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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING

This technical memorandum describes the preliminary social, economic and environmental impact screening analysis findings for the proposed I-71 MIS (Major Investment Strategy) Corridor Study (Northeast Corridor), Fort Washington Way Subcorridor. Fort Washington Way is the approximately one mile long network of local, regional and interstate roadways located on the south side of the Cincinnati central business district, just north of the Ohio River, in Hamilton County, Ohio.

The Fort Washington Way Subcorridor study is developing and evaluating alternative improvements to this existing roadway network to address both transportation service needs, including geometric design and functional deficiencies, and community development issues concerning the Cincinnati riverfront area and, in conjunction with, regional transportation improvements being studied in the I-71, Northeast Corridor and the Eastern Corridor MIS studies.

The purpose of this preliminary environmental screening is three-fold: 1) to identify potential significant adverse social, economic or environmental impacts for each alternative; 2) to determine whether mitigation measures are possible to reduce or to avoid any identified impacts; and 3) to determine whether all environmental regulations and requirements can be satisfied during subsequent environmental impact assessment studies upon completion of the MIS effort.

This environmental screening effort is based on the review of secondary source data (baseline information as obtained by the I-71 MIS Corridor Study) identifying features, resources and issues. Alternative development at this stage consists of conceptual representations of design layout or basic configuration "footprint." (although actual right-of-way estimates have not been determined at this stage). The alternative development and this analysis are limited by the fact that traffic data (projected demand) and riverfront re-development land usage plans have not yet been developed.

The following five alternatives (four build and the no build) presently under consideration (as developed as of December 18, 1996) have been evaluated in this effort:

1  No Build (rehabilitate existing facilities, maintaining existing configuration)
1A Transportation System Management (TSM)
2  Minimum Build (relocate Pete Rose Way)
3C Relocate Pete Rose Way / Retain I-71 and US 50 in Narrowed Fort Washington Way
5  Relocate I-71 / Retain US 50 / Narrow Fort Washington Way

Note: all Build alternatives include the provisions of Alternative 1A, specifically, the removal of the Dixie Terminal bus ramps, upgrading Central Parkway to an east / west urban boulevard (by removing on-street parking), implementing enhanced bus system, ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems) components and other features of the I-71 Corridor TSM Alternative.

A number of the components of Alternative 5, specifically ramp connections on both the east and west sides of the CBD, to I-75 and to the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge on the west end, and to the Daniel Beard Carter, I-471, Bridge, Sixth Street and Ninth Street, on the east end, could be incorporated into Build Alternatives 2 and 3C. However, for the purposes of this environmental screening evaluation, since these components have not yet been added to any other Build alternatives, separate references to these components have been made, and can be applied independently to the other alternatives.

Based on this environmental screening, none of the alternatives under consideration are expected to result in significant adverse social, economic or environmental impact. No "fatal flaws" in terms of environmental impact have been identified for any of the alternatives considered. Section 4(f) involvement has been identified for Alternative 5 due to its requirement of two small parks located
within the existing Fort Washington Way footprint (adjacent to the south side of Third Street); however, this Section 4(f) involvement is not expected to be a "fatal flaw," primarily since this impact is somewhat mitigated by the fact that these parks are actually part of the state-owned, existing transportation right-of-way. Of the most critical environmental concern is the potential for Section 4(f)/106 involvement with National Register of Historic Place sites located immediately north of the existing Fort Washington Way and with the Roebling Suspension Bridge, to the south. Although none of the Build alternatives will physically impact any of these historic resources, at this level of study and without further coordination with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office, the potential for adverse effects on these resources cannot be predicted.

The full evaluation of how well the current alternatives address transportation and community issues identified in this MIS as important elements of the problem statement is beyond the scope of the environmental screening and will be covered through the remaining elements of the MIS study. However, to some extent, part of this evaluation overlaps with the environmental screening.

Neither Alternative 1, the No Build, nor Alternative IA, Transportation System Management, fully address the transportation and community issues identified in this MIS as important elements of the problem statement. Specifically, both alternatives fail to correct the existing Fort Washington Way geometric design standard deficiencies, do not improve connections between the CBD and the central riverfront, and do not facilitate riverfront development opportunities. The resultant, potential adverse environmental impact of these two alternatives will need to be further evaluated in the environmental assessment phase, specifically related to air quality and economic development.

Alternative 1A has been incorporated into the remaining Build alternatives, 2, 3C and 5. In that these three Build alternatives, Alternatives 2, 3C and 5, have been specifically designed to address the transportation and community issues identified in this MIS, these alternatives are expected to provide some benefit to air quality and economic development.

There are no significant differences among the Build alternatives for the environmental impact categories evaluated. After the project proceeds through the MIS process, a full environmental assessment will be required if federal funding is pursued for implementation of the improvement.

Mitigation measures that will need to be further pursued during the environmental assessment phase will need to include:

- replacement of parkland lost (Alternative 5);
- potential mitigation of adverse impact to Section 4(f)/106 historic resources;
- noise abatement such as the consideration of noise barriers; and
- construction impact mitigation include construction procedures and maintenance of traffic plans.

Based on the screening information available, there are no conclusive differences among the Build alternatives (other than the parkland impact of Alternative 5) concerning potential mitigation requirements noted.

The following table highlights the results of this environmental screening study through a comparison of the alternatives and the potential impacts identified for each.
## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES / POTENTIAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>1 Rehabilitation</th>
<th>1A TSM</th>
<th>Build</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3C</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Required (preliminary estimates)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 warehouses/office buildings; 2 small parks, parts of 5 off-street parking lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement / Relocation of Residences</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood and Community Characteristics</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential 4(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Historic</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Possible due to proximity&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Possible due to proximity&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Possible due to proximity&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered Species</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain</td>
<td>Project area is in 100-year floodplain - design of all Build alternatives will need to accommodate flood protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Land Use Impacts</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Not determined at this time, although few sensitive receptors in project proximity; full analysis will need to be conducted during environmental phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>No Build</th>
<th>1A Rehabilitation</th>
<th>IA TSM</th>
<th>Build 2</th>
<th>Build 3C</th>
<th>Build 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality</strong></td>
<td>Based on regional traffic data, insignificant differences among alternatives and between Build and No Build: full air quality assessment will need to be conducted during environmental phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>Potentially negative, since No Build does not change existing, perceived barrier between CBD and river-front area. (although all Build alternatives require removal of on-street parking on Central Parkway)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual and Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Patterns</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Patterns</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Maintenance of traffic plans will need to be developed for all alternatives (including No Build - rehabilitation of existing facilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Replacement of parking</td>
<td>Replacement of parking</td>
<td>Replacement of parking</td>
<td>Replacement of parking: Section 4(f) park impact mitigation to be determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise abatement may need to be considered for all Build alternatives.

---

11 Some of the components of Alternative 5, specifically ramp connections on both the east and west sides of the CBD, to I-75 and to the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge on the west end, and to the I-471 Bridge, Sixth Street and Ninth Street on the east end, could be incorporated into Build Alternatives 2 and 3C. Many of the impacts identified for Alternative 5 are due to these east and west connection components.

12 No physical impact to any sites or districts listed on, or determined eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places.
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Technical Memorandum: Social, Economic and Environmental Screening
Fort Washington Way
December 1996

I. INTRODUCTION

This technical memorandum has been prepared to describe the preliminary social, economic and environmental impact screening analysis findings for the proposed I-71 MIS (Major Investment Strategy) Corridor Study (Northeast Corridor), Fort Washington Way Subcorridor. Fort Washington Way is the approximately one mile long network of local, regional and interstate roadways located on the south side of the Cincinnati central business district, just north of the Ohio River, in Hamilton County, Ohio (see Exhibits 1 and 2).

The Fort Washington Way Subcorridor study is developing and evaluating alternative improvements to this existing roadway network to address both transportation service needs, including geometric design and functional deficiencies, and community development issues concerning the Cincinnati riverfront area and, in conjunction with, regional transportation improvements being studied in the I-71, Northeast Corridor and the Eastern Corridor MIS studies.

The following five alternatives (four build and the no build) presently under consideration[1] as shown in Exhibits 3 through 7 (and more fully described in Appendix A) have been evaluated in this effort:

Alternatives Under Consideration:

1  No Build (rehabilitate existing facilities, maintaining existing configuration)
1A Transportation System Management (TSM)
2 Minimum Build (relocate Pete Rose Way)
3C Relocate Pete Rose Way / Retain I-71 and US 50 in Narrowed Fort Washington Way
5 Relocate I-71 / Retain US 50 / Narrow Fort Washington Way

Note: all Build alternatives include the provisions of Alternative 1A, specifically, the removal of the Dixie Terminal bus ramps, upgrading Central Parkway to an east / west urban boulevard (by removing on-street parking), implementing enhanced bus system, ITS (Intelligent Transportation Systems) components and other features of the I-71 Corridor TSM Alternative.

[1] This report only addresses the alternatives under consideration as developed as of December 18, 1996. Appendix A includes brief descriptions of the alternatives as presented at the December 18, 1996 Fort Washington Way Subcommittee Meeting. Some changes to the components of connections on the east and west ends of the Fort Washington Way alternatives are subject to further study based on discussion at that meeting.
A number of the components of Alternative 5, specifically ramp connections on both the east and west sides of the CBD, to I-75 and to the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge on the west end, and to the Daniel Beard Carter, I-471, Bridge, Sixth Street and Ninth Street, on the east end, could be incorporated into Build Alternatives 2 and 3C. However, for the purposes of this environmental screening evaluation, since these components have not yet been added to any other Build alternatives, separate references to these components have been made, and can be applied independently to the other alternatives.

II. PURPOSE

The purpose of this preliminary environmental screening is three-fold, 1) to identify potential significant adverse social, economic or environmental impacts for each alternative; 2) to determine whether mitigation measures are possible to reduce or to avoid any identified impacts; and 3) to determine whether all environmental regulations and requirements can be satisfied during subsequent environmental impact assessment studies upon completion of the MIS effort.

III. METHODOLOGY

This environmental screening effort is based on the review of secondary source data (baseline information as obtained by the I-71 MIS Corridor Study[1]) identifying features, resources and issues. Alternative development at this stage consists of conceptual representations of design layout or basic configuration "footprint," (although actual right-of-way estimates have not been determined at this stage). The alternative development and this analysis are limited by the fact that traffic data (projected demand) and riverfront re-development land usage plans have not yet been developed.

IV. AREA STUDIED

The direct area of impact for the improvement of Fort Washington Way is defined by the existing "footprint" of the Fort Washington Way roadway network, i.e., the existing right-of-way path of the transportation network between (and including) Third Street on the north, Pete Rose Way on the south, Central Avenue on the west, and Lytle Park on the east. The Central Parkway component of the Build alternatives, since it applies to all the Build alternatives under consideration (although it entails new no right-of-way), is also addressed in this overview.

[1] The I-71 MIS Corridor Study secondary source information used in this report is from the draft report chapter, Section 7.0 Environmental Conditions, November 1996, prepared by Burgess and Niple, Cincinnati, Ohio. In some areas, this baseline information was supplemented by pertinent environmental overview information compiled for the Eastern Corridor MIS Study and reported in Technical Memorandum B4.2: Environmental Setting, prepared by Balke Engineers, March 1996.
In addition, one of the alternatives under consideration, Alternative 5, also includes changes to the east and west connections to the interstate system, I-75 on the west end and I-71 and I-471 on the east end. Exhibit 2 shows the general boundaries covered by this environmental screening study.

V. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing Fort Washington Way footprint measured between the northern edge of the north sidewalk along Third Street to the southern edge of the south sidewalk along Pete Rose Way is approximately 657 feet (200 meters) wide and, besides Third Street and Pete Rose Way, consists primarily of the roadway network of through lanes and ramps serving I-71 and US 50 between I-75 and US 50 on the west and I-71, Columbia Parkway and I-471 on the east, with on and off ramps to the downtown Central Business District road system (Central Avenue, Plum, Elm, Race, Vine, Walnut, Main, Sycamore and Broadway Streets), to northern Kentucky (via the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge, the Roebling Suspension Bridge, the Taylor-Southgate (Central) Bridge and the Daniel Beard Carter (I-471) Bridge) and to the Cincinnati riverfront area. The width of the existing Fort Washington Way roadway system, i.e., the system of through roadway and ramps, minus the local connectors, Third Street and Pete Rose Way, is approximately 500 feet (152 meters).

Although the study area is primarily in transportation use, within this footprint area are three developed areas: two small parks located on Third Street: one, Sabin Park (= 1.2 acres), between Plum and Elm Streets, on the south side of Third Street (consisting of trees, paved walkway and benches), and the second, Fort Washington Park (< 1 acre), located on the southwest corner of Broadway and Third (also, trees, benches, walkway); and a cluster of restaurant / nightclub uses (including Caddy’s, Flanagan’s, Skyline Chili, and others) located at the northeast quadrant of Plum and Pete Rose Way.

Land use surrounding Fort Washington Way is generally comprised of office / commercial uses (high rise buildings and parking garages) along Third Street on the north and Cinergy Field / Riverfront Stadium (open air professional sports facility for baseball and football), the Riverfront Coliseum (enclosed sports and entertainment arena), the public landing, parking (both multi-story garage and open lots) and produce warehouses. Along the west end of the study area, the existing land use is generally office / commercial and warehousing. In addition to office / commercial and warehousing uses on the east end, above the Fort Washington Way ramp connections with I-71 through the Lytle Tunnel, Lytle Park consists of a small park.

[1] Discussion of land use in the project area and vicinity and reference to specific land uses is not intended to be considered as comprehensive, but illustrative of some of the area’s representative land uses to establish the context of the project and potential impact identification. This screening level of effort does not include a full field survey and the development of the right-of-way requirements for each alternative have not yet been determined.
and adjacent residential (apartment and inn) uses anchored by the Taft Museum at the far eastern end. South of Pete Rose Way and east of the Taylor-Southgate Bridge, commercial office and warehousing is interspersed with One Lytle Place, a high rise residential tower (located south of Pete Rose Way, east of Mehring Way) and two riverfront parks: Yeatman’s Cove (between the public landing and the L&N Bridge) and Sawyer Point Park (from the L&N Bridge east to where Pete Rose Way joins Eastern Avenue, east of the I-471 Bridge).

Besides this development and the roadway pavement and structures, there is some highway landscaping within the Fort Washington Way consisting of small trees, shrubs and grasses. Two overhead, covered, “skywalk” pedestrian bridges span Fort Washington Way between Third Street and Pete Rose Way, connecting the CBD sidewalk system to the plaza level of Cinergy Field / Riverfront Stadium, parallel to, and ½ block east and west of Main Street. The skywalk east of Main Street also includes a bus / taxi / service lane for vehicle access to and from the stadium and coliseum plaza[1]. In addition to sidewalk facilities on the seven north-south streets spanning or underpassing Fort Washington Way, seven staircases provide access to and from Pete Rose Way and the CBD (at the following locations: the foot of Race, east of Vine, the foot of Walnut, the foot of Main, from the pedestrian bridge east of Main, from the foot of Broadway to the Coliseum plaza, and from Pete Rose Way to the eastern end of the Coliseum plaza).

As the alternatives study has progressed, additional ramp connections have been investigated outside the existing Fort Washington Way trench area, including additional connections on the west end to I-75 and to the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge and on the east end, connections to and from the CBD at Sixth and Ninth Streets. At this point in the study, these additional connections have been investigated for Alternative 5 only, although similar connections could be incorporated into the other alternatives under consideration. Land use in the vicinity of these additional eastern and western connections consists of offices, warehouses and parking lots, in addition to the existing transportation rights-of-way.

VI. POTENTIAL IMPACTS IDENTIFIED

At this stage of the studies for the alternative improvement plans for Fort Washington Way, the identification of potential social, economic and environmental impacts is based on secondary source research and primarily focused on direct, physical impacts that are likely to occur as a result of right-of-way requirements. To a more limited extent, other social and economic impacts can also been identified that

[1] The skywalks and vehicle access lane are directly connected to the stadium plaza, although these provide access to the adjoining coliseum plaza (pedestrian and vehicles).
would likely result as a consequence to an alternative's effect on changes to traffic patterns or an alternative's effects on land use and development in the surrounding area.

In general, the potential for physical impact to environmental features by any of the Build alternatives under consideration is not expected to be substantial for two reasons:

1) the alternatives have generally been designed to reduce the existing Fort Washington Way right-of-way needs and thus require only limited new right-of-way, i.e., most of the proposed changes in access ramps and roadways would be within the area already used for transportation right-of-way; and

2) due to the fact that the existing project area had been cleared for transportation right-of-way prior to the construction of the present Fort Washington Way network (in the 1960's), the area is practically devoid of any environmental features or resources.

The following items primarily list environmental considerations in terms of potential physical impact, such as encroachment, through required taking or displacement, that will need to be addressed in the further development and evaluation of the conceptual alternatives as the study progresses. Some issues, such as air quality and economic development, cannot be fully evaluated at this point in the study since traffic data and land use projections have not been determined yet. Concurrent, but independent of this study, riverfront development plans and the determination of the locations of one or two professional sports facilities are underway with conclusions anticipated this month. In addition, the results of project coordination with the Ohio Department of Transportation, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet and the Federal Highway Administration that are also currently underway and further study directed by input received at the December 18 Subcommittee Meeting may result in changes in the potential right-of-way requirements of the alternatives under consideration.

A. Preliminary Right-of-Way Requirements

Direct impact in the form of new right-of-way requirements is an important consideration in the comparison of alternatives. However, at the conceptual alternative development level of study, all estimates of right-of-way are very preliminary. This screening report has focused on the identification of the alternatives' differences in potential right-of-way requirements and those requirements that will need further study, such as right-of-way required from Section 4(f) resources (parks, historic sites, etc.) or major developed land uses.

[1] The resultant changes or adjustments to the alternatives under study from the coordination workshop held with ODOT, KTC and FHWA on December 11 and 12, 1996 have been incorporated into the alternatives presented at the December 18, 1996 Subcommittee Meeting. However, as a result of review at the subcommittee meeting, some further changes, specifically to ramp connections on the east and west ends, will be further studied.
Although right-of-way requirements have not been determined for any of the alternatives at this stage, some preliminary estimates have been assumed from the conceptual design layouts, as described below (see Exhibits 3 through 7 for alternative layouts, Appendix A for brief descriptions of each alternative, and Exhibit 8 for potential land use impacts):

- Alternative 1: no new right-of-way; rehabilitation of existing configuration
- Alternative 1A: no new right-of-way; removes parking from Central Parkway
- Alternative 2: no new right-of-way; removes parking from Central Parkway
- Alternative 3C: no new right-of-way; removes parking from Central Parkway
- Alternative 5: requires two small parks located on south side of Third Street (between Plum and Elm Streets and near Broadway Street) [potential Section 4(f) involvement due to taking of publicly owned parkland; see Section VI.E1 of this report for further discussion]) plus the following:
  a. New Off Ramp from Clay Wade Bailey NB to Second Street eastbound may affect or require the Crosset Co. building, a produce warehouse and distribution operation located on the northwest corner of Pete Rose Way and Central Avenue
  b. New I-75 connections: 1) Westbound ramp to Northbound I-75 (from Third, west of Plum Street) requires a warehouse building on the northeast corner of Third Street and Central Avenue and some adjacent off street parking (ground lot); 2) Off ramp from Southbound I-75 to Second impacts the Hennegan building (warehouse/office) on the northeast corner of Third and John; 3) Off ramp from I-75 / US 50 to Third, requires some surface parking on the northwest corner of Third and John Streets
  c. Eastbound ramp to I-471 Southbound from US 50 Eastbound requires the back of the White Consolidated Building, warehouse and office use, located between Third and Pete Rose Way, and Butler and Eggleston
  d. I-71 Southbound off ramp to Sixth Street Westbound requires some off street ground parking lot area
  e. I-71 northbound off ramp to Ninth Street Westbound requires some off street ground parking lot area

As mentioned in Section I, east and west connections described under Alternative 5, a. through e., or similar connections, could be incorporated into Build Alternatives 2 and 3C.

B. Displacement and Relocation of Residential Development

None of the alternatives (as developed to this point) are expected to require new right-of-way that will require the displacement or relocation of any existing residential uses.
C. **Neighborhood and Community Characteristics**

Since none of the Build alternatives require significant areas of new right-of-way nor the displacement of any residential land uses, no adverse impact on neighborhood and community characteristics are expected. Build Alternatives 2, 3C and 5 will provide opportunities for positive impact in improving access to/from the CBD and the riverfront.

D. **Environmental Justice: Impact on Minority and Low Income Populations**

Since none of the Build alternatives are expected to require the displacement of any residential property, none will have any direct impact on minority or low income populations.

E. **Potential Section 4(f) Involvement**

Impact on any publicly owned park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge or any significant cultural historic or archaeologic resource will be subject to further evaluation under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 regulations (49 USC 303 and 23 USC 138) to ensure that alternatives to avoid or minimize such impact have been fully investigated. According to the Section 4(f) legislation, no federally-assisted transportation project shall use land from a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge or any significant historic site unless a determination is made that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the property, and that the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use. For this project, Section 4(f) considerations for two categories potentially apply: public parkland and cultural historic resources. In addition, cultural historic resources are subject to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR 800) requiring that consideration be given of the effect of a federally-assisted project on any site, building, structure or district listed on, or determined eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places (NR).

1. **Parkland**

Several parks exist in the vicinity of the project study area, including two within the existing Fort Washington Way right-of-way[^1] (see Exhibit 8). These two parks are small, "vest pocket" parks located on the south side of Third Street: one, Sabin Park (= 1.2 acres), between Plum and Elm Streets, consisting of trees, paved walkway and benches, and the second, Fort Washington Park (< 1 acre), located on the southwest corner of Broadway and Third, which also consists of

[^1]: Parks under the jurisdiction of the Cincinnati Park Board, but within the state-owned transportation right-of-way, developed under an agreement with the Ohio Department of Transportation.
benches, a historical marker / monument for the original site of Fort Washington, and walkways. Both parks are maintained by the Cincinnati Park Board, although the land is within state-owned transportation right-of-way.

Of the alternatives currently under study, both of these parks would be within the required right-of-way for Alternative 5. Ultimately, any improvement or change in Fort Washington Way could likely require the replacement or redevelopment of these small parks, although Alternatives 1A, 2 and 3C, as conceived presently could allow both parks to remain undisturbed with the proposed layouts.

Parklands located near, but outside the preliminary limits of right-of-way requirements of any of the Build alternatives under consideration, include:

- Lytle Park, located above I-71 ramps on eastern end of project area; and
- Park facilities and area along river (Serpentine Wall, Yeatman’s Cove and Sawyer Point).

None of the alternatives will physically impact these parklands, i.e., no land will be required from any of these other parklands. In addition, Alternatives 2, 3C and 5 have the potential to provide opportunities for the creation of new parkland on roadway deck areas or any areas opened for development by the reduction of the transportation right-of-way requirements.

Only Alternative 5 is expected to have a direct impact on parkland, requiring the displacement of two small passive use parks along Third Street[1]. If Alternative 5 is advanced into the subsequent environmental impact studies that will follow the completion of the MIS study, further study and coordination will be required in accordance with Section 4(f) regulations (49 USC 303 and 23 USC 138). However, at this time, the nature of the Section 4(f) coordination cannot be fully determined. It is possible that Section 4(f) regulations may not apply or that the necessary coordination and documentation may be lessened, since the two parks impacted are currently state-owned as existing transportation right-of-way, (although ODOT has authorized the City of Cincinnati Park Board to use this right-of-way as parkland).

[1] However, as mentioned above, during further development of either Alternative 2 and 3C, it may be determined that either or both of these parks will need to be returned to transportation right-of-way.
2. Cultural Historic and Archaeological Resources

Although there are no significant archaeological resources within the Cincinnati downtown area, there are numerous cultural historic properties. Of particular importance or significance are resources that are listed on, or have been determined eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places (NR)[1]. The following listing indicates the cultural historic resources, individual sites and districts, in the project vicinity that are listed, or have been determined eligible for listing. There are no archaeological resources in the project vicinity listed or considered eligible. This list was compiled from the I-71 MIS Corridor Study research and coordination effort and the Ohio Historic Preservation Office's National Register August 1995 listings for Hamilton County, Ohio.

Impacts to any NR listed or eligible property or resource are subject to full compliance with Section 4(f) and Section 106 regulations.

Properties in Project Vicinity Listed in the National Register of Historic Places

- 123-137 East Fourth Street Historic District
- Clark Sorgo Machine Company Building, 316-318 Main Street
- Covington and Cincinnati Roebling Suspension Bridge (over the Ohio River), National Historic Landmark
- Ingalls Building, 6 East Fourth Street
- John Church Company Building, 14-16 East Fourth Street
- Lombardy Apartment Building, 318-326 West Fourth Street
- Lytle Park District (boundaries: center of the intersection of Sycamore and Third, includes Fifth, Broadway, and Commercial Square. Butler, Pike and Third Streets are also part of boundaries) [note: Commercial Square area no longer exists - taken by P&G expansion]
- Main and Third Cluster (300-302 Main, 304-306 Main, 208-210 East Third)
- Police Station No. 2, 314 Broadway
- Taft Museum, 316 Pike Street, National Historic Landmark (located within Lytle Park District)
- Derby, H. W., Building, 300 West Fourth Street
- Hooper Building, 139-151 West Fourth Street
- West Fourth Street Historic District (including all listed boundary amendments: area roughly bounded by Central, Race, McFarland and West Fifth[2])
- Showboat Majestic, moored at the public landing at the foot of Broadway Street

[1] In addition, any other sites not currently listed or determined NR eligible that are identified and determined to be NR eligible during the environmental assessment phase will also be subject to the Section 4(f)/106 evaluation.

[2] Area bounded on north side by Fifth Street between Central Avenue and Plum Street, and Fourth Street between Plum and Race Streets, on the west by Central Avenue between Fifth and McFarland, on the east by Plum between Fifth and McFarland and by Race between Fourth and back of properties fronting Fourth Street, and on the south by McFarland between Central and Elm and extended to Race along the back of properties fronting on the south side of Fourth Street between Elm and Race (in addition there is a small extension along Elm south to the back of the properties with frontage on Third Street; see Exhibit 8).
Properties in Project Vicinity Not Listed but Determined NR Eligible

- 315 Plum (although not listed due to owner objection)
- Brockman Building (312-314 Main Street, although not listed due to owner objection)
- Building at 315 Plum Street (owner objection)
- Heister Building (308-310 Main Street, although not listed due to owner objection)
- Building at 200-204 West Fourth Street (owner objection)

As the alternatives are currently configured, none of the alternatives require the physical taking of any buildings or land from any of these cultural historic resources presently listed on, or determined eligible for, the National Register. However, further study and coordination during the environmental impact assessment studies that will be required to follow this MIS study will be necessary to determine all the project alternatives' effect on any National Register (or NR eligible) resource. Section 106 has established criteria of effect and adverse effect that include alteration to characteristics or features of the property’s location, setting or use that may qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register. Of particular concern will be the determination of the project’s effect on the following resources immediately adjacent to the project area (see Exhibit 8):

- **The Covington and Cincinnati Roebling Suspension Bridge, National Historic Landmark**: None of the proposed alternatives would have any physical impact on the Roebling Suspension Bridge (although all propose realignment / improvement of the Cincinnati approach, with the closing of the bus lane connections to Dixie Terminal). A No Effect determination of cultural historic resource impact on the Roebling Suspension Bridge could be anticipated for any of the alternatives under study.

- **The West Fourth Street Historic District bordering West Third Street between Central Avenue and Race Street (½ block north of West Third)**: Existing connections to I-75 and US 50 cut across the West Third Street and Central Avenue's northeast corner, immediately adjacent, but south of the District's southwestern corner at Central and McFarland Street. None of the alternatives as currently configured require any land from this NR district. However, the current plan layout for Alternative 5 includes the addition of a ramp north of the existing ramp, which, although not encroaching into the district's boundaries, will require the taking of additional land used for commercial surface parking and an office/warehouse building (fronting Third Street).

- **The Main and Third Street Cluster**: None of the current layouts of the Build alternatives require any right-of-way from this resource.

- **Lytle Park Historic District**: None of the current layouts of the Build alternatives require any right-of-way from this resource.
Based on the information presently available, none of the current alternatives are expected to have any adverse effect on any National Register listed or eligible cultural historic or archaeological resource. However, due to the proposed improvements' proximity to NR resources, Section 4(f) / 106 involvement will need to be fully addressed in the environmental assessment and through coordination with the State Historic Preservation Offices of Ohio and Kentucky. Even without physical impact to any National Register listed or eligible resources, further analysis and coordination, during the environmental assessment study phase, will be required to determine each project alternative's effects and to fully consider avoidance and minimization of any determined impacts on National Register of Historic Place resources.

F. **Other Nearby Land Uses Potentially Subject to Impact**

The southern boundary of the Fort Washington Way project area consists of three large scale land uses: Cinergy Field / Riverfront Stadium, Riverfront Coliseum and the Public Landing. None of the Build alternatives will have any physical impact on any of these land uses. Although riverfront re-development plans are not yet available and the location of major league sports stadiums for baseball and football are currently under study (and it is generally assumed that the existing shared use stadium will be replaced), the existing Cinergy Field / Riverfront Stadium is not physically impacted by any of the alternatives under consideration. It is anticipated, and is considered one of the project's purposes, that the re-development of the Fort Washington Way transportation network will provide opportunities for positive land use impact on the riverfront through improved access between the downtown Central Business District and the riverfront.

G. **Ecological Resources (Endangered Species, Wetlands, Natural Areas, etc.)**

There are no significant ecological resources identified in the I-71 MIS Corridor research within the project impact area. The following two tables were compiled using data and coordination responses prepared for the I-71 MIS Corridor Study. Only those resources within the Fort Washington Way project vicinity are reported in these tables.

There are no threatened, endangered or federal candidate species listed in the project vicinity; the nearest listings are for species located in or near the Ohio River. There is one plant species listed as potentially threatened, as observed or potentially occurring at the Riverfront Coliseum.
### TABLE 1

**THREATENED, ENDANGERED AND FEDERAL CANDIDATE SPECIES[III]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reported By</th>
<th>Observed / Potential Occurrence Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANIMALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acipenser fulvescens</em></td>
<td>Lake sturgeon (fish)</td>
<td>E, FC</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cumberlandia monodonta</em></td>
<td>Spectaclecase (mollusk)</td>
<td>E, FC</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyprogenia steagera</em></td>
<td>Fanshell (mollusk)</td>
<td>E, E†</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ellipsaria lineolata</em></td>
<td>Butterfly (mollusk)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ODNR</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Elliptio crassidens crassidens</em></td>
<td>Elephant ear (mollusk)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ODNR</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Epioblasma obliquata obliquata</em></td>
<td>Catspaw (mollusk)</td>
<td>E, E†</td>
<td>KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Epioblasma torulosa rangiana</em></td>
<td>Northern rifleshell (mollusk)</td>
<td>E, E†</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Epioblasma triquetra</em></td>
<td>Snuffbox (mollusk)</td>
<td>T, FC</td>
<td>ODNK USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fusconaia subrotunda subrotunda</em></td>
<td>Long-solid (mollusk)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lampsilis abrupta</em></td>
<td>Pink mucket (mollusk)</td>
<td>E, T†</td>
<td>KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lampsilis ovata</em></td>
<td>Pocketbook (mollusk)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lasigmona compressa</em></td>
<td>Creek heelsplitter (mollusk)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Leptoxis praerosa</em></td>
<td>Onyx rocksnail</td>
<td>FC</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Obliquaria reflexa</em></td>
<td>Threehorn wartyback (mollusk)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>ODNK</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Obovaria retusa</em></td>
<td>Ring pink (mollusk)</td>
<td>E, E†</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Percina shumardi</em></td>
<td>River darter (fish)</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>ODNK</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plethobasus cooperianus</em></td>
<td>Orange-footed pearly mussel</td>
<td>E, E†</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleurobema clava</em></td>
<td>Clubshell (mollusk)</td>
<td>E, E†</td>
<td>USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleurobema cordatum</em></td>
<td>Ohio pigtoe (mollusk)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>ODNK USFWS USNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 1
**OTHER SPECIES OF CONCERN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reported By</th>
<th>Observed / Potential Occurrence Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleurobema plenum</em></td>
<td>Rough pigtoe pearly mussel</td>
<td>E,&lt;sub&gt;f&lt;/sub&gt;, E,&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>USFWS KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pleurobema pyramidatum</em></td>
<td>Pyramid pigtoe (mollusk)</td>
<td>E,&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;, FC</td>
<td>USFWS KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quadrigula cylindrica</em></td>
<td>Rabbittsfoot (mollusk)</td>
<td>T,&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;, FC</td>
<td>USFWS KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quadrigula metanerva</em></td>
<td>Monkeyface (mollusk)</td>
<td>E,&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>ODNR</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stinsonias ambigua</em></td>
<td>Salamander mussel</td>
<td>T,&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;, FC</td>
<td>USFWS KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Villosa fabris</em></td>
<td>Rayed bean</td>
<td>F,&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;, FC</td>
<td>USFWS KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E,<sub>r</sub> = Endangered (State)
FC = Federal Candidate Species
T,<sub>r</sub> = Threatened (State)

Source: 1-71 MIS Corridor Study, Draft Section 7.0 Environmental Conditions, Burgess & Niple, November 1996.

### TABLE 2
**OTHER SPECIES OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Reported By</th>
<th>Observed / Potential Occurrence Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Hiodon tergisus</em></td>
<td>Mooneye (fish)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ODNR</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lota lota</em></td>
<td>Burbot (fish)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ODNR KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Moxostoma carinatum</em></td>
<td>River redhorse (fish)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ODNR</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plethobasus cyphus</em></td>
<td>Sheepnose (mollusk)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plethodon cinerus</em></td>
<td>Redback salamander</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>KSNPC</td>
<td>Ohio River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANIMALS**

**PLANTS**

H = Historical
S = Special Interest / Special Concern
* = These species are inventoried, but have not been assigned an official status designation.

Source: 1-71 MIS Corridor Study, Draft Section 7.0 Environmental Conditions, Burgess & Niple, November 1996.
Based on this information, none of the alternatives are expected to have any adverse impact on any endangered or threatened species.

Within the Fort Washington Way project area, the only other natural feature of concern is the 100-year floodplain of the Ohio River. The existing Fort Washington Way is in the 100-year Ohio River floodplain and is protected by a floodwall along the south side of the depressed "trench" area between Third Street and Pete Rose Way. In that all alternative improvements are required to be designed to accommodate flood protection (either maintaining the existing wall or replacing it within the design of the roadway improvement), there is no significant difference among alternatives.

There are no other natural areas, ecological features or resources in the vicinity of the Fort Washington Way study area identified in the I-71 MIS Corridor Study research and agency coordination. However, within the existing Fort Washington Way right-of-way, there are trees and natural vegetation generally located within the existing roadway right-of-way that will be impacted by the Build alternatives; full ecological survey and assessment will be required during the environmental assessment studies.

H. Noise Sensitive Receptors

Part of the environmental assessment studies will include the analysis of noise impact. The assessment of noise impact involves the identification of sensitive receptors in the study area and estimation of the probable noise levels which will result from construction and operation of the transportation improvement. The purpose of this analysis will be to identify existing and predicted Build and No Build noise levels and potential impacts associated with the proposed improvement of Fort Washington Way, and, if necessary, to evaluate the feasibility of various noise abatement measures. The measurement of highway noise impact is dependent on several factors, including the type, number and speed of vehicles, the characteristics of the interface between vehicle and roadway, the type of environment (urban, suburban, rural) in which the noise occurs, and the distance from the road to the receptor.

Land use types considered sensitive to transportation generated noise include (but are not limited to): residences, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals and recreational areas. Concentrations of noise sensitive receptors, e.g., more densely populated residential areas, have been identified as areas where noise impact would be of the greatest concern. A new roadway, or major expansion or change

[1] Noise sensitive receptors generally include institutional, residential and park land uses)
of an existing facility, located in close proximity to a concentration of noise sensitive receptors would result in greater adverse noise impact than the impact of the same noise level increase on an isolated home or a more sparsely developed area.

For comparative purposes, sound or noise is quantified in decibels (dB) and adjusted to approximate the way an average person hears sound. For both traffic or transit noise measurements, the "A-weighted" decibel scale is considered the most appropriate means of comparison primarily because this scale 1) yields measurements that can be easily made; 2) approximates human hearing sensitivity; 3) matches attitudinal survey tests of annoyance; and 4) is endorsed as the proper basic unit for environmental noise by nearly every agency concerned with noise worldwide**. The following listing illustrates a comparison of noise levels in the A-weighted scale, i.e., sound measured in decibels on the A scale, dBA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dBA</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>threshold of hearing*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>normal breathing*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>library*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>refrigerator*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>air conditioning unit*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>pick-up truck at 50 mph at 50 feet*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>rail transit at grade at 50 mph at 50 feet**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>medium truck* or rail transit on aerial structure** (both at 50 mph at 50 feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>rail transit at 50 mph at 50 feet on modern concrete**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;95</td>
<td>rail transit at 50 mph at 50 feet on old steel structure**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It should be noted that the noise levels increase geometrically in loudness, i.e., a ten decibel increase is a doubling of the noise level:

- 60 dBA is twice as loud as 50 dBA;
- 70 dBA is twice as loud as 60, or 4 times that of 50 dBA;
- 80 dBA is twice as loud as 70, or 8 times that of 50 dBA; and
- 90 dBA is twice as loud as 80, or 16 times that of 50 dBA.
Noise sensitive receptors in the Fort Washington Way project area include:

- high rise residential uses at One Lytle Place Tower (southeast of Mehring Way and Pete Rose Way) and Lytle Park Apartments located above the Lytle Tunnel;
- Fort Washington Park and Sabin Park (see Parkland section) along Third Street and Lytle Park, located above the Lytle Tunnel at the eastern end of Fort Washington Way.

Other land uses in the project vicinity are not generally considered as noise sensitive, such as office, commercial, warehousing, sports stadium and coliseum, entertainment / restaurant uses and parking facilities. There are no institutional land uses in the immediate project vicinity.

In subsequent environmental studies, the highway generated noise impact of this project for existing, No Build and Design Year Build conditions will be required to be analyzed in accordance with 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 772, "Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise".

23 CFR Part 772 establishes design noise level / land use relationships for various types of land developments. Land use categories "B" and "C" are applicable for the noise sensitive receptors on this project because these categories represent residential and commercial properties respectively. For Category "B," the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) is 67 dBA $L_{eq}$ ($L_{eq}$ = the equivalent steady state sound level which in a stated time period would contain the same acoustic energy as the time-varying sound level during the same time period), and applies to noise levels on the exterior of a residential or institutional structure. For Category "C," commercial properties, the NAC is 72 dBA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>$L_{eq}$ (h)</th>
<th>Description of Activity Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries and hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed lands, properties or activities not included in Categories A or B above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Undeveloped lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Category</th>
<th>( L_{eq} ) (h)</th>
<th>Description of Activity Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Residences, motels, hotels, public meeting rooms, schools, churches, libraries, hospitals and auditoriums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In general, traffic noise levels in the project area will change proportionate to changes in traffic volume levels and traffic characteristics (vehicle type, mixture and speed, etc.), whether or not the roadway is improved. In terms of noise sensitive receptors, there are no significant differences among alternatives. Traffic projections for each alternative will be required to fully evaluate noise impact in the subsequent environmental phase. Noise abatement studies will be required where noise impacts are identified in the analysis (as defined by 23 CFR Part 772).

FHWA defines noise impact by two criteria: 1) when the predicted traffic noise levels approach or exceed the applicable Noise Abatement Criteria, or 2) when the predicted traffic noise levels substantially exceed the existing noise levels.

I. Hazardous Material / Waste Sites

The focus of this aspect of the environmental screening of the study area is to identify known or recorded locations where hazardous materials are, or have been, handled, stored or dumped. Improper handling, storage or disposal of hazardous materials can and may have resulted in soil or groundwater contamination and remediation can be costly and time-consuming.

An extensive effort of secondary source data collection and state and federal agency coordination pertaining to potential hazardous material sites within the study area was compiled for the I-71 corridor. The I-71 study identified locations as potential hazardous material sites if one or more of the following conditions exists:

1) The site appears on one or more of the federal or state environmental databases.
2) A reported spill has occurred on the site.
3) The site is known to have a history of industrial use.
A summary of the number of sites identified within each secondary source for the I-71 corridor study area is shown on Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Source</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Number of Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Priority List (NPL)</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS)</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) Treatment, Storage and Disposal (TSD) Facilities</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRIS Large Quantity Generator (LQG) Facility</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS)</td>
<td>U.S. EPA</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Sites List (MSL)</td>
<td>Ohio EPA</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Site (HWS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unregulated Site List</td>
<td>KYDEP</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EPA = Environmental Protection Agency
KYDEP = Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection


**Database Listings**

The following text describes databases reviewed for the presence of sites within the I-71 study area.

- **National Priority List (NPL):** The NPL, also known as the Superfund List, is a U.S. EPA listing of uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites. This list is primarily based on a score that the site receives from the EPA's Hazardous Ranking System. NPL sites are targeted for possible long-term remedial action under the Superfund Act. Review of the NPL database indicated that there are no NPL sites located within the I-71 corridor study area.
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- **Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS):** The CERCLIS list is a compilation of known and suspected uncontrolled or abandoned hazardous waste sites. CERCLIS sites have been investigated, or are currently under investigation by the U.S. EPA for the release or threatened release of hazardous substances. Once a site is placed on CERCLIS, it may be subjected to several levels of review and evaluation and ultimately placed on the NPL. Review of the CERCLIS database indicated that there are six CERCLIS sites located within the I-71 corridor study area, although none were within the Fort Washington Way project vicinity.

- **Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS):** The U.S. EPA RCRIS database contains information pertaining to facilities that either generate, treat, store or dispose of hazardous waste. These sites represent a form of hazardous waste activity, however, they are most significant if they are determined to be out of compliance with regulations established pursuant to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Two of the RCRIS databases were reviewed in detail:
  - the RCRIS TSD List (RCRIS-TSD)
  - the RCRIS LQG List (RCRIS-LQG)

Review of the RCRIS databases indicated that there are 7 RCRIS-TSD sites and 59 RCRIS-LQG sites located within the I-71 corridor study area, although none are within the Fort Washington Way project area vicinity.

- **Master Sites List (MSL):** The MSL is a database developed by the Ohio EPA's Division of Emergency and Remedial Response to list, prioritize and track sites in Ohio the potentially pose a threat to public health and/or the environment from the release or potential release of hazardous wastes or substances to the environment. These are also identified as HWS's. Review of the MSL indicated that there are 13 MSL sites located within the I-71 corridor study area, although none are within the Fort Washington Way project area vicinity.

- **Solid Waste Facilities (SWF):** The Ohio SWF list contains information pertaining to all permitted solid waste landfills and processing facilities operating within the State of Ohio.

The Kentucky SWF report contains summary information pertaining to all registered solid waste landfills and processing facilities operating within the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

- **Registered Underground Storage Tanks (RUST):** The Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Regulations (BUSTR), a division of the State Fire Marshal's office for the State of Ohio, regulates the registration of underground storage tanks (UST's). The Kentucky UST report contains summary information pertaining to all registered UST's located within the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

A review of the maps and listings compiled for the I-71 MIS Corridor indicated that there are no hazardous material / waste sites listed in the Fort Washington Way project area. None of the alternatives are expected to have any impact on hazardous material / waste sites, although a full screening and a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the proposed right-of-way will be required during the environmental assessment studies.
The subsequent environmental phase studies will include, among other data compilation, the following sources not completed for the I-71 MIS Corridor at this time:

- **Oil and Gas Maps**: Oil and gas maps are maintained by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Oil and Gas and the Kentucky Department of Mines and Minerals, Division of Oil and Gas Wells.

- **Fire Insurance Maps**: Data contained in Sanborn Maps covers primarily residential and commercial areas within the incorporated community boundaries within the study area. Sanborn maps for rural areas normally are not available.

- **Visual Inspection**: The visual observation of quantities of hazardous substances or petroleum products on a site is used to confirm those sites suspected to contain hazardous materials which have been identified through secondary source review.

A related concern under this area is the transport of hazardous materials. During the review of the project alternatives, it was learned that the City of Cincinnati has designated a portion of Eggleston Avenue to East Third Street to the Fort Washington Way system as a hazardous cargo route. Some of the current alternatives' connections at the eastern end of the project call for closing the entrance ramp to Fort Washington Way westbound from East Third Street. A new hazardous cargo route will need to be designated if the existing route cannot be accommodated by the proposed project.

### J. Air Quality

Unlike most of the other environmental considerations discussed in this Technical Memorandum, air quality is not primarily a locational constraint for the development and evaluation of transportation solutions for the area. However, it is one of the most important environmental issues for this project, as well as the I-71 and Eastern Corridor MIS studies, in that the development of any alternative transportation solution for the corridor will require the evaluation of air quality impact to ensure conformance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality.

The OKI region (in which the Fort Washington Way project study area is located), is within the Metropolitan Cincinnati Interstate Air Quality Control Region, which has been designated as nonattainment, or failing to attain the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone or smog. Nonattainment areas are grouped into five categories identified as marginal, moderate,
serious, severe and extreme. Each of these categories has requirements for dealing with ozone problems, increasing in proportion to the intensity of the problem. This region has been designated as moderate nonattainment.

Ozone is one of the pollutants for which the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has defined national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). Based on health impacts, the NAAQS specify allowable pollutant concentrations and exposure limitations. Ozone or smog is formed when emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC's) interact with oxides of nitrogen (NOx) in the presence of sunlight. Nearly half of these emissions come from vehicles or mobile sources in urban areas. While technology to reduce vehicle emissions has improved, there are more vehicles on the road and people are driving more.

Since the region has been designated as moderate nonattainment for ozone, several steps have been taken, and are currently in place, that affect transportation planning in the area. In November 1993, OKI adopted a new long-range transportation plan for meeting the region’s transportation needs in the year 2010[1]. This plan put new emphasis on improving the operation of the existing highway network, as opposed to major new highway expansion.

The conformity requirement is one of most important provisions of the CAAA, directly linking air quality and transportation. Conformity is required among transportation plans and programs and the SIP or air quality plan. Conformity is the determination made by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO’s; OKI for this region) and the USDOT that transportation plans and programs in nonattainment areas meet the purpose of the SIP. The conformity assessment must show that transportation investments will not exacerbate air quality violations or delay the attainment of the ozone standard. Conformity is not determined on a project by project basis, but rather involves the regionwide system. For the OKI region, this means that plans must contribute to reducing motor vehicle emissions to meet national air quality standards.

While full air quality analysis is beyond the scope of this environmental screening effort (but will be required of the environmental impact assessment study phase following this MIS), available regional traffic data has been compiled for the Fort Washington Way studies and some initial statements on the potential project air quality impacts of the alternatives can be made.

The regional air quality impact for each alternative will be proportional to changes in traffic volumes and patterns. Subsequent full scale air quality analyses will evaluate both mesoscale or regional changes in air quality (total pollutant emissions) and microscale, or local, changes in carbon monoxide concentrations at specific, representative locations. For this screening evaluation, air quality impact considerations are focused on the alternatives' effects on changing regional traffic volumes. Traffic projections have been prepared for the regional network and projected volumes assigned to key locations indicative of system-wide changes\(^1\). The projected volumes at these key locations under the conditions of each alternative scenario are presented in the following table.

As can be readily seen from the traffic data in this table, the differences among the alternatives at most locations is negligible (on average, less than 1%). The primary conclusion drawn from this traffic projection analysis by KPMG (as presented at the November 22, 1996 Fort Washington Way Subcommittee meeting) was that the alternatives under consideration would not have any significant effect on regional traffic levels. Similarly, the regional air quality changes due to the various alternatives, since directly linked to regional traffic volumes, can be expected not to have any significant impact. This conclusion does not preclude the full scale meso- and microscale analysis that will be required in the environmental phase to evaluate air quality impacts, but does allow for comparison of the alternatives under the screening level of study.

In general, all the Build alternatives provide opportunities for positive impact through more efficient traffic movement and incorporation of other mode (transit) improvements resulting from I-71 MIS Corridor Study.

\(^1\) The traffic projections were prepared by KPMG using the OKI traffic model, and were specifically developed for the alternatives under consideration as defined for the November 22, 1996 Ft. Washington Way Subcommittee Meeting.
## Table 4
### Regional Traffic Volumes for Fort Washington Way Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1A</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3C</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.M. Peak Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 southbound 71/275 xc</td>
<td>21,042</td>
<td>20,805</td>
<td>20,874</td>
<td>20,746</td>
<td>20,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 southbound 71/CCH xc</td>
<td>16,561</td>
<td>16,386</td>
<td>16,526</td>
<td>16,355</td>
<td>16,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 southbound 71/NL xc</td>
<td>14,863</td>
<td>14,611</td>
<td>14,856</td>
<td>14,776</td>
<td>14,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 northbound 71/75/275</td>
<td>18,105</td>
<td>17,966</td>
<td>18,006</td>
<td>18,044</td>
<td>18,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 (OH) westbound</td>
<td>18,453</td>
<td>18,459</td>
<td>18,516</td>
<td>18,473</td>
<td>18,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross County westbound</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>5,502</td>
<td>5,437</td>
<td>5,409</td>
<td>5,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Lateral (westbound)</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>6,363</td>
<td>6,358</td>
<td>6,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 (KY) westbound</td>
<td>11,325</td>
<td>11,275</td>
<td>11,325</td>
<td>11,337</td>
<td>11,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-471 northbound 275/471</td>
<td>19,117</td>
<td>18,885</td>
<td>18,871</td>
<td>18,866</td>
<td>19,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 westbound (CI bridge)</td>
<td>15,282</td>
<td>15,216</td>
<td>15,188</td>
<td>15,131</td>
<td>15,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 southbound 75/275 xc</td>
<td>24,247</td>
<td>24,137</td>
<td>24,299</td>
<td>24,120</td>
<td>24,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 southbound 75/CCH xc</td>
<td>23,908</td>
<td>23,886</td>
<td>23,810</td>
<td>23,808</td>
<td>23,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 southbound 75/NL xc</td>
<td>18,746</td>
<td>18,766</td>
<td>18,730</td>
<td>18,678</td>
<td>18,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 southbound 75/74 xc</td>
<td>25,665</td>
<td>25,546</td>
<td>25,756</td>
<td>25,458</td>
<td>25,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P.M. Peak Period</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 northbound 71/275 xc</td>
<td>23,110</td>
<td>22,808</td>
<td>22,911</td>
<td>22,794</td>
<td>22,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 northbound 71/CCH xc</td>
<td>18,137</td>
<td>17,904</td>
<td>17,974</td>
<td>17,930</td>
<td>17,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 northbound 71/NL xc</td>
<td>17,032</td>
<td>16,845</td>
<td>16,881</td>
<td>16,838</td>
<td>16,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-71 southbound 71/75/275</td>
<td>21,845</td>
<td>21,852</td>
<td>21,773</td>
<td>21,852</td>
<td>21,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross County eastbound</td>
<td>7,508</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>7,506</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>7,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Lateral (eastbound)</td>
<td>8,193</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>8,171</td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 (KY) eastbound</td>
<td>13,708</td>
<td>13,649</td>
<td>13,665</td>
<td>13,587</td>
<td>13,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-471 southbound 275/471</td>
<td>21,146</td>
<td>20,773</td>
<td>20,678</td>
<td>20,799</td>
<td>20,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-275 eastbound (CI bridge)</td>
<td>16,043</td>
<td>15,769</td>
<td>15,755</td>
<td>15,795</td>
<td>15,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 northbound 75/275 xc</td>
<td>28,943</td>
<td>28,883</td>
<td>28,906</td>
<td>29,009</td>
<td>28,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 northbound 75/CCH xc</td>
<td>29,020</td>
<td>29,011</td>
<td>28,882</td>
<td>28,890</td>
<td>28,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 northbound 75/NL xc</td>
<td>22,665</td>
<td>22,533</td>
<td>22,474</td>
<td>22,567</td>
<td>22,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-75 northbound 75/74 xc</td>
<td>31,511</td>
<td>31,110</td>
<td>31,175</td>
<td>31,385</td>
<td>31,027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XC = Interchange
CCH = Cross County Highway
NL = Norwood Lateral
CI Bridge = Combs-Hehl Bridge
Source: KPMG, McLean, Virginia, December 5, 1996, based on project alternatives as defined prior to November 22, 1996 Subcommittee Meeting.
K. Economic Development

One of the prime goals or purposes of the study of Fort Washington Way transportation improvement alternatives is the exploration of reaping positive economic development benefits from narrowing the Fort Washington Way “trench”, including the expansion of developable land along the central riverfront (where Pete Rose Way now exists) and providing opportunity for deck ing portions of area for potential development.

Based on the review of the projected regional traffic volumes (see Table 4 in Section VI. J. of this report), the project’s impact on regional economic development is not expected to vary by alternative Fort Washington Way scenarios, since the traffic data indicates no significant regional differences among the alternative scenarios. However, this conclusion does not extend to more localized economic development impact that could occur in a direct response to changes in the roadway network and access provisions under each alternative improvement plan. The focus of this aspect of the environmental screening, then, is on potential local economic development impacts.

In general, all the Build alternatives will have a positive impact on improving the development potential of the riverfront area south of Third Street through the improvement of north-south access to/from the CBD and the river across Fort Washington Way. Also, in that the Build alternatives 1) have been conceptually designed to accommodate all existing travel demands and access to the Fort Washington Way network (although varying in access configurations by alternative plan), and 2) require relatively minimum new right-of-way from existing developed areas, there are no adverse economic development impacts anticipated by any of the alternatives.

Specific differences among the Build alternatives in terms of local economic impact are in terms of building takes and removal of existing parking areas due to right-of-way requirements (see Exhibit 8). All the Build alternatives, 1A, 2, 3C and 5, include removal of on-street (metered) parking on Central Parkway, which could have an adverse economic impact on the local businesses on Central Parkway (same impact for all Build alternatives). Although at this stage of the study final lane details are not completely resolved, it is expected that all the Build alternatives will also require the removal of on-street parking along Third Street. In addition, the eastern and western connection options under study for Alternative 5, and potentially applicable to Alternatives 2 and 3C, require the removal of some commercial off-street parking lot areas in the vicinity of Third Street and Central Avenue, 6th Street and Eggleston Avenue, and 9th Street, east of Eggleston.
However, it should be noted that some of the area opened for development by the narrowing of the Fort Washington Way footprint by the Build alternatives is envisioned to allow for the replacement of lost parking and re-development plans for the stadiums and other new riverfront development will provide additional opportunities to mitigate parking losses anticipated due to the Fort Washington Way transportation improvements. For these reasons, the economic impact of loss of parking, especially along Third Street is not expected to be significant for any of the alternatives.

Based on information currently available (i.e., riverfront development, stadium siting information still under study), there is no significant difference among alternatives in terms of economic development impact. All the Build alternatives provide some opportunities for positive impact through the creation of developable areas and the improvement of traffic flow and access. The environmental phase studies will need to fully evaluate both regional and local economic development impacts.

L. Visual and Aesthetics

Another prime goal or important community issue identified for the Fort Washington Way study as part of the project problem statement is the need to address the “visual and physical barrier between the Cincinnati CBD and the riverfront” (from the Draft Problem Statement for the Fort Washington Way Subcorridor Analysis, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade and Douglas, November, 1996). Although visual and aesthetic considerations are subjective by nature, this aspect of the project is an important issue and the project’s impact on visual and aesthetic conditions will be required to be addressed in the environmental assessment phase studies.

The evaluation of visual and aesthetic impacts focuses on the alternatives’ effects on 1) the view of the road, and 2) the view from the road. From this environmental screening level of effort, Build alternatives that narrow the Fort Washington Way roadway network, provide opportunities for decking and landscaping, and open the view to the riverfront will have positive impacts on the view of the road. Build alternatives that improve the drivers’ perspective by simplifying the travel decision-making process through the elimination of confusing entrance and exit weaving maneuvers in the trench area will provide positive impact on the view from the road.

In general, Build alternatives 2, 3C and 5 provide varying levels of opportunities to improve visual and aesthetic characteristics of the Fort Washington Way roadway network. From the environmental screening level of effort, the differences among the alternatives cannot be fully
addressed, except to note that the level and difference in visual and aesthetic impact is not considered to be significant.

M. Transportation Patterns and Facilities

Considerable effort and coordination between the project team and Ft. Washington Way Subcommittee members and with the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, the Ohio Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration has been conducted to ensure that the Build alternatives under consideration, Alternatives 2, 3C and 5, address all the major travel component needs of the Ft. Washington Way network, specifically in terms providing for all existing access connections and maintaining facilities for all interstate, regional and local through movement demands. In this regard, these alternatives are considered equal in terms of meeting the transportation goals of the project[1].

A few changes in local access will need to be further assessed in subsequent alternative development and in the environmental studies that will follow the MIS. For the most part, these local access changes are outside the existing Ft. Washington Way footprint area and are part of the eastern and western connection components described for Alternative 5 (although potentially applicable to 2 and 3C also). One change in particular that has only been recently proposed as a result of efforts to improve the western linkages to I-75, US 50 and the Fifth Street exit ramp from I-75 northbound will require the closing of John Street just south of Fifth Street (John Street currently extends two blocks north-south between Third and Fifth Streets, parallel and one block west of Central Avenue). The significance of this change will need to be further explored, in that this connection is currently used as part of the Cincinnati Metro (bus) route downtown loop between Third and Fifth, as well as access between the CBD and the Clay Wade Bailey Bridge via Third to Fifth Street.

Other changes in local access, specifically related to downtown to riverfront connections are still under development continent on recommendations on stadium siting expected in the next few weeks.

[1] Although an important element of the evaluation of alternatives, quantitative level of service measurement or the determination of how well each alternative addresses the transportation goals is not a part of the environmental screening; for the purposes of this aspect of the environmental screening, it is assumed that the three Build alternatives, 2, 3C and 5, fully address the transportation needs of Ft. Washington Way.
N. Pedestrian Patterns and Access

Like the discussion of transportation facilities above, the focus of the environmental screening review of pedestrian patterns and access is on the alternatives' abilities to maintain existing access and to provide opportunities for improved access, particularly across the Ft. Washington Way roadway system. At this stage of alternative development, it is anticipated that all the Build alternatives are capable of providing for both existing pedestrian needs and for improving pedestrian access between the downtown CBD area and the riverfront (although each alternative includes specific changes to existing pedestrian facilities related to sidewalks along roadway changes proposed).

The existing pedestrian skywalks, sidewalks along surface streets and staircases over Ft. Washington Way accessing the existing stadium, coliseum and riverfront parking have been incorporated into all the Build alternatives, although it is realized that changes in the skywalk pedestrian access to the riverfront will depend on the results of riverfront redevelopment, especially the stadium siting studies underway.

For this element of the environmental screening, no significant impacts or differences among the alternatives are noted.

O. Construction Impacts

Transportation projects of this magnitude will have construction impacts on various environmental concerns such as air quality, noise, and maintenance of traffic during construction. Construction impacts will need to be fully addressed in the environmental assessment study phase. In this screening review, based on information that is available, the differences among the Build alternatives, 2, 3C and 5, are not expected to be significant, except as the differences relate to the eastern and western connection components developed for Alternative 5. In that construction impacts are usually temporary or short term, the primary differences among the Build alternatives will be in terms of length of construction and the resultant effects due to disruption of transportation service. In general, the construction of these components would likely have the most widespread impact on traffic maintenance plans and the effect on I-71, I-471 and I-75 traffic.

Maintenance of traffic plans will be developed for any Build alternatives that are further pursued, as well as the No Build, since it requires the complete rehabilitation of the existing Ft. Washington Way facilities. These plans will address the need to provide safe, convenient temporary facilities for
local and through traffic and pedestrians, with the least possible obstruction at all times to traffic
during the construction period. These plans will include specifications to allow for the maintenance
of safety practices, devices and equipment necessary to protect the public and property in connection
with the work.

P. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures that will need to be further pursued during the environmental assessment
phase will need to include:

- replacement of parkland lost (Alternative 5);
- potential mitigation of adverse impact to Section 4(f)/106 historic resources;
- noise abatement such as the consideration of noise barriers; and
- construction impact mitigation include construction procedures and maintenance of traffic
  plans.

Based on the screening information available, there are no conclusive differences among the
Build alternatives (other than the parkland impact of Alternative 5) concerning potential mitigation
requirements noted.

VII. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING

Based on this environmental screening, none of the alternatives under consideration are expected to
result in significant adverse social, economic or environmental impact. No “fatal flaws” in terms of
environmental impact have been identified for any of the alternatives considered. Section 4(f) involvement
has been identified for Alternative 5 due to its requirement of two small parks located within the existing
Ft. Washington Way footprint (adjacent to the south side of Third Street); however, this Section 4(f)
involvement is not expected to be a “fatal flaw,” primarily since this impact is somewhat mitigated by the
fact that these parks are actually part of the state-owned, existing transportation right-of-way. Of the most
critical environmental concern is the potential for Section 4(f)/106 involvement with National Register of
Historic Place sites located immediately north of the existing Ft. Washington Way and with the Roebling
Suspension Bridge, to the south. Although none of the Build alternatives will physically impact any of
these historic resources, at this level of study and without further coordination with the Ohio Historic
Preservation Office, the potential for adverse effects on these resources cannot be predicted.
The full evaluation of how well the current alternatives address transportation and community issues identified in this MIS as important elements of the problem statement is beyond the scope of the environmental screening and will be covered through the remaining elements of the MIS study. However, to some extent, part of this evaluation overlaps with the environmental screening.

Neither Alternative 1, the No Build, nor Alternative 1A, Transportation System Management, fully address the transportation and community issues identified in this MIS as important elements of the problem statement. Specifically, both alternatives fail to correct the existing Ft. Washington Way geometric design standard deficiencies, do not improve connections between the CBD and the central riverfront, and do not facilitate riverfront development opportunities. The resultant, potential adverse environmental impact will need to be further evaluated in the environmental assessment phase, specifically related to air quality and economic development.

As mentioned in Section I of this report, Alternative 1A has been incorporated into the remaining Build alternatives, 2, 3C and 5. In that these three Build alternatives, Alternatives 2, 3C and 5, have been specifically designed to address the transportation and community issues identified in this MIS, these alternatives are expected to provide some benefit to air quality and economic development.

There are no significant differences among the Build alternatives for the environmental impact categories evaluated. After the project proceeds through the MIS process, a full environmental assessment will be required if federal funding is pursued for implementation of the improvement.
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APPENDIX A

Alternatives Under Consideration
Fort Washington Way Subcorridor Analysis

Detailed Definition of Alternatives

December 4, 1996

Conceptual Alternatives for Further Consideration

Alternative 1: No Build

Implement planned rehabilitation of Fort Washington Way

Alternative 1A: Transportation System Management (TSM)

Implement the enhanced bus system, ITS components, and other features of the I-71 Corridor TSM Alternative.

Remove the exclusive bus ramps into the Dixie Terminal for TANK buses.

Supplement rehabilitated Fort Washington Way with an upgraded east/west urban boulevard at Central Parkway by removing on-street parking, creating one additional through-lane in each direction. Maintain current left-turn bays.

Alternative 2: Minimum Build (Relocate Pete Rose Way)

Implement all of the features of Alternative 1A.

Reconfigure Pete Rose Way, shifting it approximately 150 feet north and widening it between Race and Main Streets.

Maintain existing Pete Rose Way as a two-lane service road.


Close/eliminate the following connections:
  - Race Street on-ramp to I-71 northbound.
  - Eastbound and westbound exit ramps from I-71 to the Roebling Suspension Bridge.

Alternative 3C: Relocate Pete Rose Way/Retain I-71 and U.S. 50 in Narrowed Fort Washington Way

Implement all the features of Alternative 1A.

Maintain both I-71 and U.S. 50/Columbia Parkway in Fort Washington Way trench.
Shift I-71 northbound (eastbound) lanes to the north.

Reclaim approximately 100 feet of former Fort Washington Way right-of-way.

Maintain Third Street existing width and direction (one-way eastbound).

Reconfigure Pete Rose Way, shifting it approximately 250 feet notch and widening it between Race and Main Streets.

Maintain Pete Rose Way as a two-way street.

Close/eliminate the following connections:
- Race Street on-ramp to I-71 northbound.
- Eastbound and westbound exit ramps from I-71 to the Roebling Suspension Bridge.
- Walnut Street on-ramp to southbound I-71, northbound I-71 and eastbound U.S. 50.
- Main Street on-ramp to northbound I-71.

Notes: No direct connections between I-71 and the Suspension Bridge. Indirect connections provided. Alternative 3C does not preclude options to connect with a new Madison-Race bridge, proposed under two of the I-71 Corridor Study alternatives.

Alternative 5: Relocate I-71/Retain U.S. 50/Narrow Fort Washington Way

Implement all the features of Alternative 1A.

Expand Third Street and create a new Second Street parallel to Pete Rose Way, resulting in a one-way pair of 3-5 lane arterials with Third street westbound and Second Street eastbound.

Redesign the remaining through movements in Fort Washington Way with three lanes in each direction, reducing the required roadway width.

Reclaim approximately 200-300 feet of former Fort Washington Way right-of-way.

Extend downtown north-south streets across Fort Washington Way.

Signalize every intersection of the new arterials with extended City streets, and synchronize the signals.

Improve truck access to Fort Washington Way.

Add a new ramp from I-471 north to Ninth Street.

Add a ramp from I-71 southbound to Sixth Street.

Add one lane on U.S. 50 westbound ramp to Sixth Street exit.

Add one lane on I-471 northbound ramp to Sixth Street exit.
Maintain westbound CBD-destination Columbia Parkway traffic on Fifth to Fourth Streets.

Signage directing former Fort Washington Way/I-71 traffic to:
  • I-471, or
  • I-275 (Kentucky), or
  • I-75/Norwood Lateral (Ohio), or
  • I-75/Cross-Country Highway (Ohio), or
  • I-75/I-275 (Ohio).

Direct connections to and from:
  • I-71 northbound and southbound
  • U.S. 42 and 127 (Clay Wade Bailey Bridge) northbound

Second Street directly and indirectly from Main Street

Indirect connections to and from:
  • Walnut Street, Vine Street, Race Street, Elm Street Roebling Bridge
  • U.S. 27 / Taylor-Southgate Bridge
  • I-471 northbound and southbound
  • Columbia Parkway
  • U.S. 52
  • Pete Rose Way

Notes: Alternative 5 does not preclude options to connect with a new Madison-Race bridge, proposed under two of the I-71 Corridor Study alternatives.