



**Public Meeting**

**November 19, 2003**

**Project Information**

**Project:** The proposed Portsmouth Bypass, State Route 823 from Wheelersburg to Lucasville, a four-lane freeway with access at interchanges.

### **Purpose of the Meeting**

A public meeting was held in November 2002 to display the alternatives that were being considered for the new Portsmouth Bypass. Based upon comments received, the alternatives were revised to those presented at today's open house. Within the next few months, ODOT will be recommending the final location for the proposed roadway. Before this decision is made, ODOT would like input from the public on the current alternatives. ***Please review the information carefully and assist ODOT in making the best possible decision for the citizens of Scioto County and the surrounding region.***

### **Alternatives**

The proposed Portsmouth Bypass is broken up into four sections. Currently, there are two alternatives under consideration for Sections 1, 3 and 4, while only one option is shown for Section 2. One alternative in each section generally passes through the valley, while the other generally passes through the hills.

***Each section can be mixed and matched to make the ultimate location for the roadway. Your comments are sought on which alternative you prefer in each Section of the proposed bypass.***

Currently, interchanges are planned for each end and for a connection to SR 335 near the airport. Another interchange may be constructed on Glendale Road or on Lucasville-Minford Road near Clarktown – comments are being accepted on this issue as well.

### **Funding & Schedule**

ODOT has pledged \$55 million toward the project. The remaining funds to complete the project have not yet been committed. Funding for the project will depend upon many factors, such as the Federal Transportation Bill that is currently under development. A plan for funding the entire project, or for constructing a portion with the currently pledged funds, will be developed over the next several months once the preferred alternative is chosen. It is possible that ODOT may design the roadway and purchase the right-of-way with those available funds in order to preserve the corridor while construction funding is sought.

### **Background**

The Portsmouth Bypass was first identified as part of the Appalachian Development Highway System (ADHS) in 1964, under the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC). The purpose of the ARC's programs is to reduce poverty in the Appalachian region. The highway program seeks to end the isolation of these areas and provide the roadway connections needed to attract economic development and jobs. Funding limitations have stalled the project several times in decades past. In 1998 ODOT signed the Southeast Ohio Highway Compact, which allocated money across several projects, including \$55 million toward this project if it was found to be a feasible idea.

In 1999 ODOT began a planning study for the project. A thorough traffic survey was conducted and several alternatives were considered to meet regional transportation and economic development needs, including

upgrading the existing routes and several bypass concepts. Based upon the findings of the study, ODOT determined that a bypass in the area of the county airport would provide good transportation benefits and the best chance for economic development – it would provide roadway access to flat, developable property that already possessed an airport, rail line and close proximity to ports along the Ohio River. In 2001 ODOT approved access to the funding to continue with development of the project.

In August 2001 ODOT began the current study to determine the best location for the new roadway. At the start of the study, the project team met with representatives from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and numerous local officials. Field studies have been conducted to determine the locations of critical resources like schools and community buildings, neighborhoods, farm support services, wetlands, and historic bridges and buildings. Mapping was created to show the topography and the locations of homes and businesses. Geotechnical borings were conducted to provide information on the soil conditions so the planners could better estimate construction costs and how steep the slopes can be cut. This information is the foundation upon which the roadway planning was conducted.

### **Development of Alternatives**

Beginning with the mapping and environmental information already available from other sources, the project team began to develop preliminary concepts for the location of the new roadway. Many conceptual roadway segments were drawn on the base maps that could be pieced together into thousands of combinations to make up a complete roadway. As detailed mapping and the results of the field studies for environmental and soils information became available, the project team worked to improve the initial segments based upon the more detailed information that had been collected, while searching for options to reduce costs and impacts. The segments of the Preliminary Alternatives were evaluated, based upon costs and impacts, in order to determine which would be carried forward. This information was presented at a public meeting on November 13, 2002. Based upon comments received from the public the alternatives were revised to the choices presented at today's open house.

***Please bear in mind that the final location of the roadway is not decided.*** Shortly after the public meeting, ODOT will be coordinating environmental studies with other state and federal agencies to seek their input on the revised alternatives, as well. ODOT will review all comments received prior to identifying the final location of the roadway. Any new information received as a result of the public meeting will be examined before a decision is made. All citizens, even those who do not live along the alternatives, should provide comments so that ODOT understands everyone's point-of-view.

***If one of the options on display is ultimately chosen, the final design of the roadway may not be identical to the preliminary design that is shown.*** Once a location is chosen, the design team will begin to develop roadway plans and will concentrate on trying to improve upon the recommended option by addressing concerns and suggestions of property owners. For example, the project team would like to work with the owners of potentially landlocked property to determine if a solution can be developed that would provide access to the property. Similarly, other suggestions may be received from citizens that would improve the project and reduce impacts to people and property. In other words, please make specific comments so that ODOT will have the benefit of your knowledge to make the project better for everyone concerned. Feel free to use the comment forms provided or additional sheets.

**Comments will be accepted at the meeting, by mail, fax, or e-mail until December 19, 2003:**

**TranSystems Corporation SR 823 Study Team  
5747 Perimeter Drive, Suite 240  
Dublin, OH 43017**

**E-mail: [scswartz@transystems.com](mailto:scswartz@transystems.com)  
Fax: (614) 336-8540  
Web: [www.PortsmouthBypass.com](http://www.PortsmouthBypass.com)**



ISSUE/CONCERN		SECTION 1		SECTION 2	SECTION 3		SECTION 4	
		Segment Hill 1	Segment Valley 1	Segment Hill/Valley 2	Segment Hill 3	Segment Valley 3	Segment Hill 4	Segment Valley 4
DESIGN ISSUES	Length (miles)	4.5	5.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	4.1	3.9
	Probable Cost (millions) Total	\$84	\$64	\$44	\$45	\$40	\$66	\$48
	Earthwork (incl. mitigation)	\$32	\$13	\$21	\$21	\$17	\$28	\$8
	Structures (incl. bridges, ret walls & culverts)	\$24	\$25	\$9	\$10	\$10	\$16	\$18
	Remaining Construction Costs	\$18	\$16	\$12	\$12	\$11	\$20	\$15
	Utility Relocations	\$5	\$4	\$0	\$1	\$1	\$1	\$3
	Right-of-Way/Relocations	\$4	\$6	\$1	\$1	\$2	\$1	\$4

PROPERTY IMPACTS	<b>Relocations Residential total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>
	Single-Family Residences	21	31	3	6	7	0	5
	Apartments (1 building)	10	10	0	0	0	0	0
	Other Residences	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mobile Homes	7	5	1	2	1	0	0
	<b>Other Relocations</b> church, business	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
	barns & farm buildings	4	10	2	7	12	1	5
	<b>Property Impacts by Alternative Right of Way Required</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>199</b>
	Active Agricultural (acres)	7	59	20	2	3	26	41
	Passive Agricultural (acres)	53	45	44	16	23	5	52
	Scrub/Logged (acres)	54	15	54	27	3	15	7
	Urban/Developed (acres)	63	59	11	9	8	42	58
Woodland (acres)	109	133	87	114	125	183	41	
<b>Potential Landlocked Properties*</b>								
Number of Parcels (number)	31	44	9	20	32	20	8	
Acreage Landlocked Acreage	649	547	165	226	425	399	175	

\*These properties may be landlocked, as no access was apparent and no service road appeared feasible. Access strategies will be pursued with property owners prior to making a final determination.

ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES	<b>Stream Culverted/Relocated (total lineal feet)</b>	<b>11,320</b>	<b>15,820</b>	<b>10,212</b>	<b>7,765</b>	<b>7,144</b>	<b>10,956</b>	<b>8,012</b>
	Perennial (lineal feet)	371	1,346	1,460	0	656	160	3,583
	(number)	1	2	2	0	1	2	3
	Intermittent (lineal feet)	7,519	6,385	5,249	4,024	3,036	2,794	1,966
	(number)	11	9	9	7	7	6	5
	Ephemeral (lineal feet)	3,430	8,089	3,503	3,741	3,452	8,002	2,463
	(number)	16	23	12	11	8	15	9
	<b>Stream - Bridged (lineal feet)</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>Total Wetlands Impacted Total (acres)</b>	<b>1.27</b>	<b>1.71</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.24</b>	<b>2.06</b>	<b>0.69</b>
	Category I (acres)	0.04	0.24	0.17	0.17	0.10	0.09	0.66
Category II (acres)	1.23	1.47	0.18	0.00	0.14	1.97	0.03	
<b>Ponds (acres)</b>	<b>1.93</b>	<b>1.64</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>5.61</b>	<b>0.55</b>	

HISTORIC RESOURCES	<b>Buildings Requiring Additional Study</b>							
	Within Boundaries (photo ID #)	0	1	1	1	0	0	4
	Adjacent to Alignment (photo ID #)	0	0	1	1	0	1	0

SOCIO-ECONOMIC ISSUES	<b>Residences Close to Roadway</b> Within 400' of R/W	<b>175</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>75</b>
	<b>Cemetaries</b> Adjacent to Alignment (not impacted)	Rawley Cemetary, Highland Bend Cemetary	Marshall Cemetary, Stockham Cemetary	Ketter Cemetary	Glendale Cemetary		McConnell Farm Cemetary	Jones Cemetary, Stony Hill Cemetary
	<b>Churches</b> Within Boundaries (would be purchased/relocated)		Adams Memorial Church					
	Adjacent to Alignment (not impacted)	Church of Jesus Christ, Riverview Baptist Church		Sunshine Congregational			Community Bible Church	Candy Run Tabernacle, Community Bible Church
	<b>Schools</b> Adjacent to Alignment (not impacted)							Valley Local Middle School
	<b>Libraries</b> Within Boundaries (would be purchased/relocated)							Portsmouth Public Library- Lucasville Branch

All impact calculations are preliminary based upon limited design information. Final impacts will be determined once design is complete and ultimately may be more or less than the impacts predicted above.