



MEETING SUMMARY MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP (PAG) MEETING #4 January 13, 2009

The Milton-Madison Project Advisory Group (PAG) had its fourth meeting at the Milton Elementary School on January 13, 2009, at 6:30 PM. The purpose of the meeting was to review the location alternatives screening criteria, discuss the public meeting polling planned for February 12, and review Step 1 of the Bridge Type Selection process.

Twenty-one (21) members of the PAG (or their substitutes) and seventeen (17) members of the public attended 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 KYTC and INDOT members present. John Carr introduced the project team, and asked the PAG members to introduce themselves. John discussed the winter weather information for future meetings, reviewed the meeting agenda, and asked for any public comments before the presentation. The public comment period included the following input:

- Steve Eaglin, Madison Citizen – Mr. Eaglin lives on Filmore Street in downtown Madison. His property has been in his family for 90 years and is directly in line with one of the alternatives. Mr. Eaglin is not in favor of any alternative that impacts his property; he is concerned that it will interrupt the historic area and historic properties. Other proposed locations that are farther out of town are more appropriate for the bridge and would avoid the historic area.
- Jim Olson, Jefferson County Highway Engineer – Mr. Olson suggested that the PAG think about the bridge from the highway users perspective, such as business owners that depend on US 421. He feels that a small percentage of the regular users of US 421 originate in downtown Madison. Most US 421 users would rather not go through downtown Madison, particularly trucks, and a bypass should be built on the east or west side of Madison to avoid the downtown area.

John Carr then reviewed the press release about the upcoming lane closure on the US 421 bridge.

John Mettille provided an overview of screening criteria for the location alternatives. He discussed how these criteria were developed based on the draft purpose and need for the project. PAG questions related to screening criteria include the following:

- What is the benchmark for the maintenance criteria?

Since some bridge types are easier to maintain than others, we can compare the maintenance costs for the various bridge types identified for this project.

- When will the criteria be finalized?

We should have comments back from the resource agencies by early March, 2009.

Tim Sorenson then reviewed the bridge location alternatives, including options identified during PAG #3. He provided an overview of the historic districts on both sides of the river. PAG comments related to the bridge location alternatives include the following:

- For the Around Milton Alternative, isn't this in a flood zone?

Yes, this would likely have to be built up out of the floodplain.

Aaron Stover then provided a review of the Bridge Type Selection process, including an explanation of the bridge parameters. These include the typical section, the bridge alignment/location, navigational clearances, and the initial and long-term costs. Aaron also explained the draft bridge concepts that have been developed to date for the main span of the bridge, including truss, arch, and cable-stay bridges. The girder and suspension bridge types will not be considered, since they are not cost-effective for a 900-foot span bridge. PAG comments included the following:

- The Madison Regatta uses both sides under the current bridge. Has this been considered?

This has not been included as part of the analysis to date, but it can be included as we move forward.

Aaron also reviewed the electronic polling exercise that will be undertaken at the public meeting and showed a sample of the renderings that will be used for the polling. PAG comments included the following:

- What happens if you change your mind during the exercise?

We will review all of the concepts once and then go back through them for the polling at Public Meeting #1. The polling devices will allow someone to change their mind until the responses are "locked in" for viewing. This polling is just Step 1 of the Bridge Type Selection, and there will be other options for input.

- How can a bridge type be selected without knowing the location?

We will be developing six alternatives to show in the next round of public preference polling. These will be location-specific. This polling is attempting to identify public preferences for aesthetical bridge design features only. This will be input for the designer. We are not deciding on a specific bridge.

- Would it be possible to go through the exercise twice (once before the location is selected and once after)?

We will be polling again after the bridge location has been selected.

- Is this exercise a requirement for state or federal guidelines?

It is not a requirement. We have found that this exercise gives us good information about public preference on aesthetics.

- Is there a budget for the bridge and how do we make selections without knowing the cost?

We will not show options that we can not afford at this stage. There is not a budget developed at this time, although we have eliminated the suspension bridge based on its cost for this bridge's span length.

- Is the polling happening at the February public meeting? Can anyone vote?

The polling will take place at the February 12th public meeting, and the voting will be open to all attendees. We will keep track of the PAG, Section 106, and general public polling input.

- Have any decisions been made about the location? This will change what type of bridge will be preferred.

We have not ruled out any of the location alternatives at this point. This will depend on the screening process.

- Can the PAG give a preference for the location at this time, or do you have to do the screening anyway?

We will provide the screening information at the next PAG meeting. The PAG can provide input about their preferred location for a new bridge whenever they wish.

- Would it add a lot of work to do the 18 concepts at all the different bridge locations for Public Meeting Number 1?

Yes. The polling is designed so that rating of the concepts gives us information about the aesthetic characteristics, not specific bridge types. We will be asking for input in Steps 2 and 3 of the Bridge Type Selection as well, when the bridge location has already been selected.

- If the existing bridge remains in place and a new bridge with a 900-foot clearance is constructed near the existing bridge in one of the downtown locations, some access for barges through the existing structure will be cut off. The marine industry would oppose this.

We will be reviewing the alternatives with the Coast Guard for navigational requirements.

- Can the polling be split into groups based on the location?

We can consider the logistics of this.

- There is one location alternative near the power plant that should be eliminated because of the bend in the river.

We can discuss how to include this in the criteria.

- Before the Coast Guard will sign off on anything, they will have a discussion with all of the marine industry groups.

- Is the goal of the polling to come out with a statistically valid preference of the community?

No. The preference polling is not designed to create a statistically valid conclusion. This is preference polling to get input from the meeting attendees on aesthetic characteristics.

- Will we be able to compare our input with what the DOTs select for the bridge?

The results of the input will be shown live at the public meeting, so attendees will know immediately what the public preference is. The polling input is just one element of the decision making process for KYTC and INDOT.

- Will the existing bridge be taken down?

The KYTC and INDOT will only maintain one bridge. If the new bridge is at a new location, the KYTC and INDOT will not maintain the existing one.

- When will we find out the budget for the bridge?

As we narrow the alternatives, we will be able to put together some cost estimates.

- If you have eliminated one bridge type based on cost already, you must have a range in mind.

There is not a budget at this time. The suspension bridge is exceptionally more per square foot for this span length than the other bridge types under consideration. It is more economically feasible for much wider river crossings.

- Can the preference polling be done online to get broader community input?

This methodology is not set up for online polling.

Tim indicated that the next step is the public meeting, where the project team will collect input on the purpose and need, the location alternatives, and the bridge type selection.

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

- Will the two 12-foot lanes be wide enough for the future?

We will use our traffic analysis to define the typical section of the bridge. We have shown a general cross-section that will be used for the bridge type selection renderings, but the actual cross-section has not been finalized at this time.

- What is the timeline for this project? Is there any way to get this project into the infrastructure bill?

We hope to complete the environmental document within 3 years (we started this in June 2008). There are still a lot of activities to complete before the project could move into design. It is still unclear what the economic stimulus package will include or when it will move forward. KYTC and INDOT are aware of this and will follow the development of the economic stimulus package and opportunities for this project.

- Do you have any studies that show what bridge types have been selected in other locations in the US?

There are not any studies that we know of that would provide this information.

- Is it true that there is an entity that wants to take over the operation of the existing bridge, and could they use the demolition funds for maintenance and operation?

There is historical precedence for this.

- When is the next inspection of the bridge?

An inspection of the bridge was completed in December. The KYTC does not know when the report for this inspection will be ready.

- Was the December inspection completed as part of this study?

No, the bridge inspection was completed under a separate KYTC program.

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

- We should select a bridge that is affordable. The funding is coming out of the taxpayers' pockets.
- Affordability is also a long range issue. It is better to spend the money to do the project right now, rather than spending more money later to fix a job that was not done correctly.

With no further questions or comments from the public, the meeting was dismissed at 8:15 p.m.

PAG MEETING #3 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	X		
E-ON US	David Pennybaker			
Jefferson Co. EM	Dave Bell			
King's Daughters	Roger Allman			
Madison Bicycle	Rick Lostutter		Mark Gish	X
Madison Chamber	Kevin Watkins	X		
Madison Public Works	Randy Eggenstiller	X		
Milton Fire	Ronnie Barnes	X		
Inland Marine	Robert Nolan	X		
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	X		
Regatta & Citizen	Sue Fisher	X		
Overton Farms & Citizen	Jim Overton	X		
Citizen	Carla Goins	X		
Citizen	Ann Grahn	X		
Citizen	Jim Juricic		Roy Wyant	X

Project Team

Name	Organization
Gary Valentine	KYTC
Matt Bullock	KYTC
Andrea Clifford	KYTC
Brian Meade	KYTC
Mary Jackman	INDOT
Marvin Jenkins	INDOT
Ben Lawrence	INDOT
Steve Smith	INDOT
Jim Ude	INDOT
John Carr	Wilbur Smith Associates
John Mettelle	Wilbur Smith Associates
Tim Sorenson	Wilbur Smith Associates
Samantha Wright	Wilbur Smith Associates
Aaron Stover	Michael Baker
JB Williams	Michael Baker
Kathy Francis	Doe Anderson
Jack Couch	KIPDA
Joe Cosby	Niche Marketing
Michelle Henderson	Niche Marketing

Other Attendees

Name	Organization
Tim Armstrong	Mayor of Madison
Jim Olson	Jefferson County Highway Department
Lorrie Kinkade	Trimble Banner
Betsy Liston	Citizen of Bedford & Madison
Joe Wentworth	
Darrel Henderson	Madison City Council
Randall Embry	KIPDA
Steve Eaglin	
Charles McCoy	
Randy Stevens	Trimble County Fiscal Court
Camille Fife	
Sara Denhart	Madison Courier
Rich Murray	Cornerstone
Konnie McCollum	RoundAbout Madison
Marcia Dunaway	Trimble County Schools
Shannon Hoskins	City of Milton
Arby Jack	