

Public Involvement Comment Summary CLE-32 Eastgate Improvements (PID: 82557)

Meeting Number and Purpose	Date	Comment and number of comments	Comment Disposition/Resolution
<b>I Introduce the CLE 32 project to the public and obtain initial comments</b>	10/6/2010	Respondent is concerned with traffic congestion on SR 32. (8 comments)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent is concerned with speed and congestion on Old SR 74 and Olive Branch-Stonelick Road now that Old SR 74 goes through to the UC branch campus. (2 comments)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent is concerned with turning across traffic [on local roads feeding to SR 32]. (2 comments)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent is concerned with traffic signals not corresponding with the volume of traffic – suggests access roads with no signals along SR 32, which would allow for bypassing SR 32 and still being able to access businesses. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent is concerned with the traffic signal at Old SR 74 and SR 32, at the Speedway. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent is concerned with the disturbance that will be created. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent is concerned about still being able to provide access to existing businesses. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent is concerned with noise issues. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent believes that there are too many lights within the study area. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent believes an overpass at SR 32 and Old SR 74 by the Speedway and Heitman Lane will alleviate some of the back-up for people, especially those living on Heitman Lane. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent believes that growth in the area will be inhibited due to congestion on SR 32 and safety issues. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent believes overpasses will alleviate traffic problems currently caused by traffic lights. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development
		Respondent notes that there are not safe sidewalks in the area. (1 comment)	Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development

Public Involvement Comment Summary CLE-32 Eastgate Improvements (PID: 82557)

		<p>Respondent is concerned with the cost to tax payers, the feasibility of the project, and the impact to the flow of traffic in the area. (1 comment)</p> <p>Respondent is concerned with the traffic lights in the study area and believes that they contribute to the traffic and accidents in the area. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development</p> <p>Comment noted to be used in Alternative Development</p>
<b>2</b>	9/28/2011	Alternative voting	
<b>Public vote on alternative for the entire project length</b>		Alternative 1 (0 votes)	
		Alternative 2 (13 votes)	
		Alternative 3 (9 votes)	
		Alternative 4 (13 votes)	
		Alternative 5 No Build (5 votes)	
		Other did not choose an alternative or wrote "None" (18 votes)	
		Glen Este Ramp Selections	
		Yes (19 votes)	
		No (5 votes)	
		Yes, if library is not hit (2 votes)	
<b>3</b>	7/17/14	Respondent supports alternative 4 (20 comments)	This comment is noted.
<b>Gather feedback for 2 remaining alternative (Alts 2 and 4)</b>		Respondent supports alternative 2 (8 comments)	This comment is noted.
		Respondent supports No Build Option (2 comments)	This comment is noted.
		Respondent is concerned with maintaining access to specific roadways within the project area after construction. Roads mentioned included Bach Buxton, Elick Lane, Marian Drive, and Old SR 74. (9 comments)	Three north-south access routes across SR 32 would be provided with both alternatives – a Glen Este-Withamsville Road overpass, an Old SR 74 overpass, and an overpass with the new interchange; with both alternatives, the new interchange connects to Bach Buxton. All other roadways that would be closed at SR 32 would be provided alternate access points.

Public Involvement Comment Summary CLE-32 Eastgate Improvements (PID: 82557)

		<p>Respondent wants to know what pedestrian accommodations would be provided with the project. (3 comments)</p>	<p>Pedestrian accommodations would be included with the project along some of the local roads within the project area; other Eastgate areas are outside of this project.</p>
		<p>Respondent is concerned with emergency services access to properties within the project area. (3 comments)</p>	<p>Both alternatives provide roadway extensions that would connect to the interchange (Aicholtz extension with Alternative 2 and Clepper extension with Alternative 4) and access to all properties remaining in the area would be maintained.</p>
		<p>Respondent is concerned with traffic flow in the area after the project is built. (2 comments)</p>	<p>This project would make SR 32 a limited access roadway and would add more travel lanes, so traffic flow on SR 32 should still improve even if volumes are higher.</p>
		<p>Respondent had a concern with the meeting approach and/or materials. (3 comments)</p>	<p>This comment is noted.</p>
		<p>Respondent requested access to the meeting display boards after the meeting. (2 comments)</p>	<p>Materials from the meeting are available on ODOT's website as well as the Eastern Corridor website.</p>
		<p>Respondent would like to know what improvements will be made to the surrounding roadways. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Improvements will be made to Old SR 74, Glen Este-Withamsville Road, and Clepper Lane, in addition to the upgrades to SR 32.</p>
		<p>Respondent is concerned with maintaining access to Mt. Carmel Baptist Church. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Access will be maintained to as many properties within the project area as possible. If access cannot be maintained, ODOT will work with the owner to relocate the property.</p>
		<p>Respondent wants to know about stream and wetland impacts associated with the project and what the mitigation will be. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Environmental fieldwork is ongoing and will be completed when the Preferred Alternative is chosen and the design is refined. Mitigation will be determined after the fieldwork is completed and the specific impacts are known.</p>
		<p>Respondent believes that the left turn from Shayler Road onto Old SR 74 should be prohibited. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Based on certified traffic for the year 2037 provided by ODOT, traffic on Shayler Road is expected to decrease with the preferred alternative constructed (3,780 ADT compared to 5,180 ADT in the no build scenario).</p>

Public Involvement Comment Summary CLE-32 Eastgate Improvements (PID: 82557)

		<p>Respondent wants to know if residents' opinions matter in the decision making process. (1 comment)</p> <p>Respondent does not want SR 32 to be relocated. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Residents' opinions do factor into the decision making process; however, they are not the only item that is considered. Cost, environmental impacts, and property impacts (to name a few) are also among the other items considered.</p> <p>The SR 32 relocation is part of a separate project. More information on that is available on the Eastern Corridor website.</p>
<p><b>4 Updates by the project team on design changes that have been made to the preferred alternative since the last meeting</b></p>	<p>6/9/15</p>	<p>Respondent supports the project. (4 comments)</p> <p>Respondent is concerned with the impact to their property and/or business and would like to further discuss the impacts. (3 comments)</p> <p>Respondent is concerned about existing drainage along Old SR 74. (2 comments)</p> <p>Respondent is concerned with access to their business once access points along SR 32 are eliminated, especially large vehicles that will now have to turn left from Old SR 74 to access the property. (1 comment)</p> <p>Respondent is concerned with the potential for increased traffic on Old SR 74, north of SR 32, as well as access to the First Baptist Church of Glen Este. (1 comment)</p> <p>Respondent is concerned with the potential for increased traffic on Old SR 74, south of SR 32. (1 comment)</p>	<p>This comment is noted.</p> <p>This comment is noted and has been forwarded to the appropriate County contacts.</p> <p>Drainage will be evaluated as part of the project.</p> <p>A signal is proposed at the intersection of Old 74 and Elick Lane. The intersection will be designed to accommodate WB-62 vehicles.</p> <p>Based on certified traffic for the year 2037 provided by ODOT, traffic on Old SR 74 (between Tealtown Road and Bridlewood Lane) is expected to decrease when the preferred alternative is constructed (21,300 ADT compared to 25,520 ADT in the no build scenario). Additionally, Old SR 74 will be upgraded to better handle the current and future volumes of traffic.</p> <p>Based on certified traffic for the year 2037 provided by ODOT, traffic on Old SR 74 (between Shayler Road and Olive Branch-Stonelick Road) is expected to decrease when the preferred alternative is constructed (16,140 ADT compared to 18,090 ADT in the no build scenario).</p>

Public Involvement Comment Summary CLE-32 Eastgate Improvements (PID: 82557)

		<p>Respondent is concerned with the potential for increased traffic on Shayler Road. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Based on certified traffic for the year 2037 provided by ODOT, traffic on Shayler Road is expected to decrease when the preferred alternative is constructed (3,780 ADT compared to 5,180 ADT in the no build scenario).</p>
		<p>Respondent is concerned with the speed limits on roads in the project area, especially Old SR 74. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Speed limits on local roads will remain the same.</p>
		<p>Respondent feels that the Old SR 74 overpass at SR 32 isn't warranted and the road should simply be closed off instead. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Constructing the Old SR 74 overpass at SR 32 will provide another north-south access route through the area, which will help with the overall traffic flow through the project area when SR 32 becomes a limited access road.</p>
		<p>Respondent is pleased to see the pedestrian accommodations included in the project area, but is curious about the pedestrian access across Eastgate Boulevard. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Eastgate Boulevard is a separate project; comment is noted and has been forwarded to the appropriate contacts.</p>
		<p>Respondent is concerned with the length of time that the project construction will take. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Construction is not part of this phase of the project; comment is noted and has been forwarded to the appropriate contacts.</p>
		<p>Respondent is concerned with the design changes that were shown at this meeting compared to the July 2014 meeting. Respondent is also concerned that traffic volumes used are based on temporary traffic volumes and patterns (from current construction) and are not accurate. (1 comment)</p>	<p>Comment is noted. The purpose of the June 2015 meeting was to present the design changes that had been made since the July 2014 meeting, including those made along Old SR 74. Files on ODOT's website are from the July 2014 meeting; files from the June 2015 meeting have not yet been uploaded to ODOT's website but are currently available on the Eastern Corridor website. Traffic volumes are based on the normal flow of traffic and not based on the temporary traffic conditions due to the current construction; the improvements to Old SR 74 are based on the projected future traffic conditions on Old SR 74.</p>