



**MEETING SUMMARY
MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE
PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP (PAG)
MEETING #3
December 9, 2008**

The Milton-Madison Project Advisory Group (PAG) had its third meeting at the Lanier Mansion-Madison Visitors Center on December 9, 2008, at 6:30 PM. The purpose of the meeting was to review the draft purpose and need, discuss the preliminary bridge location alternatives, and to begin reviewing potential bridge types.

Nineteen (19) members of the PAG (or their substitutes) and fifteen (15) 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, provided a summary of PAG #2, and reviewed the meeting agenda.

John Mettille provided an overview of the preliminary draft project purpose and need to-date. He reviewed the information collected from the group at PAG #2; bridge deficiencies and safety on the bridge were the primary issues. John discussed how these issues contributed to the draft purpose of the project, as well as the goals and objectives. John indicated that the draft purpose and need will be modified as the project process continues and comments are received from the public and agencies. The PAG agreed that the draft purpose and need reflects the intent of the PAG. There were no other comments about the purpose and need by the PAG.

John Mettille then reviewed the location alternative screening process. He explained how the purpose and need, goals and objectives, technical analyses, and public/agency input will be used as screening criteria during the bridge location selection process.

JB Williams and Mary Jo Hamman then discussed the pros and cons of two of the potential options for the bridge: the do nothing option and the bridge rehabilitation option. JB explained that consideration of the do nothing option is required as part of the environmental process. With this option, the bridge would likely be closed to all traffic by 2025. Mary Jo reviewed the rehabilitation option, which would maintain the historic features of the bridge. With this option, the bridge would likely be open until about 2040.

JB then briefly discussed the superstructure replacement option. He indicated that the bridge will be inspected on Wednesday, December 10th (weather permitting), to begin to determine the strength of the existing piers. This will require one lane to be closed for one day. Routine climbing inspection will also be going on this week on the bridge, but will not require lane closures. There will also be additional testing of the piers to evaluate the superstructure replacement option. Replacement of the superstructure would likely take about one construction season (9 months), and would require a detour during this time. PAG comments about this included the following:

Q: Would the approaches be changed as part of this option?

A: Yes, they would be changed. At this point, we do not know how much they would change, but we will be studying this.

Q: Is a pontoon bridge a temporary option?

A: This would not be an option because of the barge traffic on the river.

Tim Sorenson led a discussion about the location study for a possible new bridge alignment. He reviewed the information and suggested crossing locations gathered from the PAG #2 meeting. This resulted in six potential alternatives. Tim reviewed the pros and cons of these alternatives. The PAG questions about the alternatives included the following:

1) Western Bypass Alternative and 2) Lonesome Hollow Alternative

Q: If we are building too far away from the existing bridge, is it no longer considered a replacement? Would this be a problem?

A: No, that would not present a problem.

Q: Do these two alternatives stay out of the floodplain?

A: Not necessarily. In some cases, the approach roadways would still be in the floodplain.

3) Jefferson Street Alternatives

Q: For the Jefferson Street alternatives, could you develop angled parking under the bridge on the Madison side?

A: Yes.

Q: What would the grade be on the Madison side? Could there be an exception?

A: We have not considered more than 4% at this time.

Q: What is the population of Ashland, Kentucky? Madison is only about 8,000, so the difference in scale should be considered. An elevated bridge will divide a town, and even more so in a smaller town.

A: The population of Ashland is about 25,000. We agree that these are issues to be considered.

Q: With Option A on the Milton side, would it be possible for the approach to touch down in town, rather than have the loop around town?

A: It is something we can consider as we move forward.

Comment: With option B in Milton, you are still going to have tight turns. Option A is a smoother approach.

Comment: This option would divide the town and be detrimental to the pedestrian community in Madison.

4) Parallel to the Existing Bridge Alternative

There were no comments about this alternative.

5) KY 36 Alternative

Q: Will the bridge be 3 lanes wide?

A: This has not been decided yet, but it will be somewhere between 2 and 4 lanes.

Q: Could KY 36 be connected from the east into the south end of the bridge?

A: That's an option we could look into.

6) Madison Ferry Street Alternative

There were no comments about this alternative.

Tim indicated that the next step is to submit materials to the agencies for review: purpose and need, goals and objectives, and location alternatives. After this, the location alternatives will be screened and narrowed down based on the purpose and need. The narrower field of alternatives will then be looked at in more detail.

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

Q: For any of the alternative east of the existing bridge, would the project include improvements to SR 56 back to Madison?

A: This will depend on the geometry needed to connect back to the existing roadway system. Our project technically goes from touchdown-point to touchdown-point. Additional improvements could come from other project funding.

Q: There were two alternatives suggested at the last meeting. One would take off beyond the eastern edge of the landmark district in Madison, cross the river at a slight southwestern angle, and tie into the base of Milton Hill behind the homes on US 421/KY 36. The other would take off beyond the eastern edge of the landmark district in Madison, cross the river at a slight southeastern angle above KY 36, and tie into Spring Street near Canip Creek. [Note: these alternatives were drawn on the map following the meeting by Mr. Adams.]

A: SR 56 would have to be under the bridge in this location, since there is not enough room to touch down. It is preferred to cross the channel at a right angle, if possible. We can look at this option to see if it is a possible alternative.

Q: Will we be talking about Section 106¹ in this group?

A: This is a different process and will start after the first of the year. There is a handout on the Section 106 process at the sign-in table if anyone is interested.

¹ Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their projects on historic properties. This review process makes federal agencies identify historic resources, determine how these resources could be affected by a project, and look for ways to avoid/mitigate/minimize these impacts. Section 106 also allows agencies and individuals an opportunity to comment on projects and impacts to historic structures, districts, and archaeological sites.

Tim reviewed the dates for the next PAG Meeting (January 13) and the first Public Meeting (February 12). He also indicated that the project website is now up and running.

John Carr asked how the PAG liked the Visitors Center as a meeting location. They agreed that it was a good size for the group.

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

Q: A future connection on the Kentucky side should consider a connection to US 421 on the top of the hill.

A: We will consider a future connection as part of our screening criteria. It is not part of our purpose and need because it is a bridge replacement project.

Q: Was the far eastern option dismissed already? This is one that was discussed at the last PAG meeting - near Eagle Hollow Road on the Indiana side, and near the county line on the Trimble County side. It has a good alignment for a future hilltop to hilltop connection.

A: This option has not been dismissed, and can be considered as part of the preliminary alternatives screening.

With no further questions or comments from the public, the meeting was dismissed at 8:00 p.m.

PAG MEETING #3 ATTENDEES

PAG Members

Agency	Member	Member Attended	Substitute	Sub. Attended
Auxier Gas	Warren Auxier	X		
Dow Corning	Bob McKinney			
EDP	Corey Murphy			
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	X		
Madison Chamber	Kevin Watkins	X		
Madison Public Works	Randy Eggenpiller	X		
Milton Fire	Ronnie Barnes	X		
Inland Marine	Robert Nolan			
Trimble Fiscal Court	Nolan Hamilton	X		
Trimble Historic	Nathaniel Adams	X		
Woodburn, Kyle	Peter Woodburn		Wayne Kyle	X
Riverside Produce	Kenny McCoy		Justin McCoy	X
Regatta & Citizen	Sue Fisher	X		
Overton Farms & Citizen	Jim Overton	X		
Citizen	Carla Goins	X		
Citizen	Ann Grahn	X		
Citizen	Jim Juricic	X		

Project Team

Name	Organization
Rob Martin	KYTC
Amanda Abner	KYTC, DEA
Susan Neumeyer	KYTC, DEA
Mary Jackman	INDOT
Marvin Jenkins	INDOT
Steve Smith	INDOT
Jim Ude	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
Mary Jo Hamman	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
Linda Lytle	Madison Area CVB
Joe Wentworth	
Gladys Henson	
Jim Rhom	Citron
Bob Ems	WIKI Radio
Konnie McCollum	RoundAbout Madison
Sara Denhart	The Madison Courier
Danae Peckler	Kentucky Heritage Council
Kary Stackelbeck	Kentucky Heritage Council
Bruce Tandy	Tandy's Trucking
Tony Hertz	Historic Board of Review
Jim Olson	Jefferson County Highway Department
Randall Embry	KIPDA ADD
Lorrie Kinkade	Trimble Banner