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STATE ROUTE 4 - BEFORE AND AFTER

MODERNIZATION OF INTERSTATE 75
DAYTON, OHIO
PHASE 1A

BEFORE

AFTER
AESTHETIC DESIGN PROCESS
The city of Dayton and ODOT have been working with community stakeholders to create significant design concepts for Interstate 75 as it is rebuilt through the city. ODOT has carefully redesigned the I-75 corridor incorporating modern safety and engineering features. Because we understand the impact the project will have on the city, it is important to incorporate aesthetic features into the project. These concepts integrate the use of pattern, color, texture, relief and proportion throughout the project. The resulting treatments will be applied throughout all three phases of the project and will create an attractive and cohesive public works project that will help portray the character of the city for many years to come.

EVALUATE THE PROJECT’S NEEDS
This is the largest public works project to impact the city of Dayton in this generation. ODOT will provide the citizens of Dayton with a well designed corridor that coincides with the aesthetic direction the city is moving toward. To fulfill this goal, ODOT met with the stakeholders in the affected neighborhoods, Dayton city officials and local business partners to define the stakeholders vision and identify the aesthetic treatments that will work with the elements we have available on the project.

Over the past few months, ODOT has worked closely with the city of Dayton to fine tune and agree on the concepts that will be applied to the elements we have available on this project.

In each section, three images are illustrated; the current state of the area, the aesthetic proposal by the city and the treatment agreed upon by the city and ODOT. These treatments will be used as appropriate on all three phases of the project. The aesthetic design concepts of the I-75 project will confirm:

- ODOT has developed a coherent, consistent aesthetic theme throughout the project
- Areas of special treatment include the Main Street Bridge and the Great Miami River Bridge
- Decorative lighting will be applied under the Main Street Bridge and at the abutments
- Treatments on retaining walls, noise walls, bridge abutments and other highly visible areas will be cohesive and specific to Dayton.

EXISTING OHIO HIGHWAY, I-71 COLUMBUS.

RENDERING OF PROPOSED AESTHETIC TREATMENTS.

ILLUSTRATION DEPICTING THE LARGEST PROJECT ELEMENTS: PAVEMENT RIBBON, SIDE SLOPES, VEGETATION AND BRIDGE STRUCTURES, I-270 COLUMBUS.
This booklet is presented to define the proposed concepts for the aesthetic portion of I-75 Dayton project.

The city of Dayton, along with the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission, presented aesthetic concepts to ODOT. These concepts were part of the long range Renaissance Plan under development by the city of Dayton. ODOT was interested in using those plans along with community input to develop the final aesthetic plan for all three phases of the project. A series of Public Involvement meetings were held between the months of April and November of 2005 to gather this input.

ODOT then fused the public comment with the designs provided by the city of Dayton and created preliminary concepts we felt addressed the concerns of the community while maintaining the integrity of the city of Dayton's original design.

These concepts were presented at a public involvement meeting held at the Dayton Art Institute in September 2005. This meeting was attended by members of the community, Dayton City officials and representatives of CH2M Hill, the consultants who were creating the plans for the project. Responses from this meeting and the additional public involvement meetings led to the redesign of several earlier ODOT concepts.

Based on information gathered from public meetings and conversations with Dayton City officials, as well as designs provided by the city of Dayton, it was clear that the Dayton Art Institute (DAI) was the ‘gem’ of the city. This would be the basis for design concepts for the project. The distinct architectural style of the DAI is easily identifiable and adapts readily to the various structural elements throughout the project. Colors for the project were chosen to reflect and compliment the actual colors of the DAI.

The following concepts illustrate the progression in the design process.
McPherson Town

Image 1 depicts the existing area.

Image 2 is the original concept proposed by the Miami Regional Planning Commission and the City of Dayton (this image also shows proposed sections of Phase 2 bridge abutments which is beyond the scope of current discussions).

Image 3 shows the noise barrier from the highway-side. The relief on this side will have the greatest depth (3 inches). This is because the wall will be viewed at higher speeds and the casting can only be done on one side. The pedestrian side will have a shallower relief (½ inch). This is because the pattern will be "rolled" on this side of the wall before the concrete sets. It is also because local and pedestrian traffic will view the wall at slower speeds and there is the possibility of the wall being obscured by vegetation. This concept was reached by consensus between ODOT and Dayton city officials.

McPherson Town aesthetic treatment (McPherson Town (Summer 2004))

McPherson Town aesthetic treatment (Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission/City of Dayton/HOK Planning Group)

McPherson Town aesthetic treatment (Revised Concept March 2006)

**LEGEND**

1) Site as is
2) Concepts proposed by Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission/City of Dayton.
3) Concepts reached by consensus with ODOT/City of Dayton.
Image 1 depicts the existing Main Street bridge.

Image 2 is the original concept proposed by the Miami Regional Planning Commission and the City of Dayton.

Image 3 shows concept from Creative Design Resolutions.

Image 4 represents the results-to-date of meetings with all parties involved. The City of Dayton was presented with three options for abutment treatments for this location. The preferred selection was option “A” with arches flush with the wall panels under the bridge. Lighting under the bridge will be standard and lighting on the outside of the abutment is being considered. This treatment is awaiting comment from Dayton city officials.

LEGEND
1) Existing site
2) Concept proposed by Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission/City of Dayton.
3) Concept proposed by Creative Design Resolutions
4) Concept of Option “A” selected by the City of Dayton
Image 1 shows existing piers. Image 2 is the original concept proposed by the Miami Regional Planning Commission and the City of Dayton. It shows a tapered pier with pilasters extending beyond the bridge width as supports for external lighting. Constructability was an issue as the piers could not extend beyond the width of the bridge itself.

Image 3 is a concept developed after conversations with several formliner manufacturers. Because the radius of the pier “bullnose” area is too tight to accommodate a vertical mortar joint or a deep relief, it was recommended that the “bullnose” of the pier be the sandblasted surface on both tiers, with the shallow relief stone face being on the flat surface of the upper tier and the heavier relief surface on the lower tier. This concept also addresses the width issue and incorporates as much of the original proposal as possible. Any other variations from image 2 are because of constructability. This revision has been produced and is currently awaiting comment from Dayton city officials.

LEGEND
1) Site as is
2) Concepts proposed by Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission/City of Dayton.
3) Concepts from CH2M Hill/ODOT.
Image 1 shows the existing area.

Image 2 and 2a show retaining wall aesthetic treatment.

LEGEND
1) Site as is
2) Concepts reached by consensus with ODOT/City of Dayton.
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