## CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION LEVEL 4

I-275/SR 32 Interchange CLE-275-10.15, PID 76289

Prepared for:

Ohio Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration

Prepared by:



March 2008

County Clermont Route CLE-275 Section 10.15 PID 76289 SJN 486706

## **Table of Contents**

| PART I                 | GENERAL PROJECT IDENTIFICA              | TION, DESCRIPTION AND DESIGN INFO          | ORMATION | 1-4        |
|------------------------|---|--|----------|------------|
|                        | Project Description                     |  |          | 1          |
|                        |   | t  |          |            |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        |   | nstruction                                 |          |            |
|                        |   | dule                                       |          |            |
|                        |   | ent  |          |            |
|                        | ragine of way and other involvent       |  |          |            |
| PART II                | <b>IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATI</b>      | ON OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED A            | ACTION   | 5-15       |
|                        | Section A – Ecological Resources        | s  |          | 5-7        |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        | Section C - Cultural Resources          |  |          | 9          |
|                        | Section D - Section 4(f) Resource       | 9s   |          | 10         |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        | Section F – Community Impacts.          |  |          | 12         |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        |   | and Regulated Substances                   |          |            |
|                        | Section I – Permits Checklist           |  |          | 14         |
|                        |   | nitments Made and Resources to be Avo      |          |            |
|                        | Section K – Concurrence                 |  |          | 15         |
| ATT ACL                | IMENT A Information Sources             |  |          | 16-10      |
| ATTACE                 | IMENT A - IIIIOIIIIation Sources        |  |          | 10-10      |
| ATTACH                 | IMENT B - General Project Identifica    | tion, Description, and Design Informati    | on       | 19-60      |
| • B1                   | Project Location Map                    | -  |          | 19         |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        |   | and Design                                 |          |            |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        |   | 2011 TIP                                   |          |            |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        |   | ortation Improvement Program               |          |            |
| • B8                   | Preferred Alternative - Construction Pr | nasing                                     |          | 35         |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
|                        |   | Itility and Addressing Purpose and Need    |          |            |
|                        |   | is   |          |            |
|                        |   | : January 2004 Public Meeting Exhibits and |          |            |
|                        |   | ibits and May 24, 2004 Work Session Minu   |          |            |
|                        |   | mpacted Parcels Table                      |          |            |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
| ATTACH                 | IMENT C - Ecological Resources an       | d Agency Coordination                      |          | 61-89      |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
| • C2                   | NWI-Mapped Wetlands                     |  |          | 62         |
|                        |   |  |          |            |
| <ul> <li>C4</li> </ul> |   | es   |          |            |
| 0                      |   |  |          |            |
| 0                      |   | d Preserves, August 20, 2001               |          |            |
| 0                      |   | d Preserves, June 14, 2006                 |          |            |
| • C5                   | •                                       |  |          |            |
| 0                      |   |  |          |            |
| 0                      |   |  |          |            |
| 0                      |   |  |          |            |
| 0                      |   |  |          |            |
| 0                      |   |  |          |            |
| 0                      | NPS, August 15, 2008                    |  |          | 89a        |
|                        |   |  | _        |            |
| This                   | is page i of ii which is part of:       | Categorical Exclusion Level 4              | Date: _  | March 2008 |

County <u>Clermont</u> Route <u>CLE-275</u> Section <u>10.15</u> PID <u>76289</u> SJN <u>486706</u>

# Table of Contents (continued)

|    | (communication)  |         |
|----|--|---------|
| ΑТ | TACHMENT D - Other Resources   | 90-92   |
| •  | D1 OEPA Drinking Water Resources Map   |         |
| •  | D2 FEMA Floodplain Map   |         |
| •  | D3 Farmland Protection Policy Act Project Screening Sheet  |         |
|    |  |         |
| ΑT | TACHMENT E - Cultural Resources and Section 4(f)   | 93-100  |
| •  | E1 October 12, 2004 ODOT-OES Letter to SHPO on Phase I History/Architecture Survey; SHPO                                       | 0.0     |
|    | Concurrence Dated November 23, 2004  | 93      |
| •  | E2 December 3, 2004 ODOT-OES Letter to SHPO on Phase I Archaeological Investigations; SHPO Concurrence Dated December 16, 2004 | QF      |
| •  | E3 April 27, 2007 ODOT-OES Letter to SHPO on Addendum to Phase I History/Architecture and                                      | 90      |
| •  | Archaeological Investigations; SHPO Concurrence Dated May 8, 2007  | 98      |
| •  | E4 USDOI Land and Water Conservation Fund: List of Clermont County Projects  |         |
|    |  |         |
| ΑT | TACHMENT F - Air Quality and Noise   |         |
| •  | F1 USEPA and OEPA Concurrence on PM <sub>2.5</sub>   |         |
| •  | F2 OEPA Concurrence on MSAT Analysis   |         |
| •  | F3 MSAT Analysis Report  | 122     |
| •  | F4 ODOT-OES IOC: Preliminary Noise Analysis, January 11, 2008  |         |
| •  | F5 Preliminary Noise Analysis Report   | 139     |
| ΔΤ | TACHMENT G - Community Impacts   | 151-163 |
| •  | G1 Community Impact Assessment Checklist   |         |
| •  | G2 Speaks English Less Than Well Populations Map   |         |
| •  | G3 Elderly Populations Map   |         |
| •  | G4 Disabled Populations Map  |         |
| •  | G5 Zero-Car Households Map   |         |
| •  | G6 Eastern Corridor Land Use Vision Plan Map   |         |
| •  | G7 Union Township Zoning Map   |         |
| •  | G8 Minority and Low Income Populations Map   |         |
| •  | G9 Environmental Justice Assessment Tool Report  |         |
|    |  |         |
| ΑT | TACHMENT H - December 13, 2007 Public Involvement Meeting  |         |
| •  | H1 Public Meeting Notification Letter and Newspaper Advertisements   |         |
| •  | H2 Public Meeting Handout and Blank Comment Sheet  |         |
| •  | H3 Public Meeting Summary Report   |         |
| •  | H4 ODOT Responses to Public Comments   | 257     |
| AT | TACHMENT I - Hazardous Materials and Regulated Substances  | 288-314 |
| •  | I1 ODOT-OES IOC: ESA Screening, July 28, 2004  | 288     |
| •  | 12 ODOT-OES IOC: Phase I ESA, November 27, 2004  | 289     |
| •  | I3 ODOT-OES IOC: ESA Screening Addendum, March 21, 2007  |         |
| •  | I4 ODOT-OES IOC: Phase I ESA Addendum, January 3, 2008   |         |
| •  | I5 ODOT-OES IOC: Phase I ESA Addendum, February 12, 2008   |         |
| •  | I6 ODOT-OES IOC: Phase II ESA, November 17, 2008   | 314     |
| ΔТ | TACHMENT J - Photograph Index Map and Inventory  | 315_320 |
| Λ! | 1 AOTIMENT O THOOGRAPH HIGES MAP AND HIVEHOLY  |         |
|    |  |         |
|    |  |         |

Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Date: This is page ii of ii which is part of: March 2008

| Cou  | nty _  | Clermor  | nt_  | Route _   | CLE-275  | Section _  | 10.15  | PID  | 76289   | SJN  | 486   | 706   |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |   | CATEGO   | RICAL EXC  | LUSION D   | OCUME  | <u>ENT</u>  |  |   |   |
| <u>Pa</u>  | art I  | - Gen  | era  | ıl Proj   | ect Ident  | tification,  | Descrip  | tion, a  | and De  | sign l   | Inform  | ation   |
|  |  | f the Proje<br>ne of the F   |  | ty:   |  | South SR 741,<br>2 Interchange; I  |  |  |   | ODOT   | District: _   | 8   |
| Prog   | ram:   | Majo   | or Ne  | •w  | Fu   | nding Source:  | X Federa   | al X   | State X   | Local  | F   | Private   |
| PRC  | JEC  | T DESCI  | RIPT   | ION:  |  |  |  |  |   |  |   |   |
|  | nty an<br>cipalit  | d Townsh<br>ty:  | ip:  |   | Clermont Cou<br>NA   | nty, Union Tow   | nship  |  |   |  |   | <u> </u>  |
| Start  | : _  | roposed V<br>I-275: SL<br>Length:  | M 9.   | 04; SR 3  | 32: SLM 0.35<br>0 / SR 32: 3.6   | / <u>NA</u><br>km <u>I-</u>  | _ End: <u>I-27</u><br>275: 2.4 / SR  |  | mi.   |  |   | NA_   |
| If yes   | s, whe   | n did FHV  | VA g   | rant a co   | nditional appro  | e Justification Soval for this projection of the document must be seen a supplied to the following the supplied to the following the following the supplied to the following the followi | ect?   |  | d?  | es* X ate: final appro   | No<br>oval of the li  | MS/IJS.   |
| The (and E (see the I-Drive existi interconstitution)  • M  • M  • M  • M  • F | CLE-2 Eastga Attach 275/S The ng I-2 change Modifie o a co from t Eastga Modifie emov westbo Eastga Viden points Recon | ate Bouley ment B1, SR 32 interest project a p | vard Pagercha | interchange 19). Tunge and involves a rchange included -275/SR addirectional and sounterchange Road fframp ir tage Road from appastgate Se Old SR | ges in Union he project beg the Eastgate an approximat and extending in the CLE-27 32 interchange I and loop ran thbound I-275 ge.  Boulevard in 32 loop ramp tersection with direlocation is croximately Beguare Drive/Jet 74 bridge over the project of the project in the project | d capacity and Township, Cler Jins on SR 32 and Boulevard integers and to a point of the consisting of the consistency of the c | mont County, about 0.3 mile erchange to a ction of I-275 int approxima are the follow 1) reconfigurate signalized and 3) braided figuration to coulevard, and ulevard to the I project).  stgate Square Drive. | Ohio, loce west of I point about beginning tely 1.2 maying action access point amount access point amount access point amount access point access po | ally referre Bells Lane out 0.2 mil g approxim illes south as:  mps from a ants on SR anecting the d diamond tion of the d Eastgate and removal | d to as the and proceed east of ately 1.1 of the experience of the | he "Eastgate eas feeds eas feastgate miles not kisting I-27 erleaf confeel-275 intenterchange ange, inclutraffic sign rontage Return in/out | ate area" t through e Square rth of the 75/SR 32 figuration erchange e and the uding: 1) hal at the coad (the ut access |
| t  | he int   | ersection  | of re  | located O   | ld SR 74 with  | e at-grade inter<br>SR 32 and Mt.  | Carmel-Toba  | sco Road.  |   |  |   |   |
|  |  |  |  |   |  | or exhibits pres<br>senting a detai  |  |  |   |  | -10.15 pro  | ect, and  |
| (Cont  | tinued   | on Page  | 1a)  |   |  |  |  |  |   |  |   |   |
|  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |  |   |  |   |   |

Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Date:

March 2008

Form version: 11/16/04

This is page 1 of 15, which is part of:

| County | Clermont | Route | CLE-275 | Section | 10.15 | PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|--------|----------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
| ·      |          | ·     |         | ·       |       |     |       | •   |        |

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

(continued from Page 1)

#### **Project Background**

This project began in the Eastern Corridor EIS (HAM-SR32-0.00, PID 22970; FHWA-OH-EIS-04-02). The ROD selected this project (and other projects) to advance for further project development.

By agreement of state and federal agencies, the Eastern Corridor has been following a two-tiered approach for compliance with the requirements of NEPA. Tier 1 work consisted of evaluation of specific transportation and land use conditions and needs in the area, identification of key environmental resources, development of feasible multi-modal transportation alternatives, and assessment of the preliminary costs, benefits, and impacts of those feasible alternatives. This work was documented in a Tier 1 EIS (approved September 30, 2005) and Record of Decision (ROD) (issued June 2, 2006) which identified: 1) feasible multi-modal alternatives to be carried forward for further study (in Tier 2), 2) environmental commitments and impact mitigation measures, and 3) an implementation strategy for phased construction of the multi-modal components of the plan within the Eastern Corridor.

Tier 2 study and development is being implemented based on transportation needs and state and local priorities. The Tier 2 scope of work for this project includes preparation of this Level 4 Categorical Exclusion for completion of the NEPA process, followed by detailed design and project construction, which will be conducted in three phases.

### **Project Setting**

The project area is extensively developed and comprised of mixed land uses, including commercial/retail, industrial, and single and multi-family residential. The larger commercial/retail facilities in the area include Eastgate Mall, Biggs Place, Meijer, Eastgate Station, Eastgate Square, Eastgate Pavilion, Eastgate Crossing, Wal-Mart, Sam's Club, and a new commerce park (Ivy Pointe), which is located along the east side of I-275, just south of Aicholtz Road.

Smaller businesses occur as strip development along SR 32, including a variety of restaurants, gas stations, automotive repair/service facilities, hotels, and banks. Residential development in the area mostly occurs west of the I-275/SR 32 interchange along Bells Lane, Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road, Old SR 74 and Aicholtz Road, and to the north and south of SR 32, east of Glen Este-Withamsville Road. The existing roadway network in the Eastgate area consists of a major east-west route (SR 32) and a major north-south route (I-275). Old SR 74 serves as an alternative east-west route that crosses SR 32 at both the east and west ends of the project area. Access from the major roadways to shopping centers, businesses, and residential development in the area is provided from local side roads and drives that run both perpendicular and parallel to SR 32. Attachment B4, Pages 27 and 28 shows the project, the existing road network, and major commercial properties on a 2006 aerial photo base. Attachment J, Pages 315 to 320 includes photographs showing existing conditions in the project area.

#### Compatibility With State, Regional and Local Plans

State Transportation Plans - Both I-275 and SR 32 are identified as Macro-Corridor highways in *Access Ohio 2004-2030*, Ohio's Long Range Multi-Modal Transportation Plan. Macro-Corridors are transportation links of major functional or economic significance in the state, including air, water, rail and highway facilities. State Route 32 is also designated (from I-275 east across the state to West Virginia - via US 50) as a component of the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS), and is known in Ohio as the "Appalachian Highway". The ADHS, authorized under the Appalachian Development Act of 1965, was designed to generate economic development in previously isolated areas, supplement and connect Appalachia to the interstate system, and provide access to areas and markets within the Appalachian region to the rest of the nation.

Phase 1 of this project is listed as a Tier I project by Ohio's Transportation Review Advisory Council (TRAC) (December 21, 2006 draft project listing for Fiscal Years 2008-2013). Tier I TRAC status indicates the project has been selected for construction within the designated fiscal years. Phases 2 and 3 are listed by the TRAC as a Tier II project. This project is also listed as a High Priority Major New Project in Southwest Ohio (2006-2015) in ODOT's 2003 Jobs and Progress Plan.

This project is being coordinated with two other ODOT Tier II TRAC projects in the Eastgate area, as described on Page 1b. These two projects, in combination with CLE-275-10.15, will address regional system linkage and commuter traffic/freight movement issues identified in the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 EIS by providing a multi-lane, limited-access facility linking I-71

| This is page 1a of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Date: Mar |
|--|
|--|

| County  | Clermont | Route | CLE-275 | Section | 10.15 | PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|---------|----------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
|         |          |       |         |         |       |     |       |     |        |
| PROJEC1 | DESCRIP  | TION: |         |         |       |     |       |     |        |

and I-275 through the heart of the Eastern Corridor area, and by extending that facility eastward, through and to the east of the Eastgate area economic center.

- SR 32 Improvements from Glen Este-Withamsville Road to Olive Branch-Stonelick Road Interchange: A Segment IV-A project (PID 82370; see Attachment B11, Page 38) located immediately east of CLE-275-10.15 involving consolidation of access points on SR 32 (including elimination of at-grade access at Glen Este-Withamsville Road, Elick Lane and Old SR 74), extension of Bach-Buxton Road and construction of a new SR 32/Bach-Buxton Road interchange, improvements to Eastgate South Drive, and an extension of Heitman Lane (to allow for the elimination of access to SR 32 at Glen Este-Withamsville Road and Old SR 74).
- Relocation/Widening of SR 32: Eastern Corridor Segment I, II and III projects (PID 22970 and PID 80261) involving the relocation and/or widening of SR 32 to a four-lane, divided, limited-access or controlled-access facility from the west terminus of the CLE-275-10.15 project (at approximately Bells Lane) to I-71 (see Attachment B11, Page 38).

Regional Transportation Plans - The Eastern Corridor MIS Recommended Plan, which included transportation improvements in the Eastgate area, was adopted in OKI's 2030 Regional Transportation Plan (adopted September 2001), and I-275/SR 32 interchange and SR 32 improvements in the Eastgate area are identified as recommended highway projects in the OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan 2004 Update (adopted June 2004; see Attachment B5, Page 29). This project is listed in OKI's FY 2008-2011 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP), which was adopted on April 12, 2007 and last amended on January 10, 2008 (see Attachment B5, Page 30).

<u>Local Transportation Plans</u> - The CLE-275-10.15 project is included in the *Official Clermont County 2006 Thoroughfare Plan Update: Access Clermont* (Clermont County's Long Range Plan; Clermont County Department of Community Planning and Development, April 2006; see Attachment B6, Page 31) and is a key component in the overall Eastern Corridor Tier 1 work program needed to address transportation problems in the Eastgate area. The CLE-275-10.15 project is being coordinated with a number of local projects included in the 2007 Clermont County Transportation Improvement District (CCTID) Regional Transportation Improvement Program (see Attachment B7, Pages 32 to 34). These local projects, including improvements to Aicholtz Road, Tina Drive, Old SR 74 and the Eastgate North Frontage Road, are being developed and funded by the CCTID to improve capacity and access on the local road network in the Eastgate area, and to provide maintenance of traffic support during construction of the CLE-275-10.15 project. These local projects are also included in OKI's 2008-2011 TIP, and combined with the CLE-275-10.15 project, support identified capacity and access needs in the Eastgate area.

- <u>Tina Drive Extension</u>: This project (PID 82558) involves an extension of Tina Drive from Bells Lane to Old SR 74 (relocated/extended in conjunction with CLE-275-10.15) to allow for the elimination of the existing SR 32/Bells Lane at-grade intersection during CLE-275-10.15 Phase 1 construction (see Attachment B11, Page 38). It is anticipated that this project will be completed by Clermont County ahead of the CLE-275-10.15 interchange improvements.
- <u>Eastgate North Frontage Road</u>: This project (PID 82555) involves relocation and other improvements to the Eastgate North Frontage Road, and is a local road network project being coordinated with improvements to the Eastgate Boulevard interchange in conjunction with CLE-275-10.15 Phase 1 construction (see Attachment B11, Page 38). It is anticipated that this project will be completed by Clermont County ahead of the CLE-275-10.15 interchange improvements.
- Old SR 74 Improvements: This is a planned local road network project (PID 82557) that involves widening and other improvements to Old SR 74 between Eastgate Boulevard and Elick Lane in conjunction with CLE-275-10.15 and PID 22970 (see Attachment B11, Page 38).
- <u>Aicholtz Road Projects</u>: Two of the planned projects (PID 82553 and PID 82554) involve the construction of an Aicholtz Road Connector from relocated Old SR 74 at Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road southeast to Eastgate Boulevard, and a widening of Aicholtz Road from Eastgate Boulevard east to Glen Este-Withamsville Road (see Attachment B11, Page 38) in conjunction with CLE-275-10.15. A third Aicholtz Road project (PID 82552), involving the extension of Aicholtz Road from Glen Este-Withamsville Road east to Bach Buxton Road, is being planned in coordination with PID 82370.

| This is page 1b of 15, which is part of: | Categorical Exclusion Level 4 | Date: | March 2008 |
|--|-------------------------------|-------|------------|
|  |                               | _     |            |

| County  | Clermont   | Route | CLE-275 | Section _ | 10.15 | _ PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|---------|------------|-------|---------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-----|--------|
|         |            |       |         |           |       |       |       |     |        |
| PROJECT | L DESCRIP. | TION: |         |           |       |       |       |     |        |

#### **Design Parameters, Funding**

Existing I-275 in the project area is classified as an Urban Interstate. SR 32 is classified as an Urban Principal Arterial. Additional discussion of roadway characteristics and design parameters are presented on Page 3 of this Categorical Exclusion.

Funding for the project is a combination of federal, state and local funds and complimentary actions. The proposed CLE-275-10.15 project is the first of several major roadway improvement projects planned for implementation as part of the Eastern Corridor PE/EIS program. ODOT is the lead implementing agency for this project. Funding is committed and construction is programmed for an estimated 2012 construction sale date for Phase 1, and an estimated 2016 sale date for Phase 2. No construction sale date has been established for Phase 3 work. The following section further describes the planned construction phasing, including the specific activities to be included in each construction phase.

#### **Construction Phasing**

A three-phase construction strategy for the project is planned by ODOT based on evaluation of critical transportation needs, project design, and construction and funding considerations (see Attachment B8, Page 35). Phase 1 addresses safety issues associated with the existing I-275/SR 32 interchange and capacity needs on SR 32, and consists of the removal of two inadequate interchange loop ramps, creation of new northbound and southbound I-275 exit ramps to SR 32, modification of I-275 to accommodate the Aicholtz Road connector, the widening of SR 32 to (primarily) a six-lane facility, relocation and extension of Old SR 74 between Summerside Drive and Bells Lane, and construction of a superstreet intersection at relocated/extended Old SR 74 and SR 32/Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road. Phase 1 work also includes the reconfiguration and relocation of westbound SR 32 on/off ramps at the Eastgate Boulevard interchange. Phase 2 of the project adds directional ramp movements between I-275 and eastbound SR 32 and improves the remainder of the Eastgate Boulevard interchange, including safety and traffic flow issues related to this interchange's proximity to the I-275 interchange, and the reconstruction of the Old SR 74 bridge over I-275. Phase 3 completes the proposed project by adding ramp braiding along westbound SR 32 between the I-275 and Eastgate Boulevard interchanges.

Phases 1 and 2, combined, provide the majority of needed safety and congestion improvements by addressing critical merge/weave issues and providing continuous flow for regional traffic from I-275. Phase 3 work will be implemented at a later date, along with other Eastern Corridor Tier 2 improvements in the Eastgate area.

| This is page 1 <sub>C</sub> of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Da | ite: March 2008 | , |
|---|-----------------|---|
|---|-----------------|---|

| County | Clermont | Route | CLE-275 | Section | 10.15 | PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|--------|----------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
|        |          |       |         |         |       |     |       |     |        |

#### PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

#### **Background**

Transportation needs in the Eastern Corridor study area, including the CLE-275-10.15 project area, were evaluated in Tier 1 of the Eastern Corridor Multi-Modal Projects study and have been documented in the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 EIS (September 30, 2005) and Record of Decision (June 2, 2006). Key purpose and need elements identified for the Eastern Corridor included: 1) existing transportation network deficiencies within the corridor, affecting capacity, safety and accessibility, 2) limited availability of alternative transportation options (modes), 3) inadequate regional linkage and mobility between social and economic destinations, and 4) expected future economic expansion and population growth in the project area. These corridor-level issues apply to all of the multi-modal projects included in the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 recommended plan, including the CLE-275-10.15 project. Specific transportation goals for the CLE-275-10.15 project area, in support of the overall purpose and need for the Eastern Corridor Multi-Modal projects program, include the following:

- Improve safety on I-275 and SR 32 by addressing merge/weave problems, reducing motorist confusion, and addressing stop-and-go conditions and left turn conflicts.
- Meet ODOT Macro-Corridor goals by beginning to establish a limited-access freeway on SR 32 east of I-275, including, where appropriate, access point removal or consolidation and grade separations.
- Improve connectivity and establish a coordinated mainline and local road network improvement program to provide better handling of different trip types (local versus regional) and vehicular modes.
- Provide capacity to achieve minimum level-of-service "D" for peak period key elements.
- Ensure that the SR 32 and Eastgate area improvements do not result in any degradation of level-of-service on I-275.
- Preserve and possibly enhance access to the Eastgate Mall area and surrounding retail complex.
- Provide opportunity for enhanced transit access and service.

(continued on Page 2a)

### **ALTERNATIVES:**

#### **Conceptual Build Alternatives**

Eight conceptual alternatives were initially developed and considered for the I-275/SR 32 interchange in the Eastgate area, as documented in the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 EIS. Early in the Tier 1 EIS process, four of the eight alternatives were dropped due to fatal design and/or traffic flaws. The remaining four alternatives (named Alternatives I, J, K and N) were presented for public review at Eastern Corridor Public Workshops held in May 2003. Following public review, seven additional conceptual alternatives (named Alternatives O, P, Q-1, Q-2, Q-3, Q-4, and R) were developed in November 2003 in coordination with project stakeholders. Three of the eleven (total) conceptual alternatives (Alternatives I, P and Q-3) were then advanced for additional analysis and public review, since these three alternatives were determined to be representative of all eleven conceptual alternatives under consideration at that time. Alternatives I, P and Q-3 are briefly described below and shown in Attachment B12, Pages 39 to 44.

<u>Alternative I</u> - This concept involved a free-flow directional interchange at I-275 and SR 32, no collector-distributor lanes, elimination of the Eastgate Boulevard interchange, and construction of a new interchange on SR 32 at Bach-Buxton Road.

(continued on Page 2f)

| The D | o Nothing | Alternative is | s not feasible | , prudent or pra | acticable (Mark al | I that apply ): |
|-------|-----------|----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
|       |           |                |                |                  |                    |                 |

It would not correct existing capacity deficiencies;

It would not correct existing safety hazards;

It would not correct the existing roadway geometric deficiencies:

It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems, or

It would result in serious impacts to the motoring public and general welfare of the economy.

This is page 2 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Date: March 2008

Form version: 11/16/04

| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
| Χ   |    |

X X X

County Clermont Route CLE-275 Section 10.15 PID 76289 SJN 486706

## PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

(continued from Page 2)

### **Purpose and Need**

The purpose of the CLE-275-10.15 project is to improve travel efficiency and safety on SR 32 through the I-275/SR 32 and Eastgate Boulevard interchange areas by widening SR 32, modifying interchange ramp configurations and eliminating access point conflicts. State Route 32 in the Eastgate area is an intensely developed, predominantly commercial/retail highway corridor that experiences high volumes of commuter, business/freight, retail and residential traffic. The need for this project results from insufficient levels-of-service and high crash rates that are currently being experienced in the Eastgate area and are expected to worsen by 2030 (the project design year), as described below:

#### Level-of-Service Inadequacies

Level-of-service is a quantitative measure of traffic conditions taking into account a number of factors, such as traffic volumes, truck traffic, speed, travel time, traffic interruptions, maneuverability, and safety. Level-of-service ratings range from "A" to "F", with "A" being the highest level, or that which represents the best traffic conditions, and "C" being the generally accepted standard. As described in the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 EIS, existing levels-of-service on key roadway segments (including the SR 32 mainline) are already operating at or below acceptable levels-of-service. This situation is expected to worsen if improvements are not made and travel demand in the project area increases. The following table summarizes the levels-of-service that are expected to exist by 2030 if the CLE-275-10.15 project is not implemented (see also Attachment B9, Page 36).

Projected 2030 No Build Levels-of-Service

| Roadway(s)               | Roadway(s)  Segment or Location                       |                 |  |  |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------|--|--|
| SR 32                    | Between Old SR 74 and I-275                           | С               |  |  |
| SR 32                    | I-275 interchange area                                | B/C/D           |  |  |
| SR 32                    | Between I-275 and Eastgate Boulevard                  | E/F             |  |  |
| SR 32                    | Eastgate Boulevard interchange area                   | C/D             |  |  |
| SR 32                    | East of Eastgate Boulevard                            | C/D             |  |  |
| I-275                    | North and South of SR 32 interchange                  | B/C             |  |  |
| I-275/SR 32              | Ramp junctions between Old SR 74 and I-275            | С               |  |  |
| I-275/SR 32              | Cloverleaf ramp junctions in I-275 interchange        | C/D <b>/E/F</b> |  |  |
| I-275/SR 32              | Ramp junctions between I-275 and Eastgate Boulevard   | E/F             |  |  |
| Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 | Ramp junction west of Eastgate Boulevard interchange  | E               |  |  |
| Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 | Ramp junctions in Eastgate Boulevard interchange      | D <b>/F</b>     |  |  |
| Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 | Ramp junctions east of Eastgate Boulevard interchange | C/D             |  |  |
| Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 | Eastbound SR 32 Off-Ramp Intersection                 | F               |  |  |

<sup>\*</sup> Source: CLE-275-10.15 IMS (Draft).

As illustrated in the above table, if no transportation improvements are made in the Eastgate area other than routine upkeep and maintenance of existing SR 32 and the I-275/SR 32 and SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchanges, levels-of-service at a number of critical locations in the CLE-275-10.15 project area will degrade to "E" (severe congestion, operation at capacity) or "F" (functional breakdown, demand exceeds capacity). Projected 2030 Build levels-of-service are being finalized, and will be included in the final Interchange Modification Study (IMS), currently in progress. The proposed project is being developed and designed to provide a minimum level-of-service "D" for peak periods and to not result in any degradation of level-of-service on I-275.

### High Crash Rates

Eastgate area traffic crash data was obtained from the Ohio Department of Public Safety for the 2004-2006 three-year period. The following tables summarize crash data collected for critical SR 32 roadway segments and intersections in the Eastgate area (see also Attachment B9, Page 36).

| This is page 2a of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 Date: Marc | is is page 2a of 15, which is part of: | March 2008 |
|--|--|------------|
|--|--|------------|

County Clermont Route CLE-275 Section 10.15 PID 76289 SJN 486706

### PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

### Crash Data Summary – SR 32 mainline

|  | 2004-2006 Crashes* |        |          |         |       |                                   |  |
|--|--------------------|--------|----------|---------|-------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Roadway Segment                                  | Property           | Injury | Fatality | Unknown | Total | Crash Rate<br>(Statewide<br>Avg.) |  |
| SR 32: Hamilton Co. line to I-275 interchange    | 59                 | 15     | 0        | 1       | 75    | 2.2 (1.9)                         |  |
| SR 32: I-275 interchange to Eastgate Boulevard   | 71                 | 18     | 1        | 1       | 91    | 2.8 (1.9)                         |  |
| SR 32: Eastgate Boulevard to Batavia             | 499                | 183    | 0        | 5       | 687   | 3.4 (1.9)                         |  |
| SR 32: Other (could not be specifically located) | 114                | 42     | 1        | 1       | 158   |                                   |  |

<sup>\*</sup> Source: Ohio Department of Public Safety, 2007.

#### Crash Data Summary – SR 32 Intersections

|                                      | 2004-2006 Crashes* |        |          |         |       |                             |  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------|----------|---------|-------|-----------------------------|--|
| Intersection                         | Property           | Injury | Fatality | Unknown | Total | Crash Rate (Statewide Avg.) |  |
| SR 32 at Bells Lane                  | 12                 | 4      | 0        | 1       | 17    |                             |  |
| SR 32 at I-275                       | 66                 | 11     | 1        | 1       | 79    |                             |  |
| SR 32 at Eastgate Boulevard          | 57                 | 18     | 0        | 0       | 75    |                             |  |
| SR 32 at Glen Este-Withamsville Road | 42                 | 14     | 0        | 0       | 56    |                             |  |

<sup>\*</sup> Source: Ohio Department of Public Safety, 2007.

As illustrated in the above tables, 1,011 crashes occurred on SR 32 in the Eastgate area during the 2004-2006 three-year analysis period, including two fatalities. An additional 227 crashes occurred at key SR 32 intersections in the Eastgate area, including one fatality. State Route 32 in the CLE-275-10.15 project area is primarily a four-lane, divided, Urban Principal Arterial. The 2006 three-year statewide crash rate for all four-lane, divided, Urban Principal Arterials is 1.9 crashes per million vehicle miles traveled (c/mvmt). All three segments of SR 32 analyzed in the Eastgate area have crash rates that exceed this statewide average.

The level-of-service inadequacies and high crash rates described above are the result of specific roadway design deficiencies in the I-275/SR 32 and SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchange area, in combination with an insufficient local and regional roadway system. These factors result in localized traffic demand that overburdens existing roadway capacity and exacerbates conflicts at access points throughout the Eastgate area. These factors are further described below:

#### Insufficient System Linkages and High Traffic Volumes

Western Clermont County is currently the only Cincinnati suburban area that is not directly connected by interstate or major controlled-access highway to the employment and economic core of Cincinnati and Hamilton County. As described in the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 EIS, the second largest commute in the Cincinnati metropolitan area is from the Eastern Corridor area to Hamilton County/Downtown Cincinnati. Consequently commuter traffic heading west towards Cincinnati from Clermont and other eastern outlying areas, and the reverse commuter traffic heading east towards Clermont County, is forced to use the substandard and inefficient SR 32 corridor, or one of the other local or regional non-expressway facilities serving the Eastern Corridor (such as Clough Pike, SR 125 or US 50).

Additionally, SR 32, in combination with I-275, is a key route for the regional, intrastate and interstate movement of goods and services in the eastern sector of the Cincinnati metropolitan area and OKI region. SR 32 is part of the national Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) network. The ADHS network connects the entire multi-state Appalachian region to important eastern seaboard export markets, as well as midwestern, north-central and south-central regional markets. Proportional to other major Ohio roadways in the OKI region, SR 32 in the project area carries significant volumes of economically-important commodities via heavy truck (ODOT, Cambridge Systematics, FHWA and Reebie Associates, March 2002) as summarized in the following table:

| This is page 2b of 15, which is part of: | Categorical Exclusion, Level 4  | Date: | March 2008            |
|--|---------------------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| This is page 25 of 10, which is part on  | Catogorical Excitation, Ecver 1 | Date. | Widi 011 <b>2</b> 000 |

County Clermont Route CLE-275 Section 10.15 PID 76289 SJN 486706

### PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

#### 1998 Regional Commodity Movement

| Route | Commodity Movement as Total Heavy Truck Volume (daily range) | Linkage to Global Economy as Total Through Truck Tons (daily range) |
|-------|--|---|
| SR 32 | 1,501 to 5,000   | 10,000,001 to 20,000,000  |
| I-275 | 1,501 to 5,000   | 10,000,001 to 20,000,000  |
| I-74  | 5,001 to 10,000  | 20,000,001 to 50,000,000  |
| I-75  | 5,001 to 10,000  | 2,000,001 to 10,000,000   |
| I-71  | 15,001 to 30,000   | 20,000,001 to 50,000,000  |

Finally, the Eastgate area is home to numerous businesses, restaurants, and retail shopping centers, including the Eastgate Mall. Consequently, in addition to handling substantial commuter traffic and freight movement, the SR 32 corridor and the surrounding local road network in the Eastgate area are handling a substantial amount of the local and regional traffic trying to access this major commerce area.

The combination of commuter traffic, freight movement, and local business/shopping traffic in and through the Eastgate area is resulting in high traffic volumes that, for the most part, are expected to substantially increase by 2030. The following table summarizes existing and projected 2030 No Build traffic volumes on key roadway segments in the Eastgate area, along with percent truck traffic and number of directional travel lanes available (see also Attachment B9, Page 36):

### **Existing and Project No Build Traffic Volumes**

| Roadway Segment                               | Existing<br>ADT | 2030 No<br>Build<br>ADT*** | ADT %<br>Change | 2030 No<br>Build %<br>Trucks*** | Existing<br>Through<br>Lanes |
|---|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| SR 32 – West of I-275                         | 20,950*         | 45,900                     | 119%            | 3%                              | 4                            |
| SR 32 – Between I-275 and Eastgate Boulevard  | 51,160*         | 82,400                     | 61%             | 2%                              | 4                            |
| SR 32 – East of Eastgate Boulevard            | 39,850*         | 57,600                     | 45%             | 2%                              | 4                            |
| I-275 – North of SR 32                        | 72,880*         | 80,400                     | 10%             | 4%                              | 6                            |
| I-275 – South of SR 32                        | 65,950*         | 71,900                     | 9%              | 4%                              | 6                            |
| Eastgate Boulevard – North of SR 32           | 20,191**        | 21,500                     | 6%              | 2%                              | 4                            |
| Eastgate Boulevard – South of SR 32           | 17,318**        | 23,700                     | 37%             | 2%                              | 4                            |
| Old SR 74 – East of Summerside Road           | 15,200**        | NA                         | NA              | NA                              | 2                            |
| Old SR 74 – Between SR 32 and Summerside Road | 14,075**        | NA                         | NA              | NA                              | 2                            |

ODOT-OTS website (2006 traffic counts).

As shown in the above table, traffic volumes on SR 32 in the Eastgate area currently range from approximately 21,000 to 51,000 vehicles per day. By 2030, traffic volumes on SR 32 in this area are expected to increase substantially (from 45 percent to 119 percent). Notable increases in traffic volumes are also expected on Eastgate Boulevard.

As illustrated by the level-of-service data provided on Page 2a, existing local road and highway system travel efficiency and the effective movement of goods and services will continue to degrade in the Eastgate area, and will eventually break down, unless capacity and access/safety improvements responding to these traffic volumes are implemented. Without the proposed improvements, declining transportation conditions will hinder the efficient movement of freight and goods and services and the ability of people to connect with local and regional employment and economic centers, which are critical to the Eastgate area on a local level and the Cincinnati metropolitan area on a regional level, and will undermine support of regional and state commerce and economic development goals, which are important components of the overall Eastern Corridor work program.

### Access Point Conflicts

The existing high crash rates and inadequate 2030 No Build levels-of-service on SR 32 in the Eastgate area are, in large part, due to the high traffic volumes discussed above, combined with a variety of access point and design issues, including: 1) the spacing of the existing I-275/SR 32 and Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 interchanges, 2) intersection/ramp

| This is page 2c of 15, which is part of: | Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 | Date: | March 2008 |
|--|--------------------------------|-------|------------|
| This is page 20 of 13, which is part of. | Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 | Date  | March 2000 |

<sup>\*\*</sup> Clermont County Engineer's Office website (2001, 2004 and 2006 traffic counts)

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> CLE-275-10.15 MS (Draft); ADT's derived from February 2007 ODOT-Certified peak-hour data (as 10% of ADT); NA = Not included in February 2007 ODOT-Certified traffic.

County <u>Clermont</u> Route <u>CLE-275</u> Section <u>10.15</u> PID <u>76289</u> SJN <u>486706</u>

## PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

spacing west of the I-275/SR 32 interchange, 3) ramp configuration in the I-275/SR 32 interchange, and 4) numerous signalized intersections, as described below (see also Attachments B9 and B10, Pages 36 and 37):

- <u>Interchange Spacing</u>: The spacing between the existing I-275/SR 32 and Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 interchanges does not meet current design standards, and is resulting in a merge/weave traffic pattern on SR 32 (eastbound and westbound) between these two interchanges. Merge/weave patterns on high-volume facilities such as SR 32 in the Eastgate area negatively affect traffic flow and safety, and contribute to congestion and high crash rates.
- <u>Intersection/Interchange Ramp Spacing</u>: The spacing between the existing I-275/SR 32 interchange ramps and the Old SR 74/SR 32 intersection (west of the I-275/SR 32 interchange) does not meet current design standards, and is resulting in a merge/weave traffic pattern on SR 32 (eastbound and westbound) in this area.
- <u>Interchange Ramp Configuration</u>: The cloverleaf design of the existing interior I-275/SR 32 interchange ramps is resulting in a merge/weave traffic pattern on the I-275 overpass at SR 32 and on SR 32 under the I-275 overpass.
- <u>Numerous Signalized Intersections</u>: Currently, there are five signalized intersections on Eastgate Boulevard located less than 0.25 mile (north and south) from the center of the SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchange. This high frequency of signalized intersections, along with high traffic volumes on Eastgate Boulevard, are resulting in congested conditions, which is reflected in the 2030 level-of-service "F" for the eastbound SR 32 exit ramp intersection with Eastgate Boulevard, and the high number of crashes that occurred in the SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchange area in the 2004-2006 three-year period.

### **Independent Utility**

The CLE-275-10.15 project is the first of several roadway improvement projects to be implemented as part of the Eastern Corridor work program identified in the Tier 1 EIS. With the issuance of the Tier 1 Record of Decision (June 2, 2006), the Eastern Corridor is proceeding with a series of individual Tier 2 transportation projects, each with independent utility and appropriate NEPA documentation. A project is considered to have independent utility if it is usable and is a reasonable expenditure to address identified transportation needs – even if no other transportation improvements are made in the area.

#### CLE-275-10.15 Independent Utility

The CLE-275-10.15 project is the initial roadway improvement action for the Eastgate area of the Eastern Corridor, focusing on addressing the transportation inadequacies associated with the existing I-275/SR 32 and Eastgate Boulevard interchanges, and adjacent segments of SR 32 from approximately Bells Lane to just east of Eastgate Square Drive. Specifically, the CLE-275-10.15 project will improve levels-of-service and improve motorist safety in the project area by addressing congestion/high traffic volumes and access point conflicts through implementation of the following design concepts (see also Attachment B10, Page 37):

- Widen SR 32 from a four-lane facility to (primarily) a six-lane facility.
- Remove the existing Old SR 74/SR 32 intersection and extend Old SR 74 to the west to a proposed superstreet
  intersection at Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road. This will provide adequate spacing between the I-275/SR 32 interchange
  ramps and the Old SR 74/SR 32 intersection and eliminate the existing merge/weave problem on SR 32 in this area.
- Eliminate the existing SR 32/Bells Lane intersection to provide better traffic flow on SR 32 in the vicinity of the proposed Old SR 74/Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road/SR 32 superstreet intersection.
- Replace the existing cloverleaf ramps in the I-275/SR 32 interchange with a combination of directional and loop ramps and appropriately-spaced signalized intersections on SR 32 in order to eliminate the merge/weave problem in the I-275/SR 32 interchange area.
- Construct a series of braided ramps between the I-275/SR 32 and SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchanges to eliminate the merge/weave problem on SR 32 in this area.
- Reconfigure the SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchange from a partial cloverleaf design to a modified diamond
  interchange, eliminate one signalized intersection in the SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchange area, and improve
  intersection spacing in the SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchange area. This will improve traffic flow on Eastgate
  Boulevard and level-of-service and safety throughout the SR 32/Eastgate Boulevard interchange area.

| This is page 2d of 15, which is part of: | Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 | Date: | March 2008 |
|--|--------------------------------|-------|------------|
|  |                                |       |            |

| County | Clermont | Route | CLE-275 | Section | 10.15 | PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|--------|----------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
| ·      |          | •     |         | •       |       |     |       | •   |        |

### PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

• Eliminate the existing right-in/right-out SR 32 intersection with Eastgate Square Drive and Jackson Square Drive to improve traffic flow and safety between the Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 interchange and the SR 32/Glen Este-Withamsville Road intersection.

By adding capacity, eliminating access point conflicts, and addressing stop-and-go travel conditions and left turn conflicts, the CLE-275-10.15 project is expected to improve safety and travel efficiency on SR 32, as well as in the I-275/SR 32 and Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 interchanges (a critical transportation need in the Eastgate area). In doing so, a minimum level-of-service "D" is expected to be achieved for peak periods, and levels-of-service on I-275 will not be degraded. This, in turn, will help SR 32 (and I-275) meet performance goals for ODOT's Macro-Corridors, improve connectivity and help establish a coordinated mainline and local road network in the Eastgate area, preserve and enhance access to the Eastgate Mall area and surrounding retail complex, and provide opportunity for enhanced bus transit access and service (opportunity for future rail transit in the Eastgate area is also being addressed through the grade separation of I-275 over Aicholtz Road).

#### **Logical Termini**

The CLE-275-10.15 north project terminus is located on I-275, at a point about 1.4 miles north of the existing I-275/SR 32 interchange, while the south project terminus is located on I-275, at a point about 1.0 mile south of the existing I-275/SR 32 interchange. The west project terminus on SR 32 is located approximately 1.1 miles west of the existing I-275/SR 32 interchange (approximately 0.3 mile west of existing Bells Lane), and the east project terminus on SR 32 is located approximately 1.1 miles east of the existing I-275/SR 32 interchange (approximately 0.2 mile east of Eastgate Square Drive).

These termini are adequate and appropriate, and satisfy the conditions outlined in 23 CFR 771.111(f), specifically:

- The project is of sufficient length to address environmental matters of a broad scope. Broad-scope environmental
  features and constraints within the entire Eastern Corridor study area, including the Eastgate area, were assessed in
  detail in the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 EIS. The scope and concept of the CLE-275-10.15 project were developed as part
  of the Tier 1 EIS and in consideration of local and regional environmental features and constraints.
- The project has independent utility or independent significance; that is, the project is usable and is a reasonable expenditure even if no other transportation improvements are made in the area. The independent utility of the CLE-275-10.15 project is discussed on Pages 2d and 2e.
- The project does not restrict or preclude consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements. As previously discussed, the project is being developed and designed in coordination with other SR 32 projects and local Eastgate area projects currently being planned and developed by ODOT and Clermont County.

|  | This is page 2e of 15, which is part of: | Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 | Date: | March 2008 |
|--|--|--------------------------------|-------|------------|
|--|--|--------------------------------|-------|------------|

| County  | Clermont | Route | CLE-275 | Section | 10.15 | PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|---------|----------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
|         |          |       |         |         |       |     |       |     |        |
| ALTERNA | ATIVES:  |       |         |         |       |     |       |     |        |

(continued from Page 2)

<u>Alternative P</u> - This concept involved moving the entire I-275/SR 32 interchange westward to a new location (so that adequate spacing between the I-275/SR 32 and Eastgate Boulevard interchanges could be achieved), minor modifications to Eastgate Boulevard, construction of a new interchange on SR 32 at Bach-Buxton Road, and construction of two new interchanges on I-275 (one to the south and one to the north of the relocated I-275/SR 32 interchange).

<u>Alternative Q-3</u> - This concept involved a directional interchange at I-275 and SR 32, and collector-distributor lanes along I-275 and SR 32 in conjunction with special connecting ramps and structures, which would allow the Eastgate Boulevard interchange to remain connected to the system. A new interchange on SR 32 at Bach-Buxton Road and a new interchange on I-275 south of the existing I-275/SR 32 interchange were also part of the long-term plan under Alternative Q-3.

Alternatives I, P and Q-3 were presented for review at public workshops held for the Eastern Corridor Tier 1 EIS in January/February 2004 (see Attachment B12, Pages 39 to 44). The three alternatives were also comparatively evaluated in the Eastern Corridor Tier I EIS (see Attachment B12, Pages 39 to 44).

#### **Feasible Build Alternatives**

During the Eastern Corridor Tier I EIS review period, preliminary (Tier 2) development work began for the CLE-275-10.15 project. During this time, a revised version of Conceptual Alternative Q-1 was re-introduced and evaluated with Feasible Alternatives I, P and Q-3. Alternative Q-1, in general, was similar in concept to Alternative Q-3, but instead of collector-distributor systems along SR 32 and I-275, Alternative Q-1 used a braided ramp configuration to link the I-275/SR 32 and Eastgate Boulevard/SR 32 interchanges.

As a result of the preliminary (Tier 2) development work, which included additional engineering, traffic studies and environmental impact analyses, Alternatives P and Q-3 were dropped from further consideration. Alternative P was dropped due to comparatively high and unavoidable environmental impacts (particularly residential and commercial displacements), and Alternative Q-3 was dropped because Alternative Q-1's braided ramp configuration could provide better access to Eastgate commercial areas at a lower cost. As a result, Alternatives I and Q-1 were advanced as feasible alternatives for the CLE-275-10.15 Interchange Modification Study (IMS) and for the development of Certified Traffic.

#### **Preferred Alternative**

On May 24, 2004, representatives from ODOT (Central Office and District 8), Clermont County, Union Township, and ENTRAN held an IMS Work Session for the CLE-275-10.15 project (see Attachment B13, Pages 45 to 53). The purpose of this work session was to discuss the specific design, performance and environmental impact considerations and issues involved with Alternatives I and Q-1. As part of this work session, an impact/performance matrix was distributed and reviewed (see Attachment B13, Pages 45 to 53). The work session concluded with the identification of Alternative Q-1 as the CLE-275-10.15 preliminary Preferred Alternative (see Attachment B13, Pages 45 to 53), based on the following factors: 1) Q-1 offered better ability to accommodate access to Bells Lane, 2) Q-1 provided better local access to the Eastgate commercial area (no direct access with Alternative I), 3) Q-1 could potentially allow for a signalized intersection at Glen Este-Withamsville Road (Alternative I would require grade separation), 4) Q-1 better utilized I-275 and SR 32 core right-of-way area (resulting in fewer residential and commercial displacements), 5) Q-1 provided better opportunity for construction phasing and maintenance of traffic, and 6) Q-1 could provide a better level-of-service on SR 32 than Alternative I. Alternative Q-1 was then presented at an Eastgate stakeholder meeting on June, 30 2004. As a result of that meeting, no modifications were made to the Alternative Q-1 design, or the identification of Alternative Q-1 as the CLE-275-10.15 preliminary Preferred Alternative.

Following the June 30, 2004 stakeholder meeting, the CLE-275-10.15 preliminary Preferred Alternative underwent a number of notable design adjustments, including: 1) the removal of the Bach-Buxton interchange and the Glen Este-Withamsville Road improvements from the CLE-275-10.15 project (now included as part of Eastern Corridor Segment IV-A, PID 82370), 2) changes in the configuration of the I-275 ramps in response to Value Engineering (VE) study recommendations, 3) the removal of the Old SR 74/SR 32 intersection in favor of an extension of Old SR 74 west to Mt. Carmel-Tobasco Road to better address local roadway network needs, and 4) the modification of Eastgate Boulevard north of SR 32 to connect to the Eastgate North Frontage Road to better meet Eastgate area business needs.

Attachments B2, B3 and B4, Pages 20 to 28 present schematic and detailed exhibits of the current CLE-275-10.15 Preferred Alternative. Attachment B14, Pages 54 to 60 shows preliminary construction limits for the Preferred Alternative, and graphically depicts the environmental impacts expected to occur as a result of project construction. Detailed discussions of these environmental impacts are presented in Part II of this Categorical Exclusion (see Pages 5 to 15).

| This is page 2f of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Date: Mar |
|--|
|--|

| County  | Clermont | Route | CLE-275 | Section | 10.15 | _ PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|---------|----------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-----|--------|
|         |          |       |         |         |       |       |       |     |        |
| ALTERNA | ATIVES:  |       |         |         |       |       |       |     |        |

#### No Build Alternative

The No Build Alternative consists of maintaining existing facilities, without any of the proposed improvements as described on Page 1. The Eastern Corridor Major Investment Study (OKI, April 2000) concluded that the No Build Alternative would not meet the long-term transportation needs of the region or the Eastern Corridor, including the Eastgate area, and is not a viable alternative because: 1) the No Build Alternative would not improve safety and travel efficiency on SR 32 by adding capacity, eliminating access point conflicts, and addressing stop-and-go travel conditions and left turn conflicts, 2) the No Build Alternative would not meet ODOT Macro-Corridor goals, 3) the No Build Alternative would not improve connectivity and establish a coordinated mainline and local road network improvement program to provide better handling of different trip types, 4) the No Build Alternative would not achieve a minimum level-of-service "D", 5) the No Build Alternative would not ensure that the SR 32 and Eastgate area improvements do not result in any degradation of level-of-service on I-275, 6) the No Build Alternative would not preserve and enhance access to the Eastgate Mall area and surrounding retail complex, and 7) the No Build Alternative would not provide opportunity for enhanced transit access and service.

This is page 2g of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Date: March 2008

| County Clermont  | Route CLE-27            | 25 Section        | 10.15                | PID _       | 76289        | SJN            | 486           | 5706        |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|
| ROADWAY CHARA  | CTER*: Interstate       | 275               |                      |             |              |                |               |             |
| Functional Classification  | n: Urban Interstate     |                   |                      |             |              |                |               |             |
| Current ADT: 76,49   |                         | 0)                | Design Yea           | ar ADT:     | 83,280       | vpd ( <u>:</u> | <u>2030</u> ) |             |
| DHV: 7,580   |                         | 7 %               |                      |             |              |                |               |             |
| Designed Speed: 7  | <u>'0    mph</u>        |                   | Legal Sp             | peed:       | <u>65</u> mp | h              |               |             |
|  | Existi                  | ng                | Propos               | ed          |              |                |               |             |
| Number of Lanes: 3   | 3 NB / 3 SB             |                   | 3-5 NB / 3-4 SB      |             |              |                |               |             |
| Type of Lanes:   | Asphalt & Concrete/ C   | Concrete          | Asphalt / Concre     | te          | _            |                |               |             |
|  | 86 NB/36 SB             | ft.               | 36-60 NB / 36-48     | SB ft.      |              |                |               |             |
|  | 0 outside / 12-14 ins   |                   | 12                   | ft.         | (where n     | new work       | on I-275      | is proposed |
|  | 30                      | ft                | 60                   | ft.         |              |                |               |             |
| Sidewalk Width: N  | NA .                    | ft                | NA                   | ft.         |              |                |               |             |
| Setting:<br>Topography:  | X Urban<br>Level        | X Rolling         | an Rura<br>Hilly     | al          |              |                |               |             |
| Roadway Character con  | <u> </u>                | _ X _ Rolling     | 1 11111y             |             |              |                |               |             |
| •  |                         | 075 Duides 0      | CD 22                |             |              |                |               |             |
| DESIGN CRITERIA I  | FOR BRIDGES*: I         | -275 Briage O     | ver SR 32            |             |              |                |               |             |
| Structure File Number(s  | s): <u>1305735 (L)</u>  |                   | Sufficiency          | y Rating:   | 94           |                |               |             |
|  | Existi                  | ng                | Propos               | ed          |              |                |               |             |
| Bridge Type:   | 322                     |                   | Composite Ste        | eel Girder  | <u> </u>     |                |               |             |
| Number of Spans:   | 4                       |                   | 4                    |             | _            |                |               |             |
| Weight Restrictions:   |                         | on                | NA ton               | l           |              |                |               |             |
| Height Restrictions:   | NA ft                   |                   | NA ft.               |             |              |                |               |             |
| Curb to Curb Width:  | 68-71 ft                |                   | Varies ft.           |             |              |                |               |             |
| Shoulder Width:  | 14/6 ft.                |                   | 14 / 10 ft.          |             |              |                |               |             |
| Under Clearance:   | ft                      |                   | <u>15.5</u> ft.      |             |              |                | V             | N           |
| Will the structure be reh  |                         |                   | roject?              |             |              |                | X             | N<br>X      |
| If Yes, has an asbestos  | inspection been con     | ipietea?          |                      |             |              |                |               |             |
| DESIGN CRITERIA I  | FOR BRIDGES*: I         | -275 Bridge O     | ver SR 32            |             |              |                |               |             |
| Structure File Number(s  | s): <u>1305743 (R)</u>  |                   | Sufficiency          | y Rating:   | 94           |                |               |             |
|  | Existi                  | ng                | Propos               | ed          |              |                |               |             |
| Bridge Type:   | 322                     |                   | Composite Ste        | eel Girder  | _            |                |               |             |
| Number of Spans:   | 4                       |                   | 4                    |             |              |                |               |             |
| Weight Restrictions:   | NA to                   | n                 | NA ton               | l           |              |                |               |             |
| Height Restrictions:   | NA ft                   |                   | NA ft.               |             |              |                |               |             |
| Curb to Curb Width:  | _68.5 ft                |                   | Varies ft.           |             |              |                |               |             |
| Shoulder Width:  | <u>14 / 6.5</u> ft      |                   | <u>14 / 10</u> ft.   |             |              |                |               |             |
| Under Clearance:   | ft                      |                   | 15.67 ft.            |             |              |                |               |             |
| Will the atructure he rek  | abilitated or replaces  | Loo part of the p | urojoot?             |             |              |                | Y             | N           |
| Will the structure be reh<br>If Yes, has an asbestos                                     |                         |                   | roj <del>o</del> ut: |             |              |                | ^             | X           |
| * See also Attachment B3<br>for a detailed exhibit of the<br>conditions in the project a | e Preferred Alternative | on an aerial pho  | oto base, Attachme   | ent B9, Pag | e 36 for an  | exhibit h      | nighlightin   |             |
|  |                         |                   |                      |             |              |                |               |             |
| Design Criteria for Bridg  | es continued on Page    | e 3b)             |                      |             |              |                |               |             |

Form version: 11/16/04

| County Cle                         | ermont F        | Route _               | CLE-275                               | Section               | 11                | 0.15          | PID      | 76289       | SJN       | 486706                                     |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------|----------|-------------|-----------|--|
| Daadway Ohara                      |                 |                       | Daga 2\                               |                       |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
| Roadway Chara                      |                 |                       |                                       |                       |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
| ROADWAY C                          | CHARACT         | ΓER*: S               | R 32                                  |                       |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
| Functional Clas                    | ecification:    | Urban                 | Principal Art                         | arial                 |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
| Current ADT:                       | 64,850          | Olbali                | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 20 (10)               | De                | esign Yea     | ar ADT·  | 79,000      | vpd       | 20 (30)                                    |
| DHV:                               | 7,210           |                       | _ vpa<br>Trucks,                      |                       | %                 | Joigit To     | ai ADI.  | 73,000      |           | 20 (00)                                    |
| Designed Spee                      |                 |                       | mph                                   |                       |                   | Legal S       | Speed:   | 55          | mph       |  |
|                                    |                 |                       | Existing                              |                       |                   | Propos        |          |             | ·         |  |
| <b>.</b>                           | ,               | 2 0 M/D / /           | _                                     |                       | 0.5.14/5          | -             |          | * ' '       |           |  |
| Number of Langer<br>Type of Lanes: |                 | 2-3 WB / 2<br>Asphalt | 2-5 EB                                |                       | 2-5 WB<br>Asphalt | / 2-5 EB      | 3*       | _ * at inte | rsections |  |
| Pavement Widt                      |                 |                       | / 24-60 EB                            | ft.                   |                   | VB / 24-6     | SO EB ft | _           |           |  |
| Shoulder Width                     |                 | 1/10                  | 7 2 1 00 23                           | ft.                   | 10                | 10,2.0        | ft       |             |           |  |
| Median Width:                      |                 | 10                    |                                       | ft.                   | 16-54             |               | ft       |             |           |  |
| Sidewalk Width                     | ı: <u>N</u>     | NA                    |                                       | ft                    | NA                |               | ft       |             |           |  |
| Cotting                            |                 | Χ                     | Urban                                 | Suburb                | on $\Box$         | Rura          | ol.      |             |           |  |
| Setting:<br>Topography:            |                 |                       |                                       | X Rolling             | all               | Hilly         |          |             |           |  |
| ropograpny.                        |                 | <u> </u>              |                                       | 7. 1.09               |                   | ,             |          |             |           |  |
| ROADWAY (                          | CHARACT         | ΓER*: N               | lount Carn                            | el-Tobasc             | o Road            | /Bells L      | ane      |             |           |  |
|                                    |                 |                       |                                       |                       |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
| Functional Clas                    |                 | Urbar                 |                                       | ial/Urban Lo          |                   |               |          | 00 700      |           |  |
| Current ADT:                       | 17,670          |                       | vpd 20                                | (10)                  |                   | esign Yea     | ar ADT:  | 32,700      | vpd 2     | .0 <u>(30)</u> )                           |
| DHV:<br>Designed Spee              | 2,820<br>ed: 40 |                       | Trucks,<br>mph                        | 4                     | %                 | Legal S       | Spood:   | 40          | mnh       |  |
| Designed Spee                      | ;u. <u>40</u>   |                       | •                                     |                       |                   | _             |          | 40          | mph       |  |
|                                    |                 |                       | Existing                              |                       |                   | Propos        | sed      |             |           |  |
| Number of Lan                      |                 | 3                     |                                       |                       | 5                 |               |          | _           |           |  |
| Type of Lanes:                     |                 |                       | halt                                  |                       | Asphalt           |               |          | _           |           |  |
| Pavement Widt                      |                 | 32                    |                                       | ft.                   | 60                | -1            | ft       |             |           |  |
| Shoulder Width<br>Median Width:    | 1.              |                       | curb and gutt                         | <u>er)</u> ft.<br>ft. | 4 (+curl          | 0)            | ft<br>ft |             |           |  |
| Sidewalk Width                     | ١٠              | NA<br>NA              |                                       | it                    | NA                |               | it       |             |           |  |
|                                    |                 |                       | _                                     |                       | -                 | $\neg$        |          |             |           |  |
| Setting:                           |                 | <del> 1</del>         | Urban<br>Level                        | Suburb X Rolling      | an                | Rura<br>Hilly |          |             |           |  |
| Topography:                        |                 |                       | Levei                                 | A Kolling             |                   | ⊓             | •        |             |           |  |
| ROADWAY C                          | CHARACT         | ΓER*: C               | ld SR 74                              |                       |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
|                                    |                 |                       |                                       |                       |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
| Functional Clas                    |                 | Urbar                 | n Collector                           | (1.5)                 |                   |               |          |             |           | (2.2)                                      |
| Current ADT:<br>DHV:               | 12,840          |                       | vpd 20                                |                       |                   | esign Yea     | ar ADT:  | 8,300       | vpd 2     | .0 <u>(30)</u>                             |
| Driv:<br>Designed Spee             | 1,630<br>ed: 35 |                       | Trucks,<br>mph                        | 4                     | %                 | Legal S       | Sneed.   | 35          | mph       |  |
| Doolgilod Opoc                     | 7d. <u>00</u>   |                       | •                                     |                       |                   | _             |          |             |           |  |
|                                    |                 |                       | Existing                              |                       |                   | Propos        | sed      |             |           |  |
| Number of Lan                      |                 | 3                     | 1 16                                  |                       | 3                 |               |          | _           |           |  |
| Type of Lanes:                     |                 |                       | halt                                  |                       | Asphalt           |               |          | _           |           |  |
| Pavement Widt                      | *****           | 32                    |                                       | _ ft.<br>_ ++         | 36                | h)            | ft       |             |           |  |
| Shoulder Width<br>Median Width:    | I.              |                       |                                       | _ ft.<br>ft.          | 4 (+curl          | J)            | ft<br>ft |             |           |  |
| Sidewalk Width                     | າ:              | NA<br>NA              |                                       | _ ft.                 | NA                |               | ft       |             |           |  |
|                                    |                 |                       | Urbo:                                 | <del>-</del>          | -                 |               |          |             |           |  |
| Setting:                           |                 |                       | Urban<br>Level                        | Suburb                | an                | Rura          |          |             |           |  |
| Topography:                        | . == =          |                       |                                       | X Rolling             | <u> </u>          | Hilly         |          |             |           |  |
|                                    |                 |                       |                                       |                       |                   |               |          |             |           | 4, Pages 27 and 28<br>ighlighting existing |
| onditions in the                   |                 |                       |                                       |                       |                   |               |          |             |           |  |
|                                    |                 | •                     | •                                     | •                     | •                 | •             |          |             |           |  |
| This is page                       | ne 3a of 15     | , which is            | part of:                              | Cated                 | orical Ex         | clusion L     | _evel 4  | Da          | ate:      | March 2008                                 |

| County <u>Clermont</u> Ro  | oute <u>CLE-275</u>  | Section <u>10.15</u> PID _   | 76289 SJN             | 486706                |
|--|--|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| ROADWAY CHARACTE   | ER*: Eastgate Boulev   | ard  |                       |                       |
| Functional Classification: Current ADT: 23,670 DHV: 1,630 Designed Speed: 35   | Urban Collector vpd 20 (10 Trucks, mph  Existing                                     | <u>4</u> %   | 18,300 vpd<br>35 mph  | 20 <u>(30)</u>        |
| Number of Lanes: Type of Lanes: Pavement Width: Shoulder Width: Median Width: Sidewalk Width: Setting: Topography: (Design Criteria for Bridges of | 5-8  | 6-8  Asphalt  ft. 72-96  ft. 10  ft. NA  ft. NA  ft. NA  ft. H.  Suburban  Rolling  Rural  Hilly | -                     |                       |
| DESIGN CRITERIA FOR  | R BRIDGES*: Eastgat  | e Boulevard Bridge Over SR 3   | 32                    |                       |
| Structure File Number(s):  | 1300202  | Sufficiency Rating:  | 93.9                  |                       |
|  | Existing   | Proposed   |                       |                       |
| Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Shoulder Width: Under Clearance:                       | 321 2 NA ton NA ft. 80.13 ft. 10 ft. 15.2 ft.  | Composite Steel Girder   2   NA  | _                     |                       |
| Will the structure be rehabil If Yes, has an asbestos ins  |  | of the project?  |                       | Y N X X               |
| DESIGN CRITERIA FOR  | R BRIDGES*: Old SR   | 74 Bridge Over I-275   |                       |                       |
| Structure File Number(s):  | 1305719 <b>Existing</b>  | Sufficiency Rating:  | 88.5                  |                       |
| Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Shoulder Width: Under Clearance:                       | 322 4  NA ton NA ft. 33 ft. 4.5 ft. 16.5 ft.   | Composite Steel Girder  2  NA ton NA ft. 40 ft. 8 ft. 17.21 ft.                                  |                       |                       |
| for a detailed exhibit of the Pr   | pection been completed?<br>ges 21 to 26 for Schematic<br>eferred Alternative on an a | of the project? Plan Sheets for the Preferred Alternerial photo base, Attachment B9, Pag         | e 36 for an exhibit l | nighlighting existing |
| This is page 3b of 15, v   | which is part of:  | Categorical Exclusion Level 4  | Date:                 | March 2008            |

| County Clermont F  | Route CLE-275   | _ Section _       | 10.15  | _ PID _        | 76289        | SJN     | 486         | 706 |
|--|---|-------------------|--|----------------|--------------|---------|-------------|-----|
| DESIGN CRITERIA FO   | R BRIDGES*: Ram   | p D Over Rai      | тр М   |                |              |         |             |     |
| Structure File Number(s):  | NA  |                   | Sufficier  | ncy Rating:    | NA           |         |             |     |
|  | Existing  |                   | Propo  | osed           |              |         |             |     |
| Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Shoulder Width: Under Clearance: | NA         ton           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft. |                   | Three-Sided<br>NA<br>NA to<br>NA ft<br>38 ft<br>4 / 10 ft<br>16.5 ft | on<br><br>     | ch Culvert   |         |             |     |
| Will the structure be rehable of Yes, has an asbestos in DESIGN CRITERIA FO  | spection been complete  | ed?               |  |                |              |         | Y           | X   |
|  | ·   | ip o over ita     | -  | ou Doting      | NIA          |         |             |     |
| Structure File Number(s):  | 1300210 Existing  |                   | Suπicier   | ncy Rating:    | NA           |         |             |     |
| Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Shoulder Width: Under Clearance: | NA           NA         ton           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.             | 1<br>1            | Composite S 1  NA to NA ft varies ft 6 / 12 ft 16.5 ft               | on<br>:.<br>:. | <u></u>      |         |             |     |
| Will the structure be rehable If Yes, has an asbestos in   | spection been complete  | ed?               |  |                |              |         | Y           | X   |
| DESIGN CRITERIA FO   | R BRIDGES*: Ram   | p M Over SR       | ? <b>32</b>  |                |              |         |             |     |
| Structure File Number(s):  | 1300148   |                   | Sufficier  | ncy Rating:    | NA           |         |             |     |
|  | Existing  |                   | Propo  | osed           |              |         |             |     |
| Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Shoulder Width: Under Clearance: | NA         ton           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft. |                   | Composite S 1 NA to NA ft 30 ft 6 / 8 ft 18' ft                      | on<br><br>     | _            |         |             |     |
| Will the structure be rehable of Yes, has an asbestos in See also Attachment B3, P   | spection been complete  | ed?               |  | oformed Altern | nativo Atta  | chmont  | Y BA Pages  | N X |
| or a detailed exhibit of the Feonditions in the project area   | Preferred Alternative on a  | an aerial photo l | base, Attachi  | ment B9, Pag   | ge 36 for an | exhibit | highlightin |     |
| This is page 3c of 15,   | which is part of:   | Categoric         | al Exclusion   | Level 4        | Da           | te:     | March 2     | 008 |

Form version: 11/16/04

| County Clermont R  | Coute CLE-275  | Section          | 10.15         | _ PID _      | 76289        | SJN         | 48670         | 6      |
|--|--|------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|--------|
| DESIGN CRITERIA FO   | R BRIDGES*: Ramp   | M Over I-2       | 75            |              |              |             |               |        |
| Structure File Number(s):  |  | Sufficier        | NA            |              |              |             |               |        |
|  | Existing   |                  | Propo         | osed         |              |             |               |        |
| Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Shoulder Width: Under Clearance: | NA           NA         ton           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft. |                  |               | on<br><br>   | _            |             |               |        |
| Will the structure be rehab<br>If Yes, has an asbestos ins   | spection been complete   | d?               |               |              |              |             | Y             | X      |
| Structure File Number(s):  | NA   | o in Over ital   | •             | ncy Rating:  | NA           |             |               |        |
| , .  | Existing   |                  | Propo         | osed         |              |             |               |        |
| Bridge Type: Number of Spans: Weight Restrictions: Height Restrictions: Curb to Curb Width: Shoulder Width: Under Clearance: | NA         NA           NA         ton           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.           NA         ft.               | 1<br>1<br>1      |               | on<br><br>   | _            |             |               |        |
| Will the structure be rehab<br>If Yes, has an asbestos in  |  |                  | ect?          |              |              |             | Y             | N<br>X |
| * See also Attachment B3, Pa<br>for a detailed exhibit of the P<br>conditions in the project area                            | referred Alternative on a  | n aerial photo b | oase, Attachr | ment B9, Pag | ge 36 for an | n exhibit h | ighlighting e |        |

This is page 3d of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion Level 4 Date: March 2008

| County  | Clermont  | Route _  | CLE-275   | Section  | 10.15  | _ PID  | 76289   | SJN   | 486706   |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| MAINTEN   | IANCE OF  | TRAFFIC D  | URING CO  | NSTRUCTION   | :  |  |   |   |  |
| Is a tempo<br>Will the pr<br>Provision<br>Provision<br>Will the provision | ons will be mons will be mons will be monopoosed MOT  | y proposed?<br>the use of a<br>lade for acce<br>lade for throu<br>lade to accor<br>substantiall  | ss by local tra<br>igh-traffic dep<br>nmodate any<br>y change the o   | uire a ramp clos<br>ffic and so post<br>endent busines<br>local special ev<br>environmental c<br>ne proposed me  | ed.<br>ses.<br>ents or festi<br>onsequence   | es of the a  |   | os only)  | Y N X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X  |
| Remarks:  | ensure n<br>project of<br>construct<br>appropria<br>Page 15<br>(14) day<br>Project E<br>Union To  | to interruption contractor witten, and a pate advance ). The plan is prior to the Engineer will pownship will,   | n of emergence<br>Il maintain accordan note will<br>notification for<br>note will state<br>of following: the<br>forward this in<br>in turn, notify  | by services and coess to all road be developed to any lane close: The Contracte start of constitution to Cl  | to ensure madways and o ensure the ures and/or will adviruction activermont Coulocal emergen   | ninimal imply resident the contract the cont | pact on interial and constructor associated environmental | rstate an nmercial sumes the nmental eer a minand/or reship. Clear school   | be implemented to d local traffic. The driveways during the responsibility of Commitments, on the condition of fourteen and closures. The termont County and als and businesses, sources.  |
| ESTIMAT   | ED PROJE  | CT COST /  | AND SCHED   | ULE:   |  |  |   |   |  |
| Engineerir<br>Anticipate  | ng:<br>d Start Date   | \$ 24.1 M<br>of Constructi   |   | nt-of-Way: \$<br>2   | 40.1 M   | C  | onstruction:  | \$ 10   | 09.6 M   |
| RIGHT OF  | F WAY AND   | UTILITY I  | NVOLVEME  | NT:  |  |  |   |   |  |
| Approxima Approxima Approxima Has Utility Are large s Are there           | f parcels to be ate area of te area of per Coordination scale transm  | e affected for mporary rightermanent rightermanen righterm | es located with<br>nts within the   | ROW:<br>led:<br>led:<br>nin the project a  | 79<br>Not<br>App   | 3  |   | No<br>No<br>No<br>d No  | acre acre  |
| Remarks:  | acres or numbered B14g, Parbe include review of and 10 browith ODC Uniform Transport Commitm B14d and Exclusion Major utili No major as the one | new, permand in yellow or ge 60. The ted in the final property manusinesses are not right-of-DT-Office of FRelocation and Uents on Page B14e, on Futers in the present of transmission.  | nent right-or-von Attachments emporary right I design and researched to way and the Real Estate properties of the Real Estate | vay are expects 8 B14a-B14f, Pa t-of-way require ight-of-way plar photos by ENT be displaced ( relocation of res rocedures (http: operty Acquisit ation Assistance dential and cor and 58, and are lude telephone, | ages 54 to 9 ages 64 to 6 19 ages 64 to 6 19 ages 65 to 6 19 ages 75 to 6 19 ag | equired from the project of the project. Additionally and business that conductions are project. Additionally and business that conductions are project. Additionally are project of the p | om 79 parce re listed in thave not yet ditionally, batter of 2007 and February and commerces will be streatly, Title 1970 (as 49 CFR Pants are shown Part II (Pants agas, water   | able formable formation about the conduction of | approximately 35 ected parcels are mat in Attachment etermined, but will field surveys, and 008, 5 residences cture takes). The red in accordance III of the Federal ed), the Surface ee Environmental ttachments B14c, of this Categorical Illular phone tower. |
| This is pag   | ge 4 of 15, w   | hich is part o   | f:  | Categorica   | l Exclusion  | Level 4  | Da  | ite:  | March 2008   |

Form version: 11/16/04

| County | Clermont | Route    | CLE-275 | Section | 10.15 | PID | 76289 | SJN | 486706 |
|--------|----------|----------|---------|---------|-------|-----|-------|-----|--------|
|        |          | <u>-</u> |         | -       |       | _   |       | · · |        |

## RIGHT-OF-WAY AND UTILITY INVOLVEMENT:

(continued from Page 4)

The Hall Run Sanitary Flow Facility (see Attachment B14c, Page 56) and a Clermont County water tower (see Attachment B14d, Page 57) are also located immediately adjacent to the CLE-275-10.15 project, though neither of these two features are expected to be impacted during construction.

Utility coordination will be conducted by ENTRAN, in coordination with ODOT-District 8, and will be ongoing through completion of final design. A list of utility owners with utilities located in the project construction limits will be included in the project plans, and if utility relocations are required, the following plan note will be added to the final project plans (see Environmental Commitment, on Page 15): Upon the contract award, the coordination of all necessary utility relocations will be the responsibility of the contractor. All utility relocations shall be coordinated between the contractor and the utility owners in such a way to avoid and/or minimize any inconvenience to potentially affected customers. All utility relocations not included in this contract shall be performed by the affected utility or its contractor and shall be compliant with ODOT roadway design standards. Utility work will be ongoing during the construction period.

This is page 4a of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 4 Date: March 2008