

**Concurrence Point #2 Summary /
May 2009 Public Meetings Summary**



**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
May 2009 Public Meetings Summary
Concurrence Point #2**

May 6, 2009
The Gardens of Park Hills
1622 Dixie Highway
Park Hills, KY 41011

May 7, 2009
(CRC) Lincoln Recreation Center
1027 Linn Street
Cincinnati, OH 45203

Purpose of the meetings and displays

A series of public involvement meetings for the Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project were held for Concurrence Point #2 to present work completed in Step 5 and portions of Step 6 of the Ohio Department of Transportation Project Development Process.

The purpose of the meetings was to present the conceptual alternatives that were considered for the Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project, along with the recommendations of feasible alternatives for further study. At these meetings, exhibits showed information on environmental impacts, traffic, costs, engineering design, potential right of way, and the project's purpose and need. Details of the information shown during the meeting are presented in the Conceptual Alternatives Study report. Copies of technical studies completed to date were also available for review. Comment sheets and a project informational handout were provided.

Total attendees

The meetings were an open house format that allowed participants to review information at their own pace. No formal presentation was given. Project team representatives were available to answer questions and take comments. Approximately 250 people (excluding the project team) attended the first meeting held in Kentucky. Approximately 65 people attended the second meeting held in Ohio. Both meetings were held from 4 pm to 8 pm.

Summary of Formal (Written) Comments

Comment sheets were available to the public at the meetings. A 30-day comment period followed the meetings. Comments were submitted either through the project website, electronic mail, in writing or on the project hotline. A total of 89 comments were received during the comment period.

The following summarizes primary public comments from Concurrence Point #2:

- The majority of comments from property owners in Kentucky noted concern with noise issues and the need for noise abatement measures. Also, the improvements on I-75 would bring traffic closer to homes resulting in lowered property values and increased vibration due to truck traffic.

- Residents and business owners want the least impact to their property impacts. Loss of property could also lead to a loss in the tax base.
- Kentucky residents requested that the Prince of Peace School and St. John's church not be impacted by the project.
- Ohio residents in the neighborhood of the West McMicken area voiced concerns of impacts that would result from improvements to the Western Hills Viaduct. Impacts of concern include:
 - Loss of historic homes that are part of the community
 - Impact to the Community Gardens
 - Hillside, steep slopes, vegetation, and property issues during construction that could impact homes structurally
 - Noted increase in traffic at the entrance point from Western Hills Viaduct is not desired
 - Improved pedestrian and bicycle traffic options
- Alternatives E, C, and G were each preferred among presented alternatives. Some comments also favored the two bridges side-by-side. Many comments agreed with the recommendation to eliminate the Queensgate alternative.
- Changes in or maintenance of access was noted as a concern. The Cincinnati Museum Center identified a need for direct access to their facility, to other resources, and to the West End neighborhood. Questions were asked to clarify how local and through traffic will be separated. Access to/from Clay Wade Bailey Bridge and I-75/I-71 was noted. Suggestions were made for appropriate signage for access to Covington and Cincinnati and at exit ramps to specific destinations.
- Impacts to historic resources, including Longworth Hall and the Lewisburg Historic District, were noted.
- Concerns about the safety of the existing bridge were expressed.
- Short-term construction impacts to property owners and traffic were noted.
- Property owners would like to retain current views from areas in Kentucky toward the Ohio River and Cincinnati skyline.
- The aesthetic aspects of the project were noted. Comments referred to the bridge becoming a landmark for the region. Context sensitive solutions should be utilized along project corridor. The design of the roadway should also be taken into consideration. The "spaghetti" roadway system in downtown Cincinnati should be a more elegant configuration using collector-distributor system similar to Fort Washington Way.
- The scale of the project should be clearly stated to the public. The number of lanes recommended and the footprint of a new bridge could be better illustrated.
- Comments also noted the need for mass transit options.
- Residential and commercial property owners would like to be kept informed of study progress; several people requested that they be added to the mailing list.

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 - Received July 2008 to June 2009**

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
August 2008	John Perin john.perin@westshell.com 513-562-2218	Industry	Can you please put me on your email update list? Also do you have any updates that are not on the website? What businesses will be affected and where is the new bridge going to go. Thanks.	Added to mailing list. The project website has been updated with current information. Affected properties (businesses) are documented in the Conceptual Alternatives Study report. The recommended alternatives involve building a new bridge immediately west of the existing bridge.
August 2008	Daniel Burke burke.burke@us.army.mil (513) 921-6536	Government	I say keep the current bridge and just build a newer one right next to it and when that's finished keep them both open.	The recommended alternatives involve building a new bridge immediately west of the existing and rehabilitating the existing bridge.
October 2008	David Webster d-w-w@wkybb.net 859-992-7370 859-428-4004	Industry	After looking over your plans, you're not thinking 30 years from now and the traffic that will be on the roads. I see KY really isn't changing the layout and OH is making most of the changes to split the two apart (I-71/75). Why not go back and look at the 50's drawing of the interstate system where I-75 bridge was placed next to the Southern RR bridge, but make it 4 lanes each way and reconnect around the I-275 interchange. I would like to see where you're going to place the piers in the water if you build a new bridge.	Comment noted. For the recommended alternatives, a new bridge would be located approximately 120 feet west of the existing bridge. Two new piers would be placed outside of the existing bridge piers.
November 2008	Bruce Jones bjonz01@aol.com 804-262-4570	N/A	Please keep me updated regarding any design status announcements.	Added to mailing list

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
February 2009	Eugene F. Wolters, Jr. ewolters@cinci.rr.com 513-231-5579	General Public	<p>Question. Are there funds set aside in President Obama's stimulus spending package of 2009? Hearsay of various projects of individual congressmen has their districts expecting resources for their projects. Any considerations for the much-need bridge between Ohio and Kentucky. I think 2015 timeline must be pressed forward and considered now, considering its eventual cost. Let me know.</p> <p>Response: Weeks ago your response went noticed without reply. Thank you for the insight regarding future projects and the I-75 corridor. I was simply being pro-active and realized the real-time needs all the while recognizing the pace our Federal Government takes in accessing such needs. "Shovel Ready" Is fast-tracking this massive and much-needed project within question and how soon. We know the aging infrastructure of our roads cries out for attention. I say this as everything including the kitchen sink in recent days has been thrown into President Obama's Stimulus package.</p> <p>I suggest the I-75 shovel readiness qualifications may now find room to be expedited. At least public talks about shovel readiness in the coming years.</p>	<p>Most of the Economic Stimulus funds are set for "shovel ready" projects with funding requirements that can be committed within 120 days. There are some requests in ODOT's and KyTC's plans. This is in a state of flux right now until the States determine how they are going to program money for these projects. It may be that some current projects might be funded out of the Stimulus funds. Then, it may be that outlying years' funds programmed for those projects may be released for the I-75 corridor in the future years' construction.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 2009	Tim Neely tineely@insightbb.com 859-866-5604	General Public	<p>I have a couple of suggestions that should be considered as an alternative to the current choke point at the northbound entrance to the Brent Spence Bridge. Whatever alternative is being considered should include the isolation of the southbound traffic coming out of Ohio crossing the Brent Spence Bridge into Kentucky. Widening the lanes, but also creating a barrier to isolate the southbound traffic would help to eliminate people from moving all the way down the left hand lane then trying to merge over into the lanes that go south across the bridge. This is continually frustrating because it backs up traffic in the left hand lanes. A permanent barrier that begins after the I-74 interchange would ensure that people who desire to go into Kentucky across the bridge or the right hand exits are isolated much earlier. Another idea is to actually separate or tear off I-75 after the I-74 interchange into two separate highways; one that leads into downtown and US-50, and the other side dedicated to I-75 southbound and the current exits off of I-75. Another idea that saw near the Dallas International Airport was a newly constructed High-5 road and bridge system. This has been highly successful in alleviating the traffic congestion around the airport, and I believe a similar road and bridge system could be employed from the I-74 interchange south to the Brent Spence Bridge. These are just a couple of ideas that might be considered in your alternative evaluations for the Brent Spence Bridge.</p>	<p>The recommended alternatives do separate local and through traffic on I-75 starting south of the Western Hills Viaduct.</p> <p>A permanent barrier from I-74 would limit accessibility to Downtown and other areas of Cincinnati. Permanent barriers limit the number of access points for emergency response.</p> <p>Best practices and other examples will be used in the roadway configuration design.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
March 2009	Carter Miller carter_milr@yahoo.com	General Public	Alternative D is best. Restore a city block and simplify the jumble of ramps north of the bridge and west of downtown. Alternative C is good as well and for the same reasons, but it does not add the city block. However, the bridge needs three lanes in each direction for 75.	Three lanes are recommended for the Brent Spence Bridge for all alternatives moving forward. Alternatives C and D have been recommended to be combined into one alternative for further study.
April 2009	James B. Williams jwilliams@mbakercorp.com 502-339-5866	Industry	Please include me on project information. Thank you.	Added to mailing list.
April 2009	Tom Emmert fclef@zoomtown.com 513-477-4746	General Public	<p>The N-S study scope is MUCH too small. It should extend from the northern edge of Dayton, OH to Florence KY.</p> <p>I can snap a chalk line from Troy, OH to Miamitown, OH and propose a "beeline" route that completely misses both congestion centers. It would be a VERY ATTRACTIVE (shorter, faster) route for through traffic. Some upgrading of the existing I-275 western segment would be required, but NO downtown disruption in either Dayton or Cincinnati.</p> <p>Why has this never been discussed? Is there some faction that WANTS to maintain heavy traffic downtown?</p>	The North South Transportation Initiative was completed in 2004. The north/south limits of that project were between the City of Piqua, OH and Boone County, Kentucky. The BSB project came out of the recommendations of that study. The purpose of this project is to help alleviate congestion and improve safety instead of bypassing downtown.
April 2009	Emilie Dressler emoolie@yahoo.com 859-360-1257	General Public	Being a new resident of Covington, I am very concerned as to where this bridge will have entrance and exit ramps. I live in a condo in The Views so I really hope Pike Street below us, does not become the new highway! And I hope St. John's will not be torn down. It's a beautiful church and adds a lot to the skyline.	Entrance and exit ramps will be further developed in the next phase of the project. St. John's Church is not within the current impact limits of feasible alternatives.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
April 2009	John Stein js4@fuse.net	General Public	Is the new double-decker bridge to the west, going to be an aesthetically pleasing design, something innovative, or are we going to get another erector set looking bridge? When will the look of the new bridge be presented to the public? If it goes to the west of the current bridge, has anyone given thought to noise relief or deflection, for the residents living near the Devou Park and Kenton Hills general area? Thanks	An Aesthetics Committee will be looking at the type of structure for the bridge. The look of the bridge will be presented in later steps of the project after a preferred alternative is chosen. Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
April 2009	Mike Stephens mikestephens@fuse.net 859 261-0059	General Public	Would please add me to your email list for updates?	Added to mailing list.
April 2009	Greg Depenbrock DEP@ZOOMTOWN.COM 859-743-0461	General Public	Own property at 670 West Third, Covington, KY 41011 and would like to be on email list as updates occur.	Added to mailing list.
April 2009	Myra L Brandner myra@fuse.net 859.331.4875	General Public	The street I live on is within the Study Area so I am interested in this project. If you have an informational postal mailing list, please add me to it: Myra L Brandner, 1243 Upland Ave, Fort Wright, KY 41011. If your informational mailing list is sent via email, please send updates to me at myra@fuse.net. Thanks.	Added to mailing list.
May 2009	Jake Meinerding jake.meinerding@gmail.com	General Public	I think a cable-stay bridge would add a lot of beauty to the city.	An Aesthetics Committee will be looking at the type of structure for the bridge.
May 2009	Brandy O'Banion obanion.bm@pg.com	N/A	Please send me information as available.	Added to mailing list.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2009	DGentry Email : jjg6986@fuse.net	General Public	<p>Put off way too long while having to disprove what was needed by having to do the alternatives and appeasements also. Still the critical use and need for what was designed right and has lasted while the let's try this too, messed up more than it accomplished. Are they done with competitions and this is better than that yet? Regardless, we have the mess we have now. What we have is not accomplishing the needs or the goals. I would like to see some details and reasoning behind what we have today before they start again at reinventing the wheels or the bridge. As far as safety goes I am going to agree with the current design of the Brent Spence Bridge as it was when it was built, FAST. OFF LOAD IT FAST on a fast moving Interstate. THAT IS WHAT IT WAS BUILT FOR AND WHAT IT STILL IS. (Oh, by the way this is not the Internet, I am not yelling that is for significance, remember where you're at it is not all the net, thanks.) Trains want that TOO. How long have you been listening to the need for HIGH SPEED RAIL? What is the hold up? Doing all kinds of other things, including other bridges, work around and stuff like this. If you are not fast don't use it and Sunday driving knows that too when going southbound I-75 via the Big Bent, made to be used for what it does and does best. That design was not just luck, it was planned to be the way it is so what is the answer? Easiest answer you will ever have thought. The design is right the issue is volume of traffic and rail wants access. Cincinnati was a train transit hub and some how that got derailed by Detroit and our needs of vehicles and now it is coming back the other way for commerce. To be positive that was just lag in doing it until the up grading for commerce is complete. Get that commerce from taking the local routes are the problems we are having. How many? Heck, I am not keeping track, not my job. But I know those 18 wheels are not doing well on the alternatives. And we have so boxed in Cincinnati that Union Terminal is not to be included.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Early project reports, including the Purpose and Need Statement are on the Brent Spence Bridge project web site.</p> <p>High speed rail is not part of this project's scope. However, this project will not preclude rail plans.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
	DGentry Email : jjg6986@fuse.net (continued)		<p>(continued)</p> <p>The stupidity is incredible. And excuse me but I have to write that again the stupidity is incredible. So put a toll on the bridge is an alternative answer and a current possible appeasement. Talked into not doing the subway years ago and now forget about the Union Terminal and that is regarding nothing more than the fact that the commerce is not using it, yet and they will go somewhere else. Bull crap.</p> <p>It would be used just like the Brent Spence but no, we will bus in the kiddies to see a museum, instead.</p> <p>The back ups that occur now will continue with increased traffic. There have been many alternatives created such as the I-275 Loop, the other new bridges in Indiana, Kentucky and Ohio and still the I-75 route remains the most preferred. The congestion from I-275 heading to Indiana is sometimes during rush hour and just as congested as is the I-75 route to Kentucky.</p> <p>One bigger and wider Brent Bridge doing it just as good as the old one is and fast off-loading should be the safety factor as intended and was the design for the old Brent Spence Bridge. We already have the I-471 Bridge and the old blue relic and another one that is a purple people bridge and the railroad WHAT ABOUT FUTURE RAILROADS. Oh, my. Hold the presses, we forgot, that too. Yep. Could leave a little room for that also. We might get lucky and getter done right, again.</p> <p>I like small Cincinnati, too but can we stop and cease with the acting and dispensing of the stupidity and build a bigger and wider Brent Spence Bridge. Before we all give up or just leave because it seems that hopelessness and homelessness is more highly regarded and needed.</p> <p>Might just be what Cincinnati gets just because it is what was and is used and abused by anyone who would, could and of course should too.</p> <p>Okay by me. A good game is always beat by the best!</p>	<p>The project team will coordinate with railroad officials.</p> <p>The recommended alternatives propose a new bridge to the west of the existing bridge and rehabilitation of the existing bridge.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2009	Amy Heuer amyrheuer@yahoo.com	General Public	Hello, I have a question/suggestion, but first of all I love the idea of splitting up the traffic and building a second Brent Spence Bridge for the I-71 traffic, but does that mean the old bridge is not going to be re-done at all? No matter what it still isn't safe for the I-75 travelers. I think if we are going to build an I-71 only bridge, then we need to also re-build the I-75 bridge. I'm sure we can all agree it isn't well designed and well beyond just standard repairs.	The existing bridge would be rehabilitated or replaced. The new bridge will be built to handle I-75. I-71 and local traffic will be located either on the new bridge or existing bridge location.
May 2009	Emilie Dressler emoolie@yahoo.com	General Public	I was at the forum today (The Gardens, KY) and would like to know, since I forgot to ask, will there still be on/off access to I-75 from 12th street in Covington? The forum answered many questions I had. Well done!	I-71/I-75 northbound traffic will still be able to access Covington at 12 th Street. Covington traffic will also still be able to access I-71/I-75 southbound from 12 th Street.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2009	DGentry Email : jjg6986@fuse.net	General Public	<p>Hello again.</p> <p>After reviewing some of what is contained on this sight, I thank you.</p> <p>Secondly, this project is so long overdue, I can hardly begin to suggest the various problems and waste of money that the downtown developments have wasted while the traffic problems along with the parking shortages continued to be such a huge reason that the area is as under performing as it is.</p> <p>Thirdly, the waste of resources over the years has been enormous and the tax payers here have suffered greatly. Just looking back at the ridiculous need to have our own vehicles tested for pollution and pollutants while the traffic congestion was and is what causes the area to always be over the clean air quality assessments. Anyone wondering why the air was more breathable at certain times was not paying attention.</p> <p>Fourthly, the ineptness and sheer disregard that any of us can not recognize what the causes have been and how this disgrace of an excuse has been in development for years and years while becoming decades has been all the proof any reasonable person would need to have qualified to be a do'er and leader of this project. Had they not died from old age first.</p> <p>And on and on, the we all who do live here and have while knowing it and this is a waste of our own time and our own monies of "what took so long to do what needs to be done right and why". Not to mention the revisions and supposed improvement to the Kentucky part of I-75's cut in the hill. When removing the bottleneck FIRST would have improved the scheduling and planning of what to do next. Instead?</p>	Comment noted.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
	DGentry Email : jjg6986@fuse.net (continued)		<p>(continued)</p> <p>Yes it gets and got done assbackwards and none of us as far as I know have eyes in the back of our heads. And no, we are not stupid enough to not know that it all could not have been done right because of the interest of involved properties. And yes, it is quite apparent that they that including the "us" thought the goose that was to lay the golden egg would be their businesses' answers. Nothing could have been done about all of that but something surely could have been done about this public access mess that would have had better solutions than the options now presented. Which as it should, will be the easiest and the best as it was when I-75 and the Brent Spence Bridge were first installed.</p> <p>The road to discounting Downtown Cincy and the surrounding area is now the golden goose laying the cracked and broken egg that will have to wait for the next upswing and players that are interesting in playing around until something better is presented.</p> <p>It will all work out and the more we say or think that. The more just talking it to death or having waited this long to be when it has to be done. The less there is to do it with and most importantly, there are less people here who care enough any more to even talk about.</p> <p>One thing about it you can not say that the hometowners have not been providing us quite the unique niche shows of ineptness.</p> <p>O, well soon there will be two side by side bridges and hopefully when the oldest one needs to be replaced they will not have to waste the time and monies we had and no longer have.</p>	Comment noted.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2009	lu ann holmes luann.holmes@haworth.com 859-261-1733		<p>I attended the community open house in Park Hills last evening. I would like to congratulate your team on providing a great overview of the studies and options. Each presenter was very helpful and could speak to the issues at a grass roots level. I am personally pleased that the Covington exits I use will not be impacted very much, nor will some of our local shortcuts. Thank you for including the community in the process.</p> <p>One comment I have is that the options don't include correcting a big traffic snag which for some reason is out of the study area. The small distance between Buttermilk Pike and Dixie exits that requires a merge onto the interstate before hopping onto the next exit ramp has always been a mystery to me. This would seem to be a good time to correct that situation.</p> <p>I am also pleased that the existing bridge will be maintained so that the congestion will be reduced as much as possible during the construction period.</p>	The project study limits originally ended at Kyles Lane. They were extended to Dixie Highway to allow space for the number of lanes to narrow back into the existing number of lanes.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2009	Randy Merten rpmerten@fuse.net 513-352-0705	Others	<p>Thank you for the informative alternatives and public awareness/input you have invested in this critical project. I have been attending your open forum meetings for a couple of years starting at the Museum Center in Queensgate.</p> <p>My name is Randy Merten and I work for Tappan Properties, Inc. (a local real estate investor and developer). We have a couple of office buildings in the Queensgate business district, that at one point this project would have had some impact. I realize that the Queensgate alternative has been eliminated.</p> <p>This message is not one of giving any criticism but one of a business question. As mentioned we are a real estate investor with a property that may be of interest to you. It is located at 1967 Dixie Hwy. (bordering I-75, on the top of the hill in Ft. Wright, KY). It may be of interest in the sense of a coordination hub of all involved on the project (engineers, contractors, etc.). It is located within the project area making it advantageous for all involved to be close to the work site. If you could please pass this message on to anyone that would be reviewing such a site, I would appreciate. Thanks for your work and time.</p>	It is not known at this time when and where a construction team will be housed.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2009	Ben Powell bpowell@mayesh.com 305-804-4323	Industry	<p>Mayesh Wholesale Florist is a wholesale distributor of fresh cut flowers and florist supplies. We operate a business at 1130 Findlay (the former site of Old Crosley Field). A related entity consisting of Mayesh ownership owns the property there at 1130 Findlay Street. An exit off of I-75 flows directly into our parking lot.</p> <p>Please put me on the contact list for future information.</p>	Added to mailing list
May 2009	Joseph Novak joenovak77@aol.com 859-322-7927	General Public	<p>Although the Leq increase at 608 W 12th Street (my residence) may not increase by 10 dBA, which would necessitate a noise barrier, I believe the removal of 604 W 12th St (which serves as a line of sight barrier at the point of nearest approach of the Interstate), as proposed in all of the alternatives, will expose my residence to unhealthy levels of traffic noise and render my home unmarketable.</p>	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
May 2009	Ben Herndon ben.herndon@gmail.com 513 238 2364	General Public	<p>I'm really disappointed to see that you're trying to squeeze another section of road between the current I-75 and Western Ave in KY. It is loud enough already there with traffic and semi engine braking all night long. With this area being torn up for so long and now the road being closer, the resale on nearly a \$400k home is going to be terrible. Also, the Covington access points are not very convenient. I wish you'd just take out Western Ave and use that road to take an exit off into Covington. There are a lot of nice condos up that street that are going to suffer. Had I known this was going to happen I never would've moved there 4 years ago.</p>	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
May 2009	Jenny Edwards zephyrwindrails@yahoo.com Tel : 513-381-4056	Others	The community of the West End of Cincinnati is not in favor of losing property or more encroachment into the West End for this project. Unlike Queensgate, we have a greater amount of people LIVING in our confines 24/7. We do not wish to be the alternative to a side-by-side bridge barreling through our neighborhood. Thanks for allowing the voice.	Efforts to minimize impacts on adjacent neighborhoods, including the West End, will be utilized in design of alternatives.
May 2009	Mr. & Mrs. Isaiah Robinson dama117@aol.com 513-421-5654	Others	As homeowners we would like to be included on your mailing list for updates about this project	This email address has been added to the mailing list.
June 2009	Douglas W Becker dbecker@insightbb.com 859-578-8949	General Public	I live at 1569 St. Anthony Dr. Ft. Wright, KY. My concern is the increased noise that will be generated by the expanded freeway and the lowered property values that will come with the increased noise. As I understand it, the noise levels at our house already exceed the current noise abatement standards. Consideration must be given to lowering the noise that is being generated by the new freeway.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
June 2009	Cindy Gleason gleason.cindy@gmail.com 513-584-5830	General Public	My husband and I live and own our home at 2346 West McMicken Ave. We are asking you to please consider a less dramatic impact on our neighborhood in your plans for the Western Hills Viaduct. The increase in traffic, noise and loss of green space is not what our neighborhood needs, just so people can get from the west side of town to Clifton! Please consider minimizing the impact on those who live in the area. Our street with the park on the corner and access to Fairview Park by the steps is one of the things that keep me living on West McMicken Ave., with the hope for improvements in the community. The Western Hills Viaduct plan as it stands now would eliminate that hope. As a resident of West McMicken I walk and bike in the neighborhood. I also work in the Clifton area and walk to work whenever I can. I would encourage a plan that promotes this type of transportation - not a massive flow of traffic through a neighborhood. Please keep the ideas and concerns of those who live in this neighborhood and will be affected by this plan into consideration.	Western Hills Viaduct will be further evaluated in the next step of the project and will include coordination with existing and proposed connections to/from the Mill Creek Expressway Project.
June 2009	Jeff Knasel jknasel@hotmail.com 859.991.6499	N/A	I am a resident of Covington, 239 Western Ave and would like to be put on the newsletter mailing list so I know how my street and surrounding area will be affected.	Added to the mailing list

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
June 2009	Teresa McCarty timmysdoc@hotmail.com 513-651-4628	General Public	<p>I am a homeowner at 2343 W. McMicken Avenue. My property backs up to McMillan Street directly east/above the intersections of McMillan, Central Parkway, and the Western Hills Viaduct. From my kitchen window and back yard I have a very nice view of the Western Hills and the Viaduct (which I happen to think is quite beautiful).</p> <p>I have owned my home for eleven years. It was always my dream to "save" an old home and this one was it. When I bought it was frankly run-down and probably a better candidate for demolition than it was anything home else.</p> <p>Although it is still a work in progress, I have spent untold hours and money in its painstaking restoration. The back of my property is landscaped with many trees and flowering plants so that people driving east across the viaduct see something that says: "Someone cares about this place". And I not only care about my home, but also my neighborhood.</p> <p>Over the years I have been dismayed by people's general reaction when I tell them where I have chosen to make my home. People think it is a "bad neighborhood". In reality we have a great little neighborhood. Most neighbors are long-time owners of their homes and active members of the West McMicken Improvement Association. We look out for each other and take care of our properties. Really, we are the kind of people that the City of Cincinnati is just desperate to get to move into the city.</p> <p>Obviously I am very concerned about the impact that the next phase of this project will have on my home and neighborhood. I am hopeful that it will actually be a benefit--decreased noise and increased greenspace would be among the potential benefits.</p> <p>But I am very worried about the redesign, especially of the interchange between I-75 and the Western Hills Viaduct.</p> <p>Am I going to wind up with an exit ramp in my back yard? Lose part of my property or even my home to eminent domain? Wind up with an ugly, industrial multi-level viaduct instead of the nice historical one I look at now?</p>	Western Hills Viaduct will be further evaluated in the next step of the project and will include coordination with existing and proposed connections to/from the Mill Creek Expressway Project.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Concurrence Point #2 – Received July 2008 to June 2009**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
			(continued) I may not live in the trendiest or most valuable part of town but I hope the planners of this project will listen to my concerns as if I did. If the planners take the time to become familiar with our little niche of a neighborhood I think they will understand why we are so concerned about improving and preserving it.	Comment noted

Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln
Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
1	Mary C and David W Stadlander 606 Western Avenue Covington, KY 41011	We feel it is critical that Alternatives A and B be abolished! We have lived at 606 Western Avenue for many years. Our mother owns 521 and our sister owns 632 and 511. We do not want our houses taken. We love the area. It seems most logical to build immediately next to the existing bridge. It will have the least effect on people. There is a lot of positive development on our street finally and we want to keep it that way. We do feel that there should be additional studies on noise with potential for building a wall. Also do not take St. John's Church and School! Thank you for your consideration.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement. The Prince of Peace School is not within the impact limits of the conceptual alternatives.
2	Ralph Wigger 1588 Marcell Drive Fort Wright, KY 41011	You must understand you are moving the highway closer to our homes. We need to have a sound barrier wall.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
3	Sydney Terrell 1590 Marcella Drive Fort Wright, KY 41011	A 25 foot sound barrier is not going to remedy the noise from the highway. 25 feet will not begin to reach the height of the houses.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
4	Kelly Heeb 10 Lake Street Fort Wright, KY 41011 kheeb@insightbb.com	I want a sound barrier to block noise. We already have 75 noise and more noise from traffic would decrease my property values.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
5	Sister Suzanne Rose 625 Pike Street Covington, KY 41011 srose@popcov.com Representing: Prince of Peace School	I sincerely hope this project will not affect Prince of Peace School and St. Johns Church. I would like to suggest that our school would be air conditioned through the cost of the project since the road will be moving closer to the school. Also, replace faulty window with double glass panes.	The Prince of Peace School is not within the impact limits of the conceptual alternatives.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
6	Joe Schwerling PO Box 75408 Fort Thomas, KY 41075 TMJoe@fuse.net	I like the plan for two side-by-side bridges; with west bridge primarily for I-75 and east (old) bridge primarily for I-71 and local traffic. Hoping that new bridge's location and elevation would be conducive to quick and /or temporary diversion for through ramps for each expressway to be readily diverted to other span in case of accidents, maintenance, and/or eventual replacement of Brent Spence Bridge when necessary.	Comment noted
7	Denise Lansky 860 Crescent Ave Covington, KY 41011	I like Alternative E	Comment noted
8	Deborah McQueary 632 Western Ave Covington, KY 41011	I believe that the noise and visual impact on the homes on Western Avenue need to be addressed with us. Also, if the alternative B is not to be used – then don't show it on your handouts. But if "B" is used then please allow the affected people time and let us know. Don't keep people in the dark. Also we have great views at this time. Please be meaningful of our views. Most of all be honest with the people.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement. A visual impact analysis will be completed for the feasible alternatives in the next phase of the project. Alternative B was recommended to be eliminated as shown during public meetings. At that time, it was still under consideration. It has been part of previous steps of the study and had to be presented as an alternative.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
9	William Beer 818 Aberdeen Road Park Hills, KY 41011 billynbeer@yahoo.com	Re: Kyles Lane – if there is to be a new Kyles Lane overpass for a widened I-71/75, has there been any consideration for a Kyles Lane re-alignment? In the Dixie Fix study, such realignment was considered/recommended. I would suspect that if that change was to be implemented, this would be the time to do it, while such a major reconstruction of the interchange is under way.	The Dixie Fix study realignment is not part of the scope of this project, however it would only be a matter of coordinating the construction of both the Kyles Lane overpass and a Dixie/Kyles realignment.
10	Christopher W. Sudbrink 818 Aberdeen Road Park Hills, KY 41011 Chris_sudbrink@msn.com Representing: Park Hills City Council	Happy to see only a few homes and businesses will be impacted, would like to see the bridge built as a landmark. We don't get to build these kinds of things every day so it would be worth the extra expense. Please consider a car pool lane, and try to minimize impact on park space. Goebel Park is used by the city of Covington for several events and has regional appeal. To replace this park would be very expensive and would undoubtedly have an enormous impact to businesses in the Mainstrasse area if they were not able to hold large events and festivals anymore.	An Aesthetics Committee has been formed to review the bridge style and corridor context. Mitigation will be reviewed for impacts to Goebel Park.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
11	Garry (Gerhard) J. Weidl 1240 Hermes Ave Covington, KY 41011	Noise screening/abatement is a critical issue. The backyard areas encompassed by the streets of Watkins, Hermes, and Hinde are an upward "sloping funnel" that magnifies traffic noise tremendously. However, your noise screening study book shows noise field monitoring at sites KY-40, KY-3, KY-37 and these may not reflect the severity/magnitude of the noise problem, which is probably the worst at my house and my immediate neighbors on each side. I brought up the issue of a need for noise abatement when the highway was widened 10 years ago and pointed out that I-471 has a noise abatement wall from Newport thru Fort Thomas, but nothing was done then. Does Fort Thomas and Fort Mitchell (also with noise walls) have more political pull in getting noise abatement walls? I hope the noise levels amplified by the terrain of our back yards can be considered and that a noise abatement wall will be included along all area involving residential properties. Without a noise wall/abatement my back porch and back yard are useless because it's too noisy to sit there. Also, not having air conditioning and with windows open for fans, it's quite difficult to sleep with the highway noise, which will only get worse with more lanes which are closer as well! Please help!!	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
12	Jeanne Dickman, Dan Wachs, & Bob Albers 619 St. Joseph Lane Park Hills, KY 41011	We own property at 504, 512, 502, and 508 St. Joseph and was wondering how will the noise be addressed to the close proximity of the new highway and we believe our property value will go down.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
13	Forrest G. Utley 512 Scenic Drive Park Hills, KY 41011	Illustration on comment sheet referring to noise receptors shown in noise screening report. They did not check at this point (Scenic Drive). Try checking it in my bedroom at 2:00 AM. Expressway trucks.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
14	Lloyd P. Espenlaub 2634 Saint Albans Ave Golf Manor, OH 45237 Luigiwrite@fuse.net	Option E looks good especially with the improvements in the I-75 Western Hills McMillen intersection access. We still need better alternative transportation especially for moving thru freight to more efficient rail and a true 8 to 10 county rapid and local transit system with stable multi-county funding. Maps in presentation were near unreadable. Need twice as many maps (= bigger room) each covering half as much right of way.	Comment noted This project will not preclude any plans for alternative transportation.
15	Bradley Bevington 639 Watkins Street Covington, KY 40011 bzbevington@gmail.com	Very informative	Comment noted
16	Phillip and Mary Landwehr 3061 Winding Trails Drive Edgewood, KY 41011	Thanks for a good and informative presentation. Good to see we are down to three alternatives. Keep going.	Comment noted

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
17	Craig T. Bohman 3129 Riggs Ave Erlanger, KY 41018 ctb@fuse.net	<p>1. Please include interstate access to Clay Wade Bailey Bridge from/to Ohio in order to improve access/egress from Downtown Covington while still keeping access to local 2nd Street and Gest Street.</p> <p>2. Please avoid taking properties in the Lewisburg Historic District on Crescent Avenue in Covington.</p> <p>3. Overall good options. Keeping direct access to I-71 and I-75 from both Covington exits is vital.</p> <p>4. Please include sound barriers and beautifying architectural features like the suburbs get. Covington's interstate deserves to look good. It's the gateway into Kentucky and should look like it.</p>	<p>1) Access to/from Clay Wade Bailey Bridge to the interstate and Downtown Covington will be reviewed in the next step of the project development process.</p> <p>2) Impacts will be done in a way to minimize the surrounding area while still maintaining adequate level of service and safety on the interstate.</p> <p>3) Comment noted</p> <p>4) Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement. Visual quality studies will also be conducted for the feasible alternatives in the next phase of the project.</p>
18	JoAnn M Roth 1012 Altavia Ave 619 W 11 th Street Park Hills, KY 41011	<p>Currently, I have a quaint home on W 11th Street in Covington, KY with a nice yard. There are four properties owned newly (within last year) in which owners are spending lots of money in re-hab for the preservation of Lewisburg and I am worried about the noise, construction and of concern for the remaining homes. First, I think design elements should be immediately planned for to contain noise.</p> <p>Second, I believe the area should be given funds to fix up parks and provide alternative routes.</p> <p>Third, though it doesn't affect me, I think 12th Street on the west side should be made wider to accommodate the increased traffic. My home is 619 W. 11th Street and I just don't want to see the area go further into the slums.</p>	<p>1) Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.</p> <p>2) New access routes are being considered along I-71/I-75.</p> <p>3) Local road widening beyond the construction limits is not part of this study. Additionally, widening of the interstate system is being designed to reduce non-local traffic on 12th Street.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
19	Steve Stevens 300 Buttermilk Pike Ste 330 Fort Mitchell, KY 41017 Representing: Northern KY Chamber of Commerce	The preferred alternative to move forward has the least potential environmental impact due to the fact that it stays within the existing right of way. I encourage that choice since it could potentially shorten the study time for environmental impacts. I encourage FHWA to permit an Environmental Assessment vs. an Environmental Impact Statement which would both speed up construction of the project while saving taxpayer money.	Comment noted. FHWA has recommended an Environmental Assessment for this project.
20	Mark and Sherry Jahnke 51 Rivard Drive Fort Wright, KY 41011 Mark.jahnke@insightbb.com	We have been in our Fort Wright home for 20 years and this will be the third time our home (and lives) has been affected by highway changes. It is already so noisy and dirty that we can hardly sit outside or open our windows. The possible displacements show our next door neighbor's house. Frankly, if you move I-75 any closer to our house – you might as well take it too. What about possible sound barriers for the residential area between Dixie Highway exit and the Kyles Lane exit (on the northbound side)? Every so called improvement to I-75 has destroyed our home, noise level, dirty level, property value, and lives. 20 years of this is enough. Please keep us informed of any updates as they occur.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
21	Christy Munyon 1502 Monroe St Covington, KY 41014 Christy.munyon@insightbb.com	My family lives extremely close to the new construction of the new St. Elizabeth Center. When I say close, I mean estimated 10-12 feet from structure. I sit on my deck and have a row of windows looking down at us along with a security camera watching over their property along with our private yard. I understand they are close to use because of the limits this bridge project has given them. In order for them to build where they are, they had to move my way so their property would not be impacted. Now our property would be unsellable, highway noise is louder due to the sound bouncing of the building and being so close to the garbage compactor of St. Elizabeth not appealing to us. My house shows stress and we keep getting the run around. Ultimately this is St. Elizabeth's problem but it started with this project.	The development of the St. Elizabeth Center is independent of this transportation project.
22	Barb Elfers 79 Kyles Lane Fort Wright, KY 41011 Bab_elfers@yahoo.com	Make sure you put sound barriers up to decrease, or at least maintain the current noise level. It is very noisy now.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
23	Kevin Dicke 38 East Orchard Road Fort Mitchell, KY 41017 kdicke@kkgstudio.com	We currently experience a large amount of highway traffic noise. With the addition of a fifth lane and the exit ramp, this will bring the traffic and traffic noise closer to our house. Is there any consideration to sound buffers? Noise reduction? What will this highway encroachment do to our neighborhood's property value?	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.
24	Laurie Fesmire 1250 Upland Avenue Fort Wright, KY 41011 Lalamb78@hotmail.com	Please consider noise abatement with all alternatives especially down the Cut in the Hill. There is currently no regulation or enforcement of tractor trailers. They frequently "jake brake" as they go down the hill at all hours. It is loud, disruptive, obnoxious and unnecessary. Noise abatement needs to be undertaken especially if you desire to add more lanes under all scenarios.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
25	Debbie Reinhart/Ray Reinhart 520 Western Avenue Covington, KY 41011 Reinhart_debbie@yahoo.com	As a property owner on Western Avenue I am extremely concerned about the increase in noise pollution, air quality/pollution, and loss of property value with the proposed bridge designs. Consideration of these matters must be addressed. According to the existing noise study we are already over the 67 decibels. Common sense speaks to the issue – more lanes, more traffic will significantly increase the decibels. Bringing the bridge closer to our houses is at the very least huge health risks, let alone greatly impacting our view – thus our home value. Everyone understands in northern KY the value of views – these designs will destroy our views. We request acquisition of our property as first choice. At the very least, steps to minimize increased noise and pollution (i.e. sound proof windows).	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement. Visual quality impacts will be assessed in the next step of the project for the feasible alternatives.
26	Michelle and Jim Keller 315 Summit Lane Fort Mitchell, KY 41011 michellkellr@kycourts.net	Thank you so much for hosting this informational session. Our property is located in old Fort Mitchell. Most lots on our street are adjacent to Dixie Highway, which of course is parallel to I-75. It appears from the proposals that our property will not be affected by the improvements which are proposed. Our question, however, and that of many of our neighbors is the problem with highway noise. It has significantly increased over the years with the cessation of the truck ban (use of I-275) as well as geological and other changes assorted with weather conditions (i.e. wind and ice, changes to numerous large trees, etc). We are interested in discussion the erection of a wall/noise barrier on the south of I-75 from Summit Lane to Fort side or Orchard.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
27	Angela Hughes/Terry Ford 617 Watkin Street Covington, KY 41011	The highway being so close to us now, the heavy trucks already shake our home. What will more lanes and more heavy trucks on the road near our home do to our house? We have water damage- water after it rains now gets the basement wet. Because of the last blasting it was never wet before that. Our house is a frame and very old. We have done a lot of work on it. I do not wish for it to fall down because of the vibration of heavy trucks. And what about the black film all over the siding of our home. I dust every day and it is back every day. We have children and new grandchildren breathing this in. The noise I now know what a jake brake is on this big truck because I asked.	Further noise studies will be completed to determine noise abatement. Construction will be done in a way to minimize impacts on the surrounding areas.
28	Mary Ann Miller 554 Davenport #1 Cincinnati, Oh 45204 Maryannmiller600@gmail.com	Very helpful and informative. People seemed genuinely interested in giving me information on all the alternatives.	Comment noted.
29	Glenn Storrs 719 Lewis Street Covington, KY 41011 Gstorrs@cincymuseum.org Representing: Cincinnati Museum Center	My understanding from speaking with your engineers is that access to Union Terminal via the interstate from the south (i.e. travelling north) will become less easy than it currently is. Union Terminal houses Cincinnati Museum Center which serves over 1 million visitors per year and is a major economic driver for the region. The majority of visitors travel to Union Terminal/Cincinnati Museum Center via the interstate. We need to look for improved access, not impede it! This project is a great opportunity to ease travel to Union Terminal/Cincinnati Museum Center that should be taken advantage of. To further restrict/complicate access I, and many others, will view as problematic and unacceptable. I urge you to contact Douglass McDonald for further discussion.	Alternative E maintains access to Ezzard Charles Drive via I-75 northbound. Alternative C will be combined with Alternative D as a hybrid alternative and access to the Cincinnati Museum Center will be reviewed and evaluated in the next step of the project.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
30	B. Eckert 7157 Gracely Drive Cincinnati, OH 45233	Would like to see the new bridge at Anderson Ferry (west side) as it only takes about 12 or 15 minutes to reach the airport (Cincinnati/KY) from Cincinnati downtown. After all, it is a "1850's" way to a "2009" international airport in KY.	An Ohio River crossing at the Anderson Ferry location was studied in 2004 and determined that a bridge crossing here would not address the problems identified at the Brent Spence Bridge.
31	Angie Dodge 410 Copperfield Lane Cincinnati, OH 45238 Bethanny68@hotmail.com	I am glad that you are involving the public with this Brent Spence Bridge. I have been up here for almost 11 years and amazed at how much traffic can build up on 1 bridge alone. Looks like the bridge is going to be amazing once it's done.	Comment noted
32	Martha L. Burton 810 Livingston St Cincinnati, OH 45229	Travelling south if the road is straighter than now, going south to Tennessee, Bowling Green, KY it would help a lot.	Comment noted.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
33	Jan W. Evans 536 Laramie Trail Wyoming, OH 45212 J_devans@fuse.net	<p>1) I would like to ask that Longworth Hall be preserved. It has been explained that a newer part of the building may be impacted but that the historic building can be saved. Please do this with sensitivity and by working with the Cincinnati Preservation Association and owners.</p> <p>2) Since the bridge is the gateway (and the accompanying route) it is important to select appropriate, attractive sound barrier walls. The “tin man peanut butter contraptions” must go” Do not use these, please! I-75 in the Dayton, OH area has some beautiful sound barriers/retaining walls cast with airplane motif. Stone walls are also nice for sound barriers. Try to place them so a mower blade can cut the weeds at the base so they don’t look unkempt.</p> <p>3) Please be especially sensitive to exits to the Cincinnati Museum Center Music Hall will be more difficult when coming from KY. Signs are especially important in directing to these venues. The directions to Freedom Center are awful. Taking I-75 to Music Hall, the present sign cause the “unknowing” to exit before Ezzard Charles – what?!?!</p>	<p>1) If Longworth Hall is impacted, mitigation measures will be pursued to minimize impacts to the historic structure.</p> <p>2) If sound barriers are used, the design of the barriers will be determined in future steps of the project. The public will be involved in selecting design of noise walls for the project.</p> <p>3) Access to the Cincinnati Museum Center and Music Hall will be maintained in Alternative E. Alternative C will be combined with Alternative D as a hybrid alternative and access to the Cincinnati Museum Center and Music Hall will be reviewed and included in the next step of the project. Signage plans will be reviewed to provide drivers with directions to community resources.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

**Public Involvement Meeting Comments Received
May 6, 2009 – Gardens of Park Hills, Park Hills, KY;
May 7, 2009 – Cincinnati Recreation Commission Lincoln Community Center, Cincinnati, Ohio**

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
34	Maureen Smith 444 West Third Street Cincinnati, OH 45240 Maureen.smith@us.dunnhumby.com	Recommend Alternative C as it has the least impact on OH-28 (referring to displacement exhibit – 444 West Third Street). Ask to reconsider design to have collector-distributor ramp and US 50 moved just west of this property to keep the building intact.	Alternative C will be combined with Alternative D as a hybrid alternative. A design exception will be considered to determine if impacts can be minimized or eliminated at this property.
35	Kathy Jones 1907 Colerain Ave Cincinnati, OH 45214 Jones.kros@yahoo.com	Was concerned about how it would affect my property. Unaffected. Preferred Alternative E.	Comment noted. Alternative E is recommended for further study.
36	Ronald R. Dodge, Jr. 1160 Copperfield Lane Cincinnati	Like the idea of collector-distributor lanes and express lanes. Based on what I see, I-75 express lanes would need to be 4 lanes. Like to see lane narrow down all the way to Buttermilk Pike on southern end. Don't like the signalize option of I-75 NB to River Road and that ramp area would need be not as sharp as they currently are with I-75 NB and US 50 WB and I-71 SB to US 50 WB.	Per the Conceptual Alternative Study Report recommendations, I-75 will be three lanes for northbound traffic and three lanes for southbound traffic.

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
1	Tony Walsh 2359 W. McMicken Cincinnati, OH 45214	<p>My wife, two children and I live at 2359 W. McMicken, Cincinnati, 45214. Our home is listed in the cost analysis of the Brent Spence Bridge Corridor Project as being affected by the revamp of the east end of the Western Hills Viaduct. Five houses on my block are slated for demolition. Although it's not known to what extent our property would be affected, I was told at the Lincoln Recreation Center meeting that it could be a partial cut into the rear of the lot or as much as the whole property. If a portion of the property is taken, McMillan could be elevated to reduce the grade by a retaining wall in my back yard.</p> <p>My wife and I have worked tirelessly to not only renovate our house but to help revive the entire neighborhood. At a time when people are fleeing the inner city, we have chosen to stay and try to improve it. As members of the West McMicken Improvement Association and CUF Neighborhood Association we've been involved in many major improvement projects since moving here in 1987. One of our ongoing concerns has been the dangerous bend above the intersection of W. McMicken and W. McMillan, a constant site for accidents. I know the state's I-75 plans end just below this intersection, houses (on the northeast corner) and possibly part of Fairview Park. I think this spot could be improved without such extreme measures. The northeast corner of McMicken and McMillan already has a parcel of public right of way at the corner, a vacant lot (recently demolished), and a vacant house that recently sold for \$3,000.00. The next property is the West McMicken Community Garden, an award winning example of what a community can do with an abandoned lot full of trash. The first three lots could be obtained for next to nothing and the space opened up could substantially reduce the curve without displacing anyone. I wouldn't want anything to disrupt the Community Garden though.</p> <p>I realize the plans for this area aren't set in stone at this point and hope you will think about this neighborhood's concerns as things move forward. A major part of the unique appeal of Cincinnati is its hilly terrain. Where there are hills, there are curves, steep grades and hillside neighborhoods. These are all qualities worth preserving. Otherwise there won't be anything interesting left when all of the commuters can drive here so easily.</p>	<p>Western Hills Viaduct will be further evaluated in the next step of the project and will include coordination with existing and proposed connections to/from the Mill Creek Expressway Project.</p> <p>The extent of the improvements along McMillan Street between Central Parkway and McMicken Avenue have yet to be determined and will be evaluated in the next step of the project.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
2	Beth McCarty President – West McMicken Community Council	<p>The West McMicken Improvement Association recently met to discuss the impact of the proposed plans and renovation for the I-75 and Western Hills Viaduct project on our community. It is our understanding that the State of Ohio remains in the planning stages for this project and is seeking input from the communities that will be directly affected by this project.</p> <p>The West McMicken Improvement Association is an active community council that includes many invested homeowners. The community is made up of residents living in the direct area of this project including five residential properties that back up to McMillan near the intersection of Central Parkway and McMillan to McMicken Street that will be directly impacted if not eliminated by the proposed plans.</p> <p>Our members agree that the displacement of and the ecological impact on the existing housing and residents must be minimized. Additionally, the community has concerns about the damage that could be done to the hillside and the properties that rest on this hillside of Fairview during this construction and renovation. Many of these homes rest on the Fairview hillside and we fear that such a project will impact their homes structurally. Past projects in this area have already had negative impacts on the hillside.</p> <p>Our members have reviewed the proposed plans and were alarmed at the scale of the project. The amount of traffic indicated would be devastating to this community who do not wish to see an increase of traffic at this entrance point. We stand in agreement with the Clifton Heights University Heights and Fairview (CUF) community that this traffic would have a negative impact on the business district at the top of the hill on McMillan. We feel strongly that allowing increased traffic in this area for the convenience of traffic across the Western Hills Viaduct is not worth the impact it would have on a residential community. This community has worked for many years to improve the quality of life, reducing crime, and promoting home ownership in an effort to make our community a safe and welcoming environment to live. Many community members have restored homes and raised their families here.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p>	<p>Western Hills Viaduct will be further evaluated in the next step of the project and will include coordination with existing and proposed connections to/from the Mill Creek Expressway Project.</p> <p>The extent of the improvements along McMillan Street between Central Parkway and McMicken Avenue have yet to be determined and will be evaluated in the next step of the project.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
2	Beth McCarty President – West McMicken Community Council (continued)	<p>(continued)</p> <p>Some of the community projects include: working on community green spaces including several awards from the City, Mosaic Gateway Project at Straight Street and McMicken, the West McMicken Community Garden Project, Fairview Park playground replacement, Rehabilitation of the abandoned row houses at 2358 W. McMicken into single family homes, awarded a Project 180 Grant from Keep Cincinnati Beautiful to beautify three homes of elderly residents and planting trees in the park located at the corner of West McMicken and McMillan as well as trees that line West McMicken. These are just a few of the many contributions our community members have made to make our neighborhood great and to indicate to you the involvement of the members of this community. We continue to struggle with many issues that impact our quality of life but remain committed to continue to make this community better and a great place to live.</p> <p>We welcome continued dialog into this project. Our community members would like to see improvements to the intersection as well as improved pedestrian and bicycle traffic since many of us live and work in our own communities. We would welcome a design that promoted this lifestyle and provided a safe environment to have alternative transportation. We also welcome additional green space and landscaping as part of the project to decrease the visual impact of added roadway.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to listen to our concerns. We look forward to working with you in the future.</p>	

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
3	Steve Johns Executive Director Citizens for Civic Renewal	<p>My comments are in three areas: 1) The selected alternatives should be as elegant as Fort Washington Way; 2) The public should understand the scale and vision of the project; 3) The level of service conundrum should be better addressed</p> <p><u>Elegance</u> - Fort Washington Way took the existing roadway “spaghetti” and replaced it with an elegant collector distribution system in the form of the one way pair of 2nd and 3rd Streets. This approach significantly improved safety and drivability of this area by reducing all downtown access points to two – one on the east side and on the west side of downtown. There are no exits for seven city blocks. The alternatives for the Brent Spence Replacement/Rehabilitation maintain much of the existing “spaghetti” – particularly on the Ohio side. The proposed signage for the preferred alternatives reveals the myriad of decision points for drivers who do not negotiate this area on a day-to-day basis. A more elegant solution would better segregate local and thru traffic.</p> <p><u>Scale and Vision</u> - The current BSB is approximately 50 feet in width. The proposed bridge is roughly twice the size of the BSB. The public has not been exposed to visuals or renderings that can show the magnitude of this project. I believe that is the public was shown renderings or images of similar highways, they would react negatively. The 18-lanes of road proposed on the Covington side are roughly equal to the San Diego Freeway and associated feeder roads in California (image attached to letter). Highways of this scale do not put us at a competitive advantage against our regional competitors. Louisville is building similar bridges over the Ohio. A more iconic transit system would put us in a unique position to compete with the auto dependent regions of Indianapolis and Louisville and keep us on par with fast growing gazelle regions like Charlotte.</p> <p><u>Level of Service</u> - All of the existing alternatives are projected to have segments that will be at level of service E or F in 2030. This just reinforces the findings of the North South Transportation Initiative which indicated that only through the addition of transit can we hope to mitigate long term congestion in this area. This fact is related to the inaccuracy of one of the key talking points used to justify this project – that the traffic on this bridge is primary of national nature. The origin and destination study (Appendix C of Brent Spence Bridge Existing and Future Conditions Report – February 2006) clearly shows that less than 11% of the car trips during peak hour are thru trips on I-75. This study also makes it clear that the majority of trips over the BSB are local and could be accommodated through means other than a huge new interstate bridge.</p>	<p>1) Comment noted.</p> <p>2) A Bridge Type Study will be performed in the next phase of the project with alternatives for the design of the new bridge. This study will analyze different bridge types that will be suitable for this project. Renderings showing the scale and vision will be done as part of the study.</p> <p>3) Segments at LOS E and F will be reviewed and reevaluated to see if any improvements can be made to the level of service. On the south end of the project, LOS E and F will result due to matching the existing cross section at this location.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
4	Margo Warminski Cincinnati Preservation Association 342 W. 4 th St. Cincinnati, Oh 45202	Based on the information available at this meeting, Alternatives C and D seem least problematic for historic resources, and would have the least impact on Longworth Hall and the Lewisburg Historic District. Alternatives B, F, and G would appear to have greater impacts on either Longworth Hall, Lewisburg, or both. We are also concerned about possible impacts to residences on West McMicken and would like to minimize impacts to these historic residences.	Section 106 and Section 4(f) Evaluations will be completed to assess impacts on the resources. Assessments will study, direct, noise, and visual impacts. Mitigation measures will be developed to reduce impacts to cultural resources.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
5	Tony Walsh West McMicken Improvement Association	<p>Will the improvement of McMillan from the parkway to McMicken necessitate widening/straightening McMillan up to Ravine? If so what would be the impact to the neighborhood – houses, Fairview Park, traffic, etc.?</p> <p>Will the improvement to McMillan increase the traffic capacity and what are the estimates in the certified traffic study projection for 2038? Is the certified Traffic Study on the Brent Spence/ODOT websites? Do you have a link, I couldn't find it.</p> <p>Is raising the level of McMillan as it approaches the Parkway necessary (as shown in the State plans to decrease the incline)?</p> <p>The existing state plan in the alternatives still in consideration all show 2351 W McMicken to the corner of McMicken and McMillan being affected with 2405-2413 W. McMicken being torn down. If the straightening of McMillan continues through the Northeast corner of the intersection using the angle shown on the map, the West McMicken Community Garden and several houses would be in the way.</p> <p>As I said before, we'd love to have the problem with the bend above the intersection corrected by not by destroying the neighborhood.</p>	<p>The project does not include widening/straightening McMillan up to Ravine.</p> <p>The extents of the improvements along McMillan Street between Central Parkway and McMicken Avenue have yet to be determined and will be evaluated in the next step of the project.</p> <p>The entire certified traffic data is not on the Brent Spence/ODOT websites, however, results of the certified traffic is presented in the Conceptual Alternatives Study. In the next step of the project, additional traffic studies will be conducted for the Western Hills Viaduct and Central Parkway intersection.</p> <p>The Western Hills Viaduct will be further evaluated in the next step of the project and will include coordination with existing and proposed connections to/from the Mill Creek Expressway Project.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
6	Michael Schweitzer Longworth Hall, LLC 700 Pete Rose Way Cincinnati, OH 45203	<p>I would like to meet with appropriate Project Team engineers to discuss the actual amount of space potentially impacted by the alternatives. I would then perform construction estimates on the cost of rebuilding the part of Longworth Hall being torn down so that we can relocate that square footage lost elsewhere on our property, as well as gauge the impact to the building and its tenants. The entire telecommunications trunk for the building is located on the east end as well as two elevators and numerous utilities. In addition, tenants would need to be relocated. I don't see how the Project Team can make an effective proposal without a construction estimate from Longworth Hall.</p> <p>One other area of great concern is the amount of noise and nuisance created by driving pilings, tearing down one side of our building, etc. I don't believe it is realistic for Longworth Hall to undergo such construction without compensation for lost tenants. Will we be able to maintain a safe, clean, nuisance free office environment during the six year construction of the bridge? Where will the construction staging occur? How will traffic immediately around Longworth hall be impacted? I would like to address the above concerns in a private meeting so that the Project Team is aware of the complications associated with potentially removing part of Longworth Hall for the new bridge.</p>	A meeting was held between Mr. Schweitzer, ODOT, KYTC, and PB on May 20, 2009 to discuss the noted concerns and the project development process.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
7	Mr. Hartman	No comment received	<p>Thanks for taking the time to attend our meeting last night. These opportunities allow us a chance to hear directly from the users of our facilities, and enable us to improve our designs.</p> <p>As we discussed, our District 8 office does have a plan to paint the route labels on the pavement in the Fort Washington Way area and the approaches to the Brent Spence. The status of this work still needs final approval from our Statewide Safety Committee. This committee is responsible for funding these types of improvements. Our District staff is applying for these funds this month and will know if they are approved by the end of July. If approved, the works will most likely occur next spring.</p> <p>The contact person for this effort is in our Traffic Studies Section. His name is Tom Arnold, and he can be reached at 513-933-6588 if you have further questions.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
8	Debbie and Roger Weinel 626 W 12 th Street Covington, KY 41011	<p>Are there plans to put up sound barriers along the corridor that will now encroach on homes? The noise level is already increasing from traffic and will be from the construction, not to mention the plates in the street, mud everywhere, etc. It might cut down on some of that if the barriers were included when they widen/move I-75.</p> <p>I live at 626 W 12th Street in Covington and from what I am hearing from my neighbors, the “end” of the street will move up and take away 4 or 5 houses from the Bullock end of our street and move all the interstate noise that much closer (and to our poor neighbor who will then be a corner lot occupant!). Ears and property value are at stake.</p> <p>Who can we contact to beg for the barrier if it is not included? Is there a contact person for the Kentucky side of this project?</p>	<p>A noise screening has been completed as part of the latest phase of work for the project. This report will be available for review at the meeting. In addition, there will be representatives from the project team including KYTC officials, at the meetings on May 6 and 7. They will be able to answer specific questions about the report, and be able to discuss specific questions concerning your property. For your information, the KYTC contacts are Rob Hans and John Eckler. They can be reached at 859-341-2700.</p>
9	Amanda Park 320 Hooven Ave Hamilton, Oh 45015	<p>I understand that two bridges seems like a good idea but having worked in the Cincinnati area I would not want to deal with having two bridges merge onto the same road space. This sounds like adding another bottleneck to an already bloated traffic zone and it would make much more sense to keep the current traffic patterns unless the new bridge directs traffic onto another road and does not cause a bottle neck merging situation where cars are left sitting on the bridge. After seeing the bridge collapse in St Louis (<i>Note: means Minneapolis</i>) area that idea is frightening. This also does not address the issue of the aging Brent Spence Bridge and leaves an already well overage bridge in continued over-use.</p>	<p>The roadway corridor north and south of the bridge would also have added lanes to prevent bottlenecks.</p> <p>Bridge inspections conducted in 2005 by KYTC and ODOT found the Brent Spence Bridge to have a sufficiency rating between 66 and 64 on a scale of 100. While the bridge is classified as functionally obsolete due to operational characteristics, the bridge structure itself was considered in fair physical condition. A bridge inspection was also completed in December 2008 by KYTC. The Deck and the Superstructure is rated overall as a 6, the Substructure is rated overall as a 7. This is satisfactory to good condition.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
10	Robert Neel President Clifton Heights- University Heights-Fairview Neighborhood Association	<p>The neighborhood of Clifton Heights University Heights and Fairview (CUF) has assembled a task force to discuss the issue of the impact and changes foreseen by potential renovations to I-75 at its intersection with the Western Hills Viaduct. As we understand it, the State remains in the planning stages for this interchange area and has asked for input from the communities that will be affected. We have reviewed the documents and have consolidated our core determinations before the next phase of design begins.</p> <p>As an introduction to our neighborhood, CUF is a hillside residential and mixed use neighborhood with a heavy emphasis on parks and urban forestry, including the beautiful scenic Fairview Park on this hillside. The proposed changes to I-75 at the Western Hills Viaduct may have potential impacts on our community, especially as the changes will impact Central Parkway and traffic patterns at this entry site into our community. Our central business district is located within one mile of the proposed changes at Central Parkway and the Western Hills Viaduct. Given that cutting into the steep hillsides in Cincinnati has a history of encouraging damaging and costly landslides, we want to maintain the current integrity and stability of the steep slopes, rock formations, vegetation, and soil along McMillan Street and Central Parkway.</p> <p>Displacement of, and ecological impact on, existing housing and commercial concerns must be minimized. The current plan will call for five residential properties, one commercial property, and two public right of ways to be consumed. Transitions from the right of way should be landscaped and have the effect of welcoming visitors to the neighborhood.</p> <p>The scale of traffic at the entrance to the community at McMillan and Central Parkway (at the Western Hills Viaduct) should be commensurate with the scale of traffic in our central business district. Our historic business district has two lanes that go east from the west. Currently we have two lanes that merge into this from the north (from Clifton Avenue) and two lanes that merge from the west (from the existing Western Hills Viaduct to McMillan transit route). We already struggle with gridlock at these intersections. The community has concerns regarding potential increase in traffic in the business district if there is a net increase in traffic at the entrance to the community at McMillan and Central Parkway. In an ideal situation, we would not see increased traffic at this entrance point to our community or a creative solution to not damage the West McMicken community. Are there projections of the changes in the amount of traffic that we will see into our community due to the proposed changes at the Western Hills Viaduct?</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Western Hills Viaduct will be further evaluated in the next step of the project and will include coordination with existing and proposed connections to/from the Mill Creek Expressway Project.</p> <p>Projections indicate approximately a 40 percent increase in traffic along W. McMillan just east of Central Parkway.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
10	Robert Neel President Clifton Heights- University Heights-Fairview Neighborhood Association (continued)	<p>(continued)</p> <p>To avoid conditions that create gridlock, traffic should be dispersed using signage to identifying best routes for popular destinations. We still envision the Hopple Street/Martin Luther King interchange at I-75 to be the major entry way point for the I-75 traffic into our neighborhood and for the University and the local hospitals (Good Samaritan, University Hospital, and Deaconess). We are not interested in this intersection becoming a larger through-way for commuting traffic at the expense of residents of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Allowances should be made for the current and future needs of both pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Bicyclists and pedestrians should feel safe and the new design should not create any hardship as they travel through the affected zone. Our neighborhood is a residential neighborhood with a park within one block of the Central Parkway interchange at McMillan.</p> <p>We are hopeful for the future that whatever plans are created for Western Hills Viaduct will keep in mind our hope for improved public transportation, whether that involves streetcars or subways.</p> <p>The current plan will call for five residential properties, one commercial property, and two public right-of-ways to be consumed. Displacement of, and ecological impact on, existing housing and commercial concerns must be minimized. Transitions from the right of way should be landscaped and have the effect of welcoming visitors to the neighborhood.</p> <p>Staging areas, construction supplies and scheduling should be planned to minimize the burden on local residents.</p> <p>Thank you again for your time. We are very interested in remaining involved in this dialogue and in participating with our City and State to help guide future directions.</p>	

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
11	Jean Schmitz 1308 Hermes Avenue Covington, KY 41011	<p>My husband and I have been of the Lewisburg Neighborhood of Covington for many years. We have lived on Hermes Avenue before Interstate I-71/I-75 was constructed in Covington more than forty years ago. The rear of our property borders the I-71/I-75 interstate.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to address the resident's concerns in the area in which we reside. My husband and I have been active in past years trying to receive some redress from the environmental impact cause by the construction of the I-71/I-75 corridor adjacent to our property.</p> <p>One example of the impact caused by the noise level of the interstate traffic is a substantial hearing loss incurred by my husband.</p> <p>When the roadway was revamped in the 1990s I addressed concern at that time to little avail. The end result was a continuous environmental problem from 1963 to the present. One item I asked to be considered at the Hearings held for the 1990s project was the possibility of the installation of sound barriers along the Interstate to reduce the noise and pollution level. I was told that sound barriers were not "cost effective." My concern was not the cost of the sound barriers but the environmental impact on the neighborhood. I attended the Transportation Cabinet meeting on May 6, 2009 in Park Hills, Kentucky. I talked to one of the officials about the noise problem we have endured. Guess what? He advised that the solution to the problem is SOUND BARRIERS.</p> <p>One other item of concern is the maintenance of the property adjacent to the Interstate. As mentioned earlier, our property borders the Interstate property. During the summer, this property is only marginally maintained adjacent to our residence. Our driveway is next to the Interstate fence. We constantly must deal with weed overrun and fir tree needles and cones. The needles have resulted in a damaged car window mechanism and the windshield washer on our car.</p> <p>In conclusion, I have a comment on a paragraph (page 1) of the information booklet made available at May 6, 2009 Transportation Cabinet Meeting. "Particular attention is given to those effects that result directly, or indirectly, in the benefits, or <u>loss to the community</u>..."</p> <p>Human beings are the most critical element of the <u>community</u> and their well being should have priority over the environmental issues such as land impact or water run-off.</p>	<p>Further noise studies will be completed in the next phase of the project to determine appropriate noise abatement.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
12	City of Cincinnati	<p>The City of Cincinnati endorses the recommendation to eliminate the remaining Queensgate Alternative based on community and economic impacts, risk, time, and cost associated with the corridor. The remaining alignments are within the existing, previously disturbed I-75 corridor.</p> <p>It is our understanding that ODOT is proposing to advance alternatives C, D, and E for further study, with the possibility of merging their best features, perhaps resulting in a hybrid that consists of northbound alternative C, and southbound alternative D, possibly transitioning to alternative E south of the river in Kentucky. Certain features of alternative G that provide access to the Fort Washington Way trench and the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge will continue to be considered.</p> <p>The Conceptual Alternative Study (CAS) recommends that each of the alternatives be advanced with three lanes carrying I-75 traffic across the bridge. Since these cross sections are not provided in the CAS, the City wants to assure itself that these alternatives are reconciled with the recommendations of the North South Transportation Initiative as amended, and the OKI Regional Long Range Transportation Plan. The City recommends that through lanes be clearly distinguished from auxiliary lanes, and that the terms "auxiliary lanes," "collector-distributor," ramps and local roadway networks be clearly defined.</p> <p>The City of Cincinnati has prepared a document entitled "Cincinnati Interstate 75 Corridor Context and Criteria," transmitted with this letter, which serves as the basis for the City's policy guidance with respect to the I75 Corridor redevelopment, including the Brent Spence Bridge segment.</p> <p>The "Operations and Function" section discusses the City's expectations with respect to ramps and the proposed "collector-distributor" system. The City's goal is to:</p> <p><i>Maintain or improve existing access to and from the interstate system, but integrate the ramp network into the city street grid as directly as possible. The roadway, especially the free-flow and/or collector-distributor elements should be sensitive to the urban character of the areas traversed.</i></p> <p>The City of Cincinnati would like clarification of the definition of a "collector-distributor" and the design speeds and criteria proposed for their facilities. The City would like to explore with ODOT how, through aesthetic treatments or context sensitive design principle, to reconcile the design of these auxiliary lanes with the City's criteria.</p> <p>Alternative E proposes a signalized intersection on what is currently known as the Sixth Street Expressway.</p>	<p>As the study is carried forward, all feasible alternatives will be further evaluated to provide improved service and access to/from the interstate into both downtown Cincinnati and Covington.</p> <p>ODOT and KYTC will continue coordination with the City of Cincinnati regarding the design details and impacts of the alternatives.</p> <p>The definition of a collector-distributor will be clarified.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
12		<p>(continued)</p> <p>The City requests clarification about where the limited access highway begins, and where the freeway ends. Where an alternative, such as E, would require major alternations to the local street network, like modifying one-way pairs and re-establishing two-way traffic, the City requests that ODOT provide the resources to study these proposals, and that the City be given the opportunity to consider public comment and make policy decisions. This request also applies to new or improved access that would put additional pressure on City facilities, such as the intersection of Third Street and the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge. The Department of Transportation and Engineering has also prepared a letter to ODOT that addresses the City's technical concerns regarding the Interstate 75 corridor.</p> <p>The city of Cincinnati held a public hearing to obtain citizen comments on its proposed evaluation criteria, and the CAS. A summary of that testimony and written comments are included with this correspondence. One impacted property in particular, the 444 West Third Building, because of its economic importance to the City is of concern. The City communicated these concerns to ODOT and KYTC during our May 22, 2009 meeting and received ODOT's commitment to explore what it will take to avoid this structure. The City appreciates receptiveness to the request since it will involve a design exception. The City welcomes ODOT's questions about our policy guidance, and look forward to discussing how these criteria are applied to specific situations as design progresses.</p>	<p>Coordination will occur with both the City and ODOT concerning design exceptions regarding Dunnhumby (444 West Third Street).</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
13	City of Cincinnati Department of Transportation and Engineering	<p>1. DOTE agrees with the recommendations of the CAS document relative to the elimination of the Queensgate alternatives. It is agreed that the design, as it moves forward, should concentrate on the use of the existing I-75 corridor.</p> <p>2. Staff supports the recommendation to provide for three lanes in each direction on I-75.</p> <p>3. Staff also supports the recommendation to incorporate certain items from Alternative G, particularly the access ramp to northbound I-75 near Freeman. It is the desire of the City to provide access to and from Freeman Avenue as close to the intersection of Freeman and Gest as possible. It is not desirable for truck traffic to enter and exit the highway near the Western Hills Viaduct and use long stretches of urban-type arterials as the path to and from the Queensgate area.</p> <p>4. The recommendation to access the north side of the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge in Ohio may have merit, but this must be analyzed to determine the benefits versus the potential safety and capacity issues at the signalized intersections in Cincinnati and Covington. This must also be weighed against the Regional Rail Plan which shows the future I-71 Light Rail on this bridge.</p> <p>5. Staff supports the recommendation to carry forward in design a combination of Alternatives C and D and Alternative E. In our meeting of May 22, 2009 with PB, staff reiterated many of our concerns relative to access and roadway types/designs as we move forward. However, several issues were specifically discussed which will need to be addressed as the design progresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of the dunnhumby offices at Third Street and Central Avenue • Reduced design speed of the eastbound to southbound Sixth Street Expressway ramp to allow for additional land near the northeast property line of UPS • Access to Ezzard Charles Drive from northbound I-75/local streets • Establishing an appropriate Limited Access (LA) line for the western limit of the downtown streets, particularly for the Sixth Street Expressway <p>Attached with these comments is the "Cincinnati Interstate 75 Corridor Context and Criteria" dated June 2, 2009. This document was developed with the input of many City Departments as part of the City Council Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee. It identifies departmental goals and opportunities associated with the Brent Spence Bridge project.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted</p> <p>2. Comment noted</p> <p>3. Access to I-75 northbound near Freeman will be reevaluated in the next step of the project development process and will be included barring any design restrictions.</p> <p>4. Access to the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge will be evaluated in the next phase of the project.</p> <p>5. Comment noted and coordination will occur with both the City of Cincinnati and ODOT concerning design exceptions regarding the dunnhumby and UPS facilities.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
Public hearing sponsored by City of Cincinnati		The following comments are from the public hearing held on May 12, 2009 sponsored by the City of Cincinnati.	
14	J.S. Fortin 448 Klotter Ave Cincinnati, OH 45214	What will the bridge be named? By whom?	Naming of the new bridge will be decided upon by Kentucky elected officials.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
15	Russell Bozian Cincinnati, OH	<p>The Brent Spence bridge's limited capacity forms a natural, sprawl-reducing urban growth boundary of enormous economic value to Cincinnati and Southern Ohio. The current bridge's four commuting lanes in each direction are an already-in-place Cincinnati sprawl limiter that would be politically and practically quite difficult to create artificially. The vast majority of the most globally competitive, attractive, energy efficient cities in the world are sited on an island, peninsula, coastline, riverbank, valley or other natural growth boundary that discourages the loss of taxpayers to scattered sprawl in all directions. And sprawl limiters do not just benefit large cities. For example, even distant and artificial urban growth boundaries in Portland, Oregon have increased the city's attractiveness, property values and quality of life.</p> <p>The sprawl-limiting Brent Spence Bridge keeps Ohio workers living and paying taxes in Ohio. The lane limits save Ohio taxpayers millions of dollars per year by discouraging Ohio workers from living, shopping, dining and paying their property taxes in Kentucky. The bridge's limitation of Southern Ohio traffic, pollution, and expensive oil dependency are to be envied by other cities, and preserved for the benefit of Ohio taxpayers. It is doubly financially absurd to spend hundreds of millions of Ohio tax dollars to destroy a taxpayer-preserving sprawl-limiter, when that boundary destruction will by the study's own figures then drain Southern Ohio's tax base of tens of thousands of families by 2035. Increasing the daily traffic over the bridge invites further environmental damage to the OH/KY/Indiana region already beset with smog alerts. Taking \$3 billion dollars, \$700,000 per day, from taxpayers, making them pay \$14 per new crossing, to encourage workers to move to Northern Kentucky, will encourage Southern Ohio drivers to adopt a lifestyle that will be especially vulnerable to the inevitable rising oil prices that the current Brent Spence Bridge study hides from analyses. The build "Sprawlternatives" needlessly soak up state transportation money sorely needed for in State road and bridge maintenance, directly and irreversibly damaging and draining the Southern Ohio economy and its neighborhoods for decades to come.</p> <p>The study's description of the benefits of the no-build alternative, and the tax and economic losses of paying \$700,000 per day to subsidize the flight of Ohio homeowners and shoppers to Kentucky, are incomplete. The economic damage to Southern Ohio, caused by using taxpayer money to make it even easier for Ohio workers to move their property and taxes to Kentucky, has not been well studied or admitted in the current Brent Spence Bridge project documents. Nor does the study explain why Kentucky-to-Ohio commuting traffic will inevitably grow over the next 30 years, when oil prices are rising as we speak.</p>	Comment noted.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
15		<p>(continued) The study talks a lot about the long run but in the long run American cities will, in the face of \$5 per gallon gasoline, turn to mass transit to keep business and living costs down and attractive to new industries.</p> <p>My name is Russell Bozian, I have been a Cincinnati resident for 45 years. On behalf of all Ohio and Indiana residents, who do not want to see our property taxes rise as homeowners leave our state's tax base, spending \$28 per day of our newly weakened economy's tax dollars, per new Kentucky commuter, and on behalf of our Kentucky colleagues that value a strong Tri-State central business and entertainment district, and do not wish to make our region more unattractive, polluted, noisy, and gas price dependent, I ask that the Brent Spence build out's "image of inevitability" be stopped. I ask that the alternatives documents be withdrawn and resubmitted to the public at a later date. Come back to us after you have spent real money studying a full and honest accounting of the losses by driving Ohio homeowner-taxpayers to Northern Kentucky. Spend 10% of the money you've spent studying the build sprawl alternatives, and show us the total economic, tax base, environmental and transit system opportunity losses they will impose on Ohioans. Thank you.</p>	Comment noted

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
16	Cincinnati Museum Center	<p>Current access to Museum Center from I-75 is hampered in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound I-75: No direct access to Ezzard Charles or Western Avenue. Patrons are instructed to exit on US 50 and then to Linn Street, travelers must then wind their way through Queensgate to our entrance on Western Avenue. • Southbound I-75: Signed access to Western Avenue is direct, however, a more direct (and dangerous) access point is the Ezzard Charles Drive exit <p>The Cincinnati Museum Center supports those plans that (overall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access to Ezzard Charles Drive, to and from north and south bound -75 • Utilize the collector/distributor system to provide more direct and safer access to Union Terminal, Queensgate and the West End. This is an important necessity for Museum Center’s patrons, as well as for other area businesses and residents • Facilitate the use of clear signage for all Downtown Cincinnati exits, including to major arts, cultural and other “destinations” <p>Cincinnati Museum Center supports Alternative 4 with Sub-Alternative 2 from Step 4 (2008) because it provides more direct and safer access for visitors.</p> <p>Cincinnati Museum Center does not support the Queensgate Alternative, as it would result in negative impacts for both Queensgate and the Cincinnati Museum Center. It would precipitate the loss of jobs, business opportunities and impact the region with loss of earnings and property taxes.</p>	<p>Alternative E maintains access to Ezzard Charles Drive via I-75 NB. Alternative C will be combined with Alternative D as a hybrid alternative and access to the Cincinnati Museum Center will be reviewed and evaluated in the next step of the project for all alternatives.</p> <p>The alternative described in this comment is similar to Alternative F, which was eliminated from consideration. Some elements from Alternative G, which is also similar to the alternative described, will be included in the feasible alternative as appropriate. The Queensgate Alternative was also eliminated from further study.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
17	United Parcel Service (UPS)	<p>UPS has several concerns regarding the Brent Spence Bridge Project which involve company properties at 500 Gest Street and 640 West Third Street. As shared at the Transportation and Infrastructure sub-committee meeting 5/5/09, concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance of the Freeman Avenue exit and its current access to and from I-75. • Improvement of access is needed from Gest Street to I-75 southbound. Currently access is from the left side of I-75 southbound merging into the high speed lane. This is a safety concern, so our drivers will either go up to Ezzard Charles then double back, or go through Covington City Streets. • In some of the Alternatives there are “sliver takes” of properties to support the project. Currently none of the alternatives appear to encroach on UPS properties. This must remain the case as any “sliver takes” of UPS properties will require a move to a new location. It is necessary for both properties to remain intact. • An additional concern is the amount of traffic to and from the property throughout a 24 hour period. The most critical time period is during the 8:00-9:00 am window. During that time frame there are approximately 250 personal and commercial vehicles coming onto the property and 300 such vehicles exiting the property. Other time periods to note, but of lesser traffic volume is from 4:00 – 6:00 pm and again 8:00 – 10:45 pm. • During construction, maintenance of traffic with minimal delays is important to UPS business especially during the time periods mentioned above. • Not mentioned at the meeting, but also of importance, is the maintenance of easy accessibility to and from US 50 eastbound, Fort Washington Way, I-71, and I-471. 	<p>Coordination will occur with both the City of Cincinnati and ODOT concerning design exceptions regarding impacts to the UPS property.</p> <p>Accessibility to UPS and other facilities will continue to be evaluated.</p> <p>Impacts to properties will be minimized to the extent possible to avoid displacements.</p> <p>Maintenance of traffic plans will be developed in the next phase of the project development process.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
18	dunnhumby USA	<p>We are currently spending \$15 million on renovating a building at 444 W 3rd Street that has been unoccupied for the last 9 years and investing a further \$1 million in facilities.</p> <p>444 extends the footprint of downtown Cincinnati and brings life and jobs to a previously neglected area.</p> <p>444 is the last building of its kind in downtown Cincinnati that suits our ways of working and helps us win and grow. When we were making decisions last year on new space, our options were limited but we found great new space and we will continue to receive job creation incentives from the State and City that expire in 2012.</p> <p>We are told that 444 may be compulsory purchased at any point from 2012 onwards. This creates a lot of uncertainty but with our job creation incentives complete and no new similar space available, we will be forced to look at new locations across the tri-state area.</p> <p>We encourage the Federal, State, and City teams involved in this project to either fully revise this plan or, worst case, to proceed with an adapted version of Option C that by-passes our new office building as well as our parking lot.</p>	<p>ODOT, KYTC, and PB met with representatives from dunnhumby on May 14, 2009 to discuss the project and possible impacts to the building at 444 West Third Street by the feasible alternatives.</p>
19	Ohio Kentucky Indiana (OKI) Regional Council of Governments	<p>The economic significance of the Brent Spence Bridge Project cannot be understated. It doesn't simply connect southwest Ohio with Northern Kentucky. It serves as a vital element in the literal freight conveyor belt that runs between Michigan with Miami. It serves as a major connector to the ports of Los Angeles and San Jose. The fact that this bridge has more than \$400 billion of freight crossing it every year not only illustrates its regional importance but its national significance. This importance grows exponentially by 2030, when freight values increase in real dollars to almost \$815 billion dollars.</p> <p>The recommendations contained in the CAS illustrates what the region can do if its leaders work together, acting as one entity with the sole purpose of defining the best solution for the region's transportation network and economic growth.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Public Involvement Comments Received through June 8, 2009

Number	Name/Address	Comment	Response
20	Duke Energy	<p>Duke Energy completed a more in-depth review of the utility relocation requirements for the various alternatives. This review estimates the cost associated with building the new bridge in the existing right-of-way is \$22 million to \$40 million while the costs associated with the Queensgate options exceed \$100 million. Please note that these estimates are based on 2008 construction costs and have not been based on detailed engineering plans or actual construction bids. The construction complexity and costs associated with the Queensgate alternatives confirm that building the new bridge in the existing right-of-way is the preferred option from an electric utility perspective.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
21	Margo Warminski Cincinnati Preservation Association	<p>CPA is concerned about the possible impacts to historic resources in the Area of Potential Effect, including the National Register-listed Longworth Hall, two potentially Register-eligible sites near the riverfront – the West Virginia Coal & Coke Building at 725 Front Street and the John Mueller House at 724 Mehring Way – the Lewisburg Historic District in Covington, and a potential historic district in the 2400 block of West McMicken Street in University Heights, which could face demolition or the loss of rear frontage for bridge approaches. Based on the information presently available, it appears that Alternative C and D will have the least impact on Longworth Hall and Lewisburg. It also appears the Coal & Coke Building and Mueller House will not be impacted. We will monitor future developments for potential impacts to the properties on West McMicken.</p>	<p>A Phase II History/Architecture survey will be conducted on the West Virginia Coal & Coke Building at 725 Front Street to determine if this property is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.</p> <p>If impacted, the potential historic district in University Heights will be evaluated to determine its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places.</p> <p>Impacts to cultural resources will be addressed in the next step of the project. Mitigation measures will be developed to reduce impacts to cultural resources.</p>

**Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study
June 2009**

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study June 2009

Name/Address	Comment	Response
<p>US Environmental Protection Agency Region 5</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to look at the Conceptual Alternatives Study for the Brent Spence Bridge rehabilitation project...We note that the sections on natural environment do not discuss or include air impact information. The Greater Cincinnati Region is a designated nonattainment area for 8-hour ozone and PM2.5 standards. While we realize that this report is not intended to be a full environmental analysis, we note that the Conceptual Alternatives Study has not considered the relative air impacts from different alternatives. We will therefore look to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to describe the relative air impacts of the alternatives. Specific comments on the study and project are enclosed. As you know, the US Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 and Region 4 offices are sharing in the review, and Region 5 is the lead in coordinating all comments. We have enclosed our combined comments on the study and project. We also refer you to our Red Flag Summary comments, dated October 12, 2006.</p> <p>Air Quality – The CAS is not clear on whether there is a substantial difference between the alternatives with regard to their air quality impacts from vehicle emissions. We recommended that the relative potential air quality impacts from the alternatives should be considered in the DEIS.</p> <p>Water Quality – Alternatives which avoid wetlands are preferred. If wetland impacts are unavoidable, then FHWA, KYTC and ODOT will need to closely coordinate with the US EPA and other agencies involved in the Section 404 permitting process.</p> <p>Environmental Justice – Cumulative and indirect impacts of the project on EJ communities should also be considered and discussed in the DEIS</p> <p>Noise – We concur that noise is an issue of concern. In addition to traffic noise affecting residences and commercial sites along highway, we note, relevant to the proposed project, that traffic across bridges can be particularly noisy. As long as feasibility and safety requirements are met, we recommend that surfacing materials that minimize noise through source reduction be used.</p> <p>Historic Preservation –Historic preservation and cultural resource issues are topics that will need to be finalized with the State Historic Preservation Office and discussed in the DEIS.</p> <p>Secondary and Cumulative Impacts – EPA has particular concerns about how secondary and cumulative impacts could affect air quality, water quality, and species and habitats in the area. The DEIS should give a detailed analysis of secondary and cumulative impacts.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Air quality will be addressed in the next step of the project for the feasible alternatives. Results will be presented in the project Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>Secondary and cumulative impacts, environmental justice, water quality, and noise will be assessed in detail in the project Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>Coordination with SHPO's and consulting parties regarding historic resources has been initiated for the project. Coordination with these entities will continue throughout the project development process.</p>

Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study June 2009

Name/Address	Comment	Response
Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) – Division of Natural Areas and Preserves	<p>These comments are based on ODNR’s experience as the state natural resource management agency and do not supersede or replace the regulatory authority of any local, state or federal agency nor relieve the applicant of the obligation to comply with any local, state or federal laws or regulations.</p> <p>Rare and Endangered Species: The ODNR, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, has no comments on this project.</p> <p>Our inventory program has not completely surveyed Ohio and relies on information supplied by many individuals and organizations. Therefore, a lack of records for any particular area is not a statement that rare species or unique features are absent from that area.</p> <p>ODNR appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments. Please contact Brian Mitch at (614) 265-6378 if you have questions about these comments or need additional information.</p>	Rare and Endangered Species comment noted.

Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study June 2009

Name/Address	Comment	Response
<p>Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) – Division of Wildlife</p>	<p>Fish and Wildlife: The ODNR, Division of Wildlife (DOW) has the following comments.</p> <p>The DOW recommends work is done to avoid impacts to unique wildlife habitat such as wetlands, streams, and woodlots.</p> <p>Also, no in-water work is recommended in the Ohio River from March 15 to June 30 to reduce impacts to aquatic species and their habitat.</p> <p>In addition to the species addressed in the study, the project is also within the range of the bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>), a state threatened species, the sheepnose (<i>Plethobasus cyphus</i>), a state endangered and federal candidate mussel species, the washboard (<i>Megaloniaias nervosa</i>), a state endangered mussel, the snuffbox (<i>Epioblasma triquetra</i>), a state endangered mussel, the ebonyshell (<i>Fusconaia ebena</i>), a state endangered mussel, the butterfly (<i>Ellipsaria lineolata</i>), a state endangered mussel, the elephant-ear (<i>Elliptio crassidens crassidens</i>), a state endangered mussel, the Ohio pigtoe (<i>Pleurobema cordatum</i>), a state endangered mussel, the monkey face (<i>Quadrula metanevra</i>), a state endangered mussel, and the wartyback (<i>Quadrula nodulata</i>), a state endangered mussel, the shovelnose sturgeon (<i>Scaphirhynchus platyrhynchus</i>), a state endangered species, the lake sturgeon (<i>Acipenser fulvescens</i>), a state endangered fish, the speckled chub (<i>Macrhybopsis aestivalis</i>), a state endangered fish, and the Northern madtom (<i>Noturus stigmosus</i>), a state endangered fish, the Kramer's cave beetle (<i>Pseudanophthalmus krameri</i>), a state endangered species, and the Ohio cave beetle (<i>Pseudanophthalmus ohioensis</i>), a state endangered species, the lark sparrow (<i>Chondestes grammacus</i>), a state endangered bird, the Northern harrier (<i>Circus cyaneus</i>), a state endangered bird, the cave salamander (<i>Eurycea lucifuga</i>), a state endangered species, the Eastern hellbender (<i>Cryptobranchus alleganiensis alleganiensis</i>), a state endangered amphibian.</p> <p>Due to the history of mussels being found in the Ohio River, the DOW believes there is the potential for mussels to exist in the project area. Therefore, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist conduct a mussel survey in the project area. Surveys are to be done within six months of in-water construction. If mussels that cannot be avoided are found in the project area, as a last resort, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist collect and relocate the mussels to suitable and similar habitat upstream of the proposed project. Should any federal listed species be encountered, the work must cease and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service must be contacted for consultation.</p> <p>(continued on next page)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>To the extent possible, work in the Ohio River will not be conducted between March 15 and June 30.</p> <p>Further studies will be completed to assess the impact of the recommended feasible alternatives on the species noted.</p> <p>A mussel survey will be completed by qualified personnel within six months of in-water construction.</p>

Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study June 2009

Name/Address	Comment	Response
Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) – Division of Wildlife	<p>(continued) The mussel survey must be conducted using standard mussel survey methodologies to include hand grabbing, snorkeling, and the use of SCUBA equipment if depths preclude efficient sampling by other methods. In addition, it is recommended two to three, one-quarter meter quadrants be excavated to a depth of at least 10 cm to search for juvenile mussels, and any located must be relocated along with the adult specimens. Individual adult mussel specimens must be marked when relocated. Juveniles are not to be marked and will not be part of future monitoring efforts.</p> <p>If mussels are relocated, it is recommended ODOT monitor the recipient site in two years to determine survivorship. Monitoring must follow the same survey protocol used during the relocation effort, and all marked individuals must be tallied. In the event that not all marked individuals relocated to the recipient site are found during monitoring, ODOT must work with ODNR personnel to determine the appropriate compensation for what will be considered a "takings" situation.</p>	<p>(continued) The mussel survey will be completed by qualified personnel and follow required procedures.</p>

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study June 2009

Name/Address	Comment	Response
<p>US Department of the Interior – US Fish and Wildlife Service</p>	<p>This is in response to your May 1, 2009 letter received in our office on May 5, 2009, requesting our review and comments on the Conceptual Alternatives Analysis for the Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project (HAM-71/75-0.00/0.22, PID 75119) in Hamilton County, Ohio and Kenton County, Kentucky. We provided general species and habitat surveying information and recommendations for federally listed Threatened (T), Endangered (E), and Candidate (C) Species in Ohio: Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>) (E); running buffalo clover (<i>Trifolium stoloniferum</i>) (E); and sheepnose mussel (<i>Plethobasus cyphus</i>) (C). As the lead office for the Service on this project review, we have coordinated with the Frankfort Kentucky Field Office (FKFO) and incorporate their comments below.</p> <p>WATER RESOURCES COMMENTS: Several aquatic resources will be impacted by this project, including the Ohio River, three streams (two intermittent and one ephemeral), and three wetlands (2 jurisdictional and one isolated, totaling 0.59 acres). All the streams and wetlands are located in Kenton County, Kentucky. The Service recommends that culverts placed in streams and wetlands be placed to allow free movement of aquatic fauna. Also, on projects that include plans to use riprap for channel protection, we recommend using native vegetation to control erosion, or, at a minimum, using native vegetation in combination with rock. To summarize, we recommend the use of natural channel design techniques where applicable. The greatest impacts to aquatic resources will affect the Ohio River. The new bridge structure will require the placement of two piers in the river, approximately 35 feet closer to the river banks than the piers of the existing bridge. We understand that ODOT and KYTC are coordinating with the U.S. Coast Guard to determine placement of these piers. For all aquatic resources, we recommend that existing riparian habitat zones be maintained to the maximum extent possible and that in-water work be avoided from April 15 to June 15 to reduce impacts to spawning fish. In addition, all temporary and permanent impacts to the Ohio River should be appropriately mitigated.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>To the extent possible, work in the Ohio River will not be conducted between March 15 and June 30.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to reduce impacts on water resources will be identified in the next step of the project.</p>

Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study June 2009

Name/Address	Comment	Response
US Department of the Interior – US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	(continued) ENDANGERED SPECIES COMMENTS: Land use in the project area is primarily urban and suburban, composed of mainly commercial, industrial, residential, institutional, and right-of-way properties. There is no farmland in the Ohio project area. The wooded areas in Ohio include shrub/scrub growth along the interstate and narrow stands of young trees and shrubs along the Ohio River. The Kentucky project area is also primarily urban and suburban but does contain some farmland, parks, and golf courses, including some mixed-age wooded areas that appear to have not been cleared for 30-40 years. The CAS states that potential habitat areas for the Indiana bat and running buffalo clover were not identified in Ohio during a 2006 survey. However, the Kentucky project area contains one area with potential habitat for running buffalo clover and 10 woodlots that include potential habitat for the Indiana bat. The running buffalo clover habitat was surveyed in 2006, and no individuals of the species were found. Therefore, no further surveys should be required for running buffalo clover within the overall project area described in the CAS. If trees will be cleared within the potential Indiana bat habitat areas in Kentucky, further coordination with the Frankfort Kentucky Field Office will be required to determine whether cutting date restrictions, emergence counts, or mist-net surveys will be needed. Several federally listed mussel species could potentially occur within the project area. Eight Federally Endangered Species are listed for Kenton County in Kentucky: purple catspaw pearly mussel (<i>Epioblasma o. obliquata</i>); clubshell (<i>Pleurobema clava</i>); fanshell (<i>Cyprogenia stegaria</i>); northern riffleshell (<i>Epioblasma torulosa rangiana</i>); orangefoot pimpleback (<i>Plethobasus cooperianus</i>); pink mucket (<i>Lampsilis abrupta</i>); ring pink (<i>Obovaria retusa</i>); and rough pigtoe (<i>Pleurobema plenum</i>). In addition, two mussel species, Federal Candidate sheepnose (<i>Plethobasus cyphus</i>) and Federal Species of Concern snuffbox (<i>Epioblasma triquetra</i>), are also listed for both Kenton County, Kentucky and Hamilton County, Ohio. Please note that although consultation with the Service on Candidate Species and Species of Concern is not required, the sheepnose and snuffbox mussels may become officially proposed as Federally Endangered Species under the ESA during this project's development process. Once such a proposal has been published in the Federal Register, conferencing with the Service may be required under Section 7 of the ESA.	Further studies will be completed to assess the impacts of the recommended feasible alternatives on the species noted.

**Brent Spence Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation Project
Concurrence Point #2**

Agency Comments on Conceptual Alternatives Study June 2009

Name/Address	Comment	Response
<p>US Department of the Interior – US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)</p>	<p>(continued) Several of the mussel species documented in the above paragraph could occur in the Ohio River at the project site. Therefore, surveys would be needed to determine whether one or more of these species is present. The Service recommends that one transect survey be conducted under the proposed alternative sites and under the existing bridge, if any in-water work will be required for the rehabilitation of that structure. With the results of such surveys, the Service will be able to provide direction as to whether a) additional surveys will be needed for the preferred alternative, b) formal consultation will be necessary, or c) concurrence can be provided for a <i>may affect not likely to adversely affect</i> determination without additional survey work. The CAS indicates that ODOT and KYTC have coordinated with both the Ohio and Kentucky Departments of Natural Resources and the Kentucky Department of Fish & Wildlife Resources. We encourage and support continued coordination with those agencies regarding impacts to state listed species.</p> <p>GENERAL COMMENTS AND CONCLUSION: In addition to the proposed work discussed above, we understand that 52 individual utilities will be impacted by this project, 45 below ground and 7 above ground. If the relocation of these utilities will require additional clearing or will impact other resources, further coordination with the Service should occur. Also, please coordinate with our office if additional impacts within or outside the project area will occur in association with staging and/or borrow and waste activities not discussed in this study.</p> <p>These comments have been prepared under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.c. 661 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act, of 1973, as amended, and are consistent with the intent of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Mitigation Policy. At this time, the FHWA has not provided effects determinations for federally listed mussel species and the Indiana bat. The Service would like to clarify that, once a preferred alternative is approved, additional informal consultation will be necessary and formal consultation may be necessary if adverse effects to the aforementioned listed species will occur. Specific measures to avoid and minimize impacts to listed species may also be necessary pending our review of the specific level and type of impacts associated with the preferred alternative.</p>	<p>A mussel survey will be completed by qualified personnel within six months of in-water construction and follow required procedures.</p> <p>ODOT and KYTC will continue to coordinate with both the Ohio and Kentucky Departments of Natural Resources and the Kentucky Department of Fish & Wildlife Resources on this project.</p> <p>Impacts to utilities and staging areas that would have an impact on resources will be coordinated with USFWS.</p>