TRANSPORTATION
Mode Share

Mode share is the percentage of employees that commute via different modes of transportation. In Orange Township, over 90% of commuters travel in cars alone. This is the most inefficient, albeit independent, mode of transportation in terms of use of space and efficiency.

Mode Share Ranking
1. Drive Alone
2. Carpool
3. Walk
4. Public Transportation
5. Cycling

Job Locations

Identifying where residents in the Township work is essential for implementing traffic reduction strategies on routes leading to and from work destinations. The table below shows the top five employment municipalities for Orange Township workers; these areas serve as a daily destination for almost 9,500 residents.

Work Destinations for Orange Township Workers
1. Columbus (47.9%)
2. Westerville (5.5%)
3. Dublin (5.1%)
4. Worthington (2.7%)
5. Delaware City (2.1%)

Thoroughfares

Above is a map of Orange Township’s major thoroughfares.

Freeways: I-71
Major Arterials: Home Road | US-23 | Powell Road | Polaris Parkway | Lewis Center Road | Big Walnut Road
Minor Arterials: South Old State Road | Africa Road | Gemini Place | Sancus Boulevard | Worthington Road
Major Collectors: East Orange Road | East Powell Road | Shanahan Road | Bale Kenyon Road | Lewis Center Road | East Powell Road
Public Transportation

Public transportation is an essential component for public services. Orange Township is served by the Delaware Area Transit Authority (DATA). DATA services a fixed route that runs on US-23 between the City of Delaware and the Crosswoods COTA Park and Ride near Worthington. The Authority also provides on-demand service.

Missed Opportunities

The development pattern of residential neighborhoods has created a series of developments that do not connect, forcing more traffic onto major thoroughfares. These missed connections have been highlighted on the map.

Bike and Pedestrian Infrastructure

Bike and pedestrian infrastructure is fragmented across the Township, with pedestrian and cyclist paths not covering residential developments in their entirety or connecting to the overall network in Orange Township.
Public Meeting 9/12/17: SWOT Analysis

Strengths
There were unfortunately no strengths discussed by the community in terms of transportation in the Township.

Weaknesses
The main weaknesses documented by the public involved a lack of walkability and pedestrian connectivity, traffic congestion (especially on US-23), delays at railroad crossings, a lack of public and mass transit, and noise and air quality issues associated with traffic.

Opportunities
Residents of the Township decided that opportunities for growth include improving connectivity, reducing at-grade railroad crossings, collaborating with Metro Planning Organizations and public transportation authorities.

Threats
Participants were mostly concerned about conventional growth increasing traffic and its associated negative effects.

Public Meeting 10/5/17: Poster Presentations

Feedback on the goals and strategies for improving transportation in Orange Township was diverse and overwhelmingly positive. The strategies that received the most positive comments included removing barriers, like at-grade railroad crossings and isolated neighborhoods, and creating safer environments for pedestrians and cyclists. The dots below represent votes on strategies, with green being a vote for the strategy and red being a vote against the strategy.

Goal: Reduce Traffic Congestion and Improve Connectivity
- Public Transportation
- Carpooling
- Walking
- Biking
- Remove Railroad Crossings
- More Connected Street Grid
- Alternative Intersection Design
- Divert Local Traffic from Thoroughfares

Goal: Increase Bike-Ped Access
- Encourage Installation of Multi-Use Paths
- Push for Complete Streets Policy
- Increase On-Road Bike Infrastructure
- Encourage Smaller Block Sizes
- Bike Education Courses

Refer to Appendix C.1 for 9/12/17 Meeting Results
Refer to Appendix C.2 for 10/5/17 Meeting Results
Online Survey Results

Interest in transportation as a township issue was also well documented in the public survey that was conducted. The graph above is a representation of the First, Second, Third, and Fourth Areas of Interest for those that participated in the survey; each area is then arranged inside the ranking by most votes. The transportation line (in light orange) shows it was in the top three concerns for nearly all respondents.
Goal T-1: Encourage More Enhanced Street Design in New Developments

Framing the street and using alternative traffic calming measures can inspire a more attractive neighborhood design. This would increase traffic flow, pedestrian safety, and property values. Street framing can include using street trees, furniture, or reducing building setbacks.

Strategy T-1.1: Consider design principles that encourage better street design through building form, landscaping, and other characteristics, especially in commercial areas.

Strategy T-1.2: Explore using alternative intersection designs to increase traffic flow.

Responsible Parties: Delaware County Engineering and Orange Township Zoning & Roads staff.

Goal T-2: Increase Connectivity Inside the Township

Increasing connectivity is a goal that was widely advocated for in multiple public input meetings by citizens. The strategies listed below will address increasing regional connections, commercial access and traffic reduction, and more connectivity in residential neighborhoods. Where vehicular connections cannot be made, pedestrian connections should be pursued.

Strategy T-2.1: Support new regional connection with the future I-71 and Big Walnut Interchange.

Strategy T-2.2: Continue to reduce curbcuts on US-23 and encourage cross-access between private developments.

Strategy T-2.3: Reduce dead-ends and increase connections between neighborhoods by considering new developments to access existing developments.

Responsible Parties: Ohio Department of Transportation, Delaware County Commissioners, Delaware County Engineer, and Orange Township Zoning and Maintenance staff and boards.
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