**GRE-68-12.65, PID# 115388**

**Meeting with Abbott Studios on First Draft Renderings**

**2/22/2024, ODOT-D8 HQ Engineering Conference Room**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Start** | **Stop** | **Total Time** |
| **1:00 pm** | **2:30 pm** | **1.5 hours** |
| **PERSONS ATTENDING** |
|  | ***Name*** | ***Representing*** | ***Phone Number*** | ***E-Mail Address*** |
| **1** | **Katie DeStefano** | **ODOT – D8 Engineering, Project Manager** | **(513) 933-6583** | **Katherine.DeStefano@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **2** | **Tammy Campbell** | **ODOT – D8DD** | **(513) 933-6694** | **Tammy.Campbell@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **3** | **Stefan Spinosa**  | **ODOT – D8CPA** | **(513) 933-6639** | **stefan.spinosa@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **4** | **Tami Brehm** | **ODOT D8 Hydraulics Engineer** | **(513) 933-6615** | **tami.brehm@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **5** | **Amy Shell** | **ODOT – D8 Project Bridge Lead** | **(513) 933-6504** | **Amy.Shell@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **~~6~~** | **Lucas Braun** | **ODOT – D8 Utilities Coordinator** | **(513) 933-6598** | **lucas.braun@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **7** | **Tony Pankala** | **ODOT – D8 Environmental Lead** | **(513) 933-6640** | **anthony.pankala@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **8** | **Jason Watkins** | **ODOT – OES Tribal Coordinator** | **(614) 466-5101** | **jason.watkins@dot.ohio.gov** |
| **9** | **Jon Carroll** | **Fishbeck – ODOT D8 TOC, Design Lead** | **(937) 802-3273** | **jpcarroll@fishbeck.com** |
| **12** | **Josh Channels** | **Abbott Studios, Lead Project Manager** | **(614) 484-5185** | **jchannels@abbotstudios.com** |
| **13** | **Kyle Carpenter** | **Abbott Studios, Project Manager** | **(614) 484-0288** | **kcarpenter@abbotstudios.com** |
| **14** | **Brant Fulks** | **ODNR – Facilities Manager** | **(937) 382-1096** | **brant.fulks@dnr.ohio.gov** |
| **15** | **Melissa Clark** | **ODNR – District Park & Watercraft Manager** | **(937) 382-1096** | **melissa.clark@dnr.ohio.gov** |

**Agenda: (Minutes compiled by KSD)**

**Presentation of Proposed Options 1-4: Discuss Pros and Cons of Each Individual Option:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Options | Pros | Cons |
| OPTION A | Lighting added depth and dimension to the overhead bridge. | Stone texture should be larger and more subdued. |
|  |  |
| Options | Pros | Cons |
| OPTION B | Still the favorite. |  |
| Options | Pros | Cons |
| OPTION C |  | Piers along west side of US68 will not provide for conditions conducive to vegetative growth. |
|  | Piers will serve to provide conditions conducive to vagrant shelter. |
|  | Piers are not attractive. |
|  | Piers involve higher levels of maintenance |
|  | Glass panels on a bridge structure will be an added maintenance issue |
|  | Brillant glass coloring provides for too stark of a contrast to the more organic and humble surroundings.  |
| Options | Pros | Cons |
| OPTION D/E(?) | The Shawnee tribe insignia within the circle was very interesting. | The added cross trusses alongside of the bridge are massive. At 59+ feet high, they tower over everything else in town, including the new Interpretive Center. The scale is out of proportion with the surrounding buildings and landscape. |
|  | The truss features will tend to entice people to scale the trusses creating a safety issue. |
|  | The truss features are a costly addition to both construct and maintain. |

1. **Schedule:**
* February 22nd – submit presented renderings to ODOT/ODNR.
* February 28th – incorporate today’s comments and submit renderings to ODOT/ODNR
* February 29th – ODOT/ODNR to provide final comments, if any, to Abbott.
* March 1st - Abbott Studios/Fishbeck submit final 4-options to ODOT/ODNR. Append to DB Scope.
1. **Next Steps for Aesthetic Development:**
* March 4th - Aesthetic concepts will be presented to the Governor, Gov. schedule permitting.
* March 11th - The Governor’s concurrence on the three aesthetic concepts
* April 15th - Final selection of aesthetic design due, w/Gov. concurrence.
1. **Action Items:**

**ODNR:**

* Melissa Clark – Will continue to help facilitate coordination efforts between ODOT staff and ODNR Staff to confirm that all individuals necessary for tribal coordination are included in the process.

**ODOT:**

* Katie DeStefano – Compile/disseminate meeting minutes.
* Tony Pankala - ODOT and ODNR will continue to coordinate with each other on how and when to present to the tribes.
* Charlie Rowe – Language needs to be added that specifically define and emphasize what features over US68 will be maintained by ODOT or ODNR. Any structural features not attached to the bridge will be ODNR’s responsibility to maintain.
* Tammy Campbell – Discuss with Jeremy and Greene County Engineer the on how to best address the drainage issues discussed today (corrective measures for catch basin in front of Interpretive Center, and parking lot detention responsibilities)

 **Abbott Studios: Revisions to be incorporated into the next submission:**

* Submit renderings discussed today to ODOT D8 (Katie DeStefano) and ODNR as well.
* Include a rendering that illustrates the entire bridge structure, from the truss over US68 to the truss over Old town Creek. For the truss over Oldtown Creek, design elements from the span over US68, should also be incorporated into this structure as well, but on a more subdued level. No VPF required over the stream.
* Overhead utility poles, needed for service connection to the east side residents can be shown in the renderings.
* Provide side-by-side elevation renderings, for each option, so that the scale of each option can be illustrated and compared within the surrounding landscape.
1. **Critical Issues:**
* Detention – Abbott indicated that the detention system designed for the Interpretive Center sight accommodated only that which was required. No additional capacity for extra flow was included in the design. Thus, any surface flow generated by a new gravel or asphalt paved parking lot, installed to the north of the current lot, cannot be captured, and directed through the detention system for the interpretive center. ODOT can either leave the future parking area as a grassed green space or as the gravel surface, currently in place. If left as a green space, no additional detention will be required. If left as a gravel surface, ODOT’s construction plans will indicate that “detention will be installed by others”, i.e., ODNR.
* Switchback versus longer sloped exit ramp –

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Options | Pros | Cons |
| Longer Sloped Exit Ramp | Provides for the incorporation of more aesthetic park-like features. | Reduces the number of potential parking spaces. |
| Allows for EMS to access the west end of the bridge. |  |
| Allows for bicyclists to ride the path without having to walk down the ramp. |  |
| Does not require additional detention to be installed. |  |
| Warrants construction on retaining walls eliminating vagrant squatters with a pier configuration. |  |
| Options | Pros | Cons |
| Switchback Exit Ramp | Increases the number of potential parking spaces  | EMS does not have access form west end. |
|  | Bicyclists must walk their bicycles down the ramp. |
|  | If parking is installed, detention is required. |