



OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT
Regional Advisory Committee Meeting
Aug. 2, 8 a.m. to 10 a.m.

Meeting Summary

RAC Members

Mark Adams	Louisville Metro Public Works Department
Saeed Assef	Louisville Metro Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD)
J. Barry Barker	Transit Authority of River City (TARC)
Leslie Barras	River Fields
Mike Brown	Louisville Metro Emergency Management Services
David Coyte	Coalition for the Advancement of Regional Transportation (CART)
John Emmerich	Louisville Sailing Club
Tonya Fischer	Southern Indiana Chamber of Commerce
Doug Hamilton	Louisville Metro Emergency Management Services
Susan Hamilton	Louisville Metro Development Authority
Rick Johnstone	Metro Louisville Government
Clest Lanier	African-American Heritage Foundation
Joan Lindop	Sierra Club
Dee Lynch	Air Pollution Control District
Stewart Prather	Louisville Bicycle Club
Karen Scott	Louisville Regional Airport Authority
David Trotter	Clark County (Ind.) Planning, Zoning & Building Commission
Harold Tull	Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency (KIPDA)
Mayor Robert Waiz	City of Jeffersonville, Ind.
Art Williams	Air Pollution Control District

Project Team Members

Bart Bryant	Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)
Dan Burgess	Community Transportation Solutions-General Engineering Consultant (CTS-GEC)/Doe Anderson

John Carr	Wilbur Smith/SDC 5
Dan Carrier	Parsons Brinckerhoff/SDC 5
Pam Clay-Young	KYTC
Ed Cox	Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)
Chuck Craycraft	H.W. Lochner/SDC 4
Camille Ellis	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Bill Gulick	KYTC
Jim Hamilton	Butler, Fairman & Seufert/SDC 3
Ed Holmes	EH/SDC 4
Chris Jones	CTS-GEC
George Jones	FHWA
Kristen Jordan	CTS-GEC
Glen Kelly	QK4/SDC 1
Tim Lawson	CTS-GEC
Kathleen Partlow	New West/SDC 5
Brent Roberts	Butler, Fairman & Seufert/SDC 3
John Sacksteder	CTS-GEC
Maurice Sweeney	KTA/United Construction/SDC 1
Richard Sutherland	KTA/SDC 1
Lee Walker	Kentucky Ombudsman
Sharon Williams	CTS-GEC
Chuck Wood	KTA/SDC 1
Fred Yeakey	FHWA

I. Welcome – Dan Burgess

II. Introductions – Bill Gulick; Ed Cox

III. Downtown Bridge Presentation

- Team introductions – J.B. Williams, section manager; John Dietrick, engineer; Skip Smallridge, engineer; Peter Taylor, engineer; Christian Menn, design engineer; Laura Toole, public involvement; Rohena Miller; Disadvantaged Business Enterprise.
- Review of basic structure types – Girder, truss, arch, cable-stayed, suspension.
- Review of major characteristics – Bridge length and span configuration; setting and environment; factors affecting bridge type.
- Review of Context Sensitive Design
- Review of upcoming events/meetings – August 9 AAT/RAC meeting; September 20 & 22 public open houses.

III. East End Bridge Presentation

- Team introductions – Dan Carrier, section manager; John Carr, engineer; Miguel Rosales, design engineer; Kathleen Partlow, public involvement.

- Review of team members' background and experience.
- Review of distinguishing characteristics – rural context; environmental/historic character; contextual integration.

IV. Question/Answer

- *Question* – Are maintenance costs figured into the life-cycle cost analysis?
Answer – The life-cycle cost analysis includes the cost of maintenance at different intervals in the project. Two major materials are concrete and steel – some bridge decks are concrete, some are steel. Maintenance doesn't typically drive the selection of material type.
Follow-up question – So a steel truss bridge wouldn't be ruled out because of maintenance costs?
Answer – No.
- *Question* – Is there an expectation that the repainting of the Kennedy Bridge will be done before the new (downtown) Bridge is finished?
Answer – Yes.
- *Question* – How is the issue of light rail being addressed in the Bridges Project?
Answer – The Record of Decision said that the best place for light rail is the Second Street Bridge.
- *Question* – Would the new bridge types include pedestrian walkways and bike paths?
Answer – Yes, they are mandated for both bridges.
- *Question* – What is the budget? We see big numbers in newspaper stories – at what point do you know what the budget is?
Answer – Just to clarify, an estimate is how much you think it'll cost; the actual budget is how much you've got (to spend). We promote the \$2.4 billion figure because it's in year-of-expenditure dollars. A useful analogy would be buying a house – you borrow for it, anticipating future income. It's the same thing here. But there will be a documented plan showing where the money will come from. The financial plan is due in December of 2005. It spells out where the money will come from.
- *Question* – What are the probable options for where the money will come from?
Answer – All financing options are being considered. We're looking at standard financing, using bonding mechanism or some other option.
- *Question* – What about (using) tolling?
Answer – Nothing has been eliminated at this point.

- *Question* – Are increases in costs of steel and concrete factored into the overall costs?
Answer – Yes. The estimate has been reviewed by financial consultants, and they have said that it is a very realistic, on-target estimate. The Federal Highway Administration’s Office of the Inspector General said this is one of the best estimates they have seen.
- *Question* – What is the public involvement process for the financial plan?
Answer – There isn’t an overt public component to the financial plan. The public involvement of the design phase isn’t duplicated in the financial plan.
Follow-up comment – It would be helpful if there could be a briefing on the financial plan for the (project) stakeholders, the RAC specifically.
Response – Agreed.
- *Question* – Will there be an overall prioritization of transportation infrastructure maintenance? Will the condition of the highways come (before the bridges)?
Answer – That’s not in (the project managers’) purview.

VI. *Kennedy Interchange Presentation – Richard Sutherland and Glen Kelly*

- Review – Waterfront Park/Mellwood-Story Avenue studies; aesthetic guidelines; and gateways.
- Immediate Needs Report and its recommendations.
- Bikeway study.

VII. *Kentucky East End Presentation – Chuck Craycraft*

- Review of design work – balloon testing in March showed approach height; geotechnical and topographical surveying ongoing.
- Review of major design elements – barrier walls; deep cuts; tunnel portals; fills and retaining walls; emergency access.

VIII. *Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program Presentation – John Sacksteder*

- DBE overview.
- Review of initiatives – mentoring; internships and scholarship programs; reporting.
- Review of accomplishments – DBE Web page; DBE database; current DBE participation.
- Review of future initiatives – Sept. 13 Community Meeting; Entrepreneurial Development Institute Seminar in October.

IX. *Question/Answer*

- *Question* – Is the DBE program set up to be bi-state? Will businesses be prequalified and trained in both states?
Answer – (John Sacksteder) There will be a comparable program in Indiana. The Bi-State Management Team will look at how best to

coordinate both programs. Right now, the Entrepreneurial Development Institute and community meetings are run by CTS. The (design) sections handle the mentoring side of things.

Follow-up answer – (Sharon Williams) The DBE program has been in place since 2003. There are 11 DBE firms on Section 1, seven firms on Section 4, five firms on Section 2 and five firms on Section 5. It's all part of the Bi-State team's plan to make sure DBEs are an active part of the project. DBE involvement is required for any project with Federal dollars. The goal is that the 2,500 jobs created by this project will be filled by a diverse group of people.

- *Question* – Is there bi-state training and prequalification?
Answer – (Sharon Williams) Yes. Reciprocity will be a part of the DBE program on this project.
- *Question* – What happens to these jobs after construction? Lip service was given to it in the FEIS, but there appears to be no mechanism in place.
Answer – (Sharon Williams) The purpose of the mentoring program is to work to diversify the services our firms can provide in working with KYTC and other agencies.
- *Question* – Where do things stand with enhanced bus service? When will we have updates?
Answer – (Bill Gulick) Expanded bus service is a requirement; it is definitely not being ignored. We'll have updates when it starts to solidify. We're working with TARC on it now.
- *Question* - Could there be a briefing on enhanced bus service given through KIPDA, to augment the Regional Advisory Committee briefings?
Answer – (Bill Gulick) We will consider that.
- *Question* – Will the (new) funding be used to finish the design process?
Answer – (Bill Gulick) The Transportation Bill isn't signed yet. When it's signed, the experts will look at it and that will be considered as the financial plan is developed.
- *Question* – Is there a paring-down of the Six-Year Plan?
Answer – (Bill Gulick) Not sure. (John Sacksteder) There is an expected 30 percent increase for Kentucky and 34 percent increase for Indiana in gasoline tax dollars (to be provided through the new Federal Transportation Bill) over what they've gotten.

- *Follow-up comment* – We still won't meet deficits with maintenance costs going up due to the energy crisis. If the highways leading up to the bridges are impassable, the bridges are no good.
Response – (Ed Cox) Indiana is completing a 10-year plan right now, so we're very aware of maintenance needs and conscious of the budget.
- *Comment* – Kentucky is not nearly so circumspect. The six-year plan assumes revenues, but they are still (only) assumptions.

The meeting adjourned.