



SUMMARY
MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE
Section 106 Eligibility Workshop
Clifty Falls Conference Room &
Conference Call/Web Meeting
August 31 & September 1, 2009

The Section 106 Eligibility Workshop was held at the Clifty Falls State Park in Madison, IN, on August 31st and September 1st, 2009. The agenda used for the workshop is included below:

MONDAY AUGUST 31, 2009			
1	Welcome	John Mettille	8:30 – 9:00 am
2	Project Process	Tim Sorenson	9:00 – 9:30 am
3	Review of the Section 106 Consulting Parties Responsibilities:	John Mettille	9:30 – 9:45 am
4	Background	Robert Ball	9:45 – 10:00 am
5	Eligibility	John Mettille & Robert Ball	10:00 am - Noon
6	Lunch (on your own)		Noon – 1:30 pm
7	Field Visit - Convene at Shrimp House parking lot for walking tour of area around the Madison approach. Move to Milton Boat Dock for tour of area around the Milton approach.	Led by Robert Ball & Tom Meredith	1:30 – 3:30 pm
8	Review of Field Visit/Continue Eligibility Discussion	John Mettille	4:00 – 5:30 pm
9	Dinner (on your own)		5:30 – 7:00 pm
10	Details of Proposed Action	Tim Sorenson & Aaron Stover	7:00 – 8:30 pm
TUESDAY SEPTEMBER 1, 2009			
11	Archaeology	David McBride	8:30 – 9:00 am
12	Eligibility Wrap-Up	Robert Ball	9:00-9:30
13	Effects	John Mettille	9:30 - Noon
14	Lunch (on your own)		Noon -1:30 pm
15	Effects Summary	John Mettille	1:30 – 2:00 pm
16	Potential Mitigations	John Mettille	2:00 – 4:15 pm
15	Next Steps	Tim Sorenson	4:15 – 4:30 pm

Over the two-day period, attendees at the workshop included twenty-one (21) Section 106 consulting parties, twenty-seven (27) project team members (FHWA, KYTC, INDOT, and consultants), and 6 other members of the public:

Section 106 Parties

Nathaniel Adams, Trimble County Historical Interests
Karie Brudis, Indiana (IN) State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Staff
John Carr, IN SHPO Staff
Patrick Cunningham
Michele Curran, National Park Service (NPS)/National Historic Landmarks (NHL)
Camille Fife
George Freeman
James Glass, IN SHPO
Nancy Gruner, Madison Main Street
Ginger Jorgensen, Cornerstone Society, Inc.
Tracy Keller
Wayne Kyle, Hunters' Bottom Historic District
Carol Legard, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Link Ludington
Elizabeth Merritt, National Trust for Historic Preservation
Craig Potts, Kentucky Heritage Council (KHC), SHPO Staff
Genell Scheurell, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Midwest Office
Greg Sekula, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana
John Staicer, Historic Madison Foundation, Inc.
Jan Vetrhus, Madison Bicentennial Committee
Vickie Young

Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)

Mary Jackman, INDOT
Marvin Jenkins, INDOT
Steve Smith, INDOT (by phone)
Jim Ude, INDOT
Patrick Carpenter, INDOT Cultural Resources
Shaun Miller, INDOT Cultural Resources
Staffan Peterson, INDOT Cultural Resources

Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)

Gary Valentine, KYTC
Amanda Abner, KYTC, Department of Environmental Analysis (DEA)
Tim Foreman, KYTC, DEA
Phil Logsdon, KYTC, DEA
Susan Neumeyer, KYTC, DEA (by phone)
Rebecca Turner, KYTC, DEA
David Waldner, KYTC, DEA

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

MaryAnn Naber, FHWA
Jay DuMontelle, FHWA, Indiana
John Ballantyne, FHWA, Kentucky
Anthony Goodman, FHWA, Kentucky

Project Team

Tom Meredith

Aaron Stover, Michael Baker Corp.
Kathy Francis, Doe Anderson
Robert Ball, Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA)
David McBride, WSA
John Mettille, WSA
Tim Sorenson, WSA
Rebecca Thompson, WSA
Samantha Wright, WSA

Other Attendees

Tim Armstrong, Mayor of Madison
David Cheatham, Indiana State Representative, District 69
Sara Denhart, The Madison Courier
John Hillery
Maggie Hillery
Kevin Kellems

A summary of the meeting discussions is provided below and is arranged by agenda item. The summary is not a transcript of comments made at the meeting; it is meant to convey the intent of the comment or discussion item.

1) Welcome

The meeting began with a series of welcomes from the primary project partners:

- John Mettille welcomed attendees and asked participants to introduce themselves.
- Mayor Tim Armstrong thanked the group for participating in the project. He read a statement from Judge-Executive Randy Stevens (Trimble County) about the importance of the bridge to the local communities.
- John Ballantyne introduced the federal partners in attendance and reviewed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 106 process underway.
- Gary Valentine welcomed attendees on behalf of KYTC. He gave a review of the bridge conditions and the bridge replacement needs and funds available to the state.
- Staffan Peterson welcomed attendees on behalf of INDOT.

2) Project Process

Tim Sorenson gave a review of the project process to-date. Questions and comments included the following:

- **Question:** Would you define the limits of the project? Where does the bridge start?
Answer: This is a bridge replacement project and the bridge runs from abutment to abutment.
- **Question:** How far off of the bridge would improvements extend for the Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches?

Answer: There would just be the transition section from the existing road to the bridge abutment. There would not be any additional right-of-way needed with this alternative.

- **Question:** On the Superstructure Replacement slide, what does the turquoise line represent?

Answer: This shows which roads would be improved under the Superstructure Replacement with Approaches option.

- **Question:** On the Roadway/Bridge Typical Section slide, is the cross-section on the right the proposed bridge width? And the cross-section on the left is for improvements along the approach roadways?

Answer: That is correct. For the arch or truss bridge type, the sidewalk would be cantilevered outside the main structure on the downstream side of the bridge. For the cable-stay bridge type, the sidewalk could be cantilevered or included inside the main structure.

- **Question:** Is there a bridge type that is not possible on the existing piers?

Answer: The cable-stay bridge type could not be built on the existing piers.

- **Question:** Why are we talking about a cable-stay bridge if it is not possible on existing piers?

Answer: The Canip Creek and Tiber Creek alternatives are still possible results of this process. A final decision has not been made at this time.

- **Question:** How wide is the current approach? Do you have a cross-section of the existing roads on either end of the bridge?

Answer: We do not have cross-section drawings in the presentation for the existing roads. Just over the bridge, the Indiana side has 12-foot lanes, with a right-of-way of about 50 feet. SR 56 is about 20 feet wide. On the Kentucky side of the bridge, the right-of-way width is about 40 feet.

- **Question:** There is a sidewalk on the south side of SR 56, and some sidewalk on the north side. If SR 56 is widened, could we consider sidewalk on both sides of the road?

Answer: Yes, we can consider this.

- **Question:** What is the length of the detour route around Canip Creek?

Answer: We can look up this information. (Post-meeting note: This question was not discussed again at the meeting. The Canip Creek route would add 0.7 miles to the cross-river trip.)

- **Question:** Does the term ‘proposed action’ have any legal standing?

Answer: We are not aware of any legal standing for the proposed action. A final decision has not yet been made.

- **Question:** When was the proposed action decision made? Who was in the room when the decision was made? When and where was the meeting held?

Answer: Within the weeks leading up to the last Project Advisory Group (PAG) meeting, we were still working toward a conclusion. The discussions were held between WSA,

KYTC and INDOT. There was not a specific meeting held; it was a series of phone calls and emails that led to this conclusion.

- **Question:** In the press release, you provided some information on cost. Do the estimated costs include the approaches?

Answer: This depends on the alternative. Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches includes only the bridge work costs. The Canip Creek, Tiber Creek, and Superstructure Replacement with Approaches alternatives include costs for the approach work shown on the maps.

- **Question:** Is the safety component of the Purpose and Need addressed by the Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches alternative?

Answer: By definition, this is a bridge replacement project. The crash analysis for the project showed a number of crashes occur on the bridge as well as on the approaches. The Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches alternative meets the purpose and need defined for the project by providing a wider river-crossing with shoulders.

- **Question:** Where is the Mammoth Cave Meat Packing location?

Answer: We have been researching this and there seem to be two possible locations (Tim S. indicated where the two possible locations were on the map).

- **Question:** What are the gray circle areas shown on the alternatives maps?

Answer: Those would be cul-de-sacs, closing off local streets that cross the approaches for the Tiber Creek and Canip Creek alternatives.

- **Question:** Do you have elevation views from the bridge abutment to SR 56?

Answer: We do have the elevation profiles for both sides of the river, but have not included the graphics as part of this presentation.

- **Question:** The two superstructure replacement alternatives related to the approaches are extreme. Should we have considered a middle-ground alternative?

Answer: The original plan was to take these alternatives to the next PAG and Section 106 meetings and work on the alignments with each group. With the recent Proposed Action (Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches), we are asking for your input on these today.

- **Question:** Would SR 56 be at its current elevation? Would you bring the approach up to SR 56?

Answer: The elevation of SR 56 would not change with any of the alternatives. The approach would come up to SR 56 for the Superstructure Replacement with Approaches, Tiber Creek, and Canip Creek alternatives.

- **Question:** Would the bridge superstructure be at the same elevation where it strikes the abutment now?

Answer: Yes, it would be within inches of where it is today.

- **Question:** Will the road be smooth over the bridge?

Answer: Yes, we would have the appropriate vertical curve and sight distance on the new bridge.

- **Question:** If the TIGER Grant funding becomes available, what happens to the other alternatives?

Answer: We will address this question as we talk through the process today and tomorrow. Without TIGER funding, we will still be moving forward with the Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches.

- **Question:** What is the date on the aerals?

Answer: The aerals were flown in February-March 2008.

- **Comment:** The property lines on either side of the bridge are the border of the National Historic Landmark, including the bridge abutments.

- **Question:** What is the elevation difference between US 421 and the floodplain on the Kentucky side? Is any of the bridge or abutment in the floodplain?

Answer: I don't have the exact elevation difference right now, but an estimate would be about 8-10 feet. The bridge and the abutment are above the floodplain (100-year flood).

- **Question:** How wide is the existing SR 56 right-of-way for the section with 20 feet of roadway and sidewalks on either side?

Answer: The right-of-way in this section is about 26-28 feet.

- **Question:** With Tiber Creek A, would there be improvements along SR 56?

Answer: Yes, SR 56 would be improved between the new bridge location and US 421.

- **Comment:** The Madison Historic District goes all the way out to the east and 3 eligible properties have recently been identified.

- **Question:** Is there a floodplain issue on the Indiana side?

Answer: No, not like on the Kentucky side.

- **Comment:** The name of the campground on the Madison side is the City Campground.

- **Question:** Is there a truck ramp on the Kentucky side for the Canip Creek alternative?

Answer: No, a truck ramp would not be needed because the approach would be wide enough to have emergency lanes and is further removed from the steep downhill section.

3) Review of Section 106 Consulting Party Responsibilities

John Mettille gave an overview of the Section 106 Consulting Party Responsibilities.

Questions included the following:

- **Question:** Who are the required signatories for the MOA?

Answer: FHWA, the KY SHPO, and the IN SHPO would be mandatory signatories. Agencies that have a role in executing the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) would also be invited to sign, including the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Park Service.

- **Question:** Is the Corps of Engineers a signatory of the MOA?

Answer: No, the Corps would only provide input on the Environmental Document.

4) Background

Robert Ball reviewed some recent questions related to the Eligibility Notebook, including the periods of significance and eligibility criteria.

- **Question:** The National Register District for Madison was established in the 1970s. Has there been any discussion about updating the period of significance?

Answer: In the notebook, we added notes about which properties would be considered contributing to the National Register District, if the period of significance were extended.

- **Comment:** It is unusual for the NHL to have a broader period of significance than the National Register District.

- **Question:** What is a 1d form?

Answer: In Kentucky, you fill out a form for each property you survey in the Area of Potential Effect.

5) Eligibility

John M. and Robert B. facilitated the discussion about the Eligibility Notebook prepared by WSA. Questions and comments are arranged by notebook section below:

Madison National Historic Landmark

- **Comment:** 041 and 042 may be related to the Mammoth Cave Pork House, although Mr. Cunningham also provided a map showing the Pork House on his property (094).
- **Question:** 043 may also have been part of the Pork House complex. Do you have any history of why this wall was built?

Answer: We do not have any additional information about this structure. Because of the previous documentation undertaken by Camille Fife, we did not do in-depth research on the properties within the Landmark.

- **Question:** Why does the Landmark extend up the ridge (north of SR 56 on the eastern side of Madison)?

Answer: The Landmark includes the reservoir on the ridge that dates to at least the 1880s and is still in use. Madison has a distinction in its early use of utilities. This is also the boundary of the city of Madison to the north. The original Landmark application included everything within the Madison city limit. The eastern boundary of the Landmark was reduced by the NPS.

- **Question:** Is the date of 1990 for 004 correct? If the date is 1890, would that make it contributing? What about the structure would make it a contributing resource?

Answer: The 1990 date came from the NHL information and should be verified. If the date is 1890, the resource can be reviewed for contributing features. [Field Visit Note:

During the field visit, Camille Fife indicated that the 1990 date must have been a typo in the NHL information, and the 1890 date is more likely correct.]

- **Comment:** The entire bridge approach is in the Madison National Register District.

Eastern Madison

- **Comment:** 109 should probably be listed as a contributing resource to the Madison National Register District.
- **Question:** The Key West Shrimp House was originally a factory, processing shells into buttons. What is the source of the 1945 date for the Shrimp House?

Answer: The 1945 date was estimated using Camille's earlier documentation and considering the materials used in construction. We can take another look at this structure.

- **Comment:** Vickie Young may have documentation that makes the Shrimp House older, possible back to 1904. The original button factory could have been in an adjacent building, so all of the Shrimp House property may not be as old. This would still fall outside the period of significance, as currently defined.

- **Question:** How does 066 have historic fabric but is not eligible?

Answer: We should add the word "individually" in that sentence.

- **Comment:** If you affect one property within the district, then you affect the district as a whole.

Response: That is correct. We evaluated the properties for individual eligibility to try and gather as much information as possible.

- **Comment:** The final report should clarify whether each property is Not Eligible or Eligible as a Contributing Resource.
- **Comment:** 079 is an excellent example of construction of its time, using local wood in its construction. This resource should be reconsidered for eligibility.
- **Comment:** According to research by Vickie Young, 094 appears to date to 1851. There is also history of the Brushfield family in the area since 1871, which may help to date 092.
- **Question:** What is an adverse indirect effect?

Answer: Indirect effects could be noise, visual impacts, etc...

- **Comment:** We should move toward reexamining the period of significance for the Madison National Register District, bringing its dates in line with the NHL. The Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana would support this approach. This could be included as part of the mitigation strategy for this project.

Telegraph Hill

- **Comment:** 113 may have some connection to Francis Costigan, a Madison architect in the mid-nineteenth century.

Response: There are several additions on the back of this structure that led us to recommend it ineligible. We can take another look at this structure.

East Street

- **Comment:** 130 may need to be reconsidered; it may be a 19th century structure. It may be connected to 131.
- **Question:** Why were the properties in the East Street area considered?
Answer: Everything within the APE that is not within the NHL was surveyed as part of this process.

North of Madison

- **Question:** Any time an outbuilding is identified individually, should we assume there is no primary structure eligible?
Answer: That is correct.

Downtown Milton

- **Question:** Has 226 always been a church?
Answer: From the maps we were able to review, it looks like it has always been a church.
- **Question:** What is the period of significance for the 3rd Street Historic District in Milton?
Answer: 1850-1899.
- **Question:** Like Madison, will you also consider reviewing the period of significance for the 3rd Street Historic District in Milton?
Answer: There are not any other structures within the 3rd Street Historic District. There were originally a total of six structures in the District, but three have been demolished.

East of Milton

- **Comment:** 232 should be reviewed in the field.
- **Question:** Is 245 a hotel?
Answer: It is partially an office and partially a laundromat.
- **Comment:** 245 may be earlier than 1890. This should be reviewed.
- **Question:** What is the yellow circle boundary shown for 246?
Answer: The yellow circle just shows the boundary around the outbuilding. To the south, there is a large foundation which could have been the main structure at one time, but this has not been verified.
- **Comment:** Several of the forms in this section say Madison in the last line (see 243, 244, and others). This should be corrected.

School Hollow

There were no comments or questions on this section of the Notebook.

West of Milton

There were no comments or questions on this section of the Notebook.

John M. asked for any additional documentation that any of the parties might have that would add to the notebook. The comment period for the Eligibility Notebook will be through September 9, 2009. Tim S. indicated that we will send out revised pages to make each notebook complete.

6) Lunch

7) Field Visit

The field visit included a walking tour of the area to the east of the bridge in Madison and Milton. Tim S. gave an overview of the various alternatives and where they might tie in to the local streets on both sides of the river. There was an extended discussion among consulting parties about potential approach alignments along and east of Harrison Street that could be developed with the Superstructure Replacement with Approaches. A number of parties indicated a preference to create an open bridge structure along Harrison Street with adequate clearance below to preserve access to First and Second Streets. Aaron Stover talked about the bridge structure itself and what changes might be made with the Superstructure Replacement alternative. The group also reviewed some of the structures identified in the Eligibility Notebook.

Comments and questions recorded during the field visit included the following:

- **Comment:** An article published in the Madison Courier dispels the myth that a construction worker is buried in one of the piers.
- **Question:** Is the boundary survey complete? The Section 106 parties would like to have a copy of the survey.

Answer: The survey crews have been in the field working, but the survey is not yet finalized. We will send out this information when it is complete.

- **Comment:** Commitments for the appearance of the approach work could be included in the MOA.
- **Question:** Which properties would be taken for each alternative?

Answer: Tim S. talked generally about this in the field, but indicated that specific information would be provided in the Monday evening session.

- **Question:** Would it be possible to have an alternative that would pass between the liquor store and the house to the east on the Madison side?

Answer: This option would probably not provide enough clearance to have a bridge over 2nd Street.

- **Question:** Would it be possible to have an alternative that would go straight up Harrison Street, through the liquor store property, and connect to SR 56?

Answer: It might be possible to bridge 2nd Street and get up to SR 56 with the appropriate roadway grade.

- **Question:** What are the costs for the various alternatives?

Answer: We did not bring the cost information on the field visit, but Tim S. provided general cost ranges for the alternatives. The cost estimates will be discussed in the Monday evening session.

- **Comment:** The property at 1001 Park Avenue may have the wrong date in the Eligibility Notebook. This should be reviewed.
- **Comment:** Concern was expressed about the amount of takings necessary along SR 56 to improve the roadway. Property takes and effects on historic resources would be lessened if a narrower cross-section were applied.

- **Question:** What is the traffic volume on SR 56 on the east side of Madison?

Answer: It is about 2,000 vehicles per day, but we can verify this when we get back to the meeting room. (Post-field note: The traffic volume is about 3,000 vehicles per day).

- **Comment:** SR 56 is designated as an Ohio River Scenic Byway.
- **Question:** What is the clearance over High Street in Milton?

Answer: It is currently 12'4", and would probably be the same with a new bridge structure.

- **Question:** If the Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches option were built, how much work would have to be redone to add the approaches in later?

Answer: Most of the steel portions of the bridge itself are above the floodplain. KYTC could begin constructing a new approach immediately from a new abutment, keeping it out of the floodplain and tying back into the base of Milton Hill. Any improvements to US 421 coming down the hillside would have to be considered as a separate project.

- **Question:** What is the maintenance cost for the US 421 hill in Milton?

Answer: We have not looked into the maintenance costs for US 421, but we can find out what information is available.

8) Review of Field Visit/Continue Eligibility Discussion

The group agreed to wrap up the Eligibility discussion during the Tuesday morning session of the Workshop.

9) Dinner

10) Details of Proposed Action

Tim S. began the discussion about the Proposed Action for the project: Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches.

Gary Valentine gave a preliminary summary of the recent In-Depth Inspection of the bridge, provided on Monday by PB Americas. The overall rating of the bridge is Poor, primarily due to the condition of gusset plates, section loss, truss members, perforations in floorbeams, and

other conditions. Work on the structural capacity analysis will continue to determine if the 15-ton weight limit will remain on the bridge.

- **Comment:** The Section 106 parties would like to have a copy of the In-Depth Inspection report for the bridge.

- **Question:** Whose responsibility is it to enforce the current weight limit on the bridge?

Answer: KYTC does not have enforcement capacity. In Kentucky, it would be the State Police and Motor Vehicle Enforcement who would enforce the weight limit.

- **Question:** There has been increased enforcement on the bridge, but there are still trucks that cross the bridge illegally. Is there any data on how many trucks they have ticketed?

Answer: We don't have this information right now.

- **Question:** What does it really mean to be in Poor condition and that the bridge needs immediate repairs? When would the bridge be shut down based on its condition?

Answer: There are a few levels below Poor. Poor is a 4 on a 10-point scale, and a rating of 1 would mean the bridge is in danger of collapse.

- **Question:** How could the bridge go from a rating of 6-7 to a rating of 4 so quickly?

Answer: The last rating was based on the 2006 inspection, and it has had 3 years to deteriorate since then.

- **Question:** What does fracture critical mean?

Answer: If a fracture critical member of the bridge were to fail, it could mean the collapse of the bridge.

Tim reviewed the process that led up to the Proposed Action (Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches) recommended at this time. Questions and comments included the following:

- **Comment:** The Section 106 parties would like to have a copy of the Potential Parcel Impacts table.

- **Comment:** It is not clear what information the Potential Parcel Impacts table is presenting. The column headers should be more descriptive.

Response: We will work on clarifying this information.

- **Question:** Does the Potential Parcel Impacts table include vacant properties?

Answer: Yes, but they are not distinguished from occupied properties.

- **Question:** The Potential Parcel Impacts table only shows direct effects and property takes. It does not cover visual or economic effects?

Answer: That is correct. WSA is currently working on an economic impact analysis.

- **Question:** Are the costs projected to the construction year?

Answer: No, the costs are shown in 2009 dollars.

- **Question:** What about the economic impacts? Where is this included in the cost estimate?

Answer: For now, economic impacts are included in the general Other category. Once the economic impact analysis is complete, this number can be more clearly defined.

- **Question:** The ferry cost seems like a very low number. Will people have to pay to use the ferry? How often would the ferry operate? How did you arrive at the \$2 million for the ferry?

Answer: The ferry will be a free service, paid for by the project. The cost estimate assumes two ferries operating 24 hours a day, and is based on other projects for now. Additional work to verify the ferry cost is underway.

- **Question:** Is it possible to get a breakout of the Other category? We would like to know what the economic impact is assumed to be in this cost estimate.

Answer: At this level of analysis, the Other category is estimated based on a percentage of the project cost. Once the economic impact analysis is complete, we will have better information about the economic costs to the community.

- **Comment:** Closing the bridge for a year will be a much bigger cost than a flat percentage.
- **Question:** Would the states absorb the cost for mitigation, or would the TIGER Grant amount increase?

Answer: The TIGER Grant request would stay at about \$95 million. The states would split the remainder of the cost for the project.

- **Question:** Will you be updating the costs as you go along?

Answer: Yes. We are working on more specific economic costs right now that will be included as we move forward.

- **Question:** Has Kentucky ever constructed a project of this size and complexity?

Answer: The new bridge in Owensboro is the most recent Ohio River bridge for Kentucky. The Owensboro bridge is a similar span length, although this project is unique with the reuse of the piers. INDOT would oversee the construction, since they have design-build legislation.

- **Question:** Will the project proceed as a design-build-bid project?

Answer: Under the most recent schedule, we would design the bridge to 30% and then go to bid. The selected contractor would then move forward with the design-build process.

- **Question:** It seems like there is a lot of work going into the gamble of the TIGER Grant. What if the TIGER grant had never come along – where would funding have come from?

Answer: From the beginning of this project, we have been up front about what money is available in each state's budget. Since then, we have gotten the recent inspection results that indicate further deterioration of the bridge. There was also no superstructure replacement option when we started. When the TIGER Grant opportunity came along, we started to look at what the likely outcome would be.

- **Question:** Could the TIGER Grant application be worded as a two phase project? The second phase could be the approaches.

Answer: The TIGER Grant funding requires project completion by 2012. It would probably not be possible to construct the bridge and the approaches in that timeframe.

- **Comment:** This approach would also require two closures to fix the bridge and the approaches separately.

Response: It is easier to reroute traffic on land, so there probably would not be as many closures for approach work, if funding is allocated for this in the future.

- **Question:** Is there a specific environmental document for the TIGER Grant?

Answer: Right now we are working toward a Categorical Exclusion (CE) Level 3. This would remain in effect with or without the TIGER Grant.

- **Question:** What is a CE Level 3?

Answer: There is a KYTC and FHWA agreement to process CEs at certain levels. A CE Level 3 requires the signature of KYTC and FHWA. It is a higher level document because it involves the historic resources and other issues.

- **Question:** What is a Categorical Exclusion?

Answer: FHWA has two lists: the C List and the D List. The C List can be programmatically processed because they generally do not have many environmental impacts, and there are about 16-17 types of projects that would qualify for this. The D List requires a more careful look at environmental issues, and there are about 23 types of projects that would qualify for this. (Post-meeting note: More information about CE documents can be found at <http://transportation.ky.gov/EnvAnalysis>).

- **Question:** How would 4(f) be handled? Would you do a full 4(f) evaluation?

Answer: It would depend on whether the 4(f) impacts can be handled programmatically.

- **Comment:** The programmatic 4(f) evaluation would not be appropriate for this project; a full 4(f) evaluation should be done in conjunction with the NPS. You need to put how you will handle 4(f) into your TIGER Grant application. The programmatic evaluation would not work because you need to have full consultation with the NPS.

Response: We are intending to complete the full NEPA process as part of this project.

- **Question:** Is there a provision in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) that says the environmental document has to be complete in Feb 2010?

Answer: No; the timeline for the environmental document is driven by the construction schedule for completing the bridge by February 2012.

- **Question:** Early in the PAG meetings, you said there would be an economic impact assessment completed as part of this project. When will this be complete? What economists are you using?

Answer: We are currently working on the approach for the full economic analysis. At this time, we have some preliminary analysis of user costs. WSA has economists on staff that will be doing the analysis.

- **Question:** At the last PAG meeting, we talked some about what the bridge might look like. Can you talk some more about the bridge?

Answer: Sure; Aaron will be giving a presentation about the bridge in a few minutes.

- **Question:** Where is the 4(f) use of the Landmark?

Answer: The bridge abutment is included in the Landmark, but the bridge itself is not.

- **Question:** Who owns the property along the bridge? Is the work under the bridge within the existing right-of-way?

Answer: The state of Indiana owns the right-of-way under the bridge. Work for the Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches is within the existing right-of-way.

- **Comment:** Where the bridge touches down on the Indiana side forces the hand of INDOT if they improve the approaches in the future. This would be an adverse impact.
- **Comment:** As far as safety and long term improvement, not dealing with the approaches is ignoring the heart of the project. You should look at the full approach superstructure replacement alternative.
- **Comment:** You can't fall off the approach, but you can fall off the bridge if it fails. You can build the approaches in many different ways, particularly on the Kentucky side. It is good to keep these projects separate so they can be studied more in the future.
- **Comment:** The approach concerns are more for Madison; Milton does not have a National Historic Landmark.
- **Comment:** If the MOA includes provisions for the Indiana approach, it would prevent INDOT from making its own improvement later, without federal funds, and without the Section 106 process. It could be a mitigation measure for this project.
- **Comment:** You talk a lot about the deficiencies in the bridge, but there are also deficiencies outside of the bridge that should be addressed with approach work.
- **Comment:** As far as the floodplain concerns, the 1997 flood does not happen very often. The truck turning radiuses on either side of the river are not ideal; but, a safe, long-term, river crossing is more important in the short-term. The approaches can be improved in the future, as funding is available.
- **Comment:** We want to reduce the flexibility that INDOT would have in the future to damage the NHL when improving the approaches.

- **Question:** How are you addressing sustainability in the TIGER Grant?

Answer: For the TIGER Grant, sustainability is a specific question about carbon emissions and savings. We are comparing the scenario of a new bridge versus a closed bridge.

- **Question:** What is the outcome we are looking for at the end of the Eligibility Workshop?

Answer: We would like to have agreement on the eligible structures. Tomorrow we will have a discussion about effects based on the 5 alternatives. We will also begin the discussion about potential mitigation measures.

Aaron provided an overview of the bridge type and preliminary design details. Comments and questions included the following:

- **Question:** Will you be taking out the upper half of the existing piers?
Answer: No, the upper portion of the original piers will be encapsulated with new concrete to widen them.
- **Comment:** On the proposed bridge, the truss structure above the deck extends farther into the NHL than the existing truss. This could have a different impact on the NHL district.
Response: The end of the truss would still be 350 feet from the NHL boundary.
- **Comment:** The existing bridge seems to float on top of its piers. The proposed new bridge looks to sit more directly on the piers.
Response: The bearings are not represented exactly right in the preliminary renderings. The bridge would not sit directly on the piers, although the bearings on the new bridge would likely be shorter. This is a more common design now, since it provides more stability to the bridge.
- **Comment:** On the Indiana side, the spans look more simple than on the existing bridge.
- **Question:** Why does the presentation say “additional” construction costs for the pier mitigation?
Answer: The pier mitigation is included in the \$131 million cost estimate for Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches. The pier mitigation is an additional cost for the Superstructure Replacement options only, since it would not be needed for the Tiber Creek or Canip Creek alternatives.
- **Question:** Would the clearance be higher over Vaughn Drive?
Answer: Yes, the existing deck truss is about 20 feet deep. This will be replaced with a new structure that would be 6-7 feet deep.
- **Question:** Is the 5-foot walkway within the truss?
Answer: The walkway would be cantilevered outside the truss to minimize the size and cost of the truss structure itself. It would be similar to the walkway on the Roebling Bridge in Cincinnati, OH.
- **Question:** Is there a reason for including a sidewalk on the bridge? Walking over a bridge is not a pleasant experience.
Answer: The sidewalk was suggested by the community.
- **Question:** How much money would be saved by eliminating the 5-foot walkway?
Answer: We don’t have the specific costs here, but it would probably be a couple of million dollars.
- **Question:** Did you say the existing pier on the KY side would not be used but would remain?
Answer: No, it will be reused and widened some.
- **Question:** Could the cross-section on the Kentucky side be used in Indiana to minimize harm?

Answer: This could be explored with INDOT. For now, the 8-foot shoulder has been included so that maintenance or emergency work could be contained on the shoulder without impacting traffic. The sidewalk does make the Indiana side wider. On the Kentucky side, the sidewalk drops down immediately after the embankment.

- **Question:** The Missouri project has been delayed by flooding. How does our schedule fit with the local weather and flooding?

Answer: We are not doing much work in the river, but we will consider this in our schedule.

- **Comment:** The schedule looks very aggressive, particularly for a unique project like this.

Response: We have been discussing the schedule with the bridge engineers, program managers, and the construction industry; the general consensus is that this schedule can be met.

- **Comment:** Mitigation should include economic packages to both communities. This should also include mitigation if the construction extends beyond the expected schedule.

- **Question:** Did you look at an arch bridge?

Answer: Yes, we have looked at arches. A single-span arch would be about \$5 million less expensive and probably easier to construct than the truss. The 4-span truss has been studied as a mitigation measure to more closely match the existing bridge.

11) Archaeology

David McBride gave an overview of the archaeology work complete to-date for the project, including record checks within about 2 km of the bridge site and archival maps. Questions and comments included the following:

- **Question:** What is the purpose of the predictive model?

Answer: It is more of a project-wide model to help determine which alternative might have the least impacts. With the Proposed Action, we will move forward with a Phase 1 on the Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches.

- **Question:** Do you still need to consider archaeology for the other alternatives?

Answer: We are still working to address potential impacts for each of the alternatives.

- **Question:** Why would you take archaeological samples under the bridge, except for the pier locations?

Answer: The testing will occur where the piers are expected to go, although this has not been finalized.

12) Eligibility Wrap-Up

John M. gave a brief overview of Monday's field work.

- **Comment:** 232 is an interesting site, but would probably not be eligible.

- **Question:** Will we be considering effects for all of the alternatives?
Answer: Yes.
- **Question:** Is the bridge an eligible resource?
Answer: Yes.
- **Question:** Will full scale documentation be undertaken for the bridge?
Answer: That is a possible mitigation.
- **Question:** On the replacement pages, what was changed on 067?
Answer: Just the address and the owner were updated.
- **Question:** Is there another property next door to 067 on Fillmore?
Answer: The adjacent property is a modern structure.
- **Comment:** Dr. Canida has access to his home and business on 1st Street and would be concerned about any improvements that would disrupt his access.
- **Comment:** The walking tour did not go past Patrick Cunningham's, and there is another group of houses on the east side that were not discussed.
- **Comment:** If the period of significance for the Madison Historic District were extended to match the NHL, there would be additional takes for the Tiber Creek and Canip Creek alternatives. There would be no additional takes with the Superstructure Replacement with Approaches.
- **Comment:** The states will work with the SHPOs on extending the period of significance to make eligibility and effects determinations for this project.
- **Comment:** There are some typos and date corrections on some of the forms that should be addressed.
- **Question:** 100 and 104 do not have the "if the period of significance were extended" statement. Is this correct?
Answer: We only included this statement if the structure date was close to the period of significance, but these would be revisited based on the updated period.
- **Question:** Will the baseline document contain both eligibility and effects?
Answer: Yes.
- **Question:** What comments are due on September 9th?
Answer: The comments on the Eligibility Workbook.
- **Comment:** You should print the headers across all pages in the next version of the Eligibility Notebook. It would make it easier to read.
- **Question:** Why is the bridge listed as an adverse effect, rather than a complete taking?
Answer: The bridge is the property of the KYTC. Demolition is the most extreme adverse effect under Section 106.

13) Effects

John Mettille reviewed the definition of Effects in the Section 106 process. Questions and comments are summarized below by alternative:

Superstructure Replacement with Approaches

- **Question:** Would removing the bridge fall under physical destruction?

Answer: Yes.

- **Comment:** There are other impacts to consider. Even if all improvements are physically within the right-of-way, there may be visual or other impacts.
- **Comment:** If you are building the bridge and not doing the approaches at the same time, the adverse effects may occur later in time.
- **Comment:** In Madison, we should consider an alternative with the extension of Harrison Street to SR 56 to make it a full approach. This could be Superstructure Replacement with Full Approaches B.
- **Question:** What do you mean by relocation?

Answer: Relocation means the structure would be taken.

- **Question:** For Superstructure Replacement with Full Approaches, why is the alignment curved to the east when you come over the bridge in Madison?

Answer: The idea behind this approach was to accommodate the incline up to SR 56 on a berm, rather than a bridge structure within the Landmark District.

- **Comment:** The consulting parties would like to see visualizations of each of the alternatives to better understand the elevation changes. Depending on the visualizations, there may be a preference for constructing the Madison approach on a bridge structure, rather than a berm, to preserve vehicle circulation.
- **Comment:** Using grade separation would also take some traffic off of the local streets.
- **Comment:** The effect you are trying to avoid is removing historic properties. With the suggestion of Superstructure Replacement with Full Approaches B, the loss of the Fillin' Station and the lawn mowing shop would be preferred to losing any historic properties. Any solution should also maintain access to First Street.

Response: KYTC can not landlock a property, otherwise it would be considered a take. Providing access to a landlocked property could be a potential mitigation.

- **Comment:** The Superstructure Replacement with Full Approaches B could have less of an adverse effect on the Landmark.
- **Question:** Could the Superstructure with Full Approaches B be at-grade at First Street and then get up to SR 56?

Answer: We would have to check into this to see if a 4-5% grade could be achieved. It may be difficult to bridge Second Street if there is an at-grade intersection at First Street.

- **Comment:** It seems that the effect of having a bridge over Second Street would change the character of the neighborhood dramatically. The impact won't be just visual; it will be audible as well.
- **Comment:** The Kentucky side is an existing example of a bridge approach over a local road. This may not be the look we want for Harrison Street in Madison.
- **Comment:** It may be possible to use a concrete tunnel for the approach up to SR 56. This could be covered with grass like the berm idea.
- **Comment:** You should avoid masses of concrete in the Madison Historic District.
- **Question:** Would it be possible to prepare visuals and 3D renderings of the approach alternatives for Section 106 review? This could be used for mitigation.
Answer: It may be more cost-effective to look for examples where this has been done in other areas.
- **Comment:** Visualization would help us more fully assess all of the effects. We can not assess effects without visualization. It needs to be part of this process, and not some future process.
- **Question:** Could mitigation go so far to recommend how the approach would be constructed? Having this information would help us make a decision about effects now.
Answer: INDOT and KYTC could consider a mitigation item that would agree to consultation with the Section 106 parties in the future, regardless of the funding source for any approach improvements. It may be better to have the Section 106 process when the approach improvements actually proceed.
- **Comment:** The ferry also introduces potential effects.
- **Question:** What is the difference between Superstructure Replacement and Superstructure Replacement with Approaches? Why is 066 taken with one and not the other?
Answer: Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches is fully contained within the existing state right-of-way. There would be no need to remove this property unless the approach was also improved.
- **Question:** There is commercial development on either side of the bridge. How would you access these properties?
Answer: Between the bridge abutment and First Street, there would not be access on the Madison approach.
- **Question:** Has the economic effect on downtown Madison been discussed?
Answer: An economic study is underway to consider this in more detail.
- **Comment:** In Milton, there will be physical destruction of 215 and 216. There will also be a threat to the condition of 217, with 215 and 216 removed and bridge coming closer to it.
- **Comment:** There will be a change in the character of the 3rd Street Historic District
- **Comment:** There would be no adverse effect to 223, 224 and 225.

- **Question:** Can you shift the alignment to the west and relocate 215?
Answer: The further west we go, the more problematic the curve becomes to connect into Milton Hill.
- **Question:** Could you move it even 10 feet to avoid 216?
Answer: We can look at this and see if it is possible. For full approaches, we can probably do this.
- **Question:** What about the narrow right-of-way we talked about during the field visit yesterday?
Answer: We would have 40 feet within the existing right-of-way. This would apply to Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches, which was designed to not require additional property acquisition.
- **Comment:** It is not likely that moving the bridge a few feet would make 216 a more desirable place to live. This structure may be an option for mitigation.
- **Question:** 216 is probably the most important historic structure in Milton. Could it be moved somewhere?
Answer: You may not want to move it because it would impact the 3rd Street Historic District and would remove the resource from its original location.
- **Comment:** Milton businesses will likely suffer more than Madison during the bridge closure, due to tax differences for some commodities.
Response: The economic impact of the bridge closure is being assessed as part of this project.
- **Comment:** Adverse effects include a change in the character of the property's use or setting for both Madison and Milton. Closure of the bridge could affect the draw to the communities.
- **Comment:** Madison is a regional hub for commercial activity. This would be diminished if people would have to use the ferry.
- **Comment:** A year of economic impact would result in some local business closures. Businesses on both sides of the river will be impacted.
- **Comment:** Mitigation could include an economic package to help business owners.
- **Comment:** The closure of the bridge may be for a year, but the change in shopping patterns may be permanent. This should be considered as part of the economic analysis.
- **Question:** Where will the ferry parking be? How will the ferry work? What is the ferry capacity? The back up and emissions will have an impact on the historic districts.
Response: There will be some reduction in cross-river trips during the bridge closure, as some will use the bridge in VeVay. We will be studying how the ferry will work and what the impacts might be.
- **Comment:** We also have shift workers on both sides of the river. That is something we will have to consider as part of the ferry analysis.

- **Comment:** Another ferry impact will be traffic backed up beyond the docking locations.
- **Question:** When will the ferry information be ready? We should have this by our next meeting?

Answer: We are not sure if it will be ready by the next meeting, but we will share information with you as we get it.

- **Comment:** The ferry dock at West Street could be dangerous due to speeds in the area.

Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches

- **Comment:** Having a wider bridge will allow larger trucks and right-angle turns in an historic residential area. A lot of people do not travel that bridge because it is so narrow and scary. When the bridge is improved, larger and heavier trucks will use the bridge. It is not uncommon that when you improve a road, traffic increases.

Response: The traffic model work for this project does not show that more traffic will be drawn to the new bridge. Traffic volumes are expected to be same as they were before the weight limit was posted on the bridge. Over the next 20 years, traffic is expected to grow by less than 3,000 vehicles a day.

- **Comment:** There will be visual impacts with a new bridge. The structure will be new. There will be lighting and signage impacts to consider. We need to see more of these details.

- **Question:** Is the bridge going to be taller than the existing one?

Answer: No.

- **Comment:** With more traffic, there will be more noise and air pollution.
- **Comment:** With an assumed increase in truck volume, all of the buildings on Main Street in Madison will be impacted. We can already feel the vibration of passing trucks.
- **Question:** In Milton, 216 – do you really think you can construct this alternative without affecting 216?

Answer: We think we can construct it within the right-of-way without physical impacts to the structure; although WSA's preliminary effects table does show an adverse effect on 216 even with the minimal approaches.

- **Comment:** We should include vibration monitoring during construction as part of mitigation.

Tiber Creek A

- **Comment:** If the period of significance is extended for the Madison Historic District, there would be 4 full takes and 7 partial takes in the MHD.
- **Question:** The impacts are shown assuming a 56-foot cross-section. Could the impacts be reduced with a narrower roadway? Will the on-street parking be replaced for those without driveways?

Answer: These are design issues that can be discussed further.

- **Comment:** It appears that the wall on SR 56 was not dry laid and the road could be moved north without impact.
- **Question:** Since SR 56 is a state route, are there roadway standards that have to be followed?
Answer: There are some standards, but design exceptions could be considered.
- **Question:** SR 56 is an Ohio River Scenic Byway. What about introduction of truck traffic to the scenic traffic?
Answer: With the current weight restriction on the bridge, the truck traffic should be using this route already.
- **Comment:** There could be a temporary impact during construction that should be mitigated.
- **Comment:** This will be a cut-through for I-65 truck traffic.
Response: As part of this project, we did an origin-destination study. The results do not show US 421 to be a regional route.
- **Comment:** The Tiber Creek and Canip Creek alternatives will change the downtown use of Milton and there will be visual, audible, atmospheric impacts. These would have an adverse effect on Hunter's Bottom Historic District.
- **Question:** What about the visual impacts of different bridge types?
Response: There are two viable bridge type options for Superstructure Replacement – truss and arch. The bridge type selection polling from the February public meeting showed that truss bridges are preferred, so we could assume trusses would have the least impact. An arch bridge would be less expensive, but the truss could be considered part of the mitigation.
- **Comment:** The truss design mimics the existing bridge. This is less of an adverse effect.
- **Comment:** A cable-stay bridge would be the least preferred for any of the alternatives.
- **Question:** What is the construction time for the two bridge types?
Answer: The bridge closure for an arch would likely be about 9 months; it would be more like 12 months for the truss.
- **Comment:** For Milton, the setting of the historic properties has already been compromised. The visual impact does not seem as severe.
- **Comment:** The period of significance for the Madison National Register District should be updated, bringing its dates in line with the NHL.

Tiber Creek B

- **Comment:** With the period of significance extended, there would be 7 full takes and 8 partial takes with this alternative.
- **Comment:** The effects on SR 56 would be similar to those for Tiber Creek A. There is some difference in the properties affected.
- **Comment:** There are less adverse effects than with the Tiber Creek A option.

- **Comment:** With Tiber Creek A and B, the east end of First Street will lose access. The only access would be from SR 56.

Canip Creek

- **Comment:** If the period of significance were extended, there would be 8 full takes and 10 partial takes.
- **Comment:** The effects on SR 56 would be similar to those for Tiber Creek, with more structures impacted. There would be impacts to the Landmark and the MHD.
- **Question:** What's the difference between the Tiber Creek and Canip Creek properties taken?

Answer: With the current period of significance, the historic takes are similar.

- **Question:** Can you explain the significance of the differences? Some of the historic groups thought this one would have the least impacts, but now they look the same.

Answer: Through the development of the alternatives, improvements along SR 56 up to the current 4-lane section were added to the original conceptual alternatives at the request of agencies and consulting parties. This extension increases the number of impacted historic properties.

- **Comment:** The potential for archaeology is pretty good on the Kentucky side.
- **Comment:** Canip Creek does not provide the historic link between the two communities. Removing the existing bridge would create a void. It would be better to have a new bridge at the existing location than to have no bridge there.
- **Comment:** There is a pedestrian bridge in Chattanooga, TN that has improved the local community. It would not be a hole in the community.
- **Comment:** The Tiber Creek and Canip Creek analysis should consider what is going to happen to the existing bridge. This should be part of the mitigation.
- **Comment:** 1092 and 1094 are all one property. The Canip Creek alternative would cause a major change in character and use: losing a house and a workplace. The shop is considered Eligible. 1030 Park Avenue should also be considered. 1009 Park Avenue and its neighbors should also be considered. They all sit on the 1854 property originally purchased. All of these would incur major visual, audible and atmospheric impacts.
- **Comment:** The traffic speed on SR 56 will be increased. Tiber Creek B may have more impacts with the free flow move and increased speed.
- **Comment:** We have free land offered by Joe Wentworth on the Kentucky side for this alternative.

14) Lunch

15) Effects Summary

The Section 106 parties identified potential adverse effects, summarized by alternative below.

Effects of Superstructure Replacement with Approaches - Madison

- Physical destruction of the bridge
- Possible change in character of the neighborhood, with a barrier or a wall in the downtown area
- Change in visual and audible elements, since the structure and lighting will be new.
- Disruption of the traditional movement in the historic area (the cul-de-sacs are disruptive)

Effects of Superstructure Replacement with Approaches – Milton

- Physical destruction of the bridge
- Physical destruction of 215 and 216
- Threat to condition of 217, with 215 and 216 removed and closer bridge
- Change in character of 3rd Street Historic District

Effects of Superstructure Replacement with Approaches – Construction Effects

- Physical destruction of the bridge, resulting in no bridge between the two communities
- Potential deterioration due to economic losses
- Change in the character of the property's use or setting, which could affect the tourism and commercial draw to the communities
- Incompatible atmospheric elements, due to ferry traffic and emissions

Effects of Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches – Madison

- Change in atmospheric and audible elements (some parties think the new bridge will bring larger trucks through town)
- Change in visual elements, since the structure and lighting will be new.
- Potential increase in vibration (some parties think the new bridge will bring more trucks through town, causing additional vibration)

Effects of Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches – Milton

- Change in character of setting for 216, since the bridge will be closer
- Possible physical damage to Third Street Historic District
- Change in visual and audible elements for Third Street Historic District

Effects of Superstructure Replacement with Minimal Approaches – Construction Effects

- Physical destruction of the bridge, resulting in no bridge between the two communities
- Potential deterioration due to economic losses

- Change in the character of the property's use or setting, which could affect the tourism and commercial draw to the communities
- Incompatible atmospheric elements, due to ferry traffic and emissions

Effects of Tiber Creek A - Madison

- Physical destruction of structures (if the period of significance is extended, there would be 4 takes and 7 partial takes in the MHD)
- Temporary change in character of setting, with increased truck traffic during construction
- Introduction of incompatible visual, audible and atmospheric elements to Madison Historic District along SR 56 (plus effects to additional properties if the period of significance is extended)

Effects of Tiber Creek A - Milton

- Change in the character of the property's use for Hunter's Bottom Historic District from agricultural to transportation use
- Introduction of incompatible visual, audible and atmospheric elements to Hunter's Bottom

Effects of Tiber Creek B – Madison

- Physical destruction of structures (if the period of significance is extended, there would be 7 full takes and 8 partial takes in the MHD)
- Temporary change in character of setting, with increased truck traffic during construction
- Introduction of incompatible visual, audible and atmospheric elements to Madison Historic District along SR 56 (plus effects to additional properties if the period of significance is extended)

Effects of Tiber Creek B – Milton

- Change in the character of the property's use for Hunter's Bottom Historic District from agricultural to transportation use
- Introduction of incompatible visual, audible and atmospheric elements to Hunter's Bottom

Effects of Canip Creek – Madison

- Physical destruction of structures (if the period of significance is extended, there would be 8 full takes and 10 partial takes in the MHD)
- Temporary change in character of setting, with increased truck traffic during construction
- Introduction of incompatible visual, audible and atmospheric elements to Madison Historic District along SR 56 (plus effects to additional properties if the period of significance is extended)
- Change in use of property for 1092 and 1094 Park Avenue (this is one property with two structures)

Effects of Canip Creek – Milton

- Change in the character of the property's use for Hunter's Bottom Historic District

- Introduction of incompatible visual, audible and atmospheric elements to Hunter's Bottom

16) Potential Mitigations

John Mettillie facilitated a discussion of potential mitigation measures. A list of the suggestions is included below, along with the potential adverse effects addressed for some measures. Questions and discussion items included the following:

- **Question:** Will the MOA include discussion about the approaches?

Answer: Not necessarily, but we would want the approaches addressed.

- **Comment:** This project has been discussed for 20 years. The original intent was to improve the approaches. The proposed action is a super-rehabilitation that does not address the local transportation needs. This is the worst possible option.
- **Comment:** It is possible to replace the bridge itself, without improving the approaches. This project can not include all possible improvements. The proposed action is a restoration of the bridge, respectful of the historic view and route. We should move forward with mitigation discussion for the proposed action.
- **Comment:** In a recent letter, the Economic Development Partners (EDP) wrote that a bridge without approaches is a failure. The proposed action does not address the long term needs.
- **Question:** The opportunity for a TIGER Grant has stopped the process we were going through. Why did the process start if we weren't going to get a bridge anyway?
Answer: The project team started recognizing that there were limited funds in each state to support replacement of the bridge. The process has proceeded to this point and is continuing at an accelerated pace only given the opportunity for Superstructure Replacement
- **Comment:** This process is not a good service to the NHL or the community; however, in the overall scheme of FHWA's funding, this project is not high on the priority list. The desire to apply for TIGER Grant funding may be the best option for funding at this time.
- **Comment:** The proposed action does not remove the truck traffic from downtown Madison.
- **Comment:** Since 1994, Historic Madison has recommended an eastern bypass to get the truck traffic out of downtown.
- **Comment:** The bypass options have not moved forward in this process, and the other options would impact the historic districts. The proposed action is the one remaining. It does not address the trucks and the traffic, but the approaches can be addressed in the future.
- **Comment:** We could try to get the historic community behind this Proposed Action, with the conditions that without TIGER funds: 1) the bridge would be maintained as a pedestrian/bike facility, and 2) the existing bridge/piers could not be considered again for Superstructure Replacement.

- **Comment:** We should put some of the eastern or western alternatives back on the table for consideration. The Proposed Action has less impact than the closer eastern alternatives (like Tiber Creek and Canip Creek).
- **Comment:** Without tourism dollars downtown, there will not be funds to maintain the buildings and quality of life. A bypass alternative would not support downtown Madison.
- **Comment:** If no one opposes the Proposed Action enough to return to where we were in the process before, then we should move on with mitigation possibilities.
- **Question:** Will the design of the bridge as a truss be considered mitigation?
Answer: The arch bridge would be faster and less expensive to build, so the truss design would be considered mitigation.
- **Question:** Would the consulting parties be involved in the design-build process?
Answer: For a design-review process, we should identify the design elements in which the parties would be interested.
- **Comment:** An informal survey of about 20 Madison downtown business owners indicated that the proposed action would impact their sales by an average of 38%. Ms. Gruner will provide a summary of the survey.
- **Comment:** There is an example of a internet promotional campaign in Washington state (Port of Townsend) to advertise local businesses when their bridge was under construction
- **Question:** Is there an adverse effect to 215, 216 and 217? It is visible from these resources, but adverse effect is still being discussed.
Answer: The structure would be expanded out to the width of the right-of-way, and would likely have an adverse affect on 215, 216 and 217.
- **Comment:** We could propose a mitigation fund for historic district property owners and businesses in historic districts who are impacted by the bridge closure. This would be an effort to prevent a change in the character of the property's use.
- **Comment:** There was a similar idea on the Louisville Bridges project, with a grant amount of about \$300k for planning in Clark County.
- **Comment:** Betsy Merritt can provide lots of examples of this; bricks & mortar grants are one. Local stakeholders would make the decisions about how to use the pot of money.
- **Comment:** There have been several suggestions made today that could be put in this category: a mitigation fund for economic impacts of closing the bridge during construction. We could ask the local stakeholders for estimates to add together.
- **Comment:** In Indiana, there was a planning grant for I-69 that was \$1-2 million. \$50k was allotted to each community, but they had to apply for it.
- **Comment:** FHWA is bound to mitigation only for impacts of our project. It also has to be a reasonable expenditure.
- **Comment:** Even though there have been other projects where a bridge has been closed, FHWA has not done this type of Superstructure Replacement before.

- **Comment:** There is one example of a \$5 million mitigation; this was for the complete demolition of an entire Historic District. [Post-meeting Note: This was the Long Beach Naval Station, including the Roosevelt Historic District.]
- **Comment:** There is some mitigation built into the project cost estimates already. The truss commitment is at least a \$5 million mitigation. There is also the ferry commitment.
- **Comment:** The community is giving up a lot for the proposed action. Mitigation and damages in the millions of dollars range will be needed to mitigate this action.
- **Comment:** The mitigation funds discussed above would be beneficial to the grant application. Why not apply for \$99 million, rather than \$95, and use the remainder for mitigation?

Answer: The states have agreed on the \$95 million grant request, with a bi-state agreement to split the remainder of the costs.

- **Comment:** We should consider an attractive entrance at the gateway (end of the bridge) to the Landmark, including signage and landscaping. This would mitigate the new bridge structure. The gateway funds could be folded into the local mitigation fund.
- **Comment:** It may be a problem to put something new in the Landmark when we have been going for the minimal approach.
- **Comment:** We could use the design-review process for landscaping, signage, etc... This would have to be approved by the local review board. This would probably not affect a contributing element.
- **Discussion:** The team discussed the design issues that will be the most important for the parties to review. It is important to start adding the bridge design review committee to the schedule soon. Important elements will include:
 - Overall design of the truss (the proposed drawing is a reasonable design, but renderings would help give a better idea)
 - Color of concrete (new concrete vs. old concrete) and color of truss
 - Rail design
 - Shape of the portal on each side
 - Pier shape (are there other options for pier shape or finish: scored or rusticated finish, flare of pier, etc...)
 - Land piers (massive concrete should be avoided on both sides of the river)
 - Entrances to pedestrian and bicycle facilities (coordinate with local parks)
 - Lighting (walkway and roadway lighting)
- **Comment:** There should be some review of the design, but it should not be micro-managed. The community should be involved in the design review process as well.
- **Comment:** Madison's Riverwalk has just been expanded under the bridge. We should discuss whether the lighting style on the Madison side should be expanded up to the bridge.

- **Question:** What will the pavement be on the bridge?
Answer: It will be a concrete bridge deck.
- **Question:** Will it be possible to use a noise buffering pavement?
Answer: We can look into this.
- **Comment:** The local commercial ventures or pleasure boats may be impacted at the existing boat ramps if they are converted for ferry use. This should be considered.
- **Question:** Could pieces of the existing superstructure be relocated and used at other crossings? Could this be used as a recycling idea for the TIGER Grant application?
Answer: This is not usually a very economical outcome, but can be considered.
- **Comment:** Plans should be considered for managing river traffic during construction.
Response: There is a permit process for this with the US Coast Guard.
- **Question:** Could we save a piece of the trusswork and display it along the riverfront in Madison?
Answer: INDOT and KYTC both have historic bridge marketing programs. This could be a bi-state effort. There is a proposal in Indiana right now that would place two spans on display from an existing structure.
- **Comment:** Archaeological treatment should be determined.
Response: There has been outreach to the appropriate tribes, and this will be continued.
- **Comment:** Madison is working on a certified local government program application. This lacks a paid historic preservation officer. This could be covered under mitigation.
- **Comment:** The peregrine falcons and nesting boxes should be relocated.
- **Comment:** Research documents could be provided to the Jefferson County Historical Society archives, and also to the SHPOs.
- **Comment:** Historic Madison has archival (explosive nitrate) film of the opening of the original bridge. It would be good to get this transferred to regular film.
- **Comment:** Construction staging areas should be coordinated and properly returned to original condition.
- **Comment:** 066 is the property immediately adjacent to the landing of the bridge in Madison. We could provide mitigation for this property. This would help provide a gateway into Madison.
- **Comment:** The project schedule should accommodate the Regatta and other festivals.
- **Comment:** The Madison sidewalk should touch down in the park area and also connect to Harrison Street.
Response: There is not an existing sidewalk along Harrison Street to connect to.
- **Comment:** There could be improvements to railroad tie walkway from the Riverwalk up the hill on the Madison side.

- **Question:** What about the long term truck traffic issue? Can there be a truck plan put together that would address the approaches, particularly the zig-zag section through the NHL?

Answer: From talking to the shippers, the bridge is just one part of the problem for truck traffic in the area. The trucks using the bridge before the restriction will likely come back; there may also be an increase with the new bridge, but we don't expect it to be large. We also do not expect a large increase in cars either.

- **Comment:** Local perspective is that trucks have continued to increase in size and number. There is not really a noise restriction that can be put in place for trucks, because it can cause a safety problem if the trucks are not able to use jake brakes.
- **Question:** Is there a noise reduction system that can be used on the bridge?
- **Answer:** There are plexi-glass systems to mitigate noise on bridges.
- **Comment:** The trucks that are the problem are the long steel-hauling trucks.
- **Comment:** This could be dealt with through a length-restriction. We should consider technology to monitor and automatically ticket trucks that are too long.

Possible Mitigation Measures

Based on the mitigation discussion, the following potential mitigation measures were identified:

- A new bridge of a truss design and color that is reminiscent of the original bridge. This would address visual impact.
- An efficient design review process incorporated into the design-build process (for visual review). Assurance that the contractor will not change the agreed-upon design elements. Important review elements would include: overall design of the truss, color of concrete, color of truss, rail design, portal shape, pier shape, pier finish, land piers, pedestrian/bicycle entrances, and lighting. This would address visual impact.
- If the TIGER Grant is not awarded, the bridge should be recycled for another use (historic/tourist attraction). This would prevent potential demolition of the bridge.
- Complete documentation of the bridge or other structures demolished as part of the project, including photo or video documentation (documentation of the structure, process of demolishing the bridge, and the change to the neighborhoods). The SHPOs would determine the degree of documentation for each structure. This would address the demolition of the structures.
- Specific documentation of the bridge itself by measured drawings, large scale photographs, and full written documentation (Level 1 HAER Documentation). If there is a full set of as-built drawings that meeting HAER standards, and are verified to be correct, they may substitute for measured drawings and a Level 2 HAER Documentation would suffice. HAER documentation should be sent to NPS for review and archive. Research documents should be provided to the Jefferson County Historical Society archives, and also to the SHPOs. Historic Madison's archival film (explosive nitrate) of the 1929 bridge opening should be transferred to a more stable format. This would address demolition of the bridge.

- Offering temporary alternative transportation (ferry service) free of charge to preserve the economic viability of the historic districts during the full bridge closure during construction. The ferry service should provide enough capacity. A traffic and parking management plan for the ferry crossing should be developed that minimizes the impact on historic districts. Special ferry service should also be considered for local events.
- Amend the Madison National Register District to include those properties not included in the 1970s nomination (extend the period of significance) and hence make them eligible for state and federal tax credits.
- Include oral history shared by George Freeman about preservation of the Madison cliff during the 1929 construction of the bridge. The Madison treasurer stopped construction workers from grading the hillside; he got enough petition signatures to stop the work. The signatories then received tax increases for increased property values. This would address demolition of the bridge.
- Mitigation fund for historic district property owners and businesses in historic districts that are impacted by the bridge closure. This would be administered by a local agency. This would be an effort to prevent a change in the character of the property's use.
- Mitigation fund to aid in the preservation of historic properties. This would help prevent neglect and deterioration
- Preservation training funds for owners of historic properties. This would help preserve the character of properties.
- Grant funding for a Madison Main Street staff person for a period of time. This funding should be designated for the Main Street program to administer. This would help preserve the character in downtown Madison.
- Programmatic funding for promotion to compensate for loss of tourism, as well as funding for continued advertisement/signage to get tourists to Madison. This would help preserve the character.
- Funding for implementation of the branding project underway at this time, including signage. This would help to maintain the use of property.
- An attractive entrance at the gateway (end of the bridge) to the Landmark, including signage and landscaping. The gateway funds could be folded into the local mitigation fund. Provide preservation funds for 066, the property immediately adjacent to the landing of the bridge in Madison. This would help to mitigate the new bridge structure.
- KYTC and INDOT should program funds for the approach work. INDOT should make a commitment to pursue funding as soon as possible for the approach work. This would reduce the physical destruction and damage from traffic in the NHL.
- A commitment to have Section 106-like consultation on future approach work, including the alignment. NPS, HLF and the same consulting parties included in this project should be included in the future consultation. Some states have a 106-like process in place, so these could be used as examples. The consultation should be to minimize harm, not just to consult. This would mitigate the construction of the bridge without approach improvements.

- A bridge closure commitment to reduce interruption of service. This could include contractor incentives and disincentives.
- Vibration monitoring on the Milton side (215, 216, 217) to minimize harm during construction. Conditions to avoid adverse affects during construction should be included in the MOA (noise, vibration, etc...).
- A mitigation fund for Milton. This could include the development of a Preservation Plan for Milton; expansion of the boundaries of the 3rd Street HD to include the other historic structures in the area; preservation of 223 and 224 before further deterioration; consideration of relocating 216 to another site to minimize harm; and business plan development for Milton business owners to prepare for the temporary bridge closure.
- Opportunities to enhance the Milton boat launch or create a new launch during the ferry development. Opportunities to enhance the boat launches on the Madison for use during the closure and afterward.
- Relocate pieces of the existing superstructure to be used at other crossings. Save a piece of the trusswork and display it along the riverfront in Madison.
- Funding for a paid Historic Preservation Officer for Madison.
- Relocate the peregrine falcons and nesting boxes.
- Construction staging areas should be coordinated and properly returned to original condition.
- The project schedule should accommodate the Regatta and other festivals
- Improve railroad tie walkway from the Riverwalk up the hill on the Madison side.
- Develop a truck plan that would address the approaches.

17) Next Steps

- The team has requested that any additional comments on the Eligibility Notebook be submitted by Sept 9th, 2009.
- The team will review the schedule with the SHPOs.
- The next Section 106 meeting will include an outline of the Effects and Mitigation documents, and more information about the bridge. We are looking at a preliminary date of October 26th for this meeting.
- There is a Public Meeting planned for September 10th at 6:30 p.m. at the new Milton Elementary School. There will be a presentation at 7:00 p.m.

There were 2 items submitted as part of the meeting: 1) an informal survey of downtown Madison business owners, and 2) a resolution to support the Proposed Action under certain conditions.

Ludington, Link

From: BRADLEYDANE@aol.com [BRADLEYDANE@aol.com] **Sent:** Mon 8/31/2009 8:53 PM
To: Ludington, Link
Cc:
Subject: (no subject)
Attachments:

Casual Survey of Mains Street Merchants 8/21/09

*Will the closing of the Madison/ Milton bridge have any economic impact on your business? If yes, how much?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. John Wheeler Barber Shop | Negative impact, lots of KY customers |
| 2. Greeves Home Center | Big impact |
| 3. Digital Deams | 10% loss |
| 4. Madison Merchantile | 65% loss |
| 5. T-Shirt Shop | 20% loss |
| 6. Sugar Creek Collectibles | 50-60% loss |
| 7. Floating Cow | Large tourist trade |
| 8. Dusty Miller Antiques | 30% loss |
| 9. Hair Essentials | 50% loss |
| 10. Otis & Emil | 65% loss |
| 11. BC Jewelry | Strongly effected |
| 12. Little People | 30% loss |
| 13. Fine Threads | 30% loss |
| 14. Fabric Shop | 30% loss |
| 15. Main Street Antique Mall | 50% loss |
| 16. Whimsy | 10-20% loss |
| 17. Gifts That Last | 30-50% loss |
| 18. Village Lights Book Store | up to 50% loss |
| 19. Bird House | 40% loss |
| 20. Lovely Creations | 30% loss |

OF 16 RESPONDING WITH A % NUMBER DECLINE, AVERAGE IS 38%

* Restaurants we not surveyed because business was brisk and we did not wish to disrupt commerce. Many retail businesses were closed today.

Whereas: We've needed a new bridge for 20 years.

Resolved: The Preservation Community shall enthusiastically support the Proposal to pursue a Tiger Grant for the *Milton-Madison Bridge* in the amount of some 95 million dollars for demolition, rebuild of the superstructure and rehabilitation of piers. In addition, the Preservation Community shall vigorously aid in lobbying legislators, the U.S. government and the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the State of Indiana to allocate funds for amelioration of inadequate approaches to the bridge.

As mitigation for the loss of the National Register eligible, historic 1929 J. G. White "Greatest in The World"-built/National Toll Bridge Company funded/last of the trio/*Milton-Madison Bridge*, the owners of the span shall:

1. Should the Tiger application fail to be granted, Restore the existing *Milton-Madison Bridge* to at least a 4/"Good" condition.
2. Turn over ownership of the *Milton-Madison Bridge* to a to-be-formed not-for-profit entity for use as a pedestrian/bicycle/tourist destination/(in times of flooding; fishing) span.
3. Scrape, wire brush, prime and paint the superstructure.
4. Rehab piers where necessary.
5. Provide a cash settlement as final resolution mitigation.
6. Continue plans for construction of a new bridge at a different location to be used for Rte. 421 vehicular traffic including new approaches.
- 7. Under no circumstances, should the Tiger Grant attempt fail, may our historic 1929 bridge be destroyed and its cadaver be used for a new bridge.**

-0-

Our e-mail address will change soon. We don't have the new isp yet. Sorry. George and Janet Freeman. cell: (419) 937-6030. Land line: (419) 447-7514.