BURGESS & NIPLE

To: Kevin Rust, PE
Project Manager, KYTC District 6

From: Herb Mack, PE
Project Manager, Burgess & Niple, Ltd.

Date: May 13, 2003

Subject: Feasibility and Constructability Study for the Replacement/Rehabilitation of Brent Spence Bridge
BSMT Meeting No.1 Minutes

Project Memorandum

Burgess & Niple, Limited
220 Lexington Green Circle
Suite 110
Lexington, KY 40503
859 273.0557
Fax 859 273.3332

The Bi-State Management Team (BSMT) kickoff meeting for the Feasibility and Constructability Study for the Replacement/Rehabilitation of Brent Spence Bridge was held at the B&N Cincinnati offices on May 12, 2003. Attendees included:

Name	Organization	Phone/Email
Kevin Rust	KYTC	859-341-2700 kevin.rust@mail.state.ky.us
Mike Bezold	KYTC	859-341-2700 mike.bezold@mail.state.ky.us
Barry House	KYTC	502-695-4070 Barry.House@mail.state.ky.us
Brad Eldridge	KYTC	502-564-3280 Brad.Eldridge@mail.state.ky.us
Stefan Spinosa	ODOT, District 8	513-933-6639 Stefan.Spinosa@dot.state.oh.us
Diana Martin	ODOT, District 8	513-933-6597 diana.martin@dot.state.oh.us
Dirk Gross	ODOT Central Office	614-752-5576 dirk.gross@dot.state.oh.us
Larry Sutherland	ODOT Central Office	614-644-1203 LSutherl@dot.state.oh.us
Richard Crane	FHWA, Kentucky	502-223-6763 richard.crane@fhwa.dot.gov
Michael Loyselle	FHWA, Kentucky	502-223-6734 michael.loselle@fhwa.dot.gov
Herb Mack	Burgess & Niple	614-459-2050 hmack@burnip.com
Henry Osman	Burgess & Niple	857-273-0557 hosman@burnip.com
Jim Garrison	Burgess & Niple	614-459-2050 jgarrison@burnip.com

Name	Organization	Phone/Email
Richard Sutherland	American	859-233-2100 RSutherland@ace-plc.com
Steve Cecil	Parsons	317-569-3670 Steven.Cecil@parsons.com
Bryan Moser	Global Project Design	859-392-2653 Bryan@gpdesign.com

Highlights of the Bi-State Management Team kickoff meeting, by agenda item, where as follows:

I. Welcome/Introductions

- Sign in (as shown above)

II. Review Study Status

- Study area map distributed (attached)
- Draft problem statement passed out with key questions to be answered
- Initial Comments on Draft Problem Statement
    - Original shoulder widths were not wide enough to accommodate disabled vehicles
    - Solutions and corridor usages should be compatible (e.g. NAFTA vs. truck diversion)
- Comments to be provided back in a week to Kevin Rust

III. Vision and Goals

- Vision: Reviewed the Vision from the Pre-Design Conference held July 16, 2002
    - Success to Kentucky – Approach/implementation strategy with cost for feasible alternative on how to replace and/or fix Brent Spence Bridge
    - Success to Ohio – Good preliminary engineering document with action items regarding when to plan work
- Goal:
    - Complete by Christmas 2005
    - Answer the following questions:
        - Is it feasible to replace the Brent Spence Bridge at or near its existing location?
        - Can the existing Brent Spence Bridge be rehabilitated to provide additional service life and/or capacity?
        - How could traffic be maintained while the I-71/I-75 Brent Spence Bridge is being replaced or rehabilitated?
        - What are the limits of the approach work under various replacement/rehabilitation scenarios?
        - What are the costs of the various rehabilitation or replacement scenarios and the associated approach work?

        - Are there any environmental "fatal flaws" that would preclude certain options from advancing?
        - Type, size, location and costs of recommended alternative?
        - When does the bridge need to be replaced?
        - What controls action timeline: fatigue or capacity?
        - How are fatal flaws defined?
    - Seek options with an avoidance mind-set
    - Minimize approach work

IV. Study Process, Schedule, and Scope

- Scope of Services Exhibit passed out (attached)
- ODOT: Contact with Resource Agencies in Ohio will be made through OES
- Consultant Team discussed deliverable (e.g. applying limited dollars primarily to engineering efforts; concepts will be shown on aerial exhibits; roll plan format; final document - plan views with narratives, with backup and qualifiers; main span bridge limited primarily to geometry/clearance studies, aesthetics not included)
- Document discussion of why (and why not) certain alternatives taken forward for further study is important for next steps in NEPA

V. Advisory Committee

- AC members will have "technical role" and be resources for input
- Meetings will be informational, giving them an opportunity to comment on materials
- All communication with AC will go through Kevin Rust
- First meeting with AC is tentatively targeted for the end of June. BSMT representatives will contact initial list of committee members to confirm their willingness to participate

VI. Other Business

- All media communication will go through Sam Beverage
- A press release will be developed to advise the public what the current study would accomplish and what it would not include
- For future AC meetings: BSMT meeting in a.m. and AC in p.m. on the same day
- Fatigue Study: Appears money will be forthcoming

<u>Miscellaneous Notes:</u>

- Congressional delegation in Washington very interested in project; Washington FHWA is engaged in project
- NSTI completion date extended, due in September
    - ODOT asked for more information regarding what it will take to get to specific level of service
    - Information on truck-ban option could be used in this study

- "Prudent" and "feasible" will be important parameters/definitions in the evaluation of concepts
- Environmental: avoidance first, minimize next
- We should explore with the City of Cincinnati their interest in addressing access to US 50
- Previously, Covington wanted to maintain all existing access; confirm early
- ODOT will be studying I-75/I-74 and Hoppel St. interchange area soon. Projects will need to be coordinated.

Immediate Action Items:

- B&N to send electronic copy of problem statement out to attendees
- All: Send edits/suggestions on Draft Problem Statement to Kevin Rust
- KYTC District 6: Check in with John Carr regarding fatigue study
- B&N: To draft a press release

Action Items:

- B&N or KYTC District 6: Send ODOT copy of fatigue scope
- B&N to send to ODOT: Initial list of resource agencies to contact with draft letter
- B&N: Draft Performance Measures/Parameters for review and comment
- B&N: Obtain copy of ODOT's Reebie truck data from Central Office
- ODOT District 8: To call potential AC members to confirm their interest in participating

BURGESS & NIPLE

To: Sam Beverage
KYTC D-6
Chief District Engineer

From: Herb Mack, PE
Project Manager, Burgess & Niple

Date: Wednesday, July 9, 2003

Subject: Brent Spence Bridge
Feasibility and Constructability
BSMT and Advisory
Committee Meeting

Project Memorandum

Burgess & Niple, Limited
220 Lexington Green Circle
Suite 110
Lexington, KY 40503
859 273.0557
Fax 859 273.3332

See Attendance List attached.

Notes from the meetings are as follows:

I. Welcome/Team Introductions - Sam Beverage, Chief District Engineer, KYTC District 6
- Opened the meeting and addressed the following items:
  - Introductions (attendance sheet attached)
  - Explained items that led to this initial meeting
  - Reviewed study budget limitations
  - Discussed purpose of assembling the committee
  - Reported on status of the transportation authorization bill

II. Study Process and Schedule – Herb Mack, B&N Team Project Manager
- Presented process (handout provided)
  - Study process
  - Project limits
  - Limited Anderson Ferry and Truck Diversion Elements

III. Draft Problem Statement – Herb Mack
- Reviewed initial list of factors to be contained in Problem Statement
- Provided a draft at the end of the meeting for review and comment

IV. General Discussion of Bridge Alternatives – Herb Mack
- Presented the preliminary range of alternatives (handout provided)

Notes of Advisory Committee (AC) Input/Questions to BSMT
- Procedural
  - Products will be public.
  - At least two-week advance notice will be given for meetings.
  - AC will not be requested to vote but rather a sense of consensus will be sought.

- AC would like to be informed how their input will be given consideration.
  - General Group Comments
- A number of people in the room have been involved in previous studies (e.g., Anderson Ferry, Brent Spence Bridge, Truck Diversion) and have information/knowledge that could be helpful to BSMT. Consideration should be given to assembling this group.
- Consideration of routing I-71 traffic to I-471 is not part of this study. OKI will be looking at moving I-71 to I-471 sometime in the future.
- Truck Diversion Study
  - A number of the Committee members had significant concerns about the controversy created by the two previous truck diversion initiatives. The most recent during OKI's NSTI. OKI staff made a presentation to the Board of Trustees identifying the size and complexity of the issue.
  - The slide show regarding what a complete truck diversion would entail can be obtained through Diana Martin, at ODOT D8 office.
  - It was offered by a number of members that the truck diversion study not be performed. Also, possibly change name to Truck Impact Analysis to show that its only function is related to the fatigue analysis.
- Developing a recommended bridge type (e.g. truss, cable-stay) is not part of this study.

- Specific Interests:
  - City of Covington: Maintenance of traffic (MOT); relocation of private concerns; new access from Interstate; coordination with the Corps of Engineers study along riverfront; aesthetics; community sensitivity to each side of the river
  - Southbank: Kenton County and other development initiatives; regional contexts; safety; commerce
  - Kenton County: same as Southbank's; corridor level impacts need consideration
  - City of Cincinnati: asked for consideration of being included as part of BSMT; the adjacent communities; secondary road system; improving driver's way-finding; funding; simplify ramps; reducing foot print size of Interstate; aesthetics
  - Hamilton County: connectivity of corridor; public acceptance
  - Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce: region's competitive position as it relates to the transportation infrastructure
  - Cinergy Corporation: impact on other infrastructure; reliability and maintenance of electrical service to area
  - ODOT CO: controlling foot print of approach roadways
  - Cincinnati/Northern KY International Airport: balancing aesthetics and cost; utilize past studies as much as possible

- DHL Worldwide Express: visual safety at night; delays both existing and during construction; capacity/traffic flow

- Closing Comments
  - Handed out Draft Problem Statement and a comment sheet for AC members.

DRAFT

BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE STUDY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE & BSMT
MEETING NOTES
Wednesday, July 9, 2003
10:00 a.m.
Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce Headquarters
300 Buttermilk Pike
Fort Mitchell, Kentucky

I. Welcome/Team Introductions - Sam Beverage, Chief District Engineer, KYTC District 6

- Opened the meeting and addressed the following items:
  - Introductions (attendance sheet attached)
  - Explained items that led to this initial meeting
  - Reviewed study budget limitations
  - Discussed purpose of assembling the committee
  - Reported on status of the transportation authorization bill

II. Study Process and Schedule – Herb Mack, B&N Team Project Manager

- Presented process (handout provided)
  - Study process
  - Project limits
  - Limited Anderson Ferry and Truck Diversion Elements

III. Draft Problem Statement – Herb Mack

- Reviewed initial list of factors to be contained in Problem Statement
- Provided a draft at the end of the meeting for review and comment

IV. General Discussion of Bridge Alternatives – Herb Mack

- Presented the preliminary range of alternatives (handout provided)

V. Notes of Advisory Committee (AC) Input/Questions to BSMT

- Procedural
  - Products will be public.
  - At least two-week advance notice will be given for meetings.
  - AC will not be requested to vote but rather a sense of consensus will be sought.
  - AC would like to be informed how their input will be given consideration.
- General Group Comments
  - A number of people in the room have been involved in previous studies (e.g., Anderson Ferry, Brent Spence Bridge, Truck Diversion) and have information/knowledge that could be helpful to BSMT. Consideration should be given to assembling this group.
  - Consideration of routing I-71 traffic to I-471 is not part of this study. OKI will be looking at moving I-71 to I-471 sometime in the future.
  - Truck Diversion Study
    - A number of the Committee members had significant concerns about the controversy created by the two previous truck diversion initiatives. The most recent during OKI's

NSTI. OKI staff made a presentation to the Board of Trustees identifying the size and complexity of the issue.
        - The slide show regarding what a complete truck diversion would entail can be obtained through Diana Martin, at ODOT D8 office.
        - It was offered by a number of members that the truck diversion study not be performed. Also, possibly change name to Truck Impact Analysis to show that its only function is related to the fatigue analysis.
    - Developing a recommended bridge type (e.g. truss, cable-stay) is not part of this study.

- Specific Interests:
    - City of Covington: Maintenance of traffic (MOT); relocation of private concerns; new access from Interstate; coordination with the Corps of Engineers study along riverfront; aesthetics; community sensitivity to each side of the river
    - Southbank: Kenton County and other development initiatives; regional contexts; safety; commerce
    - Kenton County: same as Southbank's; corridor level impacts need consideration
    - City of Cincinnati: asked for consideration of being included as part of BSMT; the adjacent communities; secondary road system; improving driver's way-finding; funding; simplify ramps; reducing foot print size of Interstate; aesthetics
    - Hamilton County: connectivity of corridor; public acceptance
    - Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce: region's competitive position as it relates to the transportation infrastructure
    - Cinergy Corporation: impact on other infrastructure; reliability and maintenance of electrical service to area
    - ODOT CO: controlling foot print of approach roadways
    - Cincinnati/Northern KY International Airport: balancing aesthetics and cost; utilize past studies as much as possible
    - DHL Worldwide Express: visual safety at night; delays both existing and during construction; capacity/traffic flow

VI. Closing Comments

- Handed out Draft Problem Statement and a comment sheet for AC members.

BSB Advisory Committee/BSMT Initial Meeting Attendees
July 9, 2003

NAME	PHONE	REPRESENTING	EMAIL
		Bi-State Management Team	
Barry House	502-695-4070	KYTC Central Office Multimodal Programs	barry.house@mail.state.ky.us
Brad Eldridge	502-564-3280	KYTC Central Office Design	brad.eldridge@mail.state.ky.us
Kevin Rust	859-341-2707	KYTC D-6 Project Manager	kevin.rust@mail.state.ky.us
Sam Beverage	859-341-2700	KYTC D-6 Chief District Engineer	sam.beverage@mail.state.ky.us
Mike Bezold	859-341-2700	KYTC D-6 Planning	mike.bezold@mail.state.ky.us
Sharon Laycock	859-341-2707	KYTC D-6 Environmental Coordinator	sharon.laycock@mail.state.ky.us
Larry Sutherland	614-644-1203	ODOT – Central Office Deputy Director, Roadway Engineering	lsutherland@dot.state.oh.us
Diana Martin	513-933-6597	ODOT – D8 Planning Administrator	diana.martin@dot.state.oh.us
Stefan Spinosa	513-933-6639	ODOT – D8 Structures Planning Engineer	stefan.spinosa@dot.state.oh.us
Michael M. Loyselle	502-223-6734	FHWA/KY	Michael.Loyselle@fhwa.dot.gov
Herb Mack	614-459-2050	Burgess & Niple	hmack@burnip.com
Mark Willis	859-273-0557	Burgess & Niple	mwillis@burnip.com
Jim Garrison	614-459-2050	Burgess & Niple	jgarrison@burnip.com
Richard Sutherland	859-233-2100	American Consulting Engineers	Sutherland@ace-plc.com
Steve Cecil	317-569-3670	Parsons	steven.cecil@parson.com
J. Paul Silvestri	707-257-8994	National Constructors Group	jpaul.silvestri@lycos.com
		Advisory Committee	
Jim Duane	513-621-6300	OKI	JDuane@OKI.org
Gary Toebben	859-578-6380	NKY Chamber of Commerce	gtoebben@nkychamber.com
Steve Stevens	859-578-6386	NKY Chamber of Commerce	sstevens@nkychamber.com
Nick Vehr	513-579-3143	GC Chamber of Commerce	nvehr@gccc.com
Dick Murgatroyd	859-392-1400	Kenton County	dick.murgatroyd@kentoncounty.org
Ted Hubbard	513-946-8903	Hamilton County Engineer's Office	Ted.Hubbard@Hamilton-Co.org
Eileen Enabnit	513-352-6232	City of Cincinnati	eileen.enabnit@cincinnati-oh.gov
Joe Vogel	513-352-1523	City of Cincinnati DOT&E	joe.vogel@cincinnati-oh.gov
Steve Niemeier	513-352-3738	City of Cincinnati DOT&E	steve.niemeier@cincinnati-oh.gov
Bernie Moorman	859-431-2118	City of Covington	amosshinkle@yahoo.com
Terry W. Hughes	859-292-2112	City of Covington	terryhug@city-ofcovington.com
Greg Jarvis	859-292-2134	City of Covington	gjarvis@city-ofcovington.com
Bill Martin	859-767-3166	Cincinnati/N KY Int. Airport	bmartin@cvgairport.com
Russ Campbell	513-287-3696	Cinergy Corporation	rcampbell@cinergy.com
Steve White	859-283-2232	DHL Worldwide Express	Steve.White@DHL.com
Wally Pagan	859-655-7700	Southbank (River Cities)	WJPagan@aol.com
		Guests	
Bryan Moser	869-392-2653	Global Project Design	Bryan@gpdesign.com
James Pilcher	513-768-8374	Cincinnati Enquirer	jpilcher@enquirer.com

BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE STUDY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE & BSMT MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, July 9, 2003
10:00 a.m.
Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce Headquarters
300 Buttermilk Pike
Fort Mitchell, Kentucky

I. Welcome/Team Introductions

II. Study Process and Schedule

III. Draft Problem Statement

IV. General Discussion of Bridge Alternatives

V. Open Discussion – Round Table

VI. Closing Comments

BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE STUDY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE & BSMT MEETING
COMMENTS

Please return comments to:

Mr. Kevin Rust, Project Manager
KYTC District 6
421 Buttermilk Pike
P.O. Box 17130
Covington, KY 41017-0130

Email: kevin.rust@mail.state.ky.us

Brent Spence Bridge Team Meeting
Wednesday, December 10, 2003
Montgomery Inn Boathouse
Cincinnati, Ohio

Agenda

- **Welcome & Introductions**
- **Process to be followed**
- **Mission of Workshop**
  - **Determine 6 "Best" Alternatives to carry forward**
- **Information Phase**
- **Development of Parameters**
  - **Criteria used to filter alternatives to 6 "Best"**
- **Alternatives Considered in 1998 Scoping Study**
- **Brainstorming for New/Additional Alternatives**
- **Judgment Phase**
  - **Advantages/Disadvantages**
- **Results/Closing**
  - **Guidance/Concerns/Items of Interest**

Brent Spence Bridge Team Meeting
Wednesday, December 10, 2003

Name	Organization	Office Phone Number	Cell Phone	E-mail
David Kratt	KYTC C.O.	502-564-3388	502-330-4656	David.Kratt@ky.gov
John Eckler	KYTC – D-6	859-341-2700	859-750-4132	John.Eckler@mail.state.ky.us
Kevin Rust	KYRC – D-6	859-341-2700		Kevin.Rust@mail.state.ky.us
Mike Bezold	KYTC D-6	859-341-2700		Mike.Bezold@mail.state.ky.us
Larry Sutherland	ODOT C.O.	614-644-1203		LSutherl@dot.stater.oh.us
Stefan Spinosa	ODOT D-8	513-933-6639	513-218-0163	stefan.spinosa@dot.state.oh.us
Diana Martin	ODOT D-8	513-933-6597		Diana.Martin@dot.state.oh.us
Richard Crane	FHWA – KY	502-223-6763		richard.crane@fhwa.dot.gov
Michael M. Loyselle	FHWA – KY	502-223-6734		michael.loyselle@fhwa.dot.gov
Matt Shamis	FHWA – OH	614-280-6847		Matt.Shamis@fhwa.dot.gov
Jim Garrison	Burgess & Niple	614-459-2050	614-832-4340	jgarrison@burnip.com
Herb Mack	Burgess & Niple	614-459-2050	614-203-1235	hmack@burnip.com
Mark Willis	Burgess & Niple	859-273-0557		mwillis@burnip.com
Jon Brunot	Burgess & Niple	513-579-0042		jbrunot@burnip.com
Henry Osman	Burgess & Niple	859-273-0557		hosman@burnip.com
Richard Sutherland	American Consulting Eng.	859-233-2100		Sutherland@ace-plc.com
Glenn Hardin	American Consulting Eng.	859-233-2100	859-227-4461	hardin@ace.plc.com
Greg Sharp	American Consulting Eng.	859-233-2100		GSharp@ace.plc.com
J. Paul Silvestri	National Constructor’s Group	707-257-8994		Jpaul.silvestri@lycos.com
Gerry Fister	Third Rock Consultants	859-977-2000	859-619-1237	gfister@thirdrockconsultants.com
Carol Weed	Gray & Pape	513-287-7700	513-300-1520	cweed@graypape.com

Brent Spence Bridge Team Meeting
Wednesday, December 10, 2003

Meeting Notes

- Railroad under Brent Spence – 40 trains a day, Cincinnati side. Main route for CSX between the north (Chicago/Toledo) and south (Atlanta) and the coalfields; tri-weekly Amtrak to Washington, D.C.
- Cinergy – Substation
  - Feeds all Downtown and a large portion of Northern Kentucky
  - As much underground as on surface
  - 3 main transmission lines underground to Downtown
  - Relocation rumored to cost $200 million
  - Future; 345 KV addition possible
  - FHWA indicated that they may not be as concerned with going over power substation, however, gas lines could be a concern
- Cost Guard
  - Only have initial window, holding until possible locations developed
- Environmental
  - "No Fatal Flaws" from desktop survey
    - Several federal endangered mussels in the region. Study area width was 3000' total (1500' either side of I-75)
  - 37 HazMat sites documented within study area, one within the ROW limits
  - Some Superfund sites (KY definition)
  - 60 underground sites, near interchanges and industrial area
    - UST, un-documented sites expected to be found in future work
    - Substation could likely contain PCB's
  - Some parks in area
- Cultural/Historical Resources
  - Ohio
    - National Historic Register – Buildings listed on register
      A. Union Terminal – significant building both inside and out
      B. B&O Freight Terminal – "Longworth Hall" Inside is recently renovated. Floors and ceiling integrity remain. Only freight terminal of its nature remaining in country. When I-75 originally built, 135' of building was taken. However, it was not on the Historical Register at that time.
    - Feeling is that Cincinnati Preservation Association will fight to preserve Longworth Hall (unmodified). Is in a preservation easement.
    - Going over Longworth may be better than taking or modifying it.
    - Longworth:
      - If purpose and need are strong and there is no other feasible alternative then it could be taken.
      - Other existing buildings (other than terminal) not as significant
      - Any historic building or historic district impacted will add to timeline
    - 4 archaeological sites in Ohio

        - Expecting some archaeological sites in Ohio
    - Remnants of Cincinnati & White Water Canal – "not a show stopper," mostly covered by railroad bed
- Kentucky
    - A number of historic districts in Covington; added after I-75 built
    - 900 buildings within area, individually listed
    - Big part of identity of Covington
    - 1 archaeological site in Kentucky
    - Unknown resources
    - Many potential archaeological sites in Kentucky (many disturbed)
    - All theoretically can be dealt with
    - Recommend not break boundaries of the districts
    - Issue of impacts to timeline – KYTC noted that 12th Street in Covington taking over 10 years and still not built

Discussion of parameters

A. Environmental Fatal Flaws
    - ? years to resolve disposition of Longworth
    - UST/HazMat will likely be issues

B. Maintenance of Traffic

C. Relative costs (Hi-Mod-Low)

D. Operations

E. Access to Cincinnati and Covington

F. Impacts on existing buildings

G. Utility impacts

I-71/75 MIS Concepts Discussed

- The three "best" as determined from the Scoping Study were displayed and discussed.

Range of Alternatives

Initially, the team identified 12 alternatives and/or combinations. The following characterizes the major elements of the various alternatives:

- Single deck structures
- Double deck structures

- Near existing bridge (west and/or east)
- Further downstream

- Separate bridges for I-75 and I-71
- I-75/I-71 on same bridge(s)

- Separate I-75 through traffic
- Maintain all present connections

- New bridge plus existing BSB (rehabilitate)
- New bridge plus replace on existing

After considerable discussion, the list of preliminary alternatives was reduced to the following groupings:

- Parallel structure to the east (two possible)
- Parallel structure to the west (two possible)
- Rehabilitate existing BSB (no-build)
- New bridge on existing alignment
- New I-75 downstream (with no local connections) with I-71 left on existing bridge
- New I-75/I-71 downstream with all connections retained

The exhibits at the end of this document represent only a visualization of these groupings, or concepts and are intended to encourage further discussion and to get a representative sample of feasible alternatives to carry forward into design development.

Further discussion ensued on the addition of more parameters

- Minimize design exceptions
- Eliminate left-hand exits
- Minimize weaves
- 5 through lanes with full shoulders

Outstanding Issues

- Confirm typical section once traffic is developed

Brent Spence Bridge Constructability Study
Preliminary Alternative Alignment
Advantage/Disadvantage
Assessment

Rehab + I-75 West

Advantages:

- Minimizes the number of new lanes required for a new bridge crossing and its approach structure 2X3 lanes*
- Fully utilizes the existing infrastructure, existing Brent Spence Bridge, approaches, and ramps to local access with minimal construction/rehab
- Allows for un-congested "thru traffic" directly to and through I-75
- Accommodates thru/truck traffic well on the more heavily traveled I-75 roadway*
- Dramatically reduces heavy traffic loading on the existing Brent Spence Bridge structure, allowing its continued use*
- It avoids major delay and cost generators such as Longworth Hall, maintenance of traffic problems and the Cinergy power plant
- This plan allows for redundancy of the I-75 crossing of the Ohio River

Disadvantages:

- It's skewed alignment requires a somewhat longer bridge across the Ohio River
- Approach roadways may have to be elevated along the entire alignment*
- Existing overpass structures on the Ohio end cause the alignment to terminate 1600+/- feet beyond the study limits at Ezzard Charles Drive
- The alignment will pass over several existing buildings
- The alignment "chases" the existing I-75 corridor, shadowing the existing roadway below
- The rehabilitation of the existing Bent Spence Bridge may not be cost effective nor aesthetically desirable*
- This alternative does not allow for full redundancy of the I-71 crossing of the Ohio River

New East + I-75 West

Advantages:

- Allows for un-congested "thru traffic" directly to and through I-75
- Accommodates thru/truck traffic well on the more heavily traveled I-75 roadway*
- Dramatically reduces heavy traffic loading on a new bridge dedicated to I-71 and local I-75 and downtown commuter traffic*
- It avoids major delay and cost generators such as Longworth Hall, some maintenance of traffic problems and the Cinergy power plant
- This plan allows for redundancy of the I-75 crossing of the Ohio River

All lane configurations and numbers of lanes are assumed and include appropriate 12 foot wide shoulders and barriers where warranted.
* indicates assumed advantages or disadvantages that will require verification by further study (traffic analysis or detailed geometric study).

- It provides for two new major river crossing structures, allowing for greater flexibility in accommodating future traffic volumes.
- This alternative allows for flexibility of the aesthetic treatment of the bridge crossing

Disadvantages:

- This alternative requires two new bridges, in stead of one
- The I-75 "by-Pass component of this plan is a skewed alignment requiring a somewhat longer bridge across the Ohio River
- Approach roadways from the bypass alignment may have to be elevated along the entire I-75 by-pass alignment*
- Existing overpass structures on the Ohio end cause the by-pass alignment to terminate 1600+/- feet beyond the study limits at Ezzard Charles Drive
- The bypass alignment will pass over several existing buildings, possibly causing their removal
- The by-pass alignment "chases" the existing I-75 corridor, shadowing the existing I-75 roadway below
- This alternative does not allow for full redundancy of the I-71 crossing of the Ohio River
- Maintenance of traffic associated with the Kentucky side construction of the new I-75/71 bridge will be difficult*

New West W/ New Interchange

Advantages:

- Allows for un-congested "thru traffic" directly to and through I-75 and to I-71 via Fort Washington Way
- Accommodates thru/truck traffic well on the more heavily traveled I-75 roadway*
- It avoids major delay and cost generators such as Longworth Hall, maintenance of traffic problems and the Cinergy power plant
- This alternative allows for flexibility of the aesthetic treatment of the bridge crossing

Disadvantages:

- This plan does not allow for redundancy of the I-75, nor the I-71 crossing of the Ohio River
- Causes the abandonment of existing infrastructure, existing Brent Spence Bridge, approaches, and ramps to local access
- It requires an extremely wide (approximately 150'), single elevation bridge*
- It requires the construction of a new major interchange to provide local access to downtown Cincinnati
- Maintenance of traffic during construction will be very difficult and problematic*
- It may require the re-construction/ widening of 6th Street and attendant local access roads
- It's skewed alignment requires a somewhat longer bridge across the Ohio River
- Approach roadways may have to be elevated along the entire alignment*

All lane configurations and numbers of lanes are assumed and include appropriate 12 foot wide shoulders and barriers where warranted.

* indicates assumed advantages or disadvantages that will require verification by further study (traffic analysis or detailed geometric study).

- Existing overpass structures on the Ohio end cause the alignment to terminate 1600+/- feet beyond the study limits at Ezzard Charles Drive
- The alignment will pass over several existing buildings

Single Bridge Replacement

Advantages:

- It's zero skew alignment requires a minimal bridge length across the Ohio River
- The alignment partially utilizes the existing bridge approaches, and ramps to local access with moderate levels of construction/rehab
- This alternative allows for flexibility of the aesthetic treatment of the bridge crossing

Disadvantages:

- It does not completely avoid major delay and cost generators such as Longworth Hall, maintenance of traffic problems and the Cinergy power plant
- This alternative does not allow for redundancy of the I-75 nor the I-71 crossing of the Ohio River
- It requires an extremely wide (approximately 150'), single elevation bridge*
- Maintenance of interstate traffic during construction may be difficult*
- The "at grade" widening of existing I-75 on the Ohio side may be problematic or not feasible*

Double Bridge Replacement

Advantages:

- It's zero skew alignment requires minimal bridge lengths across the Ohio River
- The alignment partially utilizes the existing bridge approaches, and ramps to local access with moderate levels of construction/rehab
- Allows for un-congested "thru traffic" directly to and through I-75*
- This alternative allows for flexibility of the aesthetic treatment of the bridge crossing

Disadvantages:

- Approach roadways on the Ohio side will have to be elevated along the entire alignment*
- Two new bridges are required
- Existing overpass structures on the Ohio end cause the alignment to terminate 1600+/- feet beyond the study limits at Ezzard Charles Drive
- The alignment "chases" the existing I-75 corridor, shadowing the existing roadway below
- This alternative does not allow for redundancy of the I-71 crossing of the Ohio River
- Removal of the Brent Spence Bridge may be more difficult
- Does not provide for local access from I-75 to Covington. Addition of this access may be possible but will be problematic at best*

All lane configurations and numbers of lanes are assumed and include appropriate 12 foot wide shoulders and barriers where warranted.

* indicates assumed advantages or disadvantages that will require verification by further study (traffic analysis or detailed geometric study).

Rehab + I-75/I-71 West

Advantages:

- Fully utilizes the existing infrastructure, existing Brent Spence Bridge, approaches, and ramps to local access with minimal construction/rehab
- Allows for un-congested “thru traffic” directly to I-71 via Fort Washington Way and I-75
- Accommodates thru/truck traffic well on the more heavily traveled I-75 roadway*
- Dramatically reduces heavy traffic loading on the existing Brent Spence Bridge structure, allowing its continued use*
- It avoids major delay and cost generators such as Longworth Hall, maintenance of traffic problems and the Cinergy power plant
- This plan allows for nearly complete redundancy of the both I-71 and I-75 crossing of the Ohio River

Disadvantages:

- It’s skewed alignment requires a somewhat longer bridge across the Ohio River
- Approach roadways attendant to the new bridge will have to be elevated along their entire alignments*
- It requires an extremely wide (approximately 150’), single elevation bridge*
- Existing overpass structures on the Ohio end cause the new I-75 alignment to terminate 1600+/- feet beyond the study limits at Ezzard Charles Drive
- The alignment will pass over several existing buildings
- The rehabilitation of the existing Bent Spence Bridge may not be cost effective nor astatically desirable*

All lane configurations and numbers of lanes are assumed and include appropriate 12 foot wide shoulders and barriers where warranted.

* indicates assumed advantages or disadvantages that will require verification by further study (traffic analysis or detailed geometric study).

BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE STUDY
BSMT & ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, January 28, 2004
1:30 p.m.
Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments
720 East Pete Rose Way, Suite 420
Cincinnati, OH 45202
Board Room

I. Welcome/Introductions

II. Study Status

III. Review Alternative Concepts

IV. Comments/Concerns

V. Adjourn

BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE STUDY
BSMT & ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, January 28, 2004
Attendance List

Name	Organization	Email
Mike Bezold	KYTC	mike.bezold@ky.gov
Barry House	KYTC	Barry.House@ky.gov
Brad Eldridge	KYTC	Brad.Eldridge@ky.gov
Katy Renfroe	KYTC	Katy.Renfroe@ky.gov
Mike Yeager	KYTC	Mike.Yeager@ky.gov
David Kratt	KYTC	David.Kratt@ky.gov
Sharon Laycock	KYTC Environmental	Sharon.Laycock@ky.gov
Stefan Spinosa	ODOT, District 8	Stefan.Spinosa@dot.state.oh.us
Diana Martin	ODOT, District 8	diana.martin@dot.state.oh.us
Larry Sutherland	ODOT Central Office	LSutherl@dot.state.oh.us
Dory Montazemi	OKI	dorym@oki.org
Bob Koehler	OKI	RKoehler@oki.org
Mark Policinski	OKI	mpolicinski@oki.org
Richard Crane	FHWA, Kentucky	richard.crane@fhwa.dot.gov
Michael Loyselle	FHWA, Kentucky	michael.loyselle@fhwa.dot.gov
Evan Wisniewski	FHWA Kentucky	evan.wisniewski@fhwa.dot.gov
Charles Meyers 420 Independence Station Rd. Independence, KY 41051	Kenton County Engineer's Office	CharlieMeyers@KentonCo.org
Herb Mack	Burgess & Niple	hmack@burnip.com
Henry Osman	Burgess & Niple	hosman@burnip.com
Mark Willis	Burgess & Niple	mwillis@burnip.com

Jim Garrison	Burgess & Niple	jgarrison@burnip.com
Jon Brunot	Burgess & Niple	jbrunot@burnip.com
Donald Horn	Burgess & Niple	dhorn@burnip.com
Richard Sutherland	American	RSutherland@ace-plc.com
Glenn Hardin	American	hardin@ace-plc.com
Steve Cecil	Parsons	Steven.Cecil@parsons.com
Jill Hoffman	Parsons	jill.hoffman@parsons.com
Bryan Moser	Global Project Design	Bryan@gpdesign.com
Wally Pagan	Southbank Partners	
Russ Campbell	Cinergy	rcampbell@cinergy.com
Terry Hughes	City of Covington	BOBISS@city-of-covington.com
Lee Flischel	Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce	
Eileen Enabnit	City of Cincinnati	Eileen.enabnit@cincinnati-oh.gov
Steve Niemeier	City of Cincinnati	Steve.niemeier@cincinnati-oh.gov
Joe Vogel	City of Cincinnati	Joe.vogel@cincinnati-oh.gov
James Pilcher	Cincinnati Enquirer	jpilcher@enquirer.com

BURGESS & NIPLE

To: Mike Bezold, PE
Project Manager KYTC District 6

From: Herb Mack
Project Manager, Burgess & Niple

Date: March 10, 2004

Subject: Meeting Notes for: Brent Spence Bridge Feasibility and Constructability Study
BSMT Meeting

Project Memorandum

Burgess & Niple, Limited
220 Lexington Green Circle
Suite 110
Lexington, KY 40503
859 273.0557
Fax 859 273.3332

See attached Attendance List;

I. General Notes:
- Meetings from here on will change from BSMT meetings to be open to all Advisory Committee members in addition to the BSMT agencies.

II. Proposed Schedule
- B&N reported that it has reviewed and revised the project schedule and sees no problem completing the project by November 15, 2004.
- NTP on schedule for fatigue study March 15th, with June 1 draft Fatigue Report due.

III. Discussion of Anderson Ferry Study
- An exhibit and a brief overview of Technical Memo was presented
- Copies of the Tech Memo were distributed
- Summary: concept didn't help divert enough trucks off BSB nor help meet the Problem Statement for the Study.

IV. Discussion of Truck Diversion Study
- Tech Memo handed out and brief discussion of its contents occurred.
- Summary: If trucks are removed from BSB, based on the model, the trucks just move to the next quickest route (e.g., Clay Wade Bailey); this will turn into an enforcement issue regarding where the community wants the trucks to divert to which specific routes.

V. Status Update:
- Status of the alternatives development was discussed.
  - Presentation of concepts
    - Some minor alignment adjustments have occurred to date.

        - Details of 5 alternative alignments are being developed.
    - Identification of property likely to be impacted has begun.
    - Rehab + I-75 West Concept (Alternate 1) development was discussed.
        - Notable elements:
        - Works well on Ohio side
        - Allows for some phase construction, regarding when BSB would need to be replaced
            - Will push work up the KY hill
            - When highway was constructed it was noted that hillside was sliding. Cost estimates will need to address this
            - Working on maintaining existing access
            - MOT looks relatively promising
            - Cross section and rehab decisions will come later in schedule
            - Need to explore life expectancy or rehab need of bridges on Ohio side to see if something should be considered in the strategy
    - New BSB East + I –75 West (Alternate 2)
        - Works well on Ohio side
        - Allows for some phase construction, regarding when BSB would need to be replaced
            - Will push work up the KY hill
            - When highway was constructed it was noted that hillside was sliding. Cost estimates will need to address this
            - Working on maintaining existing access
            - Cross section and rehab decisions are down the road
            - Need to explore life expectancy or rehab need of bridges on Ohio side to see if something should be considered in the strategy
    - Single Bridge (Alternate 4)
        - Concept has been moved east to miss Longworth Hall
        - Will require considerable retaining walls on KY side up the hill and OH side to meet 5 lane requirements
    - Double Bridge Replacement (Alternate 5)
        - All of the approach on the Ohio side is elevated
    - Rehab + I-75 /I-71 West (Alternate 6)
        - Adjusted in attempt to miss key structures
    - New West w/ New Interchange (Alternate 3)
        - High cost, takes a lot of property
        - Appears to be outside the scope of the problem statement
        - Have enough alternates that could meet the problem statement
        - States should agree and document the elimination of any alternative
    - Copies of the Conceptual Typical were distributed
- States okay to moving forward with CORSIM traffic model development on Alternates 1, 2, 4, 5 & 6.
- KYTC to send out notice to Advisory Committee regarding format and future meeting
- Target next meeting for May 12th at ODOT District 8 @ 10 am
    - B&N to provide agenda and handout mock-ups one week before the meeting
    - Meeting will focus on CORSIM traffic numbers, numbers of lanes required and level of service for each Alternative
    - Plan on walking all attendees through concepts again
    - KYTC will develop mechanism to share comments given to date

BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE STUDY
BSMT MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, March 10, 2004
KYTC District 6 Conference Room
421 Buttermilk Pike
Fort Mitchell, Kentucky

I. Proposed Schedule

- **The consultant team proposes that the initial 6 alternative concepts will be completed in time for the June 10, 2004 meeting and the final 3 alternatives and project documentation completed by November, 2004.**

II. Discussion of Anderson Ferry Study

III. Discussion of Truck Diversion Study

IV. Status Update/Discussion of Issues of the Alternatives Development

V. Other Business

BRENT SPENCE BRIDGE
REHAB/REPLACEMENT
CONSTRUCTABILITY/FEASABILITY STUDY
MARCH 10, 2004

Name	Agency	Email Address	Meeting Docs
Mike Bezold	KYTC	Mike.Bezold@ky.gov	
Sam Beverage	KYTC	Sam.Beverage@ky.gov	Yes
Mike Yeager	KYTC	Mike.Yeager@ky.gov	Yes
David Kratt	KYTC	David.Kratt@ky.gov	Yes
Nancy Wood	KYTC	Nancy.Wood@ky.gov	No
Diana Martin	ODOT	diana.martin@dot.state.oh.us	Yes
Richard Crane	FHWA	richard.crane@fhwa.dot.gov	Yes
Eileen Enabnit	City of Cincinnati	eileen.enabnit@cincinnati-oh.gov	Yes
Herb Mack	Burgess & Niple	hmack@burnip.com	
Mark Willis	Burgess & Niple	mwillis@burnip.com	No
Jim Garrison	Burgess & Niple	jgarrison@burnip.com	Yes
Henry Osman	Burgess & Niple	hosman@burnip.com	
Jamie Snow	Burgess & Niple	jsnow@burnip.com	
Donald Horn	Burgess & Niple	dhorn@burnip.com	No
Richard Sutherland	American Consulting Engneers	Sutherland@ace-plc.com	
Glen Hardin	American Consulting Engineers	Hardin@ace-plc.com	
Greg Sharp	American Consulting Engineers	GSharp@ace-plc.com	No
J. Paul Silvestri	National Constructors Group	jpaul.silvestri@lycos.com	No
Bob Driehaus	Kentucky Post	bdriehaus@cincypost.com	Yes
James Pilcher	Cincinnati Enquirer	jpilcher@enquirer.com	Yes

BURGESS & NIPLE

To: Mike Bezold, PE
Project Manager, KYTC District 6

From: Herb Mack, PE
Project Manager, Burgess & Niple, Ltd.

Date: May 7, 2004

Subject: Meeting Notes for: Brent Spence Bridge Feasibility and Constructability Study Meeting, April 29, 2004

Project Memorandum

Burgess & Niple, Limited
220 Lexington Green Circle
Suite 110
Lexington, KY 40503
859 273.0557
Fax 859 273.3332

A team meeting was held on April 29, 2004 for the Feasibility and Constructability Study for the Replacement/Rehabilitation of Brent Spence Bridge.

Attendees at the meeting included:

Mike Bezold	KYTC
Jim Brannon	KYTC
Mike Yeager	KYTC
Laura Mitchell	KYTC
Diana Martin	ODOT
Stefan Spinosa	ODOT
Jay Hamilton	ODOT
Herb Mack	Burgess & Niple
Mark Willis	Burgess & Niple
Randy Kill	Burgess & Niple
Henry Osman	Burgess & Niple
Glen Hardin	American Consulting Engineers
Bob Yeager	American/Balke

Final notes from the meeting are as follows:

- The design team reviewed the most recent versions of the five alternative alignments superimposed on aerial photos. The team discussed the visual quality of the exhibits and their presentation at the anticipated May 12 meeting. It was thought by some that the glossy paper gave the impression that plans are more complete than they really are. The consensus of the design team was that, for the May 12th meeting and subsequent meetings involving the public, that non-glossy medium be used to display the alternative alignments, so as to not give the impression of a "finished product."

- Mike Bezold led the discussion regarding the people/groups to be invited to the May 12 meeting. This will include the groups formerly known as the Advisory Committee and the BSMT. The names are to be dropped in an attempt to lessen the feeling of some that they are excluded from decision making. We will postpone meeting with this "Large Group" until the CORSIM models for all alternative alignments are scrutinized by the team, calibrated, and completed.

- Randy Kill presented the preliminary CORSIM model geometry of the existing infrastructure developed to date. The traffic functionality had not been perfected beyond the CORSIM default setting stage of development. Models presented were:

    - A.M. and P.M. peak hour traffic on existing (2003) infrastructure,
    - Design Year (2030) A.M. and P.M. peak hour traffic on existing infrastructure.

- Design team comments reflected that the model geometry looked excellent but modeled traffic flow was not truly representing the congestion on I-75/I-71 and certain key ramps.

- The consultant team will continue to revise/refine the current and future existing infrastructure CORSIM models and present them in a more functionally correct form at the May 12th meeting. CORSIM geometry modeling of the alternative alignments will commence immediately. Any useful preliminary results will also be shown at the May 12 meeting for comment.

- The team will meet May 12 at 10:00 A.M. at ODOT District 8 to discuss results to date. The next meeting of the Large Group will be discussed at that time.

- The consultant team offered to increase efforts to raise the level of communication among all of the members of the design team and stakeholders by taking on more of those responsibilities. These efforts will be coordinated with Mike Bezold.

BURGESS & NIPLE

To: Sam Beverage, PE
Chief District Engineer, District 6

Attn: Mike Bezold, PE
Project Manager, KYTC District 6

From: Herb Mack, PE
Project Manager, Burgess & Niple, Inc.

By: Henry Osman, PE
Project Engineer, Burgess & Niple, Inc.

Date: May 17, 2004

Subject: Meeting Minutes for: Brent Spence Bridge Constructability and Feasibility Study Meeting, May 12, 2004

Project Memorandum

Burgess & Niple, Inc.
220 Lexington Green Circle
Suite 110
Lexington, KY 40503
859 273.0557
Fax 859 273.3332

A team meeting was held at the ODOT District 8 offices at 10:00 am on May 12, 2004 for the Constructability and Feasibility Study of the Replacement/Rehabilitation of Brent Spence Bridge.

Attendees at the meeting were:

Mike Bezold	KYTC	Mike.bezold@ky.gov
Mike Yeager	KYTC	Mike.yeager@ky.gov
David Kratt	KYTC	David.kratt@ky.gov
Brad Eldridge	KYTC	Brad.eldridge@ky.gov
Michael M. Loyselle	FHWA/KY	Michael.loyselle@fhwa.dot.gov
Evan J. Wisniewski	FHWA/KY	Evan.wisniewski@fhwa.dot.gov
Anthony Goodman	FHWA/KY	Anthony.Goodman@fhwa.dot.gov
Jay Hamilton	ODOT- District 8	Jay.Hamilton@dot.state.oh.us
Stefan Spinosa	ODOT	Stefan.spinosa@dot.state.oh.us
Larry Sutherland	ODOT-Central Office	lsutherl@dot.state.oh.us
Mark Vonderembse	FHWA/Ohio	Mark.vonderembse@fhwa.dot.gov
Victoria Peters	FHWA/Ohio	Victoria.peters@fhwa.dot.gov
Herb Mack	Burgess & Niple	hmack@burnip.com
Jim Garrison	Burgess & Niple	jgarrison@burnip.com
Mark Willis	Burgess & Niple	mwillis@burnip.com
Henry Osman	Burgess & Niple	hosman@burnip.com
Randy Kill	Burgess & Niple	rkill@burnip.com
Jon Brunot	Burgess & Niple	jbrunot@burnip.com
Richard Sutherland	American Consulting Engineers	rsutherland@ace-plc.com
Glenn Hardin	American Consulting Engineers	harding@ace-plc.com
Bob Yeager	Balke American	ryeager@balke.com

The following Draft notes from the meeting are for review and comment by all attendees. Comments received by May 31, 2004 will be incorporated into the final meeting minutes and made a part of the project record.

- Mark Willis began the meeting with a brief recap of traffic model work accomplished to date and a report of possible problems arising with the OKI TRANPLAN travel demand model that was provided for the project. The meaning of the "travel demand" model was explained. Problems identified were:

  Travel demand modeling produces theoretical traffic volumes that do not necessarily reflect current travel trouble spots in the project area. They do, tend to more accurately predict travel shortcomings that might occur in the future.

  Micro modeling (using CORSIM) of these theoretical "demand model" volumes will show traffic trouble spots that are not consistent with those currently being experienced. These apparent inconsistencies, while accurate, may cause credibility problems during the public input process later in a NEPA process.

- The design team was asked to discus the problem and suggest possible method/s to resolve the problem

Various viewpoints / concerns were debated

- The design team recommended that traffic forecasting experts from KYTC, ODOT and OKI meet with the consultant team to arrive at current and future year (2030) traffic volume estimates that would appropriately meet the needs of this project, as well as the NEPA process to follow. These figures would be "certified" as correct by these experts by letter from KYTC Division of Multi-modal Services to the project manager. The project team would adopt these volumes and resume with normal planning functions using these "certified traffic volumes" as a basis for micro (CORSIM) modeling of the alternative alignments.

- Mike Bezold is to bring these experts together, facilitate their work and expedite the results. These experts (or their designees), consisting of:

Rob Bostrom, KYTC Specialist, Division of Multi-modal Services (502) 564 7686

Bob Burgett, ODOT Project Analyses Administrator, Office of Technical Services (614) 644 8195

Cheng I. Tsai, OKI Manager, Division of Data Services (513) 621 6300 Ext.115
Randy Kill, Burgess & Niple, Inc., Traffic Engineer, (614) 459 2050 Ext. 436

Time allotted for this traffic volume certification process was estimated at no longer that 60 days form May 12th. Deliverables shall consist of current year and design (2030) year traffic volumes for average daily traffic, AM Peak hour traffic and PM peak hour traffic for the existing infrastructure and each of the five alternatives identified in the Constructability/Feasibility study to date. Traffic volumes shall be estimated in terms of numbers of passenger cars with % trucks for each link or by separate car and truck volumes for each link of the models.

The consultant team estimated that such a two-month delay would not require a revision to the anticipated project completion date of November 1, 2004.

- The consultant team will continue with the refinement of project exhibits and calibration of the behavioral characteristics of the CORSIM models in preparation of the receipt of the certified traffic volumes.
- The next team meeting will be scheduled for a time after receipt of the certified traffic volumes and their inclusion into the CORSIM models.

The meeting concluded at 12:15 pm

Copy: All in Attendance, Sam Beverage, Rob Bostrom, Bob Burgett, Cheng I. Tsai

P:\Pr33035\Meetings\HenrysCopies\5-12-04 draft meeting minutes.doc

- Mike Bezold led the discussion regarding the people/groups to be invited to the May 12 meeting. This will include the groups formerly known as the Advisory Committee and the BSMT. The names are to be dropped in an attempt to lessen the feeling of some that they are excluded from decision making. We will postpone meeting with this "Large Group" until the CORSIM models for all alternative alignments are scrutinized by the team, calibrated, and completed.

- Randy Kill presented the preliminary CORSIM model geometry of the existing infrastructure developed to date. The traffic functionality had not been perfected beyond the CORSIM default setting stage of development. Models presented were:

    - A.M. and P.M. peak hour traffic on existing (2003) infrastructure,
    - Design Year (2030) A.M. and P.M. peak hour traffic on existing infrastructure.

- Design team comments reflected that the model geometry looked excellent but modeled traffic flow was not truly representing the congestion on I-75/I-71 and certain key ramps.

- The consultant team will continue to revise/refine the current and future existing infrastructure CORSIM models and present them in a more functionally correct form at the May 12th meeting. CORSIM geometry modeling of the alternative alignments will commence immediately. Any useful preliminary results will also be shown at the May 12 meeting for comment.

- The team will meet May 12 at 10:00 A.M. at ODOT District 8 to discuss results to date. The next meeting of the Large Group will be discussed at that time.

- The consultant team offered to increase efforts to raise the level of communication among all of the members of the design team and stakeholders by taking on more of those responsibilities. These efforts will be coordinated with Mike Bezold.