

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Advisory Committee Meeting #4
July 27, 2006
Meeting Minutes**

Update of the Project Development Process

Fred Craig gave an overview of where the project is at in the Project Development Process (PDP). Part 1 of the contract has been completed. The project team is currently wrapping up the end of Step 4. The Planning Study Report, which is the end of Step 4, is under review. The project is moving forward with Steps 5 and 6 and carrying forward five alternatives and ten sub-alternatives. Some engineering from Step 6 will be done in Step 5.

An overview of the documents that were completed in Steps 1 - 4 was given. The Planning Study Report, which includes the Strategic Plan, summarizes these documents. All of the documents completed can be viewed on the project web site.

Summarized the Planning Study Report

Jennifer Graf gave a summary of the Planning Study Report. All documents leading up to the report are on the project web site. The report is in final review with comments expected to be due by today (July 27). Comments are expected to be minor and the report should be complete and approved soon. Once approved, the report will be distributed to federal agencies. The key findings from the Planning Study Report will be used as the project proceeds into Step 5.

Update of the Purpose and Need

A refresher of the project purpose and need was given. The final purpose and need statement was approved by Federal Highway Administration in May 2006. The purpose and need of the project is the gauge to measure alternatives against.

Public Involvement Update

Judi Craig gave an update of public involvement activities. The project web site has had approximately 3,000 hits to date. A current picture of the roving information display was provided in the meeting handouts. A phone hotline has been established to call and leave comments. The first newsletter has been distributed and the second is being compiled with the intent to distribute within the next six weeks. Property owner letters for notification of field work are in the process of production and will be mailed out within the following week. A review of the results from the May public involvement meetings was discussed including a summary of comments received from the public.

Updating Steps 5, 6, 7 and 8

Fred Craig and Susan Swartz discussed the upcoming steps of the Project Development Process and how this project will proceed through these steps. Traditionally, the approach to Step 5 is different from this project. Some elements from Step 6 will be pulled into Step 5. Step 5 is normally one-dimensional, but Step 5 of this project will include a three-dimensional evaluation. Step 5 will address constructability issues of the alternatives. The project team will try to design with no design exceptions. Some geotechnical work will be done in this step. There is little information right now in the

Queensgate area in geotechnical information. There are three elements that will be moved from Step 6 to Step 5: 1) horizontal and vertical design, 2) traffic demand modeling, and 3) geotechnical work. Modeling will be used to determine where there are changes in travel patterns. The modeling will be more detailed than typically done to determine connections with mainline and connecting roads.

A mostly conventional approach will be taken in Step 6. The product of Step 6 will be the Assessment of Feasible Alternatives document. There will be a preferred alternative going into Step 7 and 8. The preferred alternative will be confirmed in Step 7. This step will involve more detail and have an exact footprint. Normally in Step 7 and 8, Stage I Engineering, environmental impact statement, and a Record of Decision are completed. Stage I Engineering will not be done for this project so as to not go into final design. The goal is to end engineering in Step 7. The purpose is to do enough engineering in the Record of Decision to make the transition smoother to move forward in the following steps.

Discussion occurred on how multi-modal alternatives will be considered in the upcoming steps. The Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky (TANK) representative commented that the current alternatives do not have accommodations beyond single occupancy vehicles. At the least, TANK would like to see consideration of wider shoulders to accommodate for buses or high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. Designs with a wider shoulder can be considered in Steps 5 and 6 to determine if the design is feasible.

ODOT is going to explore the use of shoulders, but will not be making specific design decisions or accommodations for the use of shoulders by busses. The project team will be looking at allowing the use of shoulders where appropriate. Within Ohio, shoulder requirements are 12 feet inside and out. There may be added cost to allow this use in Kentucky since shoulder requirements are less than in Ohio. Additionally, one foot of additional width on the main river span could be a large cost. If agencies decided to utilize narrower shoulders then the cost would preclude bus use of the shoulders. This is where it would be necessary to cost out the use of shoulders. However, currently designs will be for 12 foot shoulders on the bridges. The intent for this use is to allow busses to use shoulders during peak periods. It is noted that busses using shoulders would have to move on and off the shoulder to avoid stopped vehicles and to use exits.

The project needs to cost future sustainability. The project will not preclude future transit possibilities, including plans for light rail transit. Existing transit recommendations are already assumed in Ohio Kentucky Indiana Regional Council of Government's demand model. The project consultant will confirm those transit assumptions. There was a comment that this stage is an opportunity to see the impacts of bus lanes and transit. VISSIM traffic simulator and Macro modeling will look at localized traffic to I-471 and the regional impacts.

Strategic Plan

Fred Craig discussed the Strategic Plan that is also discussed in the Planning Study Report. Some money is currently earmarked for the project. SAFETEA-LU monies will come in 20% over a five-year period. Money is currently available for design, but is not available for right of way and construction.

A short discussion occurred on construction phasing. The sequencing shown is based on information available to date and is only broad concepts. Phasing and the maintenance of traffic plan will be refined as the project moves forward.

Cost Estimates

Preliminary cost estimates were discussed. There has been an increase in the price since June 2005 of concrete (14 percent), asphalt (30 percent) and steel (17 percent), while the consumer price index has increased approximately 5 percent. It was noted how this project is priced differently than the method used in the previous Engineering and Feasibility Study. The preliminary cost estimates were shown for each mainline alternative and sub-alternative with costs split by state.

Upcoming Activities

Fred Craig reviewed upcoming activities for the project. Field work to determine impacts and evaluation is being conducted between August and October 2006. Conceptual alternatives will be completed in February 2007. The next Advisory Committee meeting is planned to be early next year. Public involvement meetings will likely be 10-12 months from now (March or April 2007). A detailed schedule for Step 5 activities was also shown.

Disposition of Comments from Advisory Committee Meeting, July 27, 2006

Number	Question/Comment	Response
1	When will the preferred alternative be chosen?	Approximately 12 – 18 months
2	Is a date set for public comment period?	Comments can be taken at any time. Set comment periods are at concurrence points (after public meetings or for environmental documents).
3	What is the time frame for geotechnical work?	Letters are in the process of going out now. Work will be done in the next few months through October 31, 2006. There will be drilling on public land, not private land.
4	Are HOV and bus transit lanes going to be added to the alternatives? Alternatives have no accommodation beyond single occupancy vehicles. Lanes should be included for these elements.	The recommendations from the North South Transportation Initiative had a highway piece and transit piece. The BSB project is only focusing on the highway pieces here as part of the scope. Design for use of shoulders can be considered during Step 5 and 6 to determine if they are possible. (See attached technical memo)
5	Can a bus piece be included in modeling?	Existing transit recommendations are already assumed in the model. Any additional transit issues/changes would have to go through OKI to the MIS. The consultant is not scoped to include anything additional. (See attached technical memo)
6	The MIS does not include light rail.	Yes, the MIS did address light rail and highway improvements.
7	Concern that since transit (light rail) is not in the long range plan, it could be precluded by the Brent Spence Bridge project.	This project is not meant to preclude future transit possibilities/concepts and will design with transit plans in mind. The team is trying to make sure the project is aware of existing conditions of transit and are accommodated. The project team will get an answer to the Advisory Committee members on what transit assumptions are included in the model. (See attached technical memo)
8	Will the traffic study in Step 5 include impact on all bridges connecting to this one?	The traffic model will look at regional impacts and localized impacts (micro and macro evaluation).
9	Costs of relocation - Will a number be put into the costs of alternatives on how a business would be affected?	Cost estimates use ROW for how people and businesses would be relocated. The value of a business is evaluated in the assessment of alternatives not cost estimates.
10	How often are costs updated?	Costs are updated at the end of each step or every 6 months. Contingencies get smaller as alternatives become more detailed.
11	When do socioeconomic studies take place?	Just started and will be ongoing
12	Can any information be sent out before reports are finalized? The city of Cincinnati is concerned of impacts on communities and development of	Can have meeting between communities and organizations leading up to the report and then report findings at committee meetings, but there will not be anything officially distributed before

Number	Question/Comment	Response
	communities.	then. Reports will evaluate impacts from data gathered and try to quantify the impacts.
13	Will the traffic model include induced demand?	Yes, the traffic demand model is used to benchmark the alternatives.
14	Is improving the approaches to the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge part of the project?	One of the alternatives looks at this approach.
15	Who is the contact for input from Queensgate when doing socioeconomic impacts?	Stefan, Rob or Fred are the main contacts, but would like it to be from an appointed organization or community contact so there are not several different inputs provided from the same group.

Written Comments Received from the Advisory Committee

Source: Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport

Number	Question/Comment	Response
1	The representative from TANK indicated that HOV lanes and the light rail to the airport are now dead issues. I was unaware of this. Is light rail to the airport now officially a dead issue?	No, it is not a dead issue. However, light rail is not part of the scope of this project. This project is not meant to preclude future transit concepts and will design with existing transit plans in mind. (See attached technical memo)
2	He (the TANK rep) also indicated that as a result he wanted the shoulders considered for use by the TANK buses. If this were approved would other buses be able to use the shoulder? We have buses that take passengers downtown. This could expedite our passengers' trip.	This option can be looked at in the next step and would consider all bus transit.
3	There are also Park n Ride lots under consideration in the future which would allow passengers to board a bus and ride directly to the airport. The shoulder lane would provide us the opportunity to label this more as an "express" rather than having to sit in traffic.	Comment noted.
4	There was an article in the paper last week suggesting a major increase in truck traffic by 2016. The article referenced Cincinnati as the major thoroughfare for trucks. Has any consideration been given to "No Truck Lanes" or specific lanes for trucks?	This option was given consideration during the North South Transportation study and was eliminated from further consideration. (See attached technical memo)
5	During the alternative selection you mentioned criteria that will be considered. However, I have not heard that disruptions and traffic delays, because of construction, will be a consideration. These certainly will be costly to users and, if extended for long periods of time should factor into the overall decision.	Comment noted.
6	As a note of concern, we are already feeling the competition from other airports; some of our passengers have elected to fly from Dayton rather than CVG. One reason is due to the interstate traffic delay and difficulties getting across the Brent Spence Bridge during peak periods. If traffic is disrupted severely during this project there will be adverse effects upon our passengers. This could cause even more passengers to go north to Dayton because traveling to CVG is inconvenient. The economic impact for these types of problems should be considered in your final decisions.	Comment noted.

Attachment: Interstate 75 Multi-modal Approach

The recommended preferred alternative as amended and approved by the Executive Committee of the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Regional Council of Governments, the recognized Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Greater Cincinnati region, to be incorporated into the OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan upon a completed fiscal analysis, and air quality analysis, and public review period is:

Four continuous lanes on I-75 throughout the Ohio portion of the OKI region north of I-74 and five continuous through lanes south of I-74. An additional auxiliary lane may be incorporated as warranted in areas of congestion related to interchange spacing and to accommodate merge, diverge and weave movements at existing and modified access points.

Add four continuous lanes (two in each direction) on I-75 in Kentucky from Kyles Lane to the Brent Spence Bridge.

High frequency light rail line and enhanced bus service as described in the North South transportation Initiative. The high frequency service on rail is to preserve highway capacity as defined above.

All future planning, design, right-of way acquisition, and construction will be undertaken so as to accommodate implementation of a full multi-modal system.

The current OKI 2030 Regional Transportation Plan provides fiscal constraint for the highway portion of the plan, but not the rail portion. ODOT, as the implementing agency for the highway portion, is committed to preserving the rail corridor identified in the North South Transportation Initiative. The proposed rail corridor has been included as a constraint on all base environmental mapping, and it is a goal of the studies not to encroach upon that corridor. ODOT has identified the areas where the two corridors are in close proximity, and it is our intention to consider future rail development in design decisions in order to accommodate future implementation of the full multi-modal plan.

Modal aspects of the recommended strategy address different aspects of the purpose and need, and can be implemented independently.

Use of special purpose lanes including High Occupancy Vehicle lanes (HOV), High Occupancy Toll lanes (HOT) and transit or truck only lanes were evaluated during the North South Transportation study and with the exception of HOV lanes were eliminated at Level II alternative screening as either not effective in solving the congestion problem, or requiring excessive costs and impacts to be effective. Further, HOT lanes violate current state laws in Ohio and Kentucky and would require legislative action. HOV lanes were dismissed at Level III alternative screening following the travel demand modeling determination that while only 37% of the theoretical capacity of the HOV lane would be utilized, the general purpose lanes would continue to operate at level of service (LOS) F, leading to the conclusion that limited right of way availability was better utilized for general purpose lanes.

Subsequent to the conclusion of the North South Transportation Initiative, ODOT and KYTC have reviewed their policies regarding bus transit use of shoulders and have

agreed to cooperatively explore limited Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) use of available shoulder capacity with the local transit providers.

It is recognized that I-75 will require consideration of other strategies to manage congestion other than providing more than the one additional lane of capacity, and until such time as the rail transit strategy can be implemented financially. Improvements to the I-75 corridor will incorporate transportation demand management strategies to mitigate the impact on the freeway of a build solution that accepts a reduced level of service in the design year. ODOT is implementing a system level ramp metering project on the I-74 corridor scheduled for construction in 2007, providing regional familiarity with the concept. Each interchange along the I-75 corridor will be evaluated and designed to be compatible with future ramp metering.

Use of ARTIMIS, the regional intelligent transportation system, for travel demand management and incident response will be evaluated and enhancements incorporated that will improve the delivery of these services.

Design criteria that would allow the future designation of special purpose lanes, such as elimination of left hand exits, are being incorporated into the project. The value of special purpose lanes will be reevaluated for implementation when the freeway reaches an unacceptable level of service.