



## **MEETING SUMMARY MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE PROJECT SECTION 106 MEETING February 12, 2009**

The Milton-Madison Project Team held a kick-off meeting with the Section 106 Consulting Parties on February 12, 2009 at the Visitor's Center in downtown Madison, Indiana.

A number of M3T representatives attended the meeting, including: FHWA (MaryAnn Naber, Anthony Goodman, Greg Rawlings, and Janice Osadczuk); INDOT (Steve Smith, Mary Jackman, Shaun Miller, Rickie Clark, Ben Lawrence, and Patrick Carpenter); and KYTC (Gary Valentine, Tim Foreman, and Amanda Abner). The project team members present at the meeting included the following: WSA (John Carr, John Mettille, Tim Sorenson, Robert Ball, Rebecca Ramsey, Samantha Wright, Harry Fox, and Janette Fulkerson); Baker (JB Williams and Aaron Stover); Doe Anderson (Kathy Francis); the Kentucky Transportation Center (John Ripy); and Tom Meredith Architects (Tom Meredith).

John Mettille gave the welcome, asked for introductions, and reminded the attendees to complete the sign-in sheet before leaving (sign-in sheet is attached). Folks calling into the meeting included Genell Scheurell, with the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and Michelle Curran, with the National Park Service. John also reviewed the agenda for the meeting.

MaryAnn Naber of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provided an overview of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Questions and discussion items included the following:

- Have any tribes asked to be included?

We have had several tribes express interest, including the: Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, Peoria Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, and United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians.

- How many tribes were invited to participate?

We sent invitations to all tribes identified by the two states.

- Do adverse effects include the viewshed to and from a landmark district?

This depends on whether the viewshed is considered to be a contributing element of the resource.

- Does the 106 process include the analysis of existing adverse effects that could be corrected, or just adverse effects of new changes?

The 106 process only considers the adverse effects of a new project; however, a NEPA analysis of cumulative effects would consider both.

- Is the image on Slide 20 representative of options for the Milton-Madison Bridge?

No, this is just an example of a rendering, which is often a good way to consider effects of a project.

- Would the Historic Madison group be a signatory on the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)?

FHWA may invite consulting parties as signatories if they have obligations or the right to execute, amend, or terminate an MOA. [Post-meeting note: For clarification, the required signatories are the agencies (FHWA, KYTC and INDOT), the KY and IN SHPOs, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, if they are participating in the process. Others who are signed on as consulting parties would be concurring signatories of the MOA. Their signatures would indicate that they are in agreement with the terms of the MOA.]

- At what point in time does Section 4f come into play?

This is the point that the Federal and State agencies should make sure that the 106 and 4f processes are moving forward together; although, Section 4f does not have a specific public involvement process that is in addition to the Public Involvement Requirements within the FHWA Regulations for the NEPA process.

Since there is a Register-eligible bridge involved, there could be a Section 4f use of that historic resource as part of that project.

- Will the Draft EIS be the first time to comment on the Section 4f issues?

It will likely be an Environmental Assessment (EA), and this will be the time to comment.

- Will the programmatic Section 4f evaluation be used as part of this project?

This is used when you look at a certain number of alternatives, but would not be applicable to any other Section 4f use (only the bridge structure itself). The programmatic evaluation is currently being revised.

- Does the timeframe shown in the agency coordination plan coordinate with the process explained by Ms. Naber?

The Section 106 process is integrated into the overall agency coordination plan for the project. We will ask for and document input on historic resources from the consulting parties before we make project decisions.

- What is the status of the purpose and need, screening criteria, etc.?

We are in that process now, starting with the coordination letters sent to the participating agencies. The materials are also available for review on the project website. The initial outreach to the public on purpose and need occurs tonight, as well as outreach for additional Section 106 parties and the range of location alternatives.

John Carr indicated that there is a Section 106 flow-chart in the back of the meeting handout.

John Mettelle followed Ms. Naber's presentation with a review of the project background, bridge history, and bridge condition, as well as traffic and crash data. He indicated that the Needs and Deficiencies Report is available on the project website. Questions and discussion items included the following:

- Is the bridge condition information based on the recent coring?

No, the table shows the 2006 inspection. The latest coring and inspection data is still be finalized.

Robert Ball then provided an overview of the known historic resources at this time. He indicated that this information is based on database information only and will be verified in the field as the project moves forward. Questions and discussion items included the following:

- Camille Fife: There are two resources in Madison that are individually listed and also included in the District.
- Betsy Merrit: The 3<sup>rd</sup> Street National Register Historic District boundary seems improper. This should be verified.

The mapping is based on coordinates and will be verified.

- What is the source for the maps used for the Madison historic district maps?  
These came from the National Register nomination forms.

Aaron Stover continued the presentation with a review of the three-step Bridge Type Selection Process being used for this project. John Ripy reviewed the electronic polling procedures planned for the Public Meeting on Thursday evening. Questions and discussion items included the following:

- Why are we talking about bridge type selection before the environmental process is complete?

The existing bridge is a sick bridge and something needs to be planned soon. We are trying to move this process along so that another rehabilitation is not required before a decision is made.

- It would be preferable to have a location before we decide what the bridge looks like.  
We are seeking input on bridge components at this first meeting. The preferences will be used to develop alternatives at the selected location, which will be taken to Step 2 for polling and input.
- In talking about the criteria for narrowing down the options, there was no mention of historic input.  
We will be able to separate Section 106 polling information in the process we use tonight. We will bring the Section 106 parties along as we move through this process.

- Mr. Adams: We have representatives on the PAG to comment on the historic interests. It is clear that KYTC and INDOT will only maintain one bridge. This project can not be compared to the Louisville Bridges project; neither the Downtown nor the East End Bridge is a replacement project. The local people depend on the Milton-Madison Bridge every day.

- What went into selecting the options to be shown at the public meeting?

We will be showing the three types of bridges that are feasible for this location: arch, truss and cable-stay bridges. We will not be showing girder (the span is too long) or suspension (the span is too short) bridges. We will show variations for the three feasible types: complexity, shape, color, etc. The initial 18 concepts are intended to represent the range of aesthetic options.

- Have you been able to take the Regatta course layout into account?

We have not narrowed down any of the options yet. Responding to the course layout will depend on the location of the bridge.

- In the last PAG meeting, there was sentiment that maybe the existing bridge could be maintained by a separate entity. Are you showing any renderings with the existing and new bridges together?

In the next round, that would be shown if the selected location is within sight of the existing bridge.

- Would you be willing to post the results on the website?

The Kentucky Transportation Center will prepare a document that shows the views, the scoring, and the verbal recorded comments.

- Are all of the concepts feasible at each of the location options?

The types shown tonight are found up and down the Ohio in various forms and are likely to be feasible. Not all of the bridge types are compatible with reusing the existing piers; therefore, if the superstructure replacement option is selected, the range of possible bridge types will be smaller.

- The views do not show any historic buildings in the renderings. Will you be showing these in the next round?

For Step 1, three of the most common viewpoints were selected for the renderings: from Madison, from Milton, and on the bridge. Other views can be considered for the next round of renderings, when the bridge location has been selected. If a downtown location is selected for the bridge, the view from Milton Hill may be an option to show some of historic Madison in the background.

- Will we be able to comment on the bridge types in Step 2?

Yes, we will be polling again.

- Will the renderings be made available after the meeting?

We will be putting them on the website tomorrow.

- For the existing bridge, as an historic bridge, could the demolition funds be used for maintenance?

Yes, there is precedence for this. [Post-meeting note: For clarification, Section 144(o) of Title 23 U.S.C. entitled “Historic Bridge Program” provides for the reasonable costs associated with actions to preserve, or reduce the impact of a project on the integrity of historic bridges. The intent would be to make the bridge ready for another entity to take over ownership and maintenance. The reasonable costs, up to the cost of demolition, would be a one time event.]

- How will this meeting be documented?

We will send out the summary to the Section 106 parties and post the summary on the website.

- If the existing bridge is demolished, will there be an effort to document the historical information about it?

Yes.

- Is there a ballpark estimate for demolition cost?

Not at this time. We will work to determine an estimate.

With no further discussion, the meeting was dismissed at 3:10 p.m.

# Milton-Madison Bridge Project

## Section 106 Initiation Meeting

### Madison Visitor's Center/Conference Call

February 12, 2009

1:00 PM

Please Sign In

Name	Title/Organization	Phone	Email
John Carr	Rep. of INSHPO, IDNR-DHDA	(317) 233-1949	jcarr@dnr.in.gov
Manuela Johnson	IN DHS	317-233-4282	mjohnson@dhs.in.gov
Tom MEREDITH	THOMAS M. MEREDITH (CONSULT.) WZA	765-349-9943	tmmered@reliable-net.net
Greg Rawlings	FHWA	502-223-6728	
Janice Oscher	FHWA	317 226-7486	janice.oscher.dot.gov
Frank Carpenter	INDOT-CRS	317 233-2061	fcarpenter@indot.in.gov
Greg Sekula	Historic Landmarks Fdn. of IN	812-284-4534	gsekula@historiclandmarks.org
Ben Lawrence	INDOT Environment	317-233-1164	blawrence@indot.in.gov
Tony Nerty	Madison Historic Board of Review	812-265-4736	
Shawn Miller	INDOT-CRS	317-233-6795	smiller@indot.in.gov
Heidi Kruggel	Historic Madison, Inc.	812-265-2967	hmiheidi@seidata.com
JOHN STALCER	" " "	" "	hmijohn@seidata.com
Susan Neumeier	Archaeologist, KYTC	502-564-7250	sneumeier@ky.gov
Pickie Clark	INDOT Public Involvement Hearings	317-232-6601	pickie@indot.in.gov
Tim Foreman	KYTC-DEA	502-564-7250	Tim.Foreman@KY.GOV

**Milton-Madison Bridge Project**  
**Section 106 Initiation Meeting**  
**Madison Visitor's Center/Conference Call**  
 February 12, 2009      1:00 PM

**Please Sign In**

Name	Title/Organization	Phone	Email
Carmelle Fife	WGI	812-273-8822	WGI.Madison@AOL.COM
Amanda Abner	KYTC-DEA	502-564-7250	Amanda.Abner@ky.gov
Kary Stackelbeck	KHC/SHPO	502-564-7005	Kary.Stackelbeck@ky.gov
Danze Peckler	KHC/SHPO	502-564-7005	Danze.Peckler@ky.gov
NATHANIEL N. ADAMS	HISTORIC MILTON	502-216-9494	nadaunc@northamericanstaircases.com
LINK LUDINGTON	ISM+HS	812-599-1682	LLUDINGTON@DNR.IN.GOV
Elizabeth Merritt	National Trust	202-588-6026	betsy_merritt@Nthp.org
Wayne Kyle	Hunter's Bottom HD	812-265-6551	wayne@woodbornkyle.com
JANETTE FULKERSON	WILBUR SMITH ASSOC	317-822-6269	jfulkerson@wilbursmith.com
MARY JACKMAN	INDOT	317-234-0679	mjackman@INDOT.IN.GOV
Ginger Jorgensen	Madison Historic Dist Board of Review	812-350-0171	wjorgensen@roadrunner.com
Anthony Goodman	FHWA	502-223-6742	Anthony.Goodman@FHWA.DOT.GOV
Manuela Johnson	IN Dept. of Homeland Security	317-233-4282	mjohnson@dhs.in.gov
Shawn Miller	INDOT-CRS	317-233-6795	smiller@indot.in.gov
Heidi Kruggel	Historic Madison, Inc.	812-265-2967	hmiheidi@seidata.com

**Milton-Madison Bridge Project**  
**Section 106 Initiation Meeting**  
**Madison Visitor's Center/Conference Call**  
 February 12, 2009      1:00 PM

**Please Sign In**

Name	Title/Organization	Phone	Email
KHONDA L. DEEG	MADISON MAIN STREET	812-292-6334	preservationrj@yahoo.com
MARYANN NABER	FHWA	202-366-2060	maryann.naber@dot.gov
RICHARD MURRAY	CORNERSTONE SOCIETY	812-273-1123	rdmurray@verizon.net
Rebecca Ramsey	WSA		
Samantha Wright	↓		
John Mettillie	↓		
Robert Ball	↓		
Steve Smith	INDOT		