

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Advisory Committee Meeting #3
March 23, 2006
Meeting Minutes**

MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

- Meeting Agenda
- Study Area exhibit
- Advisory Committee survey
- Evaluation matrix
- Binder for Advisory Committee members
 - Meeting 1 and 2 materials
- Project newsletter

The purpose of the meeting was to provide an update on project status and progress.

Fred Craig opened the meeting with introductions. He reminded everyone the difference between the Advisory Committee and interested parties. The Advisory Committee members are part of the working group. Interested parties are individuals/organizations to be included on Advisory Committee meeting notices, and can ask questions or provide comments at the end of the working session.

Fred Craig gave a brief update on project status. Step 3 has been completed and the project is now in Step 4. The Planning Study Report and Strategic Plan will be submitted in Step 4. Activities that have occurred include Aesthetics Committee meeting, Origin-Destination Study, Red Flag Summary, Existing and Future Conditions Report, Purpose and Need Statement, preliminary VISSIM model, and Conceptual Alternatives Solutions Report. The project website (www.brentspencebridgecorridor.com) will be updated with project documents and information.

Michael Moore reported on activities of the Aesthetics Committee. The first introductory meeting for the Aesthetics Committee was held on December 16, 2005. The next meeting will be held at the end of April to work on an evaluation matrix. The end goal will be the Aesthetics Master Plan.

The project team reviewed the project's Purpose and Need. The goals of the Purpose and Need are: improve operational character for local and through traffic, improve LOS and traffic flow, improve safety, correct geometric deficiencies, and maintain connections to key transportation corridors.

The project team explained the evaluation measures and matrix for the conceptual alternatives considered. A scoring system of "good," "average" and "poor" was used in the evaluation of the alternatives. The matrix was provided in the meeting materials.

All alternatives that will be carried forward for further study were presented by the project team. The committee was prompted to provide opinions on these alternatives. This discussion is summarized in the disposition of comments. A suggestion was made to add example pictures of roundabouts and single point urban interchanges (SPUI) linked to the Western Hills Viaduct alternatives on the project website.

An example was shown of the capabilities of the VISSIM model. Data from the I-75 Mill Creek Expressway and Thru the Valley projects were incorporated into this model. A model of the AM peak for 2004 for the project area was presented. The project team also created VISSIM simulations for the 2004 PM peak and 2030 AM and PM peaks, but these were not presented at this meeting.

The Advisory Committee and project team further discussed the conceptual alternatives. At this stage of the PDP, it is not known if the conceptual alternatives are feasible. In Step 5, the project team will answer these questions and in Step 6 the team will determine if the alternatives are feasible.

Questions and concerns were provided by the meeting participants. The comments and responses are in the disposition of comments.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of the next steps in the project which include an operational analysis and impacts analysis of the conceptual alternatives. The project schedule was reviewed and discussed. The goal is to submit the Planning Study Report on April 7. A public involvement meeting will be scheduled during Step 6.

Following this Advisory Committee meeting, a series of public involvement meetings were scheduled for May 2 and 4.

Disposition of Comments

Comments / Questions and Responses on Conceptual Alternatives from Advisory Committee Meeting, March 23, 2006

Number	Comment	Response
1	In the Queensgate area will the structure be on an elevated bridge or fill?	The structure will potentially be an elevated structure.
2	Is the northbound I-75 ramp to 5 th Street in Ohio remaining on all conceptual alternatives being carried forward for further study?	In general, this ramp will be maintained.
3	How will US 50 westbound be connected to northbound I-75?	This existing connection will be improved and maintained.
4	What is the capacity on the local end of Clay Wade Bailey Bridge in northern Kentucky?	Operational analysis will be performed during the next phase in Steps 5 and 6.
5	How flexible are the alternatives at this point in the study? Can some of the local access connections be mixed and matched between alternatives or are the alternatives carved in stone?	At this phase of the project, the alternatives are conceptual. Details will be designed in the next phase of the project.
6	The city of Cincinnati would like to receive written responses to comments they provide.	The project team will respond in writing to all Advisory Committee comments.
7	The committee asked for time to provide written comments on conceptual alternatives presented at the meeting.	Comments from the committee need to be received by 4/1/06. Responses will be posted on the website as part of meeting minutes.
8	Why are two lanes shown on the existing Brent Spence Bridge?	There are no design exceptions at this stage in the project.
9	How will collector-distributor roads connect to the local road system? Will east-west connections be in place?	East-west access will remain the same as existing connections.
10	Can there be a collector-distributor road off of Brent Spence Bridge?	Operational analysis will be performed during the next phase in Steps 5 and 6 to determine if a collector-distributor road is feasible off the Brent Spence Bridge.
11	Will there be a connection from I-75 northbound to Ezzard Charles Drive?	This connection will be addressed and considered in the next phase of the project.
12	Will there be any conflict with the construction of the 8 th Street Viaduct and the Western Hills Viaduct and other aspects of current I-75 projects?	The 8 th Street Viaduct project will be complete well before any construction starts for this project. Other I-75 projects (Thru the Valley and I-75 Mill Creek Expressway) are ahead of this project in terms of the Project Development Process and would be constructed first.
13	Concern was voiced about left hand exits off of the alternatives to local streets	There will be no left hand exits off I-75. Existing left hand exits will be corrected.
14	Have costs been developed?	Preliminary costs have been estimated.
15	Will event traffic (i.e. ball fields, stadium) be planned for?	Improvements can not be designed for specific events, but the project team will consider such traffic in development of the alternatives.

Number	Comment	Response
16	Better access is desired to the west side of Cincinnati from I-71 and I-75	Better access to the west side of Cincinnati will be addressed in the next phase of the project.

Disposition of Comments

Written Comments Received from the Advisory Committee

1 - Sources

- CCR = Citizens for Civic Renewal
- TANK = Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky
- EPHIA = East Price Hill Improvement Association
- DOT = City of Cincinnati Department of Transportation and Engineering
- CMC = Cincinnati Museum Center
- CURC = Cincinnati USA Regional Chamber

Number	Source ¹	Comment	Response
1	CCR	<p>Improve the arterial network to take advantage of excess capacity. Improvements to the approaches on either side of the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge could help take advantage of this underutilized piece of infrastructure and remedy some of the troublesome local access points to I-75.</p> <p>Improvements to the intersections and connectivity in the Queensgate area could help distribute local traffic and minimize the weaving and confusion associated with multiple entry and exit points. An example is to allow Second and Third Street near Fort Washington Way to stay one-way under the Brent Spence Bridge approach and then converge as a two-way Third Street north of Longworth Hall.</p>	<p>Improvements to the arterial network are outside the scope of this project. Arterial improvements necessitated by ramp/interstate route improvements will be investigated in future steps of the project.</p>
2	CCR	Address issue of moving existing bottleneck south.	This will be investigated in future steps of the project.
3	CCR	Is it possible that a southbound I-71 flyover could be proposed to avoid the proposed left side merge?	This can be looked at in future steps of the project. The intent of the project is to correct left hand mainline merges.
4	CCR	Alternative 5 seems to have the most merit from a cost and community impact perspective. Opinion that four lanes of I-75 across the Ohio River is desirable given the constraints both north and south of the bridge. It would be desirable to place both north and southbound through lanes between the ARTIMIS building and John Street to minimize impacts to local community.	Comment noted.
5	CCR	Evaluate a Collection and Distribution road for the I-75, I-71, US 50 Interchange. A southbound collector could start in the vicinity of Ezzard Charles perhaps merging with through traffic at or near the bridge or alternatively north of 12 th Street in Covington. Gest Street would become a one-way C-D road from Freeman to US 50. The northbound could start around 12 th Street in Covington and terminate around Ezzard Charles.	<p>This is not a viable alternative for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Duplicates available movements 2 - Adds extra bridge lanes 3 - Too complicated 4 - C-D's around interchange at: OH 2nd and 3rd Street; North of US 50/I-71/I75 interchange; south of Brent Spence Bridge to KY 12th St

Number	Source ¹	Comment	Response
6	CCR	Evaluate alternatives to solve level of service conundrum. Some evaluation must take place of how to make choosing transit an easier decision either through dedicated rights of way, HOV lanes or congestion pricing.	<p>The North South Transportation Initiative established the modal options for the corridor. Transit alignments are east of Brent Spence Bridge on Clay Wade Bailey, OH 2nd and 3rd Street and under Brent Spence Bridge at the transit center/rail alignment. The purpose of the Brent Spence Bridge project is to address roadway aspect of the regional mobility plan for the corridor. All alternatives do not preclude the future plans for the modal alternatives identified for the region. HOV lanes will be investigated in future steps if warranted by the capacity analysis of the alternatives.</p> <p>Congestion pricing is a statewide policy issue that has not been addressed by the agencies and is outside the scope of this project.</p>
7	TANK	None of the proposed alternatives incorporate any provisions for transit, managed lanes or high occupancy vehicle lanes. TANK would prefer that provisions for these types of facilities be incorporated into the alternatives. If it is determined that these facilities are not feasible, it is requested that outside shoulders be designed to support use by transit buses.	<p>The North South Transportation Initiative established the modal options for the corridor. Transit alignments are east of Brent Spence Bridge on Clay Wade Bailey, OH 2nd and 3rd Street and under Brent Spence Bridge at the transit center/rail alignment. The purpose of the Brent Spence Bridge project is to address roadway aspect of the regional mobility plan for the corridor. All alternatives do not preclude the future plans for the modal alternatives identified for the region. HOV lanes will be investigated in future steps if warranted by the capacity analysis of the alternatives.</p> <p>Shoulder design will be consistent with current design standards. Shoulders are designated for incident management purposes and adding buses to the shoulders creates conflicts.</p>
8	EPHIA	All existing ramps that connect to the Sixth Street Viaduct should continue their existence when the new I-75/I-71 bridge is built, including the on-ramp to southbound I-75/I-71 from US 50 and the off-ramp from northbound I-75/I-71 to US 50.	This will be considered in future steps of the project.
9	EPHIA	It is important to add direct access ramps from the Sixth Street Viaduct to Northbound I-75 and from Southbound I-75 to US 50 during reconstruction of the Brent Spence Bridge.	Current alternatives include these potential connections. During Step 5 an origin-destination study will be performed to help determine the need for these connections.

Number	Source ¹	Comment	Response
7	CURC	Position the highway in a manner similar to Fort Washington Way – capable of one day being capped – linking downtown to Queensgate	Current alternatives for the I71/I75/US50 area in Ohio have been established to minimize the interstate footprint. Vertical alignment of alternatives will be established in subsequent steps. Project team is aware of community's desire to improve east-west connectivity.
8	CMC	Alternatives 1 and 2 would result in a catastrophic negative impact from an economic standpoint to Queensgate and the Cincinnati Museum Center.	This impact will be included in the evaluation of conceptual alternatives.
9	CMC	<p>Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 warrant closer observation with the following considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • View existing and new routes in 3D format for easier viewing than aerial. • Clear exit opportunity from northbound and southbound traffic to Ezzard Charles since this is the main exit for the museum and Music Hall. • Create a second clear exit south of Ezzard Charles Drive to Queensgate; this could be a Freedom Center and Stadium exit and benefit the south end of Queensgate. • Clear access from Queensgate to Fort Washington Way and I-71 north. Traffic must cross four lanes from Ezzard Charles to make this exit. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts will be made to clarify view of routes in future steps. The use of 3D modeling is one option to achieve this goal. • Comment noted. • Alternatives maintain existing exit to Freeman Avenue./Gest Street. • The redesign of left hand exits to right hand exits will improve the current access.
10	DOT E	All access from the highway system to the CBD local street network should be maintained or improved with this project. Specifically, access from southbound I-75 to Freeman Avenue, Seventh Street, Fifth Street and Second Street and access from northbound I-71/I-75 to Second Street and Fifth Street and Sixth Street should be maintained.	Comment noted. All alternatives provide access to CBD; however, direct local ramp connections may be consolidated in some alternatives. Operational analysis, feasibility, and evaluation of all the alternatives will be performed in subsequent steps with the assistance of the Advisory Committee.
11	DOT E	All access from the CBD local street network to the highway system should be maintained or improved with this project.	Comment noted. All alternatives provide access from CBD; however, direct local ramp connections may be consolidated in some alternatives. Operational analysis, feasibility, and evaluation of all the alternatives will be performed in subsequent steps with the assistance of the Advisory Committee.
12	DOT E	A variety of access points are critical for the successful distribution of traffic during incidents and special events – especially baseball and football games.	Comment noted.

Number	Source ¹	Comment	Response
13	DOT E	The separation of movements for northbound and southbound I-75 from I-71 and local access is desirable, regardless of the option for a western bridge or separate bridges at the existing location of the Brent Spence.	Comment noted
14	DOT E	There are intuitive traffic flow issues that appear to be missing.	Without specifics, it is difficult to respond; however, this issue—if present—will be resolved during future steps of the project.
15	DOT E	Existing access from US 50 to Fort Washington Way and I-71/I-75 should be maintained.	Access from US 50 to Fort Washington Way and the Interstate system is provided in all the alternatives; however, some alternatives change the connections. Operational analysis and feasibility will be investigated during further studies of conceptual alternatives.
16	DOT E	Direct access from US 50 west to I-75 north is desirable. However, this connection cannot preclude the connections between I-75 and Freeman.	The goal will be considered in the evaluation of conceptual alternatives.
17	DOT E	Access to and from Freeman and I-75 must be maintained, but the access to and from Ezzard Charles and I-75 can be eliminated, provided alternate, indirect access is provided through improvements to the local street network or a collector/distributor system.	Access to and from Freeman Avenue is maintained. Ezzard Charles has several access routes.
18	DOT E	The “spaghetti” of ramps between Freeman Avenue and the River should be simplified as much as possible to gain additional developable land between Central Avenue and I-75. This goal should not take priority over maintaining the multiple access points to and from the CBD.	Comment noted.
19	DOT E	It is important to keep a direct connection to Second Street for northbound and southbound interstate traffic. Accessing Second Street from the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge is unacceptable.	Operational analysis and feasibility of alternatives will be investigated in future steps of the project.

Number	Source ¹	Comment	Response
20	DOTE	<p>Comments specific to Mainline Alternatives</p> <p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five lanes for I-75 seems excessive while two lanes on the existing bridge is inadequate. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The alternative works well for highway and local traffic but ramps from I-71 to the bridge will disrupt the Queensgate neighborhood and not generally desired. I-75 should not be elevated at Ezzard Charles as it would detract from the view of the Ezzard Charles corridor. <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally acceptable, but believe the number of lanes for local traffic is insufficient. <p>Alternative 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally acceptable, but believe the number of lanes for local traffic and I-71 is insufficient. <p>Alternative 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seems to require significant crossover of local space instead of keeping I-75 in a distinct corridor. 	<p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Noted; however, other Advisory Committee members prefer an elevated section here. <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements. <p>Alternative 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements. <p>Alternative 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. Feasibility will be evaluated in subsequent steps of the project.

Number	Source ¹	Comment	Response
21	DOTE	<p>Comments specific to River to Freeman Alternatives</p> <p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection from southbound I-75 to Fifth and Second is not clear. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection from I-71 to the west over Queensgate is not clear. <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No southbound ramp to Seventh. • Southbound ramp to Second is unclear. • Weaving of on and off traffic southbound between Fifth and Ninth is confusing. <p>Alternative 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No direct connection southbound to Second and unknown connection to Fifth. • The connection northbound to Seventh is a good proposal if traffic flow can work on Seventh. • Additional land available west of Central for development. <p>Alternative 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No direct connection southbound to Second and unknown connection to Fifth. <p>The additional street west of Central introduces a traffic signal grid that will make access from the CBD to northbound I-75 more circuitous and lead to additional safety problems and delays with little additional development space.</p>	<p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connections to Fifth and Second Street will remain as currently configured. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the intent to separate I-71 from local traffic in the vicinity just west of the Third Street on-ramp to I-71. Details will be studied in the next phase. <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct, there is no southbound ramp to Seventh in Alternate 1 for the I-75/I-71/US50 interchange alternatives. Operational analysis of this alternative will be investigated in subsequent steps. • Connections to Second Street will remain as currently configured. • The weaving in this area will be clarified during the next phase of the project. <p>Alternative 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to Second and Fifth is via a new north-south arterial exiting beginning near Ninth. Attempts to clarify movements will be made during subsequent steps. • Operational analysis will determine feasibility during subsequent steps. • Comment noted. <p>Alternative 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to Second and Fifth is via a new north-south arterial exiting beginning near Ninth. Attempts to clarify movements will be made during subsequent steps. <p>Operational analysis and feasibility of the extension of John Street. will be conducted in subsequent steps.</p>
22	DOTE	<p>Comments specific to Collector-Distributor Alternatives</p> <p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very close to existing Western/Winchell Avenues system but ramp system and access from arterials is unclear. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to Western and Winchell is more desirable than a separate, unsignalized facility as shown in Alternative 1. 	<p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The intent is to separate I-71 and local traffic from I-75 traffic as much as possible, while preserving the existing Western/Winchell Avenues system. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted.

Number	Source ¹	Comment	Response
23	DOTe	<p>Comments specific to Western Hills Viaduct Alternatives If a new bridge is designed, a single deck is preferred but will retain connections to Spring Grove. The single deck design is more appropriate if a full interchange is desired at the Viaduct.</p> <p>The City staff has serious concerns about the ability of McMillan Street to accommodate traffic volumes along the hillside and within Clifton Heights.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Operations and feasibility of the Viaduct and McMillan within the study area will be investigated in subsequent steps of the project.</p>
24	DOTe	<p>Comments specific to Western Hills Viaduct Alternatives Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff does not believe that a full roundabout will function appropriately if the Viaduct and Central Parkway are combined due to the traffic volumes that would need to be accommodated. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff does not believe that a full roundabout will function appropriately due to the volume of traffic using the roadway system – a three lane roundabout is not acceptable. • The roundabout is too close to the signalized intersection at Central Parkway, leading to potential queuing into the roundabout. <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A SPUI may not function adequately in such close proximity to the intersection at Central Parkway. 	<p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements. <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements and feasibility. • Comment noted; however, operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements and feasibility <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment noted. Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements and feasibility.
25	DOTe	<p>Comments specific to Western Hills Viaduct Alternatives City staff considered another option for the intersection of Central Parkway, McMillan and the Western Hills Viaduct. McMillan could be relocated farther to the north of Central Parkway to create a T intersection, leaving Central Parkway and the Western Hills Viaduct as a T intersection. This should be explored as a method of reducing conflicting movements at the redesigned interchange.</p> <p>City staff also considered the alternatives for a partial interchange, since it is not reasonable to assume that the traffic from a full interchange can be accommodated by the arterial network.</p>	<p>This option could warrant investigation if any of the current alternatives prove inadequate in meeting the purpose and need.</p> <p>Alternatives that did not provide full movement to and from the interstate were eliminated due to failure to meet the purpose and need. Operational analysis and feasibility will be investigated in subsequent steps.</p>