

Tim Hickin

From: William Lozier <wlozier@transconohio.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 8:56 AM
To: Glynn, Marie
Cc: Sheidlower, Erin; Holik, Will; Ty Thompson; Knerr, Jared; Alan Haines; Gary Burkholder; Flowers, Duane; Tim Hickin
Subject: Re: SR161-I70 Connections Study: Stakeholder Interview Summary Memo

CAUTION: This email message came from an external (non-city) email account. Do not click on any links within the message or attachments to the message unless you recognize the sender's email account and trust the content.

Marie-

Thanks for sharing this information, it is very concise. I would like to commend Erin and your team for this excellent stakeholder process. The meetings with the different groups within Licking County are a very good idea since their perspectives have wide variability. If there is a downside, it could be that differing priorities are counter to each other, and because of this the TID is taking on the role of drilling down a bit further with these groups in order to clarify and prioritize the input you have documented.

I met with Etna Township Trustee and Board President Gary Burkholder, Pataskala City Service Director Alan Haines and County Engineer Jared Knerr on Monday and we discussed pertinent issues of regarding traffic flow in the Pataskala/Etna Township area. This conversation included our expected traffic impacts from pending development. I can summarize this very simply in the prioritized list of intersection improvements below:

1. SR 310/Refugee Rd- Possible turn lanes all around
2. SR 310/USR 40 (Main St)- North bound left turn addition
3. SR 16 (Broad St)/Etna Parkway

These recommendations are premised on ODOT's scope of work for the study for what can feasibly be constructed in a 5–10 year horizon. Our conversation also considered anticipated long-term improvements to I-70 and the possibility of a new interchange in this area west of SR 310. The group also recognized that there will continue to be significant northbound traffic from the SR 310/I-70 interchange with destinations to Intel, and it is preferred that traffic use Mink St rather than SR 310 through downtown Pataskala.

With these general goals in mind, the group concluded that Priority 2 may actually be the highest priority, however we realize it will take much longer to develop than Priority 1 since Priority 2 will involve significant property impacts. Here are the anticipated routes to Intel that supports the need for the proposed improvements:

1. Priority 1: SR310 to Refugee to Mink

2. Priority 2: SR 310 to USR 40 to Etna Parkway to Refugee to Mink
3. Priority 3: SR 310 to USR 40 to Etna Parkway to Broad St to Mink

It should be noted that each of these projects stand on their own merit based on local trips, even without the Intel destination. The development ongoing at SR 310/Refugee is the best example of this, where multiple mixed use developments are advancing. It is also noteworthy that improvements to these intersections by ODOT will create higher demand on the local road network. Improvements to Refugee Rd between 310 and Etna Parkway is a good example where we may need to develop a part 2 TID project for this road section. Improvements to Mink north of Refugee will also need to be addressed by Pataskala.

The group also thinks that ODOT will have to improve the USR 40/Mink intersection in the near future since it is already experiencing degrading levels of service. Although it may not be desirable to encourage traffic on the section of Mink between 40 and Refugee, there are already developments that generate truck traffic on this roadway section. Also, if Priority 2 is constructed it is not known whether truck traffic will actually use Etna Parkway, or if it will continue west on 40 to the Mink intersection and then proceed north.

Since Ohio law does not allow counties or townships to prohibit truck traffic, and cities can't prohibit trucks on state routes we can't exactly say which routes will be preferred, and any traffic model developed for this will be filled with distribution assumptions. If we could direct traffic, then Route 3, above would definitely be preferred since it keeps traffic on the state routes and on Etna Parkway which was built for truck traffic and has much fewer residential impacts. However, given that we can't regulate trucks to use this route, these recommendations are based on local knowledge of what will best serve the area, and that can actually be constructed in a reasonable timeframe.

Both Etna Township and the City of Pataskala intend to pursue local legislation confirming these ranked priorities.

I hope this helps, please call any of us with questions.

Also- If your scope of services permits an exhibit depicting all these possible routes and proposed improvements may be helpful for the agencies to share as they have internal discussions.

Also- Everyone on this email should please feel free to add further comment or add anything else I missed.

William C. Lozier, PE, PS | Licking County TID Projects Director
TransCon Ohio, Ltd.

mobile 740.258.3953
email wlozier@transconohio.com

On Mon, Jul 29, 2024 at 5:15 PM Glynn, Marie <Marie.Glynn@jacobs.com> wrote:

Bill,

Thank you for the great discussion today. Attached is the draft summary of our stakeholder interviews for your review and to help in your follow up discussions with stakeholders.

This memo covers 5 of our 6 meetings, and a few more need to be scheduled (to pick up a few stakeholders that had conflicts with prior dates).

I will also reach out to you once we've pulled together the travel demand data so that we can show you the potential issue we uncovered along Thornwood Drive...specifically that there are not trips showing up in the planned Heath community center which is affecting the total trips forecasted along Thornwood Drive.

If you have any comments/edits on the document, or you learn additional details that would be good to include in this summary, please go ahead and make them in track changes and we will incorporate all your information into the master document.

Thank you,

Marie Glynn, P.E. | Jacobs | Project Manager / Senior Engineer | Highway Civil Group | 312.307.4675 | marie.glynn@jacobs.com | 525 W. Monroe Street, Suite 1600, Chicago Illinois 60661 | www.jacobs.com



this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.