



**Advisory Committee Meetings Minutes  
and Disposition of Comments**

**Brent Spence Bridge Advisory Committee Meeting #1**  
**August 19, 2005**  
**Meeting Minutes**

ODOT Project Manager Stefan Spinosa and KYTC Project Manager Kevin Rust began the meeting by introducing team members from their two organizations. Other stakeholders such as representatives from the cities of Covington and Cincinnati were also introduced.

Stefan Spinosa continued by introducing the selected consultant team and its Project Manager Fred Craig, who provided information on the project's starting point, scheduled activities and previous study information.

Fred Craig presented a conceptual meeting schedule for the Advisory Committee and an outline of its roles and responsibilities. Fred Craig also discussed the history and qualifications of the consulting team led by Parsons Brinckerhoff and included TranSystems and Wilbur Smith Associates.

The presentation that followed described the ODOT Project Development Process (PDP) that will be employed and outlined the specific pieces of information necessary at each step of the process. The presentation also included a list of deliverables prescribed by the PDP. A Red Flag Summary, an Existing and Future Conditions Report, Draft Purpose and Need Statement and Planning Study Report were all discussed. A review of alternatives presented by previous studies was also presented.

The first part of this project includes all work contained in Steps 1-4 of the PDP. In these steps, the study area will be defined, a public involvement plan will be adopted and a series of literature reviews will be completed to provide a base of information on the existing conditions of the project area. This portion of the work will also identify preliminary alternatives to be evaluated.

The second part of the project will include Steps 5 and 6 where specific alternatives are evaluated more thoroughly in terms of impacts, geometric and traffic issues. Documentation for required environmental studies will also begin in this portion of the project. The final part of the project will encompass Steps 7 and 8 of the PDP, which selects a preferred alternative for the project, provides for filing an environmental document, and complete preliminary design plans.

## **Brent Spence Bridge Advisory Committee Meeting #2 October 13, 2005 Meeting Minutes**

The meeting began with Project Managers Stefan Spinosa and Kevin Rust providing an introduction of the project team and an overview of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to provide an update and to discuss Goals and Objectives for the Brent Spence Bridge project.

Fred Craig, of Parsons Brinckerhoff, followed with a detailed project update of events since the last Advisory Committee meeting in August 2005. His presentation included a summary of the work to be performed in Part 1 of the project – ODOT Project Development Process (PDP) Steps 1 through 4. Since the last meeting, the following items have been completed:

- Aesthetics Committee Charter drafted
- Red flag site visits were conducted
- Traffic counts initiated
- Study area map and logical termini for the project were submitted
- Public Involvement Plan drafted
- Problem Statement/Goals & Objectives drafted
- Crash analysis and geometric analysis initiated

A copy of the Aesthetics Committee Charter was distributed to meeting participants. The Charter includes general guidance on the program as well as roles and responsibilities for the members of the Aesthetics Committee.

The study area was generally defined as including the I-71/75 corridor from the Kyles Lane Interchange in Kentucky to the Western Hills Viaduct in Ohio. In addition, areas east and west of the I-71/75 corridor are included within the study area. The proposed study area map was distributed to meeting participants.

The project team presented a map, which identified the traffic count locations within the study area. Numerous points along the interstate and local roadways were chosen. A conceptual schedule of when data collection would occur at those locations was presented.

Other items included in the project team presentation were a listing of historic properties and historic districts within the study area, preliminary information on the Draft Purpose and Need Statement, and schedule information for project deliverables.

After the presentation, the project team discussed the project's Goals and Objectives Statement that was carried forward from the previously completed Feasibility and Constructability Study of the Replacement/Rehabilitation of the Brent Spence Bridge.

Advisory Committee members and interested parties were asked to review the Goals and Objectives Statement and make comments. Some of the comments received are noted below:

- The project needs to balance the need to serve local and through traffic
- Linking Queensgate with downtown should be considered
- Sustainability and mobility are key issues
- Movement – modal consideration
- The project should consider strategies for incident management and handling event traffic
- The current bridge is “ unattractive”
- Consider designing the bridge to accommodate traffic beyond 20-30 years
- Congestion pricing / user costs merit consideration
- HOV, HOT or express lanes should be considered
- Be mindful of air quality and storm water drainage issues
- Homeland security is a factor in designing new facilities
- Maintenance of traffic now and particularly during construction, will be a key issue in the evaluation of alternatives
- This project is not just the Brent Spence Bridge, it includes approaches and interstate mainline throughout the downtown area
- There is limited access to I-75 between downtown Cincinnati and Hopple Street
- Better connections between the 6<sup>th</sup> Street Expressway and I-75 are necessary
- Adaptability, flexibility, expandability are all key issues to consider
- This project should build on previous improvements within the corridor

The meeting concluded with information about the next steps in project development. The project team indicated that the Red Flag Summary, Existing and Future Conditions Report and Draft Purpose and Need Statement deliverables would be submitted to ODOT and KYTC in the near future.

Preliminary alternatives will also be developed and evaluated within the coming months. A date for the next Advisory Committee meeting was not set, but the project team indicated that it would be held when appropriate to review the preliminary alternatives.

At the end of the meeting, Kevin Rust of KYTC announced that he was leaving his current position for one in the private sector. Kevin introduced Rob Hans, who will be taking over Project Manager responsibilities for KYTC.

**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](http://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.

## Advisory Committee Disposition of Comments

**Table C-1. Comments from Advisory Committee Meeting, October 13, 2005**

Number	Comment	Response
1	The project needs to balance the need to serve local and through traffic.	Comment noted
2	Linking Queensgate with downtown should be considered.	Comment noted
3	Sustainability and mobility are key issues.	Comment noted
4	Movement – modal consideration.	Comment noted
5	The project should consider strategies for incident management and handling event traffic.	Comment noted
6	The current bridge is unattractive.	Comment noted
7	Consider designing the bridge to accommodate traffic beyond 20-30 years.	Comment noted
8	Congestion pricing/user costs merit consideration.	Comment noted
9	HOV, HOT or express lanes should be considered.	Comment noted
10	Be mindful of air quality and storm water drainage issues.	Comment noted
11	Homeland security is a factor in designing new facilities.	Comment noted
12	Maintenance of traffic now, and particularly during construction, will be a key issue in the evaluation of alternatives.	Comment noted
13	This project is not just the Brent Spence Bridge, it includes approaches and interstate mainline throughout the downtown area.	Comment noted
14	There is limited access to I-75 between downtown Cincinnati and Hopple Street.	Comment noted
15	Better connections between the 6 <sup>th</sup> Street Expressway and I-75 are necessary.	Comment noted
16	Adaptability, flexibility, expandability are all key issues to consider.	Comment noted
17	This project should build on previous improvements within the corridor.	Comment noted

**Table C-2. Comments 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 <sup>th</sup> 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 received as part of the minutes distribution.
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 <sup>th</sup> Street Viaduct and the Western Hills Viaduct and other aspects of current I-75 projects?	The 8 <sup>th</sup> 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.

**Table C-2. Comments from Advisory Committee Meeting, March 23, 2006**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
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.
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.

1 - Sources

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

**Table C-3. Written Comments from Advisory Committee**

Number	Source <sup>1</sup>	Comment	Response
1	CCR	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. 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.	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.
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 <sup>th</sup> Street in Covington. Gest Street would become a one-way C-D road from Freeman to US 50. The northbound could start around 12 <sup>th</sup> Street in Covington and terminate around Ezzard Charles.	This is not a viable alternative for the following reasons: 1- Duplicates available movements 2 - Adds extra bridge lanes 3 - Too complicated 4 - C-D's around interchange at: OH 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street; North of US 50/I-71/I75 interchange; south of Brent Spence Bridge to KY 12 <sup>th</sup> St

**Table C-3. Written Comments from Advisory Committee**

Number	Source <sup>1</sup>	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 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.

**Table C-3. Written Comments from Advisory Committee**

Number	Source <sup>1</sup>	Comment	Response
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.
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"> <li>• View existing and new routes in 3D format for easier viewing than aerial.</li> <li>• Clear exit opportunity from northbound and southbound traffic to Ezzard Charles since this is the main exit for the museum and Music Hall.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Clear access from Queensgate to Fort Washington Way and I-71 north. Traffic must cross four lanes from Ezzard Charles to make this exit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts will be made to clarify view of routes in future steps. The use of 3D modeling is one option to achieve this goal.</li> <li>• Comment noted.</li> <li>• Alternatives maintain existing exit to Freeman Avenue./Gest Street.</li> <li>• The redesign of left hand exits to right hand exits will improve the current access.</li> </ul>
10	DOTE	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.

**Table C-3. Written Comments from Advisory Committee**

Number	Source <sup>1</sup>	Comment	Response
11	DOTE	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	DOTE	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.
13	DOTE	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	DOTE	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	DOTE	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	DOTE	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	DOTE	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	DOTE	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	DOTE	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.

**Table C-3. Written Comments from Advisory Committee**

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

**Table C-3. Written Comments from Advisory Committee**

Number	Source <sup>1</sup>	Comment	Response
21	DOTE	<p>Comments specific to River to Freeman Alternatives</p> <p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connection from southbound I-75 to Fifth and Second is not clear.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connection from I-71 to the west over Queensgate is not clear.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No southbound ramp to Seventh.</li> <li>• Southbound ramp to Second is unclear.</li> <li>• Weaving of on and off traffic southbound between Fifth and Ninth is confusing.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No direct connection southbound to Second and unknown connection to Fifth.</li> <li>• The connection northbound to Seventh is a good proposal if traffic flow can work on Seventh.</li> <li>• Additional land available west of Central for development.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No direct connection southbound to Second and unknown connection to Fifth.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Connections to Fifth and Second Street will remain as currently configured.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Connections to Second Street will remain as currently configured.</li> <li>• The weaving in this area will be clarified during the next phase of the project.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Operational analysis will determine feasibility during subsequent steps.</li> <li>• Comment noted.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>• Very close to existing Western/Winchell Avenues system but ramp system and access from arterials is unclear.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to Western and Winchell is more desirable than a separate, unsignalized facility as shown in Alternative 1.</li> </ul>	<p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment noted.</li> </ul>

**Table C-3. Written Comments from Advisory Committee**

Number	Source <sup>1</sup>	Comment	Response
23	DOTE	<p>Comments specific to Western Hills Viaduct Alternatives</p> <p>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</p> <p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The roundabout is too close to the signalized intersection at Central Parkway, leading to potential queuing into the roundabout.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A SPUI may not function adequately in such close proximity to the intersection at Central Parkway.</li> </ul>	<p>Alternative 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements and feasibility.</li> <li>• Comment noted; however, operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements and feasibility</li> </ul> <p>Alternative 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comment noted. Operational analysis during the next step of project development will confirm capacity requirements and feasibility.</li> </ul>
25	DOTE	<p>Comments specific to Western Hills Viaduct Alternatives</p> <p>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>

# **Summary of Environmental Justice Activities**

## **Environmental Justice Activities**

The following efforts were made to identify and engage Environmental Justice Populations within the study area about the study and potential impacts of the Brent Spence Bridge Replacement / Rehabilitation Project could have on their communities.

Members representing the following groups were asked to represent their constituents at the Advisory Committee Meetings as interested parties:

- Downtown Residents Council
- East Price Hill community Council
- Citizens for Civic Renewal
- Lewisburg Neighborhood Association
- Lower Price Hill Community Council
- Mutter Gottes Neighborhood Association
- Old Seminary Square Neighborhood Association
- Over-the-Rhine Community Council
- Price Hill Civic Club
- West Covington Neighborhood Watch
- West End Community Council
- West McMicken Improvement Association
- Westside Action Coalition

These groups were notified of the Advisory Committee Meetings, received special email notification regarding the public meetings, and copies of all other direct mail sent to the Advisory Committee.

Newsletters announcing the project, providing background, schedule, contact information and the project's purpose and need were sent via direct mail to each of the community representatives. Nearly 2,000 newsletters were sent in direct mail to property owners in the study area.

Letters announcing the public meetings which were held at the end of Step 4 of the ODOT Project Development Process were sent via direct mail to every address in the study area and every address within 250 feet of the project limits. This mailing included approximately 8,000 pieces and reached every address including individual apartments regardless of ownership status.

A mobile display providing general project information, including a study area map overlaid on an aerial photograph, was displayed among buildings open to the public including Cincinnati City Hall, Hamilton County Administration Building, Covington City Hall, Newport City Hall, Newport on the Levee, Northern Kentucky Convention Center, and Tower Place Mall.

**Organizations Representing Environmental Justice Populations  
Within the Project Area**

50 Plus Magazine  
African American Chamber of Commerce  
Appalachian Community Development Association  
Applause Magazine  
Around the Town  
Baptist Ministers Conference  
Brighton Center Inc.  
Chairman of Commission on Hispanic-Latino Community Affairs  
Cincinnati Area Senior Services  
Cincinnati Herald  
Cincinnati Human Relations Commission  
Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority Office  
Cincinnati NAACP Chapter  
Cincinnati Public School District  
Commission on Hispanic-Latino Community Affairs  
Community Action Agency of Cincinnati – Hamilton County  
Consortium of Services of Immigrants & Refugees  
Department of Human Services  
Department of Social Services  
Inclusion Network  
Japan Society of Greater Cincinnati  
Japanese-American Citizens League  
La Jornada Latina  
Lower Price Hill - Environmental Leadership Coalition  
Lower Price Hill Community Council  
Metropolitan Area Religious Coalition  
National Council of Negro Women, Cincinnati  
Neighborhood Housing  
Njema  
Northern Kentucky Community Action Commission  
Ohio Commission on Hispanic/Latino Affairs  
Pan American Society of Greater Cincinnati  
Senior Services of Northern Kentucky  
Seven Hills Neighborhood House Recreation Center  
SU CASA Ministry Center  
Talk of the Town  
United Way of Hamilton County  
Urban Appalachian Council  
Urban League of Cincinnati  
WAIF-FM  
WCET-TV 48  
WCIN-AM  
WCPO-TV  
WDBZ-AM  
West End Community Council  
West McMicken Improvement Association  
WIZF-FM  
WLWT-TV  
WNOP-AM  
WXIX-TV

**Concurrence Point #1  
Comments and Responses**

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 2, 2006 – Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment
1	James Justin Mercier, PE 518 Academy Drive Austin, Texas 78704 (512) 416-2346 <a href="mailto:jmercier@dot.state.tx.us">jmercier@dot.state.tx.us</a>	My selections are either Alignment 1 or 2 because either one provides an alternate route for through traffic which will reduce the congestion on the collectors (the old alignment). Reducing the congestion there will reduce crashes and other conflicts. The collectors will also allow traffic to assume the pattern before merging into the main lanes with less or no disturbance. The separate bridges also allow a way for traffic to bypass the scene of an incident (crash, stall) which is more likely to occur on the collector (existing) bridge.
2	Karla Ruth 523 Elizabeth St Cincinnati, OH 45203 (513) 721-3393	Options 1 and 2 are too problematic for communities and low income areas in Cincinnati. Our city cannot rebuild these communities if highways are built through them. Option 3 seems to be the best alternative. Let's not build more bridges away from existing ones. It is worth the money to address hazardous material issues.
3	Sybil Ortego 816 Dayton St Cincinnati, OH 45214 <a href="mailto:Stortego@fuse.net">Stortego@fuse.net</a>	Alternatives 1 and 2 disturb too much of West End properties. Alternative 3 seems the least disruptive with Alternative 4 running second. Alternative 5 I don't care for.
4	E. Davis Downtown Cincinnati, OH 45203	The roundabout seems cool conceptually, but I couldn't get my mind around the concept. Taxpayers will be happy with exits and interchanges staying the same, but if you plan around the businesses and keep them here we'll understand. The double-decker is the worst idea, still needs emergency lanes. Moving 75 and leaving 71 seems to work best with improvements to existing structure, but improvements needed for current bridge aesthetically.
5	Eric Alto 5750 Glengate Lane Cincinnati, OH 45212 <a href="mailto:Eric.alto@ge.com">Eric.alto@ge.com</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public forum well received and excellent support.</li> <li>• Timing/funding appears to be concern.</li> <li>• What about other loop alternatives for by-passing truck thoroughfare.</li> <li>• Alt 1 and 2 had excellent lay-outs; efficiency looked to be very evident.</li> <li>• Bridges in Cincinnati are aesthetic feature of city that adds benefit; keep design features in mind as project evolves with regard to growing city to businesses, people and transport.</li> </ul>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 2, 2006 – Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment
6	Joe Vogel City of Cincinnati DOT&E (513) 352-1523	Comments reflect personal views only Consultants, ODOT and KYTC are doing a great job on this difficult project. Keep up the good work. Supportive of current alternatives moving forward. Two specific comments: 1) Western Hills Viaduct modifications should be cautious about affecting anything west of the existing right-of-way of I-75 because the WHV is a historic structure and the arch over Spring Grove Avenue is majestic. 2) Sub-Alt 3 – Street grid extension – strongly favor this but would like to see the exist 75 in a trench with elevated collector-distributors like Fort Washington Way/2 <sup>nd</sup> St/3 <sup>rd</sup> St. I know much effort has gone into this so far but if ramp speeds were lowered and they were looked at more like city streets, I think this would be even better.
7	Mary Jo Bazely P.O. Box 5096 Cincinnati, OH 45205 <a href="mailto:maryjob@fuse.net">maryjob@fuse.net</a> Price Hill Civic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very concerned about entering and exiting I-75 north and southbound.</li> <li>• Want to improve ease of exiting and entering from US 50.</li> <li>• Likes sub-alternative 2 for US 50.</li> </ul>
8	Margo Warminski 342 W. 4 <sup>th</sup> St Cincinnati, OH 45202 (513)721-4506 Cincinnati Preservation Association	Alternatives 1 and 2, the Queensgate Alignments, appear to have the least impact on the B&O Freight Terminal (Longworth Hall), an important cultural resource. They could also provide an additional public benefit by directing more truck traffic out of the downtown core.
9	Chris Moran 2859 Gilna Court Cincinnati, OH 45211 (513)481-6058	Prefer Alternative 3 as being least obstructive and taking a smaller footprint. Maintaining some traffic flow across the river during construction is important and some improvement to approach to the bridge from southbound 71 would help. Please ensure some capacity on bridge across the river for transit, specifically rail.
10	Debbie Reinhart 520 Western Ave Covington, KY 41011 <a href="mailto:Ray_Reinhart@yahoo.com">Ray_Reinhart@yahoo.com</a>	We are concerned about being “left” more so than being taken. Because: Noise and increased traffic will impact quality of living...noise already significant with current bridges; View – if bridge elevation is higher, will ruin view and property value; resale opportunities already compromised by speculation. All in all, my preference as well as my neighbor’s would be to take the property so we may move on and the sooner we know this we can begin to make plans.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 2, 2006 – Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment
11	Pat O'Callaghan, Jr. 619 Linn St Cincinnati, OH 45203 (513) 721-5503 Queensgate Food Service	Both Alternatives 1 and 2 would be far too disruptive to the longstanding businesses of Queensgate. I really hope you can find a less destructive way of fixing traffic issues.
12	Michael Schweitzer 700 W. Pete Rose Way Cincinnati, OH 45203 (513) 721-6000 Longworth Hall	My primary concern is the impact the construction will have on Longworth Hall. I am worried that such a large project surrounding our building will reduce occupancy to such a degree that our building is no longer commercially viable. Further, if Longworth is "squeezed" between two bridges, our property's value may decrease. Is there a chance federal monies can be made available to purchase Longworth Hall at fair market value?
13	Adrienne Carmichael 1639 Sycamore St. A Cincinnati, OH 45202 <a href="mailto:ucurchin@hotmail.com">ucurchin@hotmail.com</a>	Alternative 3 is the 2 <sup>nd</sup> best alternative in my opinion – a double-decker bridge will take up less space and renovating the existing bridge is better than tearing it down and starting somewhere else. Building a bridge should consider the option which will cause the least amount of destruction of the environment, business and buildings. I am also concerned that bicycles and pedestrian's pathways are improved in the process. Also, all non-local truck and semi traffic should be routed around the city and not through downtown. Of course the #1 option is the No Build alternative. If we can find solutions without building new development, this is best. Development is expensive, destructive to the environment and to the flow already created. Not building at all should be given the most consideration with global warming creating extreme environmental problems people should be driving less. We should not plan for more cars to drive through our area but rather plan for less and create more and more options like light rail and better and more bus and train services so people can drive cars less and yet still get around easily. This should be our concern and the idea of our engineering plans. Use email only – no mail please.

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 2, 2006 – Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment
14	John Carmichael 1639 Sycamore St Cincinnati, OH 45202	<p>The option for a new bridge should be chosen first and foremost by which option creates the least destruction of environment, infrastructure, businesses, homes to buildings in Ohio to Kentucky. The old bridge should definitely be rehabbed. All possible consideration should be given to maintaining and improving pedestrian and bicycling access and corridors which go through the areas in Cincinnati and Covington. Don't allow this project to end up making things worse. Remember: better, not worse. Also, give great consideration to how this project could be created to improve bus and other mass transit in southwest Ohio/Northern Kentucky. In order to help relieve congestion non-local truck and semi traffic should in the future be re-routed off of this problematic I-75, I-71 corridor and should instead be sent around I-275.</p> <p>I support first the no-build option. Instead, we should be focusing on how to improve the environment, quality of life, car and truck congestion, business, etc. by creating better transportation alternatives – light rail, commuter rail, improved bus systems (especially connecting through Ohio to Kentucky), cycling and pedestrian. Thriving cities such as Portland, OR are more and more using no-build options combined with improved (and much used) alternative transportation options of all of these types. Our future quality of life and future environmental quality depend on getting off of oil dependency and switching to alternatives. In the near future, passenger train service through our region to other destinations should be increased and improved so there would be less need for people to travel so much and so ineffectively by interstate car travel. Likewise for freight – more materials moving by freight rail means fewer 80,000 pound semis damaging our roads and bridges. Fuel wise, freight rail is also about 10 times more efficient than freight on semis.</p> <p>If something ends up being built, option 3 seems at this point to contain the least destruction and damage. Please do not put me on a mailing list.</p>
15	Charles S. Tappan 1150 W. 8 <sup>th</sup> St Cincinnati, OH 45203 <a href="mailto:chiptappan@aol.com">chiptappan@aol.com</a> Tappan Properties	<p>After studying all 5 alternatives closely, we would probably favor Alternative 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separates local traffic from through traffic for both I-75 and I-71.</li> <li>• Best preserves access via existing bridge, ramps and U.S. 50 to our buildings at 1150 W. 8<sup>th</sup> St and 19 Broadcast Plaza.</li> </ul> <p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall impact on Queensgate area once done.</li> <li>• Disruption in Queensgate area during construction.</li> </ul>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 2, 2006 – Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment
16	Randy Merten 1150 West 8 <sup>th</sup> St Cincinnati, OH 45203 <a href="mailto:rpmerten@fuse.net">rpmerten@fuse.net</a> Tappan Properties	Would prefer to endure pain up front to reap the benefits for the future. Alternative 2 looks as if it would be more city (CBD) friendly. Regional traffic would flow away from commuters going into downtown and Queensgate, Western Hills, etc. The impact on the community would be the question. Would the elevated ramps from I-71 create needed parking for CBD?
17	Georgia W. Crowell 10001 Brehm Road Cincinnati, OH 45252 <a href="mailto:aimsbooks@fuse.net">aimsbooks@fuse.net</a>	I prefer Alternative 1 since it seemed the simplest and the construction would cause the least disruption with existing traffic. Since I only go downtown or to Kentucky a few times a month, the exits and lane changes are confusing and I am sure they are even more so for anyone coming through for the first time. All the other alternatives seem to make it even more confusing. I strongly suggest that you put in HOV lanes. I asked about this and was given several reasons why it was impractical for Cincinnati, but it should be a requirement for any new construction, especially with so many commuters going back and forth to Kentucky and the necessity of getting good reliable transportation (taxis, shuttles and hopefully, eventually buses) to the airport. Why are you even thinking about light rail when there is not even a bus there now? I was in Boston recently and found HOV lanes convenient. Anyone who is stuck in traffic and looks over to see the HOV lane moving will definitely consider either carpooling or taking public transportation. Anything that encourages saving gasoline should now be essential.
18	Bill Burwinkel, CEO National Marketshare Group, Inc. 2155 West Eighth Street Cincinnati, OH 45204 <a href="http://www.nmsg.com">www.nmsg.com</a>	Alternate 1 and Alternate 2 would result in a catastrophic negative impact from an economic point of view to Queensgate. Situating the bridge as described in either one of these options would precipitate loss of jobs, business opportunity and impact the region with loss of earnings and property taxes. Alternates 3, 4, and 5 warrant closer observation as they are developed and we would like to see the following considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is difficult to see what is actually happening to US 50. Would it be possible to see existing and new routes in a 3-D format?</li> <li>• We would like to see clear exit opportunity for traffic from northbound and southbound traffic to Ezzard Charles. This is the main exit for the Cincinnati Museum Center and Music Hall.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• We also believe it is important for there to be clear access from Queensgate to Fort Washington Way and I-71 North. Presently, traffic must cross four lanes of traffic from Ezzard Charles to make this exit.</li> <li>• We believe consideration should be made to minimize/eliminate truck traffic on State Street.</li> </ul>

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 2, 2006 – Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment
19	Leo Taske 3643 Shortridge Circle Cincinnati, OH 45247 <a href="mailto:Leotaske1@aol.com">Leotaske1@aol.com</a>	When coming north thru the bridge at night with a truck on both sides, my wife goes crazy. If they need to make it two decks, make sure it is well lighted.
20	Mike Emerine 2535 Spring Grove Avenue Cincinnati, OH 45214 <a href="mailto:Mike.emerine@kaobrand.com">Mike.emerine@kaobrand.com</a>	None of the proposed Western Hills Viaduct sub-alternatives provide for vehicle access to Spring Grove Avenue. Can this be added to a new sub-alternative? Reason: there is significant truck volume to/from our business and other manufacturing sites along Spring Grove Avenue that now exits I-75 at Hopple Street or US 50 W to Dalton Avenue. Access to Spring Grove Avenue at Western Hills Viaduct would alleviate much of this traffic through adjacent neighborhoods.
21	Laura H. Chapman 2159 Colerain Avenue Cincinnati, OH 4521	Extremely helpful in depicting and explaining the options. I had questions about the assumptions – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increments in our nation’s dependency on oil and automotive transport.</li> <li>• Not much progress on public transport by other means.</li> </ul> Staff well-prepared to answer questions. Clear visuals at various levels of detail.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 4, 2006 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, Kentucky**

Number	Name /Address	Comment
1	Louis Wartman 1572 St. Anthony Circle Ft Wright, KY 41011 (859) 578-9096	My major concern is the noise that will be generated by this project. I realize that noise studies will be conducted. I would like to volunteer my property for one of these studies. I would like to know about property acquisition and noise abatement.
2	Nancy Hampel 1997 Pieck Dr Ft Wright, KY 41011	What about sound barriers on the KY side, like Ohio has done on I-71? It seems that staying as close as possible to the current configuration for the bridges is the least disruptive to areas of Northern Kentucky. I believe the effort to maintain neighborhoods is very important.
3	Marc R Rulli 4551 Elderberry Court Burlington, KY 41005 (859) 743-0477 <a href="mailto:MRulli@fuse.net">MRulli@fuse.net</a> Gold Star Chili, Covington, KY	The options that move the thru traffic off of the existing bridge (option 1, 2, 3), I think would negatively impact the traffic flow around the 5th Street exit. I was told there are 155,000 vehicles moving across the current bridge. I was also told 75% of the 155,000 vehicles are thru-traffic. I can not give an exact count of my guests that are thru-traffic guests, but 90,000 less people accessing 5 <sup>th</sup> Street and 12 <sup>th</sup> Street in Covington would be significantly less vehicles in Downtown/Riverfront Covington. The 5 <sup>th</sup> Street exit is the only food and gas exit when traveling south for a significant amount of miles/time. Please understand the value that the 5 <sup>th</sup> Street exit provides to the local community and the people passing thru. I need to be aware and want to be an active participant in the project.
4	Jeffrey Reser 1203 Highway Ave West Covington, KY 41011	West Covington is upwardly mobile on a socio-economic scale. Much is being re-gentrified and there is a growing interest in the picturesque community with beautiful river views/city views. Bridge alternatives 1 and 2 would adversely affect the quality of life in West Covington by placing a larger, noisier bridge twice as close to the residences. Our family and neighbors are in favor of options 3, 4 and 5 which keep the new bridge about where it currently is now. Please consider the opportunity cost to our community.
5	Dora Vorchern 1103 Ridgeway Court Covington, KY 41011 (513) 379-0779	Options 3, 4 and 5 are the best. They will disrupt least number of citizens. From a sustainability point of view, these options also re-use more of the existing infrastructure.
6	Rebecca Weber 730 Lewis St Covington, KY 41011 (859) 491-5073 <a href="mailto:rweber@huff.com">rweber@huff.com</a> Lewisburg Neighborhood	The Advisory Committee has a city employee listed as a representative for the Lewisburg Neighborhood Association. While I feel city representation is essential to this project, I feel concerned citizens from Lewisburg should be included on the committee. Also there should be representation from the West Covington Neighborhood. I appreciate the opportunity to see the plans and hope that more public forums will continue.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 4, 2006 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, Kentucky**

Number	Name /Address	Comment
7	Dawn Ramsey 837 Perry St Covington, KY 41011 (859) 291-2412 <a href="mailto:Dawn.ramsey@insight.bb.com">Dawn.ramsey@insight.bb.com</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please add me to the mailing list.</li> <li>• 2 – Please add large portions of city residents to mailing list, i.e. all of Mainstrasse.</li> <li>• 3 – Recognize that hazardous waste removal, while expensive, may be of benefit to the community. How about having a positive impact (beside just improved traffic flow)?</li> <li>• 4 – Engage neighborhood coalitions – the Center for Great Neighborhoods in Covington has an active community organizing program. Most neighborhoods in Covington have a neighborhood association. They will provide major info on what’s happening “on the ground.”</li> <li>• 5 – Expand project study area (east/west) – it is very unrealistic at the moment. It doesn’t even include all of Philadelphia St in Covington. Philadelphia parallels the interstate and all homes will be impacted by any construction.</li> <li>• 6 – Prefer alternative which includes separate (7 lane?) bridge for 71/75 and leaves existing Brent Spence for local traffic only (Alternative 2).</li> <li>• 7 – Prefer alternative which would improve entrance to Clay Wade Bailey Bridge. Bridge very under utilized currently. Good bridge which should be used more.</li> </ul>
8	Bernie Wagner 10955 Arcaro Union, KY 41091 (859) 384-0481	<p>There are 3 checkpoints on I-75:            the I-74/75 interchange;            the bridge itself;            I-275 off of I-75/71 south there is not enough distance for trucks to get out of the far right lane before the I-275 exit comes. Also, the trucks can’t get over from I-71, drivers won’t allow them. Consequently, the trucks heading south going up the hill in the far left lane – this is slowing all traffic.</p> <p>As to the 5 alternatives:            The politicians will most likely support #5 because it looks to be the least costly and disruptive. However, in my opinion Alternative 2 appears to be the best long-term solution.            Alternatives 2, 3, 4 don’t appear to solve the main problem – but they do get rid of left-hand exits. I go for Alternative 2 – separate I-75 and I-71 traffic.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 4, 2006 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, Kentucky**

Number	Name /Address	Comment
9	David Vorherr 1103 Ridgeway Court/421 Western Ave Covington, KY 41011 (513) 385-2411	I prefer options 3 and 5. I do not want to see Crescent Ave. cut up by option 4 if that is the case. The Western Ave. neighborhood has seen a dramatic increase in property value and desirability over the last twenty years. No neighborhoods have been improved by being cut up or seen their proximity to an enlarge highway make them more desirable. Look at what Cincinnati did to protect and preserve Mt. Adams with the highway threatened that hillside and its desirable homes and businesses. I drive I-75 every day to go to and from work and I would rather find an alternative route for several years to allow the Brent Spence Bridge to stay more or less in the same place. It would be bad to loose the Kentucky businesses on either side of the bridge but it would be worse and expensive to loose the homes and people. Once gone they are gone forever! No property taxes, no income taxes and no patrons to the business in Mainstrasse, Covington, etc.
10	Leslie Hendricks 512 Western Ave Covington, KY 41011 <a href="mailto:Leslie.hendricks@cbre.com">Leslie.hendricks@cbre.com</a>	I live at 512 Western Ave and love it. Please don't do Alternative 1 or 2.
11	Jeff Hendricks 512 Western Ave Covington, KY 41011 <a href="mailto:Jeff.hendricks@fuse.net">Jeff.hendricks@fuse.net</a>	1 and 2 take our place. I think I prefer 3, 4 or 5.
12	Steve Morrison 666 W. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street Covington, KY 41011 (859) 431-4040 <a href="mailto:Smorrison@docrusk.com">Smorrison@docrusk.com</a>	I am concerned about the property that I own and operate my business Rusk Heating and Cooling, Inc. from. Please keep me informed of all plans that would effect me and my business. This includes: 1 - Will I have to relocate with one or all five plans? No one can tell me how I will be affected with either plan. 2 – If I am able to stay will I be able to work during construction. 3 – If I stay will it effect my property value and if so how will I be compensated? 4 – Do I need a lawyer? 5 – Option 3 concerns me if all traffic directed away from downtown, this will effect all property value around me.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 4, 2006 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, Kentucky**

Number	Name /Address	Comment
13	Richard B.L. Fowler 13 Observatory Point Drive Wilder, KY 41076 (859) 441-5348 OASIS, Inc.	In my judgment, Alternate 2 seems the most workable in spite of the industrial impact in Cincinnati and the residential impact in Covington. The wetland study is of concern south of 12 <sup>th</sup> Street in Covington. Drainage from the west is worse by experience. Keeping the current bridge with reduced traffic yet maintaining 3 to 4 lanes is a must. This is especially important during the construction phase of the new bridge. Diverting I-75 traffic as a “bypass” looks good. Having I-71 provide local traffic looks workable if the interchanges have enough distance for thinking and planning while driving. How about the light rail corridor and planning for the rapid transit system?
14	Charles D. King Box 852 Covington, KY 41012 (859) 491-3608 Covington Urban Design Review Board	Alternate 3 – least disruptive to Covington and its businesses 12 <sup>th</sup> ramp alternative 2 – most interesting but one probably needed earlier
15	Joe Stratman 3 Highview Dr Ft. Wright, KY 41011 (859)344-1434 <a href="mailto:Strats10@fuse.net">Strats10@fuse.net</a>	Are there plans to erect sound barriers as far south as River Drive in Fort Wright. Sound is annoying now and will only get worse with increased traffic. This has been very informative. The representatives were very well versed and were extremely helpful and professional.
16	James Lewis Vaughan Sr. 647 Dalton St Covington, KY 41011 (859) 431-5613 <a href="mailto:Puff_1964@yahoo.com">Puff_1964@yahoo.com</a>	Are there going to be noise barriers installed to keep noise and dust down to a minimum? Will home owners be notified before plans are initiated? Will home owners be kept up to date on future meetings?
17	Gayle and Ray Laible 913 Highway Ave Covington, KY 41017 <a href="mailto:laible@fuse.net">laible@fuse.net</a>	Prefer Alternatives 3, 4 or 5 on Interstate 71/75
18	Kathy Rowland 1509 Kavanaugh Street Covington, KY 41011 581-3036	Worried about noise level behind my home. Already get the noise but will this make it greater. Barriers would be nice.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 4, 2006 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, Kentucky**

Number	Name /Address	Comment
19	Edwin E. Bales 906 Highland Ave Ft. Wright, KY 41011 (513) 226-0349	When the present 75/71/Cut in the Hill the water runs off in to houses and it destroys the street or avenue. Water comes into houses.
20	Bob Beatrice 211 Grandview Dr. Ft. Mitchell, KY 41017 331-3232 Gold Star Chili, Covington	As a property owner at 4 <sup>th</sup> and Bakewell in Covington, Kentucky this project will have tremendous impact on my business. Options 1-3 appear to have the greatest impact in this area. It will have impact not only on by business but all businesses in that area. Any option that directs a significant flow of traffic away or prohibits the ease of access to the area will be devastating. All the options require decisions to be made to stop at the 5 <sup>th</sup> Street exit in Covington well in advance to approaching the area. Adequate signage along the interstate to both sides of the river will be important to the business community.
21	Michael A Thornton 9268 Tranquility Drive Florence, KY 41042 253-0974	Logically, Alternative 1 seems the most likely solution, facilitating a quicker north-south transition of I-75 traffic, as well as providing a secondary means of transit over the refurbished Brent Spence/I-71 bridge. P.S. Skip the environmental studies; there's already a bridge there! The catfish(??) won't mind another.
22	Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Landwehr 3061 Winding Trails Dr Edgewood, KY 41017 (859) 331-3498	Thanks for very good, informative and well put on sessions. We appreciate everything you all have and are doing in this project. Comments: No particular preference as to alternates.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Public Involvement Meeting Summary  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 4, 2006 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, Kentucky**

Number	Name /Address	Comment
23	<p>Jeff Perholtz 333 Western Ave Covington, KY 41011 <a href="mailto:jperholtz@insight.bb.com">jperholtz@insight.bb.com</a></p>	<p>Strongly oppose to Alternatives 1 and 2 As a small business owner and proud resident of Western Avenue I am deeply concerned about several of the proposed plans. Along with countless other residents of Western, my wife and I have quite a determination to beautify this area and make it an even more wonderful place to live. We are quite proud and protective of our “country-fied” city paradise. The quality of new housing and relentless rehabilitation efforts up and down our street clearly reflect a universal determination to better out community. It would be an indescribable insult to squander the progress we have made and supporting a majority of these plans would an uncharacteristically “corporate/big business” move for a historically docile community like Covington. I am mainly concerned with the following: - The possible destruction of our home and the thought of relocating elsewhere. - Noise. The thought of waking up every five minutes to the sound horns and jake-brakes. The drone of traffic on the Brent Spence is for the most part tolerable, but I could not imagine it any closer. - The loss of our wonderful view of downtown. - The repercussions of a closer freeway will have on our property value - The loss of privacy With all of that being said, we are realists and understand that something must be done. However, we will do everything in our power to protect our community from being destroyed. I can only hope that this great city will stand shoulder to shoulder with its citizens, most of who would conservatively like to see the least amount of change. Is it not thru that our way of life is more important than the destruction of a Cinergy power plant on the other side of the river? I’m sure the threatened citizens of Cincinnati would agree. We would like to take an active roll in fighting for an appropriate alternative. Please let us know what we can do to participate.</p>
24	<p>Nancy L. and Jerry J. Spivey 1576 St. Anthony Drive Fort Wright, KY 41011 <a href="mailto:nlspivey@netzero.net">nlspivey@netzero.net</a></p>	<p>The presentation was very well illustrated. A major concern is the use of taxpayer money to prepare the different alternatives, hold the meeting, etc., since this project is slated for 2015 and many different courses of action can come up in the meantime, like lack of funding.</p>
25	<p>George Schuhmacher 307 W 21 Street Covington, KY 41014-1113</p>	<p>Overall a good presentation. Many informed people who could answer question and were on-site available. Think Plan 1 is best. Traffic needs an additional way out and in, especially traffic going through. Need separate way for I-71/I-75. #1 would avoid all local congestions and hopefully relieve present “jam-ups.” New Queensgate way would have to be well marked.</p>

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received  
May 4, 2006 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, Kentucky**

Number	Name /Address	Comment
26	Ruth Crider 6209 Kingsgate Drive Burlington, KY 41005	<p>I just read 'Bridge plans bring worries.' What a negative headline! Why not consider a bridge (one of the three proposed) at the end of Route 237 in Hebron, KY. Boone County is growing not only business-wise but also residential. Boone County owns land on Route 8 which Route 237 flows into.</p> <p>I traveled from Burlington to Cincinnati for years since I worked downtown. I always wondered why a bridge was not constructed near the Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky airport to accommodate Ohioans who travel I-71/I-75 to Routes 237 to the airport and also Northern Kentuckians who travel/work in Ohio.</p> <p>I believe if the airport was contacted, they would realize the convenience for not only travelers but, also, their employees.</p> <p>Help get the traffic load off the dangerous I-75 hill. Maybe the Cincinnati Enquirer's headline would read: 'Airport and Boone Co. citizens thrilled with bridge plans!'</p>
27	Mike Delmonaco 1132 Cedar Ridge Lane #3 Park Hills, KY 41011	<p>I don't like looping junction, space utilization causes a need for them, expand width from standard 12 feet to 16 feet lanes.</p> <p>Divert truck traffic southbound onto I-275, Ronald Reagan and Norwood Lateral (through).</p> <p>Option, for US 50 westbound, too much infrastructure centralized.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 22	John Compton <a href="mailto:Johncompton88@msn.com">Johncompton88@msn.com</a>	General Public	Speaking as a member of the general public that DOES NOT live in the Cincinnati area, but drives thru several times a month.....may I suggest that the new bridge be located to the west of the new one, this way the curves could be straitened out (downtown Cincinnati). Also I would like to suggest the 71/75 split should be in Kentucky with 71 still on the Brent Spence bridge. I also believe the new bridge should be a very majestic structure; with enough versatility to be able easily be expandable to handle future traffic needs.	NA
March 23	Mary Sutton <a href="mailto:msutton@clearchannel.com">msutton@clearchannel.com</a> 513-470-6809 513-241-0358 (f)	General Public	The purpose of contact info is to be on the list to stay informed.	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 24	Jeff Perholtz <a href="mailto:jperholtz@insightbb.com">jperholtz@insightbb.com</a> 859-431-3069	General Public	<p>As a small business owner and proud resident of Western Avenue I am deeply concerned about several of the proposed plans. Along with countless other residents of Western, my wife and I have quite a determination to beautify this area and make it an even more wonderful place to live. We are quite proud and protective of our “country-fied” city paradise. The quality of new housing and relentless rehabilitation efforts up and down our street clearly reflect a universal determination to better out community. It would be an indescribable insult to squander the progress we have made and supporting a majority of these plans would an uncharacteristically “corporate/big business” move for a historically docile community like Covington.</p> <p>I am mainly concerned with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The possible destruction of our home and the thought of relocating elsewhere.</li> <li>- Noise. The thought of waking up every five minutes to the sound horns and jake-brakes. The drone of traffic on the Brent Spence is for the most part tolerable, but I could not imagine it any closer.</li> <li>- The loss of our wonderful view of downtown.</li> <li>- The repercussions of a closer freeway will have on our property value</li> <li>- The loss of privacy</li> </ul> <p>With all of that being said, we are realists and understand that something must be done. However, we will do everything in our power to protect our community from being destroyed. I can only hope that this great city will stand shoulder to shoulder with its citizens, most of who would conservatively like to see the least amount of change. Is it not throe that our way of life is more important than the destruction of a Cinergy power plant on the other side of the river? I'm sure the threatened citizens of Cincinnati would agree.</p> <p>We would like to take an active roll in fighting for an appropriate alternative. Please let us know what we can do to participate.</p>	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 24	Ryan Vose <a href="mailto:voserw@gmail.com">voserw@gmail.com</a>	General Public	I just read the article today regarding the possible ideas for the bridge. The article quoted Jim Olman complaining about a new bridge possibly hurting Queensgate businesses. I hope that your committee looks past these small business interests and design the most efficient bridge regardless of what businesses you might have to tear down. This bridge is a vital link in I-75 and takes precedence of local business. I understand the individual business's concern, but for the greater good of the Cincinnati area the bridge must be top priority.	NA
March 24	Ryan Ziemba <a href="mailto:rziemba@cinci.rr.com">rziemba@cinci.rr.com</a> 513-289-5093	General Public	I'm disappointed and curious why you abandoned project #3. It had the most promise for many reasons. One reason is to demolish the old bridge. If you keep the existing structure and add yet another bridge then all we do is clutter up the river! The other thing this project does is open up the river bank for even more development! Do we want people to come downtown or not? Let's give people a reason to. I sure as well don't care if I come downtown, unless it's for a baseball game maybe three times a year.	Thanks for the clarification and we have noted your comment. One of the reasons that the Queensgate alignments were carried forward is to separate local, I-71, and I-75 traffic to provide capacity and safety across the bridge. The disadvantage of the Queensgate alignments is that they take additional land for right of way that is currently planned for redevelopment, irrespective of whether the existing bridge is retained or not.  Thanks for contacting us. Please check the website periodically for updates. Public meetings will be held in late April.
March 24	Nick Azbell <a href="mailto:boiinnng@hotmail.com">boiinnng@hotmail.com</a>	General Public	I would hope that when this is all said and done that signs are posted ordering all trucks to stay to the right/left or whatever becomes necessary when going up the cut in the hill. That's the main problem right now, trucks are not warned ahead of time that they need to move over, and when the steepness of the hill forces them to slow down, it causes widespread backup.	Yes, that problem has been noted. Enforcement of the existing signs and new ones is needed. Also, additional truck climbing lanes are proposed for consideration.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 24	Mitchell Landwehr <a href="mailto:m.landwehr@insightbb.com">m.landwehr@insightbb.com</a> 859-586-5170	General Public	<p>I think this project is going to be one of the most important and influential undertakings that the Northern Kentucky community will receive in decades. The current traffic situation during rush hour in the morning and evening hours has a demoralizing effect on the Northern Kentucky workforce commuting to and from Cincinnati. The amount of time and stress level during this time reduces workforce productivity. Fatigue from having to leave home/work earlier causes more wrecks and increases speeding.</p> <p>The current traffic system between the Buttermilk Pike exit extending over the I-75 bridge has been improved over the years, but the main bottleneck is the bridge and the lanes leading into and out of the bridge. Many lanes are converging into the bridge entrance lanes from Covington. Once onto the bridge, more crossing traffic patterns converge from the Covington entrance ramps. If you are in the left hand lane northbound on the bridge, you must cross these converging traffic patterns to get to the I-71 exit ramp. This is very dangerous and slows the already bottlenecked flow even more adding to the problem backing up all the way up the cut-in-the-hill. This does not include what happens when there are wrecks or flashing police lights for minor fender benders.</p> <p>Please put up signs that say "Minor fender benders must, by penalty of law, pull of the road into emergency lanes."</p> <p>My next and final point is the need for special hazard lanes for police to use during traffic stops and the wrecks. There must be a way to include these on the bridge itself and the I-75 cut-in-the-hill. When people see flashing police lights they slow down and change lanes, as the law requires. Please add hazard lanes or zones to the bridge to provide uninterrupted emergency resolution while allowing continuous traffic flow.</p> <p>If this is not considered, all of your hard work will be a waste because small traffic stops like these foil the traffic flow model with the human rubber neck element.</p>	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 24	Jeffrey Reser <a href="mailto:Jeffrey_reser@earthlink.net">Jeffrey_reser@earthlink.net</a> 859-491-4555	General Public	<p>My young family of four lives in West Covington along river where we enjoy a spectacular view of the River and Cincinnati.</p> <p>Any plans to build a new bridge much northwestward of the current bridge would only disrupt the upward evolution of our neighborhood in its current socio-economic trajectory.</p> <p>West Covington holds great promise and is becoming an attractive bedroom community centrally located, green and just far enough away from the bridge to be picturesque. The bridge noise is not overwhelming at present.</p> <p>Move the bridge and all that could change -- putting the neighborhood back into a downward spiral from which it may never recover. Additionally, the quality of Devou Park would be somewhat compromised.</p> <p>We are in favor of a larger (and BTW, more beautiful) bridge to be constructed right next to and in the space of the current bridge.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the opportunity cost to the emerging upscale West Covington community.</p>	Thanks for your comment. Public meetings will be held in April. Please plan to come and make your opinion known. We will incorporate your comments into the public comments.
March 24	John Schlagetter <a href="mailto:jschlagetter@yahoo.com">jschlagetter@yahoo.com</a>	General Public	Alternate 1 appears to reclaim the most high value Downtown and West End real estate. Would be helpful to see farther north where the new alignment ties in to the existing roadway. I assume the Freeman Avenue exit goes away? It appears a Route 50 West exit is feasible. How does each Alternate align/coordinate with thinking on the Sixth Street Viaduct re-do?	NA
March 24	Mike King <a href="mailto:mking@altaquip.com">mking@altaquip.com</a> 513-674-6411 513-674-6469 (f) Colerain Township	General Public	Everyone involved has done a great job in looking at alternatives and presenting them to the general public. This is a tough challenge. However, I was curious if anyone has ever looked at a tunnel as an alternative to a bridge. This idea crossed my mind as I was passing through a tunnel in Baltimore a few months ago. I know tunnels are very expensive, but it could mean less disruption to the bridge during the construction process. I was just wondering because I had not seen it addressed in any of the alternatives.	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 24	Tim Coffey <a href="mailto:tcoffey@wondergroup.com">tcoffey@wondergroup.com</a> 513-357-2950 513-621-1162	Industry	I hope that we will not adopt a patchwork approach. This bridge will define the aesthetic of the city and the region for decades. We can do something bold and exciting or add to the industrial sprawl that is typical of a rustbelt city. Either approach will make a statement about who we are as a region.	NA
March 24	Scott Macmann <a href="mailto:scmacmann@mac.com">scmacmann@mac.com</a> 513-702-2341	General Public	My thoughts: 1. Queensgate Alternatives. As attractive as it might seem, putting a couple of miles of interstate highway right through an urban industrial and commercial area will cost several fortunes and cause huge disruptions of business. This seems very very wasteful and destructive. 2. I think alternative 5 is the best of the choices. But I would put I-75 entirely on the west side and I-71 entirely on the east side (side byside) which would maximize keeping the traffic separated. 3. The Brent Spence is not only ugly, but being 40 years old... is it really going to be safe? Our engineering today is so much more advanced than it was 40 yrs ago. We should tear it down.	NA
March 24	Greg Riley <a href="mailto:gjr@ssastructural.com">gjr@ssastructural.com</a>	Industry	As a structural engineer, I would like to see a cable-stayed bridge. It would be a nice contrast to the existing truss-bridges and compliment the Roebling very well.	NA
March 25	Lawrence Turner <a href="mailto:lwtur@aol.com">lwtur@aol.com</a> 513-251-5179	General Public	I prefer choice #2. It separates the fast through traffic from local traffic, saves the Brent Spence Bridge for local traffic and only requires building one bridge.	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 25	Paul Spencer <a href="mailto:spencepd@gmail.com">spencepd@gmail.com</a> Mt. Lookout	General Public	<p>I think the only way to improve the terrible congestion through downtown I-75 is to use Alternate 1 or 2. Building a straight stretch of highway along with a new bridge designed for a high volume of traffic seems to be the right way to get this project completed. The other solutions only patch up the problem and we will always have continued accidents and congestion in the downtown area. That would be a shame since we all have to live with this decision for many years to come.</p> <p>I like Alternate 2 because it gets all of our traffic out of our city.</p> <p>But only if we can somehow regain the land of the current I-75 system.</p> <p>Simplifying that stretch of road (removing lanes, exit ramps, etc) broadens our land within Cincinnati for development. It could also connect a large plot of land to the west of the current I-75 with the downtown of Cincinnati. If this is not possible, then lets save the west side land and not build those 71/75 entry ramps, and just use Alternate 1.</p> <p>Thanks for listening.</p>	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 26	John Stein <a href="mailto:Jstein2@fuse.net">Jstein2@fuse.net</a> 859-635-7960 Alexandria City Councilman	Government	Please view this site in Charleston SC <a href="http://ravenelbridge.net">http://ravenelbridge.net</a>  The Ravenel Bridge replaced 2 large bridges that crossed two large rivers. I hope your dept. can come up with nice design, unlike the Taylor Southgate erector set bridge.	Thanks for your comments. They will be included in the record. We will be having public meetings in late April and I hope you will attend to register your comments as well. We will not be choosing the bridge type or final location for about 18 months. I appreciate your comments about the aesthetics of the bridge and approaches. There is an Aesthetics Committee led by Michael Moore, the City Architect for the City of Cincinnati. A number of local officials and experienced design professionals are involved. The Ravenel Bridge was designed by Parsons Brinckerhoff, for whom I work. It was a design build project with Skanska as the contractor. We are very proud of the bridge and I appreciate your accolades about it. The design manager on that bridge was Dan Carrier, who worked for me on Ft. Washington Way as well. Dan is the design manager on the Brent Spence Bridge project. My project team includes Miguel Rosales as the bridge architect. He is internationally known. Miguel worked with PB on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge in DC and the Zakim Bridge in Boston. I hope you'll visit the respective web sites to get an appreciation for the highly skilled and talented team working on this project. They will be May 2(OH) and May 4(Ky) at a location to be chosen. We will make sure you are notified.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Responses</b>
March 27	Jim Hungler <a href="mailto:Jimmy9@fuse.net">Jimmy9@fuse.net</a> 513-315-4644	General Public	I would encourage NO TRUCK TRAFFIC, except local routes, inside of the 275 beltway on southbound 75. Instead, I would suggest, detouring via westbound 275 and have Kentucky build a bypass thru the western countryside that will connect back with 75 in the area south of Richwood/Mt. Zion.	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 29	Paul Martin <a href="mailto:Paul.martin@earthlink.net">Paul.martin@earthlink.net</a> 937-207-8435	General Public	<p>I drive I-75 to Cincinnati from the Dayton area daily, and regularly see the type of traffic on the Brent Spence bridge and the entire I-75 corridor through Cincinnati, and experience the congestion the traffic brings. The congestion is a huge waste of time and gasoline, and alternatives need to be implemented much sooner than the 2015-2020 time frame.</p> <p>It seems to me that about 15% of the traffic consists of semi trucks, most of which appear to be through traffic. If the bridge (and I-75 through town in general) is currently carrying twice the design traffic load, why is the bypass (I-275) not required for through trucks, especially at rush hours (6-9 am and 3-6 pm)? Requiring trucks with no commercial purpose inside of the I-275 loop to use the bypass, if only during high volume periods, would significantly reduce the traffic flow on the bridge and other traffic bottlenecks (i.e., the Reagan merge / Lockland split issue).</p> <p>Traffic on the bridge and the I-75 corridor is always heavy, but the only real congestion issues occur in the rush hour periods.</p> <p>Another alternative for the bridge issue could be to route I-71 concurrently with I-471 / I-275, eliminating the I-71 traffic across the Brent Spence bridge. Has this been considered?</p>	<p>Some of the trucks have origins or destinations within the 275 corridor, so these must use the system as is. Enforcing a truck diversion has been tried here and elsewhere and found difficult to implement. It is against FHWA policy to forcibly divert trucks, who pay considerable road use and fuel taxes, from using any part of the roadway system, except for hazardous cargo routes. Diverting trucks into other communities also runs into opposition. Diverting trucks also adds 1 hour to their trip time through the region, increasing the number of miles they must travel, and increases the number of lane miles affected by the heavy trucks' wear and tear. Since drivers' shifts are limited to 8-10 hrs, the reduces by 60 miles or more, the distance that a driver can drive in a shift. This shifts an economic burden on the truck industry which they have resisted. However, truck bans occurred during construction projects such as Fort Washington Way. Enforcement is critical to catch and prosecute "blockade running". 3500 tickets were written during that 3 year project and caught only a fraction of the truck diversion violators. About 30% of the trucks ran through the diversion.</p> <p>Resheilding the I-71/I-471 routes has been discussed. Cars would use 275 to connect to I-471 to I-71 over the Daniel Carter Beard Bridge (Big Mac) instead of using Fort Washington Way. This shifts the wear and tear to the very robust Brent Spence Bridge to a lower capacity bridge. I-471 has capacity problems as well which this concept worsens. It works for cars but just moves the truck problem as I-471 is steeper than 75 and has a lower capacity interchange at 275 in Kentucky.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 29	Alan Burke The CAPlan Group, Inc. <a href="mailto:alanburke@caplan-group.com">alanburke@caplan-group.com</a> 859-991-4049	Others	Have you considered a 71/75 option to tunnel under the Ohio River to provide the following... A) More usable land mass on each side of the river, B) Less 'pinch points' and exchanges/intersections on each side of the river, C) A tunnel would provide a much needed 'attraction' for the Greater Cincinnati Area, D) Possible cost reduction, E) Improved river traffic flow, F) Improved environmental/aesthetics. We would be willing to complete this study.	Yes, a tunnel was considered and evaluated for cost concerns. The interchange at the north end of the bridge is too large and complex for a tunnel and connections to Fort Washington Way and Covington would have to be eliminated. Grades and connections were evaluated from south of Kyles Lane to Ezzard Charles and found to be too steep to connect. The tunnel needs 20-30 feet of cover under the river to avoid shipping damage. Even at the maximum grade, the tunnel would be more than 1.5 miles long and cost more than \$1Billion. It was considered in detail and not recommended for further study.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
April 5	Matthew D. Birck <a href="mailto:birckmd@muohio.edu">birckmd@muohio.edu</a>	Academia	<p>After reading the proposed alternatives for the Brent Spence Bridge project, I was curious to know why a tunnel was not included among the alternatives. Understandably a tunnel would be more costly, but certainly that should not be a deciding factor in the preliminary stage of a feasibility study for its omission from consideration. I'm also assuming that it is not geologically infeasible, considering that the Water Works has an 8-ft diameter pipe running directly beneath the Ohio River.</p> <p>I'd appreciate if someone could send me a reasonable explanation for the exclusion of a traffic tunnel as one of the functional alternatives for this critical project. Thank you.</p>	<p>A tunnel was considered and a conceptual alternative developed. The tunnel portal began well south of Kyles Lane and daylighted at Ezzard Charles Drive for the mainline of I-75. The tunnel needs to be 4 lanes in each direction plus shoulders for emergencies given the current and future needs of I-75, assuming the tunnel does not carry I-71 as well (see below). This makes each tunnel, if circular in cross section, nearly 80 feet outside diameter. It needs at least 20 feet of cover under the River so the invert of the tunnel is nearly 100 feet lower than the bottom of the Ohio River. Chasing the grades at a maximum of 6% set the tunnel portal locations and the tunnel length.</p> <p>The tunnel could not carry both I-71 and I-75 due to the interchange at US50, I-71, and I-75 southeast of downtown Cincinnati. The interchange with Fort Washington way cannot be underground due to breadth and grade separation required for local access etc.</p> <p>Because of these complications and the Purpose and Need requirements (laneage, local and through access, cost) the tunnel was not carried forward.</p> <p>Is this sufficient detail?</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2	Jim Pan 824 Crescent Av Covington, KY 41011 <a href="mailto:PJ11022002@yahoo.com">PJ11022002@yahoo.com</a> 859-291-2841	General Public	<p>I would not be able to make it to Thursday's public hearing due to a business trip. Here are my initial thoughts on the alternatives:            Alternative 1 and 2 have            1) Major negative impact on the surrounding areas in Covington. There has been a condo booming in the area along the hill (Western, Crescent, Pike). The new queen city bridge would ruin all the development. It would be costly as acquiring these properties would not be cheap.            2) Eliminating the exit of I-75 on 5th in Covington would have a big negative impact in the economic development of Covington river front.            3) The bridge really needs to be well designed to be a signature of the region and a symbol and image for the progressive region for the further The old, ugly Brent Spence bridge would make it really hard.            Alternative 4 and 5 are better in those regards. But it still has some negative impact on the neighborhood on the west side of the highway in Covington as the highway will be much closer to those houses (I am one of the owners). Structured buffers and landscaping are necessary to reduce these negative impacts.</p>	<p>The impacts to Western and Crescent Avenues in Covington are being documented and others brought these up. The right of way costs in Kentucky and Queensgate will be quantified to help with decision making. The 4th and 5th street ramps will be replaced with alternative access points for Covington intended to improve access. Current ramps are very short tight radii which have resulted in a number of crashes.</p> <p>The urban design of the roadway near your property and the aesthetic designs of the bridge are noted concerns. These will be considered in the next phase of work.</p>
May 2	Mike Frazier <a href="mailto:mfrazier@cinci.rr.com">mfrazier@cinci.rr.com</a> 513-351-6636	General Public	<p>I own seven houses on Wright St and Western Ave in Covington and like to know how this will affect my property. Who and what contact information can you give?</p> <p>Hi Fred Craig. Thank you for your prompt response!!!!            The property I own since the early 80s are as follows:            205 Western Ave., 207 Western Ave., 209 Western Ave., 211 Western Ave. I also own 210 and 212 Wright St. and 214 Wright St. all Covington KY 41011. How will this effect the value of said property. May I have your direct telephone number, again?</p>	<p>Can you give me street addresses? Two of the alternatives go through part of Western Ave at the north end. These alternatives will be evaluated further over the next two years before a final decision is made. Community impacts are a concern and your property interests and comments will be noted. Thanks for contacting us.</p> <p>Also, there is a community group forming on your street to consolidate neighborhood comments. I will find the name of the individual and put you in touch with them.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May5	John and Jennifer Stein <a href="mailto:Jstein2@fuse.net">Jstein2@fuse.net</a> 859-635-7960	General Public	Please consider the serious impacts to the hillside neighborhoods and the approach to Devou Park. A lot of people depend on that route to their home and the park. There are also hillside issues, excavation, damage to hillside homes, due to possible use of explosives and auguring to loosen the earthworks. Why not build it up against the east side of the existing bridge? The cut over would seem much easier to manage from the east. There are no homes in that area. Noise would be tremendous if it were built to the west. It also keeps you away from the West End Electric substation network grid. Also please build us a bridge that is pleasing to the eye, not an erector set. Consider Charleston S.C. Ravenel Bridge design or the Maysville, KY bridge. Thank You	We will consider noise, geotechnical and construction impacts during the next phase of the work and will make that information available on the web site. The bridges on the east side of the existing bridge would have substandard geometry or require reconstruction of part of Fort Washington Way. Bridges on the west of the existing have community impacts and would have to miss or move the substation. There is an Aesthetics Committee that will provide input on the bridge design. PB designed the Ravenel Bridge and the Owensboro bridge which is like the Maysville bridge. The bridge type and design will be considered in the next phase.
May 5	Linda Jones <a href="mailto:lkj@djj.com">lkj@djj.com</a> 859-331-8971 513-419-6235 (f)	General Public	You can't possibly consider closing the interstate bridge to replace it! There is too much traffic everyday that would clog other arteries to and from the two states. Build another bridge and open it and then rehab the current bridge. I know that takes time and money, but not only does it help the current travelers, but it's a better long range plane.	NA
May 5	Rex Goon <a href="mailto:Rw41042@fuse.net">Rw41042@fuse.net</a>	General Public	Cincinnati voted down mass transit but it is obvious that we will someday need to build some form of mass transit train system across the Ohio river. Why not look ahead to the future and include that into the new bridge. Someday we will finally come to the realization that we need mass transit it will cost a fortune later to add a bridge for that purpose.	NA
May 5	William Holiday <a href="mailto:Wp_doc_holiday@fuse.net">Wp_doc_holiday@fuse.net</a> 859-468-2871 859-341-4924 (f)	General Public	How long can you keep building new bridges and winding roads? Let us get real and build a light rail system or a subway system and get these cars off the road.	NA

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project  
Concurrence Point #1**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms  
Concurrence Point #1**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 5	Dennis Andrew Gordon, Exec Dir <a href="mailto:dgordon@nkapc.org">dgordon@nkapc.org</a> 859-331-8980 859-331-8987 (f)	Government	Your list of Advisory Committee Members includes Keith Logsdon of my staff. I would appreciate it if you would identify him as a representative of: N KY Area Planning Commission; or, simply NKAPC. Listing him as a representative of "Northern Kentucky" is pretty vague and indescriptive of our agency. Thank you for your attention to this matter.	I am sorry he was misidentified. We will make the correction. Thanks for his and your assistance on this project.
May 9	Mary Christina Stadlander <a href="mailto:tin.stadlander@nlrb.gov">tin.stadlander@nlrb.gov</a> 859-261-8016	General Public	<p>I attended the May 4 presentation in Park Hills and would like to express my comments as follows: I am not in favor of any bridge proposal that would involve the disruption of my current living conditions, especially Proposals 1 and 2. I do not want a bridge or expressway any closer than it already is.</p> <p>We have lived here at 606 Western Avenue since 1980. I love the location and love my home. We have put our blood, sweat and tears into making it a wonderful place that we enjoy coming home to. I do not want to be displaced by "Eminent Domain," which, in my opinion, should never have been passed by the Supreme Court! I am fearful of this.</p>	NA