

**Interstate 80 Improvement Project
Public Involvement Meeting
June 9, 2010**

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

**TRU-80-8.56
PID 81510**

August 20, 2010

An open house public involvement meeting was conducted on June 9, 2009, from 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm at Reed Middle School located at 150 Hall Avenue, Hubbard, Ohio. Preliminary plans, maps and the local traffic pattern alteration route for Mount Everett Road were on display along with information from detailed environmental studies completed to date, including ecological and cultural resource studies and hazardous material site assessments. Representatives from the Ohio Department of Transportation and the project consultant, CT Consultants, were available to discuss the project and address questions.

Public officials, business/property owners and interested citizens 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) resulting from a news release issued by ODOT, District 4 Office of Public Information on May 25, 2010.

Approximately twenty-nine (29) 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 and CT Consultants. Sixteen (16) written comments were received during the public involvement meeting and the public comment period that concluded on June 23, 2010. One (1) additional written comment was received by ODOT, District 4 after the public comment period closure date.

Fourteen (14) of the twenty-nine (29) attendees who submitted written comments support Alternative 17. In addition, three (3) attendees who submitted written comments support Alternative 33. The other two (2) attendees who submitted written comments either had "no opinion" on the project or they fully opposed the project.

At the public involvement meeting, a number of area residents and public officials expressed their concerns regarding emergency response times.

Emergency Response Times-This issue was raised as a concern by several people at the public involvement meeting and in written correspondence received afterward. Most people are concerned about the amount of time it will take for emergency response vehicles to get to the other side of the township if Alternative 33 is selected.

ODOT reexamined the response times for police, fire and emergency medical services for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the alternative selection.

The following is a summary of all seventeen (17) received written comments and responses to the comments.

Selected Alternative- Since the preparation of the responses below, ODOT, in cooperation with Hubbard Township, has secured additional funding to construct the Mt. Everett Road realignment. ODOT will proceed with Alternative 17, including the realignment of Mt. Everett Road as the preferred alternative selected for further project development.

No.	Comment	Response
Richard & Carole Fedorchak (letter) 6-22-2010		
1	<p>Support Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Realignment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “For the safety and convenience of all local residents, please do not close Mount Everett Road at or near the railroad crossing under the I-80 bridge in Hubbard Township. The construction of a through road just north of I-80 would be a much more desirable option.” 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments noted.
Fire Chief, John J. Clemente Jr., (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
2	<p>Supports Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Realignment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fire trucks do not have a short turn radius; therefore, how does ODOT plan to address the geometry of the proposed cul-de-sac? 2. Is concerned about the amount of time it will take for fire vehicles to get to the other side of the township. 3. The 2 million dollars spent for the Mount Everett Road realignment is rather insignificant considering the impacts associated with the Mount Everett Road closure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design of the cul-de-sacs will accommodate the turn radius of all fire vehicles. 2. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection. 3. Comment noted.

No.	Comment	Response
Edward J. Williams (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
3	<p>Supports Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Realignment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mount Everett Road should remain open to the public in order to maintain appropriate response times for police, fire and EMS. 2. The closure of Mount Everett Road will impede traffic on State Routes 7, 62 and 304, thus creating problems for school buses entering and exiting the Hubbard Schools complex and for traffic entering and exiting I-80. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection. 2. The 700 vehicles/day currently using Mount Everett Road will be redirected onto other routes, but will not impede the traffic. The existing routes on SR 7, US 62 and SR 304 have additional capacity to handle the added traffic.
Todd D. Coonce (letter), Police Chief 6-18-2010		
4	<p>Supports Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Realignment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “I am writing to express my objection to the proposed closing of Mount Everett Road and creation of cul-de-sacs at both ends. However, I am in favor of the realignment and extension of Mount Everett Road to Drummond Avenue north of I-80.” 2. The realignment of Mount Everett Road will have no effect on current response times. 3. The realignment of Mount Everett Road should be done first, so there will be no interruption to police services. 4. “The Hubbard Township’s police station does <u>not</u> sit in the center of Hubbard as referenced on page 8 of ODOT’s Mount Everett Road closure study. The most direct route for the township police to access the west side of Hubbard Township from the station located at 2600 Elmwood Dr. Extension, utilizes Elmwood Drive, Hubbard-Masury Road, US 62, Drummond Avenue and Mount Everett Road. This is, without a shadow of a doubt, the most direct route to the west side of our township. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comments noted. 2. Comment noted. 3. ODOT will attempt to schedule the project such that the Mt. Everett Road realignment will be completed as early as possible. 4. Comment noted. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>If we are forced to use one of the alternative routes, the mileage, and subsequently the response time, will be doubled for emergency calls for that area.”</p> <p>5. Other factors that make the use of alternative routes impractical:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. “When there is a large increase and presence of children walking to and from school, combined with school buses coming and going, this creates a potential safety issue when emergency vehicles are trying to navigate through this route.” b. “The shutting down of I-80 between SR 193 and US 62 for whatever reason, i.e., inclement weather, crashes, etc., causes commercial traffic to be rerouted through Hubbard, further congesting traffic on US 62.” c. “Hubbard Township is not equipped with the traffic preemption system to control traffic signals when responding through the City of Hubbard. Township cruisers and motorists would be exposed to a higher risk of a crash occurring when responding to emergencies through Hubbard City.” d. “If we were at a call on either end of the proposed cul-de-sac, and received another call for service at the cul-de-sac on the other end of Mount Everett Road, this would be our worst case scenario for response time.” 	<p>5.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Comment noted. b. Comment noted. c. Township cruisers could be equipped with the new light preemption system to better respond to emergencies within Hubbard Township. d. Comment noted. Response times for this unlikely scenario would be expected to increase by about 5 minutes by using Wick Campbell Ave and Drummond Ave. Ext. This increased time is less then it would take to get from the township police station to the west side of the township.

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>e. "Page 8 of ODOT's Mount Everett Road closure study states a delay in response time as 2 minutes. As we are not located in the center of town, we did our own drive of the proposed permanent detour, using miles instead of time. Currently, from our station to the proposed west end cul-de-sac is a distance of 2.3 miles. This distance will increase to 4.8 miles using the permanent detour. This is more than double the mileage, which equates to double the response time regardless of what speed you are driving."</p>	<p>e. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.</p>
Michael A. Fedorchak (letter) 6-18-2010		
5	<p>Supports Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Realignment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "As a lifelong resident of the Township, I travel on Mount Everett Road frequently. It is one of the area's only east to west roads allowing easy access from the western side of the Township to the I-80 Truck World Interchange area. There are few alternate routes and traveling any of them will add several miles to a trip." 2. "Please consider keeping Mount Everett Road open in some passable form for vehicle traffic. Whether retaining the bridges in their current configuration, creating a one-way roadway under I-80 for single car passage, or realigning Mount Everett Road to the north of I-80." 3. "The loss of this passage would not only inconvenience motorists, but it would also hamper emergency vehicles traveling east to west in the Township." 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted. Travel time to the I-80 interchange would increase up to 5 minutes. 2. Comment noted. 3. Comment noted. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.
Robert & Nancy Gaut (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
6	<p>Support Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Road Realignment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is concerned about disturbances from vehicles at a relocated Mount Everett Road. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comment noted.

No.	Comment	Response
	2. Is concerned about safety at the proposed new Mount Everett Road/Drummond Avenue intersection.	2. Comment noted.
Ralph Cooper (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
7	Supports Alternative 17-Mount Everett Road Realignment. No written comments were provided on the comment sheet.	
Leanna Latronico (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
8	Supports Alternative 17-Mount Everett Road Realignment. No written comments were provided on the comment sheet.	
Charles Latronico (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
9	Supports Alternative 17-Mount Everett Road Realignment. No written comments were provided on the comment sheet.	
James Letro (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
10	Opposes the proposed Mount Everett Road Project 1. "Mount Everett road needs to exist in its current route." It serves as an alternate route for emergency vehicle traffic and other traffic when I-80 is closed.	1. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.
Tom & Karen Jones (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
11	Support Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Road Realignment 1. Response times for police and fire will be too long with Alternative 33.	1. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.
Ronald Smith (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
12	Supports Alternative 33-Mount Everett Road Closure 1. Cul-de-Sacs should not be placed in an isolated area that would encourage illegal dumping.	1. Comment noted.

No.	Comment	Response
Debbie Pysher (comment sheet) 6-9-2010		
13	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emergency response time is a big concern. 2. Is concerned that two cul-de-sacs will encourage illegal dumping. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection. 2. Comment noted.
Hubbard Township Board of Trustees (letter) 6-18-2010		
14	<p>Support Alternative 17 – Mount Everett Road Realignment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The realignment of Mount Everett Road is essential for emergency vehicle traffic and to respond to police, fire and medical emergencies within Hubbard Township. 2. The Drummond Avenue railroad overpass, at its current height, does not provide enough vertical clearance for fire vehicles to pass underneath. Additionally, the vertical clearance of the Drummond Avenue railroad bridge is too low to accommodate bus traffic in the event that Mount Everett Road is permanently closed. Why can't ODOT address the condition of the railroad bridge on Drummond Avenue so it can accommodate larger vehicles? 3. With a water line already in place under the interstate bridge, the proposed expansion of the water line to the western part of the township would be in jeopardy. This proposed water line will provide water to low and moderate income families. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection. 2. Comment noted. ODOT does not have ownership of the railroad overpass on Drummond Avenue. 3. Comment noted.

No.	Comment	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. "By closing Mount Everett Road, access to 271 acres of land zoned heavy industrial will be affected. Any hope of using the rail line and road access would be lost along with potential jobs." 5. The impact of additional travel distances combined with stop and go traffic will have a negative impact on air quality. 6. The City of Hubbard and Hubbard Township have formed a Joint Economic Development District (JEDD) to further develop the community. Mount Everett Road abuts the JEDD District and may impose restrictions on its expansion if Mount Everett Road were to be permanently closed. 7. Request that the Mount Everett Road realignment be done properly as to limit future maintenance costs to be absorbed by Hubbard Township. 8. Request that the realignment of Mount Everett Road be constructed prior to the closure of the current Mount Everett Road, so access to the area by emergency vehicles will not be restricted at any time during construction. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Access will be provided to the site at Drummond Avenue and by a new rail spur. 5. The realignment of Mount Everett Road would warrant a qualitative air quality analysis study to determine what impacts, if any, will be associated with a new road on a new alignment as proposed with Alternative 17. 6. Comment noted. 7. Comment noted. 8. The proposed project will be phased accordingly.
Lifefleet Ambulance Services (letter) 6-18-2010		
15	<p>Support Alternative 17- Mount Everett Road Realignment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mount Everett Road is a busy thoroughfare for Lifefleet Ambulance. Taking the proposed alternate route, would result in increased emergency response times. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.

No.	Comment	Response
Frederick V. Hudach (Trans Rail America, Inc.) (letter) 6-21-2010		
16	<p>Support Alternative 17- Mount Everett Road Realignment</p> <p>Regarding Alternative 17:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why can't the planned cul-de-sac be placed further west so that TRA can have access to the cul-de-sac that will not functionally land-lock TRA's property? 2. Alternative 17 shows that TRA's property to the north of Interstate 80 is Wetlands. Who conducted the wetland delineation? 	<p>Regarding Alternative 17:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The cul-de-sac locations are only conceptual at this time and are subject to change. ODOT will explore ways to maintain access to the TRA parcel south of I-80. This access could be potentially maintained by moving the cul-de-sac location or providing drive access through the existing road right-of-way. If we are not able to maintain access to this parcel, ODOT would be obligated to compensate TRA accordingly. 2. A wetland delineation report was prepared by an Ohio Department of Transportation-Office of Environmental Services pre-qualified consultant (ms consultants, inc.) for ODOT, in July 2009. The Army Corps of Engineers has not yet reviewed this delineation. The wetland limits shown on the public meeting display for the area to the north of I-80 between the railroad and Drummond Avenue were inadvertently shown beyond the actual delineation limits from the report. The actual delineation did not extend beyond the project study area. This display had a large area marked as wetlands that was not within our project study area. Our study did not evaluate this area for wetlands and thus we have no knowledge of the actual wetlands status of the area beyond the project study area.

No.	Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="358 258 383 289">3.</p> <p data-bbox="298 380 850 438">3a. When will the decision be made to whether or not to implement Alternative 17?</p> <p data-bbox="298 653 915 743">3b. If Alternative 17 is chosen as the plan, when can I formally meet with the person in charge of purchasing a portion of TRA's property?</p>	<p data-bbox="1037 226 1062 258">3.</p> <p data-bbox="992 289 1386 621">3a. A decision will be made per ODOT's Project Development Process. Our intent is to make a decision in the next three to six months, however since there is a significant difference in cost between the two alternatives; this decision may be delayed due to the need to secure additional funding if Alternative 17 is preferred.</p> <p data-bbox="992 625 1386 926">3b. Significant additional plan development needs to occur before the project can move into property acquisition. It is likely to be a year and a half to two years until this project begins right-of-way acquisition. At that time, an appraiser for the state will contact the property owner to review the parcel.</p>
	<p data-bbox="358 961 383 993">4.</p> <p data-bbox="298 1020 886 1110">4a. Will the State of Ohio pay the cost of engineering and construction in order to provide a new rail spur off the Norfolk-Southern main line?</p> <p data-bbox="298 1115 915 1173">4b. If Alternative 17 is chosen, when will the new rail spur to TRA's property be constructed?</p>	<p data-bbox="1037 961 1062 993">4.</p> <p data-bbox="992 1020 1398 1896">4a. & 4b. Since the existing spur to the TRA parcel will no longer be accessible in either alternative, ODOT performed preliminary engineering to explore the feasibility of adding a new switch and siding to maintain rail access to the TRA property. The new spur location shown on the project displays is only intended to indicate one potential feasible location for maintaining rail access to this parcel. It is anticipated that the exact disposition of this rail access will be negotiated as part of the right-of-way acquisition process. It is ODOT's current preference that TRA be directly compensated for any additional cost to maintain rail access to their parcel. TRA would then be able to have the engineering and construction completed on a schedule that is determined by TRA. Other methods of addressing this situation may be available and can be discussed as part of the right-of-way negotiations.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>5. Will the vertical clearance associated with the new Interstate 80 bridges be enough to allow double stacked intermodal containers to travel under Interstate 80?</p> <p>6.</p> <p>6a. What will be the weight limit of the new relocated Mount Everett Road?</p> <p>6b. Who will take ownership of the new relocated Mount Everett Road?</p> <p>6c. Will TRA have legal frontage access to the new relocated Mount Everett Road?</p> <p>Regarding Alternative 33:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It appears that TRA will lose its frontage access to Mount Everett Road east of the Norfolk/Southern main rail line. 2. It appears that TRA will lose approximately two-fifths of its frontage access to Mount Everett Road west of the Norfolk/Southern main line. 3. It appears that the cul-de-sac planned for Mount Everett Road will not be constructed in a location as to provide access to Mount Everett Road. 	<p>5. Bridge clearances over the railroad tracks will be coordinated with the railroads during project design. The typical required clearance for double stacked intermodal containers is 20'9". The existing bridge clearance exceeds this dimension and it is anticipated that the final clearances will also exceed this dimension.</p> <p>6.</p> <p>6a. There will be no weight restrictions beyond the current maximums established by state law associated with the newly relocated Mount Everett Road. Mount Everett Road will be constructed per ODOT's current design standards.</p> <p>6b. Trumbull County/Hubbard Township will take ownership of the newly relocated Mount Everett Road.</p> <p>6c. Yes.</p> <p>Regarding Alternative 33:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The TRA parcel would not have access to Mt. Everett road east of the NS main line. Access to this parcel would still be available via Drummond Avenue. 2. The cul-de-sac locations are only conceptual at this time and are subject to change. ODOT is able to explore alternative cul-de-sac locations. 3. The cul-de-sac locations are only conceptual at this time and are subject to change. ODOT will explore ways to maintain access to the TRA parcel

No.	Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="537 594 919 772">4. It appears that there is no short distance to reach the north side of Hubbard or Interstate 80 for people who live west of the Norfolk/Southern main line.</p> <p data-bbox="537 804 862 863">5. Wetlands delineation is incorrect.</p>	<p data-bbox="1084 226 1393 590">south of I-80. This access could be potentially maintained by moving the cul-de-sac location or providing drive access through the existing road right-of-way. If we are not able to maintain access to this parcel, ODOT would be obligated to compensate TRA accordingly.</p> <p data-bbox="1036 594 1377 800">4. ODOT will consider the potential for additional travel time when making its decision. It is estimated that the travel time will be increased a maximum of 5 minutes.</p> <p data-bbox="1036 804 1393 1839">5. A wetland delineation report was prepared by an Ohio Department of Transportation-Office of Environmental Services pre-qualified consultant (ms consultants, inc.) for ODOT, District 4 in July 2009. The Army Corps of Engineers has not yet reviewed this delineation. The wetland limits shown on the public meeting display for the area to the north of I-80 between the railroad and Drummond Avenue were inadvertently shown beyond the actual delineation limits from the report. The actual delineation did not extend beyond the project study area. This display had a large area marked as wetlands that was not within our project study area. Our study did not evaluate this area for wetlands and thus we have no knowledge of the actual wetlands status of the area beyond the project study area.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
	<p>6. Alternative 33 will result in litigation.</p> <p>7. ODOT was influenced by others.</p> <p>8. This alternative obstructs safety forces.</p> <p>General Comments and Questions:</p> <p>1. Why were Alternatives 1-16, 18-32, and 34 not presented during the public involvement meeting?</p> <p>2. The structures need repairs now.</p>	<p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. ODOT has pursued this project as an improvement to the I-80 bridge structures with a goal of minimizing costs and reducing the potential impacts of the project while maintaining traffic on I-80.</p> <p>8. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.</p> <p>1. A variety of alternatives with different beam types, bridge lengths and pier configurations were considered throughout the preliminary design process. Alternatives were eliminated based on high costs, constructability and the inability to meet current design standards. Alternatives that were not presented were either not feasible or minor variations on the presented alternatives.</p> <p>2. Substantial temporary repairs have recently been performed on these structures.</p>

No.	Comment	Response
John Morris, Eagle Joint Fire District (CIMS Inquiry #51843) 7-22-2010		
17	<p>Supports Alternative 17- Mount Everett Road Realignment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The closing of Mount Everett Road would pose response delays for fire, police, and ambulance services. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ODOT has reexamined the response times for police, fire and EMS for the closure alternative. The response times are not expected to increase more than two minutes in most cases. ODOT will consider the increased response times along with other considerations when making the preferred alternative selection.