7 will be problematic as northbound traffic slows for upcoming intersection and/or to turn into the service station.</li> <li>2. Those who use SR-626 as a link to westbound CR-32 will have to merge with northbound SR-7 traffic and then move into a left turn lane to access Western Reserve Road. This will compound the left turn situation at that intersection by adding vehicles that would have ordinarily driven straight through the intersection as it currently exists.</li> </ol> <p>The easiest way to reduce queue time and the number of collisions at the intersection would be to widen CR-32 between SR-7 and I-680 to a full four lanes.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently, approximately 135 left turns from SR 626 to SR 7 southbound occur each day. This number of turn movements is a very low volume of traffic, similar to many driveways or side streets in the area that operate without difficulty. Traffic analyses determined minimal delay (good Level of Service) will occur at the proposed new SR 7 / SR 626 intersection.</li> <li>2. Traffic analyses determined widening only Western Reserve Road will not eliminate traffic congestion at the intersection in the future. In addition, while such a project may be useful, the cost to widen Western Reserve Road to 4 lanes between SR 7 and IR 680 would be very expensive. Widening Western Reserve Road between Hitchcock Road and SR 7 is currently under study by the Mahoning County Engineer.</li> </ol>
<b>Glenda Niddel (comment sheet) 5-7-2008</b>		
13	Ms. Glenda Niddel opposes the project. She believes there will be more accidents.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Studies (National Cooperative Highway Research Program 500, Strategy 17.2 B14) have determined that reducing the number of roadway approaches to an intersection reduces the number of vehicular crashes.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
<b>Andy Ragan (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
14	<p>Mr. Andy Ragan opposes the project. He feels that the project is a "major waste of taxpayer's money." He feels that the project does not eliminate the traffic problem at I-680 and Western Reserve Road. The traffic lights are not set up to avoid back-ups from South Avenue, East, on Western Reserve Road. At peak times the exit ramp getting off I-680 to Western Reserve Road is backed up to the slow lane on I-680. An interchange to I-680, further south on South Avenue would eliminate excess traffic on South Avenue. Access roads could connect with Market Street close to turnpike. Access roads could connect with Market Street close to turnpike entrance.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The purpose of the project is not to improve the interchange of IR 680 and Western Reserve Road.</li> <li>2. The IR 680 / Western Reserve Road interchange is currently under study. As part of that study, a new interchange at IR 680 and SR 164 is being investigated. Initial discussions with FHWA, the Federal agency with approval authority on new interchanges along the interstate system, indicate that a new interchange is not likely to be approved due to the proximity to the IR 680/Ohio Turnpike interchange. Even if approved, a new interchange is likely to be costly and many years from completion.</li> </ol>
<b>Joanne Galey (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
15	<p>Ms. Joanne Galey opposes the project. She feels that this project is not needed and that we are spending money that could be used elsewhere.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Lucille Wright (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
16	<p>Ms. Lucille Wright opposes the project. She states "this project will not solve the problems that you people say it will."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Scott Conway (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
17	<p>Mr. Scott Conway opposes this project for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Taxpayer money could be spent elsewhere.</li> <li>2. Safety issues with cars turning on the four lanes of Market Street.</li> <li>3. We have not had any issues with current road.</li> <li>4. Traffic will simply cut thru the businesses next to the cul-de-sac.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed project is funded by FHWA Highway Safety Program (HSP) funds. The HSP funds may only be used on qualified HSP locations such as the SR 7/SR 626/Western Reserve Road intersection.</li> <li>2. Currently approximately 135 left turns from SR 626 to SR 7 southbound occur each day. This number of turn movements is a very low volume is of traffic, similar to many driveways or side streets in the area that operate without difficulty. Traffic analyses determined minimal delay (good Level of Service) will occur at the proposed new SR 7 / SR 626 intersection.</li> <li>3. Comment noted.</li> <li>4. Decreased traffic congestion as a result of the proposed SR 626 realignment will reduce driver frustration that leads to cut-through</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
		movement.
<b>Rusty Wiery (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
18	<p>Mr. Rusty Wiery opposes the project. He states "this is a total waste of time and money." He feels we should use the money elsewhere. He feels we should put a traffic engineer on timing the lights at South Avenue, Western Reserve Road and I-680.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed project is funded by FHWA Highway Safety Program (HSP) funds. The HSP funds may only be used on qualified HSP locations such as the SR 7/SR 626/Western Reserve Road intersection.</li> <li>2. Due to the proximity of 3 existing traffic signals and the heavy turning movements within the interchange area, a traffic congestion free operation is not possible without a highly expensive, major interchange reconfiguration.</li> </ol>
<b>Holly Anthony (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
19	<p>Ms. Holly Anthony opposes the project. She feels that the motor vehicle accidents discussed in report are not specific to SR-626. Traffic congestion is primarily on Western Reserve Road – which could be widened. An additional interchange between Western Reserve Road and the turnpike on I-680 would reduce traffic at this intersection. Ms. Anthony feels this plan creates a new problem at the intersection of Market Street and the proposed SR-626 realignment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic analyses determined widening only Western Reserve Road alone will not eliminate traffic congestion at the intersection in the future. In addition, while such a project may be useful, the cost to widen Western Reserve Road to 4 lanes between SR 7 and IR 680 would be very expensive. Widening Western Reserve Road between Hitchcock Road and SR 7 is currently under study by the Mahoning County Engineer.</li> <li>2. The IR 680 / Western Reserve Road interchange is currently under study. As part of that study, a new interchange at I-680 and SR 164 is being investigated. Initial discussions with FHWA, the Federal agency with approval authority on new interchanges along the interstate system, indicate that a new interchange is not likely to be approved due to the proximity to the IR 680/Ohio Turnpike interchange. Even if approved, a new interchange is likely to be costly and many years from completion.</li> <li>3. Traffic currently exiting SR 626 is predominantly right turn movements that will have minimal delay entering Market Street. Approximately, 135 left turns from SR 626 to SR 7 southbound occur each day. This number of turn</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
		<p>movements is a very low volume is of traffic, similar to many driveways or side streets in the area that operate without difficulty. Traffic analyses determined minimal delay (good Level of Service) will occur at the proposed new SR 7 / SR 626 intersection.</p>
<b>Mario &amp; Nicki Finocchi (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
20	<p>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Finocchi oppose the project. They feel that by closing Woodworth Road, there will be more accidents on Market Street and more traffic congestion and that the businesses on Woodworth Road will suffer.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Studies (National Cooperative Highway Research Program 500, Strategy 17.2 B14) have determined that reducing the number of roadway approaches to an intersection reduces the number of vehicular crashes. The traffic congestion at the intersection will also decrease as a result of the project.</li> <li>2. Comment noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Gary Delast (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
21	<p>Mr. Gary Delast opposes the project. He states "there are a lot of questions unanswered and that this project will ruin businesses we need in our township."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Tom Compton (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
22	<p>Mr. Tom Compton supports the project. He states "if it makes traffic flow better and eliminates accidents then it should be ok."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Don Wright (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
23	<p>Mr. Don Wright opposes the project. He states "we will lose revenue for our business to competitors."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comments noted.</li> </ol>
<b>Gary Sovik (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
24	<p>Mr. Gary Sovik opposes the project. He says "just make Western Reserve Road 5 lanes and be done with it."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic analyses determined widening only Western Reserve Road alone will not eliminate traffic congestion at the intersection in the future. In addition, while such a project may be useful, the cost to widen Western Reserve Road to 4 lanes between SR 7 and IR 680 would be very expensive. Widening Western Reserve Road between Hitchcock Road and SR 7 is currently under study by the Mahoning County Engineer.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
<b>Leonard V. Costantini (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
25	Mr. Leonard V. Costantini opposes the project. He thinks this proposal to close SR-626 and substitute a cul-de-sac at the intersection of SR-626 and Western Reserve Road is a bad idea. He states "spend the money to upgrade the roads and keep them resurfaced."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted. The proposed project is funded by FHWA Highway Safety Program (HSP) funds. The HSP funds may only be used on qualified HSP locations such as the SR 7/SR 626/Western Reserve Road intersection.</li> </ol>
<b>Catherine Ferrago (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
26	Ms. Catherine Ferrago opposes the project. She feels that during these times of economic hardship, government spending should be on the decline. She states "if safety is the true issue then why not put a light at the new SR-626/ SR-7 intersection. I feel that accidents will rise quite a bit when people are trying to turn left on SR-7 with no safety light to go south."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted.</li> <li>2. Currently approximately 135 left turns from SR 626 to SR 7 southbound occur each day. This number of turn movements is a very low volume is of traffic, similar to many driveways or side streets in the area that operate without difficulty. Additionally, the proposed new intersection does not warrant the installation of a new traffic signal.</li> </ol>
<b>Larry Kerr (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
27	Mr. Larry Kerr opposes the project. He states "use money to extend I-680 down to the truck stops on Market Street in North Lima."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The interstate cannot be extended for numerous reasons as well as being prohibitively expensive. However, the possibility of a new interchange on IR 680 at SR 164 is being investigated as part of a separate, independent access study.</li> </ol>
<b>John R. Ramun (comment sheet) 5-7-2009</b>		
28	Mr. John R. Ramun supports the project but also says that the project should be tied to part of a new interchange with I-680 at South Avenue and the Ohio Turnpike. He feels that the Market Street / Ohio Turnpike interchange should be closed and would result in significant cost savings having one new 2-way interchange at I-680, South Avenue and Woodworth Road.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The IR 680 / Western Reserve Road interchange is currently under study. As part of that study, a new interchange at I-680 and SR 164 is being investigated. Initial discussions with FHWA, the Federal agency with approval authority on new interchanges along the interstate system, indicate that a new interchange is not likely to be approved due to the proximity to the IR 680/Ohio Turnpike interchange. Even if approved, a new interchange is likely to be costly and many years from completion.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
		2. ODOT does not have jurisdiction over the Ohio Turnpike. Thus, ODOT cannot close Ohio Turnpike interchanges.
<b>Connie Sammartino (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
29	<p>Ms. Connie Sammartino opposes the project. She cites several reasons for her opposition. Mainly she cites a probable increase in dangerous driving behavior and difficulty in making a left turn off of Market onto Woodworth. She also proposes that the fire department, in the case of an emergency, would have difficulty reaching the area. Furthermore, Ms. Sammartino believes that traffic would be increased onto residential roads that she states are "full of young children."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Typically, left turns across one direction of travel are not difficult to make. This maneuver is evident in the traffic analyses that determined this movement to operate at Level of Service A in the year 2030.</li> <li>2. Emergency services will not be compromised as a result of the project. Emergency services arriving from the south will actually reach SR 626 quicker upon completion of the project. Arrival times for emergency services from other directions would not appreciably change or improve due to decreased traffic congestion.</li> <li>3. No substantive changes in the local traffic patterns from residential roads will result with the project.</li> </ol>
<b>Rita and Greg Griffin (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
30	<p>Mr. and Mrs. Griffin oppose the project. They suggest a change in the traffic pattern at 680 and Western Reserve road instead of the proposed project. In support of their statements they say that they have never had a problem in this area. They also propose that this project will cause a regrettable "mess."</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The IR 680 / Western Reserve Road interchange is currently under study. As part of that study, a new interchange at I-680 and SR 164 is being investigated. Initial discussions with FHWA, the Federal agency with approval authority on new interchanges along the interstate system, indicate that a new interchange is not likely to be approved due to the proximity to the IR 680/Ohio Turnpike interchange. Even if approved, a new interchange is likely to be costly and many years from completion.</li> <li>2. Comment noted.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
<b>Ed and Carrol Zeock (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
31	Mr. and Mrs. Zeock oppose the project. They cite that this project would be taking a safe situation and making it into a dangerous one as people would then have to cross Rt. 7 to make a left turn.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Currently approximately 135 left turns from SR 626 to SR 7 southbound occur each day. This number of turn movements is a very low volume is of traffic, similar to many driveways or side streets in the area that operate without difficulty. Traffic analyses determined minimal delay (good Level of Service) will occur at the proposed new SR 7 / SR 626 intersection.</li> </ol>
<b>Ed Wright (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
32	Mr. Wright opposes the project and states that the project will be ineffectual in reducing traffic on Western Reserve Rd. He points out the lack of traffic control for people seeking to get onto Rt. 7. He cites the same issue for those attempting to get onto 626 at 7.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although traffic on Western Reserve Road will not be reduced, the realignment of the SR 626 approach will allow additional green signal time to be allocated to both Western Reserve Road approaches thus, reducing traffic congestion at the intersection.</li> </ol>
<b>Eugene and Julie Wright (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
33	Mr. and Mrs. Wright oppose the project on the grounds that their business will lose a significant amount of revenue with the proposed changes.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted. Potential loss of business cannot be substantiated as a result of the project.</li> </ol>
<b>Martin and Kay Hornung (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
34	Mr. and Mrs. Hornung oppose the project citing their status as taxpayers in connection with this being a waste of taxpayer money and a violation of their desires. They state that the project is unnecessary and ask that should it go through, a traffic signal be installed where the new road meets Rt.7. In conclusion they cite this project as proof that common sense is uncommon.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted.</li> <li>2. Traffic analyses determined the proposed new SR 7 / SR 626 intersection will operate with minor delay (Level of Service B). Additionally, the proposed new intersection does not warrant the installation of a new traffic signal.</li> </ol>

No.	Comment	Response
<b>Richard Grate (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
35	Mr. Grate opposes the project. He provides a note before his comments "safety first=death last." He also states that he feels his life would be in danger making a left onto Rt. 7.	1. Traffic analyses determined the proposed new SR 7 / SR 626 intersection will operate with minor delay (Level of Service B). Additionally, the proposed new intersection does not warrant the installation of a new traffic signal.
<b>Carol Bailey (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
36	Ms. Bailey opposes the project. She feels that there will be "accidents galore" and more accidents after the project than ever before.	1. Studies (National Cooperative Highway Research Program 500, Strategy 17.2 B14) have determined that reducing the number of roadway approaches to an intersection reduces the number of vehicular crashes. The traffic congestion at the intersection will also decrease as a result of the project.
<b>Patrick and Birgit Nagy (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
37	Mr. and Mrs. Nagy oppose the project. "It is a safety hazard."	1. Studies (National Cooperative Highway Research Program 500, Strategy 17.2 B14) have determined that reducing the number of roadway approaches to an intersection reduces the number of vehicular crashes. The traffic congestion at the intersection will also decrease as a result of the project.
<b>Ann Oakley (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
38	Ms. Oakley opposes the project. Asking, "Please leave the road the way it is."	1. Comment noted.
<b>Madeline Dickey (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
39	Ms. Dickey opposes the project stating that she has lived in the proposed project area for 11 years without a problem. She says that the project is "the most ridiculous thing I have heard of" and asks that well enough is left alone.	1. The purpose of the project is to improve safety by reducing vehicular crashes that occur at the existing SR 7/SR 626/Western Reserve Road intersection.
<b>Betty Ray Kovach (comment sheet) 5-7-09</b>		
40	Ms. Kovach opposes the project on the grounds that it is "nothing but a way to spend the taxpayers money on something that doesn't need fixed."	1. The purpose of the project is to improve safety by reducing vehicular crashes that occur at the existing SR 7/SR 626/Western Reserve Road intersection.

No.	Comment	Response
<b>Jim and Ada Perkins (written on copy of newspaper) Undated.</b>		
41	Jim and Ada Perkins oppose the project. Saying "We do not need this."	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted. The purpose of the project is to improve safety by reducing vehicular crashes that occur at the existing SR 7/SR 626/Western Reserve Road intersection.</li> </ol>