

STA-62 Public Involvement Meeting Comments

Conceptual Alternative Solutions (Micro Analysis)

Held on Thursday October 13, 2011 @ ODOT Maintenance Facility

Alternative	# of Comments	Summary of Comments
General Comment	5	General Comments and/or suggestions. (See Comments 7, 13, 15, 18, 19)
G1 Alternatives – General	4	Mostly concerns over the impacts to local streets with limited access from U.S. 62. (See Comments 4, 5, 6, 12)
Alternative G1-b	6	Concerns that decreasing the number of signals will only increase traffic speeds and create more safety issues. (See Comments 1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 14)
G2 Alternatives – General	1	Proposal of an alternative; however, this is already incorporated. (See Comment 10)
Alternative G2-b3	1	Connectivity of the neighborhoods is a strong benefit. (See Comment 6)
G3 Alternatives – General	2	Concerns over vehicles using K-Mart and Wal-Mart parking lots as “cut-throughs”. (See Comments 6, 16)
Alternative G4-e	1	Concerns of further encroachment onto the residences along Broadway. (See Comment 3)
Alternative G4-i	2	Like the idea of the modern roundabout at this location. (See Comments 8, 10)
Unspecified Alternative	1	“Roundabout will work...” if designed correctly. (See Comment 17)
Harrisburg/Middlebranch	2	Minor comments were made in regards to this section. This portion of U.S. 62 is no longer part of the STA-62 Corridor Study. The comments were passed on to be incorporated in that locations separate study.

Comment #: 1	Name: Joseph & Sharon Nardis	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1-b – Signal at Rowland Avenue relocated to St. Elmo Avenue		
Comment Summary: Increasing the flow of traffic by removing traffic signals would only cause speeding and make it more dangerous to have residences along U.S. 62. Preference is for an alternative that entails eliminating the homes on the north side to create a limited access roadway.		
Response: The primary reason for removing the Rowland signal traffic signal is to reduce the large number of rear-end crashes occurring there. This would be accomplished by increasing the spacing between the freeway portion of US 62 and the first signal encountered on the arterial portion of US 62. In regards to causing speeding, while the relocation of the signal may cause and increase in the average speed of eastbound vehicles, it will probably have little effect on the maximum free flow speed of vehicles.		

STA-62 Public Involvement Meeting Comments

Conceptual Alternative Solutions (Micro Analysis)

Held on Thursday October 13, 2011 @ ODOT Maintenance Facility

Comment #: 2	Name: Michael Beall	Date: 10/29/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1-b – Signal at Rowland Avenue relocated to St. Elmo Avenue		
Comment Summary: Increasing the flow of traffic by removing traffic signals would only cause speeding and make it more dangerous to have residences along U.S. 62. Preference is for an alternative that entails eliminating the homes on the north side to create a limited access roadway.		
Response: The primary reason for removing the Rowland signal traffic signal is to reduce the large number of rear-end crashes occurring there. This would be accomplished by increasing the spacing between the freeway portion of US 62 and the first signal encountered on the arterial portion of US 62. In regards to causing speeding, while the relocation of the signal may cause and increase in the average speed of eastbound vehicles, it will probably have little effect on the maximum free flow speed of vehicles.		

Comment #: 3	Name: Larry & Elizabeth Hill	Date: 10/17/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G4-e – Broadway Avenue		
Comment Summary: Northbound and southbound queuing has never been experienced at Broadway Avenue. Adding left-turn lanes will only encroach further towards properties that have already been encroached upon during the widening of U.S. 62.		
Response: The decision to install left-turn lanes on Broadway Avenue was based upon traffic analyses of 20 years in the future, traffic observations, and stakeholder input. The proposed lane widening is possible without any permanent impacts outside of the existing right-of-way.		

Comment #: 4	Name: Laurie Conrad	Date: 10/29/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1 – Western End Limited Access Alternatives		
Comment Summary: The frontage road proposal is a trade-off between bottlenecked traffic and disconnected neighborhoods including pedestrian/bicyclist activity. This will also increase traffic on the residential streets where these pedestrians/bicyclists will be forced to.		
Response: These are issues that will be weighed when determining the best, most feasible alternative to improve the western section of U.S. 62. If the intersections that allow vehicular traffic to cross US 62 are eliminated, ped/bike access will likely be provide via bridges over US 62.		

Comment #: 5	Name: Thomas L. Friedman	Date: 11/14/11 (Received)
Regarding Alternative(s): G1 – Western End Limited Access Alternatives		
Comment Summary: Concern over the impacts to traffic accessing the residences surrounding this portion of U.S. 62 including emergency vehicle response times with the limited access alternatives. Preference is for Alternative G1-a (existing signals with a center median) as it is the least disruptive, least costly, and maintains investment in the signal system recently installed.		
Response: The impacts to emergency vehicle response time will be considered in those alternatives that restrict access points into the nearby neighborhoods.		

STA-62 Public Involvement Meeting Comments

Conceptual Alternative Solutions (Micro Analysis)

Held on Thursday October 13, 2011 @ ODOT Maintenance Facility

Comment #: 6	Name: Dan Moeglin	Date: 11/04/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1 – Western End Limited Access Alternatives, G2-b3 – Columbus Road/34 th Street Connection, G3 – Central Section East, & Harrisburg/Middlebranch		
Comment Summary: G1 – The four-lane limited access alternative through the northern properties should be pursued. If money is not available at this time, ROW purchases can be made over time. -G2-b3 – Maintaining connectivity between neighborhoods is a strong plus. Recommend a second look. -G3 – The preferred route for Lesh Street north of U.S. 62 is to dead-end into the existing K-mart parking lot. This will force people to use the lot as a cut-through. This is not good for the traffic movements or the long-term redevelopment of the area. -Harrisburg/Middlebranch – A comment was made for this section of the corridor. See response below.		
Response: G1 – The comment has been noted. -G2-b3 – The benefits of connectivity are outweighed by the cost and impacts to safety. The remaining alternatives provide conditions similar to existing conditions with access to Root Avenue and/or 34 th Street remaining open. -G3 – The alternative would be to create a dedicated roadway through or around the existing parking lot which would require much higher costs and impacts to the existing K-Mart property. -Harrisburg/Middlebranch – It should be noted that this location has become its own study and is no longer included within the STA-62 Corridor Study. Not applicable for this study; therefore, no response necessary.		

Comment #: 7	Name: Steve Mentelewicz	Date: 11/17/11
Regarding Alternative(s): General Comment		
Comment Summary: Suggestion to construct a bridge over the existing U.S. 62 starting at S.R. 43 and ending near Kirby Avenue. Interchanges would be constructed to provide access to the local street system.		
Response: This alternative has already been evaluated during the macro level analysis and dropped from consideration due to cost and the impacts to residents.		

Comment #: 8	Name: Gary E Kameron	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G4-i – Roundabout on California Ave.		
Comment Summary: Suggest Figure 21 (Alt. G4-i) due to the modern roundabout.		
Response: The comment has been noted.		

Comment #: 9	Name: Denny Szittai	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1-b – Signal at Rowland Avenue relocated to St. Elmo Avenue		
Comment Summary: The removal of the traffic signal at Rowland Avenue will only increase traffic speeds.		
Response: While the relocation of the signal may cause and increase in the average speed of eastbound vehicles, it will probably have little effect on the maximum free flow speed of vehicles.		

STA-62 Public Involvement Meeting Comments

Conceptual Alternative Solutions (Micro Analysis)

Held on Thursday October 13, 2011 @ ODOT Maintenance Facility

Comment #: 10	Name: John Barnhouse	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G4-i – Roundabout on California Ave., G2 – Central Section West, & G1-b – St. Elmo Signal		
Comment Summary: G1-b – Like the idea of moving the signal at Rowland Avenue to St. Elmo Avenue. -G2 – Why not close off Columbus Road with a cul-de-sac and force traffic to Regent. -G4-i – Like the idea on Figure 21 (Alt. G4-i) as it would eliminate the conflict point at Reno Avenue but it could create a cut through for traffic heading to St. Thomas.		
Response: G1-b – The comment has been noted. -G2 – This is a presented alternative (G2-a1) with Columbus Road dead-ending into a business driveway (listed with a Columbus Road address). The details of this dead-end would be analyzed in the design stages. -G4-i – This was considered to be unlikely as access to Reno Drive is made simply and safely through making a u-turn at the proposed roundabout.		

Comment #: 11	Name: Mike Skelley	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1-b – Signal at Rowland Avenue relocated to St. Elmo Avenue		
Comment Summary: The removal of the traffic signal at Rowland Avenue will increase traffic speeds. EB traffic currently backs up to a point in which the highway traffic is “warned” of a red-light. With the light at St. Elmo, traffic will be unaware of the signal condition. The re-routed U.S. 62 through the north side properties is the best option.		
Response: The signal relocation would increase the time and distance before US 62 eastbound motorists would encounter the first signal on the arterial portion of US 62. While the relocation of the signal may cause and increase in the average speed of eastbound vehicles, it will probably have very little effect on the maximum speed of vehicles. Additionally, there are various countermeasures available to either warn traffic of upcoming signals or which will adjust the operation based on approaching traffic.		

Comment #: 12	Name: Scott Johnson	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1 – Western End (Rowland Avenue – Maple Avenue)		
Comment Summary: Figure 1 (Alt. G1-a, existing signals with a center median) is probably the best and safest solution. Not in agreement with taking the north side houses or moving the traffic signal to St. Elmo Ave.		
Response: The comment was noted.		

Comment #: 13	Name: Dave Johnson	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): General Comment		
Comment Summary: “All are bad for me”		
Response: The comment was noted.		

Comment #: 14	Name: Sonia Pasoualucci	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G1-b – Signal at Rowland Avenue relocated to St. Elmo Avenue		
Comment Summary: “Like idea of Alt G1-b”		
Response: The comment was noted.		

STA-62 Public Involvement Meeting Comments

Conceptual Alternative Solutions (Micro Analysis)

Held on Thursday October 13, 2011 @ ODOT Maintenance Facility

Comment #: 15	Name: Mike Storesina	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): General Comment		
Comment Summary: Develop a truck bypass from 62-West to 30-West to access 77-South to reduce traffic and air/noise pollution on U.S. 62. Also, the installation of advanced warning flashers for the signals on the eastern end (specifically Harmont Avenue) would be beneficial as well.		
Response: The problematic areas indicated within this study do not depict any safety issues due to truck traffic on U.S. 62. The immediate needs of the roadway are with concern towards roadway user safety. Additionally, the construction of bypass routes were already studied and found to be prohibitively expensive and impractical in such a developed area. The crash data at the Harmont intersection does not indicate a problem with either red light running or rear-end type crashes which are indicative of the need for additional warning signs. While the comment is not clear as to what type of advanced warning sign is desired, studies have shown that PREPARE TO STOP WHEN FLASHING signs are undesirable since they tend to increase vehicle speeds and rear-end crashes as some drivers try to "beat the light". It should be noted that the ODOT District office is currently testing/implementing alternative methods of dilemma zone detection.		

Comment #: 16	Name: Todd LePage	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): G3 – Central Section East		
Comment Summary: The K-Mart and Wal-Mart parking lots would likely issues with "cut-through" traffic.		
Response: The comment was noted and will be considered in the later stages of the alternative analyses.		

Comment #: 17	Name: Michael K. Phillips	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): Unspecified Alternative		
Comment Summary: "The roundabout will work if you did it right and eliminate the people. If not it's a bad idea."		
Response: The comment was noted.		

Comment #: 18	Name: Michael K. Phillips	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): General Comment		
Comment Summary: "There are a lot of ideas that will work. Just make sure Fire and Police Department like it and it is easy for them to get to the neighborhood."		
Response: The impacts to emergency vehicle response time will be considered in those alternatives that restrict access points into the nearby neighborhoods.		

Comment #: 19	Name: Dale Barley	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): General Comment		
Comment Summary: Request for the drawings presented at this public involvement meeting.		
Response: The requested drawings were mailed to Mr. Barley.		

STA-62 Public Involvement Meeting Comments

Conceptual Alternative Solutions (Micro Analysis)

Held on Thursday October 13, 2011 @ ODOT Maintenance Facility

Comment #: 20	Name: Michael Miller	Date: 10/13/11
Regarding Alternative(s): Harrisburg/Middlebranch		
Comment Summary: Alternatives 2B or 2C appear to look the best. As the owner of the car lot on the NE side of U.S. 62 and Middlebranch, the proposed turn lane on Middlebranch for NB traffic would deem my lot too small to operate as a dealership.		
Response: It should be noted that this location has become its own study and is no longer included within the STA-62 Corridor Study. However, as with any project, designs are modified to avoid property impacts as much as practical.		