



**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Ohio Consulting Party Meeting Summary
November 2, 2011**

Attendees:

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Jennifer Graf | PB |
| Valerie Robbins | PB |
| Fred Craig | PB |
| Patrick O'Bannon | Gray & Pape |
| Tim Hill | ODOT OES |
| Susan Gasbarro | ODOT – OES |
| Larry Hoffman | ODOT – OES |
| Erica Schneider | ODOT – OES |
| Stefan Spinosa | ODOT – District 8 |
| Keith Smith | ODOT – District 8 |
| Stacey Hans | KYTC – District 6 |
| Nancy Campbell | OHPO |
| Mark Epstein | OHPO |
| Thomas Grooms | OHPO |
| Michael Schweitzer | Longworth Hall |
| Joseph Trauth | KMK |
| Margo Warminski | Cincinnati Preservation Association |
| Steve Schuckman | Cincinnati Parks |
| Norman Kattelmann | Dayton Street Historic District |

Jennifer Graf opened the meeting, which began with introductions of the meeting attendees. J. Graf presented an overview of the meeting agenda and then proceeded with an update of the Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation project activities and status since the October 7, 2010 consulting parties meeting.

The preliminary engineering activities completed in 2011 were reviewed. These included identification of a preferred alternative (Alternative I); and completion of the Preferred Alternative Verification Report, Interchange Modification Study, and Main River Bridge Type Selection Study. The three finalist bridge types were presented and it was explained that these three alternatives would be presented to the public for review and comment at the public hearings. The preferred bridge type would be selected after the public hearings and comment period.

The outstanding environmental activities and their schedules were discussed. These included the noise analysis, environmental assessment, Section 6(f) documentation and coordination for Goebel Park, determination of final mitigation measures for Goebel Park, Lewisburg Historic District and Longworth Hall, and Section 106 memorandums of agreement for Ohio and Kentucky resources.

J. Graf described the design of Alternative I and discussed the rationale for recommending Alternative I as the preferred alternative. This recommendation is based on the design features, local access features, traffic operations, estimated costs, and environmental impacts of



Alternative I. Alternative I has a smaller footprint in Kentucky compared to Alternative E. Stacey Hans noted that Alternative E would close Crescent Avenue in the Lewisburg Historic District and Alternative I would not. Alternative I minimizes impacts to the Lewisburg Historic District. J. Graf explained that the tight urban diamond interchange (TUDI) shown with Alternative I also minimizes impacts to the West McMicken Avenue Historic District in Ohio. The TUDI does not encroach upon the district but the single-point urban interchange, shown with Alternative E would displace eight residences within the district. Stefan Spinosa clarified that the TUDI can be used with Alternative E, and that there are currently two alternatives for the Western Hills Viaduct interchange. Each interchange option can be used with either Alternative I or E.

J. Graf discussed the Section 106 activities that had occurred in 2011. The archaeological investigations and documentation were completed in Kentucky. The Phase I surveys and documentation of effects for historic resources were completed and mitigation measures recommended. The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of the adverse effects of the project on Longworth Hall and the Lewisburg Historic District. The Advisory Council responded that their participation in the Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project was not warranted at this time.

ODOT distributed the ACHP correspondence, draft Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Longworth Hall, *Determination of Effects Report* (June 2011), and *Longworth Hall Impact Analysis Report – Part Three: Potential Mitigation Measures* (June 2011) to Ohio Consulting Parties in August 2011. ODOT distributed the ACHP response letter to Consulting Parties in September 2011 along with an invitation to the next meeting. ODOT coordinated with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO) regarding the adverse effects finding for Longworth Hall on October 28, 2011.

Tim Hill led the next portion of the meeting which focused on the recommended mitigation measures for Longworth Hall. He explained that Alternatives E and I would result in the removal of 204 feet of the east end of Longworth Hall. Parsons Brinckerhoff and Gray and Pape prepared a report entitled: *Longworth Hall Impact Analysis Report, Part Three: Potential Mitigation Measures* (June 2011). This report evaluated the following six mitigation measures:

- Preparation of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Documentation on Longworth Hall
- Reconstruction of portion of the fourth floor of the building that was demolished by fire, which would allow the building to regain historic integrity and floor space that will otherwise be lost during construction of the bridge.
- Installation of appropriate storm window throughout the building to reduce traffic and ambient noise, reduce dust and debris from the roadway, and to protect historic windows.
- Rehabilitation of the associated scale house, located on the property north of Longworth Hall for interpretative use.
- Completion of a contextual study of extant large scale railroad freight house in Ohio.
- Minimal removal and reconstruction of the upper floors of Longworth Hall to allow for the bridge construction and whether any of the lower floors could remain in service.



These mitigation options were developed to a conceptual level of detail and evaluated for feasibility. Preliminary cost estimates were also prepped for each measure. The positive and negative aspects of each mitigation measures were identified. The report presents the results of the analyses completed for each of the six mitigation measures.

T. Hill discussed each of the six mitigation measures for Longworth Hall. He explained the details of the measures, their advantages and disadvantages, and estimated costs. T. Hill also discussed the purpose and content of the Draft Ohio MOA. He stated that a Section 106 MOA will also be prepared for the Lewisburg Historic District.

During the mitigation discussion the following questions were asked:

- How close will the new bridge be to the reconstructed end of Longworth Hall?
- Was a parapet wall considered for the fifth floor?
- Has a contemporary look been considered for the new east wall?
- What would be the future use of the boiler house if it was reconstructed? The cost of mitigation depends on the proposed use of this building.
- Could repainting the water tower be considered for mitigation?
- Can a cornerstone with original building date and date of reconstruction be included as part of the reconstruction of new east wall?

Michael Schweitzer inquired about the role the property owner has in deciding on the mitigation measures for Longworth Hall. T. Hill replied that the owner must be in agreement with the mitigation decisions. M. Schweitzer stated that he did not think the costs were very high for the proposed mitigation and asked if all the proposed mitigation measures could be implemented. T. Hill replied that implementing all the mitigation measure for Longworth Hall would likely not occur. T. Hill stated that consulting parties should focus on the priorities for preservation.

The consulting parties discussed the removal and reconstruction of the upper floors of Longworth Hall. Fred Craig explained that the demolition and utilities work would have to be done manually and would be very costly.

Noise impacts to Longworth Hall and the West McMicken Historic District were discussed. J. Graf explained that the noise analysis for the entire project was being re-evaluated due to changes in the Federal Highway Administration's noise analysis procedures. Existing and future noise levels will be determined for both resources. Noise mitigation will be difficult for Longworth Hall due to the setting of the building. Storm windows and insulation on the rebuilt east end of the building would minimize noise levels from the interstate. OHPO representatives agreed that storm windows and masonry repairs would be very beneficial to Longworth Hall. Margo Warminski commented that custom "invisible" storm windows could be installed on the exterior of the building.

Larry Hoffman questioned the future use of the boiler house if it was reconstructed. The cost of mitigation depends on the proposed use of this building. The shell of the boiler house could be constructed and the owner could then decide how he wants to improve the building for future



use. Steve Schuckman suggested mitigation which would reflect the footprint of the former roundhouse and provide information about similar buildings nationwide.

Following the discussion of Longworth Hall mitigation measures, Stefan Spinosa presented the following project schedule:

- Noise Study Re-analysis: November 2011
- Complete Kentucky Section 106 MOA
- Complete Section 6(f) Coordination (Goebel Park): April 2012
- Approval of Environmental Assessment by FHWA: December 2011
- Public Hearing: January 2012
- FONSI: May 2012
- Detailed Design Start: Fall 2012
- Right-of-Way Acquisition Start: Summer 2013
- Construction Start: 2015
- Construction End: 2023

Mitigation for Longworth Hall would occur prior to highway construction. Right of way plans would be done as soon as possible on the Longworth Hall parcel pending funding approval as part of ODOT's Major New funding process. S. Spinosa stated that he would request right of way funding in the spring of 2012 to advance certain activities. ODOT's appraisal process for Longworth Hall would take six months to complete.

It was decided that ODOT will hold another consulting party meeting in December 2011 to continue the discussion of the mitigation for Longworth Hall. PB provided the consulting parties CDs with the *Longworth Hall Impact Analysis Report, Part Three: Potential Mitigation Measures* (June 2011) and draft Section 106 memorandum of agreement. PB will also provide paper copies of this report to consulting parties. Consulting parties can provide comments within two weeks based on the report and today's discussion. Comments can be sent to Stefan Spinosa at ODOT District 8.