

MEETING SUMMARY

Resource Agency Meeting
Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project (LSIORB)
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Louisville, KY
December 14, 2011, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

ATTENDEES

Lead Agencies

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA): Janice Osadczuk (by phone)
- Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC): Gary Valentine, David Waldner, Tim Hagerty
- Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT): Paul Boone, Laura Hilden, Mary Kennedy (by phone)

Cooperating Agencies:

- US Army Corps of Engineers: Max Hagan

Participating Agencies

- City of Jeffersonville, Division of Planning and Zoning: Brian Fogle (by phone)
- City of Prospect: Ann Simms
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 4: Ramona McConney (by phone)
- EPA Region 4: Ntale Kajumba (by phone)
- EPA Region 5: Virginia Laszewski (by phone)
- Indiana Department of Natural Resources (IDNR), State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Staff: John Carr (by phone)
- IDNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife: Daniel Gautier (by phone)
- Metro Sewer District: Saeed Assef, David Johnson, Tony Marconi, Brad Selch
- Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet, Division of Waste Management: Jeff Grow (by phone), Tim Hubbard (by phone)
- Transit Authority of River City (TARC): Barry Barker, Aida Copic, Kay Stewart
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD): Krista Mills (by phone)
- Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection, Division of Waste Management, Superfund Branch: Sherry Adkins (on phone)

Project Team Members

- Community Transportation Solutions (CTS): Jeff Vlach, John Sacksteder, David Kroll, Benjamin Ross, Rich Dutton, Brian Shaw, Mitchell Green, Steve Rice, Craig Moore, Kathy Francis, Bob Lauder, Rich Glasser, Allen Chandler, Kaleb Lay, Rachael Feldman

- Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA): Rob Bostrom, John Mettillie, Tim Sorenson (by phone), Rebecca Thompson, Samantha Wright
- QK4: Tom Springer, Jane Wehner

Other Attendees

- Project Ombudsman: Lee Douglas Walker (KY)

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION

1. Welcome and Introductions

John Sacksteder welcomed attendees to the meeting and asked for introductions from those in the room and on the phone.

2. Project and Coordination Update

John Sacksteder provided an overview of the project sections, including the Downtown Bridge and Approaches (Sections 1-3) and the East End Bridge and Approaches (Sections 4-6). He also reviewed the coordination points for the project, from the 2003 SEIS and ROD, up through the SDEIS Notice of Availability in November 2011. Questions and comments included the following:

- Virginia Laszewski: Have you received comments on the SDEIS already?

John S.: We have received some agency comments at this time, but no public comments.

3. Highlights of the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS)

The consultant team provided a summary of the highlights of the SDEIS. The presentation was arranged by topic, and each section began with a summary of agency comments received to-date. Cory Grayburn began with a summary of traffic model updates and comments received concerning purpose and need for the project. There were no questions on these topics.

Cory summarized the alternatives considered for the project, including the FEIS range of alternatives, the modified selected alternative, tunnel design options, tolling, and transportation system management. Questions and comments included the following:

- Ramona McConney: If there are no toll booths, how do out of state drivers pay tolls?

John S.: A gantry system would be used to capture license plate numbers. Tolling bills would be received in the mail.

- Ramona M.: How will the out of state drivers know what the fees are?

John S.: This has not been defined specifically, but there will be signage for notification of tolls and for alternative routes.

- John Carr: You mentioned a less than 1% difference in volumes for toll sensitivity. Do you have a projection between tolling and not tolling?

John S.: I don't have this information here, but it is in the document in the alternatives section if you want to see the actual numbers. The 1% difference means that people will

still cross the river. In the do-nothing scenario, the congestion is expected to deter people from crossing the river.

- EPA Region 4 Speaker: Is there an alternate bridge without tolls?

John S.: Yes, the 2nd Street bridge and the I-64 bridge are both currently projected to be toll-free.

- Virginia L.: Is there a chance that a different type of tolling will be used in the future?

John S.: It would definitely be electronic tolling. Tolls booths would not be considered. There could be peak period or other period tolls to help manage traffic, but this has not been decided at this point.

- Virginia L.: As far as those avoiding the tolled bridges, have you considered the traffic diversion?

John S.: We have used a macro-level traffic model to consider diversion from the tolling scenarios.

- Virginia L.: Have you looked at what local street improvements would be needed to handle diversion?

John S.: We will be addressing this later in the presentation.

- Barry Barker: TARC has asked that buses not be tolled under any tolling scenario.

Cory G.: We have noted this; further decisions on this will be made by the Bridges Authority.

- Virginia L.: Are you calling the alternatives 'C1 Modified' and 'A15 Modified'?

Cory G.: We are using 'C1' and 'A15' to refer to the alternatives in the FEIS, but we are using the 'Modified' name for both the downtown and East End bridges in the most current alternative.

- Virginia L.: I have questions about the pedestrian/bikeway on the Downtown Bridge. Should we discuss this now?

Cory G.: Let's wait until we discuss this later in the presentation.

Brian Shaw provided a summary of the social and economic considerations for the project, including relocations, environmental justice, and agriculture. Questions and comments included the following:

- Brian S.: To answer Virginia's last question, the Big Four Bridge will carry the bike/pedestrian movements for the downtown area.
- Speaker: You mentioned something called a "key component" in an EJ neighborhood. What does this mean? Do you mean there will be no EJ relocations?

Brian S.: There will be some relocations within the EJ neighborhoods, but no key relocations. A key relocation would be a community center, store, day care, or other higher impact area.

- Speaker: Are all of the relocations for the Downtown Bridge area? Do you have numbers for what proportion of relocations are EJ?

John S.: In the East End, the ROW width did not change as a result of project changes in the Modified Selected Alternative. In the downtown area, the ROW was reduced from project changes in the Modified Selected Alternative. The relocations in this area in Kentucky are businesses. On the Indiana side, there are some residential relocations, including 5 historic homes that could potentially be relocated. We are not anticipating anything that is directly EJ related.

- Virginia L.: Have you finished the EJ documentation?

Brian S.: It is documented in the SDEIS. We will check the documentation for the EJ relocations.

- Speaker: The draft SDEIS is still using the 2000 census; we would like to see the new data incorporated.

Brian S.: If that data becomes available, we will update it in the final SEIS.

- Speaker: I would still like to see proportion numbers for the relocations. You are saying that tolling will not affect low income bridge users, even though you show low income populations use the bridges more frequently? Is this based on the survey you did? Why wouldn't there be an impact?

John S.: There are references in the EJ document for the 5 homes discussed before. None of the relocations in the Jeffersonville area are considered EJ properties. In the Kentucky downtown area, there is a Wayside Mission that would be relocated to another area in the metropolitan area. Key components would be grocery stores, service areas, etc...

Brian S.: For the tolling impact on EJ communities, average weekly crossings of the bridge between poverty and non-poverty population groups are very close.

John S.: When you compare to the No Action Alternative, the anticipated growth will impact the ability to cross the river. Tolling would have a lesser effect than the No Action. There are also still toll free river crossing options that would be more easily available in the non-peak periods.

- Speaker: Are you saying that the EJ populations would be expected to use different travel patterns or times to travel?

John S.: The \$1.50 toll would be less than what they would spend if no action is taken. And there are still toll free options available.

- Virginia L.: The traffic changes shown on Slide 46 show EJ areas. Did you consider air quality and noise and congestion and safety? Did you locate the schools in these areas? Where in the document is this information?

John S.: The air and noise are in different areas of the SDEIS. Diversion is discussed in the alternatives chapter. The green areas on Slide 46 show a split between I-64 and I-65. The level of traffic changes we are talking about is 1-2 cars per minute. The changes along River

Road have more to do with the elimination of the Frankfort Avenue interchange. We will cover the air and noise later in the presentation.

David Kroll provided an overview of the historic and archaeological resource updates, and the Section 4(f) evaluation. Comments and questions included the following:

- Virginia L.: Was the Big Four Bridge looked at for eligibility?

John S.: It does have historic elements, but it is a separate project.

Janice Osadczuk: There was a 4(f) document for the project which applies only to DOT projects. However, in this case, the EA and FONSI included the 4(f) in the document.

- John S.: With some other projects going on in Jeffersonville, there have been a series of graves located adjacent to the project. We have done an investigation in our project area but have not found any indication of such sites in our project area.

Mitch Green provided an overview of the air quality and noise considerations for the project. Questions and comments included the following:

- Aida Copic: Would you please address construction impacts on air quality? Are there mitigation measures? What about monitoring?

Mitch G.: There are mitigation measures identified in the SDEIS. In the MSAT Appendix B, there are also measures identified there. Particulate impact measures are not required for projects with construction timeframes less than 5 years – this is a standard. Ongoing monitoring during construction has not been discussed at this time.

- Virginia L.: Did you look at localized impacts for MSATs, particularly in the diversion areas?

Mitch G.: For PM2.5, we showed no delay in attainment for the worst-case scenario. Traffic in the diversion areas is expected to be less than the worst-case considered, so we are not expecting impacts in these areas. In existing areas, some congestion will be reduced and these vehicles/emissions redistributed.

- Virginia L.: Is this 1-2 cars per minute every minute of every day?

Mitch G.: This is in the peak hour. If the 1-2 per minute were throughout the day, this is still only 10% of the level for impacts.

Gary Valentine: We looked at the peak hour for the 1-2 cars per minute increase. Diversion does not occur as much during the peak hour – it occurs more during the off peak hours. The daily traffic volumes are shown in the Traffic Forecasting Report – Appendix H.

- Virginia L.: For the venting of the tunnel, how will this be done? What about air quality for the local areas as a result of this?

John S.: This is an 1800-foot tunnel, which is short for a tunnel. There will be fans to keep air flow, but because of the short length of the tunnel, there is not an air quality impact expected. The tunnel is too short for there to be a concentration of emissions.

Mitch G.: The tunnel is right at the threshold where you wouldn't have to provide venting at all; however, we will be adding the exhaust fans to facilitate air flow.

- Virginia L.: How many vents? What are the proposed locations? What about vent noise?

John S.: The tunnel has not been designed at this point. The vent locations and number of vents would be identified during the Final Design, after the completion of the SEIS. Personal experience shows that tunnel vents do not produce significant noise. We can discuss this further with our tunnel folks and provide follow-up information.

Mitch G. continued the discussion with the vibration analysis and thresholds considered for the project. There were no questions at this time.

Mitch G. then provided an overview of the natural and water resource updates for the project. Comments and questions included the following:

- Daniel Gautier: Mitigation coordination with DNR needs to be included.

Mitch G.: IDNR is included in our permits section and we will be following up on this.

- Tony Marconi: Any floodplain activities/impacts need to be coordinated with MSD.

Mitch G.: Thank you, we will note this.

- Virginia L.: In terms of stream impacts, which streams include bridges and wildlife corridors? Are you bridging the 100-year floodplain for streams?

Mitch G.: There is a stream impact chapter in the SDEIS.

John S.: Most of the stream resources are being bridged. There is one area in the original FEIS identified for wildlife passage over in Indiana. This area will be bridged. We will be bridging the 100-year floodplain for streams.

- Virginia L.: For runoff in the tunnel area, have you considered the intensity of storms due to climate change?

John S.: There has not been a specific study for climate change.

- Virginia L.: For the East End Bridge, is all of the runoff going to the KY side?

John S.: Yes, the bridge is on a downgrade from Indiana to Kentucky. The system catches water on the bridge. The water on the Indiana approach will be directed to channels on the Indiana side.

- Virginia L.: On the Indiana side, is the wellhead protection area downstream?

John S.: There is one upstream of the bridge on the Kentucky side, but not downstream.

Mitch G. provided an overview of the visual considerations for the project. There were no questions or comments at this time.

Cory G. provided an overview of hazardous substance and energy considerations for the project. There were no questions or comments at this time.

Cory G. provided an overall summary of the environmental impacts for the FEIS Selected Alternative and the Modified Selected Alternative. John S. indicated that the costs shown are based on the traditional Design-Bid-Build process. With the Design-Build process, there would be the opportunity to reduce the construction schedule, as well as the inflationary cost associated with this.

John S. provided an over view of the next steps on the project. The SDEIS comment period ends on January 9th, 2012.

4. Comments and Questions

Janice O. indicated that all comments should be sent to her and copied to John Sacksteder. Contact information for John S. is:

jsacksteder@ctsgec.com

John Sacksteder
Community Transportation Solutions
305 N. Hurstbourne Parkway, Suite 100
Louisville, KY 40223

With no further questions or comments, the meeting was dismissed at 12:30 p.m.