



**MEETING SUMMARY  
MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE  
PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)  
MEETING #5  
March 24, 2009**

The Milton-Madison Project Advisory Group (PAG) had its fifth meeting at the Milton Elementary School on March 24, 2009, at 6:30 PM. The purposes of the meeting were to 1) review Screening 1 for the location alternatives and 2) discuss preferences for moving alternatives forward for more detailed analysis in Screening 2.

Twenty (20) members of the PAG (or their substitutes) and thirty-eight (38) members of the public signed in at the meeting. A list of attendees is attached to this summary.

Jack Couch opened the meeting and welcomed PAG members and public observers. He introduced the project team members and local officials in attendance. John Carr reviewed the previous meeting topics.

Andrea Clifford, KYTC's District #5 Public Information Officer provided information concerning findings and recommendations from the December 2008 Fracture Critical Inspection by KYTC. The bridge will have a reduced load limit of 15 tons, will undergo repairs on three different components this summer and will undergo a full in-depth inspection to determine whether the load limit can be lifted. Andrea and David Steele, Transportation Engineering Branch Manager for the Bridge Preservation Office in the Division of Maintenance responded to questions and comments. These questions and comments will be attached to the meeting minutes as an addendum at a later date.

John Carr reviewed the meeting agenda and asked for any public comments before the presentation. The public comment period included the following three items:

- Greg Sekula, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana

Mr. Sekula presented a letter to the PAG written by the National Trust for Historic Preservation and sent to Jose Sepulveda with the Federal Highway Administration. The letter recommends Alternative 12 (Canip Creek B) as having the fewest impacts on the National Landmark District in Madison. Mr. Sekula was asked to clarify who the letter was from, and indicated that it was supported by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana, Historic Madison, the Cornerstone Society, and one representative of the Hunters' Bottom Historic District. One of the PAG members, Nathaniel Adams, indicated that the letter was not supported by all of the Section 106 parties.

- George Freeman, Section 106 Consulting Party

Mr. Freeman read a copy of a petition written by the Trimble County Historical Society. The petition is being circulated for signature and promotes the preservation of the existing bridge for pedestrian, bicycle, and tourism use.

- Vickie and Cunningham Young, Citizens

The Young's live in an area that would be impacted by Alternative 12 and they are opposed to the National Trust recommendation. The Park Avenue area seems to be overlooked and was

not included in the Landmark District. There are and were many historic buildings in this area that are not included on the Sanborn maps. The Young's have their shop in an 1850's warehouse that has had many uses, including a church at one time.

Tim Sorenson provided an overview of where we are in the project, using an updated version of the process chart. He explained the screening process set up for the location alternatives, and discussed how these criteria were rated based on the draft purpose and need for the project. Tim also provided an overview of the input received about the location alternatives at the public meeting.

The PAG was divided into five groups for two activities during the meeting. The groups were divided as follows:

- Group 1 – Warren Auxier, Kevin Watkins, Jim Juricic, and Nolan Hamilton (Aaron Stover as facilitator)
- Group 2 – Peter Woodburn, Randy Eggenpiller, Bob McKinney, and Mark Overton (JB Williams as facilitator)
- Group 3 – Corey Murphy, Ann Grahn, Justin McCoy, and Ronnie Barnes (Kathy Francis as facilitator)
- Group 4 – Bruce Tandy, Roger Allman, Carla Goins, Neil Bryan, Nathan Adams (John Carr as facilitator)
- Group 5 – Larry deBuhr, Heidi Kruggel, and David Pennybaker (Tim Sorenson as facilitator)

For Activity 1, John Mettelle asked the groups to review the Screening 1 matrix and provide comments on the ratings. The groups were given 20 minutes to discuss the matrix and each facilitator reported the group comments to the audience. The comments included the following:

### **Group 1**

- The group concurred with the matrix as presented.
- The group discussion focused on connectivity between lower Milton and lower Madison. There was more concern about Milton maintaining a downtown connection than Madison.
- The increase in travel distance may be a good measure for whether or not to advance a particular alternative to the more detailed analysis.
- Alternatives that would not meet purpose and need include: Bypass (Alt. 4), Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13), Eagle Hollow (Alt. 14), and possibly Canip Creek A (Alt. 11) and Canip Creek B (Alt. 12).

### **Group 2**

- The group concurred with the screening of Purpose 1 (improve or replace bridge) and felt Purpose 2 (improve or maintain mobility and connectivity) was extremely important.
- Beyond the bridge itself, SR 56 and Milton Hill need improvement. Alternatives should also address trucks passing through downtown Madison and historic concerns.
- The Bypass (Alternative 4) is good for truck traffic.
- Alternatives as far out as the Bypass (Alt. 4) and Canip Creek A/B (Alts. 11/12) still provide connectivity for the two communities. There is a lack of connectivity with the Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13) and Eagle Hollow (Alt. 14) options.

- Beyond the two connecting points where the bridge touches down, what other roadway elements are being improved? Is the project improving any links outside of the bridge – like SR 56, KY 36, or US 421 in eastern Madison?
- Preferred alternatives should result in the least damage to the community as a whole and should provide the most correlation to current problems (including SR 56 and Milton Hill).

### **Group 3**

- The group concurred with the matrix as presented.
- There is concern that emergency services may be an issue with the alternatives that are farther from downtown.

### **Group 4**

- The group concurred with the matrix as presented.

### **Group 5**

- The group is concerned that travel distance between intersections does not provide a good measure for the local connection. Travel time may be a better measure, and would show more of a difference for Around Milton (Alt. 9), Ferry Street (Alt. 10), and Canip Creek A/B (Alts. 11/12).
- Maintaining a linkage between lower Milton and lower Madison could also be a visual linkage, and could be met by Canip Creek A/B (Alts. 11/12).

For Activity 2, the groups were asked to review the Screening 2 considerations and provide ratings where possible. They were also asked to narrow down the alternatives to 2-3 preferred options, if possible, and to provide the reasons why. The groups were given 30 minutes for this exercise. The group comments included the following:

### **Group 1**

- Parallel (Alt. 7), Ferry Street (Alt. 10), and Canip Creek A/B (Alts. 11/12) should move forward for more detailed consideration.
- The Bypass (Alt. 4), Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13), and Eagle Hollow (Alt. 14) should not move forward because they are too far and too costly.
- Jefferson Street A/B (Alts. 5/6) should not move forward because of historic concerns and the division of the community with the approach structure.
- The most important secondary considerations are connectivity, budget, and timeframe.
- Pedestrian and bicycle access is important and should be included as a consideration.
- The alternatives that are farther from downtown may be a problem for emergency services.

### **Group 2**

- Jefferson Street A and B (Alts. 5/6) are the preferred alternatives for 3 of the 4 group members. These alternatives provide a straight shot through town and eliminate the turns on the approaches. There is some concern about truck noise and fumes with these alternatives.
- Canip Creek B (Alt. 12) is the next choice among the group members.
- The group considered better overall connectivity as a priority in their decision-making.

- The western Bypass (Alt. 4) is the most expensive alternative.
- In general, the far eastern and western alternatives could negatively impact businesses, jobs, healthcare, and environmental resources. On the other hand, these alternatives could provide fewer conflict points on the approaches and better future connections to the bridge. These are the best alternatives for Indiana.
- In general, the downtown alternatives could negatively impact historic resources, cause more construction delays, negatively impact the Regatta, and lead to more disruptions to the communities. On the other hand, there is concern that these alternatives will not improve the conflict points or travel time on the approaches.
- The Bypass (Alt. 4) and Jefferson Street (Alt. 5-6) reduce truck traffic through neighborhoods. Though the bypass would remove trucks from downtown, it would open new opportunities for development along the bypass itself.
- The group is opposed to the Do-Nothing (Alt. 1), Rehabilitation (Alt. 2), and Superstructure Replacement (Alt. 3) options.
- Improvements to KY 36 and SR 56 should be considered between US 421 and any of the alternatives.

### **Group 3**

- Ferry Street (Alt. 10), KY 36 (Alt. 8), and Jefferson Street B (Alt. 6) should be moved forward for more detailed study.
- Ferry Street (Alt. 10) provides a straight shot across the river, it might cost less with minimal approaches, and it offers future connectivity to US 421 on both sides of the river. KY 36 (Alt. 8) also provides good future connections on both sides of the river. Jefferson Street (Alt. 6) might take longer to build since it is in the historic district.
- The group is in favor of the alternative that can be completed in the shortest timeframe. This is important for economic development.
- The Bypass (Alt. 4) should not be considered due concerns about commerce, emergency services, and cost.
- Canip Creek A/B (Alts. 11/12), Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13), and Eagle Hollow (Alt. 14) should not be considered because of the additional cost for the approaches and the increased distance for emergency services.
- Around Milton (Alt. 9) should not be considered because it is too costly for Indiana side and the angle of the bridge may cause navigational concerns.
- Parallel (Alt. 7) should not be considered because it might not be attractive if old bridge is maintained and the double set of piers may cause navigation problems.
- Jefferson A (Alt. 5) should not be considered because it bypasses the Milton businesses.

### **Group 4**

- Canip Creek A (Alt. 11), Around Milton (Alt. 9), KY 36 (Alt. 8), and Parallel (Alt. 7) should be moved forward for more detailed study.
- The Bypass (Alt. 4) should not be considered due to cost.

- Jefferson Street A/B (Alts. 5/6) should not be considered due to historic concerns, although the group agreed that the community could adjust to this option if it was accomplished with Context Sensitive design.
- Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13) and Eagle Hollow (Alt. 14) should not be considered because they are too far from downtown.
- Ferry Street (Alt. 10) should not be considered due to historic resources and impacts to the Key West Shrimp House.
- The group agreed that maintaining the option for a future connection is important.
- Considerations should be made to build KY 36 out of the floodplain.
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be considered for any alternative, and would have reasonable local connections with any of the four preferred alternatives listed above.

### **Group 5**

- Ferry Street (Alt. 10) should be moved forward for further study. This alternative maintains downtown Milton. The group suggested modifying the alignment with a curve to the east on the Madison side to avoid the Landmark.
- Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13) should be moved forward for further study, although the group agreed that it may be too far to maintain the local connection.
- Canip Creek B (Alt. 12) should be moved forward for further study. The group suggested a modified version to connect Spring Street around to the bridge on the Milton side (like Alt. 11).
- The group did not recommend Canip Creek A (Alt. 11), although they agreed that this alternative provides a continuous route for US 421.
- Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13) and Eagle Hollow (Alt. 14) seem to have the potential for future connections on the Indiana side, but the Kentucky side is more challenging.
- The group recommends considering natural hollows for a future connection with any alternative. It would be possible to upgrade SR 56 and/or KY 36 leading away from town and, in the future, create a new hilltop connection through either Eagle or Lonesome Hollow in Indiana or through School Hollow in Kentucky.
- The group agreed that any alternative should be built out of the floodplain.

Other questions and comments from the PAG members included the following:

- Navigating a tow through multiple piers is difficult. Has anyone contacted the Coast Guard about the navigational impacts of having two bridges in this area?

Response: We are in communication with the Coast Guard and they will give us input on this as we move forward.

- The Coast Guard does not like an angled bridge as well as a perpendicular one.

Response: That is correct. The bridge structure is longer in order to meet the horizontal navigational clearance requirements. An angled bridge can be made to work when necessary.

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

- Is the purpose and need finalized? Is the screening criteria finalized?  
Response: We are in negotiations with FHWA to finalize this. The draft purpose and need and screening criteria are available on the project website for public review.
- What will happen at the next meeting? Will there be models and drawings of the various alternatives?  
Response: At the next meeting, we will present the location alternatives that will be moved forward for more detailed analysis. There will also be a summary of the Bridge Type Selection exercise that took place at the Public Meeting in February.
- How will you narrow down the process so that the most insightful choices will be made?  
Response: We will use the purpose and need screening, secondary criteria, PAG input, agency comments, public comments from review of the website information, and input from KYTC, INDOT and FHWA to narrow down the options.
- What about visualization of the landings? What about elevated approaches to the bridge that would be in the historic districts? Doesn't this also play a role in the selection?  
Response: We have done some preliminary analysis for this. At PAG #7, we will show the approaches, touchdown points, impacts to properties, etc. for the 4 or 5 alternatives that are moved forward. The PAG will be able to offer suggestions for adjustments to these.
- Have you ever seen a group change their mind or reject all detailed alternatives?  
Response: We will be asking the PAG for their input, and will have hopefully addressed as many preferences as possible.
- When does the Section 106 process start?  
Response: We had an initiation meeting last month, and the coordination on eligibility will start between Public Meetings 2 and 3.
- Will you consider the feasibility of moving historic structures that might be in the way?  
Response: This would be part of the mitigation of impacts included in the Section 106 process.
- At what point does there need to be a decision on the existing bridge's future? Would this impact the location decision?  
Response: The only alternative that closes the option for future third party ownership of the existing bridge is the superstructure replacement option. We should have more information about this soon. The testing is complete and we are performing the analysis to determine if this is still a viable option. The results should be available in June or July. For the other alternatives, the decision about the existing bridge would not have to be made until the end of the process.
- Is there any precedent for communities taking over a bridge?  
Response: The closest place this has happened is with the Purple People Bridge in Cincinnati, OH. Whoever assumes the ownership of the existing bridge takes on the responsibility, liability and maintenance of the bridge. If a private group wants the bridge, they must be backed by a governmental agency.

- Taking over the bridge doesn't sound like a decision that could be made quickly (within 6 months).

Response: That is correct and it probably would not be settled until the construction phase.

- When is this study scheduled to be completed?

Response: Spring of 2010.

- When could construction begin?

Response: Normally, it would take about 2 years for design, 1 to 2 years for right-of-way acquisition and utilities, and 2 years for construction. So if a new bridge is built at a new location, we are a minimum of 5 years away before a final decision on removal of the bridge must be made.

- Can we start collecting tolls on the existing bridge to pay for it?

Response: This is not an option at the present time.

Several comment forms and a copy of the National Trust letter were submitted during the meeting. These items are attached to the meeting summary.

With no further questions or comments from the public, the meeting was dismissed at 9:15 p.m.

## PAG MEETING #5 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	X		
Trimble Fiscal Court	Nolan Hamilton	X		
Trimble Historic	Nathaniel Adams	X		
Woodburn, Kyle	Peter Woodburn	X		
Riverside Produce	Kenny McCoy		Justin McCoy	X
Regatta & Citizen	Sue Fisher			
Overton Farms & Citizen	Jim Overton		Mark Overton	X
Citizen	Carla Goins	X		
Citizen	Ann Grahn	X		
Citizen	Jim Juricic	X		

### Project Team

Name	Organization
Gary Valentine	KYTC
Andrea Clifford	KYTC
Tim Foreman	KYTC
David Steele	KYTC
Marvin Jenkins	INDOT
Ben Lawrence	INDOT
Steve Smith	INDOT
John Carr	Wilbur Smith Associates
John Mettelle	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Ramsey	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
Jack Couch	KIPDA
Joe Cosby	Niche Marketing
Michelle Henderson	Niche Marketing

## Level 2 Screening against Secondary Considerations

This matrix presents a summary of the comments received at the PAG 5 Meeting on March 24, 2009.  
The PAG was divided into five groups and asked to complete this matrix as a discussion tool to determine which alternatives were preferred within each group.

4. Bypass	5. Jefferson St-A	6. Jefferson St-B	7. Parallel	8. KY 36	9. Around Milton	10. Ferry St	11. Canip Creek-A	12. Canip Creek-B	13. Lonesome Hollow	14. Eagle Hollow
<b>FACTOR: Minimize Cost to Build/Maintain Bridge</b>										
<i>Can the project be built? Can it be built quickly? What kind of construction and maintenance costs are expected?</i>										
General Note from PAG discussions: Group will support whichever alternative can be implemented most quickly because it is so important to economic development										
General Note from PAG discussions: Budget and timeframe are one of the most important screening criteria										
High Costs  Would have to build a new road on the KY side  May be a long-term project	Expensive to connect on KY side  Costs for downtown Madison	Expensive to connect on KY side  Creates costs for downtown Madison  Cost effective and quicker to build	Feasible and affordable	Costs increase to get KY 36 out of the floodplain  Cost effective and quicker to build  Requires less approach work than Alt 7	IN approach would be expensive  Costs increase to get KY 36 out of the floodplain  Cost effective and quicker to build  Feasible and affordable but angle crossing over river could be an issue	May reduce costs to have minimal approaches needed  Cost effective and quicker to build	Approaches expensive  Feasible and affordable	Approaches expensive  Feasible and affordable	High costs to fix KY 36 and SR 56  Approaches expensive  Feasible and affordable but too far removed from communities	High costs to fix KY 36 and SR 56  Approaches expensive  Feasible and affordable but too far removed from communities
<b>FACTOR: Maintain or Enhance the Quality of Life</b>										
<i>Will a bridge at this location provide access to jobs, health services, and retail stores? How does it compare to the access provided by the existing bridge?</i>										
General Note from PAG discussions: Maintaining roadway and visual connectivity is one of the most important screening criteria										
Longer distance may have negative impact on emergency services  Too far to provide access  Hurts commerce downtown	Negligible impacts on access vs existing conditions  Does not provide access on Milton side	Negligible impacts on access vs existing conditions  Satisfies economic development concerns  Better for emergency services  Does not provide access on Milton side	Negligible impacts on access vs existing conditions	Negligible impacts on access vs existing conditions  Satisfies economic development concerns  Better for emergency services	Negligible impacts on access vs existing conditions  Better for emergency services	Negligible impacts on access vs existing conditions  Better for emergency services  Satisfies economic development concerns	Longer distance may have negative impact on emergency services	Longer distance may have negative impact on emergency services	Longer distance may have negative impact on emergency services  Too far to provide access  No access to Milton	Longer distance may have negative impact on emergency services  Too far to provide access  No access to Milton

4. Bypass	5. Jefferson St-A	6. Jefferson St-B	7. Parallel	8. KY 36	9. Around Milton	10. Ferry St	11. Canip Creek-A	12. Canip Creek-B	13. Lonesome Hollow	14. Eagle Hollow
<i>Does this alternative reduce the number of large trucks on neighborhood streets?</i>										
Reduces the number of trucks on neighborhood streets	Reduces trucks in neighborhoods but the number of trucks downtown doesn't change  Provides straight shot up the US 421 Hill	Reduces trucks in neighborhoods but the number of trucks downtown doesn't change  Provides straight shot up the US 421 Hill	Does not reduce the number of trucks in neighborhoods  Connection to SR 56 and KY 36 removes trucks	Does not reduce the number of trucks in neighborhoods  Connection to SR 56 and KY 36 removes trucks	Reduces the number of trucks	Reduces the number of trucks  Improves traffic flow on Milton side	Reduces the number of trucks  Does not reduce traffic on neighborhood streets	Does not reduce traffic on neighborhood streets, especially for Spring Street in Milton	Does not reduce traffic on neighborhood streets  Reduces truck traffic	Does not reduce traffic on neighborhood streets  Reduces truck traffic
<i>How much disruption will this alternative have on the Madison historic business district? Think about during construction and after it is built.</i>										
Fewer impacts during construction  Large impacts after construction	Downtown alternatives have more impacts during construction  Worst impacts of any alternative  Community may be able to adjust after bridge is built	Downtown alternatives have more impacts during construction  Worst impacts of any alternative  Community may be able to adjust after bridge is built  Minimal effects on local businesses	Downtown alternatives have more impacts during construction  Major impacts during construction but negligible changes afterwards	Downtown alternatives have more impacts during construction  Minimal effects on local businesses  Major impacts during construction but negligible changes afterwards	Downtown alternatives have more impacts during construction  Major impacts during construction but negligible changes afterwards	Downtown alternatives have more impacts during construction  Impacts in Milton and Madison  Impacts are tolerable if key buildings are relocated  Minimal effects on local businesses  More impacts during construction than Alt 9  Fewer post-construction impacts than Alt 6	Less disruption to historic business district	Less disruption to historic business district	Less disruption to historic business district  Fewer impacts during construction	Less disruption to historic business district  Fewer impacts during construction
<b>FACTOR: Sensitive to Local Resources</b>										
<i>How much disruption will this alternative have on the communities of Milton and Madison? Think about during construction and after it is built.</i>										
	Elevated structure will divide community  Bypasses Milton businesses  Approach goes over Lower Milton	Elevated structure will divide community	Difficult on businesses	May impact Milton Bank		Fewer impacts in Milton	Fewer impacts on communities	Fewer impacts on communities	Fewer impacts on communities	Fewer impacts on communities

4. Bypass	5. Jefferson St-A	6. Jefferson St-B	7. Parallel	8. KY 36	9. Around Milton	10. Ferry St	11. Canip Creek-A	12. Canip Creek-B	13. Lonesome Hollow	14. Eagle Hollow
<i>What impacts will this alternative have on historic resources? Is it in the National Historic Landmark District? Is it in any of the National Register Districts? Are there historic structures or archaeology sites within the corridor's footprint?</i>										
General Note from PAG discussions: A letter from National Trust supported by 4 local historic preservation groups was circulated at the meeting which stated Alternative 12 is preferred by five Section Consulting Parties identified in the letter.										
No historic districts	In NHL, Madison & Third St Historic Districts	In NHL, Madison Historic District	In NHL, Madison & Third St Historic Districts	In NHL, Madison Historic District	In Madison Historic District	In NHL, Madison Historic District	In Hunters Bottom & Madison Historic Districts	In Hunters Bottom & Madison Historic Districts	In Hunters Bottom & Madison Historic Districts	In Hunters Bottom Historic District
Fewer historic impacts	Impacts to historic resources	Impacts to historic resources	More historic resource impacts for downtown alternatives	More historic resource impacts for downtown alternatives	More historic resource impacts for downtown alternatives	More historic resource impacts for downtown alternatives	Fewer impacts to historic resources	Fewer impacts to historic resources	Fewer impacts to historic resources than Alts 5-10	Fewer impacts to historic resources than Alts 5-10
Potential economic issues	Landmark makes this alternative unrealistic but the community could adjust	Landmark makes this alternative unrealistic but the community could adjust  May take longer to build in the Landmark District		Huge impacts to historic resources	Very few impacts to historic resources	Impacts to historic resources, Key West Shrimp House, and Pilgrim Church  Large impacts in both states			More impacts than for Alternatives 11-12 but not substantial	
<i>What impacts could this alternative have on tourism? Does it provide access to downtown Madison? Will it affect the Regatta?</i>										
General Note from PAG discussions: No effect on the Regatta for any Alternative										
	Negative impacts: the structure would divide the town	Negative impacts: the structure would divide the town	Acceptable for Madison tourism	Acceptable for Madison tourism	Acceptable for Madison tourism	Acceptable for Madison tourism	Acceptable for Madison tourism	Acceptable for Madison tourism	Acceptable for Madison tourism	Acceptable for Madison tourism
<i>What impacts could this alternatives have on the environment? Consider parks, floodplains, water quality, the riverfront and boating facilities, farmlands, wetlands, threatened and endangered species habitats, noise-sensitive resources, and environmental justice populations (minorities, low income, elderly, and disabled community pockets).</i>										
General Note from PAG discussions: Getting KY 36 out of the floodplain is important										
Fewer environmental impacts downtown from trucks (noise, fumes)	Fewer environmental impacts from trucks (noise, fumes) because trucks go straight up the hill  Potential floodplain issues	Fewer environmental impacts from trucks (noise, fumes) because trucks go straight up the hill  Potential floodplain issues	Do not like aesthetics if existing bridge remains  Potential floodplain issues	Potential floodplain issues	Potential floodplain issues	Impacts Milton Park  Potential floodplain issues  Possible impacts on campground	Possible to get out of floodplain	Potential floodplain issues	Fewer environmental impacts downtown from trucks (noise, fumes)	Fewer environmental impacts downtown from trucks (noise, fumes)
<b>FACTOR: Consider Future Connections to US 421 from Hilltop to Hilltop</b>										
<i>Is a hilltop connection possible with this bridge location? Consider costs, impacts, and other construction issues.</i>										
General Note from PAG discussions: Overall connectivity should be a priority for decision-making, including connections to town along KY 36 and SR 56										
Best potential for future connection	No hilltop connection possible in KY	No hilltop connection possible in KY  Most convenient, "common sense" route		Good future connections on both sides		Straight shot across the river  Possible future connections on both sides			Best potential for future hilltop connection  Direct path for IN approach; KY could be routed up hollow	Best potential for future hilltop connection  Direct path for IN approach; KY could be routed up hollow
<b>FACTOR: Improve System Reliability</b>										
<i>Will this alternative provide a consistent travel time from Lower Milton to Lower Madison? Can the bridge be wide enough for traffic to travel around a crash in one lane?</i>										
Increases travel time	No impact on travel time	No impact on travel time	No impact on travel time	No impact on travel time	No impact on travel time	No impact on travel time	Slight increase in travel time	Slight increase in travel time	Increases travel time	Increases travel time

4. Bypass	5. Jefferson St-A	6. Jefferson St-B	7. Parallel	8. KY 36	9. Around Milton	10. Ferry St	11. Canip Creek-A	12. Canip Creek-B	13. Lonesome Hollow	14. Eagle Hollow
<b>FACTOR: Provide Safe Cross-river Mobility for Bicyclists and Pedestrians</b>										
<i>Does it make sense to have a pedestrian or bicycle path along the bridge at this location? Are there sidewalks or bike paths nearby on either side that the trail could connect to?</i>										
General Note from PAG discussions: Bicycle/Pedestrian access is important and should be included.										
No connection for bike/ped to existing or planned facilities	Bike/ped trail would have to double back to Heritage Trail on Vaughn Drive	Bike/ped trail would have to double back to Heritage Trail on Vaughn Drive  Allows pedestrian crossing	Feasible bike/ped connection	Feasible bike/ped connection	Feasible bike/ped connection	Feasible bike/ped connection	Feasible future bike/ped connection  No connection for bike/ped to existing or planned facilities	Feasible future bike/ped connection  No connection for bike/ped to existing or planned facilities	No connection for bike/ped to existing or planned facilities	No connection for bike/ped to existing or planned facilities
<b>FACTOR: Maintain or Improve Safety on Connecting Roadway Links</b>										
<i>Does this alternative reduce the number of conflict points between the US 421/KY 36 intersection and the US 421/SR 56/Jefferson St intersection? A conflict point is anywhere two vehicle paths cross each other, like at intersections or driveways where drivers have an opportunity to turn.</i>										
Fewer conflict points	More conflict points	More conflict points	More conflict points	More conflict points	More conflict points	More conflict points	Continuous movement along US 421  Eliminates sharp bend in US 421		Fewer conflict points	Fewer conflict points
<i>Does this alternative improve or avoid existing safety problems on connecting roadways? List and explain.</i>										
	Straight shot up hill in Madison removes truck turns	Straight shot up hill in Madison removes truck turns								
<b>FACTOR: Provide Criteria for River Navigation</b>										
<i>Does this alternative meet river navigational clearance requirements?</i>										
			Double set of piers may pose navigational issues if existing bridge remains	Double set of piers may pose navigational issues if existing bridge remains	Angle of bridge may cause concerns; Double set of piers may pose navigational issues if existing bridge remains	Double set of piers may pose navigational issues if existing bridge remains	Angle of bridge may cause concerns			
<b>FAVORITE ALTERNATIVES, Based on PAG Group Discussions</b>										
	Group 2	Group 2, 3	Groups 1, 4	Groups 3, 4	Group 4	Groups 1, 3; Group 5 with modification	Groups 1, 4	Groups 1, 2; Group 5 with modification	Group 5	
<b>ALTERNATIVES TO ELIMINATE, Based on PAG Group Discussions</b>										
Groups 1, 3, 4	Group 1, 3, 4	Groups 1, 4	Group 3		Group 3	Group 4	Group 3	Group 3	Groups 1, 3, 4	Groups 1, 3, 4