



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

FIRST COMBINED SECTION 1 & 3

AREA ADVISORY TEAM/REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

KYE'S AT WATER TOWER SQUARE

500 MISSOURI AVENUE, JEFFERSONVILLE, IN

AUGUST 9, 2005

6:00 - 8:00 PM

SUBJECT: Ohio River Bridges Project Parameters, Design Guidelines, Context Sensitive Design Guidelines and Evaluation Criteria

MEETING ATTENDEES

(AAT Members)

Barry Alberts – Downtown Development Corporation

Emily Boone – Clifton Community Council

Graham Cooke – Louisville Metro Councilwoman Tina Ward-Pugh's Office

Peggy Duffy – City of Jeffersonville

Jay Ellis – Jeffersonville Main Street, Inc.

Bill Gatewood – Louisville Metro Councilman Tandy's Office

Steven Kersey – Phoenix Hill Neighborhood Association

Mike Kimmel – Waterfront Development Corporation

Carol Millhollan – Town of Clarksville

Joe Rafferty – Rose Hill Neighborhood

Jim Segrest – Butchertown Neighborhood Association

Carla Coleman Stallard – Clarksville Town Council

Evelyn Umbach – Clarksville Parks Department

Mary Vanderpool – Southern Indiana Realtors Association

The Honorable Robert Waiz – Mayor, City of Jeffersonville

(RAC Members)

Mark Adams – Louisville Metro Public Works

Phillip Adams – Coalition for the Advancement of Regional Transportation

Saeed Assef – Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District

John Baker – Knob and Valley Audubon Society

Leslie Barras – River Fields, Inc.

David Coyte – Coalition for the Advancement of Regional Transportation

Mike Douglas – Regional Leadership Coalition

John Emmerich – Louisville Sailing Club

Tonya Fischer – Southern Indiana Chamber of Commerce

Ray Flynn – Louisville/Jefferson County Metropolitan Sewer District

Susan Hamilton – Louisville Metro Planning Commission



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

Clest Lanier – African American Heritage Foundation
Richard McCarty – Regional Leadership Coalition
Bill McCreary – Kentuckians for Better Transportation
Stewart Prather – Louisville Bicycle Club
Jack Ragland – Southern Indiana Economic Development Council
Bill Sexton – Transit Authority of River City
Doug Stubblefield – South Central Indiana Central Labor Council
Harold Tull – Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development
Art Williams – Louisville Metro Air Pollution

(Non-AAT/RAC Members)

Organizations/Community Groups/Businesses

Fernando Messier – Messier & Associates

Ohio River Bridges Project Team Members

Bart Bryant – Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)/Bi-State Management Team
Dan Burgess – Community Transportation Solutions-General Engineering Consultants (CTS-GEC)
John Carr – Section 5 Design Team/Wilbur Smith Associates
Dan Carrier – Section 5 Design Team/Parsons Brinckerhoff
Ed Cox – Indiana Department of Transportation/Bi-State Management Team
Bill Gulick – KYTC/Bi-State Management Team
Jim Hilton – CTS-GEC
Brian James – CTS-GEC
Chris Jones – CTS-GEC
George Jones – Federal Highway Administration/Bi-State Management Team
Kristen Jordan – CTS-GEC
Steve Nicaise – CTS-GEC
Brent Roberts – Section 3 Design Team/Butler, Fairman & Seufert
John Sacksteder – Acting Project Manager, CTS-GEC
Lee Walker – Kentucky Ombudsman
Samantha Wright – Section 5 Design Team/Wilbur Smith Associates

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

Kenny Caples – Niche Marketing
John Dietrick – Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Gordon Glass – Burgess & Niple
Shaun Lockhart – 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.



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

COMMENT SHEET RESPONSES

Bridge Design Guidelines

- TARC requested that the design of the bridge and the Kennedy Interchange not preclude a latter opportunity to provide mass transit (light rail or bus rapid transit). KYTC agreed this would be considered.
- Make an elegant & simple visual statement – e.g. asymmetric cable arrangement and tower on North shore (Ind.) incorporating a restaurant/observation platform. Don't be a victim of adjacent bridge design.
- Something compatible to the present Kennedy Bridge.
- East Bridge – Something more interesting such as cables – from high Utica to Prospect.
- We should keep in mind the vision of each side of the river, both under the bridge as well as over it. Louisville is a beautiful view, let's not lose it.

Context Sensitive Design Guidelines

- No hazards to resident and migrating birds.
- Pedestrian/bicycle use.
- Light rail from Indiana to Southern Louisville should be considered.
- Should be different so that it speaks on its own.

Evaluation Criteria

- Appearance
- Multi-functional
- Local labor
- Ground level appeal.

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

There were no comments

Other ideas/suggestions?

- Overall comment: The structure of these discussions functioned to structure the options into only two categories or choices and to MINIMIZE creativity. Not the type of format to encourage out of box thinking from a \$203 million project which is not an all volunteer endeavor with extremely limited resources.



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

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) and Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) 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 and RAC members introduced themselves. The assembled members of the Baker Team then presented the following information, shown below as abridged:

Project Parameters

- Alignment
- Clearances
- Bridge Cross-Section
- Environmental Commitments
- Cost

Project Design Guidelines

- Navigational Guidelines
- Structural Guidelines
- Highway and Geometric Guidelines
- Architectural and Aesthetic
- Budget Guidelines

Context Sensitive Design (CSD) Guidelines

- The Approach: to address Structural, Aesthetic and Contextual Issues in an integrated manner
- Landmark in the Urban Landscape
- Gateway for Drivers
- An Urban “Room”
- The Pedestrian Experience

Typical Evaluation Criteria

- Cost
- Aesthetics
- Maintenance
- Constructability
- Public Input

Upcoming Events

- Open Houses
 - Fall 2005: Guidelines & Evaluation Criteria



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

- Late 2005: Concepts
- Early 2006: Alternatives
- AAT/RAC Meeting
 - Fall 2005
 - Winter 2006
 - Spring 2006

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

Questions/Comments (*Note: Q=Question, A=Answer, C=Comment*)

Design Guidelines

General Questions

Q: Does cost factor in choosing bridge for up and/or downstream? What about the cost factor in building a suspension bridge upriver? Would such a bridge be more compatible downriver?

A: Whatever options we choose have to be within the budget guidelines. As we refine bridge type concepts, we will do cost estimates as we go along. I don't think that the costs will be significantly different between Sections 2 and 5. Both sections have budget guidelines that need to be followed, and they are similar. If the East End Bridge costs less than anticipated, that does not create additional funding for the Downtown Bridge. The budget guidelines for the two bridges are separate and equally important.

Q: What is the difference between a round pier and a square pier? Are there differences in cost between the two?

A: Round piers are better than square and rectangular from a hydrodynamic perspective, in terms of water flow around the piers. Round piers are more common. The costs of both are about the same.

Q: Some of the Big 4 bridge piers have a different face on the on upriver side vs. the downriver side. What is the significance of that?

A: They are probably more rounded on the upriver side, as that is the direction the water comes from.

Bridge Type/Styles: Contrasting or Complimentary?

Q: Is there a standard for parallel bridges? It seems that one would want compatibility with a bridge that is going to be next to the existing Kennedy Bridge.



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

- A: There is no official standard, but generally you would design a structure that is either complimentary or contrasting.
- C: Neither of the existing bridges is very graceful. It would be nice to see something comfortable to the eye; more aesthetically pleasing.
- C: Per the slideshow: the team showed a number of bridges in Pittsburg that were all different in style and in very close proximity. That was appealing.
- C: I am leaning towards a contemporary bridge that could represent a move toward the future, in contrast to the existing bridges that represent the last century.
- Q: On the examples of bridges that are around the room (boards), does the team have examples of a modern bridge that has been built near bridges that are 50+ years older?
- A: On slide 17, there is an example of a new bridge by an existing older bridge, in an attempt to show two compatible yet independent bridges (old truss bridge vs. new suspension bridge).
- C: I want to see creativity in selecting the new bridge style – not limiting the bridge type to only one or two styles – and create an innovative design that blends into the existing bridge. The new bridge should not necessarily complement completely nor contrast completely.
- C: The new bridge should also reflect the Ohio River Corridor Master Plan land use document re: preservation and connecting people to the river both physically and visually. Views of the river need to be preserved and enhanced. I would prefer clean, simple elegant view lines to encourage this.
- C: I like the idea of a deck truss that would be underneath the major bridge structure; it would create a simpler look – and the painters would be underneath! *(NOTE: team addressed this comment later on in the program, noting that there are some practical challenges with a bottom deck truss, due to the vertical clearances that must be maintained over the river per Coast Guard requirements).*
- C: For the Downtown Bridge, we are in essence talking about two bridges; one vehicular, one pedestrian. Pedestrian and vehicular bridges will have different types of connections on either side of the river. How these two reflect one another is critical. We need to see more examples of pedestrian bridges in this project.



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

Bridge as Gateway

C: Any type of bridge that is built should be a gateway. I would lean more towards a simple construction.

C: We need to remember that the real asset in this project is the Ohio River. We need to minimize the human footprint on the river and create a bridge style that reflects the river as an asset to the community.

Q: I like the idea of the bridge as a gateway. We also need to think about the life expectancy of the Kennedy Bridge, how long is it going to last? What will be the life expectancy of the new bridge?

A: We don't have this information on hand, but the Kennedy Bridge is inspected every two years and is maintained as needed. We do not have a specific number in mind when we talk about the life expectancy of the new bridge, but at least 50-75 years.

C: We need to place these questions in light of what is happening on either side of the river; put the new bridge in context. Coming over the river is the gateway, and compatibility with either side of the river needs to be taken into consideration, not just compatibility with the existing bridges.

Bridge as Landmark/Symbols Incorporated

C: The existing bridges are landmarks. The new bridge will be a landmark, as well.

C: We run the risk of getting "tacky" when we talk about too much symbolism in design.

Bridge Height: An Issue of Concern?

C: Height is definitely an issue of concern: if the bridge is too tall, it would overwhelm its surroundings and the focus would be only on the new bridge. The new bridge does not necessarily have to be consistent with its surroundings, just not excessive.

C: The new bridge should not play against the existing Kennedy Bridge.

Q: In order to fit in with the re-configured Spaghetti Junction intersection, the new bridge ramps need to be significantly elevated. Does this impact the elevation of the new bridge itself?

A: The ramps leading up to the bridge do not govern the height of Spaghetti Junction. For example, a recent flyover of the Spaghetti Junction ramp onto the Kennedy Bridge showed that it was 40 feet lower than the highest point on Kennedy Bridge.



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

C: In order to get a sense of the new bridge height in relation to the existing bridges and surrounding environments on either side of the river, it is important to have some sort of visualization of new bridge. *(Team noted that in the fall, when the group meets again to develop Bridge Concepts, visualizations will begin to be presented for feedback).*

C: *Team noted that the existing bridges downtown are rectilinear in comparison to the other bridges shown on boards. The challenge for the design team is to create a new bridge that complements the rectilinear shape but also brings a new look and feel to the overall surroundings.*

Piers: Aesthetic Treatment as Important as Type?

C: The new bridge in Sarasota has piers that are lit up at night. This is an aesthetic element, but it is very effective and important in making the bridge attractive.

C: I would assume that the piers would be made of cement/concrete, and would have rounded edges. But I am not sure how this could be embellished.

Piers: How Important is Placement?

C: Placement of piers is important – as flood protection is a concern.

C: Since we are at the historic area of the Falls of the Ohio, if we are going to make a landmark, would it be possible to have piers be made of limestone like the railroad bridge in New Albany? This could create a more historic effect. Round piers would be more aesthetically pleasing as well.

C: Debris on the waterfront is an issue in Jeffersonville. Whatever solution causes the least amount of debris is what we would prefer (in reference to whether piers should be on land or in the river).

C: The Ohio River Greenway could incorporate beautification around the piers.

Vantage Points: What View of the Bridge is Most Important?

C: The view from the neighborhoods is most important. The viewpoint from the bridge is least important.

Underside of Bridge

C: The underside of the bridge is extremely important: bicycle, pedestrian experience; boating experience. The underside should be considered part of the overall cohesiveness of design.



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

- C: We need to maximize the sky, sunlight is important. We need to be sure to enhance the feeling of nature.
- C: The underside of the bridge should be safe and well-lit. We should use whatever means possible to make less debris along the edges. The underside should also be aesthetically pleasing and fit into the environment.
- C: Bridges are wonderful reflectors of light. The underside of the new bridge would need different lighting in the park than along the City waterfront.

Feature Lighting: Lighting the Structure

- C: The lighting should be compatible with the natural environment, natural surroundings. I would be very interested in renewable energy sources: solar powered and/or wind powered? Bridge light would be pleasant to look at, but we need to be careful of the people who live near the bridge so as not to create too much light in their homes.
- C: Re: cost of lighting: who will be paying for it? Will Louisville and/or Jeffersonville ultimately be responsible for the costs? If so, then would it be worth it?
- C: I would not like to see any light in my front door. In addition, the energy waste aspect is important.
- C: Just to note, the lighting across 2nd Street Bridge is very nice and appreciated by the community.

Evaluation Criteria

Are there Evaluation Criteria that have not been addressed? What are the top 2-3 Criteria that should be employed in the Bridge Type Selection Process?

- C: The public needs to have sufficient input. Because of its location so close to the other bridges, the new bridge should at least seem similar to existing ones.
- Q: Safety; functionality: how do these criteria fit in? If you have an accident on the bridge, how does safety/functionality fit in terms of making the bridge traffic move smoothly again?
- A: Safety is a given. It is not a criterion that is going to be used to distinguish one type of bridge alternative from another. Safety will be built into every alternative, not one versus the other. Safety is paramount and will be treated equally.
- Q: Refining the question: would any particular type of bridge work better when lanes are closed, etc. due to accidents?



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

A: A primary provision in each alternative will be two very wide shoulders that would allow for removal, etc. in the case of an accident. That will not be something that will change from one type of bridge alternative to another.

Q: Will there be a center lane down the middle of the bridge to handle removal in case of accidents?

A: There will be six driving lanes and two twelve-foot shoulders, but no additional middle lane.

Q: Will there be fencing to separate the pedestrian vs. automobile traffic?

A: There will be concrete barriers much stronger than a fence along the bridge that will separate pedestrians from automobiles.

C: I like the aesthetics and public input criteria and agree with costs criteria in order to keep project in budget. Maintenance should be built into costs. Constructability is important, but should be a given.

C: It seems that a lot of the issues we are discussing (piers, height, etc.) will be determined by the type of bridge structure that is ultimately selected. Therefore, the type of structure is paramount to all the other items. It seems that there is a lot of interest in Cable-Stayed bridges; with clean, simple lines, aesthetics, and low cost, high constructability. Cable seems simplest and most attractive. The bridge needs to be a landmark for community. In terms of context: the bridge can be the glue that connects the cities on either side of the Ohio River. We need to focus on the pedestrian component as well, and use this to connect the community at the ground level, not just through automobile traffic.

C: I would like to add connectivity/pedestrian/aesthetics as criteria.

C: I would like to see provision for light rail as criteria.

C: I do not want the design team to preclude having light rail or bus route.

There being no other questions or comments, attendees were asked to fill out comment sheets in the final five minutes, after which the meeting was adjourned.