



SUMMARY
MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE
Section 106 Aesthetics/Mitigation Meeting
Clifty Falls Conference Room &
Conference Call/Web Meeting
December 10, 2009, 10:00 a.m.

1. Welcome/Introductions

John Carr (WSA) welcomed the meeting attendees and asked for introductions. Attendees included the following

Section 106 Consulting Parties

Nathaniel Adams, Trimble County Historical Interests (by phone)
John Carr, Indiana (IN) State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Staff
Patrick Cunningham, East Madison
Michele Curran, National Park Service (NPS)/National Historic Landmarks (NHL) (by phone)
Camille Fife, Citizen, Madison
Jim Glass, Indiana (IN) State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Staff
Nancy Gruner, Madison Main Street
Tracey Keller, East Madison
Carol Legard, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (by phone)
Link Ludington, Madison NHL
Elizabeth Merritt, National Trust for Historic Preservation (by phone)
Craig Potts, Kentucky Heritage Council (KHC), SHPO Staff
Genell Scheurell, National Trust for Historic Preservation (by phone)
Greg Sekula, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana
Kary Stackelbeck, Kentucky Heritage Council (KHC), SHPO Staff (by phone)
John Staicer, Historic Madison Foundation, Inc.
Jan Vetrhus, Madison Bicentennial Committee
Vickie Young, East Madison

Federal Highway Administration

Eryn Fletcher, FHWA (by phone)
Janice Osadczuk, FHWA Indiana (by phone)
John Ballantyne, FHWA Kentucky (by phone)

Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)

Kevin Hetrick, INDOT
Patrick Carpenter, INDOT Cultural Resources
Shaun Miller, INDOT Cultural Resources
Staffan Peterson, INDOT Cultural Resources (by phone)

Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)

Andy Barber, KYTC

Amanda Abner, KYTC, Department of Environmental Analysis (DEA)

Tim Foreman, KYTC, DEA

Project Team

Greg Stiles, Michael Baker Corp.

Aaron Stover, Michael Baker Corp.

J.B. Williams, Michael Baker Corp.

Kathy Francis, Doe Anderson

Tom Meredith, Thomas M. Meredith Architect, LLC

Robert Ball, Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA)

John Carr, WSA

Brad Johnson, WSA

John Mettelle, WSA

Tim Sorenson, WSA

Rebecca Thompson, WSA

Samantha Wright, WSA

Other Attendees

Casey Bloos, WORX/WXGO Radio

William Briner, Citizen, former employee of Madison State Hospital

Sara Denhart, Madison Courier

Linda Lytle, Madison Area CVB

Phyllis McLaughlin, Trimble Banner

Don Ward, RoundAbout Madison

2. Bridge Aesthetics

Aaron Stover provided an overview of some of the aesthetic features of the bridge. These include geometry, truss color, portal style, sway bracing, barrier type, pedestrian railing, pedestrian access, form liners, and pier shapes. He reviewed the truss elements that make up the bridge.

- Camille F.: The first time we discussed the bridge aesthetics, we did not discuss the costs associated with them. Are the Section 106 folks expected to make a mitigation decision that would have cost implications?

Aaron S.: Most of the items on the list don't make a whole lot of difference one way or the other when it comes to cost.

- Jan V.: It was not a Section 106 decision to have a truss bridge and take a \$5 million penalty to mitigation. We are not interested in a truss bridge.

John C: If this is the consensus of the parties, we can take the recommendation back to the M3T and the contractor will have complete flexibility in the design.

Camille F.: The question is a matter of priorities. None of us want the truss bridge in lieu of strong mitigation efforts to preserve the historic district.

John C.: The truss design is not in lieu of other mitigation items. If the truss is not built, the project cost would just be \$5 million less. The truss design is no longer a stipulation in the MOA.

Jan V.: There are other things that are more important. The truss is not essential. The truss was not a favorite option of the people. We are getting beaten up every day over the truss design.

- Betsy M.: Since you submitted a truss concept design for the TIGER Grant, would it create a problem if the design was changed?

John C.: It would not. You can give the contractor the option to do something other than a truss. You would get whatever the design team wants to provide, since there would not be aesthetic parameters and would be based on lowest cost.

- Greg S.: If the truss design cost is not going to part of mitigation, we should move forward with the truss.

Camille F.: Agreed, if it is not part of the mitigation.

Michele C.: I thought it was already in the “Whereas” section and not in the stipulation section.

John C.: That is correct.

- Nancy G.: The cable-stay bridge is not feasible on existing piers?

John C.: Correct.

Aaron S. continued the discussion of the truss color. The blue-gray option is closest to the existing color.

- John C.: The original bridge color was a dark green.
- Michele C.: Do any of the paint colors last longer than others? Is there a recommendation from the team?

Aaron S.: We are not aware of any studies that show longer wear for certain colors.

- Craig P.: When we are discussing colors, are these preferences and how will these will relate to what the PAG members say?

John C.: We will take this input, the PAG input, the public input, and provide all of this to KYTC and INDOT and they will make a decision.

- Link L.: I recommend blue-gray.
- Camille F.: I recommend green.
- Nancy G.: I would like something that is not a contrast with the surroundings, but not brown.

Aaron S. asked for a show of hands for the blue-gray color: 5 in the room + 2 on the phone. He also asked for a show of hands for the green color: 3 in the room.

- Michele C.: I have no color preference.

Carol L.: I have no preference.

- John C.: Can those who prefer green live with the blue-gray?

Group: Yes.

Link L.: Green can be pretty variable and harder to select than blue-gray.

- Aaron S.: Should the blue-gray match the existing color?

Group: Not necessarily; it may be too difficult to get an exact match.

- Michele C.: What color is the primer that they use? If the paint peels, it will show through less on the blue-gray.

Aaron S.: We believe it to be grayish color; some are shop painted.

Aaron S. then discussed the portal shape options, including the W-shaped portal requested in our last meeting.

- Betsy M.: Are there cost differences?

Aaron S.: There would be, but they are not that variable. The states have agreed that all of these are reasonable options.

- Jan V.: The Ms are obvious for connecting Madison and Milton.

Aaron S. asked for a show of hands for the M-shape: 5 in the room.

- Betsy M.: How does the height of the opening to the lower bar compare with the existing bridge?

Aaron S.: The height is about 20' which is comparable to the existing bridge.

Aaron S. discussed the internal sway bracing options for the bridge.

- Betsy M.: The animation is not playing on the web meeting.

- Camille F.: Is there any implication to do with weight? Are you adding weight with different bracing?

Aaron S.: It should not make a difference between the options.

- John S.: What about cost for future maintenance?

Aaron S.: With the sway, you do have more surface area for painting or deterioration. This can come from salt spray.

John S.: Would less surface area lead to less pigeons?

Aaron S.: Yes.

Aaron S. asked for a show of hands for the minimal bracing: 8 in the room + 1 on the phone.

- Betsy M.: I have no preference.

Michele C.: No preference.

- Link L.: It seems like this is one element that should be selected based on engineering rather than aesthetics.

Nat A.: I assume everything you do is structurally sound, so if the choice is aesthetic I say minimal bracing.

Aaron S. then discussed the roadway barrier. He asked for a show of hands for the open metal barrier: 9 in the room + 4 on the phone.

- Carol L.: No preference.

Aaron S. discussed options for the pedestrian barrier.

- Betsy M.: Are there cost differences?

Aaron S.: The ornamental railing is generally more expensive.

Betsy M.: What about the open vs. the vertical ones?

Aaron S.: We have not run the cost estimates on these two.

- Link L.: I like the simple.
- Camille F.: This group is shy about selecting something that is more expensive. The simple or the ornamental would be fine depending on what the public likes.
- Greg S.: The ornamental does not look bridge-like; it looks residential. The look should be more industrial, so the simple satisfies that.

Aaron S. asked for a show of hands for the simple railing: 7 in the room + 2 on the phone.

- Michele C.: I have no preference.
- Vickie Y.: If there were ever a reason to enclose the sidewalk, would it make a difference what kind of railing we choose?

Aaron S.: It would not make that much difference in cost.

Aaron reviewed the pedestrian access points for both sides of the river.

- John C.: One of the NEPA mitigation items is to do a pedestrian and bicycle study for Milton.
- Craig P.: There was a concept with a stair closer to the riverbank. Has that been eliminated?

John C.: Yes. That would get you down to the open field. This option gets you down to the existing businesses and the touchdown is not on private property.

- Camille F.: How do you get to the two businesses on the left of the Milton graphic?

Aaron S.: You would exit off at Coopers Bottom and cross to the parking area.

Camille F.: So this is ground level?

Aaron S.: Yes. This would be a crosswalk.

- John S.: The gray line is a curb?

Tim S.: Yes.

John C.: This helps to control the traffic and turns.

- Betsy M.: Can you explain what the bump-outs are on the inside of the curb?
Aaron S.: That just shows the turn-ins to the gas station.
Betsy M.: So this is at-grade?
Aaron S.: Yes.
- Tim S.: Outside the sidewalk and the curbs, it is not going to look a lot different than what is out there today.
- Nat A.: Where is the access for the pedestrian walkway? If my kids wanted to go to Madison, I would rather see them go down to High Street and come back up the other way. Walking in front of the businesses and crossing Coopers Bottom would not be desirable. It is a free-for-all in there. This would be taken care of in the future approaches, but we need a solution for the meantime. It would be better to have this access further from this intersection.
John C.: On Coopers Bottom and US 421, there would be some channelization and an island to help in crossing the street. It is not the perfect fix, but it is some improvement to what is there now.
Nat A.: I would still prefer to go under the bridge at High St. and mount the bridge at the other side.
Tim S.: We do have some problem with grades in this area and with right-of-way. We have included the bike and pedestrian study as mitigation to try and plan for this in the future.
- Jan V.: Be careful not to mix the semi-trucks with the kids. The trucks will be coming off a curve and will not be able to see.
- John S.: Is there a way to add in a staircase at High St.?
John C.: Any access here has to be ADA compliant, so it would have to be a ramp.
Tim S.: We also do not have the right-of-way in this area at this time.
- Craig P.: At the Coopers' Bottom crossing, would it make sense to move the crosswalk further down where Cooper's Bottom is more narrow?
John C.: We can look at this. Without a stop control, like you have at the intersection, pedestrians tend to think they can cross without warning.
Craig P.: We would recommend that this is studied a little further.
- Patrick Cunningham: For both sides, who will clean off the sidewalks in the winter and at what point does the maintenance turn over to the cities?
Andy B.: I will have to find out about this.
- Link L.: You could have a heated walkway, but not as 106 mitigation.
- Vickie Y.: Could you put up a pedestrian traffic signal?
John C.: KYTC has warrants for signals and there is not enough traffic here to meet the warrants.

Aaron S. continued the discussion of the pedestrian access on the Indiana side, including the switchback ramp to Vaughn Drive. We do not have the right-of-way to extend the walkway to the existing river walk.

– Tim S.: This could be added in the future.

– Jan V.: We just said that we liked the simple pedestrian railing on the bridge. How do you tie this in to the river walk?

Aaron S.: You will have to transition the railing at one place or the other.

Jan V.: Could you do this with color?

John C.: We can talk about this.

– Camille F.: It looks like the width of the roadway is shown in the renderings as about the same as it is now. Is this correct?

Tim S.: The roadway expands out within a few feet of the bridge.

– Jan V.: Is the long-straight switchback cheaper than a circular ramp?

Aaron S.: It is probably cheaper and the circular would take up a larger footprint in the park.

Aaron S. discussed the form liner examples for the abutments and walls.

– John S.: It is difficult to give a preference without seeing the size and scale of the abutments. We should put this off for future discussion.

Greg S.: Didn't the switchback graphic show this?

Aaron S.: Yes.

– Jan V.: Plain concrete is not an option. It needs to look like a stone or brick.

– Greg S.: We should look for inspiration around town.

Camille F.: There is a lot of dry-laid river stone in town that is grayer in color.

– Patrick Cunningham: Aren't both abutments now made of concrete? Why would you change it to stone now? This seems to go against replicating the existing bridge.

Greg S.: This is an opportunity to enhance the design.

– Betsy M.: Would it be possible to look at the six different options? The consultants should develop proposals that are specifically tied to some local feature or look, with an explanation of what it comes from.

John C.: If we had time, this would be a great opportunity. We are about 90 days from getting a notice out to the contractors. I don't know that we would have time to develop these and meet again with the Section 106 groups for input. Maybe you could tell us what you think is not appropriate in these options.

Betsy M.: There is no reason why that would take so long. We could do your work for you.

Link L.: I think we can do that today without additional renderings. The masonry in this meeting room is comparable to the ashlar and dry-stack stone shown in the presentation. This is representative of what is found all over Madison. Can you manipulate the color of the concrete?

Aaron S.: Color can have additional cost implications.

Camille F.: There is an aged concrete wall there now, surrounded by the dry-laid gray stone. This dry-stack example is not as horizontal, but it is very similar.

Craig P.: We just want compatibility with what is out there now. The cultural resource experts are probably able to make recommendations for materials based on what they have seen out there now. You don't really see coarse stone that much.

- Carol L.: I agree with the statement about this being a 1930's style truss bridge that was designed with a concrete abutment, and does not need another style added into the abutment.

Nat A.: I agree with that thought completely. I am a member of the dry stone foundation, and I agree that adding a stone wall to this bridge is a study in contrast. A more compatible material would be brick.

- Jan V.: From a city resident perspective, we are adding a lot of concrete that will lead to crime and graffiti. We need to have a pattern, maybe even steamboats or contemporary art.
- Vickie Y.: How close is the concrete pier to the wall on the Madison side?

Aaron S.: It is about 100 feet.

- Greg S.: Will the length of the abutment be increased?

Aaron S.: It will be 30-feet wider and closer to the river than it is now on both sides.

- Link L.: There are other form liners to consider.

Aaron S.: We could write into the specs that the form liner will be compatible with local resources.

- John S.: This goes back to the question of design review, since we are trying to make decisions without renderings.

Aaron S.: We can do additional renderings, but the timing will be next year.

- John C.: We would make a recommendation to the two states. You have eliminated some of the form liner concepts. Most of the group (except Patrick, Carol and Nat) are interested in the ashlar or dry-stack stone. We can follow up with our cultural resources folks to make further recommendations.

Betsy M.: I would like to see a narrower field of patterns with input from your cultural resources professionals and more renderings. It does not need to be decided right now.

John C.: We will take this back and discuss it with KYTC and INDOT.

- Patrick: How much right-of-way will there be on either side? How much will be covered with landscaping?

Aaron S.: The artist has added some landscaping to the renderings, but there would be room on both sides for landscaping.

- Greg S.: We could handle this through an email approach and collect input from the parties.
- Nancy G.: From a design aesthetic point of view, we need to think about scale. Brick is too small of a scale and should not be in the mix.

Greg S.: On other large historic bridges, a lot of the stone tends to be larger size and uniform in size. We could consider that.

Nat A.: For dry-stack stone, the comments about scale apply as well. There are brick structures much larger than dry-stack walls. To make a dry-stack wall work, the stones on the bottom would be very large with smaller stones on top.

Aaron S. then discussed the shape of the truss piers in the water.

- Jan V.: Are there cost differences?

Aaron S.: There are differences in the amount of materials going into each of these.

- Camille F.: Will the land piers follow the same pattern?

Aaron S.: That has not been decided. We have renderings of these to discuss today as well.

- Nancy G.: I like the second two options because they make the bridge look taller and more elegant.

Betsy M.: Are those the less expensive options?

Aaron S.: Yes. It appears these are the preferred.

Jan V.: The rectangular is preferred.

Nat A.: I like the full taper.

Jan V.: That is a more expensive option.

Aaron S. asked for a show of hands for the full taper option: 1 on the phone.

- Betsy M.: I have a slight preference for number 2 over 3.

Carol L.: I have no preference.

Aaron S. asked for a show of hands for the rectangular option: 8 in the room.

- Vickie Y.: Is there a difference structurally?

Aaron S.: There are different but they will all be safe and sound.

- Patrick Cunningham: Is there a maintenance issue with spalling or anything?

Aaron S.: There is not really a difference here.

Aaron S. discussed the approach pier shape.

- Betsy M.: Can you put them all on the screen together?

- Link L.: Would the hammerhead option add construction time?

Aaron: Any of the options can be built within the year-long timeframe.

- Vickie Y.: Do any of the options match the existing Indiana approach piers?

Aaron S.: The closest would be the square column piers.

Patrick Cunningham: The existing piers match the remnants of the Madison Water Works. It would be best to keep this shape if possible.

Aaron S.: The new piers will be twice as wide, which will change the look of the arch somewhat.

- Betsy M.: For the round and square columns, the horizontal bar appears to stick out beyond the bridge.

Aaron S.: That is the pier cap, and it would stick out beyond the last beam.

Betsy M.: How far?

Aaron S.: Probably a couple of feet.

- Jan V.: Are any of the options better for pigeons?

Aaron S.: No.

- Jan V.: None of them look very attractive.

- Aaron S.: There seems to be a preference for the two column bent with a similar look to the Indiana approach piers.

Aaron S. asked for a show of hands for a land pier similar to the existing Indiana approach piers: 9 in the room.

- Betsy M.: The two columns are preferred over the hammerhead.
- Genell S.: I agree.
- Michele C: I have no preference.
- Carol L.: No preference.

Aaron wrapped up the discussion of bridge aesthetics and showed the animation of the bridge drive-through.

3. Draft MOA

John Carr began the discussion of the Draft MOA by section. Comments and discussion items included the following:

a. Whereas Section

- Betsy M.: There is a design issue in the Whereas clauses. The 5th Whereas should be reflected in the stipulations as a design-review process. If the design is changed significantly, it could require input from the Section 106 parties.

John C.: We will record this comment. Betsy was going to send me an example of a design-build design-review process.

Betsy M.: I will look for this today.

- Michele C.: I agree with Betsy. It is written as too open-ended. We want to have input on this.
- John C.: This is going to be extremely difficult in the design-build process.
- Greg S.: I agree with Betsy and Michele. We need a process spelled out specifically.
- Michele C.: When will the EA be out for review?

John C.: At the end of the month (December). We are looking at January 14th for a Public Hearing.
 - Craig P.: All agreement items are not necessarily mitigation.
 - Greg S.: In the 8th Whereas, you left out the Third St. Historic District.
 - Michele: In the 8th Whereas, it says the project will have impacts, but it does not say there will be adverse indirect and cumulative effects to the NHL. We want this as a separate point.

Betsy M.: To add to Michele's comment, we are concerned about the narrowly defined adverse effect. It should just say adverse effect in general.

Greg S.: What about a Whereas earlier in the document to say that there is an adverse effect.

Jan V.: I am concerned about taking out the word "economic."

Greg S.: It should be the 2nd Whereas.
 - Nat A.: If the parties do not want to take credit for the truss, it should be reflected in the MOA.

Jan V.: This is reflected in the 3rd Whereas.

Michele: The 3rd and 4th points cover the truss design as credited to the designers.

Nat A.: It should say that the design was presented by the consulting team.

Carol L.: I thought it was by the larger public process.
 - John C.: FHWA has directed us to put it as a Whereas; they are the ultimate owner of the document.
 - Nat A.: The objections of the Section 106 parties to the truss concept should be more clearly made.

Michele C.: This is not necessary in the MOA.
 - John C.: We will take these comments back to FHWA for their consideration.

b. Stipulation IA

- Jan V.: There isn't anything about safety.

John C: Safety is included in the purpose and need (the design goal).

c. Stipulation IB

- Craig P.: Why did you say periodic?

- John C.: Since we don't have the design build schedule, it is difficult to say when the meetings would be.
- Craig P.: How will you update the parties about the stipulations that are being implemented?
John C.: I expect it would be through email and conference calls.
Jan V.: Will you still have the website?
John C.: Yes.
 - Jan V.: A lot of construction projects have online cameras. You could add this to the project website.
John C.: We can talk about this as the time gets closer.
 - Tim F.: We could add some language about the meetings occurring close to significant project milestones or events.
Greg S.: For the Ohio River Bridges (ORB) project, they provided progress within the document. This would be very helpful. This gives the context of the mitigation item.
John C.: We would have to defer that to KYTC and INDOT.
Tim F.: There are a lot more complexities in the ORB project than in this project.

d. Stipulation ICi

- Greg S.: Why do you say "may", instead of "will" or "shall"?
John C.: It was just a choice of words. If the project does not receive the TIGER Grant, we may not use the design-build process.
Betsy M.: Will we know about the TIGER Grant before the MOA is signed?
John C.: The timing of the TIGER grant is supposed to be toward the end of January. We will be circulating the MOA around the same time.
- Craig P.: Since Betsy will have to sign off soon, let's let her make specific comments.
Betsy M.: I will give you these comments in writing. I have some language for the vibration issue on page 6. The other issues will be raised by the other parties.
- Michele C.: This item should be split into two and should explain what both processes would be (with the TIGER Grant and without).
- John C.: We can change the "mays" to "shalls."

e. Stipulation ICii

- Camille F.: Is it necessary to state a minimum capacity of the ferry?
John C.: I don't think this is advisable. It depends on the size and number of ferries provided by the contractor.

Jan V.: Do you need to state how much capacity the ferries have to provide? You could state it as a percentage of the daily traffic.

Camille F.: The initial information we have is that the ferries will not handle the full volume per day.

Tim S.: That is correct.

Camille F.: What Jan is concerned about is establishing what percent of the existing traffic will be handled by the ferry system.

John C.: The ferry system and contract will be performance based. This may or may not be appropriate in the MOA, but we will bring this up to the clients.

f. Stipulation IDi

- Michele C.: Milton and Madison need to be separated.

John C.: There was meeting with the Visitors Bureau and Milton together. They agreed these would be together, and the amount is now \$225k (\$25k for Milton). We would like to leave those together because the Bureau will be doing the work for Milton.

Michele: OK.

- Carol L.: This is a good stipulation, but it does not tie it into promoting the historic district. You might consider modifying the wording to say heritage tourism or something like that.
- Link L.: How does the LPA work?

John C.: The money would come through INDOT to the City of Madison who would have the Local Public Agency Agreement, then the City would contract with the Visitor's Bureau. INDOT can not contract with the Bureau itself.

Camille F.: Our stipulations can provide guidelines for the use of the money.

Link L.: The agency is just the conduit for the money. I thought we were talking about a group of agencies helping control the money.

Camille F.: The initial idea was to follow the Amelia Earhart bridge process where the funding was administered by the SHPO. This MOA has divided the money up into different items, rather than one fund.

Nancy G.: Link is bringing out the idea that the promotional funding was originally thought to be a fund that the use of would be determined by a number of agencies.

Link L.: I didn't think this was just about tourism.

Michele C.: The business part is addressed in point IDiii. In IDi, one example would be to help with the branding program.

Nancy G.: It specifically lists an internet campaign.

John C.: This is intended to be a tourism campaign to let people know that Milton and Madison are still open. It is also a promotional campaign to return customers when the bridge is open.

- John S.: The money would go from the City to the CVB, but the CVB is planning to set up an inter-agency group to help decide how to use the money.

Link L.: Then why not put it in the MOA?

- Nat A.: Are we considering the tourism/promotional money to be redirected to other efforts?

John S.: No, just how the tourism/promotional money would be directed for the campaign.

Carol L.: It should be directed toward promoting the historic qualities of the cities.

- Nat A.: My understanding was that this was for the downtown businesses, not limited to Main Street. The advertising was intended to keep business coming to the downtowns. The money will come from INDOT to the City in the MOA. After that, where the money goes does not need to be in the MOA?

John S.: That is correct.

- Michele C.: Is 6 months before the closure enough time?

John C.: 12 months will not be possible because that is February. 8-10 months would probably be the most advanced warning we could give.

- Michele C.: Why would the awarding of the contract have anything to do with when this money would be dispersed?

John C.: We don't know when and for how long the bridge will be closed until we see the contractor's plan. The states will want to know this before they hand over the money.

John S.: We will want to start doing press releases as soon as we know this information.

- Greg S.: To address Carol's concern, can we add language to tie into historic districts. You could still break out Milton separately with the \$25k through the Madison CVB through an LPA. Then the Madison historic district language could be inserted.

Camille F.: Can we just add "in the locale, vicinity of, etc...of the historic districts"?

Michele C.: The money is coming to this community because there is an NHL.

Jan V.: The reason we are getting the mitigation funds is the historic districts, which is helping the people.

Craig P.: Could we qualify the two communities by Historic Madison and Historic Milton?

John C.: Can we add "within the Madison Historic Districts"?

Nancy G.: This does not stipulate where the money goes after it goes to the City.

Michele C.: This is part of my concern too. There is a limited amount of money and it should be controlled very carefully.

- Carol L.: The LPA can be set up to have an advisory group to assist with the vision and decisions. The local groups would have representatives.
- Link L.: The CVB could administer the funds as long as they are not making all of the decisions too.

John C.: The \$200k came from a proposal from the CVB that showed what it would take to do a tourism promotional campaign.

Jan V.: They underestimated and did not include enough money for signage.

John C.: Road signs would be taken care in the other project funds.

- Nat A.: Will this be signed in advance of the announcement of the grant? Do we need to include something about whether or not we get the grant?

John C.: The MOA will be signed in late January, around the same time as the grant announcement. I think we are covered under the last sentence which says the money comes in 6 months before the bridge is closed.

- Camille F.: There is a Branding Leadership Team in Madison that represents the concerns of the historic district. What about saying “coordinated by” instead of “coordinated with.”

Greg S.: You will need to provide some context for this team; say something like “created through a branding effort by the City of Madison.”

John S.: The team already has regular meetings for consensus building.

- Nat A.: Are there any members of Milton on this team?

John C.: I think we would have to separate out Milton to a separate stipulation. Their decisions would likely be made by City officials.

Craig P.: We may want to have further discussions on this. There is not a local historic preservation group in Milton. We may want to involve the SHPO or others in the conversation.

John C.: Milton does have a plan they would like implement. They want their focus to be in the camping and recreational areas along the river which brings in people to serve the local businesses.

- Patrick Cunningham: Will these budget numbers still work if the project is delayed a number of years?

John C.: If we get 5-6 years down the road, we can revisit the MOA and adjust these numbers if needed.

- John S.: I will send John C. some information on the leadership team.

Link L.: It makes sense that the Leadership Team would help the City pick who would administer the funds.

- Janice O.: As long as the City is a signatory, they are bound by the MOA language.

- Michele C.: The money should go from INDOT to the city of Madison to a group that actually works to preserve the historic districts. The CVB represents many more interests than just the historic area.

Camille F.: The Branding Leadership Team is 90-100% concerned about the historic districts.

Nancy G.: This needs to be clarified for the people who don't live in Madison. The brand is based in the downtown historic area. The city may want to hire an outside firm.

- John S.: The idea is that the CVB already has a staff and a plan, and they could implement something more quickly and more efficiently.

Camille F.: The sentence that says CVB should come out. There is a tension between marketing the historic district and the region.

- James G.: What is the \$70k mentioned in this stipulation?

John C.: This is the local budget the CVB already had for the bridge closure. The \$200k mentioned is in addition to the local budget.

James G.: The language should clarify what the \$70k is for and where it is coming from.

John C.: It shows the commitment on the part of the CVB.

g. Stipulation IDii

- Greg S.: Thanks for including this stipulation. We should add that the Historic Preservation Officer (HPO) should meet the CFR61 standards. (Greg S. will send the language to John C.).

- Jim G.: Is the amount adequate with benefits to get make a competitive offer to a qualified person?

John C.: This item is written to be an activity, since FHWA can not cover a position. This would also be a reimbursable fund.

Michele C.: Why does it say "up to \$40k?"

John C.: It depends on the amount of work that person does toward the cause.

Michele C.: So this would force the City to have someone on staff that does this kind of work.

- Camille F.: What is the reimbursement time period?

John C.: I am not sure about INDOT. In Kentucky, it runs from 30-180 days.

- Patrick Cunningham: The city has not included an HPO in the last two budgets. Why would they do it now?

John C.: This gives them motivation to fund a position. Preliminary discussions indicate that they would.

- Link L.: Should this say that the HPO will undertake all the duties of an HPO?

John C.: It is written this way to tie it back to effects.

h. Stipulation IDiii

- Jan V.: How does a business planning seminar help businesses. stay open during the closure?

John C.: The thought was that it would help create new business plans during the closure.

Jan V.: Was this something that came out of the interviews with local businesses?

Greg S.: No, it came from our last meeting.

- Jan V.: This is not assistance. Assistance is fixing up the façade and attracting customers.

John C.: Attracting customers is covered under the marketing campaign.

- Jan V.: A revolving loan program would be better.

John C.: The states and FHWA are not willing to fund something like this.

- Camille F.: We would prefer to follow the model of the Amelia Earhart Bridge.
- Betsy M.: Why did the states and FHWA reject this?

John C.: The reasoning is that this is a short term impact, and they did not feel that the impacts here are the same as in the model example given by Camille.

- Jan V.: How many businesses have to go under to feel the impact of no bridge? John Staicer had a great example for the New York Bridge where they compensated people in cash.

John C.: We can take this stipulation out if you do not like it. The Lake Champlain Bridge was closed suddenly and there does not appear to be funding to build a new bridge.

Jan V.: They are even paying people for the extra transportation costs. We need monies to be sure the buildings are maintained. We need a no-interested loan program.

- Craig P.: This came up at the last meeting when we talked about businesses that could adapt to make it through the year. It does have some merit.
- Greg S.: My issue is that it should be ongoing assistance, mentoring throughout the closure as issues arise. Providing funding to the Madison Main St. program would help to cover this.

Camille F.: These are two separate issues.

Jim G.: How about a business planning consultant that is available throughout the closure?

Nancy G.: This should be done within the context of the Madison Main St. program. This program is already focused on the target area.

Jim G.: As far as a business planning consultant, I would add “Madison business owners in the Madison historic districts.”

- Betsy M.: As far as funding for the buildings, can we measure the business impacts and then if the impacts exceed a certain level, then the mitigation would be triggered?

John C.: Have you seen that done before? Can you share some language about this?

Betsy M.: There is one in Honolulu right now. It is an elevated project with a 5-year term.

John C.: Please send me some language and we will be glad to discuss this.

- Nancy G.: The Madison Main St. funding we have requested before has been nixed twice because it was for salary. I put something together for an LPA for \$40k to help fund Madison Main St. to help businesses during this time.

Michele C.: There is the matter of routing the funding. This should be stated in the stipulation.

Nancy G.: There is also an issue for reimbursement.

John C.: It would have to be a reimbursement program to the City. I don't know what the turn-around would be.

Craig P.: Is there no flexibility?

John C.: No, all federal dollars are subject to reimbursement.

- Jan V.: You need to specify this in IDi. as well, if the City were to set up a revolving loan fund.

John C.: This would still be a reimbursable program.

Betsy M.: The overall project is being done with federal money.

- Jan V.: Buildings can not be maintained with less income.

John C.: Our economic study is for a three-county region. The local survey information is all over the board.

Camille F.: Hopefully we will look back and this will help make Milton and Madison and not kill them.

Nancy G.: Your process has already admitted there will be an economic impact. There is not a lot in the MOA to deal with the economic impact. There are very few businesses now that make money. There is not significant mitigation to address the adverse effect of the project.

Jan V.: I am confused because everything I hear about stimulus dollars is to help jobs and the economy. Why are we not using the TIGER funds to help the businesses?

- Nancy G.: The project will put the businesses in jeopardy.

John C.: What will happen if there is no project?

Nancy: The businesses will limp along. We will lose some businesses and gain others. With the closure, it will only be losing businesses, which brings down profits for the rest of the businesses.

Jim G.: How much would it help to fund Nancy's proposal?

Nancy G.: It would help significantly. Independent businesses are very much on their own. They are very often not trained and use up their life savings.

Jim G.: I support Nancy's proposal.

- Camille F.: The small businesses are what keep this town vibrant. We are not saying the downtown will go downhill if this project doesn't save it. At best, small businesses struggle. I think you have the framework with the advertising and the business aspects. You should expand IDiii to about \$100k to make this more of a one-on-one assistance.
- Nat A.: I am not unsympathetic to these concerns. However, closing the bridge for one year will not kill Madison. Restoring the river crossing is intervention already. The intent of this issue was to help businesses out with advertising and visibility, and not through direct payments.

Nancy G.: We have been discussing these issues since the very beginning.

Jan V.: These are not uncommon in other mitigations.

- Nancy G.: I am concerned about the businesses and the activities, not the Madison Main St. Program.

i. Stipulation IEi

- Michele C.: This should mention the NHL and that the NPS will be invited to consult.

Jim Glass: I suggest that the two SHPOs be added to the consultation along with the Advisory Council. The process is paralleling the consultation process.

John Carr (IN): Could we be more precise than that? Can we stipulate that it will be the 106 process?

Jim Glass: Can we say KYTC and INDOT will utilize the Section 106 process?

Betsy M.: Yes, let's take it to Carol to see what she says about it.

- Betsy M.: What about asking that the approach project be included in transportation planning programs (STIPs, TIPS, etc...)?

John C.: The KYTC is not in a position to do that. They do not have the money in the program. The existing 6-year plan is actually a 15-year plan – it is over programmed, even the federal money. Indiana is in a similar situation.

- Jan V.: When we first started this, the project included approaches. Because of the TIGER fund, the approaches got deleted.

John C.: It was because of the condition of the bridge.

Jan V.: Whatever. We need to get the approaches on the list now.

John C.: We can't put them in the STIP because it is a 3-year fiscally constrained document.

Jan V.: What is the other one?

John C.: In Kentucky, it is the Unfunded Needs List. I'm not sure what it is in Indiana.

Tim F.: That is a function of our legislature. You can write your legislator about including this as a project.

Kevin H.: Our projects are planned well ahead. We can not add a project out of 106 consultation either.

- Jan V.: Our politicians have led local officials to believe this is important to them.

John C.: I can take this back to the states, but the answer is probably no.

- Betsy M.: So you are saying this stipulation is meaningless?

John C.: No, it could be added by the legislature and then a 106-like process could be followed.

- Michele C.: Since this project has been segmented to exclude the approaches, there should some commitment here.

John C.: There is a disagreement about whether this is a segmented project. It is a segment of independent utility and a project to replace an unsafe bridge.

- Carol L.: The agreement should specify that in the future there will be a Section 106 process, but I don't see how we can establish priorities for the state DOTs.

- Jim Glass: Carol: can we use the 106 process itself?

Carol L.: No, unless there is a federal agency involved. There would be no real leverage. We should call it a similar process, maybe spelled out more than what is in there now.

Tim F.: There is another avenue to engage 106 consultation, if there is federal approval for this.

Janice O.: That is correct for any undertaking that includes either federal action (federal permit) or federal money.

Betsy M.: Would there a Corps permit?

Janice O.: If you put fill within the ordinary high water.

Carol L.: I will send some language on this.

j. Stipulation IEii.

- Camille F.: After "City of Madison", add "or an appropriate non profit agency."

k. Stipulation IEiii

- Jim Glass: For the folks from Madison, is there interest in saving a piece of the historic truss for display?

Camille F.: Can the bridge be dismantled to offer part of it?

John C.: The law requires that we offer the entire thing. It is not very feasible to take the truss apart.

Aaron S.: The deck truss spans are about 150-feet in length.

Betsy M.: But you are just going through the motions.

Tim F.: I don't know that it is feasible to offer pieces.

Camille F.: There is probably no one that could take the entire structure. So if someone wants a piece, they would have to take the entire bridge.

Jan V.: So you are making it impossible to work.

- Betsy M.: Let's have Indiana be included in this provision since they have a program for reusing historic bridges.

l. Stipulation IEiv

- Michele C.: Delete "archive" and insert "submittals to the Library of Congress."
- Jim Glass: Add "accurate as-built plans."

Michele C.: I concur. Will I be working with both KY and IN SHPOs on this? Or will one take the lead?

Craig P.: We are comfortable delegating this to the IN SHPOs.

- Michele C.: Add the Midwest Regional Office for the NPS and add the IN SHPO as the lead agency. We will let them know what all the standards are. SHPOs determine whether they are Level 1 or Level 2.
- Camille F.: Throughout the document, wherever you refer to Historic Madison, call it Historic Madison, Inc.

m. Stipulation IEv

- Jim Glass: A master negative should be created and the original should be conserved..
- Craig P.: Where will these be archived? Would this be a state level? The Kentucky Historical Society and the Heritage Council should also have copies.

Jim Glass: They can be stored at the Indiana State Archives.

Camille F.: HMI should have a say-so where it is stored, since they own it. The Jefferson County Historical Society should also receive a copy.

n. Stipulation IEvi

- John Carr (IN): We think that once you get into amending it, it may be more involved than we are anticipating at this point. The Madison NRD is very succinct. We suspect the NPS may recommend more reevaluation be made rather than just adjusting the end date. The boundaries are arbitrary. The NPS may require adjustments to the boundaries which would bring in or exclude other properties.

Michele C.: If you want to exclude eligible properties, it goes beyond an amendment. It would be a revised National Register nomination.

John C.: Will John Carr (IN) offer language for this?

John Carr (IN): Yes. The timelines shown may leave you with less than a year to do all of this work.

Vickie Y.: Even the Fulton area can not be done in a year.

Patrick Carpenter: We have a derivation clause that is 6 years. We could then take out the last sentence.

o. Stipulation IEvii

- Craig: Just make this one consistent with IEvi.

p. Stipulation IFi

- Michele C.: I am concerned about how the construction materials are coming into the area. We don't want this to cause damage to the NHL.

John C.: Our vibration analysis shows that traffic will not cause building damage. The construction equipment would be down by the river.

Michele C.: Yes, but they would have to go through the NHL to get under the bridge. Someone will need to pay attention to this.

John C.: I don't have an answer to this since the contractor's plans are not yet set.

Michele C.: We need to add some kind of assurance that if construction vehicles go through town, there would be construction monitoring.

Betsy M.: What about designating certain routes?

Michele C.: The main roads through town are in the NHL and they could damage buildings. We need some kind of guarantee that the contractors will be supervised.

John C.: They do carry insurance and are required to cover any damages.

Michele C.: We would prefer to prevent this from happening through some stipulations.

John C.: We could ask them to provide a traffic routing plan to be approved by KYTC or INDOT.

Betsy M.: Could we have vibration limitations along the construction route. We have found that historic buildings and foundations can be damaged when traffic patterns change for construction, particularly along narrow streets. One example in DC is when they closed Pennsylvania Avenue and it caused damage on H Street.

Jim Glass: Is it possible to skirt the NHL and get to the staging area?

John C.: The staging area will likely be in Jaycee Park along Vaughn Avenue.

Camille F.: This should be coordinated with the City of Madison – a proposed construction route. This would also be a way to alert folks.

Vickie Y.: You could also have ferry traffic sitting in this area as well.

- Craig P.: Do KYTC and INDOT have specialists to observe the vibration monitors? This may need to be changed. Changes to construction methods should happen before the damage occurs or to get vibration levels down.
- Betsy M.: We should add the limits of 0.2 inches per minute, and 0.12 for extremely fragile buildings.
- Nat A.: What if trucks along this route contribute to the vibration already?
Betsy M.: It is the cumulative impact that is relevant.
Nat A.: Could this lead to shutting down commercial activity routinely?
Betsy M.: Construction gets treated as the activity that pushes the vibration over the limit.
Nat A.: But would it shut down the commercial traffic as well?
Craig P.: Commercial traffic and construction traffic would not likely occur at the same time. There are lots of things that we have no regulatory oversight over, but we do have oversight over the construction of this bridge.
- Craig P.: The building on the east side of the KY approach is in a fragile state.
Betsy M.: Is this the one on High Street?
Craig P.: It is the two-story brick on the east side of the bridge.
John C.: It is number 57.
Betsy M.: The 0.12 threshold might be appropriate for this one based on the fragility.
Craig P.: It is reasonable to request that FHWA makes sure that the construction activities do not damage the structures.
John C.: Betsy – send us your language and we will take it to FHWA.
Michele C.: Will your language consider the delivery route as well?
Betsy M.: Do you want a single vibration provision?
Jan V.: Can this be put in the second bullet point?
Michele C.: It should just be a separate item.

q. Stipulation IFii

- Betsy M.: What are the local standards?
Jan V.: The City just revised their noise ordinance. It is for levels, not hours. It was not intended to include construction.
Kevin H.: Construction is exempt in the noise ordinance from 6 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

r. Stipulation IFiii

- Jan V.: Can the plan be adjusted if it is not working?
John C.: It is the responsibility of the resident engineer to make sure the plan is working.

Jan V.: Can we define “not working” with a length of queue or something?

John C.: I think we will have to trust KYTC and INDOT on this.

- Craig P.: There is a missing item that we talked about before, including sidewalks and curbing for Milton.

John C.: The decision was made to do the planning study instead for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Craig P.: Milton will be a parking lot for the duration of the ferry. These facilities would help this situation.

John C.: The ferry staging area is intended to help with this.

Craig P.: Milton is missing any kind of preparation for how the downtown will be utilized during the construction. We would like an opportunity for continued discussion of this.

s. Stipulation IFv

- Betsy M.: Be more specific and state which events in the MOA.

Michele C.: The specific known events should be listed, and there should be a clause for additional events as needed.

Jan V.: The Regatta and Chautauqua are two big ones.

- Michele C.: If there is some misunderstanding about which events will be planned for, it could have a negative effect on the economy.

John C.: We will ask the Cities which ones they want to include.

t. Stipulation IGiii

- John Carr (IN): These professional standards are the same ones we referred to earlier in the MOA.

Michele: It is the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications (36CFR61) 1997. (Michele and Betsy are sending the official title).

- John Carr (IN): Rick Jones will be providing comments about this.
- Craig Potts: Our archaeologists are OK with it for now, but do not want to preclude additional comments.

u. Stipulation IH

- Michele C.: What if the contractor goes over the time limit? Will you consider modifications to the stipulation?

John C.: I don’t think either state intends to do that.

- Jan V.: What about the ferry and the marketing funds?

John C.: The ferry is for the full closure period. The marketing funds are for two years.

Jan V.: But if the closure is 18 months, then we should get additional marketing funds.

Carol L.: KYTC and INDOT will do everything they can to minimize the time needed to build the bridge. If the closure period goes way beyond expectations, we can make an amendment to the MOA.

- Camille F.: I need some clarification on the timelines.

John C.: The bridge closure has to happen in February 2011 due to the peregrine falcon.

Camille F.: So the planning period would be from June next year when the contractor is selected through February when then closure happens.

- Jan V.: If there is an increase in bridge closure time, is there opportunity to consider amendments to the stipulation?

John C.: I can asked KYTC about this.

- Betsy M.: Why would the consultation process have to be completed within 14 days?

John C.: We wanted to get it done as quickly as possible. Is there a better timeframe?

Betsy M.: It could play out where mitigation could be taken off the table with the party's participation. It sounds like bait and switch.

John C.: The contractor wants to make money. He doesn't make money by going over schedule.

Betsy M.: I will offer some language on this.

Carol L.: I would say 30 days to consult is appropriate. I will provide my comments to you in writing. You need to include Native American consultation for human remains.

v. Stipulation IIE

- John Carr (IN): We will need 15 days for this.

w. Stipulation IIIA

- Betsy M.: Should this be the SHPOs and not the contractor? Stipulation IIIB brings FHWA back into the picture. This does not seem right.

Tim F.: Typically they have to consult anyway, for example: borrow.

John C.: We will look at this language again and find out what the Indiana requirements are going to be.

x. Stipulation VB

- Jan V.: We decided we would tie this to milestones.

y. Other

- John Carr (IN): Jim Glass thinks it would be a good idea to invite the other consulting parties to sign the MOA as concurring parties. The advantage is their buy-in with the agreement.
- Jan V.: The Indirect Effects document says the bridge will not change traffic, air quality, noise, etc... Is this studied after to find out if it was true?

John Carr: It is not studied after. Based on what we know, we don't have reason to believe this will occur.

At this point in the meeting, John Carr made brief comments about the remainder of the meeting agenda items:

- 4. 800.11e Report** – This is available today for the parties to start their review.
- 5. Results of Economic Study** – This information is on the Project Website.
- 6. Results of Ferry Study** – This information is on the Project Website.
- 7. Status of Environmental Assessment** – The EA will be available at the end of December for review.
- 8. Comments and Discussion** – There were no additional comments at this time.
- 9. Upcoming Coordination Points** – The Public Hearing is scheduled for January 14th, 2009.

With no further discussion, the meeting was closed around 5:20 p.m.