



# **MEETING SUMMARY MILTON-MADISON BRIDGE POST-LETTING INFORMATIONAL MEETING**

## **WEBINAR/TELECONFERENCE MADISON VISITOR'S CENTER**

**October 20, 2010 at 11:00 a.m.**

### **1. Welcome/Introduction**

John Carr (WSA) welcomed the meeting attendees and asked for introductions. Attendees included the following:

#### Project Advisory Group (PAG) Members

- Nathaniel Adams, Trimble County Historic Interests (also Section 106 Consulting Party)
- Neil Bryan, Farmers Bank
- Jim Juricic, Citizen Representative
- Corey Murphy, Economic Development Partners
- Carl Risk (for Roger Allman), King's Daughters Hospital

#### Section 106 Consulting Parties

- John Carr, IN State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Staff
- Patrick Cunningham, East Madison
- Michele Curran, National Park Service (NPS)/National Historic Landmarks (NHL)
- Jim Glass, IN State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)
- Phillip Johnson, Kentucky Heritage Council
- Elizabeth Merritt, National Trust for Historic Preservation
- Greg Sekula, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana
- John Staicer, Historic Madison Foundation, Inc.
- Wesley Stoner, Kentucky Heritage Council
- Jan Vetrhus, Madison Bicentennial Committee
- Vickie Young, East Madison

#### Agencies

- Mayor Tim Armstrong, City of Madison
- Larry Chaney, Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency (KIPDA)

- Jack Couch, KIPDA
- Joe Craig, Jefferson County Council
- Jenny Eggenpiller, City of Madison
- Mayor Denny Jackson, City of Milton
- Linda Lytle, Madison Area Convention and Visitors' Bureau
- Jim Olsen, Jefferson County Highway Department
- Randy Stevens, Trimble County Judge Executive
- David Studt, United States Coast Guard Bridge Branch

#### Federal Highway Administration

- Michelle Allen, Indiana Division
- Maryann Naber, Federal Preservation Officer
- Greg Rawlings, Kentucky Division
- Jeff Smith, Kentucky Division
- Eryn Fletcher

#### Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)

- Jason Bunselmeier, Project Manager, Seymour District
- Patrick Carpenter, Cultural Resources
- Kevin Hetrick, Project Manager, Indianapolis
- Ben Lawrence, Environmental Services
- Steve Smith, Transportation Planning
- Will Wingfield, INDOT Spokesman

#### Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)

- Amanda Abner, Environmental Analysis
- Andy Barber, Project Manager
- Tim Foreman, Environmental Analysis
- Susan Neumeyer, Environmental Analysis
- Gary Valentine, Project Manager

#### Baker Team

- Larry Collins, Michael Baker Corp.
- Pat Osborne, Michael Baker Corp.
- Aaron Stover, Michael Baker Corp.
- Kathy Francis, Doe Anderson
- Robert Ball, Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA)
- John Carr, WSA
- Harry Fox, WSA
- Len Harper, WSA
- John Mettill, WSA
- Tim Sorenson, WSA
- Rebecca Thompson, WSA
- Samantha Wright, WSA

#### Walsh Construction Company

- Charlie Gannon
- Will Banik

## Other Attendees

- Laura Hodges, RoundAbout Madison
- Chris Sauer
- Peggy Vlerebome, Madison Courier

## 2. Presentation

The purpose of the presentation was to update the Section 106 Consulting Parties on the status of the Milton Madison Bridge project. John Carr (WSA) gave a presentation at the Madison Visitor's Center while Samantha Wright (WSA) facilitated a webinar presentation.

## 3. Questions & Answers

- Q: Which portions of the bridge will use the sliding technique?  
A: The superstructure over the river and the approach spans will slide into place simultaneously, moving as a single unit.
- Q: When will the design details be available to the environmental agencies and consulting parties?  
A: Most of that information will be developed this winter. Most likely some design details will be available in December.  
Q: Isn't the construction of the temporary approaches part of Phase 1 construction? What are the adverse effects of the temporary approaches on historic properties?  
A: We don't have all the design details but we will be looking at these impacts once the designs are available.  
Q: If construction begins January 2011, that will not leave much time for review.  
A: We don't anticipate any additional adverse impacts to the historic properties. We will review all of this once the design details are provided.
- Q: Will the new design change the impacts to adjacent structures?  
A: Phase 1 construction appears to be further away from the historic properties. We need to take a deeper look at Phase 3 construction.
- Q: How does this bridge sliding technique compare to what was used on the Huey P. Long Bridge? They used a lifting technique on the Huey P. Long Bridge.  
A: Not sure. We have not looked at the Huey P. Long Bridge but I do not believe our bridge uses the lifting technique.
- Q: Will river traffic be closed during bridge sliding?  
A: Yes. Walsh will be in contact with the USCG and USACE about any permit amendments.
- Q: Is this a four span bridge? Will each of those spans be but on rails and slid into place?  
A: Yes. The first approach span to the south will also slide into place.
- Q: Will the temporary piers be aligned with the existing piers?  
A: Yes.
- Q: What are the archeological impacts related to the temporary bridge approaches?

A: No impacts are anticipated in Indiana because no sites were identified in the vicinity. There is an archeological site on the Kentucky side we have started to look at; the project team will continue investigations and coordinate with the Kentucky SHPO.

- Q: What about the archeological impacts of the temporary piers?  
A: We did not identify any archeological sensitive areas in the river.  
Q: What about the new construction area where the temporary piers will be?  
A: The temporary piers fall within the planned scour mitigation area. This area was surveyed previously.
- Q: How can we afford to construct temporary piers but not new permanent piers?  
A: The cost of the temporary piers is expected to be cheaper than running a ferry for a year.
- Q: Are the temporary piers within the caisson area?  
A: The temporary piers will be placed about 15 ft downstream of the existing piers. We are not sure yet if this falls within the caisson (cofferdam) area.
- Q: What will be the weight restrictions on the bridge?  
A: This is still being discussed.
- Q: What are the temporary piers made of?  
A: Large steel pipes.
- Q: What is the procedure for reviewing the adverse effects which might occur due to this drastic change in construction technique?  
A: The FONSI will be reevaluated and changes documented. If changes are needed in the MOA, there will be discussions with the Section 106 Consulting Parties to gather consensus. The modified MOA will have to be signed again.  
Q: Will this process hold up construction?  
A: We have not identified anything that we anticipate will hold up construction.
- Q: What is the impact on the number of construction jobs predicted in the TIGER grant?  
A: We don't anticipate a major impact to the number of jobs. The only likely change will be the duration of the construction jobs.
- Q: Can we get copies of the presentation?  
A: Yes, we will post the presentation to the project website.
- Q: Do we know the approximate number of days for each construction phase?  
A: Not yet.  
Q: What about an order of magnitude for the schedule?  
A: We will work with INDOT and Walsh to come up with an order of magnitude for the schedule.
- Q: Will the temporary bridge approaches accommodate one-way or two-way traffic?  
A: Two-way traffic.
- Q: Additional traffic and/or construction on Ferry Street could have Section 106 impacts.  
A: Impacts to Ferry Street were previously looked at for the temporary ferry service. Additional impacts that might occur due to increased traffic will be considered.

- Q: Things have already been planned for the mitigation money listed in the MOA. When will the MOA be reviewed?  
A: We need the design details before we can review all of the MOA details.  
Q: What kind of timeframe are we talking about? We need time to assess the impacts.  
A: We don't have specific dates at this time. Walsh is working on the construction details now.
- Q: What is the next step in coordinating with the Section 106 Consulting Parties and amending the MOA?  
A: After we get the construction details, we will meet with the M3T parties. After that we will meet with the Section 106 Consulting Parties.
- Q: The MOA listed funding for a Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Madison with funding available January 1, 2011. Will this funding be available?  
A: We will review this.
- Q: Will the construction of the temporary piers and temporary bridge approaches create additional vibrations which might affect the historic properties?  
A: We don't know yet, but we will look into this.
- Q: Will portions of Vaughn Drive near the bridge be closed during construction?  
A: Yes. Vaughn Drive was also closed to vehicular traffic in the previous design.
- Q: How will the construction materials be delivered?  
A: We don't know yet.
- Q: Where will the bridge spans be constructed?  
A: We don't know yet.
- Q: The original TIGER Grant application stated construction would be complete by February 2012. Has an extension been granted?  
A: Yes. FHWA agreed to extend the deadline to 2013. This is true for most of the TIGER Grant projects.
- Q: Will there be a ferry service during the 5 day closure periods?  
A: We don't know yet. The Walsh bid included a ferry service during the bridge closure periods.
- Q: If there is no ferry service, is it possible the ferry staging areas might still get used?  
A: Yes
- Q: Will the boat ramp in Milton be temporary or permanent?  
A: It is intended to be temporary.
- Q: Will there be a change to the multi-modal access on the proposed bridge?  
A: The completed bridge will provide bicycle and pedestrian access. There won't be any multimodal access during construction, but this is not a change from the previous plan or from what is out there today.  
Q: Are any radical design changes expected for the multi-modal elements of the bridge?  
A: We don't anticipate any major changes.
- Q: Will the contractor have liability insurance for historic structures which might get damaged during construction?

A: Yes, the contractor will have liability insurance.

Q: Will the insurance cover the added cost needed to restore historic structures? Previous experience restoring the Madison Courthouse indicates that insurance companies are not necessarily sensitive to the specific needs of historic restoration outlined in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

A: We don't know, but we will make Walsh aware of this issue.

- Q: Is the temporary bridge any more vulnerable to violations of weight restrictions? Do we need more enforcement to ensure larger vehicles don't use the temporary bridge?

A: We will discuss this with the M3T.

- Q: Will the demolition of the existing bridge be done mechanically?

A: We believe so. Walsh will discuss this with the USCG as the permits get updated.

- Q: With the bridge closure period reduced, do you think the economic impacts will be reduced?

A: Yes, but we don't know yet.