



EAST END BRIDGE

East End Kentucky Approach & East End Indiana Approach

Area Advisory Teams Meeting

Thursday, July 13, 2006

Frazier International History Museum, Louisville, KY

6:30 PM - 8:30 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

As the East End Kentucky Approach (Section 4) and the East End Indiana Approach (Section 6) Area Advisory Team (AAT) members arrived and signed in, each was presented with new and updated handout materials for their notebook. Attendees were invited to view 3-D models of the 3 recommended bridge alternatives that were on display (doors opened at 6:00 p.m. to provide an opportunity for model viewing prior to the 6:30 start of the presentation).

As reflected in the sign-in sheets, 30 people attended the meeting, including 10 members of the Bridges project team.

A total of 70 invitations were mailed to the AAT members and alternates three weeks prior to the meeting. E-mail reminders were sent one week prior and phone call reminders were made 2-3 days prior.

EAST END BRIDGE PRESENTATION

East End Bridge Section 5 Manager Dan Carrier began the meeting by welcoming the AAT members and introducing the members of the Bi-State Management Team and the East End Bridge design team present. Dan then mentioned that the purpose of the meeting was to share with the AAT members the 3 recommended bridge alternatives and get their comments and answer questions.

Dan briefly reviewed the Bridge Type Selection Process, explaining that this was Step 4 (Select Bridge Type) of a 4-step process. Once the bridge type is selected, the project will enter the design phase. He also reviewed the East End Bridge footprint and the cross-section of the East End Bridge.

Dan explained that the 3 recommended alternatives had been developed based in part on the 6 bridge alternatives from Step 3 and the input received from the advisory team members, from public open houses, from meetings with the HPATs and other feedback

received through the project Web site and other venues. The recommendations also considered technical feasibility and costs of the various alternatives.

Dan then introduced Miguel Rosales, who took the audience through the 3 recommended alternatives. Miguel briefly reviewed the natural landscape and rural and historic context of the East End site. He then introduced the 3 recommended alternatives, showing various views of each (bluff, shoreline, pedestrian, aerial, underside, drive-through). The 3 recommended alternatives are:

- Alternative R1– Diamond Tower Cable Stayed with outside cables
- Alternative R2 – Median Tower Cable Stayed with outside cables
- Alternative R3 – Median Tower Cable Stayed with median cables

Dan then discussed a chart that compared various elements of the 3 alternatives (towers, deck type and width, superstructure type, cables, deck openings, constructibility and maintenance). Dan closed by explaining that the next step would be a similar presentation to the Historic Preservation Advisory Teams (HPATs) and the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) on July 18, 2006. After all comments are received, the 3 recommended alternatives would be finalized and submitted to the Executive Bridge Selection Committee later this summer. The selection of a bridge type by that committee is expected sometime in the Fall of 2006, with final bridge design beginning in early 2007. Dan and Miguel then took questions (see below) and thanked the participants for attending the meeting and for their input throughout the Bridge Type Selection Process. Dan also added that their input would be needed during the upcoming design phase of the project. With no further questions or comments, Dan closed the presentation at approximately 8:20 p.m. and invited attendees to view the bridge models and meet with the design team one-on-one.

Meeting Notes

Combined Sections #4 and #6 AAT Meeting
 Frazier International History Museum
 July 13, 2006
 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Attendee Questions/Comments	PB Team Responses (As Necessary)
Will there be any street lighting/traffic lighting on the bridge?	There will be roadway lighting across the bridge. This is usually minor in scale compared to the lighting of the towers. There are many options in type of lighting, brightness, type of pole, etc. that will be addressed during the design phase.
I was surprised to see the bicycle and pedestrian area. How will this be accessed?	On the KY side, it will be connected to River Road with a down-grade walkway. On the IN side, you cross at grade. These elements have not been finalized, and will be coordinated with the two section designers during final design.
For R1, the offsets on the bicycle and pedestrian path – is this a safety platform?	The shape shown in the model is just a representative shape that shows one way to come around the tower. The platform could possibly have benches to allow pedestrians to enjoy the bridge itself. Options for the bike/ped walkway will be explored in the design phase.
What did we do before computers and simulations to build a bridge?	These are just tools that help us get a better idea of what the bridges will look like in the landscape. The tools we have today make the bridges we build possible.
Are any of the bridges more expensive than another?	We have put together preliminary construction cost estimates, and all three alternatives are similar in cost and fall within the project budget.
Do any of the bridges have noise reduction on them?	They are all about the same. Joints are better in design and construction than they used to be. The natural scenery and trees can absorb some sound.
Will there be exposed steel on the bridges?	The superstructure is generally exposed, but these three alternatives don't have much steel. These bridges have plate girder elements, rather than truss girder elements, which tend to require less maintenance.
All of the models were beautiful.	
Can we have all three?	
I like the two designs that have the openings in the deck. These are more appealing.	
R3 is the preference, with a slimmer, sleeker design.	
R3 is the better alternative to minimize the visual impact. Seems to have fewer cables.	The number of cables is the same, but the visual appears to be fewer. There are actually two planes of cables in the median, although you do not really

	notice it.
Is there any reason why you can't exchange the tops of the towers for R2 and R3?	You can change the shape at the top of the towers, as long as you don't go over 300'. The towers will be studied in detail because they are the predominant visual of the bridge. The next step in the project is the structural details, where some of these ideas can come into play.
R1 is the best and the most unique. This breaks the vertical and parallel lines so typical of modern architecture. It really feels like you are passing through a gateway over the river.	
R1 is the least favorite. It is too busy. R2 is very interesting, but R3 appears to have the least impact on the bridge site. R3 is minimal and the best for the area.	
How much less maintenance does R3 have?	All of the bridges have superstructures that are steel. R3 may have somewhat less maintenance since more of the structure is concrete.
R3 is the most preferred. It is clean, the smallest, gives the best views, and it is the least noticeable.	
R3 gives an open view and will give a neat driving experience across the bridge.	It will be important to find a railing that is transparent enough to carry this open view to the side of the bridge.
What is the winter maintenance like compared to a standard bridge?	Snow is plowed onto the shoulders, and we have inside and outside shoulders. Bridges that use shoulders as lanes now tend to have more problems in the winter, since there is nowhere to push the snow.
Transparent rails do not protect those who live around the bridge from noise, pollution, light, etc... The rails should be a compromise between those living near and driving on the bridge. It would be best to have no light on the bridge at all.	This is a very special site, and whatever can be done to balance the bridge with the existing environs will be done. More study will go into the appropriate lighting and other treatments in the design phase of the project.
The architectural lighting really makes a statement and will be very important to the bridge.	
Are there federal highway standards that require roadway lighting?	For the roadway, there are illumination standards. There are fixtures now that direct the light to the road better, and reduce the amount of light pollution to the surroundings. The architectural lighting is not required by the standards.

ATTENDEES**REPRESENTING****(AAT/RAC Members)**

Paul Bickel	St. Francis in the Fields Episcopal Church
Aida Copic	Louisville Metro
Bill Huff	City of Green Spring
Joe Kehlbeck	City of Prospect
Sandra Leonard	City of Prospect
Jim McCoskey	Fox Run Homeowners Association
Karen Napolilli	Transylvania Beach
Kevin Oechsli	Louisville Metro Dept. of Neighborhoods
Chris Phillips	Louisville Metro Public Works
Ann Simms	City of Prospect
Rick Storm	Louisville Metro Public Works
Ron Teaford	City of Brownsboro Farms
Debbie Wanke	Fox Run Homeowners Association
Wayne Wells	Transylvania Avenue
Jim Witten	Charlestown Chamber of Commerce
Tony Yates	Wolf Pen Woods Community Association

(Visitors)

Karen Hanson	
Denise Jones	
Donna Kampffhammer	Prospect News
Bob Lauder	Bandy Carroll Hellige

(Project Representatives/Staff)

Bill Hanson	Federal Highway Administration
Kristen Jordan	Community Transportation Solutions
Jerry Leslie	HW Lochner and Associates
Matt Linville	J.Y. Legner Associates
Steven Nicaise	Community Transportation Solutions
John Sacksteder	Community Transportation Solutions
Aaron Stover	Michael Baker
Laura Toole	Michael Baker
Tierra Turner	Community Transportation Solutions
Lee Douglas Walker	Kentucky Ombudsman