



**THE LOUISVILLE-SOUTHERN INDIANA OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT
SECTION 2, DOWNTOWN BRIDGE**

**FIRST SECTION 1 & 3 AREA ADVISORY TEAM MEETING
TRANSIT AUTHORITY OF RIVER CITY
1001 WEST BROADWAY
JUNE 30, 2005**

MEETING ATTENDEES

(AAT Members)

Mark Adams – Louisville Metro Public Works
Emily Boone – Clifton Community Council
Graham B. Cooke – Louisville Metro Councilwoman Tina Ward-Pugh’s Office (alternate)
Aida Copic – Louisville Metro Government (alternate)
Jay Ellis – Jeffersonville Main Street, Inc.
Rob Haynes – Louisville Metro Councilman Tandy’s Office
Carol Hensley – Main Street Association
David Kareem – Waterfront Development Corporation (alternate)
Steven Kersey – Phoenix Hill Neighborhood Corporation
Mike Kimmel – Waterfront Development Corporation
Mohammed Nouri – Louisville Metro Government
Doug Magee – Phoenix Hill Neighborhood Association (alternate)
Bill Marzian – East Downtown Business Association
Joe Rafferty – Rose Hill Neighborhood
Jim Segrest – Butchertown Neighborhood Association
Susan Slayton – Southern Indiana Realtor’s Association (alternate)
Kathleen Skaggs – Frankfort Avenue Business Association (alternate)
Evelyn Umbach – Clarksville Parks Department
Mary Vanderpool – Southern Indiana Realtors Association

(Non-AAT Members)

Organizations/Community Groups/Businesses

Eddie Atchley – Matrix Consulting Group
Leslie Barrus – River Fields
Carolyn Franklin – Louisville Coalition of Neighborhoods
J. Cleve Gatchel – Phoenix Hill
Jessie Gatchel – Phoenix Hill
Dale Orem – C Bank
Laura Renwick – Historic Landmarks
Janie-Rice Brother – Kentucky Heritage Council
Norman Tasman – Tasman Industry
Jon C. Smith – State Historic Preservation Office, Indiana
Doug Stubblefield – Indiana Central Labor Council

Ohio River Bridges Project Team Members

Dan Burgess – Community Transportation Solutions-General Engineering Consultants (CTS-GEC)
John Carr – Section 5 Design Team/Wilbur Smith Associates



**THE LOUISVILLE-SOUTHERN INDIANA OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT
SECTION 2, DOWNTOWN BRIDGE**

Dan Carrier – Section 5 Design Team/Parsons Brinckerhoff
Richard Cary-Brown – CTS-GEC Project Manager
Ed Cox – Indiana Department of Transportation/Bi-State Management Team
Bill Gulick – Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)/Bi-State Management Team
Stephen C. Hoefler – CTS-GEC
Chris Jones – CTS-GEC
George Jones – Federal Highway Administration/Bi-State Management Team
Kristen Jordan – CTS-GEC
Tim Lawson – CTS-GEC
Steve Nicaise – CTS-GEC
Kathleen Partlow – Section 5 Design Team/New West, LLC
Brent Roberts – Section 3 Design Team/Butler, Fairman & Seufert
Richard K. Sutherland – Section 1 Design Team/American Consulting Engineers
Maurice Sweeney – DBE Coordinator, Section 1 Design Team/KTA
Lee Walker – Kentucky Ombudsman
Sharon K. Williams – CTS-GEC
Tom Wright – KYTC District 5

Section 2 Design Team/Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

Robert Bondi – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Stephanie Brooks – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Kenny Caples – Niche Marketing
John Dietrick – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Rick Fitch – Burgess & Niple
Gordon Glass – Burgess & Niple
Shaun Lockhart – Niche Marketing
Rohena Miller – Niche Marketing
Patrick Osborne – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Skip Smallridge – Crosby/Schlessinger/Smallridge, LLC
Laura Toole – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
J.B. Williams – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

COMMENT SHEET SUMMARY

Did this evening's AAT meeting provide the right kind of information about the overall project and the bridge type selection process? If not, please tell us what should have been addressed.

- It was very informative and excellent points were raised by the public.
- Yes, I felt it did.
- Yes (2)

Please tell us any specific thoughts you have about the bridge type selection process for the Downtown Bridge.

- Will members of the public be able to vote on this?
- The bridge should be made enjoyable for pedestrians as well as for motor vehicles.
- Leave it up to informed decision-makers for ultimate safety and structure.



THE LOUISVILLE-SOUTHERN INDIANA OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT SECTION 2, DOWNTOWN BRIDGE

- I am still learning more about it.

Do you have any suggestions for our future AAT/RAC meetings: time, location; other comments?

- The room filled up too quickly so maybe a larger venue.
- Many people had no where to sit.
- All questions were not addressed equally.
- Room seemed too small for this meeting but everything was great.
- Food was delicious. Kudos to meeting organizers!

Other ideas/suggestions?

- There should be more time allowed at the end for questions to be answered.
- I like that individuals were allowed to approach the speakers afterwards to ask more questions.

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order at 6:05pm. J.B. Williams, project manager for the consultant team for the Downtown Bridge welcomed the Area Advisory Team (AAT) members. He introduced members of the Section 2 Design Team as well as representatives from Community Transportation Solutions, the Bi-State Management Team and the Federal Highway Administration, after which AAT members introduced themselves. After presenting the team's organizational structure, the assembled members of the Baker Team presented the following information, shown below as abridged:

The Bridge Type Selection Process

- Step 1 – Develop Guidelines
- Step 2 – Develop Concepts
- Step 3 – Develop Alternatives
- Step 4 – Select Bridge Type

Range of Bridge Types

- Girder
- Truss
- Arch
- Cable-Stayed
- Suspension

Major Bridge Characteristics

- Bridge Length and Span
- Setting and Environment
- Factors Affecting Bridge Types
 - Engineering/Functional Requirement Compliance
 - Environmental Commitment Compliance
 - Navigational Compliance (Coast Guard, etc.)
 - Public Input



**THE LOUISVILLE-SOUTHERN INDIANA OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT
SECTION 2, DOWNTOWN BRIDGE**

- Cost, Budget Compliance

Context Sensitive Design

- Bridge in context of Downtown Louisville/Downtown Jeffersonville
- Adjacency to Kennedy Bridge
 - Should new bridge be similar? Contrasting?
 - Environment created by two waterfronts and the Kennedy and “Big 4” bridges

Next AAT/RAC Meeting

- August 9, 2005
- Under Discussion:
 - Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria
 - Project Parameters

First General Public Open Houses

- September 20 and 22, 2005 (specific locations to be announced)
- Downtown Louisville and Downtown Jeffersonville (specific dates to be announced)
- Under Discussion:
 - Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria
 - Project Parameters

DBE Community Meeting

- Fall 2005

Mr. Williams and other team members answered the following questions:

Questions/Comments

Q: Will there be a Bicycle/Pedestrian (Bike/Ped) focus within this project?

A: Bike/Ped is definitely a focus within bridge design. Safety is the key issue and will determine lane lengths, symmetry, etc.

Q: Could AAT members have access to pictures of similar interstate bridges with sidewalks?

A: Absolutely, the design team can provide this. However, interstate bridges with sidewalks are fairly unique. There is a distinct separation between the pedestrians and interstate traffic that needs to be considered. The Woodrow Wilson Bridge has a Bike/Ped way.

Q: Is light rail under consideration on this bridge?

A: It is not; that option was eliminated during the Environmental Impact Study (EIS). The Bridge Type Selection process is operating under the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) from this EIS which dictates six traffic lanes and a pedestrian/bicycle pathway on both new bridges.

Q: Concerning the new bridge’s relationship with the “Big 4”. These are historic bridges; new bridge should not compete with or destroy the view of the Big 4, nor disturb its historic uniqueness.



**THE LOUISVILLE-SOUTHERN INDIANA OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT
SECTION 2, DOWNTOWN BRIDGE**

- A: The team is concerned with the foreshortening of the view of the Big 4, and will be creating photo simulations, etc. that will offer insight into possible bridge design impact on the overall view and minimize obstruction of it.
- Q: Local officials hope and want to stress that public input remains at the top of the list in this project, especially in Butchertown, Phoenix Hill and the local businesses there. If this meeting is any indication, it sounds like the team is on the right track.
- A: Public input is at the top of our list and is a large component of this project. Affected members of the community include not only residents and businesses, but travelers, commuters, etc. It is a very large picture.
- Q: What about noise mitigation on the bridge? The bridge will be traveling over a public park.
- A: This is technically a design issue for the adjacent sides of the bridge, Sections 1 and 3. (Section 2 consists of only the bridge span itself). However, the Section 2 team will work with Sections 1 and 3 teams to model noise barriers into the bridge design. There will be a noise analysis to determine what needs to be done to minimize noise on the bridge as it approaches each side of the river. For example, noise levels could automatically be lowered by reducing joint use in bridge design, as well as concrete/asphalt use. The design teams will be looking at “quiet pavement” and its usage throughout the project.
- Q: How much will the bridge impact the Colgate plant in Jeffersonville?
- A: This is an issue for Design Section 3, and will be addressed at their meetings, which are open to everyone.
- Q: A key issue is making the new bridge user-friendly and encouraging neighborhoods to use it. If Bike/Ped usage is a challenge to incorporate into bridge design, how is the team dealing with this challenge?
- A: Making the bridge a welcoming place is our goal – we will be dealing with the Bike/Ped challenge as one of the many safety and accessibility issues in this project. Accessing the Bike/Ped lanes are outside Section 2 (as part of Sections 1 & 3) but our bridge design will be affected by how and where the bridge touches down on either side of the river and how the Bike/Ped lanes are accessed there.
- Q: What are the roles of the architects in this project? How closely will they work with the project engineers?
- A: Engineers are the “scientists”; architects are the “artists”. This project will be a chance to marry the two disciplines. Additionally, we have engineers on the team who have an artistic eye and work well with architects.
- Q: Is it possible for the new bridge to be both good looking, innovative, and in harmony with the surrounding area?
- A: That is the key Context Sensitive Design question: do we want the bridge to blend in or stand out? That is what we want to hear from you.
- Q: Are there any available photos of projects like this one, with similar contexts, etc.?
- A: We will be gathering information about past projects with similar conditions.



**THE LOUISVILLE-SOUTHERN INDIANA OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT
SECTION 2, DOWNTOWN BRIDGE**

- Q: Hopefully this will not mean that the new bridge will be a copy of a previous one?
A: A key project goal is to ensure that the new bridge is distinct. The area is already different from most cities; the bridge spans are different, we are starting from a unique place and it follows that the uniqueness of the area will set the overall aesthetic for the bridge.
- Q: What is the current status of the “Big 4” becoming a pedestrian bridge?
A: That project is being executed by the Waterfront Development Corporation. We have no updates/information about that, but will keep our ear to the ground.
- Q: What about issues of transparency in the design of the new bridge? The waterfront is getting very natural, could the proposed design leave as little human footprint as possible, so as not to disturb “greening” efforts on both sides of the river?
A: That will be a key element in design and ensuring environmental compliance.
- Q: What about mixed-use materials and asymmetrical designs within the bridge structure?
A: It is definitely possible to use asymmetric designs. These would have to be developed in the early design concepts.
- Q: Re: Coast Guard: will nautical constraints be considered with this signature bridge?
A: There may definitely be some constraints about clearance issues. But in other areas, we do not know yet what will be important to the Coast Guard and other similar agencies. At each Step of the Bridge Type Selection process, we will solicit feedback from the Coast Guard.
- Q: What about the Army Corps of Engineers?
A: It will be involved throughout the process.
- Q: Bridge height – we need to be sure it does not overwhelm surrounding bridges.
A: The ultimate bridge height will not vary that much from other bridges.
- Q: Will the Coast Guard weigh in about a distance between the piers of the new bridge and those of the adjacent Kennedy Bridge?
A: The Coast Guard will weigh in on that subject.
- Q: Are there any case studies/precedents about asymmetrical bridges that we can turn to? Could there be separate uses horizontally and vertically?
A: There are (Zakim Bridge, Boston MA is one that the team has experience with). Within the EIS MOA there are no specifics as to any symmetry, so we have flexibility in this area.

There being no other questions or comments, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:30pm.