



**MEETING SUMMARY
MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE
PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)
MEETING #7
August 13, 2009**

The Milton-Madison Project Advisory Group (PAG) had its seventh meeting at the Milton Baptist Church Fellowship Hall in Milton, KY on August 13, 2009, at 6:30 PM. The meeting agenda included the following items: status of the environmental tasks, results of the foundation analysis, historic bridge maintenance costs, new alternatives suggested after the alternatives report, alignments for the remaining alternatives, and a proposed action for the project.

Eighteen (18) members of the PAG and forty-seven (47) members of the public signed in at the meeting. A list of attendees is attached to this summary.

John Carr opened the meeting and welcomed PAG members and public observers. He introduced the local officials in attendance and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. No one signed up for the public comment period at this point in the meeting.

Tim Sorenson provided an overview of the activities since the last PAG meeting, such as the mussel survey, sonar scan, archaeology predictive model, survey of historic structures, and compilation of project sheets for each structure which will be used at the Section 106 Eligibility Meeting.

Tim S. gave a summary of the pier analysis report, indicating that Piers 6-8 are in good shape. He explained the mitigation measures that would be needed to reuse the piers for the Superstructure Replacement option. Questions included the following:

- How much does the pier mitigation add to the cost of Superstructure Replacement?

The cost is about \$17 million to retrofit the piers; we will show an additional table with all of the cost information later in the presentation.

Tim S. reviewed the historical maintenance costs for the existing bridge. Questions included the following:

- Are the same inspections required even if the traffic is different (pedestrian vs. vehicle) going across the bridge?

Yes.

- Would the \$10 million deck rehab also be required?

Deck rehabilitation would still be required; the timing of this would change based on the loading (pedestrian vs. vehicle).

John Mettille discussed the requirements to engage Environmental Justice (EJ) populations during the project. He explained the project map showing EJ communities within the project area. John asked the PAG members for ideas about how to reach these populations in the local communities:

- Would targeted mailing be cost prohibitive?

This is something we can look into.

- Public comment: A lot of these areas are occupied by weekenders who do not see the local news. You may want to contact the owners of these parks.

Tim S. reviewed the location alternatives suggested since the last PAG meeting. An alternative at the end of Fulton Street would require a loop over SR 56 to reach the grade of the existing road. This would require a cut into the hill and would likely be cost prohibitive. Another alternative was suggested just to the east of the power plant. This alternative would not meet purpose and need, and the cost would likely be prohibitive.

Tim S. reviewed the work on the detailed alternatives that has been completed since the last PAG meeting. He provided an explanation of the big-picture for the alternatives, and then gave a detailed explanation for each alternative on both sides of the river. Tim also provided an overview of the NEPA impacts for the Superstructure with Full Approaches, Tiber Creek (A and B), and Canip Creek Alternatives.

Questions included the following:

Superstructure Replacement with Full Approaches

- On the IN side, are there houses coming down SR 56?
We would try to leave the property by the stone wall.
- On the IN side, what about the houses on the south side of SR 56?
There would probably be 3 that would be taken.
- On the IN side, what about within the triangle (between 2nd St. and Main St.)?
Yes, there a few houses that would need to be taken.
- Are we going to dig back into the hill along SR 56 to have the same cross-section as the bridge?
Yes, we would use the 56-foot cross-section.
- Going up to the T-intersection, how tight would the turn be for trucks and emergency vehicles?
This would be a modern, standard intersection that would allow for truck traffic.

Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches

- Would the full approaches be possible in the future if this option were selected?
We don't have a full answer to this, but it would be feasible to come back in the future and expand the approaches.
- Could the IN approach also be expanded in the future?
Yes.
- We still have the issue of the approach turns on the IN side. This alternative does not address this.
- On the IN side, is there any possibility to expand this one to the next intersection at Second Street?
This is something we can consider.

- We are limited on the Baltimore corner of the Second Street intersection.

Tiber Creek A

- If the old bridge is preserved, would the new bridge have piers that line up with the old bridge?

We would have to work this out with the Coast Guard. The horizontal clearance alignment for a new bridge is 900'; the old bridge clearance is 700'.

- Would this add cost to the project?

If the new bridge had a horizontal clearance of 700' like the old bridge, it would actually save some money since the main span of the bridge would be shorter.

Tiber Creek B

The PAG did not have any questions or comments on this alternative.

Canip Creek

- What about the prime farmlands in this area?

This alternative crosses through part of the farmland in this area.

Tim S. then provided a review of the cost estimates for the identified alternatives. Questions included the following:

- Would the ferry be free?

Yes, it would be covered as a cost of the project.

- Would a toll still be used, even if the least expensive option is selected?

Tolling will still be considered as part of the project.

- What is the largest sized vehicle you would put on a ferry?

Normally a panel truck would be largest and this would include ambulances. We are not sure whether fire trucks would be permitted on a ferry.

- You won't be able to handle the current volume of traffic with a ferry.

That is probably correct.

- Would this be a 24-hour service?

For this cost estimate, we assumed it would be a 24-hour service for 12 months. We assumed two ferries in the estimate, with one based on each side of the river.

- Does this include the approach work for the ferries?

The \$2 million cost estimate is for operation of the ferry; the approach work is included in the "Other" category in the cost estimate.

- Where would the ferry landings be located?

We are still studying the possible ferry locations and potential impacts.

Tim S. discussed the potential parcel impacts for each of the identified alternatives. John C. indicated that the table includes WSA's estimate of the number of Eligible or Contributing resources within each alternative. Eligible and contributing resources will be further discussed with the Section 106 parties at the Eligibility Workshop at the end of the month. Tim S. also reviewed the Section 110 and Section 4(f) considerations.

Tim S. then explained the Proposed Action for the project: the Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches. He reviewed the requirements for the TIGER Grant program. Questions and comments from the PAG members included the following:

- What has to be completed by September 15th?

The Tiger Grant application has to be completed by September 15th. This includes a letter that explains the project, an estimated cost, estimated benefits of the project, safety improvements, infrastructure improvements, and other information.

- When do the Section 106 and NEPA processes wrap-up?

We need to have the NEPA document complete in early 2010. The TIGER funding requires that the project be complete and open in 2012.

- With this timeframe, can you meet the Section 106 process requirements with appropriate review times?

We are currently working on a schedule that will provide a full Section 106 process before the completion of the NEPA document.

- It seems that the Section 106 impact would be less with this alternative, since there are no direct impacts to properties.

That is correct. The primary impacts would be visual.

- How much money would the states request in the grant application?

We would ask for about \$100 million and the states would match the rest.

Tim S. then reviewed the next steps that we will need to undertake to meet these deadlines, including letters of support from the local community. He emphasized that we will complete the NEPA, Section 106, and 6002 processes as part of this project. Questions from the PAG included the following:

- If we go through the accelerated process and do not win the grant, what will happen?

We should know by January if the project is awarded a grant. If we do not win, the states will then work toward getting the funds programmed into the state budgets.

- Can the TIGER Grant money go towards new bridges?

It can go toward a new bridge, if it replaces an old bridge. In the scoring of the grants, you get additional points for replacing old infrastructure. Since the funding requires the project to be complete by 2012, the alternatives that require right-of-way acquisition would likely not fit within the timeframe.

- If we win the grant, would each state handle its own approaches?

Yes, each state would handle its own approach beyond the touchdown points.

- Does the TIGER grant allow for early acquisition of right-of-way?

The project itself will be on a fast track, and early acquisition of right-of-way would not help at this point. In the past, the right-of-way process has taken up to 5 or 6 years for a large project such as this.

- Would the TIGER grant eliminate the need for tolls on the new bridge?

Yes.

- JB Williams indicated that construction would have to begin in the second quarter of 2010 in order to be complete by 2012.

- Have KY and IN agreed to provide the rest of the money if we win the grant?

Yes, the states are in agreement on this.

- What is the expected service life of the Superstructure Replacement bridge? What will the weight limit be?

The lifespan will be over 80 years. There will not be a weight limit for the bridge, beyond what is normal for a bridge.

- There is still concern about the turns on the IN side and this project does not address that.

This project is considered a project of independent utility, meaning that it can function without adjacent improvements. This does not preclude any future improvements on either side of the river that each state may want to undertake.

- How much longer would it take to do the approaches on either side?

We are unsure about this, since the resolution of right-of-way and historic issues are unknown at this point.

- We are facing a question of known funding now or unknown funding later.

That is correct.

- Is there any funding set aside now for the project?

There is funding for the environmental process that we are going through now. Otherwise, KY gets \$50 million in bridge replacement funds a year and there are over 10,000 bridges in the state.

- Can you foresee anyone not wanting to pursue this money?

The two states came to the same conclusion.

- Will this have any impact on anything historic?

The bridge itself would be impacted. We will also work with the Section 106 parties on the visual impact of a new bridge. The bridge type selection process showed us that there was some preference for a similar bridge at the existing location.

- Why would you want a bridge like the one you already have? It's going to have to be painted and there will be pigeon problems.

There are new and improved paint systems in use now. Even the new paints are more resistant to the corrosion of pigeon droppings.

JB Williams indicated that any structure we put back would have to be a steel structure because of weight.

- Is there a cap for each state out of the \$1.5 billion in TIGER grant funding?
There is cap of \$300 million for each state.
- Will there be a lot of grant applications from each state?
Kentucky is going after very few of these grants and we are getting nowhere near the cap of \$300 million. We think this project is unique because the two states are coming together for the application. We also need to get letters of support from the community.
- Will there be results from the current in-depth inspection that could add information to the grant?
The field work for the in-depth inspection should be completed by tomorrow (August 14th). The report will probably not be ready until September, but we will try to use some of the results in the grant application.
- What types of issues would keep you from applying for a grant?
Two items to consider could be: 1) if we find a fatal flaw in trying to get the environmental work done, or 2) if we identify a flaw in the constructability of the bridge.
- Would you continue with the grant application without the support of the SHPOs?
The states are committed to applying. The KY SHPO has indicated that they will work with us to resolve any issues and will not throw up any barriers to the application.
- Would this option be acceptable to the Coast Guard?
We will coordinate with the Coast Guard on this approach.
- Is this the way we are going to go at this time?
This is our proposed action for the project, but we still have to go through the NEPA, Section 106, and agency processes.
- Will we still have PAG meetings?
We will probably have a PAG meeting after the submission of the grant application in September. We want to keep the PAG and the public involved. The PAG has been very gracious with their time, and their continued participation on this will be invaluable. The local officials have also been very helpful throughout the process.
- Would it help if the PAG went on record to support the submission?
Yes, this would be positive for the grant application. (Note: A straw poll showed that all but three of the attending members would support a resolution from the PAG.)
- A representative from Congressman Hill's office indicated that the Congressman is willing to support the grant application as well.
- This is not the best choice for the project, but it looks like the best chance to get funding.
- It is great that the team has taken on this challenge to go after the TIGER grant. It would be ideal to have the approaches at the same time, but it would be best to have a good bridge for starters. If you didn't have to consider the approaches, could you come up with other solutions on the KY side?
Judge Stevens answered this by saying that all the KY options end at Milton Hill, which is another problem that should be resolved at another time.

With no further questions or comments from the PAG members, public attendees were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments:

- The leadership of Grote Industries supports whatever can happen to get a replacement bridge. Thank you for your comments.

- The outcome of the project was pre-determined before this process started. This option will put the bridge in the floodplain on the KY side. The costs shown for the alternatives are not correct.

The project team is made up of professional engineers who take their responsibilities very seriously. The information we present is the best to our knowledge at this time. Thank you for your comments.

- After watching the flood of 1997, the water comes up on the KY side very quickly. If you are not going to change the approaches, will the KY side be flooded?

If there is a flood of that magnitude, the KY approach to the bridge would be underwater.

- Does the team have the results of the public input from the last public meeting in Madison? The team has done away with public opinion in recommending the proposed action. I am worried about putting a heavier bridge on old piers.

We do not have the meeting summary here tonight, but we have all of this documented in our reports. Thank you for your comments.

Post-meeting note: There was one comment about the Superstructure Replacement option that was submitted at the May 19, 2009 Public Meeting:

- Building on the same piers would cause economic damage to the local communities, and a ferry service could not support the existing traffic.

There were also comments and questions about the Superstructure Replacement option that were submitted during the June 2, 2009 Online Forum:

- My wife and I live two lots east of the bridge and we hope that a new bridge is not built on the existing piers.
- If a new bridge is built on the existing piers, what mitigation might be undertaken to offset the loss of the old bridge?
- If a new bridge is built on the existing piers, would a ferry be provided during construction?
- Take it straight through Madison on 421.

- What is the timeframe for the 15-ton restriction on the bridge? When construction starts, when will the bridge be closed to traffic?

The in-depth inspection is going on now, and the load rating will be re-evaluated after this inspection is complete. The piers would be worked on first, and some time early in 2011 the bridge would be closed to traffic for about 12 months. The target date for having the majority of the construction complete would be February 2012; although we would like to use contractor incentives to reduce the 12-month closure time.

- What happens if we don't get the TIGER grant? Do we go back to the other alternatives?

We would continue the process to its conclusion.

- What information shows that the bridge is in bad shape?

The inspection this spring brought on the repairs this summer. The in-depth inspection will show what other repairs are needed. The lifespan is probably no more than 2025, but we will know more about this after the in-depth inspection.

- Would the 2025 lifespan be with the continued 15-ton weight limit?

We will have to see the results of the in-depth inspection to determine this.

- If you could get everyone to agree to sell their properties, could we move forward with the alternatives that require new right-of-way?

There are federal laws that dictate a specific process for buying right-of-way. Unfortunately, we can not just get a verbal agreement from them.

- What if I personally give you the property on the KY side for the Canip Creek alternative?

That is very gracious, but there are many other people that we would need to coordinate with for right-of-way acquisition.

- How long would it take to build a new bridge on a new location?

It would take about a year longer to build a new bridge.

- What about the effects on local businesses?

There is no question that there will be impacts to local businesses. We will do what we can with the ferry service to help mitigate this.

- What is the blue square by the KY ramp?

This is the Third Street historic district. It is made up of 3 properties. There used to be more properties, but they are gone now.

- Would there be properties affected by bringing the bridge up out of the floodplain on the KY side?

There are both businesses and residential properties that would be affected.

- The Superstructure Replacement option does not preclude future improvements to the approaches?

When funding becomes available to the two states, they could make improvements as they see fit.

- It will be difficult to sell this recommendation in the community without hearing the presentation. The community thinks that this option is throwing away money.

Are you suggesting an opportunity for the public to hear the presentation? The states have put in an extra level of study to understand the situation with the piers. We will look for ways to share this information with the public.

- Can you use the PAG to carry your message?

Yes, the PAG helps us share and gather information.

With no further questions or comments from the public, the meeting was dismissed at 8:50 p.m. There were no comment forms submitted by the PAG or the Public during the meeting.

PAG MEETING #7 ATTENDEES

PAG Members

Agency	Member	Member Attended	Substitute	Sub. Attended
Auxier Gas	Warren Auxier	X		
Dow Corning	Bob McKinney	X		
EDP	Corey Murphy	X		
Farmers Bank	Neil Bryan	X		
Hanover College	Larry DeBuhr	X		
Historic Madison	John Staicer		Heidi Kruggel	X
E-ON US	David Pennybaker	X		
Jefferson Co. EM	Dave Bell			
King's Daughters	Roger Allman	X		
Madison Bicycle	Rick Lostutter			
Madison Chamber	Kevin Watkins	X		
Madison Public Works	Randy Eggenstiller	X		
Milton Fire	Ronnie Barnes	X		
Inland Marine	Robert Nolan			
Tandy's Trucking	Bruce Tandy			
Trimble Fiscal Court	Nolan Hamilton	X		
Trimble Historic	Nathaniel Adams	X		
Woodburn, Kyle	Peter Woodburn	X		
Riverside Produce	Kenneth McCoy	X		
Regatta & Citizen	Sue Fisher			
Overton Farms & Citizen	Jim Overton	X		
Citizen	Carla Goins	X		
Citizen	Ann Grahn			
Citizen	Jim Juricic	X		

Project Team

Name	Organization
Gary Valentine	KYTC
Andrea Clifford	KYTC
Tim Foreman	KYTC
David Waldner	KYTC
Mary Jackman	INDOT
Marvin Jenkins	INDOT
Ben Lawrence	INDOT
Steve Smith	INDOT
John Carr	Wilbur Smith Associates
Harry Fox	Wilbur Smith Associates
John Mettelle	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Thompson	Wilbur Smith Associates
Tim Sorenson	Wilbur Smith Associates
Samantha Wright	Wilbur Smith Associates
Aaron Stover	Michael Baker Jr. Engineers
JB Williams	Michael Baker Jr. Engineers
Kathy Francis	Doe Anderson

Public Attendees

Name	Organization
Wilma Boyer	
Bob Boyer	
Carol Becker	
Nancy Ward	
John Hillery	
Donnie Oakley	Mayor, City of Milton
Shannon Hoskins	City of Milton
Mike Beard	
Darrel Henderson	Madison Council, Milton Auto Sales
Patty Jackson	Riverside Produce
Shirley Hamilton	
George Freeman	Section 106
Harold Butler	
Larry Truax	Grote Industries
David Scott	
Vickie Young	
PM Cunningham	
Rodney Booth	
Joe Craig	Jefferson Co. Council
Charles McCoy	
Jerry Richter	Prescription Soils LLC
Bill Henderson	
Joe Wentworth	Wentworth Contracting
Jerry Harmon	Milton City Commissioner
Pete Backus	Madison City Council
Dave Taylor	
Cheryl Taylor	
Peggy Vlerebourne	
David Collier	Madison Area Chamber
Sara Denhart	Madison Courier
Ken Ritchie	Madison Courier
Robert Scott	
Gerald ??	
Wayne Kyle	Woodburn, Kyle & Co., Section 106
Cari Stewart	
Sherry Burkhardt	Our House Restaurant
Jewell Henderson	
Denny Jackson	City of Milton
Fritzi Jackson	City of Milton
Ruby Rowlett	City of Milton
Chris Liter	
Wayne Beard	City of Milton
Jim Hoskins	City of Milton
Steve Brierly	City of Milton
Liz Palmquist	Congressman Baron Hill
Dave Stevens	City of Milton
Chris Browning	