

Chapter 9: Recommended Transportation Plan

This chapter summarizes the LRTP recommended transportation plan. The LRTP addresses all modes of transportation and is fiscally constrained. For the purpose of the LRTP analysis, projects were grouped into one of the following four categories:

Table 9-1.1: Project Length

| Project Categories | Length Of Construction Period | Time Period |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| 1) Short-Term Projects | Within 10 years | Between 2025 & 2035 |
| 2) Mid-Term Projects | 10-15 Years | Between 2035 & 2040 |
| 3) Mid-Long Term Projects | 15-20 Years | Between 2040 & 2045 |
| 4) Long-Term Projects | 20 Years or Greater | 2045 & Beyond |

It should be noted that the categories were used merely for analyzing the various transportation improvements and does not guarantee that a specific roadway improvement will be constructed or that it will be constructed during the identified timeframe. It should be further noted the design, engineering, and construction of the specific roadway improvements identified in this LRTP depend heavily on the availability of transportation funds. The improvements and policies are described in the following sections and strive to meet the plan's stated goals and objectives (Chapter 2). This plan's goals and objectives were aligned with ODOT's long-range plan priorities as identified in the Access Ohio 2050 planning document to ensure that ERPC's regional future potential projects and policies are compatible with those of the state.

9.1 Roadway Improvements

The **overall roadway policy guidelines** consist of the following:

- Encourage the adjusting of all roads to recommended widths based on ODOT design guidelines.
- Encourage the preservation of the transportation network by expansion and adaptation of existing facilities to meet transportation needs, as opposed to the creation of wholly new facilities
- Support the recommendations from the US 6 Corridor Improvement Study – Phase 2
- Encourage the creation and implementation of access management regulations for municipalities and villages.

Improvements to Roadways include preservation and expansion projects. Typical expansion projects include the addition of a center lane. **Figure 9-1** and **Figure 9-2** depict the recommended roadway preservation and expansion projects.

One significant roadway project included in the expansion projects is the consideration of a new interchange in Port Clinton at Fulton Street and SR 2. The project was introduced by the City of Port Clinton based on local challenges with the existing system. This included emergency vehicle access to the hospital along Fulton Street, freight traffic impacted by the railroad overhead bridge on Fulton, and vehicular congestion issues during peak hours caused by the school and hospital campuses. Regionally,

improved access to SR 2 from Fulton Street would create an additional entrance and exit into the city, that are all currently bottlenecked on routes at the east and west end of the city. The proposal is in early stages of consideration, and would require a significant level of analysis and considerations of alternatives before moving forward with the project.

9.2 Operational/Congestion Management Strategies

The **overall operation congestion management strategies** consist of the following:

- Encourage the adjustment of all roads to recommended widths based on ODOT design guidelines
- Encourage the preservation of the transportation network by expansion and adaptation of existing facilities to meet transportation needs, as opposed to the creation of wholly new facilities
- Support the recommendations from the US 6 Corridor Improvement Study – Phase 2
- Encourage the implementation of access management regulations for municipalities and villages
- Deployment of ITS technology and implementation of access management techniques along major corridors in the MPO, including US 250, US 6, and SR 4
- Promoting transit use to tourist attractions and offering employee incentives to use transit for everyday travel

Also, important to note is that project sponsors are responsible for obtaining any environmental type permits as required for proposed projects. For example, an USACE permit according to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act if applicable to the project (as outlined in Section 5.10 of this document).

9.3 Transit Improvements

Public transportation provides mobility to older adults, disabled persons, and disadvantaged persons as well as basic access to employment opportunities, health care facilities, shopping activities, and community services for the population as a whole.

Overall transit policy guidelines consist of the following:

- Work with local transportation/transit stakeholders to secure funding for transit services
- Support the Sandusky Transit System's initiatives to update, collaborate, improve, and expand services
- Participate in the update of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan every three years or as requested by ODOT
- Support maintaining the transit mobility manager and communication between transit providers
- Explore, expand, and streamline cross county transfers

Key transit projects under the expansion of service include the following project improvements:

Service Expansion: Service expansion involves the curb-to-curb service as it currently exists in the City of Sandusky and portions of Perkins Township, the City of Huron, and the City of Vermilion as provided by the **Sandusky Transit System (STS)**. As a means of focusing on the overall transit policy guidelines, it is assumed that as new services are implemented; the level of service associated with these newer services will be improved as funding permits. This would include expanding the hours of service that transit is available and also improving the flexibility of scheduling demand response trips.

It would also allow a minimum level of service to more areas of the entire County while continually striving to improve the existing services. Additionally, transit waiting area improvements should be made as funding permits.

Intermodal Connections: A key to facilitating transportation in the region is the development of intermodal transfer points in and around the Village of Milan. A possible location for a facility would be in **Downtown Milan** is at Church Street and Main Street or near the Interstate 80 and US 250 Interchange. These intermodal facilities could also serve as a stop for the **MegaBus** service and could include other amenities such as a **park-and-ride lot** that could serve commuters traveling to regional destinations like Toledo, Akron, or Cleveland via carpools or vanpools. They could also serve as transfer points for coordinated human service agency transportation. Additionally, if a MegaBus stop were to locate in the county this could help facilitate a link between the region and the existing MegaBus stops in Cleveland and Toledo.

Since the 2040 Long Range Plan update, the Sandusky Transit System has built a **transit hub** that is housed with **AMTRAK** and **Greyhound**. These intermodal connections have expanded transit options in the area. AMTRAK is currently in the middle of station upgrades, including ADA compliance and drainage repairs. ERPC MPO has long supported AMTRAK and **regional passenger rail** for increased connections to Toledo, Cleveland, and states beyond in a more efficient manner. Additionally, Sandusky Transit System has expressed an interest in expanding its services to **water taxis**. This service would be located downtown along the waterfront. This service would assist in facilitating travel between areas such as Port Clinton, Catawba Island, Kelleys Island, and Put-In-Bay.

Fixed Route Corridors: The Sandusky Transit System (STS) has been operating multiple (currently five interloping) **fixed routes** since the 2045 Long Range Plan Update. Lines are now color-coded and have designated pick up schedules. These routes offer transportation to work as well as a shopping and medical circulator service for those in the Sandusky and Perkins areas. In addition to the current fixed route in place, the 2050 LRTP Update calls for the development of a corridor fixed-route transit service along **SR 4 creating a medical corridor** from Firelands Hospital to NOMS.

Alternative Fuels: STS continues to research alternative fuel options for fleet to help reduce overall costs and possible roadway emissions. STS had previously made consideration for moving the fleet towards compressed natural gas (CNG) and propane vehicle. As funding is made available and fleet turnover continues, the 2050 LRTP calls for support of considerations for alternative fuel vehicles for the STS fleet as funding is made available.

Transportation Coordination: In 2018 Erie County was notified that they were assigned a **mobility manager** from the **Great Lakes Community Action Partnership**. A mobility manager had been supported and recommended in the 2040 Long Range Plan Update. Continued support of the mobility manager is important in the region as they provide travel training, updates from ODOT transit, and assists in coordination efforts. Support of the Mobility Manager is consistent across Erie and Ottawa County.

It is also recommended that the **Erie County Coordinated Transportation Plan** and **Ottawa County Coordinated Transportation Plan** to be maintained. The plan is important for local organizations to be eligible for certain FTA funding programs (5310). In 2018, ODOT created a standardized template for the Coordinated Transportation Plan and implemented new requirements for participants. Prior to the

standardized template each organization created their own which created a lot of variability. Along with the format changes ODOT also requested the reboot of the transit advisory committee so that further transit collaboration and coordination could occur. Another requirement is that the plan is reviewed annually and updated every three years with committee members' involvement. The mobility manager has assisted ERPC staff with these efforts.

Seasonal Transit (Tourism) Support: It is important to continue seasonal transit service to Cedar Point from downtown Sandusky and the fixed-route transit service to add more vehicles to the route for improved service frequency. Tourism is very important to the MPO region's economy, including in the Catawba Peninsula, downtown Sandusky and Cedar Point Causeway. The continued support of this service provides a key connection between hotels and Cedar Point for tourists, but also as a means of getting seasonal Cedar Point employees to work from outlying areas. The Sandusky Transit Systems has added various fixed-line services that travel to the **major tourist destinations** on major corridors including **US 250, Perkins Avenue, downtown Sandusky** and **SR 6**. Additionally, ERPC MPO will look to support efforts to support tourism transit in Ottawa County from **downtown Port Clinton** to various restaurants and wineries in Catawba and Danbury Township.

9.4 Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

Existing bicycle travel within the MPO consists of primarily on on-road bikeway, but also consists of some off-road bikeway. The recommended plan for pedestrian and bicycle (non-motorized) improvements are shown in **Figure 9-4.1**. The MPO's recommended plans for the non-motorized network comes from the **2018 Ottawa County Active Transportation Plan, 2020 Erie County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**, and review by stakeholders on the ERPC MPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. Some alternative routes were also listed within the plan by veteran bicyclists. These routes were not listed in the cost estimates chart.

Overall Non-Motorized Policy Guidelines:

- Build off the existing bicycle/pedestrian facility system as rated in the Erie County **2020 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update** and **2018 Ottawa County Active Transportation Plan**
- Continue **public outreach education** efforts through Active Transportation Month and the ERPC website
- Continue meeting and working with the **Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee** (established in 2015)
- Continue **working with local jurisdictions and agencies** to support bicycle and pedestrian improvement efforts
- Support local **complete streets** efforts




Figure 9-4.1: Recommended Expansion Projects

ERPC MPO 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan

Table 9-4.1 Expansion Projects

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|----------------|------------------|--|---|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Groton Township | SR 4 Expansion 3-Lane | Expansion of SR 4 and prioritized access management to improve north-south freight and peak summer travel | 2040-2045 | \$ 14,617,356.00 |
| 2 | Perkins Township | SR 4 Expansion 3-Lane | Expansion of SR 4 and prioritized access management to improve north-south freight and peak summer travel | 2035-2040 | \$ 10,920,079.30 |
| 3 | Perkins Township | SR 4 Expansion 3-Lane | Expansion of SR 4 and prioritized access management to improve north-south freight and peak summer travel | 2040-2045 | \$ 17,299,469.42 |
| 4 | Perkins Township | New East-West Road Near Quarry | Future connection from Milan Road/US 250 to Columbus Avenue following the useful life of the quarry | 2045-2050 | \$ 2,667,672.73 |
| 5 | Perkins Township | US 6 Connectivity Corridor Plan Implementation | Installation of 6-roundabouts and lane widening and turn lanes to improve roadway safety and congestion | 2025-2035 | \$ 53,809,199 Includes \$24.5 Million BUILD Grant |
| 6 | Perkins Township | New East-West Road Connecting US 4 and Bell Avenue | East-West Connection extending Bell Avenue to Hayes Avenue/US 4 in Perkins Township | 2035-2040 | \$ 2,924,510.36 |
| 7 | Perkins Township | Bay Winds Drive Extension | Extending the Bay Winds Drive Roadway to Columbus Avenue to improve east-west connections | 2035-2040 | \$ 2,544,683.28 |

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|---|------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| 8 | Port Clinton | Fulton Street/SR 2 Interchange | New Interchange at SR 2 and Fulton Street on Port Clinton's South End | 2045-2050 | \$ 45,000,000.00 |
| 9 | Catawba Township | Catawba Road throughlane | Addition of throughlane/turn lanes to address congestion created by the West Harbor bottleneck | 2045-2050 | \$ 3,394,725.55 |
| 10 | Portage Township | Plasterbed Road Relocation | Relocation of Plasterbed Road to the west and closure of old roadway due to abandoned gypsum mines in area. | 2025-2035 | \$ 15,250,000.00 |
| *Cost estimates were identified through ERPC MPO TIP when available | | | | | |




Figure 9-4.2: Recommended Preservation Projects

ERPC MPO 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan

Table 9-4.2 Preservation Projects

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|----------------|---------------------|--|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| 11 | Margaretta Township | Intersection Improvements - SR 101 at Bardshar Road | Safety improvements at signalized intersection along SR 101 | 2040-2045 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 12 | Village of Castalia | Intersection Improvement S. Washington Street at W. Lucas Street | Safety improvements at signalized intersection along SR 269 | 2040-2045 | \$ 1,050,000.00 |
| 13 | Village of Castalia | Main Street Resurfacing | Resurfacing in downtown Castalia from Barden Street to S. Washington Street/SR 269 | 2025-2035 | \$ 169,201.05 |
| 14 | Groton Township | Intersection Improvement - SR 269 and Portland | Convert Two-Way stop-controlled intersection into single-lane roundabout | 2025-2035 | \$ 4,312,720.00 |
| 15 | City of Sandusky | W. Monroe Preservation | Resurfacing and improvements along W. Monroe Street from Camp Street to Poplar Street | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,697,793.00 |
| 16 | City of Sandusky | Camp Street Road Rehabilitation | Phased repaving of Camp Street from Monroe Street to Perkins Avenue | 2025-2035 | \$ 407,039.39 |
| 17 | City of Sandusky | Hayes Ave/Columbus Ave Roadway Preservation | Urban Paving along SR 4 in City of Sandusky From Perkins Ave to Washington Row | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,791,720.00 |
| 18 | City of Sandusky | Tyler Street Safety Improvements | Pedestrian Countermeasures along Tyler Street at the Firelands Regional Medical Center Campus | 2035-2040 | \$ 61,885.16 |

| | | | | | | |
|----|------------------|---|--|-----------|----|--------------|
| 19 | City of Sandusky | First Street Paving and Bikepath | Repaving First St and adding extending multimodal facilities as part of the Sandusky Bay Pathway | 2025-2035 | \$ | 1,603,235.64 |
| 20 | City of Sandusky | Cedar Point Drive Resurfacing | Repaving Cedar Point Drive from First Street to Cleveland Road | 2025-2035 | \$ | 1,361,107.08 |
| 21 | Perkins Township | Intersection Improvements - Campbell St and Strub Rd | Replacing signalized intersection with single-lane roundabout | 2025-2035 | \$ | 2,322,000.00 |
| 22 | Perkins Township | Intersection Safety Improvements - Strub Road and SR 4 | Replacing signalized intersection with single-lane roundabout | 2025-2035 | \$ | 4,000,000.00 |
| 23 | Perkins Township | Intersection Safety Improvements - Bogart Road and SR 4 | Replacing signalized intersection with single-lane roundabout | 2025-2035 | \$ | 4,625,000.00 |
| 24 | Perkins Township | Old Railroad Road Preservation | Old Railroad Resurfacing and Bike path accommodations | 2025-2035 | \$ | 1,106,840.70 |
| 25 | Perkins Township | Campbell Street Preservation | Resurfacing and installation of new sidewalks from Bogart Road to Bell Avenue | 2025-2035 | \$ | 1,179,682.00 |
| 26 | Perkins Township | Perkins Avenue Preservation | Perkins Avenue Resurfacing and Access Management to help manage roadway safety and congestion | 2040-2045 | \$ | 7,888,846.12 |
| 27 | Perkins Township | Crossings Road Resurfacing | Repaving and preservation of Crossings Road west of US 250 | 2035-2040 | \$ | 296,502.71 |
| 28 | Perkins Township | Perkins Avenue South Side Walkways and Preservation | Perkins Avenue Resurfacing and installation of sidewalks and crosswalks | 2040-2045 | \$ | 3,305,096.46 |

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|----------------|------------------|---|---|-------------------|----------------------|
| 29 | Perkins Township | US 250 Safety Improvements | Convert three leg stop-controlled intersection into single-lane roundabout | 2040-2045 | \$ 5,600,000.00 |
| 30 | Oxford Township | SR 99 - Grade Crossing Improvements | ITS Systems for advanced warning of blocked rail crossings along SR 99 | 2025-2035 | \$ 250,000.00 |
| 31 | Village of Milan | Access Management Study through Milan | Review of major State Routes in Milan for improved freight and pedestrian traffic through the village | 2035-2040 | \$ 100,000.00 |
| 32 | Milan Township | Intersection Improvements - 250 at Huron Avery Road | Safety Improvements at US 250 and Huron Avery Road | 2045-2050 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 33 | Milan Township | Intersection Improvements - US 250 at Mason Road | Safety Improvements at US 250 and Mason Road | 2035-2040 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 34 | Milan Township | Intersection Improvements - Mason Road at Kelley Road | Roadway realignment and intersection improvements at Mason Road and Kelley Road | 2035-2040 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 35 | Milan Township | Resolve Alignment Issue - SR 13 and Mason Road | Replacing signalized intersection with single-lane roundabout | 2025-2035 | \$ 4,000,000.00 |
| 36 | Milan Township | Resolve Alignment Issue: River Road, Berlin St., and SR 113 | Roadway Realignment for improved intersection conditions at Berlin Street and River Road | 2035-2040 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 37 | City of Huron | Berlin Road and US 6 Safety Improvements | Safety and congestion improvements at the Cleveland Road/US 6 and Berlin Road intersection | 2035-2040 | \$ 92,194.62 |

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|----------------|--------------------|---|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| 38 | City of Huron | Route 6 Preservation and Rehabilitation | Roadway reconfiguration for safety, efficiency and livability improvements along US 6 through central Huron | 2045-2050 | \$ 2,956,787.64 |
| 39 | City of Huron | ERI US 0006 16.27 Phase 2 | Pavement resurfacing and intersection improvements with revised intersection geometry and ADA improvements for walk/curb ramps | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,798,585.05 |
| 40 | City of Huron | US 6 Major Bridge Rehab | Major Bridge Rehabilitation over the Huron River | 2025-2035 | \$ 44,907,000.00 |
| 41 | Berlin Township | Resolve Alignment Issue: SR 61, SR 113 and Collins Road | Roadway Realignment for improved intersection conditions at W. Collins Road, SR 61 and SR 113 | 2035-2040 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 42 | Berlin Township | Access Management Planning Study SR 61 | Safety improvements and access management planning for SR 61 Corridor | 2045-2050 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 43 | Vermilion Township | US 6 Phase 2 Study - Safety Improvement Implementations | Safety Improvements along the corridor and extension of multimodal facilities between Huron and Vermilion | 2035-2040 | \$ 3,507,526.76 |
| 44 | Vermilion Township | SR 60 Road Preservation and Gateway Treatments | Speed Management and safety countermeasures as gateway treatments entering into Vermilion Township along SR 60 | 2035-2040 | \$ 1,330,111.95 |
| 45 | Vermilion | W. River Road Preservation | Resurfacing of W. River Road from Linda Drive to Libery Ave/US 6 | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,250,915.49 |

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| 46 | Vermilion | Vermilion Road Preservation | Resurfacing of Vermilion Road from Jerusalem Road to North Ridge Road | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,145,912.36 |
| 47 | Vermilion | High Bridge Road Widening and Repaving | Major Roadway Rehab to accommodate larger traffic flows from Liberty Avenue to Vermilion Road | 2025-2035 | \$ 2,142,467.63 |
| 48 | Vermilion | Brownhelm Station Road Repaving and Interchange | Lane widening to ODOT standards and Interchange improvements from Brownhelm Station Road to Sunnyside Road | 2035-2040 | \$ 3,111,156.77 |
| 49 | Kelley's Island | Preservation of Kelley's Island Existing Network | Resurfacing of roadways and maintenance of existing pedestrian facilities | 2035-2040 | \$ 3,000,000.00 |
| 50 | Put-In-Bay Township | Preservation of Bass Island Existing Network | Resurfacing of roadways and maintenance of existing pedestrian facilities | 2035-2040 | \$ 3,000,000.00 |
| 51 | Village of Put-In-Bay | Preservation of Put-In-Bay Village Existing Network | Resurfacing of roadways and maintenance of existing pedestrian facilities | 2035-2040 | \$ 3,000,000.00 |
| 52 | Erie Township | Resolve Alignment Issue - W. Harbor Road and W. Three Mile Crossing Road | Safety Countermeasures and roadway realignment for at grade crossing and stop-controlled intersection | 2040-2045 | \$ 750,000.00 |
| 53 | Erie Township | Intersection Improvements - SR 2 and W. Lakeshore Drive | Safety Improvements at the terminus of W. Lakeshore Drive at SR 2 | 2035-2040 | \$ 3,000,000.00 |
| 54 | Bay Township | Intersection Improvement - Dual Roundabouts at US 2 and SR 53 | Safe Street 4 All Implementation of dual roundabouts at SR 2 and SR 53 Interchange | 2025-2035 | \$ 4,500,000.00 |

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|----------------|------------------|--|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| 55 | Bay Township | W. Fremont Road Preservation and Gateway Treatments | Speed management and safety countermeasures along W. Fremont Road/SR 53 between US 2 and McKinley Drive | 2035-2040 | \$ 1,463,596.04 |
| 56 | Port Clinton | Intersection Improvement - Perry St and Monroe St | Roadway reconstruction and improved pedestrian safety crossings at W. Lakeshore Drive and W. Perry Street 5 way intersection | 2025-2035 | \$ 2,817,800.00 |
| 57 | Port Clinton | Fulton Street Preservation and Safety Improvements | Resurfacing and pedesitran improvements along Fulton Street from US 2 to Perry Street | 2035-2040 | \$ 1,863,735.07 |
| 58 | Port Clinton | Perry Street Widening and Rehabilitation | Resurfacing Perry Street with multimodal facilities and recommended lane widths | 2035-2040 | \$ 4,760,925.42 |
| 59 | Danbury Township | Intersection Improvements - E. Harbor Road and SE Catawba Road | Safety Improvements and congestion management | 2035-2040 | \$ 4,500,000.00 |
| 60 | Danbury Township | Intersection Improvements - E. Harbor Road and S Bridge Road | Safety Improvements and congestion management | 2040-2045 | \$ 4,500,000.00 |
| 61 | Danbury Township | Church Road and E. Bayshore Road Resolve Alignment Issues | Convert three leg stop-controlled intersection into single-lane roundabout | 2035-2040 | \$ 3,000,000.00 |
| 62 | Danbury Township | Intersection Improvements - Church Road and E. Harbor Road | Convert three leg stop-controlled intersection into single-lane roundabout | 2035-2040 | \$ 4,000,000.00 |
| 63 | Danbury Township | E. Bayshore Road Resurfacing | Repaving of E. Bayshore Road from E. Port Clinton Road to S. Hartshorn Drive | 2025-2035 | \$ 2,487,030.00 |

| Project Number | Location | Project Name | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|---|------------------|---|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| 64 | Catawba Township | Miller Ferry - Ferry Loading, Roadway, and Pedestrian Safety Improvements | Redesign of Miller's Landing Ferry site to accommodate intermodal travel and support local island services | 2040-2045 | \$ 10,000,000.00 |
| *Cost estimates were identified through ERPC MPO TIP when available | | | | | |




Figure 9-4.3: Recommended Non-Motorized Projects

ERPC MPO 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan

Table 9-4.3 Non-Motorized Projects

| Project Number | Location | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost |
|----------------|------------------|--|-------------------|---------------------|
| 65 | Perkins Township | SR 4 Sidepath | 2040-2045 | \$ 1,741,005 |
| 66 | Perkins Township | Campbell Street Sidewalks | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,682,528 |
| 67 | Huron Township | Galloway Road Multimodal | 2035-2040 | \$ 305,507 |
| 68 | Huron Township | Perkins Avenue Multimodal | 2035-2040 | \$ 596,905 |
| 69 | Perkins Township | Perkins Avnue Sidewalks | 2025-2035 | \$ 522,005 |
| 70 | Perkins Township | Bogart Road Sidepath | 2040-2045 | \$ 3,606,054 |
| 71 | Huron Township | Bogart Road Sidepath | 2040-2045 | \$ 2,022,473 |
| 72 | Milan Township | US 250 Sidepath | 2040-2045 | \$ 4,671,301 |
| 73 | Perkins Township | Strub Road Multimodal | 2035-2040 | \$ 848,835 |
| 74 | Perkins Township | Hull Road Multimodal | 2035-2040 | \$ 1,248,185 |
| 75 | Huron Township | Osborn Metropark Connector | 2035-2040 | \$ 573,927 |
| 76 | Perkins Township | Old Railroad Multimodal | 2040-2045 | \$ 1,822,825 |
| 77 | Perkins Township | Columbus Avenue Multimodal | 2035-2040 | \$ 977,085 |
| 78 | Danbury Township | Peninsula Trail | 2025-2035 | \$ 2,203,883 |
| 79 | Danbury Township | S. Bridge Road Connector | 2040-2045 | \$ 1,286,843 |
| 80 | Danbury Township | East Harbor Loop | 2045-2050 | \$ 3,135,988 |
| 81 | Catawba Township | Islander Trail | 2035-2040 | \$ 2,693,312 |
| 82 | Marblehead | S. Alexander Pike Connector | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,125,927 |
| 83 | Danbury Township | Peninsula Trail | 2045-2050 | \$ 4,217,703 |
| 84 | Danbury Township | Peninsula Trail | 2035-2040 | \$ 6,126,726 |
| 85 | Milan Township | Huron River Towpath - Norwalk to Milan | 2045-2050 | \$ 171,049 |
| 86 | Huron Township | Huron River Towpath - Milan to Huron | 2045-2050 | \$ 1,082,592 |
| 87 | Port Clinton | W. Lakeshore Drive Shoring and Sidepath | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,581,011 |
| 88 | Port Clinton | E. Perry Street Waterworks Route | 2025-2035 | \$ 896,421 |
| 89 | Erie Township | Portage River Trail - Oak Harbor to Port Clinton | 2040-2045 | \$ 3,027,563 |
| 90 | Berlin Township | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Huron to Vermilion | 2025-2035 | \$ 5,765,488 |
| 91 | Sandusky | Cedar Point Causeway | 2025-2035 | \$ 992,112 |

| Project Number | Location | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost |
|----------------|---------------------|---|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 92 | Sandusky | Sandusky Bay Pathway - 1st Street Extension | 2025-2035 | *Cost Covered in Preservation Project |
| 93 | Bay Township | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Port Clinton to Fremont | 2045-2050 | \$ 4,034,032 |
| 94 | Huron | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Huron | 2025-2035 | \$ 368,605 |
| 95 | Huron | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Huron Connection | 2025-2035 | \$ 178,383 |
| 96 | Vermilion | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Vermilion | 2035-2040 | \$ 825,896 |
| 97 | Huron Township | Sandusky Bay Pathway - US 6 Connectivity Corridor | 2025-2035 | *Cost Covered in Expansion Project |
| 98 | Bay View | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Bay View to Sandusky | 2035-2040 | \$ 2,615,798 |
| 99 | Port Clinton | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Port Clinton to Bay View | 2045-2050 | \$ 20,739,408 |
| 100 | Sandusky | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Venice Road to downtown | 2025-2035 | \$ 1,442,074 |
| 101 | Margaretta Township | Sandusky Bay Pathway - Sandusky to Fremont | 2045-2050 | \$ 999,276 |




Figure 9-4.4: Recommended Transit Projects

ERP MPO 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan

Table 9-4.4 Transit Projects

| Project Number | Location | Project Description | Project Timeframe | Planning Level Cost* |
|----------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------|
| 102 | Sandusky | Healthy Hayes | 2035-2040 | \$ 200,000.00 |
| 103 | Sandusky/Danbury Township | Sandusky Bay Water Taxi Loop | 2045-2050 | \$ 800,000.00 |
| 104 | Sandusky | AMTRAK - Passenger Rail Improvements | 2035-2040 | \$ 100,000.00 |
| 105 | Milan | Park And Ride Facility | 2045-2050 | \$ 50,000.00 |
| 106 | Port Clinton to Catawba Township | Seasonal Tourism Loop - Downtown Port Clinton to Catawba | 2045-2050 | \$ 800,000.00 |

9.5 Freight & Regional Transportation Modes

Continued investment in the rail and airport facilities is necessary to maintain and enhance the region's position as a hub for freight and passengers. Intermodal facilities benefit the MPO area by supporting economic development throughout the MPO area across all modes of transportation.

Overall policies include:

- Integrate land use and freight transportation planning process
- Foster strategic partnerships and alliance for public-private regional freight collaboration
- Invest in and promote region's multimodal and intermodal capabilities
- Improve freight mobility, safety and operations
- Expand regional freight planning capabilities
- Increase freight awareness among all stakeholders

The railroads that serve the MPO are owned and operated by private freight entities; therefore, no designated funding is available for government or improvement of these facilities, beyond adopting policies to ensure the safety and maintenance of the network, especially the smaller class lines. In addition, these facilities and their operations are typically regulated through the Federal Railroad Administration.

Railroad freight services are directly correlated with the economic vitality of the businesses and the communities that they serve. Therefore, ODOT has implemented the following statewide objectives for its management of the railroad network in the Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan: ODOT will coordinate with the major carriers, such as Norfolk Southern on all track abandonment to preserve the right-of-way for future work and to minimize any adverse impacts on the communities affected by abandonment. ODOT will work with the small railroad companies to support their efforts to maintain appropriate conditions of their infrastructure, including enhancement of their access to the major carrier lines. ODOT will continue its railroad grade-crossing improvement program to minimize the conflicts between railroad operations and people and property and ensure a safe and efficient railroad system.

Because of the expense of roadway freight shipping, private companies continue to seek new ways to haul more raw goods and materials via rail service. This expansion of rail service does not necessarily equate to infrastructure expansion but improving the operations by either "double-stacking" the cargo containers or other efficiencies. While there are some significant projects taking place statewide, no railroad infrastructure expansions in the operations are expected in the ERPC MPO region in the near future.

9.6 Funding and Costs

This section summarizes the financial analysis of potential transportation investments. Estimated revenue from existing and proposed funding sources is compared with estimated project costs of constructing and maintains the transportation system to the year 2050. Prior to ISTEA and TEA-21, LRTP's often contained "wish lists" of projects that had very little chance of being constructed. The planning

regulations of ISTEA and TEA-21 brought about a change that required MPOs to consider the financial implications of their planning efforts. To this end, the federal planning regulations put in place the requirement for financial constraint of these documents. In 23 CFR 322 (b)(11), it is stated that transportation plans shall: *“Include a financial plan that demonstrates the consistence of proposed transportation investments with already available and projected sources of revenue. The financial plan shall compare the estimated revenue from existing and proposed funding sources that can reasonably be expected to be available for transportation uses, and the estimated costs of constructing, maintaining and operating the total (existing plus planned) transportation system over the period of the plan. The estimated revenue by existing revenue source (local, State Federal, or private) available for transportation projects shall be determined and any shortfalls identified. Proposed new revenues and/or revenue sources to cover shortfalls shall be identified, including strategies for ensuring their availability for proposed investments. Existing and proposed revenues shall cover all forecasted capital, operating, and maintenance costs. All cost and revenue projections shall be based on the data reflecting the existing situation and historical trends.”*

Funding for the ERPC MPO’s transportation maintenance and improvement projects comes from a variety of Federal, State, local and private sources. The federal government is the primary source of funding for transportation systems in the United States. These funds come from federally assessed user fees, fuel taxes, and landing fees. They are apportioned back to the states on a formula basis. The primary source of revenue at the Federal and State levels includes motor fuel taxes, vehicle registration fees, special motor carrier fees, parking fees and toll fees. Finance at the county and municipal levels are primarily based on property taxes, sales taxes, and special assessments. The private sector, such as developers and business associations, often support transportation projects through impact fees, right-of-way donations, and cost sharing.

Federal, State, local agencies and private developers have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the region’s transportation system over the past several decades. In the late 1990’s, programs such as TEA-21 significantly increased Federal and State funding authorizations above previous levels. However, the cost of maintaining the existing transportation infrastructure is continually increasing as the facilities age. The challenge that the MPO faces in the future is to balance the maintenance of the existing transportation infrastructure while at the same time identifying adequate funding for the construction of new transportation facilities.

Roadway improvement costs were identified using the current Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) (**Fiscal Year 2026 to Fiscal Year 2029**) and programmed project funding. For those projects not included in the TIP, general planning level construction costs were developed using general cost estimates provided by local and state agencies. It is important to consider the following when reviewing the project cost estimates. First, because it is difficult to identify a specific year that each project might be constructed, all estimated costs are presented in 2025 dollars. Second, since specific details regarding design, engineering, and construction are often not available, the estimated costs represent a very general planning level cost estimate. As projects proceed to the detailed planning and engineering phases, resulting in more accurate estimates, the project cost estimates contained in this LRTP should be updated. Based on the identified projects and estimated costs, it is projected that the roadway improvement projects would total approximately **\$339.7 million in year 2025 dollars**.

Projected Revenues: The projected funding levels provide a general comparison between the estimated roadway improvement costs and estimated funding levels. It should be noted that the estimated maintenance costs and funding sourced are **tabulated in year 2025 dollars** to provide a consistent comparison to the estimated roadway improvements, which are also presented in year 2025 dollars. A significant percentage of funding over the next twenty-five years will be dedicated to the preservation of the existing transportation infrastructure. This includes the routine maintenance and repair of bridges, pavement, traffic signals and traffic signs, and overall funding will go to projects outside of long range plan. Based upon the assumptions, the estimated preservation costs for the next twenty-five years total approximately **\$171.3 million in year 2025 dollars** as shown in **Table 9-4.2**. The estimated funding sources over the next twenty-five years are approximately **\$461.7 million in year 2025 dollars**, including transit and active transportation improvements. Under this funding scenario, there would be approximately **\$290.4 million** available for the implementation/construction of the transportation improvement projects identified in **Table 9-4.1**, which total just under **\$168.4 million**.

Federal Funding Sources: While the percent of federal funding for a project varies by category, the Federal government typically provides 80 percent of the funding, with 20 percent of the funding matched by ODOT or a local agency. Of the federal funding programs identified in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), the MPO has direct access to three. Although congress assigns Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funding to each MPO, ODOT sub-allocates a portion of the STBG, TA and CRP funding assigned to Ohio. Funding for all other categories is determined by ODOT (through a statewide ranking process), by the Federal government, or is not applicable to the MPO. The categories that the ERPC MPO has direct input and/or selection responsibility include the following.

Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG): This category is for transportation needs with urbanized areas with populations less than 200,000 and greater than 50,000. Funding is 80 percent Federal and 20 percent State and Local. Census population allocates funds and projects are selected by the MPO and ODOT.

Transportation Alternative (TA) Program: Ten percent of STBG funding is available for this category. Enhancements include bike and pedestrian facilities, preservation of historic site, scenic beautification and other transportation related projects. The MPO must submit a letter stating their support of the project, identifying funding, and attesting that the project is consistent with long-range transportation plans.

Carbon Reduction Program (CRP): New from IIJA in 2022, CRP funds are made available to the MPO's for the purpose of providing funds on projects that reduce transportation emissions. Enhancements can include traffic monitoring and management, public transportation projects, and transportation alternative projects. Typically, ERPC MPO rolls CRP funds into the TA funds solicitation in order to grow the overall funding available for the projects.

Additional Funding: Additional funding is available through the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) discretionary funding categories where USDOT solicits for applicants and selects projects based on a set of selection criteria. Within the short term expansion projects is the US 6 Connectivity Corridor,

receiving a Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) Grant in the amount of \$24.5 million.

State Funding Sources: State funding is administered by ODOT. Among the most common forms of funding are the following:

- **Motor Vehicle and Gas Tax (MVGT):** This tax is collected on each gallon of gas that is purchased. The State of Ohio levies a tax of 38.5 cents per gallon of gasoline. The tax is included in the selling price, so the user of the motor fuel ultimately pays the tax. The tax is collected by the Department of Taxation and distributed to local governments. To qualify for funding, municipalities must be incorporated. Municipalities receive their funding based on population. Counties receive their allotment based on total license fees in the county.
- **Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG):** The STBG is administered by the State of Ohio for the MPO. STBG money is sub-allotted to each MPO for use on many transportation projects. Ten percent of all STBG funds must be used for safety projects. These funds can be used for rail crossing improvements, signals, and other accident-reducing methods of transportation improvement.
- **Economic Development Funds:** Economic Development funds may be used for transportation projects if the new or improved facility will attract or create jobs. This program can be used for industrial, commercial and recreational projects if the project is necessary.
- **Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRRP):** HBRRP Funds are provided to replace or rehabilitate structurally deficient bridges on or off the system for the safe and expeditious transportation of the general public. The funds are allotted to districts based on a formula involving square footage of eligible bridges. Ohio distributes BR funds through the Municipal Bridge, Major Bridge, County Bridge, and Ohio Bridge Partnership programs.
- **Ferry Boat Program (FBP):** FHWA makes available formula funding to ODOT for the Ferry Boat Program for designing and constructing ferry boats and for designing, acquiring right-of-way, constructing ferry terminal facilities and other eligible activities. Currently, Put-in-Bay Boatline Company (AKA Jet express) is the only eligible entity in Ohio and have previously used the funds.

Local Funding Sources: The basis of local funding of transportation projects in the local municipalities and counties is primarily through Federal and State allocations and block grants. Additional revenues come from property taxes, sales taxes, special assessments, and special tax districts. General funds for the roadway maintenance may be obligated from the general property tax proceeds for transportation purposes. While this represents a funding source, the trend in local government is to use general fund

property tax proceeds for operation and maintenance of general government. Additional funding includes:

- **Bonds:** Transportation projects may be financed utilizing bonded indebtedness. This method allows a unit of government to raise capital through the sale of public bonds to be repaid with interest by either general property tax receipts, motor fuel tax, or revenue from the project upon completion.
- **Tax Increment Financing (TIF):** The TIF technique captures all increases in property tax resulting from improvements to a property until such time as allowable project expenses have been paid. Proposed improvements and planned expenditures are defined in a plan and must meet eligibility requirements under the enabling legislation. City government defines district and program in consultation with units of local government impacted by the proposed district.
- **Capital Improvement Program (CIP):** Funding for near-term (one to five years) transportation projects are identified in the State's multi-year program also known as Issue 2, municipalities' Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and both Erie County and Ottawa County's CIP. Estimates of near-term transportation funding are based on appropriated levels of federal funding, cash flows of state funding sources, and city and county bonding programs and general revenue sources.

Private Sector Funding Sources: As a community grows, vacant land or farmland is often converted to urban uses. As part of that growth, land developers may pay the cost of infrastructure development including streets. Particularly as it relates to commercial development and industrial development, developers may potentially pay a large share of arterial and collector street widening, enhancement, or rehabilitation. The continued enforcement and management of growth through subdivision code administration minimizes the cost to the community. When developing major roadways, units of local government may negotiate with private interests to share in the development costs of arterial or collector streets that provide direct benefit to private interests. The amount of money available using this technique is limited only by the degree of commitment from the private sector and the willingness of the private sector to share in those costs. Impact or entertainment fees are costs assigned to new development of the maintenance of existing facilities. Developers pay these fees with costs generally passed on to the eventual owners of the property.

Funding/Implementation: As part of metropolitan planning organization regulations, the recommended long range transportation plan must be financially constrained. The capital cost estimate in dollars for each transportation improvement and the schedule for implementation of those projects are summarized in **Tables 9-4.1 through 9-4.4**, with additional analysis in the appendix. Overall, the amount of dollars that will be available to fund the planning, design, and construction of the recommended transportation plan projects can be divided into two types of funds: Roadway/Non-Motorized project improvement funds and Transit project improvement funds.

Roadway/Non-Motorized project Improvement Funding: Several types of funding are available including:

- **MPO funds:** Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Transportation Alternative (TA), and Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) are available
- **Other Funds:** Transportation Review Advisory Council (TRAC), ODOT District 2 and District 3, County CSTP, County Bridge, City Bridge, and Safety

Based on the available information for existing and future funding of transportation projects the following dollars will be available:

- In the **Year 2026, \$18,014,689** is potentially available for roadway/non-motorized improvements
- In the **Year 2050, \$19,151,949** is potentially available for roadway/non-motorized improvements

Transit Project Improvement Funding: Funding for transit project improvements are available through the Federal Transit Agency and are distributed by the Ohio Department of Transportation (operating costs excluded):

- In the **Year 2026, \$414,358** is available for transit maintenance costs.
- In the **Year 2050**, the current amount is forecasted to increase by 2% per year to **\$673,002**.