



PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARY

Project Name: ERI-6 Phase 2 Corridor Planning Study

Meeting Date: December 4, 2025

Meeting Format: In-Person; Open House

End of Comment Period: January 9, 2026

Public Meeting Attendees: 44

Comments Submission Method:

- At Meeting: 19
- Phone: 2
- Email: 3
- Mail: 1

Major Comment Themes:

- Feedback was received on the recommended alternative of a shared use path on the south side of US 6 and a road diet on the 4-lane section near Vermilion.
- Most respondents were supportive of a shared use path in the area and many supported the recommendation for the south side.
- Many respondents were also supportive of the road diet near Vermilion.
- Some respondents shared concerns with additional impacts, including those to businesses, with maintenance, and with safety at crossings.

Public Officials in Attendance:

- Kevin Cannon, ERPC
- Tim King, ERPC

Consultant Team in Attendance:

- Al Biehl, TranSystems/GFT
- Aaron Grilliot, TranSystems/GFT

- Frank Konopka, TranSystems/GFT
- Russ Critelli, OHM

Meeting Notifications

Type of Notification	Publication Date	Publication Location
Invitations	11/13/2025 11/17/2025	Post Card mailing to public Email to Stakeholders
Press release	11/25/2025	ERPC email to local media
Publicly-available documents	12/8/2025	Materials posted to ERPC website

Meeting Details

A public meeting for the ERI-6 Phase 2 Corridor Planning Study was held on Thursday, December 4, 2025, at the Ritter Public Library (5680 Liberty Avenue, Vermilion, OH 44089) in Meeting Room A. The meeting was an open house format scheduled from 4:00 to 7:00 PM; no formal presentation was given so attendees were able to attend anytime during the open house. Meeting materials included: a project fact sheet and comment form; and display boards showing proposed typical sections for 2-lane and 4-lane segment alternatives and design alternatives for pedestrian crossings and bridge crossings. A computer was also set up where attendees could look at planning-level linework of the shared use path alternatives to see more details of the alignments. Members of the project team were available to discuss study area concerns from attendees at the open house.

Meeting Summary

Meeting Materials

The following materials were provided at the meeting.

- Sign-In Sheets
- Project Fact Sheet
- Comment Form
- Display Boards
 1. 2-lane Typical Section Alternatives
 2. 4-lane Typical Section Alternatives
 3. Pedestrian Crossing Alternative
 4. Bridge Crossing Alternatives
- Computer w/planning-level shared use path alignments

Summary of Comments Received & Responses Provided

Attendees were given the opportunity to share their comments on the alternatives for the project with the recommended alternative of a shared use path on the south side of US 6 (separated by a grass median) and a road diet from west of Colonial Court to Decatur Street in Vermilion. Comments were accepted at the meeting and throughout the 30-day comment period following the meeting via mail, email, and phone. Materials from the meeting were posted to ERPC's website following the meeting.

The majority of respondents were supportive of the shared use path following the southern alignment, the road diet on the 4-lane section near Vermilion, or completing both components of the project. Many of those supportive of the project felt that it will provide safer travel accommodations for all road users. Less than half of respondents didn't support one component of the project or the project as a whole, with many of these respondents saying the project wasn't needed. Concerns that were raised in comments, both supportive and not, were related to maintenance of the roadway and the path, especially when it snows, accommodating agricultural equipment using the roadway, impacts to residential properties as well as businesses in the area, project funding, and general questions about pedestrian visibility. Consideration of a connection to Sherod Park was mentioned by multiple respondents.

Following the meeting, the Project Team also met with representatives from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR), who were unable to attend the public meeting. ODNR was interested in the project and potential future connections through the project area and to their property; they noted that there are trails on their property that aren't currently used by the public, but they could be if there was a safe connection from the surrounding area. They also stated that they would be willing to help with environmental stewardship related to the project, and can help with outreach to the local community.

Conclusion

This meeting and public comment period resulted in 25 public comments, along with holding discussions with ODNR. Feedback was received on the recommended preferred alternative for the project. Comments received were primarily supportive of the project although some people were opposed to one component of the project or the project as a whole.