



**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 and gave a brief overview of the recent weight restrictions for the bridge.

Andrea Clifford reviewed the recent weight restriction information. Based on the findings of the December 2008 Fracture Critical Inspection by KYTC, the bridge will be limited to 15 ton vehicles and under starting in April 2009. Andrea and David Steele responded to questions and comments as follows:

- What about emergency vehicles during the construction shutdown?  
We can make preparations for a vehicle less than 15 tons to squeeze through the construction zone.
- We will want plenty of advance notice if no emergency vehicles will be able to cross the bridge during construction.
- Why is there a delay in doing the detailed inspection of the bridge? Could the two inspections have been completed at the same time?  
It is the fracture critical inspection that tells us we need the in-depth inspection.
- Can you predict the likelihood that the next improvements will restore truck traffic on the bridge?  
This will not be likely since there are other problems on the bridge that must be addressed.
- How will you determine which vehicles are above 15 tons?  
Commercial vehicle enforcement will help get this process started.
- What about commercial vehicles that are empty and weigh less than 15 tons?  
Enforcement is usually based on the weight limit of the truck, and not the current load.
- What about fire trucks that weigh 38,000 pounds?  
There should be enough equipment on both sides of the bridge to cover most emergencies.

- If there is a 15 ton weight limit, is the bridge still safe when loaded end-to-end with 15-ton trucks?

This is taken into consideration and the bridge would be able to withstand this.

- Why not cap the weight limit at 25,000 pounds and keep all of the commercial vehicles off of the bridge?

The weight limit is set based on our experience with other similar bridges.

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 Eggenspiller, 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 Mettillle 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, this can be accomplished through partnering with 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

Public Attendees

Name	Organization
Bob Ems	WIKI Radio
Margo Watkins	
Link Ludington	
Sara Denhart	The Madison Courier
Camille Fife	The Westerly Group
Patty Lewrs	
Wayne Kyle	Wayne, Kyle, and Company
Jerry Richter	P.S., LLC
Brent S	
Mary B	
Brad Miller	Cornerstone Society
Darrell Henderson	Madison City Council
Nancy Gruner	Madison Main Street
Louis Alexander	Milton Madison Precision
Ginger Jorgenson	Madison HDBR
Kevin Thompson	IKT
Heidi Saueressig	Cornerstone Society
Connie Pantington	Cornerstone Society
Liz Palmquist	Congressman Baron Hill's Office
Rick Raud	KY State Representative
Bob Canida	
Mark Overton	
Peggy Vlerebome	
Steve Joslin	Sticks
Jan Vetrhus	Madison Bicentennial
Randall Embry	KIPDA
Marcia Snyder	
David Collier	Madison Chamber
R. Murray	Cornerstone
Glen Kelly	QK4
Casey Bloos	WORX/WXGO Radio
Vickie Young	
Phil Wotring	
Greg Sekula	Historic Landmark Foundation, Indiana
George Freeman	
Dave Morgan, IKT	
Robert Saueressig	Historic Madison Review Board
Kenneth Hall	