

PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY

King Avenue Bridge #282-0.97 Over Little Miami River Improvements Project April 25, 2017 Open House Public Meeting

The Warren County Engineer's Office (WCEO) held a Public Open House for the King Avenue Bridge #282-0.97 over Little Miami River Improvements Project on Tuesday, April 25th, 2017, from 4:30 PM to 7:00 PM at Kings Junior High School. Exhibits on display at the meeting, as well as the project fact sheet, comment sheet, and Section 106 Consulting Party application provided to the public at the meeting were posted on WCEO's website after the meeting for additional public review. The comment period ended on May 26, 2017. **Thank you to all who attended the meeting or visited our website and provided comments!** Your input is greatly appreciated and is an important part of the project development and decision-making process. Attached is a summary of all written comments received by WCEO, including all comment forms, letters, and emails. A brief summary of comments is as follows:

- **339 people attended the meeting**
- **164 written comment sheets/emails/letters were received**
- **Question 1:** 160 alternative preferences were specified (Alternative 1, 2, or 3). Several written comments did not specify a preference, or specified a preference for more than one alternative.
 - 128 specified a preference for Alternative 3
 - 21 specified a preference for Alternative 2
 - 11 specified a preference for Alternative 1
- **Question 2:** 147 of the written comments specified a preference for bike/pedestrian use on the Alternative 3 bridge.
 - 110 support bike/pedestrian use
 - 37 do not support bike/pedestrian use
- **Questions 2, 3, and 4:** A variety of other important topics/questions were raised, including (but not limited to):
 - general safety concerns for bikers/pedestrians
 - safety concerns at the Grandin Road/Little Miami Scenic Trail crossing and at hairpin curves
 - traffic volumes/traffic flow (particularly in Kings Mills); truck traffic/truck restrictions
 - potential need for traffic signals at Striker/Grandin and at the Peters site entrance
 - project funding/tax concerns
 - keeping the existing bridge open for bike/pedestrian use
 - parking for the Little Miami Scenic Trail and other related recreational amenities
 - other potential project alternatives (upstream or downstream)

WCEO Responses: The attached comment summary includes WCEO responses (last column). WCEO provided specific responses to direct questions or comments/topics that warrant clarification or additional information. Questions and comments to which WCEO specifically responded are shown in **blue text**.

Preferred Alternative: WCEO has selected Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) as the Preferred Alternative for the project. The decision was based on the safety of the traveling public, safety of the Little Miami Scenic Trail users, longevity of the new bridge, and public support for this Alternative. WCEO has received Federal Funding for the project to be constructed in 2022. The project will now move into the environmental clearance/detailed design phase. Please contact Roy Henson at (513) 695-3310 or via email at (Roy.Henson@co.warren.oh.us) with questions related to the public comment summary or the Preferred Alternative.

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project being, or have been, carried-out by ODOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 11, 2015, and executed by FHWA and ODOT.



| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 1 | | | • | Alternative 2 would be my choice - fiscally sound and causes the least disruption. Little disruption to housing, traffic patterns, and businesses on Kings Mills Road. | | • | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Please do not disrupt something that is working and more fiscally sound. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 2 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the best option given development in the area. | | • | Because so many currently use the roadway to access the trail, this makes it safer for all. | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4 | Please indicate (on website) why a new road from Great Wolf to Grandin is not a viable option. Would avoid houses on Kings Mills entirely. | Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. A new road and bridge from Great Wolf to Grandin Road does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. |
| 3 | | | • | Alternative 3 is a great plan for geometry/safety, and would improve access to scenic trails. Would like to see some limitation of truck traffic if possible. | | • | As long as safety of drivers, bikers, and pedestrians is paramount. | Peters Cartridge Factory cleanup is a great start. Would hope that improvements would include park area along Little Miami Scenic Trail and pollution prevention by all motorists and trail users. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 4 | | | • | A new bridge is the only sensible choice. The new bridge must be three lanes wide with an alternating-direction middle lane. | | • | Too much liability. | Plans must account for doubling/tripling of current 10,000 vehicles per day within 10-15 years or less. | Involve elected officials to secure federal funding. Hold future meetings where travelers reside. | Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Expanding road/bridge capacity (i.e. adding travel lanes) does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. |
| 5 | | | • | Alternative 3 is plausible to avoid inconveniences during construction. | | • | No other comment provided. | See Question #1. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 6 | | | • | Alternative 1 is a non-starter. We need the bridge. Don't play around. Alternative 3 is the right solution if we can pay for it. | | • | Bikes and pedestrians currently use bridge, might as well make it safer. Police are not preventing current usage. | Alternative 3 should include a ban on truck traffic through Kings Mills and across bridge. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 7 | | | • | Likes Alternative 3. | | • | Cars and pedestrians should have separate access ways. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 8 | | | • | Alternative 3 provides a much safer alternative for vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. | | • | Important to provide access to Carter Park at lower level than current access at Kings Mansion. Access to Carter Park from the Little Miami Scenic Trail is important. | Safety for bike riders is of paramount importance. Current setup is a serious accident waiting to happen. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 9 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the only viable (long-term) option presented. Community service isn't the only factor that needs addressed. Public safety paramount. Alternative 3 comprehensively addresses all issues. | | • | People currently use existing road as is. Alternative 3 provides ease of use for all and addresses safety concerns. | Due to approved development, a safer option (Alternative 3) must be considered and is presented. | Appreciate diligence in gaining public acceptance. However, safety must take priority. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 10 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the only project which should be considered. | | • | I have seen bike riders/pedestrians nearly struck on several occasions with the current configuration. This needs to be corrected. | Current configuration needs to be replaced. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 11 | | | • | Supports Alternative 3. | | • | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 12 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the best option. Alternative 2 is better than Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would be a major inconvenience for our community of 200+ homes at the top of Grandin and Striker for access to I-71. | | • | Too dangerous. | Not in favor of allowing any through truck traffic. Would be very noisy. | Hoping this will not raise taxes. Already exorbitantly taxed for school district. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated. |
| 13 | | | • | Full support of the biggest solution possible (\$8-\$12 Million). Thanks for all your efforts on this. | | • | Yes, but not wild about it (bikes/pedestrians on bridge). | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Comments acknowledged. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|-----|--|---|--|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | |
| 14 | | | • | Time to spend money on a new structure that will last many years. | • | | No other comment provided. | Heavy trucks on incline will slow traffic at rush hours. COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Comments acknowledged. |
| 15 | | | • | Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | There will be more traffic on King Avenue near the school - perhaps semi trucks. No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 16 | | | • | No advantage to Alternative 1 or Alternative 2. Still very dangerous for bikers and traffic. | • | | No other comment provided. | Does the developer of the Peters site like Alternative 3? No comment provided. | WCEO has been in contact with the developer of the Peters site, and will continue coordination as the project progresses. |
| 17 | | | • | Likes Alternative 3 with some concern about truck traffic. Also likes that the bike path will be safer. Really likes the Alternative 3 traffic pattern. Safer for all, especially with development of the Peters site. | • | | No other comment provided. | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 Comments acknowledged. |
| 18 | | | • | Would like to see Alternative 3. | • | | Only if there is a lane separating bikes/pedestrians from cars. | No comment provided. Tax the new developments and also a bond so it can be completed quicker. Do not want to have the bridge closed because it is unsafe. | If Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) is the selected by WCEO as the Preferred Alternative, bikes/pedestrians on the bridge would have a dedicated lane separated from vehicular traffic. Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated. |
| 19 | | | • | Favors Alternative 3. It keeps the existing bridge open as long as possible. Closing the road is not an option. | • | | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 20 | | | • | Alternative 1 is not an option that should be considered. Alternative 2 is better than Alternative 1. Alternative 3 is my choice. No trucks should be permitted. | • | | Only if an additional lane is provided for bikes/pedestrians. | Traffic is very heavy - no trucks should be allowed. No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. If Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) is the selected by WCEO as the Preferred Alternative, bikes/pedestrians on the bridge would have a dedicated lane separated from vehicular traffic. |
| 21 | | | • | If Alternative 3 is chosen, continue truck restrictions currently in effect. | • | | Yes, if an additional lane is provided for bikes/pedestrians. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. If Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) is the selected by WCEO as the Preferred Alternative, bikes/pedestrians on the bridge would have a dedicated lane separated from vehicular traffic. |
| 22 | | | • | Prefers Alternative 3. Alternative 1 is an inconvenience to all residents on Miami Bluff. Alternative 2 is a useless waste of \$3 Million. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 2. | • | | Consider keeping existing bridge for bikes/pedestrians. This would keep them off the new bridge which would likely see increased traffic. | If existing bridge is not kept for pedestrian use, then restrict large trucks from new road. No comment provided. | Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed. WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 23 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the only good use of funds. It addresses all issues and corrects the problem. | • | | Prefer not to have bike traffic on bridge. A good alternative would be to keep existing bridge open for bike/pedestrian traffic. | No comment provided. | Alternative 3 is a good solution. Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|-----|--|--|---|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | |
| 24 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no solution other than Alternative 3. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This provides for safe cycling and better motorist compliance. | <p>Be sure all guidelines regarding preservation of the Little Miami River are observed.</p> <p>No comment provided.</p> | <p>WCEO has been in contact with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR)-Scenic Rivers regarding this project and will continue coordination with ODNR and other appropriate state and federal agencies as the project progresses.</p> |
| 25 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only Alternative 3 seems doable. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not with semi (truck) traffic. | <p>Please have access to bridge blocked as little as possible.</p> <p>No comment provided.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged.</p> |
| 26 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please build a new bridge and keep old bridge open during construction. Start (project) before old bridge is unusable. <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3.</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Or keep existing bridge for bicycles/pedestrians. | <p>Concern about access at Striker and Grandin (intersection). Traffic is bad in the evening.</p> <p>What is the cost for taxpayers?</p> | <p>Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed.</p> <p>The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed.</p> <p>The estimated construction cost for Alternative 3 is approximately \$8.5 million. Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds within the anticipated remaining lifespan of the existing bridge. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated.</p> |
| 27 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need a new bridge. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too dangerous. | <p>Traffic signal may be necessary to control increased traffic due to Peters site development.</p> <p>Does not believe there is any other option except to build a new bridge for local traffic.</p> | <p>A Traffic Impact Study completed for the Peters site concluded that a traffic signal is not currently warranted on Grandin Road at the entrance to the Peters site. WCEO will continue communication with the developer of the Peters site as the project progresses.</p> |
| 28 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New bridge is the way to go. Hope existing bridge will last until new bridge is constructed. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other comment provided. | <p>No comment provided.</p> <p>No comment provided.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged.</p> |
| 29 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 1 is not realistic - major roadway with more than 5,000 vehicles per day. Alternative 2 is a poor alternative - doesn't correct deficiencies. Alternative 3 is best solution, but access at Peters site looks dangerous. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If it reduces overall project cost (assumes leaving the existing bridge is cheaper than removal). | <p>Alternative 3 solves traffic flow problem caused by hairpin curve.</p> <p>Would project impact property taxes? Some have said they would not support if it does. WCEO needs to clarify this concern.</p> | <p>Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed.</p> <p>Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated.</p> |
| 30 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly in favor of Alternative 3. It presents optimal long-term solution for traffic flow, convenience, and safety. Likes that it would be a clear-span and overpass bike trail and eliminates tight approaches. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not safe for bikes/pedestrians to share road with vehicles. Has witnessed several cyclists disobeying the law there. | <p>The biggest environmental threat was cleaned up when lead was removed. Would not like to see the Peters site developed for residential use, especially if rental properties.</p> <p>COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 AND QUESTION 3.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged.</p> |
| 31 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Something needs to be done, so Alternative 1 is not an option. New bridge is the best choice. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other comment provided. | <p>Easier access would help.</p> <p>No comment provided.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged.</p> |
| 32 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 solves many problems including twisting road, narrow bridge, bike trail crossing, and truck restrictions. Well-worth the added cost. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be nice, but would cost more money and create additional traffic with potential congestion. | <p>Traffic volumes are already too high during rush hours. Land use should actually improve with reduced distance of roadway.</p> <p>A clear-span bridge should have an aesthetic and longevity advantage over the current bridge. Keeping current bridge will cause the inconvenience of either permanent or construction bridge closures.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged.</p> |
| 33 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers Alternative 3, but Alternative 2 would be okay if money is tight. There needs to be a bridge here. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other comment provided. | <p>Would love kayak access to Little Miami River here. Samples water for Greenacres Foundation at this site and currently drops an anchor from bridge to obtain sample because it is difficult to get to the riverbank.</p> <p>No comment provided.</p> | <p>Comments regarding kayak/canoe access and related amenities will be coordinated with ODNR.</p> |
| 34 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 (if affordable) is the best option by far. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other comment provided. | <p>No comment provided.</p> <p>No comment provided.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged.</p> |
| 35 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 2 - costs less, safe structure, eliminates thoroughfare for trucks. Safety concern about bike trail traffic. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalks would be greatly appreciated on any street. Pedestrian traffic should be encouraged and provided for on all streets. | <p>What is best for type of neighborhood. Pedestrians and cars only since we live in neighborhoods. Sidewalks to walk to shops/restaurants. No trucks.</p> <p>Appreciate opportunity to speak with engineers about project. When making decision, please consider yourself living in a quiet neighborhood. How can we keep it like that? So much growth in area that is pedestrian friendly, peaceful, calm, family. No trucks!</p> | <p>Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Due to engineering constraints, Alternative 2 cannot provide bike/pedestrian access across the bridge and still be able to reuse the existing piers. Constructing new sidewalks along King Avenue/Grandin Road beyond the limits of the project does not fit the Purpose and Need and is therefore not part of this project, but your interest in sidewalks for this area is noted.</p> |
| 36 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although cost is higher, Alternative 3 will provide a long-term option for growing community. | -- | -- | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No preference specified or other comment provided. | <p>No comment provided.</p> <p>No comment provided.</p> | <p>Comments acknowledged.</p> |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|-----|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | | |
| 37 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers Alternative 3 but only with a traffic signal at Striker/Grandin intersection. | | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. See Question 1. | <p>The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed.</p> <p>Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. WCEO looked at rehabilitation of the existing bridge on existing alignment (Alternative 2) and various concepts for a new bridge immediately upstream of the existing bridge (Alternative 3). New road and bridge alternatives further upstream or downstream are either not feasible (due to engineering/topographic constraints) or do not fit the Purpose and Need of this project.</p> <p>Did you look at other solutions not going through neighborhood? Or just straightening existing bridge to eliminate turns by the factory?</p> | | |
| 38 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers Alternative 3 but good with Alternative 1 as well. Too many drivers struggle with 180 and 90 degree turns. | | | No! | As long as the construction contractors do not get lazy and use the river as a means of materials disposal. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 39 | -- | -- | -- | No alternative preference specified or comment provided. | | | COMMENT MOVED TO QUESTION 3 | No comment provided. | Alternative 2 bridge closures for repairs would place a burden on too many regular travelers on this road. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 40 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 1 is not viable. This road and bridge are needed due to high traffic volumes. Alternative 3 is the best option if funds can be obtained. | | | | Provides safer access to trail. | The existing concrete barriers are hazardous. Trucks should be managed in a different way - fines and/or pay for damages. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 41 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 is the best option if federal funds are available. No trucks, bikes or pedestrians. | | | | No! | Eliminating hairpin curves works. Eliminating trail crossing also works. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 42 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other comment provided. | | | | No other comment provided. | Loves the switchback - but it is time for a more efficient bridge. | I just have to live to see it! Nice presentation, very informative, thank you. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 43 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly recommends Alternative 3. Existing bridge should have been built like Alternative 3 in the first place. | | | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 44 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep a bridge with no truck traffic; traffic must slow down to cross bridge (good). Alternative 3 increases (number and speed) of trucks. | | | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 45 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definite no to Alternative 1. Favors Alternative 2 from a cost perspective. Doesn't think it is a bad thing that big trucks will not be able to use this portion of the road. | | | | Does not like Alternative 3, but if Alternative 3 must be chosen, yes to bike/pedestrian use on bridge. | Would like to see as much greenspace preserved as possible. | Alternative 2 provides a safer, better bridge but maintains a slower-paced traffic pattern. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 46 | -- | -- | -- | <p>Concerned about increased truck traffic on Alternative 3 - noise, congestion, increased traffic would make neighborhood less desirable. Alternative 2 would keep things as-is longer. Requests one lane be kept open during construction.</p> | | | | Supports it but doesn't foresee using it. Uses the bike trail a lot. | If truck traffic could be restricted, Alternative 3 would be OK. | <p>If the current bridge could be rehabilitated for longer use, funds could be set aside for new bridge that would route traffic to another main road in the future (preferable).</p> | <p>Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge and financial constraints, the existing bridge cannot be used to maintain traffic during construction if Alternative 2 is selected as the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route.</p> <p>Rehabilitation/repair of the existing bridge (Alternative 2) will provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River and therefore addresses the Purpose and Need of the project. Constructing a new bridge at a different location in order to reroute traffic to another main road (in addition to rehabilitation/repair of the existing bridge) is not a necessary component of this project, does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project, and therefore is not being considered for this project. Furthermore, federal bridge funds obtained for this project (regardless of alternative) cannot be "set aside" for use on a different project with a different Purpose and Need.</p> |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|---|--|--|---|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 47 | | | | Alternative 1 does not make sense considering how much traffic uses the bridge. Alternative 2 would prolong life of existing bridge for a number of decades but does not address safety issues of approaches and bike path. | | | Safety measures have to be taken to ensure that bikers are safe under all weather and seasonal conditions. | This area will continue to grow in population. Makes the most sense to plan for the increase now instead of in future when the cost of replacing the bridge will be greater. | The alternatives seem to be well thought-out, taking many factors into consideration. Thank You! | Comments acknowledged. |
| 48 | | | | New bridge is the only alternative. There already has been a lack of foresight in building infrastructure for growth in Kings Mills/Maineville. | | | The bike trail is an asset for the area. Allow people and bikes on the bridge. Survival of the fittest! | Waiting until 2023 is insane! Build it now! | No comment provided. | The tentative 2023 construction schedule for Alternative 3 is based on the earliest availability of the federal funds required to build this alternative. |
| 49 | | | | Alternative 1 - No. This area needs to be maintained and improved. Alternative 2 - Prefer this alternative because it improves roadway but will not destroy the beauty. Alternative 3 - Will bring trucks and increased traffic and destroy the peace of the area. | | | If Alternative 3 is chosen then safe bike/pedestrian access is needed for the increased traffic. | I hate that if Alternative 3 is chosen the road will become a major thoroughfare. The beauty and quaintness of the area will be destroyed along with the wildlife. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 50 | | | | Requests a four-lane highway instead of a two-lane road. | -- | -- | No preference specified. Making these changes (would result in) high traffic, congested (conditions). | Thinks it would change historic preservation. | No comment provided. | Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Expanding road/bridge capacity (i.e. adding travel lanes) does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. |
| 51 | | | | No 18-wheel trucks should be permitted. | | | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3 | Limit trucks (on Alternative 3). Hills will slow traffic to a standstill. Will change the environment forever. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 52 | | | | Alternative 2 is best because Alternative 3 would accommodate 18-wheel trucks going uphill on Grandin. No thanks. Should not be Alternative 3. | | | No other comment provided. | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 53 | | | | Ideal choice is Alternative 3, but available funds is key. Alternative 2 would be OK as opposed to no bridge at all. | | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 54 | | | | Prefers Alternative 2. Don't want to destroy beauty of environment by having truck use. | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 55 | | | | Alternative 3 is obvious choice. Alleviates traffic congestion resulting from Peters site development and planned development further north/east on Grandin. | | | Safety issue. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3. | Live in Landings of Willow Pond and enjoy being close to river, wildlife, and bike path. Environmental conservation is a major concern. Additional parking for residents on west side of river. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 56 | | | | Alternative 1 is not a option. Alternative 2 is a bad compromise. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4. | | | An opportunity to have a safe bridge over the Little Miami River. | (Land) use looks fine. | The Engineer's Office has an opportunity to make an impact in Warren County, and have a positive impact on the community of Kings Mills at large. Be sure to contact the National Weather Service about the river gauge on the current bridge. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 57 | | | | Alternative 3 represents a great improvement to the traffic routing as long as the approach from King Avenue is strengthened on the hillside. Currently it seems to be eroding quicker than normal. Would be difficult to close a heavily-used artery by favoring Alternative 1. If it needs to be fixed, fix it the right way (Alternative 3). | | | Just an opportunity for accidents involving pedestrians and bikes and possible lawsuits. Keep pedestrians/bikes confined to the Little Miami Scenic Trail. | Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 need to include maintenance of King Avenue through Kings Mills. Given the amount of traffic and added truck use, would surely add to the likelihood of road deterioration. | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | The condition of King Avenue in Kings Mills will be monitored on a regular basis and maintenance will be performed as conditions warrant. |
| 58 | | | | Likes Alternative 1. Road is not large enough for traffic today. Tomorrow will not be any better. | | | No other comment provided. | Lives in Kings Mills. Traffic is bad and will not get better. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 59 | | | | Hates Alternative 1 - blocks access to trail from the west which is the reason for living here. Alternative 3 is the clear best answer. | | | Likes riding to the trail from Kings Mills - this would be great. If (bike/pedestrian use on bridge) is cost prohibitive, it could be dropped from Alternative 3. | Continue to prohibit large trucks over bridge even with Alternative 3. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|--|---|---|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | |
| 60 | | | • | Prefers Alternative 3 - has least impact to regular King Avenue/Grandin Road users. Would eliminate road closures due to truck hang-ups, but would increase truck traffic through Kings Mills. Alternative 2 would be second choice. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4. | • | | Has witnessed pedestrians/bikers on existing bridge and there isn't a lot of extra room on the bridge deck. | Possible increase in truck traffic through Kings Mills/Grandin Road (with Alternative 3). Concerned cost may impact taxes. | Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated. |
| 61 | | • | | Not practical to close bridge permanently. The alternate route is too circuitous. Not in favor of Alternative 3 due to cost, traffic, trucks. | • | | Will provide crossing when existing bridge is closed. Better alternative than doing nothing. | Grandin is busy enough during certain periods without trucks. Getting out of Striker Road (at Grandin) will become more difficult. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1. | No comment provided. Comments acknowledged. |
| 62 | | | • | Do not close bridge permanently. Prefers Alternative 3. Continue to restrict truck access to bridge. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 2. | • | | Any new bridge should have bike/pedestrian access to the bike trail. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 63 | • | | | First recommendation is to close bridge. Traffic is horrible especially 4-7 p.m. New bridge would increase traffic to area. There are intersections that currently struggle to handle the traffic. | | • | No other comment provided. | Current traffic is terrible. Widen SR 48 and direct traffic to that road. | What happened to the idea of building a route from Western Row Road/I-71 down Striker Road to US 22? Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and fiscal constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. A new road and bridge connecting Western Row to US 22 does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. |
| 64 | | | • | Alternative 1 - no thanks. Best option is Alternative 3 which will serve communities on both sides of river now and in the future. | • | | Makes sense given proximity to trails. | This is currently a major route considering the growth of Maineville and it is a link to I-71. | No comment provided. Comments acknowledged. |
| 65 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the only long-term solution. | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. Comments acknowledged. |
| 66 | | | • | If spending money, do this right. Alternative 3 enhances all aspects - bike trail, renovation of Peters site, traffic flow. Absolutely not Alternative 1 as it will worsen traffic on SR 48 and US 22. Alternative 2 closure during construction will temporarily do the same and will not solve all concerns. | • | | Keep bikers safe - huge draw for the area. | This area has huge potential and should be supported with the best solution for recreation and rush hour traffic. | Realize funding is a challenge. Property owners might fear project, but creating a great area with the right traffic flow can only help property values. Comments acknowledged. |
| 67 | | | • | In favor of Alternative 3. Lives at the top of Grandin Road in Miami Bluffs and travels this road every day. Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would be a disastrous waste of taxpayer money. Alternative 3 is superior option. "S" curves are deficient and dangerous. A smooth transition up the hill is safest option for travelers. | • | | No other comment provided. | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | No comment provided. Comments acknowledged. |
| 68 | | | • | Great alternative (Alternative 3). Will not increase my property taxes. | • | | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | No comment provided. | No comment provided. Comments acknowledged. |
| 69 | | • | | In favor of Alternative 2 and even Alternative 1. Cost of Alternative 3 is too much. Traffic will significantly increase on Grandin Ridge and Grandin Road. Need much better highway access to this (east) side of the river. These fixes are way too small for the traffic. | -- | -- | No preference specified. Hill is too steep for bike traffic. Need a bike path from South Lebanon to Mason that does not go up a steep hill. | There is way too much traffic on SR 48 now and everyone goes this way. We need a four-lane road or bigger across the river, not just improve a two-lane road. | No comment provided. Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Expanding road/bridge capacity (i.e. adding travel lanes) does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. |
| 70 | -- | -- | -- | No alternative preference specified. As a resident who uses the bridge on daily basis, no bridge (Alternative 1) is not a viable option. Traffic is already a nightmare and will only worsen. Removing access would impact our willingness to stay in this community. | • | | As long as a bike lane is added to the bridge. | Traffic must be able to continue over the river otherwise the rest of the traffic will be even worse. | No comment provided. Comments acknowledged. |
| 71 | | | • | Alternative 1 is not acceptable. Alternative 2 is a band aid. Alternative 3 is only feasible option to provide most use. | • | | The wider the better, especially to serve emergency vehicles. Buses also - save \$\$\$. | Need river access for kayaks, etc. Very economical - mainly parking. | Need parking for 100 - for trail use only. Commerce park should provide its own parking. The county/state should buy the Peters site and make it a park. Comments regarding kayak/canoe access and related amenities will be coordinated with ODNR. The proposed parking lot for the Little Miami Scenic Trail has 30 spaces (roughly twice the amount of the existing parking lot) and could potentially be expanded by ODNR to the west in the future. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|---|---|---|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 72 | | | | Does not like Alternative 1. Favors Alternative 3 before Alternative 2. For a major project of this size you must think of the future. Alternative 3 provides the best long-term solution and a base for future traffic solutions. | | | • COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Many use the existing bridge, undesirable as it is. Traffic will only increase as more residential development occurs on the abundant available land. | Whichever option is chosen, the trail should be seen as a valuable asset to be preserved, maintained, and improved. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 73 | | | | Alternative 3 would have the least negative impact on traffic flow and would restore original river crossing. | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 74 | | | | Alternative 3 is wider and straighter and safer for long-term use with community growth. Accommodation of pedestrians/bikers is added perk. Cost will always be higher in the future. | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 75 | | | | Alternative 3 is the only alternative for continued growth. Economic growth and well-being of the community dictate Alternative 3. | • | | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | All OK - new bridge is the prime goal. | This improvement is necessary! | Comments acknowledged. |
| 76 | | | | Approves of Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | OK with everything. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 77 | | | | In favor of Alternative 3 to build a new bridge. | • | | No other comment provided. | The current roadway cannot continue to support the growing traffic in the area. | When the Peters site development starts without a new bridge, afraid of an increase in accidents. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 78 | | | | Alternative 3 is obviously best for the long-term. | • | | No other comment provided. | Traffic will only become heavier - build for the future. Short-sightedness means another new bridge. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 79 | | | | There is only one alternative and that is Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 80 | | | | Alternative 3 is the only way to consider for the future. | • | | No other comment provided. | None. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 81 | | | | Alternative 3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | Need better access near power station at top of the hill. | When will the construction or teardown begin? Hope that both will not be done at the same time! | Construction is tentatively planned for 2023. For Alternative 3, the existing bridge will remain open during the majority of construction and will be removed once construction of the new bridge is complete. |
| 82 | | | | Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 83 | | | | Alternative 1 is not an option. Alternative 2 is only a band aid. Alternative 3 is best option, but still prohibit trucks. Make it three-lane (reversible middle lane). Since the new bridge may only have two lanes and because of steep grade, trucks should still be prohibited - they are used to alternate routes. | • | | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | No comment provided. | If the Peters site development occurs, traffic will be even higher. A traffic signal and other safety features will need to be considered at the entrance to the Peters site. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Expanding road/bridge capacity (i.e. adding travel lanes) does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. A Traffic Impact Study completed for the Peters site concluded that a traffic signal is not currently warranted on Grandin Road at the entrance to the Peters site. WCEO will continue communication with the developer of the Peters site as the project progresses. |
| 84 | -- | -- | -- | No alternative preference specified. COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4. | • | | Any bridge should allow for this! What are we thinking! | Number of cars will be too much shortly. Will need a traffic signal at the entrance to the Peters site/bike trail. | Band aid fix! Need a four-lane bridge. Will be obsolete in 10-15 years. What are we thinking! | A Traffic Impact Study completed for the Peters site concluded that a traffic signal is not currently warranted on Grandin Road at the entrance to the Peters site. WCEO will continue communication with the developer of the Peters site as the project progresses. Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Expanding road/bridge capacity (i.e. adding travel lanes) does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. |
| 85 | | | | Favors Alternative 3 (new bridge). | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 86 | • | | | Prefers Alternative 1. King Avenue struggles to handle existing traffic - dangerous road - would love to see the bridge closed. | • | | King Avenue cannot handle current traffic, and adding bikes/pedestrians to the mix is downright dangerous. | Suggest traffic counts during busy times of day. King Avenue cannot handle more traffic through Kings Mills. | Close current bridge and consider relocating entirely. Current roads on the Kings Mills side of the river cannot handle an increase in traffic. Monitor existing traffic. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 87 | • | | | Prefers Alternative 1. Roads leading to the existing bridge are not able to handle current traffic. | • | | The amount of traffic on the road is dangerous and as someone who enjoys biking, there is too much traffic to do so safely. | The traffic on King Avenue is too much for the road to handle. It is a residential area and the speed and traffic is too much for the road to handle. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|--|--|---|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 88 | | | • | Please choose Alternative 2 as the traffic is bad enough without trucks. Alternative 3 - no trucks and too expensive. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4. | | • | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | As resident of 30 years, have watched lack of infrastructure lead to traffic congestion for miles every single day. For the greater good of all, build a bridge from Grandin behind Kings Island to where current work is being done on Columbia Road . Thanks for the opportunity to vent. Appreciate your commitment to the citizens of Warren County and look to you to work together for the best solution for all (not Alternative 3). | Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. A new road and bridge from Grandin to Columbia does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. | |
| 89 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the only sensible choice. | | • | No other comment provided. | Alternative 3 would be necessary to handle the increasing traffic. | With 100+ apartments plus businesses planned for the Peters site, need to do something ASAP. Putting off construction for 3+ years does not make sense . Knows a lot of planning is involved, but the sooner the better. | The tentative 2023 construction schedule for Alternative 3 is based on the earliest availability of the federal funds required to build this alternative. |
| 90 | -- | -- | -- | No alternative preference specified. There is no way the bridge can be closed. Access to I-71 is critical for eastern subdivisions. Putting more traffic on SR 48 or US 22 would be a big mistake. | | • | No other comment provided. | An overpass of the bike trail would increase safety for trail users. | Just bought a house in Miami Bluffs. No bridge (Alternative 1) would affect property value. How would improvements be funded? Taxes already too high. Do not need another tax increase. | Improvements (Alternative 2 or Alternative 3) will be made using a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated. |
| 91 | | | • | Absolutely cannot close the bridge. Redistributing the traffic in the area would be a nightmare, not to mention property value losses in Miami Bluffs and surrounding area (including the one I just purchased). Would not have purchased home if aware that bridge closure would be considered. If had to choose, would select Alternative 3. | -- | -- | No preference specified. Cannot answer without knowing if bikes/pedestrians would be separated from vehicles. If so, would support. | Environmental concerns went out the window with the development of the Peters site. | Taxes are already ridiculous. Please bear in mind that Hamilton Township has some of the highest taxes in the area. How will this be funded, other than the Feds? ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1. | If Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) is the selected by WCEO as the Preferred Alternative, bikes/pedestrians on the bridge would have a dedicated lane separated from vehicular traffic. Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated. |
| 92 | | | • | Would like to see a new bridge if the cost is kept down. | | • | Supports if guardrails separate bikes/pedestrians from traffic. | Grandin Road will get awfully busy and people on top of the hill will not have access to the road. | Does not want taxes to increase - older (73) and live on a fixed income. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1. | If Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) is the selected by WCEO as the Preferred Alternative, bikes/pedestrians on the bridge would have a dedicated lane separated from vehicular traffic. Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated. |
| 93 | | | • | Alternative 3 is the best option. It would be great to get rid of the hairpin curves. | | • | Straightening the road would only increase speeds and be hazardous for bikes/pedestrians. Leave the existing bridge for bike/pedestrian use. | Lives in Heritage at Miami Bluffs. Property joins with the wooded area across from the Army Reserve. Concerned about heavy trucks if permitted on the new bridge. | No comment provided. | Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed. |
| 94 | | | • | Prefers Alternative 3. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4. | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | How come the Kings Mills residents never received information about the meeting? | The public meeting was advertised a number of ways, including direct mailings to residents in the project vicinity (including Kings Mills). However, there was a problem with mail deliveries to Kings Mills residents with post office boxes. Once WCEO was made aware of the problem, new mailers were sent which provided affected Kings Mills residents with information on where to view public meeting materials and how to ask questions and submit comments. |
| 95 | | | • | Uses the bridge every day to go to work. It is needed! Do not permanently close it. Alternative 3 will remove the dangerous curves. Good thing! | | • | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Traffic is heavy so a new bridge would be welcomed! | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 96 | | | • | Does not like Alternative 1- it would affect work commutes, property values, and inconvenience people. Alternative 3 makes most sense - easy access across the Little Miami River without curves which I assume means trucks can use without destroying the bridge or the access to the bridge. If you spend the money to do Alternative 2 today, why not spend the extra money for Alternative 3 and do it correctly and solve all the problems? | | • | No other comment provided. | Believes traffic will increase so why not do Alternative 3 to avoid doing it again (another project) a few years later. | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Comments acknowledged. |
| 97 | | | • | Alternative 3, no question. Will likely make planned condos, apartments, business developments possible and greatly improve access for the thousands who use the bridge every day. | | • | Definitely. More bikes/pedestrians make more business = more tax revenue. | Traffic is heavy; twisting and turning road is dangerous. | Sounds like a well thought-out plan | Comments acknowledged. |
| 98 | | • | | No for Alternative 1. Yes for Alternative 2. Likes the fact that trucks will not be using the bridge with Alternative 2. Too much truck traffic! Noise will be loud for Heritage at Miami Bluffs and Miami Bluffs. | | • | No other comment provided. | If a new bridge connects on Grandin, a traffic signal will be necessary at Striker Road. | No comment provided. | The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed. |
| 99 | | • | | Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 are acceptable. Alternative 1 a bad choice. Prefers Alternative 2 - will keep traffic flow lower and retain a more county-like setting. Alternative 3 will result in congestion on Grandin. | | • | No other comment provided. | The location of current roadway is charming and hope it is retained. Alternative 3 will make excessive truck noise. | Excellent overview of alternatives. | Comments acknowledged. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 100 | | | | • No other comment provided. | • | | No other comment provided. | Concern over added traffic as a result of Peters site development. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 101 | | | | • Alternative 3 is best. | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 102 | | | | • Alternative 3 provides for future! Would be best overall return over time. | | • | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 103 | | | | • Alternative 1 is not a fix - we need a bridge there. Alternative 2 only if Alternative 3 is not possible due to funding. Alternative 3 is best choice to move the area forward. Not excited about truck use, but straighter road would be wonderful. Many seniors live in the area and we need a safer route to I-71. | | • | Because of the grade. Alternative 3 will bring heavier traffic at faster speeds than present. Don't add bikes/pedestrians to the mix too. | No comment provided. | Wondering how the Peters site will be developed? No matter how the bridge is changed, better and more parking for the trail is needed. And better trash removal. | The Peters site is tentatively planned for mixed use development (residential and commercial). |
| 104 | | • | | Alternative 2 - repair/rehab current bridge. No trucks. This is a problem for the bike trail as well. | | • | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 105 | | | | • Alternative 3 is best idea. Like that it would straighten the road. Use the bridge every day for commute so shutting it down is a bad idea. | | • | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 106 | | • | | No to Alternative 1. If truck traffic is permitted on Alternative 3, then Alternative 2 is favored. | | • | Only if semi-truck traffic is prohibited. | See Question #2. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 107 | | • | | Alternative 2 would be my choice. Alternative 3 would allow trucks. King Avenue through town would not support that kind of traffic for too long. | | • | Alternative 3 would allow truck traffic. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 108 | | • | • | No to Alternative 1. Alternative 2 would eliminate trucks (a positive). Alternative 3 would eliminate hairpin curve and antiquated bridge (a positive). | | • | No other comment provided. | The concern would be the impact trucks would have on the area - i.e. safety, wear an tear on road, lack of consideration for future residential and commercial growth. Two lanes seems inadequate based on our experience. | Is there no other option downriver? | Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. WCEO looked at rehabilitation of the existing bridge on existing alignment (Alternative 2) and various concepts for a new bridge immediately upstream of the existing bridge (Alternative 3). No options are considered feasible immediately downstream of the existing bridge due to the Peters site and other engineering/ topographical constraints. New road and bridge alternatives further downstream (or upstream) do not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. |
| 109 | | | | • Alternative 3 appeals to me. Please consider bikers/runners as this area is beyond capacity on many summer Saturdays. | | • | As an avid runner, there is a real need for more capacity here. Bridge access for pedestrians would allow access to Carter Park trails on west side of the Little Miami River. | Access with bike lane/sidewalk for pedestrians to get down the hill on the east side is important. | As one who travels this route two times daily, Alternative 3 appeals to me. Would love to hear more about project and would be more than willing to be contacted. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 110 | | | | • Although Alternative 3 is most expensive, it meets the needs of a growing community. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4. | | • | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | Concern over property tax hike. Is there grant money involved to support a project of this size? | Alternative 3 will be constructed with a combination of federal and local funds. No bonds or local tax increases specifically for this project are anticipated. |
| 111 | | • | | (Alternative 1) is cheapest alternative and would prevent a majority of the present traffic. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTIONS 3 AND 4. | | • | Only if bridge is strong/wide enough to accommodate vehicles and bikes/pedestrians, with wider lanes and good lighting at night. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4. | Current traffic is crazy. I live on King Avenue and sometimes it takes 10-20 minutes to back out of driveway. | At the bike path crossing (Grandin Road) bikes/pedestrians have stop sign but some drivers yield to bikes/pedestrians. Fears an accident due to bikes/pedestrians ignoring stop sign. Existing bridge is narrow and unlit - refuse to use after dark. Sharp curves above and below bridge need to be eliminated. | Comments acknowledged. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|--|---|---|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 112 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 2 is fine but prefers Alternative 3. Would still prohibit truck access. King Avenue is not conducive to truck traffic. <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 2.</p> | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be silly not to accommodate bikes/pedestrians, since the bike trail is right there. Once the Peters site is developed, it would be huge selling point. If Alternative 3 is chosen, can the existing bridge be kept for bike/pedestrian traffic only? | <p>Have seen bald eagle in the area along the bike trail and would want that the area be looked over to be sure there are no nests.</p> | No comment provided. | <p>WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route.</p> <p>Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed.</p> |
| 113 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers Alternative 3 - makes most sense long-term. | | | No other comment provided. | <p>Because the project is located along the river and bike trail (wildlife), would hope the least invasive disruption would be considered.</p> | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 114 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacing bridge with new, properly-aligned bridge is a must from socio-economic viewpoint. <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4.</p> | | | No other comment provided. | <p>Ultimately a traffic signal will be needed at Grandin and Striker. Suggest requiring developers to pay for signals when seeking approval for development along Grandin and Striker, as other communities do.</p> | Maineville (US 22/SR 48 intersection northward) being stifled by lack of access. Commercial properties go unsold; community cannot grow without proper access. Access via SR 48/Fields-Ertel exits totally inadequate for bridge closure. Would require widening/ replacement of Little Miami River bridges in Landen and/or South Lebanon due to resulting traffic increase. | The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed. |
| 115 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers Alternative 3 if funds are available. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to provide bike/pedestrian access from Kings Mills on approaches and access bridge to the trail. Maybe keep the existing bridge for bikes/pedestrians only? | <p>Live in Kings Mills and would like to walk or bike to the trail, but because approaches and bridge are so narrow, have to drive to trail parking lot. I would like to see sidewalks from Kings Mills to trail.</p> | No comment provided. | <p>Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed.</p> <p>Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Alternative 3 can accommodate safe, long-term bike/pedestrian access across the Little Miami River, connecting the existing Carter Park trail system to the Little Miami Scenic Trail within the limits of the proposed project. However, constructing new sidewalks beyond the limits of proposed project to improve bike/pedestrian access from Kings Mills to the Little Miami Scenic Trail (via the new Alternative 3 bridge) does not fit the Purpose and Need and is therefore not part of this project, but your interest in sidewalks for this area is noted.</p> |
| 116 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also provided a supporting email in addition to the comment sheet. Alternative 1 = best choice. Alternative 2 = too expensive for small results. Alternative 3 = too much traffic in Kings Mills. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, only if Alternative 3 is chosen. Trucks and constant traffic will make walking or biking too dangerous. Also, too expensive. | <p>Desires less traffic in Kings Mills, already too much traffic and risky/dangerous to turn either way on streets. Traffic also causes congestion at I-71 and that is dangerous and an accident waiting to happen. Current traffic lowers property values, increases noise and pollution, and is very dangerous to kids and adults in town. Kings Mills should not be only I-71 access to northeast suburbs.</p> | <p>Soon SR 48 will be improved and traffic can use it, I-71, Columbia, Mason-Millgrove, US 22, and other roads. No New Bridge. Please choose Alternative 1.</p> | Comments acknowledged. |
| 117 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For future traffic needs, Alternative 3 is by far the best choice. | | | No other comment provided. | <p>Has consideration been given to rerouting the road from Kings Mills to go between back of houses on King Avenue and the housing development to decrease traffic (in Kings Mills)?</p> <p>Could the bridge be built higher using the existing road where it would meet the new road for access to the Peters site (rather than the driveway presented in Alternative 3)?</p> | No comment provided. | <p>Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. A realignment of King Avenue in Kings Mills does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project.</p> <p>Constructing the new bridge at a higher elevation would adversely impact driveway access at the Peters site and is therefore not considered a feasible option due to grade/safety concerns.</p> |
| 118 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 is the only one that makes sense. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intersection of the bike trail and Grandin Road is very dangerous. Bikes cannot easily see cars and vice versa. There is high traffic on both the trail and the road. | <p>Vehicle traffic on King Avenue/Grandin Road seems to increase every year. At rush hours there is a steady stream of cars making crossing risky. Trail traffic also increasing.</p> | <p>New paved/expanded parking lot for trail users is definitely needed.</p> | Comments acknowledged. |
| 119 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likes Alternative 3 and feel that if new bridge is needed, we should improve the whole road system and remove sharp curves. <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3.</p> | | | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3. | <p>Does not like the extra truck traffic that will occur. Lives on the bluff and a traffic signal at Grandin and Striker will be necessary.</p> | <p>Good luck, I believe this is sorely needed!</p> | The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|--|--|--|---|------------------------|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | | |
| 120 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided a supporting letter in addition to comment sheet. Friends of the Little Miami State Park support Alternative 3, a new bridge. Primary reason is promoting safe use of the Little Miami Scenic Trail. <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3.</p> | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | Grandin Road is one of the busiest, most dangerous intersections on the Little Miami Scenic Trail, which logged 1.2 million users in 2016 and increases each year (attached summary from Trail Counting Program). Alternative 3 would eliminate this hazard. Alternative 1 eliminates hazard at the cost of eliminating Little Miami Scenic Trail access at Grandin and burdening other access points. Alternative 2 does nothing to address hazard, missing rare opportunity to correct this issue. | Provided a supporting letter detailing the general comments and concerns on project alternatives, and providing information on the "FLMSP Counting Program" for the Little Miami Scenic Trail and a graph detailing total visits per trail section in 2016. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 121 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avid cyclist and accesses the trail at Grandin Road pretty often. Also rides through this intersection often. Alternative 3 provides a much safer situation and this is my preference. | • | | No other comment provided. | The trail is a real treasure in our community. Additional public parking for the trail would be helpful. | No comment provided. | The proposed parking lot for the Little Miami Scenic Trail has 30 spaces (roughly twice the amount of the existing parking lot) and could potentially be expanded by ODNR to the west in the future. | |
| 122 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 1 significantly inconveniences large number of daily users. \$3.3M expenditure for Alternative 2 would do nothing but preserve unappealing status quo. Alternative 3 is only logical/rational choice. | • | | Would provide residents on both sides of the river with non-vehicular access which currently does not exist. | The Grandin Road intersection with the Little Miami Scenic Trail is undoubtedly one of the most, if not the most, dangerous on the entire 50 mile long trail. | Alternative 3 is the only option which addresses the hazardous trail crossing. Current danger is particularly acute for traffic coming from the Kings Mills area, as the "S" curve on the far side of the bridge impedes drivers' sight lines. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 123 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 seems to be the only logical choice. We should do something that will last for many years. | • | | No other comment provided. | The number of cars using this roadway will probably be more than forecast. We need the infrastructure to handle it. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 124 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefers Alternative 3 - new bridge. Our family uses this bridge multiple times a day for commute. Growth of Hamilton Township will increase daily commute on this road to access I-71. New bridge is safest and best long-term solution for the community. | • | | Only supports this if there is a specified bike/pedestrian lane that does not interfere with traffic flow. Likes that Alternative 3 allows trail users to go under the bridge - much safer than what is currently available. | No comment provided. | Only concern with Alternative 3 is increased truck traffic. Currently, with no trucks, traffic flow up and down hills on both sides of the river is usually no issue. With the new bridge allowing trucks, the flow of traffic becomes a concern when a truck is going up either hill on Grandin or King. Understands there is a trade off, but that would be a concern - especially during peak flow. | If Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) is selected by WCEO as the Preferred Alternative, bikes/pedestrians on the bridge would have a dedicated lane separated from vehicular traffic. | |
| 125 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 is the best option for growth in the Maineville/Hamilton Township area. It will open a better and faster route between those areas and I-71. | • | | Allowing bike/pedestrian access would be great. Eventually this should allow the bike path to be connected up to Kings Mill and also up Grandin into the SR 48 area. | Concerned about opening up the new bridge to truck traffic. Grandin/King Avenue is already very busy and Kings Mills residences are close to street with no continuous sidewalks. Truck traffic should be restricted in some way. | No comment provided. | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. | |
| 126 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 makes the most sense with time, funds, and need. | • | | With all the pedestrians around the trail, a safe crossing would be appreciated. | Traffic is heavy, especially around school and work hours. A roadway to support it would be helpful. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 127 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposes Alternative 1 due to present/future use. Would direct traffic to already-overloaded alternate routes (Mason-Morrow-Millgrove). Uses the present route frequently and enjoys the scenic value. Alternative 2 is a short-term solution that does not address safety issues/traffic problems. Alternative 3, while most expensive, is a better long-term solution as population increases in the area. | • | | Would increase traffic (especially trucks) and create a considerable safety hazard. | No comment provided. | Please protect historic features/environment. | ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 128 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are not viable options. Alternative 3 would alleviate many current problems and concerns, and would be very convenient for many nearby residents and businesses. | • | | Fears it would create a safety hazard with the anticipated increase in traffic, especially truck traffic | Believes Alternative 3 would create more traffic in the area, but good roads are needed to handle the area's needs. | Believes Alternative 3 is well thought-out and supports it with great enthusiasm. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 129 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully supports Alternative 3. | • | | If walkers/cyclists can access without a motor vehicle this will help with parking. | Believes the new bridge will have less impact and even improve the area while still serving community needs. | Willing to do without other government resources to fund new bridge. Understands the concerns of King Avenue residents, but they can be addressed through existing traffic regulations. Emailed Senator Wilson in support of new bridge. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 130 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 2 is best and most feasible change to accommodate those who use the roadway. Alternative 1 would be terrible and cause many to use circuitous routes - will also create great amount of traffic at US 22/SR 48 intersection which hardly handles the traffic now. Traffic would be moved to US 22 creating difficulty at major intersections with Fields Ertel and SR 48. | • | | No other comment provided. | See previous comments. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 131 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes Alternative 3 is needed. Bridge is widely used by community. Existing bend in the roadway is dangerous. | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. | |
| 132 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 appears to be best option for long-term growth in this part of Warren County. | • | | No other comment provided. | While Alternative 3 will probably contribute to heavier traffic, this option will relieve congestion on Grandin Road at the river as well as make cycling much safer. | Moved to this area in 2011 and have seen positive growth and would like to see this continue. Having quick and convenient access to Kings Mills and I-71 is important. | Comments acknowledged. | |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|--|-----|--|--|---|---|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 133 | | | • | Favors Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | No comment provided. | Location for Open House Meeting was hectic due to other school activities. Perhaps seek alternative for future sessions. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 134 | | | • | Alternative 1 - unacceptable to ask 8,000+ vehicles to find alternate route. Alternative 2 - acceptable, but still an old solution to new problem. Alternative 3 - the sooner the better - looks great! | • | | Steep grades on either side of the Little Miami River currently prevent riders from crossing the river. Bike/pedestrian paths would allow us "east siders" to access the Mason trail system. | Living off Striker, sees the need for a traffic signal at Grandin and Striker. Rush hour traffic makes it nearly impossible to get out. With Alternative 3, volumes and speeds will be even higher. | Appears that traffic coming out of the Peters site may also have a difficult time (accessing Grandin Road). | The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed. A Traffic Impact Study completed for the Peters site concluded that a traffic signal is not currently warranted on Grandin Road at the entrance to the Peters site. WCEO will continue communication with the developer of the Peters site as the project progresses. |
| 135 | | | • | Please focus on the long-term for this project. Area is growing rapidly and will only continue. Alternative 3 is the only way to move forward. | • | | Again, looking long-term - world is becoming increasingly more active. To spend this money without including pedestrian/bike features would be negligent. | Alternative 3 appears to be best option to keep traffic flowing smoothly in the future. | Please don't allow our area to be held back by short-sighted, simple-minded people. Prepare for the growth that is inevitably headed our way. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 136 | | | • | Favors Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | Concerned about traffic entering/exiting Kings Mills Park (Peters site), particularly during rush hours and with the addition of large trucks on bridge. Sees this as high-accident location. Traffic signals are only solution. | The parking lot for the trail needs to be bigger - extend further west. | A Traffic Impact Study completed for the Peters site concluded that a traffic signal is not currently warranted on Grandin Road at the entrance to the Peters site. WCEO will continue communication with the developer of the Peters site as the project progresses. The proposed parking lot for the Little Miami Scenic Trail has 30 spaces (roughly twice the amount of the existing parking lot) and could potentially be expanded by ODNR to the west in the future. |
| 137 | | | • | Alternative 1 - not a good option, not good plan for future needs. Alternative 2 - slightly better than Alternative 1 but still not preferable (truck restrictions). Alternative 3 - best option. Improves road and bridge, addresses transportation needs, recreation, and parking needs. Hopefully parking lot is big enough to accommodate increased use. | • | | Area is seeing increased usage due to bike trail access. Parking on both sides of bridge would serve anticipated growth. | Area is the main route to I-71 for many in this community. As much land as possible should be available to the community as greenspace or park-like atmosphere. | Moved to current location in 2013 because of quick access to I-71 and SR 741. As an older resident, I need easy access for shopping and getting on the highway. Alternative 3 fits my needs and presumably many others as well. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 138 | | | • | Alternative 1 - not logical. A bridge is needed for all of the traffic from Kings Mills to Maineville. \$700k removal with nothing in return. Alternative 2 - only a last resort if Alternative 3 cannot get funded. Band-aid option that still costs \$3.3 million. Alternative 3 - best plan if funding is available. Provides better traffic flow and would be the safest. It will best serve increasing traffic across the river. Only down side is it would encourage more truck traffic. Likes the proposal for more parking for the Little Miami Scenic Trail. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 3. | • | | Bike/pedestrian lane or sidewalk would be the safest way to cross the river. It would allow more people to utilize the bike trail. Sees people trying to take bikes up the existing road now and it is not safe. | A traffic signal may need to be installed at Grandin and Striker. Maineville area is still growing with more houses being built. This increases the number of cars using the bridge over the Little Miami River. There needs to be better traffic flow across the river. Will Kings Mills be able to support the increased traffic if more trucks come through with the new bridge? | Some bridge improvement will need to be done. There is too much traffic across the river not to have a bridge. To close the bridge and do nothing would cause more traffic problems on SR 48 and Mason-Morrow-Millgrove, which cannot stand 8,000-10,000 more cars per day. There definitely needs to be more parking added for the Little Miami Scenic Trail. What is going to happen with traffic flow if the Peters site develops as anticipated? | The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed. WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. Traffic demand/flow associated with the Peters site has been considered (and will continue to be considered) during the development of this project. |
| 139 | | | • | Clear choice is Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | Alternative 3 alleviates dangerous roadway/bike path intersection. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 140 | | | • | Vote for Alternative 3. | • | | No other comment provided. | Do not like the idea of trucks using the bridge. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 141 | | | • | In favor of Alternative 3 - eliminates unsafe intersection with the trail at Grandin Road. Increases safety by eliminating dangerous curves. Alternative 2 only a temporary, unsafe fix because traffic continues to increase on both the road and the trail. | • | | It would allow cyclists to safely access the trail. | Traffic would be eased with Alternative 3 because the road would be straighter and not cross the trail. | Let's do it right with Alternative 3. Seems a good candidate for a federal grant, so let's do all we can to secure it. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 142 | • | | | Choose Alternative 1. Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 are ridiculous solutions. Alternative 3 is stupid. Alternative 3 would bring worse traffic than we have now. We can't turn out of our streets as-is, plus traffic is backing up on I-71. | • | | Way, way, way too much traffic. Too dangerous. Who would use a walkway with non-stop traffic? Will not get used. No. | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Don't drag down Kings Mills even worse with more traffic. How can this be allowed? Please close the bridge. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 143 | • | | | Prefers Alternative 1. Close the bridge when it is no longer safe. Alternative 3 is too expensive and allows too much traffic. | • | | COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1 | Kings Mills has already changed because of constant traffic. Please close the bridge. | Thank you for asking for feedback. Traffic is horrendous already and can use SR 48 in future. Traffic causes great danger on I-71 already. No new bridge. | Comments acknowledged. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|---|--|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | |
| 144 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 1 would be a disaster for our area. The bridge is vital for traffic flow and closing would bog down US 22 and SR 48. Closure would also isolate Kings Mills from Mason. Alternative 3 is the most expensive but best option for area. It allows for more traffic flow, a safer bike trail, more parking and easier access to Maineville. For our growing community, this is what we need. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be much safer for Kings Mills residents to access the bike trail. | <p>Traffic flow needs to be as unaffected as possible - trying to get to Maineville/Morrow area is already a nightmare and bridge closure would make it worse.</p> <p>Believes tractor trailers should not go down there but other small box trucks could.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1.</p> | Comments acknowledged. |
| 145 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Likes Alternative 3 in some regards, but vote is for Alternative 2. Favors Alternative 2 for lower cost, lower traffic, truck restrictions. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses the trail often and it is often hard to cross. Also, if a vehicle stops to allow trail users to cross, it causes back-ups at times. Hard to see cars are stopped. | <p>Roads leading to/from the bridge at either end are not adequate to support the additional traffic Alternative 3 would produce. That part of the infrastructure doesn't seem to be addressed in this analysis.</p> <p>COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 1</p> | Expanding road/bridge capacity (i.e. adding travel lanes) does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project. Alternative 3 will replace the existing bridge with another two-lane bridge (possibly with a bike/pedestrian lane). Based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3, and overall, only a minimal increase in traffic is expected. |
| 146 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 1 costs a third of Alternative 2 but get nothing in return. Do not support. Alternative 2 costs less than half of Alternative 3 but keeps road open (except for construction) - acceptable solution. Alternative 3 by far the best solution if costs allow. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be nice, but not critical. | <p>Concerned that Alternative 3 allows truck traffic. Will King Avenue and Grandin Road support trucks?</p> <p>Parking lot for the Little Miami Scenic Trail needs to be significantly larger than the existing parking lot. Where will residents, etc. park if improvements are completed and the Peters development occurs?</p> | <p>WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route.</p> <p>The proposed parking lot for the Little Miami Scenic Trail has 30 spaces (roughly twice the amount of the existing parking lot) and could potentially be expanded by ODNR to the west in the future.</p> |
| 147 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a frequent user of Little Miami Scenic Trail, believes that Alternative 3 is the safest option for trail users, though more costly. Mixing cars and bikes can be dangerous, especially for families on the trail. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would be nice for bikes/pedestrians to have a safe way of crossing the bridge, though won't frequently use (prefers to stay on the trail away from cars). | <p>Road crossings on the bike trail aren't an issue when the road has little traffic, but the King Avenue crossing can be dangerous.</p> <p>Alternative 3 is the most responsible option. Safety should always be a priority. The Little Miami Scenic Trail is popular with a range of user groups and Alternative 3 would be appreciated by both trail users and motorists. Thank you!</p> | Comments acknowledged. |
| 148 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alternative 3 - best alternative. Alternative 2 - second best alternative. Alternative 1 - least desirable. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety concern: traffic and bikes/pedestrians do not mix well and bridge traffic is heavy as-is. | <p>Traffic should be maintained on existing bridge during construction. Closure and detour would burden SR 48 and US 22.</p> <p>Truck traffic must be restricted on new bridge. Without, residents on Kings Mills Road (with elementary school), King Avenue, Grandin Road, and the residents of the Miami Bluff area will be severely impacted.</p> | WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route. |
| 149 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided a supporting two-page letter in addition to comment sheet. Alternative 1 - favored option. Alternative 2 - second favored. Alternative 3 - not at all. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not support Alternative 3 in any way. | <p>Current traffic is dangerous/problematic for Kings Mills (speed/volume) and has altered the character of the community.</p> <p>Long-time resident of Kings Mills. Sees drivers who speed on King Avenue every day and more traffic than the road can handle. Visibility, making turns, and crossing King Avenue on foot are very difficult. People who bought houses off Striker Road and to the east use King Avenue as a shortcut to I-71 and surely approve of Alternative 3 (since it benefits them). This is a matter of great importance to Kings Mills, though most fear their opinions will be ignored.</p> | Comments acknowledged. |
| 150 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided a supporting two-page letter in addition to comment sheet. Prefers Alternative 1 because Kings Mills is a historic, quaint town. If Alternative 2 - do not widen the bridge. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTIONS 3 AND 4. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher traffic load already creates more dangerous factors for car drivers. Needless to say, with bikes/pedestrians sharing the bridge, can see more traffic accidents than conveniences. | <p>Higher traffic load will create environmental hazards. Air quality will be poor and will adversely affect historic buildings. Please preserve quaint, historic town to attract more visitors, not commuters. Please build parking lot on the river bank and use the current bridge for bikes/pedestrians only to access the trails on the other side of the river.</p> <p>Continue use of existing bridge as a local bridge. When the bridge is too dangerous, make it a bike/pedestrian bridge, which will make Kings Mills a destination/leisure town to attract people for trails and biking. Please widen SR 48. If SR 48 maintains good flow, Maineville residents will prefer to use it. Please preserve historic Kings Mills downtown. Please do not build a new bridge upstream. Avoid using existing bridge for Maineville commuters. Kings Island already adds a tremendous traffic load.</p> | Comments acknowledged. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|---|--|---|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 151 | | | | <p>Comments received via email (no comment form). Totally agree with Alternative 3. But without widening, concerned about dangerous pedestrian/vehicle conflicts in Kings Mills and in front of the elementary school.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTIONS 3 AND 4.</p> | | | <p>COMMENTS MOVED TO QUESTION 4</p> <p>With current bridge gone, any thoughts of an access point to the Little Miami River for kayak/canoe? Possible partnership with Little Miami Inc. to create a park setting for access point and with ODNR for restrooms like at Fosters Point?</p> <p>Can King Avenue be widened to three lanes with turn lanes in Kings Mills?</p> <p>Can grade separation be added at the entrance to the Peters site to avoid left-turn conflicts?</p> <p>Will project accommodate school buses and school expansion?</p> | <p>Supports the trail being realigned under the bridge (Alternative 3) and appreciate extra trail parking.</p> <p>Did the traffic analysis take into consideration the Peters site development (more cars, parking, traffic)?</p> <p>Is there room to grow the parking footprint and roadway width over time?</p> <p>Appreciate concern for environmental factors. Thanks for listening.</p> | <p>Comments regarding kayak/canoe access and related amenities will be coordinated with ODNR.</p> <p>Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Widening of King Avenue in Kings Mills does not fit the Purpose and Need of this project.</p> <p>Grade separation for access to Peters site is not feasible due to topographic constraints.</p> <p>The project will accommodate bus traffic. Kings Local School District has been notified of the project and coordination will continue as the project progresses.</p> <p>A Traffic Impact Study has been completed for the Peters site. Traffic demand and traffic flow associated with the Peters site has been considered (and will continue to be considered) as this project progresses.</p> <p>The proposed parking lot for the Little Miami Scenic Trail has 30 spaces (roughly twice the amount of the existing parking lot) and could potentially be expanded by ODNR to the west in the future. Widening the roadway in the future may be feasible, but will likely result in substantial environmental/property impacts and high construction costs.</p> | |
| 152 | | | | <p>Comments received via email (no comment form). Live in Miami Bluffs subdivision. Would like to see Alternative 3 pursued. Despite greater investment, will better serve residents and businesses and will prevent serious accidents and associated costs. Alternative 2 may exacerbate periodic/seasonal weather-related bridge closures (due to increased traffic/accidents and trucks trying to access the bridge).</p> | | | The addition of bike/pedestrian access on the bridge is preferable. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 153 | | | | <p>Comments received via email (no comment form) Alternative 3 is best long-term fix.</p> | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | Thank you for the informative open house public meeting. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 154 | | | | <p>Comments received via email (no comment form) Retain existing bridge for pedestrian/bike connector to tie the Little Miami Scenic Trail to Deerfield Trail, allowing Kings Island bike access to the surrounding neighborhoods. This could also be part of the Miami2Miami project.</p> | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Due to long-term maintenance costs and scenic river considerations, the existing bridge will be removed if Alternative 3 is constructed. |
| 155 | | | | <p>Comments received via email (no comment form) Hopefully there are funds for Exhibit 5 (Alternative 3).</p> | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 156 | | | | <p>Two emails were received which detail comments in duplicate (no comment form). Strongly supports Alternative 3. Is a Friend of the Little Miami State Park and a Trail Volunteer and a trail user. Has always thought the bridge crossing should be improved. Only place to cross river in the area and is dangerous. New bridge and overpass for trail would improve traffic crossing, bike/pedestrian crossing, and adds trail parking, which is much needed. All of these things are needed to improve safety and access to the trail.</p> | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | Unable to print comment form. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 157 | | | | <p>Comments received via email (no comment form) Please choose Alternative 2 or 3. Do not close road! Prefer Alternative 2 over Alternative 3 because it prohibits trucks, but either option is better than Alternative 1.</p> | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 158 | | | | <p>Comments received via email (no comment form) As residents of Miami Bluffs, we use the bridge frequently and have great interest in this project. We support Alternative 3.</p> | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | Looks like the three alternatives presented cover all bases. Hope environmental clearance and final design and construction move ahead quickly. | Comments acknowledged. |

| Comment ID | QUESTION 1: ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE | | | QUESTION 2: BIKE/PEDESTRIAN USE ON BRIDGE | | QUESTION 3: TRAFFIC, ENVIRONMENT, or LAND USE CONSIDERATIONS | QUESTION 4: OTHER COMMENTS | WARREN COUNTY ENGINEER'S OFFICE (WCEO) RESPONSE | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-------|-------|---|-----|--|--|---|--|--|
| ID # | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | COMMENT SUMMARY | YES | NO | COMMENT SUMMARY | COMMENT SUMMARY | | |
| 159 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received via email (no comment form) Alternative 1 - would negatively impact property values of homes on the southeast side of the river and would cause a loss for businesses along King Avenue. Worst option. Alternative 2 - does not address sharp curves. Second choice if funds are not available for new bridge. Alternative 3 - first choice. It would make the bridge safer although it would allow trucks which could be a problem. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would only support this if there is adequate protection for pedestrians. | <p>Currently very difficult to turn left from Striker to Grandin; recently waited 10 minutes to turn left (only 5th in line), and eventually turned right and turned around. With more traffic and truck traffic, a traffic signal would be needed (timed and activated during busy times).</p> | <p>Would the Alternative 2 (rehab) bridge have the same lifespan as a new bridge?</p> | <p>If Alternative 3 (with bike/pedestrian use) is the selected by WCEO as the Preferred Alternative, bikes/pedestrians on the bridge would have a dedicated lane separated from vehicular traffic.</p> <p>The Striker/Grandin intersection will be evaluated by WCEO to determine if any improvements are needed.</p> <p>Rehabilitation of the existing bridge (Alternative 2) will provide a safe, long-term crossing of the Little Miami River (and therefore meets the Purpose and Need of the project). However, since a rehabilitated bridge will utilize some existing bridge components (piers/abutments), the lifespan of a rehabilitated bridge will likely be shorter than that of a completely new bridge (Alternative 3).</p> |
| 160 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received via email (no comment form) Alternative 3 would be best. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would support bike/pedestrian use of the bridge. | No comment provided. | <p>Trucks should be prohibited from bridge.</p> | <p>WCEO will not be able to legally ban or limit trucks from using King Avenue/Grandin Road if Alternative 3 is constructed. However, based on a recent traffic study completed by WCEO, 3 percent truck traffic is anticipated for Alternative 3. Furthermore, Alternative 3 will not substantially alter the existing steep grades on both sides of the river, which will likely limit heavy truck usage. Following construction, signs will be installed on King Avenue and Grandin Road warning drivers of steep grades to discourage truck use, and WCEO is considering posting an alternate truck route.</p> |
| 161 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Works Director, on behalf of Deerfield Township (comments received via email - no comment form) Supports the project and Alternative 3. Advocates realignment of approaches as integral to safety. The proposed geometry change would be a tremendous benefit to all of Deerfield Township and the Kings Mills community. | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests pedestrian access from the Little Miami Scenic Trail to the Kings Mills sidewalk system and Carter Park path network (part of Deerfield Twp. comprehensive Plan, and long sought part of Miami2Miami Connection Feasibility Plan). Adding bike/pedestrian use to the new bridge will accomplish the movement of bicycle traffic, consistent with the recommendation in that plan. | No comment provided. | <p>It is not only a goal to encourage bike/pedestrian connectivity within Deerfield Township, but promote connections to surrounding jurisdictions to create a regional network.</p> | <p>Due to the deteriorating condition of the existing bridge (and financial constraints), the specific purpose of this project is to provide a safe, long-term bridge crossing for King Avenue/Grandin Road over the Little Miami River. Alternative 3 can accommodate safe, long-term bike/pedestrian access across the Little Miami River, connecting the existing Carter Park trail system to the Little Miami Scenic Trail within the limits of the proposed project. However, constructing new sidewalks beyond the limits of proposed project to improve bike/pedestrian access from Kings Mills to the Little Miami Scenic Trail (via the new Alternative 3 bridge) does not fit the Purpose and Need and is therefore not part of this project, but the interest in additional sidewalks/pedestrian access for this area is noted.</p> |
| 162 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hamilton Township Administrator, on behalf of Hamilton Township (comments received via email - no comment form) Consensus here is Alternative 3. | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 163 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received via email (no comment form) Hopefully Alternative 1 is not a real option. Live in Miami Bluffs and closing bridge would cause significant heartache and drastically impact access to I-71 for many. Highly prefers Alternative 3. Would best serve development of our community and encourage further economic growth. Larger vehicles (and businesses) could better access I-71, and new bridge would better encourage the Peters site development and draw more customers/tenants. Alternative 2 is obviously cheaper but would not address switchbacks, barriers and vehicle restrictions. Numerous incidents (wrecks, trucks getting stuck, ice closures due to steep grades) would not be fixed by rehabbing the bridge. | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | No comment provided. | Comments acknowledged. |
| 164 | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments received via email (no comment form) Strongly believe Alternative 2 will be the best choice for Kings Mills and Hamilton Township. | -- | -- | No preference specified or other comment provided. | No comment provided. | Thank you for presenting alternatives to community for consideration. | Comments acknowledged. |
| | ALT 1 | ALT 2 | ALT 3 | | YES | NO | | | | |
| | 11 | 21 | 128 | | 110 | 37 | | | | |