

Resource Agency Comments
condensed for review / reference

Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
December 14, 2011

Date	Name	Agency	Comment	SDEIS Reference
6/8/2011	Ramona McConney	EPA (Region 4)	Are all Wetlands / 404 impacts in Indiana, only?	KY and IN: locations shown in Appendices B.5.1-5.3. Identified by type in Section 4.10.2
6/9/2011	George Gilbert	KY EEC	No mention about investigation UST's or superfund sites	Section 5.12 for Hazardous Substances, discusses Phases I, II ESAs
6/9/2011	David Studt	US Coast Guard	Reference Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918	Section 5.7.3.1, p. 5-179
6/9/2011	David Studt	US Coast Guard	Wants to ensure there will be a permit for Harrods Creek	Section 5.8.3, Navigable Waters
6/9/2011	David Studt	US Coast Guard	Will Harrods Creek be crossed by the project?	Section 4.8 and Section 5.8.3
6/10/2011	Tony Cooley	KY EEC-DEP DWM	Identifies the LWC lagoon special waste permit in the project limits	Section 5.8.2
6/14/2011		US Coast Guard	Appreciates the opportunity to review project documents and to be consulted on future navigation requirements or issues - no comment on P/N	Comment noted
6/21/2011	Charles Hagan	US Army Corp of Engineers	Draft Environmental Analysis Methodology; add reference to the regional supplements to the USACE Wetland	Comment noted
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should contain a full environmental analysis of impacts for each alternative identified for evaluation	Chapter 3 and <i>Alternatives Evaluation Document</i> , Appendix A.3; Chapter 5
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Include 2003 EIS relevant information in the DSEIS and provide a detailed reference to the 2003 EIS.	SDEIS chapters and subsections begin with a summary of updates since the 2003 EIS. The 2003 FEIS is included on a CD with the SDEIS.
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Recommends additional alternatives be evaluated: Selected Alternative without tolls and the Modified Selected Alternative without tolls	Section 3.1.1.3 and <i>Financial Feasibility Revenue Estimates for the FEIS Selected Alternative</i> , Appendix G.4
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should evaluate how the in-place reconstruction of the Kennedy Interchange affects the project's purpose and need, traffic flow, safety, environmental impacts, and community and EJ impacts	Sections 3.2 (P/N), 5.1.3 (Social), 5.1.7 (EJ); Environmental Impacts throughout Chapter 5
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should evaluate the impacts of the East End Bridge with roadway and tunnel including advantages and disadvantages of four-lane facility and the impacts on this change compared to the previous design plans (6-lanes) as well as environmental and community impacts.	Section 3.3.2.2 illustrates operational differences of the four lane facility, vs. the six lane facility. See east end corridor discussions throughout Chapter 5; and Appendices D.5 through D.8
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Provide info regarding design, construction of Big Four Bridge including design and construction of Jeffersonville ramp. DSEIS should evaluate the removal of the pedestrian/bikeway facility from the downtown I-65 Bridge.	Section 2.1, Section 3.2.3, Section 4.1.4, Figure 4.1-5, and Section 5.1.4
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Clarify how tolls will be collected; explain what the tolls are expected to be used for; describe the effect that tolls will have on traffic, commuters and residents and whether tolls would represent disproportionate impacts to low-income motorists. Identify whether tolling is permanent or temporary; infrastructure required to support tolling should be evaluated.	Sections 3.2.3, 3.3.8, and 5.1.7; Appendix A.3, and Appendix G.1-G.5
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Project's design and scope must be reflected in Long Range Transportation Plan	Section 4.4.1
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Toll booth locations should be evaluated for traffic congestion and possible violation (due to idling) of NAAQS	There will be no toll booths.
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should discuss likelihood of demonstrating conformity for each alternative	Sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.3

Resource Agency Comments
condensed for review / reference

Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
December 14, 2011

Date	Name	Agency	Comment	SDEIS Reference
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should identify how exhaust in tunnel will be vented and provide an evaluation of localized adverse air quality impacts to people living in the vicinity of the emissions vents and/or toll booths or other areas that may be prone to congestion. Potential mitigation measures to avoid, reduce, and compensate, for any potential adverse impacts should be identified.	Jet fans will be provided in the tunnel. Tunnel is less than 2000' in length, which would not cause concentrations of emissions
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should discuss impacts of greenhouse gas emissions	Sections 5.4.6
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should discuss impacts and measures to reduce impacts resulting from climate change	Sections 5.4.6
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	MSAT analysis should evaluate impacts of each build alternative including cancer and non cancer health effects; sensitive receptor populations (schools, healthcare facilities, elderly, EJ communities) should be specifically considered for emissions of, at a minimum, benzene, 1,3-butadiene, formaldehyde, acrolein, and diesel exhaust. Both regional and near roadway impacts should be considered. MSAT analysis should include disclosure of all locations at which exposures to sensitive receptors may increase due to constr., and an assessment of factors influencing the degree of adverse impact. Analysis should address cumulative impact resulting from project impacts in combination with other chemicals in project area	Section 5.4.4
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should identify and implement overall diesel emission reduction activities	All required air quality analysis has been performed and is included in the SDEIS
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should address designs to redirect stormwater and hazardous material spills to areas of detention and possible treatment	Section 5.8.2 and 5.8.5
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Deicing materials should be specifically addressed	Special drainage systems are being designed to protect the wellhead protection area from pollutants
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should provide update on quality of Ohio River and various streams in project area including identification of total max daily loads for a particular stream	Section 4.8
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Measures to avoid and minimize impacts to all streams should be discussed in DSEIS	Section 5.8.5
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Recommend bridging across streams and their 100-year floodplains when feasible	Appropriately sized structures have been utilized at all locations
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	RE: wellhead protection areas (WHPAs), the DSEIS should evaluate effects on water supply related to the amount of impervious surfaces to be constructed. Ensure that proper construction practices are followed and coordination takes place to determine whether site specific protection measures are needed.	Section 5.8.2
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Impacts of alts on surface and ground water should be addressed including mitigation	Section 5.8.1
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should evaluate wetland impacts including avoidance minimization. If wetlands impacts exist, DSEIS should include draft wetland mitigation plan.	5.10, 8.1, and Appendix B.5
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Efforts to reduce both operational and construction impacts should be disclosed and minimized. Construction impacts should include discussion of methods to reduce impacts including fuel choice and engine tuning of equipment, site selection staging areas, working hours during the day, limiting open burning, use of shieling for stationary equipment, fugitive dust control, and other areas.	Section 5.5.4 (Construction Noise), 5.6 (Vibration), 8.3 (Mitigation)

Resource Agency Comments
condensed for review / reference

Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
December 14, 2011

Date	Name	Agency	Comment	SDEIS Reference
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Traffic across bridges should be evaluated since it can be particularly noisy.	Project noise analysis included the bridge locations
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	If noise walls are not feasible, other measures to minimize noise impacts should be evaluated including vegetative barriers, earthen berms, type of roadway surfacing materials.	Section 5.5
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	EJ assessment should identify EJ communities, determine whether communities would bear disproportionate impacts from the project, give details regarding plans for involvement by EJ communities, and list the benefits/burdens on residents and EJ communities in the project area. If impacts are disproportionate, mitigation should be evaluated.	Section 5.1.7 and Appendix B.8.2
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should include updated demographic information and identify EJ populations and data sources. EJ maps of the surrounding communities that indicate the proximity of communities with potential EJ concerns to the proposed project should be included. Information from these sources should be used in conjunction with info acquired from public involvement, community interviews, surveys and/or ground verification processes.	Section 5.1.7 and Appendix B.8.2
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	The effects of tolling as a revenue source on the communities in the project area should be disclosed. Public participation and outreach should include EJ communities and other stakeholders that will be impacted.	Sections 5.1.7, 7.1.6 and Appendix B.8.2
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Adverse impacts on human health should be controlled so that significant effects are avoided and/or minimized. Cumulative & secondary impacts on EJ communities should be discussed.	Section 5.1.7 and Appendix B.8.2
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	EPA will defer to USFWS re potential impacts to federally protected species. DSEIS should clarify whether there are any threatened or endangered species in or near project. Mitigation should be addressed in the DSEIS.	Secitons 5.7.3; and 8.1; Appendix B.3.2
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should provide detailed analysis of secondary and cumulative impacts for communities as well as species, air, water quality, habitat. Impacts should be listed and discussed including those facilities that would be induced to locate in the project area due to the new bridges and roadways. DSEIS should identify if local communities have implemented or updated their comprehensive plans or updated zoning or other ordinances since the 2003 EIS/ROD.	Sections 5.2.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.5.5, 5.8.4, 5.9.2, 9.10.2, 9.11.4, 5.1.7 (p. 5-35); regarding planning updates, Sections 4.1 and 5.1.
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Historic and cultural resource issues need to be finalized with SHPO's in IN and KY. DSEIS should reflect the project team's coordination with the SHPO's. DSEIS should discuss procedures for events such as unearthing arch sites during construction.	Sections 4.3, 5.3, and 8.3; Appendix D
6/30/2011	Heinz Mueller	EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Understand that Big Four Bridge may be eligible for listing in register. Coordination should continue with IN, KY SHPO's re bridge design plans and plans for Jeffersonville ramp.	Section 4.3.1 (page 4-16)
6/30/2011	James Glass	IN DNR	Outstanding rating with IHSSI does not verify the property is necessarily individually eligible for National Register	This will be further clarified in the SFEIS
6/30/2011	James Glass	IN DNR	Suggest adding four specific standards and guidelines when evaluating impacts to historic and cultural resources	The standards and guidelines will be followed.
6/30/2011	James Glass	IN DNR	Want to review traffic modeling and diversion studies to determine APE	Chapter 2, pp. 2-22-3. Section 3.3.8 (changes in travel patterns), and Appendix H <i>Traffic Reports</i>

Resource Agency Comments
condensed for review / reference

Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
December 14, 2011

Date	Name	Agency	Comment	SDEIS Reference
7/1/2011	Kay Stewart	TARC	No objections to the P/N document	Comment noted
7/6/2011	James Glass	IN DNR	Concern increased traffic on local roads will have an impact on historic properties	Section 5.3, beginning p. 5-43, addresses traffic, and effects to historic properties are discussed throughout section; Appendix H.1, Section 7, discusses changes in travel patterns, and H.2 and 3 have additional traffic analyses data
7/6/2011	James Glass	IN DNR	Concern tolling will result in increased capacity of the Sherman Minton and Clark Memorial bridges.	Section 3.3.8
7/11/2011	Larry Chaney	KIPDA	Four comments on the references in the document - no issues with P/N	Comments were addressed
8/23/2011	James A. Glass	IN DNR	Comparison chart for Section 5 and 6 indicate "2003 EIS MOA commitments will be addressed"; under the impression that existing MOA commitments would be honored. Request clarification about why similar statements are not found in the chart for Section 2 and 3.	2003 EIS MOA commitments will be completed where feasible, in consideration to the Modified Alternative. This will be discussed further in future 106 meetings.
8/23/2011	James A. Glass	IN DNR	If substitute steel plate girders for the steel tub girders in Section 2, then pedestrian friendly measures (lighting, preventing birds from roosting, etc.) will need to be revisited if the modified alternative chosen.	Considerations for this concern will be given.
8/23/2011	James A. Glass	IN DNR	Previous consultation regarding visual, physical and access related effects of the various ramps in the vicinity of the George Rogers Clark bridge and the Ohio Falls Car and Locomotive Co, Historic district may be affected in the modified alternate. Suggest if chosen, there should be further consultation.	Section 5.3.1.2, pp.5-51 and 52 discuss Clark Bridge and Administration Building and summarizes effects. Table 5.3-3 identifies effects to the bridge and the Ohio Falls Car property. Section 106 consultation will be ongoing.
8/23/2011	Amy Simms	City of Prospect	RE: Draft <i>Range of Alternatives</i> , the City favors the building of the revised plan; and remains adamant that the bridge approach be constructed beneath US 42 through Prospect.	Comment noted regarding the revised plan. Regarding US 42, the tunnel under the highway is a feature of both build alternatives.
8/25/2011	Craig A. Potts	Kentucky Heritage Council	RE: Draft <i>Range of Alternatives</i> , the KHC has no particular issue with the document, except for vague references to evaluating design options for the east end tunnel. Requested information re how/whether to address issue at this time.	SDEIS Section 3.1.1.3 reference (p.3-7 and 3-8), and Appendix D.5, <i>Construction Options at U.S. 42 and the Drumanard Estate Historic District</i> clarify evaluation.
8/25/2011		US Coast Guard	Navigation clearances are consistent with those in project file.	Comment noted
9/2/2011	Frank Hecksher	Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma	Please include on all mailing lists and share info as available	Request noted for follow-up
9/6/2011	Barry Barker	TARC	Potential for enhanced bus service and mass transit deserves careful consideration in light of plans to scale back the project and rely on tolls to help cover costs. Planning, design, funding for enhanced bus service should be incorporated into project's development and should be part of the completed project.	Section 3.2.3
9/6/2011	Barry Barker	TARC	Specifics to be addressed in the SEIS include ensuring turning radii & lane widths meet design criteria to accommodate buses, establishment of permanent park and ride facilities, express and shuttle bus service during construction, new bus stops and shelters, and public information campaign to communicate with the public re public trans service and arrival times for buses.	Section 3.2.3 - Enhanced bus service options will be coordinated with TARC.
9/6/2011	Barry Barker	TARC	TARC services and the passengers who use public transportation in the project area should be exempt from paying any tolls.	Will be determined at a later date by the Bridges Authority.

Resource Agency Comments
condensed for review / reference

Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
December 14, 2011

Date	Name	Agency	Comment	SDEIS Reference
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Original Purpose and Need statement in 2003 FEIS needs to be updated regarding safety data and traffic forecasting information.	Chapter 2
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Recommends detailed financial studies, including tolling studies and identify specific dollar amounts that can be expected from tolling under each SEIS alternative and assess the financial feasibility of each alternative accordingly.	Section 3.2.3, Revenue Estimates and Indicative Financial Capacity—SEIS Modified Selected Alternative Tolloed Scenario (Appendix G.5), and Financial Feasibility Revenue Estimates for the FEIS Selected Alternative (Appendix G.4)
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Requests following alternatives be evaluated in SEIS: FEIS Selected with tolls, Modified version of Selected Alt w/o tolls and cost saving alternatives.	Section 3.1.1.3 & <i>Financial Feasibility Revenue Estimates for the FEIS Selected Alternative</i> , Appendix G.4
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Agree that TDM, TSM and mass tranis alternatives have some potential to improve transportation system and were included in 2003 Selected Alternative. DSEIS should clarify extent that the proposed modification to the Selected Alternative will include these elements.	Section 3.2.3, page 3-19, and <i>Alternatives Evaluation Document, Section 4.1</i> (Appendix A.3)
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Include Alt comparison table in DSEIS that provides cost of each alternative and dollar amounts expected from each funding source for each alternative as well as each alternative's environmental impacts.	Summary of Impacts - Tables 3.3-8 & 5.18-1. Costs - Table 3.3-9. Funding sources - <i>Financial Demonstration for the Ohio River Bridges Project in Support of the Louisville (KY-IN) Metropolitan Transportation Plan</i> , Appendix G.2, Appendix A.2
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Include timeline of construction / completion for each alternative and measures to avoid or minimize traffic disruption	Section 3.3.9
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Include map showing the alternatives at an easy-to-read scale	Appendix A.6 - 2003-2010 Comparison
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Maintenance cost should be taken into consideration for the alternatives.	<i>Financial Demonstration for the Ohio River Bridges Project in Support of the Louisville (KY-IN) Metropolitan Transportation Plan</i> , Appendix G.2
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	Draft Range of Alts discusses financial feasibility of project and revenue sources. DSEIS should clarify whether revenue source is limited to tolls or also includes other sources of funding.	Sections 3.1.1.3 and 3.3.9 and <i>Financial Demonstration for the Ohio River Bridges Project in Support of the Louisville (KY-IN) Metropolitan Transportation Plan</i> , Appendix G.2
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should clarify the research used for the project that shows how tolling the Modified Selected Alternative is a financially feasible option for funding any portion of the project. Clarify if there is a contingency plan in the event that not all potential funding sources become available.	Section 3.2.3, Revenue Estimates and Indicative Financial Capacity—SEIS Modified Selected Alternative Tolloed Scenario (Appendix G.5), and Financial Feasibility Revenue Estimates for the FEIS Selected Alternative (Appendix G.4)
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should consider effects of mass transit ridership and employer-based trip reduction programs on current traffic, traffic during construction, and post-construction traffic.	Chapters 2 and 3
9/12/2011		EPA (Regions 4 and 5)	DSEIS should include update regarding progress of Big Four Bridge. If ped/bike path is eliminated from Big Four, it should be reconsidered as part of LSIORB Project.	Section 3.2.3, page 3-19
9/19/2011	J. Matthes Buffington	IN DNR, DFW	Advises to submit a copy of this letter with requisite construction in a floodway permit application. identifies measures to minimize resource losses, which will be a permit requirement.	Comment noted
9/19/2011	J. Matthes Buffington	IN DNR, DFW	RE: Natural Heritage Program database, no plant or animal state or federall T/E/Rare species reported to occur in project vicinity.	Comment noted

Resource Agency Comments
condensed for review / reference

Resource Agency Coordination Meeting
December 14, 2011

Date	Name	Agency	Comment	SDEIS Reference
9/19/2011	J. Matthes Buffington	IN DNR, DFW	Multiple comments regarding impacts to creeks/habitat as result of most alternatives studied in FEIS; recommends select A-9, eliminate A-15.	Chapter 3 discusses alternatives in FEIS and those carried forward in the SDEIS. See also Alternatives Evaluation Document in Appendix A.3; and SDEIS sections 5.7 through 5.10, which identify impacts to natural resources, water resources, floodplains, and wetlands.
9/19/2011	J. Matthes Buffington	IN DNR, DFW	Recommends impacts mitigation ratios.	Section 8.1, p.8-2, 8-5, 8-6 discuss INDOT ratios
9/19/2011	J. Matthes Buffington	IN DNR, DFW	Notes "environmentally positive changes" in Section 6 (wildlife crossings and bridges).	Comment noted
9/19/2011	J. Matthes Buffington	IN DNR, DFW	Identifies measures to minimize resource losses, which will be a permit requirement.	Impacts and avoidance/minimization/mitigation are discussed throughout Chapter 5, including sections 5.7 through 5.10 for natural resources. Comment noted regarding permit.
10/14/2011	Thomas R. Galligan, Brian Fogle	City of Jeffersonville	Do not agree with comments at recent consulting parties meeting that historic districts affected in part by expanded APE should be treated as being affected in total.	Comment noted.
10/14/2011	Thomas R. Galligan, Brian Fogle	City of Jeffersonville	Do not believe that existing National Register Historic District should be expanded as a way of protecting surrounding areas from future infrastructure reconstruction.	Comment noted
10/14/2011	Tyler B. Howe	Eastern Band of Cherokee	Teleconferenced meeting: do not have comments at this time since most recent consultation pertained to historic structures, not Native American Indian arch sites.	Comment noted
10/14/2011	James A. Glass	IN DNR	Agree with changes in workbook for 2011 Expanded APE - Downtown Bridge - Clark and Floyd Counties; Swartz Farm, farmhouse @ 2307 Utica Pike, Thomas Benton Jacobs House, James A. Smith Farmstead; and with evaluations of properties documented in workbook for purposes of 106 review in 2003 APE - Downtown Bridge, Jeffersonville and Clarksville, Clark County.	Comment noted
10/14/2011	James A. Glass	IN DNR	2003 APE - East End Bridge - Clark County; Concur that Utica Lime Kilns are eligible as multiple properties under criteria A and D. Archaeological features above and below ground are eligible. Ask that rationale be provided for boundaries of the sites.	Determinations for the Utica Lime Kilns will be concluded with future meetings with the Indiana SHPO and the 106 consulting parties.
10/14/2011	Lindy Casebier	KY Heritage Council	Understood that within expanded APE effects are expected to be indirect and will be assessed at district or neighborhood level.	Section 5.3, p. 4-47 notes this, and Section 5.3.1.4 assesses effects at the district / neighborhood level.
10/14/2011	Lindy Casebier	KY Heritage Council	Sec 2; concur with new determinations in this section	Comment noted
10/14/2011	Lindy Casebier	KY Heritage Council	Sec 3; 8/11/2011 letter provided comments re expansion of APE to account for indirect impacts due to tolling. In the same month, FHWA submitted Draft Range of Alts Document but specific information re vibration effects, specifically excavation near proposed tunnel, has not been presented. Will reserve comments re potential for additional direct effects when more detailed information on changes to design have been submitted as part of the effects phase of the 106 process.	Section 5.3 identifies effects; Section 106 consultation ongoing.
10/14/2011	Lindy Casebier	KY Heritage Council	Sec 3; Share concerns raised by consulting parties re historic districts that are bisected or split by the APE. Effects must be evaluated on district as a whole.	This is being reviewed and will be discussed further at the next 106 meeting.
10/14/2011	Lindy Casebier	KY Heritage Council	Sec 4; concur with reevaluation of resources whose eligibility did not change and new eligibility determinations with exception of 105-133 W. Main (Whiskey Row), and 114 W. Main & 652 S. Second St which are not individually eligible but do retain integrity to be considered as contributing resources within a historic district.	This is being reviewed and will be discussed further at the next 106 meeting.