



Meeting Summary

Section 1 Kennedy Interchange Approach (Meeting No. 6) and Section 2 Downtown Bridge Area Advisory Team Meeting June 20, 2011

A Kennedy Interchange Approach and Downtown Louisville Bridges Area Advisory Team meeting was held on June 20, 2011, 6:30 p.m. at the Mellwood Arts Center in Louisville.

Several topics were presented including Project History, Why We Are Here, Section 1 (Kennedy Interchange) Modified Alternative Overview, Section 2 (Downtown Ohio River Bridge) Modified Alternative Overview, and Next Steps.

The following paragraphs list those in attendance and summarize key points in the presentations. Questions asked, with responses, and comments made in the discussion period following the presentations are also described. You will find attached the PowerPoint slides used in the presentations. In this summary the key points of the presentations are summarized by the slide number shown in the attachment.

Meeting Attendees

Area Advisory Team Members:

Steven Kersey	Phoenix Hill
Cassandra Culen	Clifton Community Council
Branson Coan	Butchertown Neighborhood Association
Andrew Cornelius	Butchertown Neighborhood Association
Patti Clare	Downtown Development Corp.
Deb DeLor	Louisville Downtown Management District
David Kareem	Louisville Waterfront Development Corp.
Michael Kimmel	Louisville Waterfront Development Corp.
Ted Pullen	Louisville Metro Public Works
Ken Baker	Louisville Metro Planning/Design
Norma Ward	Louisville Metro Housing Authority

Other Organizations:

Charles Buddeke	Bridges Authority
Kerry Stemler	Bridges Authority
Jon Salomon	BNA
Jerry Leslie	H.W. Lochner
Steve McDevitt	Burgess & Niple
Vaughan Scott	One Southern Indiana
Debbie Stemler	KM Stemler



Ohio River Bridges Project Team Members:

Gary Valentine	Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
Andy Barber	Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
Ann Gibson	Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
Paul Book	Indiana Department of Transportation
Scott Stewart	Indiana Department of Transportation
Duane Thomas	FHWA
Carl Penzcy	Indiana Ombudsman
Lee Douglas Walker	Kentucky Ombudsman
Kevin Villier	CTS-GEC
John Sacksteder	CTS-GEC
Paul Hilton	CTS-GEC
Kathy Francis	CTS-GEC
Bob Lauder	CTS-GEC
Kate Killia	CTS-GEC
Rachael Feldman	CTS-GEC
Richard Glasser	CTS-GEC

Section 1 Design Team (KTA)

Richard Sutherland	Entran
Andy Gilley	QK4
Glen Kelly	QK4

Section 2 Design Team (Michael Baker Jr., Inc)

JB Williams	Michael Baker
Aaron Stover	Michael Baker
Pat Osborne	Michael Baker

Project History (John Sacksteder)

Slide 1. Six sections to LSIORB. Tonight's meeting is on Sections 1, Kennedy Interchange, and Section 2, Downtown Ohio River Bridge.

Why We Are Here (Gary Valentine)

Slide 8. Lack of Conventional Funding. 1993 last time the Federal gas tax was increased. That tax is what pays for highway maintenance and improvement. Since 1993 our infrastructure continues to age.



Construction costs continue to escalate. Vehicles are more fuel efficient. This constricts spending on highway projects.

- Slide 9. Additional funding is needed to fill the gap for the Bridges project... The Bridges Project has been put in Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
- Slide 10. Leaders seek saving measures including consideration of rebuilding the Kennedy Interchange in place and for the Downtown Bridge moving the pedestrian/bicycle facility to Big 4 Bridge.
- Slide 11. Cost Comparisons. Current estimate \$4.1 billion for EIS Selected Alternative. The estimate for the Modified Alternative is \$2.9 billion.
- Slide 12. A Supplemental EIS is a Federal requirement to address possible impacts of tolling and cost saving ideas.
- Slide 13. Traffic Diversion analysis - What will happen to traffic when tolls are introduced? A model has been developed to project traffic. No decision has been made on a tolling policy. Ranges of tolls and what impacts that will have are being evaluated: \$1-\$2 cars; \$2-\$4 box panel trucks; \$4-\$8 for semi truck. No decision has been made on tolling.
- Slide 14. Purpose and Need. It remains the same. A white paper has been developed on this matter and is on the Bridges Project website.
- Slide 15. Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) Alternatives: no action, 2003 EIS Selected with tolls; 2011 Modified with tolls.

Section 1 Overview (Glen Kelly)

- Slide 17. With the January 4th, 2011 announcement by the two governors and mayor of Louisville to explore options to reduce costs and impacts, the Section 1 consultant team in the development of a modified in-place alternative has focused on the LSIORB Project Purpose and Need. This need for action includes addressing traffic congestion and traffic safety. The Kennedy Interchange was listed as the 11th worst interstate bottleneck in the United States according to a 2009 bottleneck analysis study of freight significant highways by the American Transportation Research Institute (ATR) and the Federal Highway Administration. The need for safety improvements is demonstrated by a University of Kentucky study that shows the accident rate in the interchange as being double the statewide rate for interstates.
- Slide 18. Existing Kennedy Interchange commonly identified areas of congestion and safety issues. These include current issues with merging and weaving traffic for I-64 and I-71 to/from I-65 in which half the traffic must switch lanes in a short distance. This merging and weaving results in daily backups and heavy congestion. The I-64/I-71 traffic weave areas along I-65 to/from Jefferson and Liberty Streets as well as the weaves north of Story Avenue along I-64 are also locations that experience daily congestion. The substandard ramp curves from I-64/I-71 to I-65S and from I-65S to I-64/I-71 as areas with high crash rates were also mentioned. Additionally, safety related issues result from narrow bridge shoulders though out the interchange. Both the selected and modified alternatives address these congestion and safety issues.
- Slide 19. Existing Kennedy Interchange - If nothing's done, the average travel speed in 2030 during peak hours will be about 20 mph with over 1,200 hours of average total network delay. Ramp curves and shoulder widths on bridges do not meet current AASHTO criteria. The existing conditions east of I-65 can be



looked at as four threads or four 2-lane roads resulting in eight lanes across the center of the interchange in the area of the Campbell Street/ RR overpasses.

The current elevation of I-65 is about 500 feet above sea level, which is about 80 feet above the normal pool of the Ohio River. At the I-65 junction, the ramps to/from I-64 and I-71 pass under I-65. West of Story Avenue, I-64 dips to an elevation of about 435' where it passes under I-71. This area is currently drained by a pump station to address storm flooding.

Slide 20. EIS Selected Alternative - Average travel speed in 2030 during peak hours will be about 50mph with 100 hours of average total network delay. From a safety standpoint, all design will meet current AASHTO criteria. With this alternative, the interchange moves south from the river and is built on new alignment bringing I-64 to the center. By shifting I-64 to the center, the exits and entrances to I-65 are moved to the right side instead of the left. I-64 and I-71 moves to/from I-65 have individual threads with no merge weave. The ramp from 2nd St has its own thread through the interchange. A new downtown entry point is created at Preston/River Road for I-64WB and I-71SB traffic. All these threads result in some 22 lanes in the area of the Campbell Street Crossing. The EIS Selected Alternative has two flyover ramps over I-65. The elevation of the highest is about 540', which is about 40' higher than current I-65. I-64 is raised above the 500 year flood level west of Story Avenue resulting in a high point elevation of 508'.

Slide 21. Modified Alternative – Provides about the same average travel speed and average total network delay as the EIS alternative (50 mph and 100 hours). Design for ramp curves and shoulders meet current AASHTO criteria. The major change to the reconstructed interchange configuration (vs. the EIS Selected Alternative) is that I-64 remains on the outside with left hand exits/entrances to I-65 maintained. The I-64 and I-71 moves to/from I-65 all have individual threads with no weaves. The result is about 14 lanes across of the interchange in the area of the Campbell Street Overpass, in lieu of 22 in the EIS alternative. The ramps at I-65 are maintained as movements under mainline I-65. The high point in the I-65 stack will be about 508'.

Slide 22. The EIS Selected Alternative:

- Estimated cost is \$1.5 billion
- Impacts 92 parcels of Right of Way containing 70 acres with 38 relocations with 43 of the parcels considered contaminated
- Requires relocation of a major overhead electric transmission line on the south side of the interchange
- Raises the elevation 40 feet higher at I-71 over I-64 than what it is today, and 20 feet higher at I-71 over Frankfort Avenue
- Eliminates the need for a pump station for I-64 and provides for 500 year flood design.
- Provides access to/from I-71 NB at Frankfort Avenue and raises Frankfort Avenue above the 10 year flood level and provides direct local access under I-64 to Witherspoon Street.
- Provides a Mellwood to Story connection to facilitate I-64WB exit movements to WB Story Avenue.
- Eliminates the jog or need to switch lanes on I-64EB at Story Avenue.
- Eliminates the weave from the Story entrance ramp to I-65 across two lanes of I-64WB traffic.



- Provides a collector distributor system on I-65 between Jefferson/Liberty/Muhammad Ali and I-64/I-71 movements.
- Provides 2nd Street access to I-65 N
- Eliminates the 3rd Street ramp and adds a new access point and downtown connection east of Preston Street.
- Creates the potential for future direct access in Butchertown to River Road and Waterfront Park
- Reconstructs the bridge(s) over the great lawn to align and reduce piers and enhance the view shed.

Slide 23. For the 2011 Modified alternative:

- Estimated cost is about \$700 million.
- Contains 42 bridges versus 95 in the EIS selected with a total of 1.2 million square feet of structure versus 3 million.
- Earthwork is reduced to 0.8 million cubic yards versus 2.8 million in the EIS.
- Retaining walls have been reduced to 80,000 square feet from 250,000.
- Right of way impacts are reduced significantly to 30 parcels containing 11 acres and 16 relocations.
- The modified major electric transmission line on the south side of the interchange is avoided.
- Left hand exits and entrances on I-64 are retained.
- The I-64 Pump station with a 100 year flood design (same as existing) is retained.
- There will be no new access to Frankfort Avenue from I-71; and no new connection under I-64 between Frankfort and Witherspoon.
- The I-64 movements at Mellwood stay the same as today.
- The 2nd Street access stays the same (no new access to I-65NB).
- The 3rd Street ramp continues to operate and there will be no new access at Preston Street.
- The bridge over the great lawn stays the same.
- The Story Avenue weave to I-65 will be eliminated with a flyover.
- The Collector Distributor (CD) system along I-65 in the EIS selected is essentially maintained.
- The Butchertown access to River Road and Waterfront Park is essentially the same as today.

Section 2 Overview (JB Williams)

Slide 25. Crossing alignment is just east of the Kennedy Bridge with a slight skew and total length of 3300 ft.

Slide 26. Navigation requirements are dictated by the Coast Guard. 71 feet vertical clearance is required with a Primary Channel width of 750 feet and a Secondary Channel width of 500 feet.

Slide 27. EIS Selected Alternative – Includes, six 12 foot lanes, two 12 foot shoulder and a 17 foot bicycle/pedestrian way. The Modified Alternative removes bicycle/pedestrian way but has the same number of lanes and capacity. Pedestrian and bicycle riders will use the Big Four Bridge.

Slide 34. The existing Kennedy Bridge will be converted to six lanes SB and 2 shoulders. The median barrier will be removed and deck will be replaced to accommodate new bridge cross-slopes. This is required



because the new ramps will go in different directions than currently so slopes must be reconfigured. No changes to the truss structure are included.

The deck will be replaced and the bridge cross-slope reconfigured (ramps will go in some different direction so slopes in some areas will have to be reconfigured). No real changes to the structure.

Next Steps (Gary Valentine)

Slide 36. Federal Review Process includes Public involvement meetings. What we're doing is stop, look and listen, to make sure we're going in the right direction. The two bridge alternative is still the only way to meet the Purpose and Need. There are not enough traditional funds to pay for either the Selected or Modified Alternative. We're looking to carry forward the 2003 and 2011 Alternatives with tolls. Do you agree with our conclusion? Are the alternatives correct? If they are, we will carry these alternatives forward. We will come back and document this in a draft SEIS. Public hearing and comments will be received. We will review and submit to FHWA. We believe we can get the draft SEIS this year and follow up next year with an amended SEIS and new ROD.

Discussion

Note: Regular Text: Area Advisory Team Member comment or question

Italicized Text: Project Team response

Post-Meeting Addition: Indicates additional comment received after the meeting

Question - Andrew Cornelius: Slides don't show connectivity between the Big 4 Bridge.

Response – The modified alternative doesn't change the access to the Big 4 Bridge. Butchertown access to the Big 4 will be the same as it is today.

Question – Cassandra Culen: Glad to see we don't have 22 lanes. I chair the pedestrian and access committee. There are two issues with removing the pedestrian bike lane from the proposed downtown bridge. The new bridge would encourage bikes and pedestrian use as more of a transportation mode whereas the Big 4 is seen as more recreational. The other issue is the Big 4 Bridge is closed between 11pm and 6am. I assume it would be a 24 hour access change for the Big Four Bridge. Also the modified alternative ends before Clifton so what about the noise wall?

Response - Noise wall would not be a part of modified alternative.

Comment – Michael Kimmel: We like pedestrian path being on Big Four Bridge. Entry points are much improved. Because they can enter on River Road, it's not a part of the park. There's no decision on when it will be open and closed.

Question – Steven Kersey: Is this faster to construct.



Response – We’re not constructing near as many bridges in the modified alternative. It’s safe to say the schedule will be accelerated. The cost estimate does not include an accelerated schedule. The authority is looking at alternative deliver models and that will be apart of that analysis.

Question – Steven Kersey: Is this modified alternative an all or nothing thing. If the public wants a menu approach, what happens?

Response – We listen and go from there.

Question – Deb DeLor: The bottleneck study refers to projections to 2030. Time has lapsed and the economy had changes, particularly gas prices. What extents can your preliminary projections take into account current operating standards, travel patterns, etc.? Now that those parameters have changed, how have you accounted for that?

Response – The time of day model, takes into account all up to date information on growth and projections. We’re showing 312,000 crossing the river in 2030. That’s down but it’s still beyond capacity of current bridges. We still don’t have the system linkage in the east end. We still have inefficient mobility. It’s still consistent with planning at the KIPDA level. All those factors still exist.

Question – Deb DeLor: The East End Bridge would be the first to build. Are there continued studies before downtown work begins? Do you continue to study traffic projections?

Response – That would be determined on how the project is delivered. A P3 (Public Private Partnership) could have one contract. A lot of that hinges on how this project is delivered to construction.

Question – Andrew Cornelius: Has anyone taken the 98 traffic projections and compared them to today?

Response – You compare them to today and you don’t see a lot of growth. We didn’t expect a recession to create no growth.

Question – Cassandra Culen: I’m a big supporter of the Big Four Bridge, but it is seen as more recreational. The new bridge is seen as more for transportation.

Response – State supports the Big Four Bridge Big Four Bridge and has contributed 12 million towards its construction.

Question – Andrew Cornelius: Is modeling with tolls versus no tolls.

Response – The only tolls considered are on the bridges. All the costs a traveler incurs are taken into account. The model considers where a driver may go if tolls are introduced. Traffic would not be the same if it were not tolled.

Question – Deb DeLor: What goes on with shoulders and ramps in terms of green space?



Response – In the northern part, we'll have walls so we don't encroach upon Waterfront Park. It likely won't be appreciably different than what it is today.

Comment – Patti Clare: We love Waterfront Park and context sensitive design is important. It's important to make sure berms don't have undesirable impact. A while back, we didn't anticipate the growth development in downtown housing.

Question – Steven Kersey: Is there a change in mitigation due to 106 process?

Response – It could be. We're beginning a new 106 process. The change is that the indirect effects could move traffic somewhere.

Question – Cassandra Culen. Will there be a new MOA

Response – It could be amended.

Question – Steven Kersey: Some of the mitigating things could go away?

Response – Gary Valentine: That's possible. That's why we're revisiting the 106 process. There are many phases: What's impacted and how do you mitigate that. Are there any new properties that weren't considered as part of the original process. Are there any changed or new effects to existing properties. As we finalize methodology, we will meet in the middle of August.

Question – Steven Kersey: 106 process, for example, required mitigation of brown fields. The modified alternative won't require mitigation of brown fields. By changing the R/W, that means it doesn't improve some of the flood protection and mitigate the brown fields that the other would do.

Response – Gary Valentine: That's why were in the public comment stage.

Question – Cassandra Culen: It was mentioned that all the left hand ramps would change, but there would be a flyover on story.

Response – The flyover will allow you to pass over I-64WB and tie into the I-65 moves. You won't have to work across two lanes of traffic like you do today.

Question – Andrew Cornelius: Where is this traffic study? Who did it? Is it available?

Response – Gary Valentine: Wilbur Smith Associates is completing the traffic study. It's not finished yet. When it is, we'll make it available.



Post-Meeting Addition - Deb DeLor: One additional consideration or opportunity we would like to share: some of the highway spans over ground level streets or roads are quite wide. With a little forethought, if an extensive overhead or “bridge” over a downtown road should be designed, and is adjacent to a public green space, whether existing or newly created due to the elimination of berms throughout downtown (our preference), could, parking for events, or spaces for events become included in the design of the “bridges” over the urban areas. Adding lighting to keep the spaces interesting and well lit could only enhance the condition.



The Louisville - Southern Indiana
Ohio River Bridges Project
(LSIORBP)

June 20, 2011

1

1. Welcome / Introductions
2. Project History
3. Why We Are Here
4. Proposed Alternatives
5. Next Steps

2

The Bridges Project



3


Federal EIS Phase

- 1998 - Federal process begins
- Considered 9 bridge locations in 1 or 2 bridge combinations
- Extensive public involvement process
- 5,000 comments received on Draft EIS



4

2003 Record of Decision



Selected Alternative:

- Construct New Downtown Bridge
- Construct New East End Bridge
- Reconstruct Kennedy Interchange

5

Progress Since 2003

- Design Engineering
- Right-of-Way Acquisition
- Major Project Financial Plan and Update
- Creation of Louisville and Southern Indiana Bridges Authority (LASIBA) - 2010


6

Why We Are Here

7

Lack of Conventional Funding

- Federal highway funds come from gasoline tax
- Purchasing power of federal gas tax dropping



8

Additional Funding to Fill Gap

- Metropolitan Transportation Plan amended to add tolling
- Bridges Authority developing financial plan



9

Leaders Seek Cost-Saving Measures

Governors, Mayor identified potential project savings

1. Rebuild Kennedy Interchange in place
2. Reduce East End bridge, roadway and tunnel from six lanes to four lanes
3. Complete the Big Four Bridge pedestrian / bike path under a separate project



10

Cost Comparisons

Project Segment	2003 Selected Alternative	2011 Modified Alternative
Section 1 - Kennedy Interchange	\$1,530.0	\$728.2
Section 2 - Downtown River Bridge	\$569.7	\$532.6
Section 3 - Downtown IN Approach	\$392.7	\$177.8
Section 4 - KY East End Approach	\$885.2	\$794.8
Section 5 - East End River Bridge	\$406.2	\$326.2
Section 6 - IN East End Approach	\$234.8	\$231.7
Other Costs ⁽²⁾	\$124.2	\$125.0
TOTAL⁽¹⁾	\$4,142.8	\$2,916.2

(Costs in \$, million)

(1) Totals may not sum due to rounding

(2) Includes costs that are not section specific, including Project Oversight, Environmental Mitigation of Hazardous Materials, Wetland Remediation and Historic Preservation

11

Supplemental EIS


- Federal requirement to review potential changes
- What are the impacts associated with:
 - Tolling
 - Implementation of cost saving ideas
- Focused effort

12

Traffic Diversion Analysis



- Computer program to model traffic
- Range for diversion study
 - Cars, trucks, SUVs - \$1 to \$2
 - Box / panel trucks - \$2 to \$4
 - Tractor trailers - \$4 to \$8
- Actual toll rates determined through separate analysis by Bridges Authority



13

Purpose and Need



- Safety problems
- Traffic congestion
- Inefficient mobility
- Inadequate system linkage
- Planning consistency



Bottom line: Improve cross-river mobility

14

Proposed SEIS Alternatives



- No Action
- 2003 Selected Alternative with tolls
- 2011 Modified Alternative with tolls

15

Section 1 Kentucky Approach to Downtown Bridge and Kennedy Interchange



16

Kennedy Interchange



Specific factors demonstrate the need for action including:

- Traffic congestion
- Traffic safety

17

Kennedy Interchange Operation Concerns



18

Existing Kennedy Interchange



19

EIS Selected Alternative



20

Modified Alternative



21

EIS Selected Alternative



22

2011 Modified Alternative



23

Section 2 Downtown River Bridge


24

Bridge Crossing Alignment



Section 2 - Downtown Bridge

- Just East of Existing Kennedy Bridge
- Slight Skew with Kennedy Bridge
- 3300' Total Length




25

Navigation Requirements



Section 2 - Downtown Bridge

- Required by United States Coast Guard
- 71 Feet Vertical Clearance



26

EIS Selected Alternative



Bridge Cross Section Including Pedestrian Walkway/Bikeway



View Looking Toward Indiana

27

Modified Alternative



Bridge Cross Section Without Pedestrian Walkway/Bikeway



View Looking Toward Indiana

28

EIS Selected Alternative



View From Pedestrian Walkway/Bikeway

29

Bridge Type Selection



Section 2 - Downtown Bridge

- 4 Step Public Process
- 31 Original Bridge Concepts
- 3 Bridge Type Concepts
- 14 Member Executive Committee
 - Kentucky Gov.
 - Indiana Gov.




30

Final Bridge Type Selection



Section 2 - Downtown Bridge

3 TOWER CABLE-STAYED



31

Final Bridge Type Selection



Section 2 - Downtown Bridge

3 TOWER CABLE-STAYED



32

Downtown Bridge



Modified - w/out sidewalk



33


Existing JFK Bridge Rehab




Section 2 - Downtown Bridge



- 6 Lanes Southbound Only
- Shoulders, Each Side
- Deck Replacement
- Remove Median Barrier
- New Signing
- No change to the Steel Structure



Existing Traffic Pattern



Proposed Traffic Pattern

34

Next Steps



Federal Review Process



- Public Involvement Meetings
- Analysis of Alternatives
- Draft SEIS published
- Public Comment period
- Final SEIS published
- FHWA review
- Record of Decision

35

36



June 20, 2011