



*Groundbreaking by Design.*

# MEETING MINUTES

**Project:** Brent Spence  
**Purpose:** BSB Aesthetics Ft. Wright & Ft. Mitchell  
**Place:** Kenton County Government Building, Fiscal Court Room  
**Meeting Date:** March 29, 2023  
**Prepared By:** David Reed  
**Attendees:**

Mayor Jude Hehman	City of Ft. Mitchell
Edwin King	City of Ft. Mitchell
Mayor Dave Hatter	City of Ft. Wright
Jill Cain Bailey	City of Ft. Wright
Nicole DiNovo	Human Nature
Gary Wolnitzek	Human Nature
Stacey Hans	KYTC – D6
Gary Valentine	KYTC - CO
David Reed	Qk4

## 1. Introductions

A brief introduction was made by Gary Valentine, who provided an update on the project status and turned the presentation over to Gary Wolnitzek.

- The overview of the proposed changes affecting the Dixie Highway and Kyles Lane interchanges included a review of the interstate lanes, new collector/distributor lanes, existing ramp modifications, and the reconstruction of new bridges for both Dixie Highway and Kyles Lane.
- The overview also included locations for the latest soundwall locations affecting the subject area. Stacey noted that the intent was to maximize the extents of soundwalls, A series of typical sections depicting optional shoulder treatments were provided as illustration, with details to be determined as part of final design. Of the sections provided, Section B represented the most likely condition to be expected in this area, which located soundwalls immediately behind the barrier walls.

## 2. Aesthetic Concepts

Gary provided an outline for each of the two interchanges, which included the architectural treatments for bridges and abutments, interior and perimeter landscape recommendations, alternative bridge or abutment signage options, and other minor aesthetic elements such as bridge fencing, perimeter fencing and soundwall patterns and textures. Gary also provided a series of historic photos which were used as the source of inspiration for the selection of brick and limestone material types, as well as the selection of architectural forms and geometries, where the civil war history of the area and previous fortress features offered unique character elements to support the aesthetics proposed. Gary also noted that there were three options generated for each interchange, ranging from traditional to more contemporary.

### a. Ft. Wright – Kyles Lane

- Option 1 included the use of brick abutments (precast panels to mimic brick color and texture), bridge parapet mounted signage, and a simple but light and subtle fencing above the bridge parapet. Landscape concepts included the planting of the expanded abutment wall geometry, as well as tree plantings within the interior of the interchange (beyond clear zone dimensions) and along the perimeter of the interchange adjacent to right of way. Decorative fencing along the right of way perimeter was also depicted. The landscape ground plain offered a combination of mown turf within the maintained clear zones, and interior areas of higher and more colorful meadow zones outside the clear zone limits.
- Option 2 was similar but more simplified and utilized stone abutment detailing and signage mounted to the face of the abutment walls facing approaching traffic.
- Option 3 was further simplified and reflected more contemporary detailing of the bridge and abutment walls.
- Each option depicted how the bridge and signage could be illuminated outside daylight hours; and how the new bridge decks would support a separated zone for pedestrians on one side, and a slightly wider zone for combined pedestrian and bicycle use on the other side, each side separated from vehicular travel lanes by a curb and railing behind the curb.
- The ramp intersections also included the use of signage markers or pilasters which were a carryover from original concepts offered by the city.
- Comments from the Fort Wright group members included a preference toward the more traditional options presented and favored the idea of both interchanges offering a similar coordinated aesthetic theme, to offer continuity along this portion of the corridor. Ft. Wright members also favored bridge mounted signage (as opposed to abutment signage) but wanted to see how signage would look if centered across the entire length of the bridge and included “City of...” (like the Evendale example offered as precedent image). Ft. Wright members noted that light fixtures on the bridge should be coordinated with the bridge character (traditional vs. contemporary) and other lighting within the city; and Ft. Wright also asked about the possible use of transparent sound walls - Gary Valentine indicated transparent barriers are being considered in the Covington area of the corridor at key locations due to the interstate being elevated through this area.
- Ft. Wright also expressed interest in landscaping the center medians within Kyles Lane in the areas beyond the ramp intersections. These areas outside of the ramp terminals are not a part of the Brent Spence Corridor project, and would need to be handled separately. Ft. Wright acknowledged this condition and their willingness to utilize their own funds to support features like these which may not be supported by project funding.

b. Ft. Mitchell – Dixie Highway

- Gary presented a similar set of options for the Dixie Highway bridge and interchange, which again ranged from traditional, to intermediate, to more contemporary.
- Option 1 included a traditional brick abutment with brick and stone towers at each end of the bridge.
- Option 2 included the use of stone in the bridge, abutments, and tower features, with abutment signage shown as free-standing elements atop the abutment wall..
- Option 3 was further towards the contemporary, with the use of more modern architectural abstractions of the fortress forms and geometries.
- All options included a long retaining wall extension beyond the primary abutment wall on the west side of the bridge, where proposed interstate widening would make an already steep embankment steeper, and where the use of additional retaining wall would help manage the grade change and provide additional landscape planting area between the abutment and adjacent ramps. The northbound ramp in this area was also highlighted to receive width reductions in response to earlier public comment, making the pedestrian crosswalk much shorter and safer.
- All options for the Dixie interchange offered similar landscape solutions as the Kyles Lane examples, with lawn within maintained clear zone and meadow areas beyond supporting tree plantings. One area of tree plantings was noted as the “Freedom Grove” area – a previous planting initiative - which was recommended for preservation and expansion as part of the overall landscape plan. The perimeter landscape buffer area adjacent to the cemetery to the northeast was identified as an area of excess right of way which could be donated to local government for public use, or sold as excess property to an adjoining owner.
- Ft. Mitchell representatives preferred the character of stone over brick, and liked the tower features which anchored the ends of the bridge section. Ft. Mitchell was also aware and cautious about the introduction of features which would require their additional maintenance responsibilities. For this reason, they were less inclined to push hard for aesthetic fencing and accept the long-term maintenance required – Ft. Wright representatives agreed with this position. Both communities also favored the introduction of meadow plantings in landscape areas outside the clear zones and favored the more traditional Options 1 and 2. Ft. Wright also favored the bridge tower features included in the Ft. Mitchell options, and seemed to prefer the images supporting a mixture of brick and stone.
- Both communities would like to have the presentation available to share with their respective council or caucus groups for review and further input. It was agreed that Human Nature would edit the presentation to modify the alternatives to only include the more traditional Options 1 and 2, and to further modify the Ft. Wright options to reflect more of the Ft. Mitchell architectural character (primarily the use of tower features which was absent in the Ft. Wright options). Human Nature representatives also agreed that they would be available to present the revised images to each of the community groups and identified the evenings of April 17 and 19<sup>th</sup> as the preferred dates for presentation.
- Mr. Reed reminded the group that the goal is not to develop final solutions at this time, but rather to generate aesthetic guidelines and optional features that are strongly supported by each community for the ultimate Design-Build Team to use as aesthetic examples to develop their final designs solutions. Further, it is the intent that the communities will continue to be involved in the development of final design details as part of the next phase of the design-build process – which will likely result in actual construction during the 2025-2026 timeframe.

### **3. Next Steps**

The presentation will be revised and re-presented at each of the April community meetings.

**End of Meeting Minutes**