

ODOT Stakeholder Discussion

Wednesday, May 25, 2022

Via Microsoft Teams

In Attendance:

- Mary Hoy, ODOT
- Keeghan White, City of Dayton
- Susan Vincent, City of Dayton

The meeting started with the [Stakeholder Meeting Presentation](#)

General:

- The goal of “Safety” will need to consider both traffic safety and crime.
 - Are there ways to increase a sense of safety on our paths and trails by including lighting, ensuring clear view-sheds, etc?
 - There’s a difference between recreational trail use and commuting. Rec trails should probably close at dusk, just like city parks, but there is a need for lighting of those paths that are used for commuting.
- Maintenance needs to consider both long-term preservation and seasonal weather impacts. Are there creative solutions that might involve resident volunteers?
- ODOT has expanded their purview beyond just state routes and is conducting analysis of local streets as well. Currently, they are looking at Keowee Street and studying the potential for a road diet.
- Pedestrian commute assessment was surprising – universities could play into that

Hopes:

- State funding sources often look to localities to have specific project rankings; the ATP should include a list of highest priority projects
- Combining the SRTS travel plan with the ATP is a great opportunity because kids are not only walking/biking to school – where are they going after school?
- Include funding sources in the prioritization including the three ODOT funding types under the highway safety improvement program:
 - Formal Safety Funding = for higher-cost, more complex safety improvements that require a more detailed review. This program is meant to address locations with a history of fatal or injury crashes where low-cost safety improvements have failed to solve the problem.
 - Systemic Safety Funding = project applications that focus on preventing injuries resulting from pedestrian and roadway departure crashes through systemic infrastructure improvements. Systemic improvements are meant to be proactive and widely implemented based on roadway features that have been associated with specific crash types.

- This was the source for the scattered pedestrian improvements around the city of Dayton. Might be a good option for a round 2 to catch the projects that didn't make the first cut.
- Abbreviated Safety Funding = purpose of the abbreviated application process is to quickly implement safety improvements at locations with a crash pattern and safety concern. This process has been simplified to help us review and potentially fund less expensive, less complex safety improvements quickly

Concerns:

- Level of traffic stress analysis is helpful in identifying priorities
 - We want to be able to walk and bike on these arterials . . . do we want to put in mid-block crossing when there are intersections? How to balance traffic concerns with those for AT
- The plan should balance the needs of all road users – drivers, walkers and riders
 - Road capacity needs to be maintained while providing as many separated facilities as possible for cyclists to ensure comfort on both sides
 - Make the roads comfortable for AT but make the experience pleasant for drivers too . . . separation is not a bad thing.
 - How to make crossings convenient for pedestrians (crossing where they want to) . . . look at specific locations where people might WANT to cross?

Places or Corridors

- Comments will be recorded on the [Stakeholder Google Map](#)