

I-471 / KY 8 INTERCHANGE PROJECT

Interchange Advisory Committee (IAC) & Section 106 Consulting Parties (S106cps)

Progress Review Meeting

Location: Newport High School
Date: Wednesday, January 10, 2008
Time: 5 to 7 p.m.
Purpose: Reviewing progress of design team and traffic analysis

ATTENDEES:

Interchange Advisory Committee

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Cathy Volter | Dayton | Robert Koehler | OKI |
| Ian Budd | Newport | Kenneth Rehtin | Campbell Co. Commissioner |
| Keith Spoelker | City of Bellevue | Mike Dutle | |
| Jack Meyer | City of Bellevue | Corey Siddall | Newport |
| Brenda Guidugli | City of Bellevue | Marty Theurer | for R. Victor, City of Cincinnati |
| Tom Guidugli | City of Newport | William Scheyer | Southbank Partners |
| Robert Horine | Campbell County | Melissa Williams | Campbell County |
| Steve Pendery | Campbell County Judge Exec. | | |

Section 106 Review Consulting Parties

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| Kathleen Almoslechner | Bellevue Neighborhood Assoc. |
| Julie Boudousquie | Friends of Bellevue |
| Carolyn Bruns | Newport |
| Emily Jarzen | City of Newport |
| Jody Robinson | City of Bellevue |
| Margaret Warminski | Cincinnati Preservation Society |

Design Team

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Carol Callan-Ramler | KYTC District 6 | Steve Bergman | HDR Engineers |
| Jim Brannon | KYTC D6 | Adam Lynch | HDR Engineers |
| Stacey Hans | KYTC D6 | Helen Powell | H. Powell and Co. |
| Rob Hans | KYTC D6 | Virginia Goodman | Third Rock |
| Environmental | | | |
| Brad Eldridge | KYTC CO | Jennifer Barber | CRAI |
| Warren Iulig | GRW Engineers | Laura Mize | H.W. Lochner, Inc. |
| Richard Guidi | GRW Engineers | Michael Galbraith | H.W. Lochner, Inc. |
| Steve Poland | GRW Engineers | Ben Fister | GRW Engineers |
| Rebecca Turner | KYTC DEA | Craig Kowalski | Entran |

INTRODUCTION:

The meeting was announced to the Interchange Advisory Committee (IAC) and Section 106 Consulting Parties via mail and email.

Carol Callan-Ramler's opening comments included welcome, project team introductions and defining the meeting purpose as sharing the Design Team's progress on the "Final Four" Alternates as opposed to decision making as previous meetings have been. The Team will share recent refinement of impacts and traffic analysis on the alternates. Input on design issues will be solicited from attendees and information on what is up and coming will be shared with the committee.

POWERPOINT PRESENTATION:

Warren reviewed photos of Beard Bridge back ups. He discussed short-term improvements that have been done in August 2007 such as the addition of the dual left turn on Park Avenue and signalization changes on KY 8. While the improvements provide improved conditions they still do not suffice for many special events (such as New Years Eve). He went on to explain that when congestion incidents occur on KY 8 many times the Ramp / Park Avenue traffic cannot turn right or left when the signal is green. This is because of downstream problems and more green time has no effect. This results in the pictured New Years Eve type queues and many accidents on southbound I-471 over the River.

The audience was reminded about the questionnaire in the hand out packet and encouraged to fill out and return their comments regarding the KY 8/Park Avenue improvements.

He reviewed upcoming development and timelines such as Harbour Green in Bellevue, occupancy on March 1, The Pavillion in Newport, partial 2008/full 2009 and Southshore in Newport, 2009 occupancy. The Southshore Phase 1 Tower alone will bring 80,000 square feet of office space and 140 condos which means new traffic. This increase has been factored into the traffic analysis done thus far. He shared factors of South Shore development, discussing the port of entry and Riviera an addition a right-in/right-out through the floodwall nearly opposite Beech Avenue. This access point has not yet been formally approved by the Highway Department.

The addition of a 4th lane to I-471 will be recommended for the long range corridor plan and will be submitted to stakeholders of the I-471 Corridor Study for their consideration and concurrence. This Study is being conducted for OKI. In anticipation of approval of the fourth lane recommendation the Interchange Project has conducted a study to evaluate how best to apply the fourth lane to the southbound I-471 lanes in the vicinity of the Interchange Project. The Fourth Lane Study considered both NB and SB sides however the final recommendation only considers the SB side since the Purpose and Need of the I-471 / KY 8 interchange project is focused on addressing the southbound congestion problem. Four options were presented (A, B, C and No-Build) and included in the hand out. Traffic analysis of each option was discussed and a Level of Service evaluation matrix (in hand out) was shown. Based on the traffic analysis, Option C is the preferred option and all of the three Build Alternatives reviewed at the meeting utilized the Option C method of adding the fourth lane. (See hand out for option descriptions).

Q- Is the 4th lane going to be added to bridge as well?

A – No. We can't widen the Daniel Carter Beard Bridge as part of this project.

The four alternates that were carried forward (No-Build, 1, 2B, 5D) were displayed and reviewed and cross sections in critical areas were provided (see handout packet for alternates).

Alternate 1:

The merge for cars going North on Park was noted as a problem because of the large volume of ramp traffic entering onto Park Avenue near Third Street. The Design Team presented a realignment of the south intersection leg to create more of an acute approach angle for better sight distance. The approach would have a stop condition at the ramp.

Concern was voiced over having to cross two lanes of ramp traffic at this intersection location.

Discussion took place regarding potential reversal of one-way 3rd Street between Park and Providence Way. Currently Third Street is one way westbound at this location with the exception of a 100' two-way portion in front of Trent Montessori School. This leg of Third Street would become one-way eastbound towards Providence Way. A more direct route home for Mansion Hills residents would be realized with this change but egress from this neighborhood would only be via Fourth Street. The design team requested input on this.

Alternate 2B:

Southbound Ramps parallel Providence Way and the Dog Park. I-471 bridge piers and footings were field surveyed in Autumn, 2007 and ramp underpass geometry was upgraded to 30 MPH design speed minimum. It was pointed out that this was the first iteration of setting geometry and refinements would still be made. At this point though, the Design Team has tried to depict worst case scenarios.

Both Alternatives 2B and 5D require reconstruction of Riviera Drive. Two methods were presented to the meeting attendees and it was emphasized that both are viable options and could be implemented with either Alternative 2B or 5D. One option avoids impacts to the Save a Lot shopping center and impacts Taylor Creek while the other avoids impacts to Taylor Creek and impacts the shopping center. About 20 feet of the building would be lost with the latter. Warren explained that severe impacts to a creek result in required coordination with the Corps of Engineers and Division of Water permitting with potential mitigation or fees and obtaining permits. This could increase Design Team level of effort and the project length (in time) considerably.

Widening Riviera will provide 2 extra lanes from the southbound exit ramp intersection with Riviera. Riviera widening will result in a small impact to the Bellevue Vets Park. The Vets corner parking lot will need to be closed and relocated or reconstructed in some manner. It is currently so close to a major intersection and is (as it is now) a safety risk.

Alternate 5D

This Alternative is the same as 2B except for the southbound exit ramp terminates at KY 8 just west of Linden Avenue. There a single point intersection is formed with the southbound entrance ramp. Also, the westbound KY 8 movement to the southbound entrance ramp would be a dual lane movement.

Many retaining walls will be required for Alternatives 2B and 5D. One is required to accommodate the I-471 fourth lane and keep the southbound entrance ramp in the same relative position. Retaining walls will be needed next to Providence Way. These may be combination sound barrier / retaining walls if the noise analysis shows noise mitigation is in order.

Providence Way is shown reconstructed in both Alternatives 2B and 5D. Field survey has not been completed in this area so the depictions of impacts have been developed for worst case situations. Upon taking field survey and refining geometry more precise impact predictions can be made. Providence Way will most likely be one-way with either parking on one side or both sides depending on the impacts to the neighborhoods.

The southbound ramp as it passes through the Dog Park area is located about 15-20 feet below the grassy park area that currently exists. The ramps must be that low to pass under the I-471 bridge near the Campbell County Library building. Ten Landominiums are shown as future development just south of the Dog Park and lie directly in the path of the proposed southbound exit ramp. This conflict will have to be worked with the developer to allow advancement of this ramp option. Mitigation options for damages to the Dog Park will also need to be explored.

With Alternative 5D, the southbound ramp would pass below the northbound entrance ramp near the Newport Island Community. More precisely, it passes close to the backs of several houses that front Third Street. The ramp itself would be approximately 20 feet below the existing ground level, requiring tall retaining walls. This in effect would create a "trench-like" ramp that returns to ground level as it approaches KY 8 just west of Linden Avenue. Gravity drainage of the sump under the proposed northbound entrance ramp bridge would be possible due to an extremely deep storm sewer system at KY 8.

Preliminary Costs:

- No Build: \$0
- #1: \$7 Million
- #2B: \$26,000,000
- #5D: \$29,000,000

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:

Q- We are not moving ramps along the northbound side to accommodate the northbound 4th lane. Is the cost for adding the 4th lane to the northbound side part of this project or another project (the study)?

A – We have looked at how a fourth lane would perform for both northbound and southbound I-471. We do this to ensure that in this case, partial improvements made do not detrimentally impact adjacent areas. FHWA will not allow us to fix one area at the cost of making another one worse. This Project concerns itself with the southbound lanes of the KY 8 Interchange. Any other improvements such as extending the fourth lane south to I-275, even though needed would have to be picked up by a future project. The Corridor Study that is being conducted at this time is not a Project as such and will not build anything.

Q – Would access to the Party Source from KY 8 help alleviate traffic congestion?

A – We will consider that as a detail on down the line.

Q – How much money is shown on the costs for the 4th lane?

A – The construction costs are what's shown. I think the fourth lane as we have it with Option C would cost about 4 million dollars. The right of way is not included.

Q – How close to the Vets front door?

A – We can't determine exactly yet, however it is very tight.

Q – Are traffic projections for the Interchange Project the same as those used in the Corridor Study?

A – The traffic data for both "projects" is based on the same OKI regional travel demand model. The Corridor Study is more of an overview of the corridor and the Interchange Project is much more detailed in a smaller area. The Corridor Study is not intended to duplicate efforts of the KY 8 Interchange Project traffic analysis nor to confirm or dispute the analysis or project recommendations. The Study will incorporate the KY 8 data, findings and recommendations as developed in the project level efforts.

Q – Dog Park mitigation – what does that involve? What type and to whom?

A – The Dog Park may either be avoided, relocated or enhanced/extended if Alternative 2B or 5D is recommended and the exit ramp to Park is closed. The existing ramp if closed could potentially be converted into green space.

Q – Is there a risk of change in funding due to the new governor?

A – We've been instructed to complete whatever phase we are in. Right of Way is the next phase and we won't be requesting funds for that until 2010/2011. It will get down to how it competes with other projects.

The group dismissed for 10 minutes to look over the alternates with team members present at each alternate to field questions.

The VISSIM visual modeling was shown. This provided an idea of what the traffic would look like for each alternate. The VISSIM is for planning and not design and more intensive modeling will be done to determine design traffic conditions. The modeling simulated behaviors, chosen routes, geometry, etc. A Level of Service is the measure by transportation planners to identify quality of travel along a route. It is scored from A (best) to F (worst or failing).

Five VISSIM models were shown.

#1: 2006 with existing roadway geometry and signal timing. Shows 5 p.m. dual left and right that has recently been added and existing queues on KY 8.

#2: Predicting an 18% increase to 2035. Shows better operations of signals. More ques on KY 89 which takes it back to what it was before the third lane was added on Park.

#3: Alternate #1 with KY 8 and ramp improvements, optimized signalization. Showed more traffic at ramps and stacking.

#4: Alternate 2B KY 8 improvements and ramp improvements, moves to other side of 471 and splits. The footprint of the intersection has not been determined yet.

#5: Alternate 5D. The ramp goes under the bridge on KY 8 and the SB ramp goes under the NB ramp.

Q – Are the exit ramps really going to be tight like the AA off 275 in Wilder?

A – The speed will be based on 30 mph design speed so yes, they will be similar. If we were to decrease design speed to 20 mph the interstate speed would be too high to give cars time to slow down to make a 20 mph speed on the ramp.

Q – What is the largest component of the \$29,000,000 cost?

A – Ramps and structures, new pavement, earthwork, retaining walls, fill dirt hauled off.

Comment – I know PM peaks showed more accidents and that indicates visitor traffic. The late PM – I hear sirens. Better signage on the bridge before you get there would be helpful.

Q – Because of the increase in traffic I see a difference in 2006 vs. 2035. I expected a greater increase. How was 2035 increase in traffic arrived at.

A – 2035 is based on an 18% increase from 2006.

Q – Where's the value of \$20,000,000?

A – Granted there is a major difference in the cost of Alternate 1 vs. Alternates 2B and 5D. If Alternate 1 proves to satisfy the Project Purpose and Need Statement then we probably have saved taxpayers some money. At this point we haven't completed our detailed traffic

analysis so the value in the extra money appears to buy us more of a guarantee that traffic will not back up along the extremely long ramp storage provided by the more expensive alternates.

Q – What is Level of Service?

A – Range of delay. These are viable values until we do more detailed analysis. Level of Service C is and average range of delay.

Q – So it is a tool error of the software. So the next time we see this LOS and it has been refined would we see a C-/C+++?

A – What FHWA will be looking at is the balance of it all – all impacts. Must fulfill purpose and need, avoid cultural/historical/environmental and traffic components.

Q – Those will be spelled out in future meetings?

A – Yes. We're trying to do a snapshot of how the alternates will perform preliminary right now in the models.

Q – Given the very long term project with estimated completion 2013, will that date remain the same assuming funds remain?

A – Yes, We are on schedule.

Q – How do you account for new technology in automobiles when determining forecasts of traffic (i.e. self propelled cars)?

A – All we can do is make our best educated guess.

Warren Iulig announced the next meeting will be in the spring to present and discuss in more detail environmental issues and refined traffic. All displays will be available from the 1/10/08 meeting at the Campbell County Library on Sixth Street for approximately 10 days. Also, three DVDs showing the traffic presentation will be available for check-out at the Campbell County Library for the same period of time.