

Attachment D

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-1-10	Peter Dryer	General Public	I prefer the cable-stayed bridge with inclined supports with cables that are evenly spaced along the supports. The less zip zagging between the levels of traffic the better, I think. Thanks for listening!	
2-1-10	Pat	General Public	The website states to review the 6 bridge designs and make comments. One cannot locate the 6 designs to review. There is a link to click for bridge designs but nothing happens. Let's update the website so that the public can take a look at the 6 finalists.	
2-1-10	Steve Purnell	General Public	Yes, we need a bridge. But the proposed designs vary only from pitiful to boring. Hopefully we can get better looking designs. This bridge can be significant to beautify our city, we don't need variations on the MAD Magazine Poit! We need to encourage architects to design beautiful, inspiring bridges.... not utilitarian junk. while we are at it Music Hall should be upgraded and requests for proposals should be written in such a way as to encourage NEW designs for as near perfect acoustics as possible. Give these ideas to the University of Cincinnati, design and architecture departments, encourage NKU and other nearby schools to compete with the WORLD to make the best bridge, and the best upgrade to Music Hall. Make something substantial, not just a boring bridge. It will reflect YOUR leadership ability. The designs proposed as shown in the Cincinnati Enquirer show a boring leadership, no ideas, no vision for the future. Come on, be creative, I could find a better looking bridge in a catalog. Build a bridge to a better future. No more, boring stuff that does little more than generate campaign funds. BORING!	
2-2-10	Mark Robben	General Public	I think the cable-stayed with inclined support design is a winner! (#3 of 6 in the Enquirer's online photo gallery)	
2-2-10	Richard J. Hicks	Industry	The Project Aesthetic Committee meeting/presentation held on 1/29/10 at the Northern Kentucky Convention Center was a good overview of some of the options considered for the I-75 bridge. I am sure you have already heard this before, but I believe the best bridge design would be to make it as transparent as possible, as some of the designs presented were extremely cluttered, busy and unattractive. I think some of the most open designs would be preferred. Although the group did not seem too interested in the arch designs, I liked the option 4- tapered arch. I liked the book end idea to the existing 471 arched bridge, and possibly adding some decorative considerations (such as lighting, etc.) to the design may serve the area well. I recommend narrowing the choices down to include the arch design as well as the cable stayed designs.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Cynthia Morris		I saw the renderings in today's Cincinnati Enquirer. I vote for Plan 6 based on aesthetics.	
2-2-10	Alvin Elsbernd	General Public	I own a home on W 9th Street in Covington. I am trying to determine what the chances are that my house will be impacted.	
2-2-10	Chris Sluder	General Public	I like the arch bridge design the best it fits in with existing bridges and brings together the other arch bridge (Carter) and the Brent Spence design into one. The second one is the cable with the inclined support.	
2-2-10	Damien Lass	General Public	Of the 6 designs remaining, I especially like the design which includes a cable-stayed bridge with one main vertical support tower near the Ohio side of the river. I think this design will continue to add to the Cincinnati skyline and make it a distinguishing bridge that is less similar to other cable-stayed bridges in other cities (i.e. Boston).	
2-2-10	Jack Varney	General Public	Design #6 is my favorite and really makes a statement over the Ohio River between the great states of Ohio and Kentucky.	
2-2-10	Ken Smith	General Public	I just saw the pictures in the Cincinnati Enquirer. I wanted to say that I really liked the Cable Stay designs. In fact I really liked the ones where the spires point to both Kentucky.	
2-2-10	Jim Rathbone	General Public	I'm trying to find the pictures referred to in today's Enquirer of the six, or 12, alternatives for bridge construction. I can't find the pictures anywhere on your website. There should be a link on the home page if you hope to have comments by Friday.	
2-2-10	John Heilman	Government	Where are the design alternatives referenced in today's Enquirer?	
2-2-10	Kirk Huggins	General Public	I don't mean to be pessimistic about the condition of the bridge or the bridge itself but I strongly feel that the bridge needs to be replaced altogether. I recognize that as a result of extremely tight budget constraints, you've had your hands tied limiting what can be done. I think I'm not alone by saying that by now the bridge is an eye sore aside from the fact that it's facilitating far more traffic than it was designed for. Traveling across it every day gives me 20 second adrenaline rush because of the tight confines of traffic and the ever prevalent pot holes. I hope this email can help serve as constructive criticism in any way, shape or form.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Frank S. Duke, Jr.	General Public	I wanted to comment on the designs but the pictures published in the Enquirer today did a very poor job of portraying the bridge designs. Since you could not see the cables on the cable stay bridges, they looked like disconnected towers. When I went to your website, I could not find any of the pictures published in the Enquirer. Plans seemed to have letters, while the ones in the Enquirer had numbers. Your website is an overload of information and it is difficult to find the alternative plans in an easy to understand form. I don't think you really want to hear from us, just give the appearance that you solicited public input.	
2-2-10	Steven M. Kordis	General Public	With all the long standing issues with "the cut in the hill", it seems that this would be an ideal time to have an additional run of highway west of where this current stretch of I-75 exists, eliminating this problem for the majority of users.	
2-2-10	Jeff Blunt	General Public	I'm writing because I understand you are soliciting feedback on the design of the new Brent Spence bridge. Of the six designs submitted, I believe that the cable-stayed design with two inclined supports is the most Visually interesting. However, I want to very strongly encourage you, beg you in fact, to take steps to make this bridge as architecturally interesting as possible both while driving across the bride and from afar. This bridge will be a critical component of Cincinnati's skyline and identity. So many of our bridges are pure utilitarian, blandly designed and even painted in drab colors. PLEASE take this opportunity to go beyond pure utility and create something beautiful for generations of Cincinnatians to enjoy...even if it costs more. Think about Monday night football games with city skyline shots broadcast all over the world, think about the millions of people whose only impression of Cincinnati will be driving through on I-75 and over this bridge. This bridge is a chance to create lasting impressions of our city. I'd love to see flowers and greenery on and around the bridge as well, maybe even artworks...something to set it, and our city apart. To sum up, I believe the aesthetics are as important as the utility, form as important as function. PLEASE, make this our version of the Golden Gate. Thank you for listening.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Mike Niehaus	General Public	<p>I favor the cable-stayed bridge with inclined supports. Cables are gathered toward the top of the supports, and there is an additional smaller support leg by the main supports. This has an interesting design, blends in the historic Suspension bridge upstream, and would provide good sight-lines from the hills surrounding the area.</p> <p>I am a member of the Anderson Township Transportation Advisory Committee. Tom Caruso is the committee chair, and could provide additional input if desired.</p>	
2-2-10	Charles P. Hammock	Industry	<p>The final five designs appear to be actually two designs with four variations on a theme with respect to the cable-stayed concept. The arched suspension concept is a handsome look, one that we are all familiar with up river. The cable-stayed concept, the one with the most potential for aesthetics, falls short with the proposed tuning-fork towers. Whether vertical or leaning or double supported under-deck, they really aren't very aesthetic if aesthetics is something you're looking to achieve. Maybe if the leaning towers each flared out at the bottom next to the deck (somewhat like a plane's stabilizer wing) it would add interest. I think of the beautiful masts that Santiago Calatrava has created with his bridge designs that exemplify grace in engineering. Those designs make a statement those designs are remembered. Here the Queen City has an opportunity to not only eliminate traffic congestion, it has the opportunity to create a landmark. Saving a few million on a couple billion-dollar project is not considered aesthetic, profitable maybe, but not aesthetic. Now if you can coat the Brent Spence with invisible paint all the better, as I don't know how travelers on the new bridge will be able to see the downtown through all of its adjacent truss work.</p>	
2-2-10	Pat Holbrock	General Public	<p>My vote goes to Plan 6/7. Plan 6/7 is attractive and balanced. Plan 4 is repetitious of the existing "Big Mac" bridge. Plan 9 appears to be a bridge that is already falling. Plan 12 is just plain and ugly.</p>	
2-2-10	Shelly Hansen	General Public	<p>I would like to comment on the aesthetic qualities of the remaining bridge design concepts. Plans 9 and 10 are by far the most sophisticated with their graceful incline supports. The effect of the artist's rendering is symmetrical, yet stylish. I would very much like to see this design on the skyline. Plan 12 however, is a nightmare. It looks as if the engineers ran out of materials halfway through construction and decided one vertical support tower would have to suffice. Please do not consider this eyesore for our proud Ohio River.</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Erika Brenner	General Public	After looking at the designs in the Enquirer and on your site, personally I would suggest either using the Plan 4 or the Plan 6 designs. If you use the #4, you will create a "bookend" look on the river. Seeing as how the Daniel Carter Beard bridge is a similar design, it creates a kind of end cap on each end of the riverfront. However, please don't paint it yellow, the color is terrible. As for using the #6 design, it harkens to the look of days past and is similar in design to the Suspension Bridge. I like the straight up and down look of the pillars versus anything that leans backwards in similar designs. Growing up in Cincinnati and having grandparents that live in Park Hills, I travel and have travelled across the river more times than I can count. I have never liked the look of the Brent Spence and welcome the change to something new. Being someone who prefers continuity in design, either of the above mentioned designs would complete the "riverfront package" the best. Thank you for your time and good luck in your plans.	
2-2-10	John M. Arthur	General Public	Thank you for providing so many alternatives. I think #12 is the most iconic and shows the forward-thinking I am hoping our region's reputation obtains.	
2-2-10	Greg Wirthlin	General Public	First choice, concept #12, Second choice, concept #8	
2-2-10	Tracy Denham	General Public	I like the arch bridge design (plan 4) for the new bridge.	
2-2-10	Jeffrey Smith	General Public	My vote will go to Concept number 11. In my opinion, it provides the best looking approach to give our downtown area an updated look. It is also different than any other bridge design I have seen.	
2-2-10	Gene Froelicher	General Public	I definitely like Plan 4 the best. 6 & 7 are ok, 9 & 10 are unique but goofy for no reason and 12 is just silly. I'm not sure why a continued double-decker approach is best or why a local/non-local approach is best. I guess that's where the \$47 million of study money went. Anyway, it is my opinion as a commuter, the reason N-75 bottlenecks at the bridge is because of the "claustrophobic" effect...that is people instinctively slow down, vs. the top side because they feel boxed in. As far as the local/non-local thing goes the downside I see is trucks. Local basically means access to downtown and I-71. If there were some way to designate a lane just for trucks, regardless of their destination, I think this would help fully achieve the goal of quicker pass through of this critical corridor. Thanks for allowing the input.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Leon Spitz	General Public	Suggestion: Build new structure to accommodate all traffic simply because Spence is outmoded and concrete and steel is stressed and would need to be replaced sooner than later. Aesthetically it would be best to replicate Spence bridge. Any other design would uglify. A bridge should also be a "sight to behold" should be a stand-alone structure. I say recycle the Spence structure and relegate it to history. By the way, none of the designs in today's paper excite me. The designs are just ordinary and plain. We can do much better.	
2-2-10	Nancy Cason	General Public	I like the one that looks like Daniel Carter Beard bridge. Kinda fits right in!	
2-2-10	Mike King	General Public	I love the designs and am encouraged that this is finally being addressed. An article I read said the people can vote for their option but I didn't see that on the website. I would vote for #5 if we are keeping the I471 bridge for years to come as it mimics it and would basically depict the queen city inside the two bridges. But I also like #8 as it is more open (just cables) and you would be able to see the city and surroundings easier. Are there any studies on accidents because of the ability to look around easier? I wouldn't want people focused on our beautiful city instead of the road! Very encouraged!	
2-2-10	Charles Curran	General Public	A comment on design alternatives. Plan 4, the arch bridge, gives symmetry to the community's river front balancing with the Daniel Beard Bridge. The other designs, while nice were this a stand- alone project, conflict with the 5 other bridges in the basin. The cable-stayed designs of Plans 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12 would conflict with all the other bridges. We have our community's local landmark, the Roebling Bridge and as long as the Brent Spence is to remain, the new bridge would never be a clearly viewed landmark regardless of its design. Thank you.	
2-2-10	Marty Schilds		You want the public to response to the designs for the Brent Spence Bridge, but I don't see a link to see the designs.	
2-2-10	Wayne D. Webster	General Public	Who cares how big or fancy design it will have. It just has to be big enough for the future and be able to stand for time. This also needs to be done in a reasonable amount of time because of the traffic flow it handles every day. No long delays having it built and no local government interference.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Dan Stricker	Others	Pick the bridge that will be the cheapest to maintain. I can't tell from the designs you have so far which one that is but, I know that maintenance costs will far out-weigh the cost of the bridge, (from being in the maintenance business) Keeping maintenance costs down will help ensure that this is done on a regular basis and hopefully this money will not be stolen/siphoned off of the project by political hacks looking out for their own interest. The original price is not the true cost of this project. Planning should be the number one concern. I remember this bridge being built. It was not that long ago. I also know that the suspension bridge was built in the 1800's. Have we gotten worse in building bridges or has technology gone down since then? I think not. We have one of the best Engineering schools only a few miles away from this bridge. Use it.	
2-2-10	Craig Wales	General Public	I would like to recommend that throughout the process of choosing and building this bridge, we keep rail options in mind. Perhaps not as part of the original structure, but as part of a later project. I think as this country starts to think about investing more in passenger rail, we should use this opportunity to be forward thinking about what our needs may be. And how this bridge project can be an inspiration to how we move in the future. Thank you for your time.	
2-2-10	John Kahler	General Public	Proceed with the arch bridge (Plan 4) unless there is a significantly lower cost for one of the other plans.	
2-2-10	Michelle Myfelt	General Public	After reviewing the different plans for the Brent Spence Bridge, I like #6, #7 or #12. I am impressed by all of the designs and am glad this project is moving forward as I cross this bridge twice a day. Thanks!	
2-2-10	Karen Rush	General Public	I prefer the 1st design on the website....it seems to fit better w/ the original bridge design and blends well w/ the river landscape of bridges in the area.	

Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Lynne Rice	General Public	I have looked at all of the 12 bridge concepts and prefer #3 or 4. They are the right height to blend in with the other bridges, and the shapes balance the east and west approaches to Cincinnati. There would not be 5-6 different bridge designs connecting Cincy and KY. Either of them would make the Daniel Beard Bridge and either one of them bookends to Cincinnati, sides of a fan, etc. They do not detract from the Brent Spence and are in the same proportion. Next favorite is #1 concept. It blends in with the Brent Spence, but makes each bridge different. #6 - 11 are all too high for the setting and too different from the other bridges. The forked ones are not beautiful, don't fit in, and are not appropriate next to the Brent Spence. #7 looks like tepees hovering over the river. #9 looks unstable and already falling down. #12 looks unbalanced with only the OH end having huge towers. Studies of other bridges seem to show that when the car to bridge height ratio is too large people hurry to get off of the bridge. We want a bridge that blends in with the others, is in proportion to its setting and is comfortable to cross at highway speeds, as well as get stuck on. I feel #3 or #4 are the best with #1 a far second choice. Your website is difficult to navigate, and the information should have been accessible without downloading. The downloading process made flipping back and forth between the designs for comparison nearly impossible because of the time involved. The pictures are life like though, and beautiful to look at. Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this process.	
2-2-10	Marshall Bailey	General Public	If and when they build a new bridge 71/75 replacement, they should have an EMERGENCY LANE on both sides, north and south for cars that break down so they won't get hit.	
2-2-10	Karen Fitzpatrick	General Public	For the Brent Spence Bridge replacement design I prefer: Plan 4, the arch bridge.	
2-2-10	John Q. Public	General Public	I like #12. Looks riverboatish (two stacks).	
2-2-10	Leonard Rescek	General Public	Given that all the plans will have the maximum number of lanes and will be equally capable of carrying the load, take the plan that costs the least. Save the millions (or billions) of dollars on aesthetics as ninety-nine percent of drivers will only be impressed by how quickly the traffic flows across it while not having to avoid potholes.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Gerald C. Kaufman		You have the design narrowed down to six. Include all six in the bid package to the contractors bidding on the bridge replacement. Let them include in their bid package the design they want to go with for their bid. This will provide the lowest cost structure and the lowest cost to the tax payers. All the designs look good – Let's go for savings.	
2-2-10	Steve DeWitt	General Public	Saw the alternatives in the morning paper. Plan 4 is the most attractive and it will bookend the city nicely with the 471 bridge. Definitely the best alternative, I think.	
2-2-10	Robert Biggs	General Public	In response to the article in the Cincinnati Enquirer, dated 2/2/2010, soliciting input from residents as to the type of design for the new bridge ---- my vote goes to the arch-style, which has clean lines and seems to better frame the view of the existing Brent Spence Bridge and also replicates the other arch-style (Daniel Carter Beard "Big Mac") bridge to the east. Thanks for considering my input.	
2-2-10	Lois Reed	General Public	We like the design of PLAN 4. BEAUTIFUL COMPLIMENT TO THE I-471 BRIDGE.	
2-2-10	John A. Gehring, Ruth Gehring	General Public	I like Plan # 4	
2-2-10	Ben	General Public	Concept #8	
2-2-10	Todd A. Bricker	General Public	#12 and #4 are much better than #'s 6, 7, 9, and 10. #12 I call "Tall Stacks" and though I usually prefer odd symmetry two "stacks" work best near the river. #4 has the neatest look framing the riverfront area with the Daniel Carter Beard bridge. #'s 6, 7, 9, 10 make me feel like I'm being poked in the eyes with a couple of forks-ouch! #,s 6,7 although rakish and initially appealing , after looking at them a while they seem almost pornographic or , at least gynecological-we don't want the riverboatmen commenting about the splayed supports being the "Queen City's" open legs "welcoming" them to town! Also the tilted supports may be disorienting to some drivers. Thank you for your fine work on this project!	
2-2-10	Brad Thomas	General Public	As for the bridge designs, I am in favor of the 500 foot single tower on the Ohio side.	
2-2-10	John Bowen	General Public	I would like to offer my suggestion for the Brent Spence Bridge replacement as Option 1, the arch bridge. I feel as if this design offers the most aesthetically pleasing lines and matches well with the Daniel Carter Beard Bridge on the other side of the city. The other options, while nice, seem to offer this image of trying too hard to be architecturally significant and I don't think they accurately represent the city of Cincinnati.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Liz Wippel	General Public	I love the new designs of the bridge that came out today in the newspaper. My favorite is the arch design which looks like the Daniel Carter Bridge aka Big Mac bridge along I-471. It looks like two arches into Kentucky and into Ohio. It looks very neat. I have lived in this area for 24 years and I'm so excited about the new bridge. We desperately need one for Ohio and Kentucky. Linking the two wonderful states with two bridges with arches would signify the Greater Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky feel as most of us cherish each and every day. Thanks for letting the citizens have a chance to comment on the designs.	
2-2-10	Miranda Marshall	General Public	I would like to cast a vote for option six of the replacement bridges (single tower cable stayed). Thanks for encouraging the public to voice an opinion!	
2-2-10	Joan Lockman	General Public	I like Plan #4 the best. Plan #9 would be my 2nd choice. Good Luck!!	
2-2-10	Debbie Bennett	General Public	I currently work on Mehring Way, will this area be affected? If so, how? Thank you	
2-2-10	Heather	General Public	I like concept #5. It is the most original of the bunch and it looks very structurally sound. This design is definitely the most visually appealing.	
2-2-10	Brandon Druffel	General Public	I personally prefer #10 for its use of symmetry and the substance that the second tower creates, but I also believe that # 12 is much more iconic and monumental. Essentially I think that based solely on design that #12 would create a greater 'architectural impact' on the city.	
2-2-10	Patrick Dole	General Public	I'll admit the concepts are neat and creative, but ones that I think would be more appropriate for Cincinnati are Concepts 3-5 and/or Concepts 6-7. Either Concepts 3-5 would, if built, "bookend" the city's "Bridge Stretch" with the Roebling Bridge right in the middle and with the Arches of the Big Mac and Brent Spence at each end serving as Gateways into the city. However, if those concepts fail, Concepts 6 or 7 would also look nice. If built, they would serve as a signature bridge of Cincinnati and also as the gateway into Ohio or Kentucky, depending on which direction you're traveling. But, Concepts 3-5, either one of those would be my first choice.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Lloyd Espenlaub	General Public	<p>1. Concept 10 gets my overwhelming vote. 9 runs a close second if the [presumably smaller cable diameter?] actually gives it a lighter feel though the lower deck looks like it would have more masking beams, No notes to help compare, and I had to page 4 pages back and forth, back and forth before I could really see any differences.</p> <p>2. Concept 5 makes a good bookend with the 475 bridge at the other end. Concept 2 is also an echo of the new Newport bridge, but do we want a bridge which is simply an echo of another.</p> <p>3. Concept 1 is as just plain ugly as the existing Brent Spence is. Both are a horrible "Welcome to Backward Kentucky" or "Welcome to Backward Ohio" as you can get. Any new bridge should not repeat its design, so that when the old span is finally scrapped and replaced it can be replaced with a much more open, welcoming and 21st century design.</p> <p>4. The file is huge and will be unavailable to anyone trying to access it on dial up. Multiple HTML pages as an alternative would give wider access.</p> <p>5. Concepts 6 and 7 look identical until I count cables, Is this the only difference? If so, the illustrations do not give me a feel for the difference in effect of fewer larger [presumably] cables or many smaller cables. Are we talking 2/3 greater diameter, or double the diameter, No notes again to explain or point out subtle differences.</p>	
2-2-10	Robin E. Harvey	General Public	<p>The only remaining bridge design that bears any relationship to the existing bridgescape over the Ohio River linking Cincinnati, Covington, Newport and Dayton is the arch bridge design that is designated Plan 4 in today's Cincinnati Enquirer. The vertical, inclined and single support designs overwhelm the Roebling bridge rather than highlight it and clutter rather than complete the sweep of the River from East to West.</p>	
2-2-10	Karen Burke	General Public	<p>The Cincinnati Enquirer asked for readers to let you know what bridge plans we prefer. The Plan 4 bridge, I believe, is the best one. It is aesthetically pleasing to the eye. Thanks for listening!</p>	
2-2-10	Doug Barclay	General Public	<p>I like the Design 10..... Was told you were looking for feedback but can't find where one would vote for which concept.</p>	
2-2-10	Sharon Chaney	General Public	<p>My favorite is #6 with #8 close. It reminds me of the cables on the roadway over I-75 on second street. I like that look a lot as the look on the bridge into Maysville, KY.#4 compliments the I-471 bridge, but I think it's nicer to have a different look on the other end. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I've lived here all my life-born and raised--61 years.</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Dane Griffith	General Public	The concepts for the new Brent Spence are wonderful, however, yet another girder-encrusted bridge is what the Cincinnati riverfront does NOT need. The suspension bridges, concept # 8 for example, would be a beautiful addition to the panoramic vistas of the Covington/Cincinnati riverfronts. From people passing through to those of us who live here, the Golden Gate-style bridge concepts would be a delight to see and drive over on a daily basis. Please, if my input is valued, select one of the suspension designs! I work in Fort Mitchell, KY, and live in downtown Cincinnati, so I love and cherish the improvements to the area that have been going on in recent times, and a beautiful new Brent Spence would just continue that trend.	
2-2-10	Ted Smith	General Public	Keep it simple. I opt for the simple arch like the Dan Beard Bridge. The simple arch would require less painting and be easier to maintain than the truss. The single tower looks "artsy" but all of those long cables worry me. The two towers have too many cables, too. The fewer cables, the better.	
2-2-10	Jason Orabella	General Public	I would like to thank you for taking the time to make a website and taking into concern the general public. I would like to applaud the professionalism of this website, and the quality of the plans I viewed. I felt all of the renderings in the paper today, February 2, 2010, were aesthetically pleasing. Thank you for taking the time to read this email, A member of the public.	
2-2-10	Wayne Grodkiewicz	General Public	I am a local bridge "freak" and it would be very cool if you went with either Plan 9 or Plan 6. Cable Stayed and Suspension Bridges are much more beautiful than arch or cantilever.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Bob Little	General Public	<p>Thank you for sharing Brent Spence design proposals with the citizens of Cincinnati. What is offered is a beauty contest between look alike bridges from Hangzhou, Pitt River, Songo City, Tampa, Alsea Bay Oregon (a look alike Big Mac), or the Ben van Berkel proposal for Rotterdam. Cincinnati would be replicating another similar span. We have an exceptional opportunity to showcase Cincinnati at the convergence of several freeways. Traffic counts are enormous at this key point of entry and visibility. My answer on design: select none of the proposed designs. We have the most historic and beautiful bridge on the Ohio River here in our town, yet none of these designs reflect an updated design reflective of the Roebling's character and strength. The proposed Big Mac design is powerful, yet not a compliment to the Brent Spence span. A second Big Mac is simply repetitious. Maybe a competition between great designers would produce a concept as fresh as the tiara on our newest hi-rise building, or possibly a modern like the sweep of the Paul Brown Stadium deck. If we choose not to be innovative or brave, how about a straight clean roadway with under structure support allowing the existing Brent Spence to be a beautifully renovated, uniquely painted symbol of this historic crossing point? Don't squander our chance to secure a distinctive and unique gateway to our remarkable city. Our budget must be contained, but not hometown spirit, creativity nor ingenuity. An important consideration is for traffic planning on both sides of the river. It was disappointing not to see traffic plan alternatives in the proposal. Cincinnati is historically poor at traffic solutions so let's not miss the primary objective here. Do round-a-bouts work? Massachusetts just removed a major one. Other cities have typically removed them on heavy traffic interstate or state highway corridors. Let's start with traffic (I like the I-71, I-75 separation idea) then secure the best bridge solution for Cincinnati. Make time to do it right.</p>	
2-2-10	James M. Ochs	General Public	<p>Looking at the 6 proposals in the Enquirer today, and studying them further on this site, I would choose between concepts 3 & 12. Concept 3 would provide an overall symmetry from I-71/75 to I-471. In complete contrast, concept 12 is visually stunning and would instantly provide the landmark status the criteria specifies. I love the asymmetrical line against the backdrop of the cityscape as well as the height of the support columns. I would not be disappointed in the more conservative choice of concept 3, but I think concept 12 would be a great addition to the already phenomenal Cincinnati skyline. Go with a BOLD vision!</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Carol Ramler	General Public	<p>In response to the comments for Bridge Design, the website needs to be updated to state clearly what are the 6 alternatives being moved forward. Further, given the amount of time necessary to upload the 12, uploading only 6 would be appreciated. I am in favor of an arched type bridge profile. It would be the book end to the Big Mac. Given the context of the existing bridges, it would much better compliment the other bridges as opposed to the various cable stayed bridges. The issue of potential river traffic interference for an arched bridge can be worked out in later design phases. Pretty much the impression of all of the cable stayed (CS) bridges was that of a sore thumb. Consider when 2nd & 3rd Streets were constructed w/ the Fort Washington Way project. I don't believe any bothered to artistically render the absolute clutter caused by the proliferation of the lights, banners, etc. That is one of the issues w/ the proposed CS bridges. The cables are either lost in view due to the Brent Spence or look discordant rising above the clutter of trusses from all of the other bridges. Another issue, even more important, the CS bridges that really look good are bridges that don't share the landscape w/ a multitude of other bridges. Their gracefulness compliments the landscape & vice versa. In this location, w/ all the other bridges, the effect of gracefulness is obliterated. Whether looking upriver/down river or from some angle - the Brent Spence is going to be right there, in all of its truss glory, with the even older Clay Wade Bailey and RR bridges being mighty close. A CS isn't going to be able to make much of "statement" when it has such lovely competition! To continue, the artistic renderings herein are quite deceptive in that the immediately adjacent Brent Spence Bridge is "right there", not simple a smattering of trees on the OH side. They fail to show that a CS side-by-side w/ a truss doesn't have a remote chance of looking good. Because of that critical adjacency, the aesthetic goals are next to impossible to be met. No matter how clutter free a CS bridge offers, driving on the new bridge, you'll see the old one - both levels. Therefore, the selection of a structure made of similar materials and the simple grace of an arch, I believe, will have a greater chance of aesthetically complimenting the waterfront. Thanks for considering these comments.</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Mike Lockhart	General Public	Please, build a pretty, aesthetically pleasing bridge. Something that will be perhaps uniquely Cincinnati's or at least eye-catching. Cincinnati's bridges are so utilitarian and ugly aside from the 471 bridge. I would vote for the cable-type bridge, like the new one over the Ohio river that connects Maysville, KY and Aberdeen, OH.	
2-2-10	Bill Baker	General Public	DO THE ONE WITH THE LARGE TOWERS ON THE OHIO SIDE - NO QUESTION THIS IS THE MOST DISTINCTIVE....	
2-2-10	Angie Garber Zengel	Academia	I love the different design options and I'd like to share with my third grade students, is this is where we would give feedback or are you collecting public opinion in a different way. Please let me know how we can give you feedback regarding our favorite bridge design. Thank you.	
2-2-10	Nancy Wishart		This is a comment on the Brent Spence project. My vote goes to Plan 6, it is beautiful, I would prefer the cables evenly spaced and not in the x pattern. Thank you for your consideration.	
2-3-10	Steve Mary	Hamilton Co Engineer Office	After reviewing the different alternatives I was surprised that there was not a two legged two tower alternative. This would appear to be less expensive than the three legged alternatives. The two legged tower with the arched top was just two different and was not well received. Use the same idea minus the arched top and show a strut between the legs well above the deck. This is a more common design and has been enthusiastically received by the public in other locations.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-3-10	Cathy Marksteiner	General Public	<p>The Cincinnati Enquirer had an article about the design for the Brent Spence Corridor bridge replacement. The article ran 2 Feb. 2010. While only 4 photos were shown, there were 6 concept plans mentioned. Public comment was invited. First, thank you for the public invitation. Second, I took the opportunity to review the 12 different designs for the bridge alternatives. I did read some designs were eliminated by a project advisory board. Even so, I would like to comment my top 2 design preferences. Plan 4 and Plan 8 were my top two choices. Plan 8 may be one of the potentially eliminated plans. Plan 4, with its arch, mirrors the Daniel Carter Beard Bridge. The design would "bracket" the city connections between Cincinnati and the Northern Kentucky communities. The visual continuity on the river would also be a bonus. Instead of parallel bowstrings, the Arch in plan 4 has converging bowstrings. Nice change. The open cable stays and lower deck truss configuration gives greater views. I have seen some of the big cable suspension bridges. Plan 8 is unique in design from all of the other cable bridges. The inverted "V" supports are distinctive, would be unique to Cincinnati, provide open views in many directions, would not be as tall as most of the other cable suspension designs, and would be a great addition to the Cincinnati/ Northern Kentucky skyline. Thank you again for the opportunity to submit our thoughts about the bridge design.</p>	
2-3-10	Dick Young	General Public	<p>I drive I-75 at least 4 days a week so I'm familiar with the traffic pattern. The biggest problem facing construction is the Southbound approach to the bridge, essentially I-75 goes from 4 lanes to 2 creating the bottleneck when traffic starts to get heavy, any Friday, rush hour or Holiday evening. We need it to be 4 lanes all the way across the bridge with an extra lane for breakdowns. This is not as much of a problem on the approach Northbound since the approach stays 4 lanes until the I75/71 split on the north side of the river but there is a need there for the breakdown lane. In my opinion anything less than 5 lanes is a waste. Also, the Southbound approach would be better if it was a straight line over the river starting around the Freeman exit area, that would give out of town drivers not familiar with the area a better view of the bridge. I really don't care which design is used as long as it can handle the present traffic plus any future needs, I would go for 6 lanes that should carry the load until at least 2030. Thanks for the opportunity for the input.</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-3-10	Mark Teschauer	General Public	I feel that the new designs for the bridge lacks the foresight into a possible light rail or even commuter rail development that could serve as an effective link between Downtown and CVG airport. Dedicating a portion of the bridge to future development would allow for an excellent mixed-use transportation system that could serve as a means of reducing traffic. Thank you for your consideration.	
2-3-10	Jeremy Mosher	General Public	Just wanted to share a vote of favor for "Re-Design #12" for the Brent Spence Re-Design. I find it to be a distinctive and eye-catching solution to the bridge re-design. In my opinion "Re-design 4" would be a nice second option, as it offers a nice "book-end" to the Daniel Beard "Big Mac" Bridge at the eastern border of Downtown Cincinnati. However, regardless of aesthetics, I feel strongly that the #1 design consideration should be making the new bridge accessible for pedestrian/light-rail right-of-way. Bike access would be great (as seen on New York City's Queensboro and RFK Bridges, which offer bike/pedestrian lanes separated from traffic by railings) but rail access needs to be part of this design, if our city is going to be as accessible -- and as competitive -- as possible.	
2-3-10	Dan Longano	General Public	The design I like best is the one with the two very high columns on one side.	
2-3-10	Carole Lauber	General Public	I prefer the Plan 6.	
2-3-10	Jennifer and John Stein	General Public	You were asking for bridge concept votes. I guess this is the place to comment. My vote is for design #8. Stay with the cable designs, they are very pleasing to the eye. How will noise issues be addressed? The echo from the current double-decker throws a lot of noise out and onto Kenton Hills. Please consider some type of sound shielding. Thanks.	
2-3-09	David Ventre	General Public	Have a provision to allow vehicles to detour from one bridge to the other (and vice versa) during periods of wrecks, road surface repair, line painting, and general maintenance etc.	
2-3-10	John Pratt	Industry	I support bridge design number TEN. It is the most aesthetically pleasing alternative.	
2-3-10	Chris Ridenour	General Public	After seeing the publicly released designs for the Brent Spence Bridge replacement, I feel that your designs failed to meet the initial criteria. None of those stand out as a visual landmark that this city could be proud of. They are good looking bridges, but all have been done before or don't fit the distinct visual appeal of the current Brent Spence Bridge or our city in general. I hope to see more concepts in the future.	

Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-3-10	Howard Fishburn	General Public	Of the four designs in the Enquirer, I prefer #4. It gives balance to the riverfront with Big Mac on the other end. Some might think it SAME OLD - SAME OLD. #6 is my second choice. Something different, balanced, frames the river. #9 looks like the bridge is too heavy for the towers, and they have to lean back to support the weight. #12 would probably be the most stunning of all because of its height. Maybe since you only get a new bridge every 50 - 60 years, that is the way to go. GOOD LUCK!!!	
2-3-10	Abbie Jones, PE		I like concept 8 the best. As a Kentuckian, I would prefer something that is a little bit different from other "designer" bridges. (i.e. don't want to match the coastal GA bridge, etc). I hope that a color other than white will be chosen to separate KY from others too. Any other design details that allow for KY symbols would be outstanding (i.e. the three star layout on most new interstate bridges in TN). One idea of such is to have "K" and an "I" in the truss structure (either the superstructure or the lower level members). That would be subtle but a nice detail. I also notice that there is no vertical curve in the design. I would assume that each structural layout allows for different heights of boats/barges underneath (further limited by other bridges which will eventually be replaced as well). I hope that is given strong consideration as well as aesthetics.	
2-3-10	Rick Pansiera	General Public	As an Architect in the Cincinnati area, I thought I would take you up on your offer & provide my personal feedback on your project designs. I shall keep comments brief. Please, Please do our area a favor & finally provide a public infrastructure project worthy of national attention. That said, I feel this could be accomplished by proceeding with concepts #9 or #10, followed closely by #8. These concepts all provide elegant answers to a fairly non-elegant type of structure. Not only do they present the design best from the land based views, but also importantly address the view from the river as well, which is a very important part of the city. Whatever you do, I think you shall be faced with years of ridicule if you accept concepts #3, #4, or #5. These appear to be "We don't have any better ideas than the Big Mac, so we'll go with it!!" Maybe we can paint it purple & call it the "Purple Car Bridge". That would certainly be novel. Thank you for taking the time to review our input. Best of luck to you.	
2-3-10	Peter Hoyt	General Public	The new bridge designs are really pretty good. In particular I like design #12, with #6 and 9 as second choices. What really bothers me is that the existing bridge will be kept after the new bridge is built. While I understand why it is kept I wish further studies could be done to determine if it can be removed and local traffic served by the other existing bridges.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-3-10	Charles Simon	General Public	I give Concept 9 an A+. Second choice would be Concept 4. Third place Concept 1. My background architecture and construction.	
2-3-10	Jerry Bain	General Public	The front page article in the February 2, 2010 edition of the Cincinnati Enquirer stated that public feedback was invited on the designs for the Brent Spence Corridor bridge. My choice is for Plan 12 with Plan 9 the next. There was nothing I could find in this web site directly related to yesterday's article. Also, when I phoned Parsons Brinkerhoff as noted in the article, my call went to voice mail. Not easy to offer public comment under these circumstances.	
2-3-10	Manfred Schnetzer	General Public	Regarding the designs listed in the Feb.2 Cincinnati Enquirer: I vote for Plan 4 ("Big Mac" bridge type)My least desired design is plan 9 with the slanted supports. Even though statically good, it's not a pleasing design. I have seen plan 12 as an AUTOBAHN bridge over the Rhine River near Duesseldorf, Germany. Looks very majestic!	
2-3-10	Gwen	General Public	Yes to the arch style, as it mimics the Newport bridge, like the taller of the looks here... Yes to the Golden Gate style as it looks grand as our city should look! Big NO to the triangle or pointed posts leaning backwards...YUK!	
2-3-10	Rick Mitchell	Others	In your schedule window on this site under Task, after (FONSI) you should put "NOTHING OF CONSEQUENCE ACCOMPLISHED" I've been crossing that rusty death trap almost twice a day for over THIRTY years now and you're not even out of the "GEE HOW DO YOU THINK WE OUGHT TO DO IT?" stage. You need to whittle it down to three! Here's a thought - throw a dart. Anything's better than what's there now. Or you could simply hire someone who can make a decision. But that's just my opinion and only shared by a couple million others I'm guessing.	
2-3-10	J. Bevis	General Public	I like the looks of the bridge that resembles the Daniel Beard bridge.	
2-3-10	David Hahn	General Public	One problem with the current bridge is congestion on the northbound portion. The main cause seems to be the addition of traffic from the 12th and 5th streets of Covington on the right hand side just before I-71 and I-75 diverge. If traffic from these ramps could choose which side of the highway to merge onto (e.g. merge into the left lane for I-75 bound, and the right lane for I-71 bound) you could cut down on the amount of lane crossing necessary for people to get into the proper lanes within this short corridor. Improved traffic flow would also reduce the average load being carried by the bridge, assuming that cars will drive further apart at higher speed.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-3-10	Elizabeth Stoehr	General Public	One of the complaints we often get about Cincinnati is that it is not with the times. This bridge we will build is a fantastic opportunity to demonstrate and reflect our unique geographical setting, history (the Roebling Suspension Bridge, prototype to the Brooklyn Bridge) and sophistication as a city and region. The view from the cut in the hill, in Kentucky, is one of the most dramatic entrances to a city. You might want to see how the new bridge design will look from that angle. The six designs shown on your website, in my opinion, come off as ordinary and dated. They could have been designed fifty years ago. They are not 'now'. Please search for a more forward-looking, inspiring design; Santiago Calatrava (www.e-architect.co.uk/.../calatrava_bridge.htm) comes to mind. Who knows, maybe the bridge will become a destination!	
2-3-10	Viola Nagel	General Public	This bridge needs to be designed like the William H. Harsha Bridge that goes from Aberdeen Ohio Route 52 to the AA highway in Maysville Kentucky.	
2-3-10	Fred Hornback	General Public	I like bridges 9 and 10. They look the same in these pictures, but I like them, their design is forward looking. I know we can't have the best money can buy, so I pick them. Is there a lower deck on any of them?	
2-3-10	Randy	General Public	Concept number 11 is both aesthetically appealing and future looking, warmer with arch and cable design. Frankly and strangely the concept has an organic welcoming feeling to it. Out of the options in the PDF file this concept is cool and would define a new vibrant river-scape for our region.	
2-3-10	Rose Pranger		We live very close to I-75 - near the new St. Elizabeth Emergency Hospital here in Covington. We witness too many bad accidents going in both directions - very busy on certain days. Here are my remarks in my ongoing file. ROSE HAS SPOKEN. I cannot believe that someone hasn't thought of this solution already: The Brent Spence Bridge already exists. Another similar bridge construction is planned for the foreseeable future to the West of this structure. Why - in the name of good sense - can't the powers that be regulate that one bridge be used for all commercial vehicles - and motor homes could be included in the mix - and use the other span for private passenger cars. Doable? Why not?	
2-3-10	John Paul Casey	Industry	My choice is Plan 10 without the center support like Plan 12. My gut feeling is the elimination of the center support will make for easier entrance and exit to and from the bridge. Cincinnati should have a unique design bridge like the "Big Dig" cable-stayed bridge in Boston.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-4-10	Ed Aug		<p>Your design pictures are all beautiful. My preference is Alternative 6 for a couple reasons. Aesthetically it is beautiful and it looks very impressive to go across a bridge without any superstructure above you. It looks so unobstructed on the upper deck. The lower deck looks good too. Any of the similar designs would be okay.</p> <p>I would rule out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >the Brent Spence mirror image - too old fashioned >the Big Mac one - we already have one >the Golden Gate one - something about the tilted towers just doesn't look right >the single tower one - not symmetrical, although the tower being the size of the Carew Tower has some appeal, but it needs a second one for symmetry. Actually, it should be one foot taller to match the Great American Tower. Hopefully the costs are no more with the suggested alternative than the others. Thanks for taking my input. 	
2-4-10	Desta Daniel	Academia	This is the only place I could find to "vote" for the design of the new bridge. I prefer the 3rd slide with the 2 towers.	
2-4-10	John Spurrier	General Public	<p>Six years of research before the design is completed and selected? And you've publicly stated that it is going to take complete decade before the first shovel breaks ground to replace what was antiquated bridge in the 70's? What a waste of tax dollars in a time when YOU need to be most frugal! The job should be done right, but this is not "RIGHT". I bet it looks like I-275 when it's done. By the way, those are lovely changes from the old road to the new. Whoever approved that should be fired from their job. As for the concept designs - It is 2010. Not 1989! It will be 2020-2025 before this thing is done. What do you think the capacity will be then? My thought, if there is one place the government shouldn't be conservative in estimating, it's anticipating road capacity 15 years from now. On the plus side, at least with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet involved we may be able to drag ODOT by the hand and get something done.</p>	
2-4-10	Jennifer	General Public	Concept no. 8	
2-4-10	Nik	Academia	My favorite of the narrowed-down Brent Spence bridge designs is number 12.	
2-4-10	Melissa Stephens	General Public	I like bridge design option #12 the best - it mimics the already existing "Big Mac" bridge and it the most visually interesting of all the options.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-4-10	John D. Becker		I assume this is the "forum" for responding to the bridge designs released this week? I'm happy to see that a number of alternatives are being considered. I am an architect, so of course, will be quite critical and difficult to please! We're given a unique opportunity every once in a while to make an important impact on our built environment. This is clearly one of those times. A project of such high profile (both physically and politically) in our region deserves our full attention! While there is obviously not an unending fund of monies to finance this project, the design of a bridge can be a huge symbol of the character of a people, a signpost for an entire three state area (and beyond). One needs only look at the differences between our beloved historic Roebling Suspension Bridge and the staleness of the antiquated Brent Spence. That being said. Many of the designs presented are disappointing. Certainly not of the realm of say a soaring Calatrava designed project. The tower/cable-stay designs seem best as they do offer some reference to the Roebling. The towers, however, as they become so very tall (500 feet?!), should be significant in their own right ... not simply soaring pieces of steel, unchanged until they stop abruptly. Structure (with its detail and connections) can be as ornamental as the brick piers and light towers of the Roebling if handled with the skill of a deft designer. Please take the time to consider and select the proper course here. It's never too late to bring on more talented designers with current engineers to make this our once-in-a-lifetime gift to the river and cities of Covington and Cincinnati. THANK YOU!	
2-4-10	DeJoseph	General Public	We like design 1 or 3. Hate the tall ones and one looks like we're trying to be St. Louis.	
2-4-10	Troy Marwehe	General Public	After viewing the article in the Cincinnati enquirer on Sunday January 31st I was pleasantly surprised by the design concepts that have been proposed thus far. Plan four which mimics the Daniel Carter Bridge is beautiful and graceful but perhaps is too conservative or redundant. I'm most impressed with plan 9 and 10. This to me is a great combination of elegance and beauty and a wonderful sense of optimism for a new century. This is a path that I believe Greater Cincinnati should pursue, one which promotes our region as a leader in forward thinking design tempered with a pleasing and graceful aesthetic that would be viewed by later generations as an example of timeless design. Kudos to those involved in this important project for the obvious attention to detail and sense of style. This a chance for Cincinnati to have a bridge that can become an iconic image for the city (with a little luck) on the scale of New York or San Francisco. Thank you for the chance to comment on a project that affects everyone.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-4-10	Sarah Herkamp	General Public	<p>I heard a radio spot asking for opinions on the redesign of I-75 and the designs for a new bridge to work beside the Brent Spence, and I've looked through the papers on rearranging I-75 and I-71. I'm glad to see how much attention matters of lane changes and shoulder widths are receiving. I like the idea of using the existing bridge for local traffic and a new one for through traffic very much--separating the commuters who know the roads and are in a hurry to get to work from the through travelers who are just trying to pass through with a minimum of lane changing and adjustments in speed seems like a good way to improve safety for everyone using I-75, the bridges, and the feeder roads. I am apprehensive about the traffic nightmares that tearing up and temporarily rerouting existing surface roads and parts of I-75 will cause. The chances of horrible wrecks only increase when people are frustrated by detours and unexpected changes to lane routing and sitting in bumper-to-bumper traffic. I realize that a certain amount of hassle is inevitable, but I for one would appreciate further radio spots during the construction phase of the project, announcing that this access road or that one will be closed (temporarily or permanently), that commuters who want to go to downtown Cincinnati should use the _____ exit as the _____ exit is down to one lane, that there is a new stoplight to be aware of, etc. The roadside warning signs are helpful, but the restriction on the length of their messages means they can't adequately explain what's happening along the length of a large and complex construction project. I'd also like to hear "progress reports" on the local news, from time to time--it would be a nice change from the usual crime and fire reports. I personally would find it much easier to tolerate the traffic tie-ups if I knew that the reason the lane beside mine is blocked off and without machines or workers on it is that opposing traffic is going to be using that lane starting tomorrow morning. I also recommend posting big signs with this web address, and a message along the lines of "Want to know what's going on with the new bridge? Check out the website for weekly updates and announcements!"</p>	

Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
	Herkamp (continued)		<p>I looked at the aesthetic design criteria for the new bridge, and then at the proposed designs. If I had to choose one of them, I'd pick Bridge #11--I like the arches over the road (they make the bridge look sturdier and more like a cohesive structure--though they are reminiscent of St. Louis' famous Arch) and the converging lines of the cables. That said, I did wonder why there are no traditional suspension bridges among the proposals. To my eye, the most aesthetically pleasing bridge in this city is the Roebling Bridge. If designed correctly, a suspension bridge could appear to be carrying the existing Brent Spence Bridge on its cables, with its towers framing the top curve of the old bridge. To be honest, though, the existing bridge isn't attractive, and the best thing I can think of to improve it (short of replacing it) would be to paint it black with polished silver accents and give it an "Age of Steam" look, then construct the new bridge to further evoke the Steam Era (making use of modern materials and engineering to avoid spending the entire bridge budget on steel, and blocking the view up the river with columns and girders(the old bridge will block the view downstream)) rather than the oversmooth, narrow lines of the "modern" aesthetic. Lots of cities have bridges consisting of rods in the air supporting dead-straight cables to hold up a deck with nothing to recommend or offend--those aren't landmarks, they're just 1960s-style modern traffic carriers. A note on paint--I'd recommend not going with white. It gets washed out against the gray skies of a Cincinnati winter, it shows the smallest speck of dirt, and it's on a lot of other bridges all over the country. We have the blue of the Roebling and our wonderful Purple People Bridge, which is fun just to say. White reflects heat, and I suppose it could make it easier to spot cracks and other maintenance issues, but the Roebling and the Purple People Bridge function very well in other colors. A more substantial design of the towers would allow for a tourist elevator--with a parking lot within easy walking distance of the bridge approaches, of course. That's something those stick-thin modern bridges can't offer. I'd like to be able to go up an elevator and take pictures of the river and both Covington and Cincinnati from a panoramic viewpoint, and I wouldn't be the only one. The opening of the new bridge! I'd pay three or four dollars for such a photo opportunity, and if it was done well, a tourist elevator could help pay for the maintenance of the bridge. Thanks for asking for public input--I'll be alert to further developments on this project, and I look forward to the opening of the new bridge!</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-4-10	Michael Bishop	General Public	Our family reviewed the various bridge options and we are glad you are considering aesthetics as a major part of the bridge design. The engineers are to be commended for generating clearly understood drawings and photo renderings that effectively communicate what the various options will look like. While by themselves the arched bridges are nice designs, we feel that since we already have the Big Mac bridge, there is no need to duplicate that kind of visual statement. It looks like "me, too" instead of standing on its own. The cable-stayed versions are so nice and open. Version #6 is the best option, in our opinion, because it makes a great statement on the horizon and the x-bracing on the lower level makes a nice braided rhythm as you drive along--it doesn't look like other bridges. Version 6 is a good complement to the existing bridge. That being said, we would be happy to have any new bridge since this is one of the first things people experience when entering either state. Cable-stayed bridges are great statements and it seems as if there would not be much maintenance since there is not as much massive steel to keep painted. Thank you for your time.	
2-4-10	Thomas Lewis	General Public	After reviewing the alternate designs, our family prefers Concept 3 over the other plans. Concept 3 is visually attractive, less obtrusive, more symmetrical in nature, and similar to the Daniel Carter Beard bridge which should have an appeal to our traditional city. This lower profile provides a better view of the cityscape both on and off the bridge. Concepts 1 & 2 appear to be a major paint effort and hinder the view when looking through the bridge. The remaining concepts appear more obtrusive with the tall supports. However, cost and maintenance should be a major factor in the final decision.	
2-4-10	Troy Daum	General Public	Looking at the different bridges that you have listed. I would like to say, in the Northern Kentucky / Cincinnati area, we both have a lot of items to offer to our visitors. The Cincinnati skyline has always been a warm welcome home, after being gone for a while. In saying this I would like to welcome the newest view and my vote for the new bridge, and would hope you agree or the vast public would go for bridge number 12. IT has a crisp clean look to it, and I would love to see that one get put up! Thanks for your time.	
2-4-10	Billy Wayne Dick	General Public	I like PLAN 4 or 12. #9 is the worse. Whatever you do create some green space - an entry way...not a concrete maze that consumes you. It's the gateway to the city. Make it welcoming.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-5-10	Brad Seligmann	General Public	Of all the bridge designs, I really like Option 4. It looks like an updated "Big Mac" bridge and has a shape that is elegant yet simple. It's definitely the best design of the bunch. The tower suspension bridges all have a dated appearance and look like they're trying too hard to stand out. It seems like everything is trying to be the next Guggenheim, so to speak, but if everything is a "Guggenheim" then nothing stands out. Let a bridge just be a bridge, and pick 4!	
2-5-10	Jim Ramey	General Public	I like bridge designs 12, 10, 6, 7 and 3. I also think that the color paint chosen should be bright but pleasing to the eye. I like the Big Mac yellow and pedestrian purple.....thanks.	
2-5-10	Mrs. Garber's class	Academia	We really liked looking at the different bridge models. As a class we preferred the more modern bridges models Concept 6-12. Our class favorite was concept 11. Chad really likes the big arch. Kendall also likes the arch. Bobby likes that it would be higher than our current bridge. No matter which bridge you build we ALL can't wait to drive on it!	
2-5-10	David Barber	General Public	Design concepts 9 and 10 would be a great addition to the landscape of Greater Cincinnati Northern Kentucky. In fact, concept 9 & 10 are well tied in to the look of Paul Brown Stadium.	
2-5-10	Scott Grenerth	General Public	I am a truck driver based in Ohio who very regularly drives the I-75 & I-71 corridor. I am not particularly worried about what the new bridge looks like, but I like the suspension bridge. That style has advantages other than looks. The current bridge has supports for the upper deck that block the view of the signs for traffic on the lower deck. It appears that this is not the case on the suspension bridge designs. This is particularly bad for truck drivers not familiar with the area. Sitting up much higher in the cab of a semi truck you may only get less than a seconds view of the signs telling you which lane to be in as the interstates split going north into Ohio. Please make certain that the signage in the bridge will be much easier to read than is currently the case. I believe a huge help for that is to have a large sign at least a mile before the bridge that clearly shows which lanes to be in for the split on the north shore of the river. Yes I know that's means a very expensive sign, but we are talking about making the roads much safer and avoiding traffic tie-ups due to accidents. Please do not even think about using tolling to fund the bridge. If we need an increase in fuel taxes for unleaded and diesel to fund very desperately needed transportation infrastructure such as this bridge, well then let's do it and make sure the money is spent transparently and responsibly where it is needed the most. Thank you.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-5-10	Doug Bauereis	General Public	I like the 7 and 11 versions. There is a beautiful bridge near Boston I believe, which is a cable bridge I love this style. I think that the new bridge should be big enough to handle all of the traffic from 71 and 75 with more lanes that it has now. I think it will look terrible to build a new bridge next to the old and leave the old one. The old one needs a lot of repair work and it really takes away from the look of the new bridge, from up the river you see the old one and can't hardly see the new one. I hope that a lot of other people express the same opinion. Why build a new beautiful bridge that you can't hardly see. The great thing about the suspension bridge is that it can be photographed and there are no other bridges really close to it. Please try to make the new bridge a new landmark and signature of the city. The one that is in Boston is pictured on TV a lot in the background on Fox news or CNN. If that is not possible I guess the version 1 would be sufficient because it just allows vehicles to get across the river and it looks really boring, so no one would look at as a landmark.	
2-15-10	Maureen Dewing	General Public	I would like to submit my vote for bridge plan # 9. Thanks, Maureen Dewing My son Brendan Dewing submits his vote for bridge plan # 4. Thanks, Brendan Dewing	
2-6-10	John Heidrich (#1)	General Public	Why not design a bridge similar to the Tower Bridge in London England. It could be used by vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. Imagine the views from the tops of the north and south towers. It could signify the importance of the Ohio river during the civil war. It could be a national tourist attraction. I'm sure the people of Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky would donate money if they could see their names etched in the bricks used to make the towers or walkways. After 9/11 I think all of major construction of bridges, buildings, etc. should be built as if they are monuments. Designed as a testament of what this country is made of.	

Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-6-10	John Heidrich (#2)	General Public	Bridges should evoke emotions as well as serve the peoples' needs. Look at the JK Bridge in Brazilia, Brazil. Or just imagine a bridge for our future generations. A bridge for vehicles, possible light rail, pedestrians, cyclists. Think outside the box and come up with a bridge that with a wow factor! Cincinnati, Northern Kentucky is a stunning region with many rolling hills surrounding it, rich in history. Sometimes living here we take it for granted. I want to be able to walk to the middle of the new bridge and admire everything around me. So much money has been spent on projects around our city and I think we should not underestimate the importance of our bridges. Our bridges connect two great states, two great regions (the north and south). Our new bridge should be a statement of unity, success, beauty. It should be unique. I hope it signifies our region so that the people traveling the busiest interstate in the country can appreciate it and remember crossing it.	
2-6-10	Anne Kunkel	General Public	Our family was excited to view the possible bridge designs but we were disappointed that they were all modern in architectural design. Cincinnati has preserved and still uses so many beautiful buildings full of intricate designs. Landmarks such as Music Hall, Fountain Square, old hotels, The Museum Center, etc. What would suit our city perfectly would be a throw back in the look of the bridge but with the latest of engineering. A modern design with clean lines doesn't look like "Cincinnati" to our eyes.	
2-6-10	Ron Edgerton	General Public	You asked for feedback on the alternative designs for the new bridge. Here are my thoughts: 1. It FIRST must meet the future traffic demand. 2. It must be cost effective. 3. It must seek to minimize adverse effects on the built and natural environment. 4. It must reflect a creative design that fits our urban environment. Based on the designs offered in the paper (2/2) and on your website, I definitely prefer Plan 4. This Arch Bridge works like a "bookend" to the DCB Bridge (I-471) at the east end of the Downtown, reflects a contemporary design and has been proven to be a good bridge structure. Hopefully, it will also meet the other criteria above.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-6-10	George Hill		First, thanks for asking for comments on the bridge design. I am sorry I am a day late for the deadline requested in the paper. I am certainly not the most artistic person in the area. I do think that I prefer concept 4 since it seems to have a consistent design to the Daniel Carter Beard Bridge giving the bridge network between Ohio and Kentucky a more symmetrical appearance. I think that concept 12 is my least favorite in terms of appearance. I do believe that whatever the most structurally efficient bridge is out of the six selected should be the number one choice. I think that function should overrule form on the bridge design. While the current project objectives state they are intended for roadway use only, I wonder if the project is too far along to not consider a design that would use rail to connect commuters from Northern KY and Cincinnati suburbs to the downtown area and to CVG. Since it has been over 40 years since the construction of the Brent Spence Bridge, I wonder if the transportation design has taken into consideration the transportation infrastructure needs that would make this design something that would make the Cincinnati-Northern KY area a place that would be desirable for major employers because of transportation efficiency 35 to 40 years from now. Thanks for listening.	
2-6-10	Steven White	General Public	The Cincinnati Enquirer directed readers to this website to view and comment on the final 6 designs. I can't find these 6 designs or anyway to comment on them on this website. Can you have you web designer place the six images and a "voting" button on your home page?	
2-6-10	Matthew Lee	General Public	I like alternative 11. It is the only one that offers a gateway experience to the driver (on the upper deck anyways).	
2-7-10	Charlie Padgett	General Public	Please reconsider these designs. This is such an awesome opportunity to create an awe inspiring gateway as travelers come into our city, please don't short change us, the city's history and future generations with one of these designs. One only has to look east along the river to see how to design a beautiful functional landmark, the Roebling bridge. It's iconic. Consider the use of stone, the beautiful archways. The latest proposed designs lack character and warmth. I apologize for the negativity but I love this city too much not to speak up. I/we only want to see something great, to be proud. Thank you.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-7-10	Jim Haney	General Public	Overall, I was disappointed with the prelim designs released in the Enquirer the first week of Feb. This bridge needs to be a signature piece for the Cincinnati region for the next 100 years. Cincinnati is always too understated, and I felt the designs were very utilitarian. I like the cable concepts best, but it is critical that creativity and uniqueness be brought forth. I really did not like the "bookend" concept to make it look like the Big Mac bridge - boring and uncreative was my thought. So please, think Golden Gate, Sydney Harbor, Roebling as you look at other designs.	
2-7-10	Laura Steele	General Public	I am an architect from Cincinnati, educated in NYC, and working in Los Angeles. Concept 4 best suits the downtown Cincinnati city-scape in my opinion.	
2-7-10	Tina Cartigan	General Public	Great job on bridge designs! My personal faves are concepts 9 and 10. You can count those as votes if you wish. Best of luck on the project.	
2-10-10	Michelle Huber	General Public	Thank you for posting the design concepts of the Brent Spence Bridge alternative online for the public to view. Even though I reside in Lebanon, I try to involve myself in local news and city planning. As an interested citizen, I wanted to offer my opinion on the selection of the bridge design. My first choice is concept 12 because it looks modern, unique and updated. We want Cincinnati to look as though it's moving strongly forward into the future. In addition, it also provides for views of the city and river without interference. All other spire/cable designs obstruct the view of the city more than concept 12. My second choice is concept 4 because of its simplicity (in comparison to the other arc designs) and the fact that it matches the Big Mac Bridge. It still stands as unique while fitting into the skyline of other Cincinnati/KY bridges. Concept 4 does not obstruct the view as much as concept 1. Thank you again for your efforts. I would like to continue to receive updates on this project via my e-mail.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-4-10	Martha Kelly	City of Cincinnati	<p>I do not support the use of a traditional truss bridge. I feel that either the cable stayed or arch concept would create a more impressive statement for the region and gateway into Ohio and Kentucky. If I was forced to choose my preference right now, I would select the arch concept – option 3 on the matrix. Of the cable stayed concepts, I prefer option 7.</p> <p>I chose these options due to the cost of construction and constructability relative to the other options, as well as the “look”. There are several items that concern me as we move forward, besides the cost of construction. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is my understanding that the cable stayed with only two supports will require decks with a thicker web – 12 feet instead of 6 feet. If the wider web is used, and keeping the height above the river as a constant, the top deck will be twelve feet higher with the two support system. Will the grades work from the bridge to Fifth Street so that I-75 will be under Fifth Street? We do not want the highway over the City’s east-west street grid. If this is an issue, then I would prefer the three support system if the cable stayed is selected. 2. I want us to consider the removal/replacement of the existing Brent Spence Bridge in the future. While it may be nice to simply “widen” the new bridge in the future to accommodate the removal of the existing, I don’t believe this would be feasible. Therefore, I would like to consider a bridge design that looks good today, but imagine a new “baby” bridge next to it in the future. This also means that the bridge type that we pick today would have to be built so that major construction can occur next to it in the future without impacting the pier design, etc. (Maybe I am thinking too much!) I believe that the arch bridge would be better for this future bridge, but only from the perspective of “looks” and only if it is NOT the basket handle. However, I am not a structural engineer, so I may be totally wrong from an engineering perspective. 	
2-4-10	Martha Kelly continued	City of Cincinnati	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. I want to make sure that we pick a structure type that can be maintained in the future with the least disruption to traffic. We should have options for moving traffic from lane to lane for maintenance, and not have to shut down the whole bridge for minor repairs. <p>I fully recognize that more work has to be done to determine the best bridge type for the Brent Spence. Therefore, I don’t want to comment on the deck truss type or top bracing until we have a better sense of feasibility and maintainability relative to my issues above. I am sure that others will have even more issues that need to be weighed as we move forward.</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-5-10	Greg Long	City of Cincinnati	<p>In addition to Martha's comments I will also offer the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The preliminary bridge concepts presentation is quite confusing on exactly how the lane assignments work. Option 11 has all the 71 and 75 NB and SB assignments and both the local NB and SB connections identified in a clear manner; however, the remaining alternatives seem to be mis-labeled and have some duplicate movements. For example, options 2 through 10 have no NB I-71 movement shown and have two local SB movements shown with 2 lanes on the existing BSB and 3 lanes on the proposed BSB. I assume the new bridge is going to carry the NB I-71 traffic on the lower deck in these alternatives, but wanted to clarify. Option 1 has two SB I-71 movements- probably a typo and the western movement on the lower deck is a NB movement? Just need clarification- the lane assignments were generally addressed at the public meeting, but are not clear. 2. Several options show the I-71 SB movement (2 lanes) on the lower deck of the proposed BSB adjacent to a 7.5 foot lane. I assume this is a pedestrian/ shared use path? From a personal perspective assuming this is a pedestrian/shared use path, I would prefer the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. To be on the top deck as a pedestrian on the new bridge. b. To be on the exterior of the bridge to the west rather than in the interior adjacent to the columns. c. To only have traffic on one side rather than be wedged between two travel lanes with no interior column and beam protection (Option 1 is basically an open concept with pedestrians in the middle- not desirable). <p>I also feel that the better fit for the corridor is an arch or cable stay concept. My arch preference would be for a tall arch with open vertical members similar to the Daniel Carter bridge (option 4) but to make it different by the basket style. My cable stayed preference is also concept 7.</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-8-10	Jack Martin	City of Cincinnati	<p>I'm not submitting a vote on which bridge I like best, but it's probably between #1 and #12. Either do something different, or don't.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The view of the bridge that most people will experience is the one approaching on the top deck. I think #12 would look best for that, particularly northbound. · There aren't going to be many views from the new bridge – to the east, none. From the lower deck, minimal. Northbound from the upper deck, not much of a view. Southbound from the upper deck, with the arched or cable-stayed bridges, Ludlow and the Devou Park hill will look nice (better than from the current bridge). For that reason, I'm not sure how much trouble and expense we should go through to "open up" the bridge. It makes some sense to use #1, so people can just pay attention to where they're going – there's nothing to see anyway... · Also, re: #1 – It's was really cool when you could put all your friends' and cousins' Erector Sets together to make something really BIG! 	
2-8-10	Jeff Brown	General Public	<p>Out of curiosity, what is the hope for the new bridge type? You know and I know there is a...shall we call it a "favorite" of the KYTC. I do not like the cable stayed types at all. Just doesn't seem to match the city. I do like the arched truss that is sort of like the Big Mac. To me that frames the city pretty well. Probably less expensive too.</p>	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	<p>Bridge #4 is the best one. Numbers 6, 9, and 12 look like construction is going on. Not professional looking.</p>	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	<p>Bridge #4 is the best. Don't like the posts sticking up on the other ones.</p>	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	<p>Bridge #4 is striking and graceful. Color is good. Others look awkward.</p>	
2-2-10	Hugg C. Koon (verbal call)	General Public	<p>Bridge #4 is first choice; next bridges 6 and 7. Bridges 9 and 10 look like the arches are falling apart – kind of looks like Haiti. Bridge #2 looks like a suspension bridge.</p>	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	<p>Should be painted burnt orange like the Golden Gate Bridge which is named after Joseph Baerman Strauss who was an engineer and designer of the Golden Gate Bridge and went to U.C.</p>	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	<p>Number 4 looks prettier than the others. Number 12 is ugly.</p>	
2-2-10	Verbal Call – no name provided	General Public	<p>Number 4 is best. I like the matching arch – it balances the other existing bridges. Numbers 6 and 7 would be okay without the "X". Needs to be evenly spaced.</p>	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-2-10	Charles Bucklew – verbal call	General Public	Should be cable-stayed bridge. Number 12 – one pier is good. Would be a beautiful bridge like in Maysville, KY and in West Virginia. Make the top of the pier look like the stacks of a steamboat.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan #4 look nicest; probably easiest to maintain too.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Cable-stayed bridges more aesthetically pleasing. Price counts too of course. We have a great skyline, especially coming in from the south. Have the opportunity to enhance our city.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	I am an engineer. First choice is Plan 6. It is without question the best of the concepts. More practical. Cheaper, easier, and faster to build. Second choices - #9 would be greater cost, as would #12 with the big mast.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 matches better with the Big Mac Bridge. Is aesthetically good. Capable design – good for capacity.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 looks more like Ohio and Kentucky.	
2-2-10	Robert Olson – verbal call	General Public	The bridge to build should be the least expensive to build and maintain.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 looks like the Big Mac bridge. Would look good at both ends. Should paint them the same color too.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 and Plan 9 are best. Have seen cable-stayed bridges in Japan and here in the states and they are really pretty.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Prefers arch bridge because vertical supports are ugly. The other bridges take away from the skyline.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	I am 83 years old and I think Plan 4 looks good. Numbers 9 and 10 look like someone has been drinking. Plan 4 really looks good, like the golden arches.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 – 2 votes!	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 is the only one worth considering. Anything else would be a stupid choice. Arches at each end are delightful.	
2-2-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 12 – you can put tall stacks on the top of the vertical tower.	
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 – give us a mirror image on the Ohio.	
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 is a great set-up. The arch set-up on this end, as well as at the other end is very nice.	
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 9 is the best fit.	

**Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments**

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 or Plan 2 with two spokes. We need something to set Cincinnati apart.	
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 6 cable-stayed with cross braces looks good.	
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Arch type – Daniel Carter Beard Bridge is good and aesthetically pleasing. Plan 12 is horrible.	
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4, Arch Bridge has symmetry and compliments the city skyline. #9 and # 12 are terrible, horrible. Plan 6 is okay, but not great.	
2-3-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Was any consideration given to the bridge in Maysville? I don't like Plan 9 and 12. The bridge in Maysville is very elegant and makes such an entrance. The cables don't look like cables at all, they look like jewelry! Whatever gets chosen, it has to be tall.	
2-3-10	Joe Buffey – verbal call	General Public	Plan 4 is the best bet – very sturdy design.	
2-3-10	Robert Olsen – verbal call	General Public	Bridge chosen should be least expensive not only to build, but to maintain.	
2-9-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 12 – put tall stacks on the top of vertical tower.	
2-9-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 9 is the best fit.	
2-9-10	Verbal call – no name provided	General Public	Plan 4 or 12 with two spokes. Need something to set Cincinnati apart.	
2-10-10	Stephanie Dunlap	General Public	I like Bridge Design Eight. Its appearance brings the Roebling bridge to mind; it seems like a modern version of the Roebling.	
2-11-10	Rick Hicks	Industry	I have discussed some of the designs with others at Duke Energy. Considering concept 12 - the single tower cable stay bridge with the tower on the Ohio side. I expect this design would require fewer foundations to impact the area around Mehring Way, Rose Street and Augusta. Maintaining these roads should help to reduce the impacts to Duke Energy's existing underground transmission and distribution circuits. I wasn't sure if this design is one of the finalist options considered.	
2-16-10	David Chapdelaine	General Public	Both my wife and I looked at the bridge designs...we like the look of design concepts # 6, 7, & 8 out of all the 12. Thanks.	
2-18-10	Marian Benavides	General Public	The white arch is the most attractive and balances, in my opinion. This repeats the "Big Mac" arch theme from further up the river and acts as a visual counterweight. The others just do not seem to harmonize with the current bridges over the Ohio. Thanks.	

Website Comment/Feedback Forms
Aesthetics Committee/PAC Meeting - January 29, 2010
Bridge Type Selection Step 1
Disposition of Comments

Date Received	Name	Affiliation	Comments	Responses
2-18-10	Carl Swartz	General Public	A great deal more imagination needs to go into the bridge design. Concept 8 is the only one close to being aesthetically pleasing. This Cincinnati landmark should be a cable stayed bridge along the lines of the new Panama Canal crossing bridge, Puente Centenario, or the Rama VIII bridge in Thailand, or the beautiful Zakim Bunker Hill bridge in Boston which would be perfect for this span. The Rion-Antirion bridge in Greece is also very striking.	