



MEETING SUMMARY MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE PROJECT ADVISORY GROUP (PAG) MEETING #6 April 28, 2009

The Milton-Madison Project Advisory Group (PAG) had its sixth meeting at the Broadway Hotel/Livery Stables in Madison IN on April 28, 2009, at 6:30 PM. The purposes of the meeting were to 1) review the results of Bridge Type Selection Step 1, and 2) review the recommendations for moving location alternatives forward for more detailed study.

Eighteen (18) members of the PAG and thirty-seven (37) 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 provided a brief overview of team activities since PAG Meeting #5 and reviewed the meeting agenda. No one signed up for the public comment period at this point in the meeting.

Ted Grossardt provided an overview of the electronic polling exercise from Public Meeting #1 in February 2009. He explained the two models for the polling output (Public/PAG and Section 106) and reviewed the bridge concepts and design elements considered as part of the polling exercise. Ted then reviewed the general observations and summarized the preferences for each bridge type.

Questions and comments from the PAG members regarding the Results of Bridge Type Selection Step 1 included the following:

- Was there a preference among the three types?

The cable-stays had the highest average score, arches had the middle average score, and trusses had the lowest average score. Within each structure family, some concepts did better than others. This tells us which aesthetic features are preferred. Preference scores for the PAG and the public were very similar, indicating that the PAG is a good sample of the local preferences.

Tim Sorenson provided an overview of the screening process for the Location Alternatives. He reviewed the Purpose and Need screening and explained the removal of four alternatives: Rehabilitation (Alt. 2), Bypass (Alt. 4), Lonesome Hollow (Alt. 13), and Eagle Hollow (Alt. 14). Tim then discussed the secondary screening and the removal of four more alternatives: Jefferson Street (Alts. 5 and 6), Parallel (Alt. 7), and KY 36 (Alt. 8).

Tim then reviewed the alternatives that are recommended to move forward for more detailed study. The Superstructure Replacement (Alt. 3) will move forward, and we expect the inspection results for the existing piers in the next month or so. Tim then described two other alternatives that are recommended: Tiber Creek (Alt. 9/10 Hybrid) and Canip Creek (Alt. 11/12 Hybrid). Tim indicated that the Superstructure Replacement alternative would not accommodate a Cable Stay Bridge.

Questions and comments from the PAG members regarding the Recommended Alternatives for More Detailed Study included the following:

- Does the width shown on the drawings indicate the width of the bridge?

Response: No, this is much wider than will be needed for the bridge. The shaded area on the map is a range for the location, which will depend on the findings of the more detailed studies.

- For Tiber Creek, if you are going over KY 36, how do you get on the bridge?

Response: In Milton, and the details will have to be worked out.

- Will the Madison stopped approach tie up traffic on the bridge?

This will be constructed to accommodate trucks. We will analyze traffic as part of the alternatives evaluation to identify and address any traffic issues that might arise.

- How will these be built out of the floodplain?

This will be one of the detailed studies in the next step. We will have to weigh filling in the floodplain versus building a viaduct.

- On the IN side, SR 56 is not good enough to handle the rerouted traffic. What improvements are planned?

Improvements to SR 56 are not part of the plan as this point.

- Do Alternatives 9, 10, 11 or 12 take into consideration a future connection?

For Tiber Creek (Alt. 9/10), it may be possible to use School Hollow Road on the KY side. On the IN side, it could require improvement of SR 56 out to Eagle Hollow or Lonesome Hollow. The solutions would be similar for Canip Creek (Alt. 11/12).

- At the top of the documents, who is the M3T team?

This is the management team overseeing the project – KYTC, INDOT and FHWA.

- Is there a summary of the agency comments that is available to the PAG?

This information is included in the appendix of the Screening Report. We hope to post that soon, once we have approval from FHWA.

- Could you explain how the Superstructure Replacement is different than the Rehab?

The Superstructure Replacement is a completely new structure on top of the existing piers, and would remove the Functionally Obsolete and Structurally Deficient elements. Rehabilitation improves the existing structure, but does not remove the Functionally Obsolete elements.

- How long would the detour be for Superstructure Replacement?

This would take about 9 to 12 months.

- With every alternative, is a pedestrian/bike path planned?

It is possible on all of the structure types, except for Rehabilitation (Alt. 2), and will be considered as we move forward.

- With Superstructure Replacement, will the road be out of the floodplain on the Kentucky side?

Not necessarily. This is something we will look at in our more detailed study.

- Why should we put a new structure on existing piers? The piers are old and must be weaker.

We would not move forward unless the piers are as safe as a new bridge. The potential is there for this option to be cheaper and faster. The existing historic location and piers are maintained with this option.

- Will the estimated costs include the construction, the detour, the ferry, etc...?

We will have these estimates in our next phase of work.

- Will the economic cost to commuters and employers be counted?

Yes, these factors will be included in the cost estimates.

- Does the No-Build Alternative actually mean no build?

The Do-Nothing option is basically patching and minor repairs until the bridge is closed at the end of its life. There is no rehabilitation in this option. The Do-Nothing is not a realistic option, but is our baseline for comparison.

- Has the Rehabilitation Alternative been removed?

We are recommending that the Rehabilitation Alternative is not moved forward. A major rehabilitation can take two years with intermittent lane closures throughout. It does not meet the Purpose and Need because it does not address the structural and geometric deficiencies on the existing bridge. We have reviewed the new guidelines for rehabilitation of historic bridge structures, and have concluded that this bridge is not a good candidate for this program.

- Alternatives 9, 10, 11, 12 do not include improvements on SR 56. What about a spot improvement on the corner by the hotel? This is a bottleneck now, particularly with trucks avoiding the weight limit restriction.

The traffic flow will be part of our more detailed study. This section of SR 56 may need to be an independent project for improvement.

- In terms of screening, will the cost estimates include the approaches in both states and any road improvements to connect to existing roads, even for Superstructure Replacement?

Yes, these will be considered.

- Who would pay for helicopter service for medical emergencies?

This will have to be considered in the next phase. Our past experience has been that the National Guard provided this service, with the costs covered by Kentucky.

- One of the recent bills included an earmark to pay for ferry service for the Missouri project.

They had been charging \$8/ride, and the earmark was to make the service free.

- You have stated that the Superstructure Replacement is cheaper, faster, and feasible. What factors would rule this option out? What would make another option better than Superstructure Replacement?

These are the items we will consider in our more detailed study. It could be resources in the area of the bridge, historic areas in Milton or Madison, public or agency input, cost estimates, economic impacts of construction, or others.

- Would tolling be considered as a means of funding a new bridge? It seems like you would have to use such a high toll to make any impact that it would not be acceptable to the public. We will be looking at tolling and rates of return as part of this project.
- At our last meeting, there was a letter from the National Trust. This letter did not recommend the Superstructure Replacement. Does this organization have the right to stop the project?
Neither the Trust nor the Section 106 Consulting Parties can stop the project. The decision rests with the two states and FHWA on what they want to do with the bridge. The National Trust has issued an opinion, we are respectful of their opinion, and we have recorded it as public input. Once we have all of the information on the existing piers and the more detailed studies, a more informed decision can be made about this option.
- Are the people shown copied on the National Trust letter all signatories of the letter?
No, just those parties listed in the letter.
- What power would a lawsuit by the National Trust have to stop the project?
It depends on whether a judge would issue an injunction to stop work until all of the issues are resolved. Then it would depend on whether the suit could be settled out of court. We are trying our best to involve the interested parties to prevent this type of course of action.
- Given the tremendous detrimental impact of having no bridge in this community, it appears that the letter does not address the local sentiment. The PAG, public and team that have worked so hard on this project should not be subject to the narrow view handed down by the National Trust.
- One of the local rumors is that the Section 106 parties can stop any project. Is this true?
This is not true. However, the Section 106 opinions are held in high regard and there are laws like Section 4f and 106 that we will address on this project. We have Section 106 consultation built in throughout this process. We would like the parties to sit down with us and help us review resources (“consult with us”) as we consider alignments within alternatives.
- How is consultation going to work when the letter came out of your first meeting with them?
The Section 106 parties do not get engaged on a formal level in purpose and need or alternatives screening. They get engaged on a formal level in the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and the remaining alternatives. They have given us an early opinion, and we have considered this as public input in the screening process.
- Have we heard anything on the core samples?
The samples are being tested and we hope to have the report in a month or so. As the samples came out of the holes, we did not see any visual problems with the concrete. These holes were refilled with concrete after the coring.

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

- Have Alternatives 13 and 14 been eliminated? What about using these hollows for a future connection? This would still impact the hollow. There is history in the country too, and farmland.

A future connection to the bridge is not part of this project and would have to be a separate project. Part of our charge was to make sure the alternatives did not preclude a hilltop to hilltop connection. There are probably other options to make this connection as well. Before Indiana would consider connecting this project to the top of the hill, they would have to go through an entire environmental process like this one.

- The public thinks that the recommendation for the Superstructure Option using the existing piers has already been made anyway, so they are not coming to the meetings. You need to do a better job of getting the word out that people and ideas are welcome.

We would really prefer to have people attend the meetings and bring their input. We are doing our best to keep this project process open and honest.

- The large tows and barges on the river will have to be considered during construction.

There were no comment forms submitted by the PAG or the Public during the meeting.

Tim provided the upcoming Public Meeting information. With no further questions or comments from the public, the meeting was dismissed at 8:10 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			
Hanover College	Larry DeBuhr	X		
Historic Madison	John Staicer	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			
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			
Overton Farms & Citizen	Jim 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
Marvin Jenkins	INDOT
Ben Lawrence	INDOT
Steve Smith	INDOT
Anthony Goodman	FHWA
John Carr	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
Ted Grossardt	Kentucky Transportation Center
Jack Couch	KIPDA
Joe Cosby	Niche Marketing
Cedric Goodrich	Niche Marketing

Public Attendees

Name	Organization
Gladys Henson	
Sara Denhart	The Madison Courier
Konnie McCollum	RoundAbout Madison
Grant Butters	
CJ Keller	
Greg Sekula	HLFI
Betty McVay	Property Owner
India Cooper	
Jim Olson	Jefferson County
Darrel Henderson	Madison City Council
Tracy Kelee	
Rick Rand	State Representative
Link Ludington	Section 106
Casey Bloos	WORX WXGO Radio
George Freeman	Section 106
Joe Wentworth	
Andy McLaughly	
Phyllis McLaughly	
Louis Alexander	
Carolyn Lopez	
Dorothy Cochran	
Janet Heberle	
Doug Heberle	QK4
Nancy Gruner	Madison Main Street
Bert Fitzgerald	
Rich Murray	Cornerstone
David Collier	Madison Chamber
Wayne Kyle	Section 106
Linda Lytle	Madison Area CVB
John Maeder	
Lauri Maeder	
Bob Canida	
Danae Peckler	KHC
Craig Potts	KY SHPO/KHC
Fred Burrell	
Kary Stackelbeck	KY SHPO/KHC
Illegible	BBQ Pit Stop