

From: [John Sacksteder](#)
To: [Kowalski, Cindy](#); seis@ctsgec.com
Cc: ["Valentine, Gary \(KYTC\)"](#); [Kevin Hetrick](#); ["Boone, Paul"](#)
Subject: FW: Bridges Commission meeting Monday, Dec 19: John Sacksteder's comment
Date: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 11:45:47 AM

For the record, I discussed the response in the SDEIS for the tunnel with both Mr. Frankenberger and Mr. Lammers and commented that the conclusion of that report was that we was proceeding with the tunnel based on the avoidance of the historical property. Mr. Frankenberger seeks to remove the historical designation based on his opinion of the facts, but that is not what we are currently dealing with.

Mr. Lammers did discuss this with me on the first night of the hearing and quoted me in the paper the next day. Mr. Frankenberger talked to Braden and me on the second day and Braden did come to me to confirm the discussion we previously had.

From: Janice.Osadczyk@dot.gov [mailto:Janice.Osadczyk@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2012 10:44 AM
To: denisrhc@yahoo.com
Cc: Gary.Valentine@ky.gov; jsacksteder@ctsgec.com; khetrick@indot.in.gov
Subject: RE: Bridges Commission meeting Monday, Dec 19: John Sacksteder's comment

Dear Denis,

Thank you for your comments concerning the Ohio River Bridges project's DEIS. Your comments are important to us and will be addressed in the FEIS. They will also be added to the project record.

From: Denis Frankenberger [mailto:denisrhc@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2011 5:16 PM [Moble, Diane \(FHWA\)](#); [Sepulveda, Jose \(FHWA\)](#); [Tally, Robert \(FHWA\)](#); [Rentch, Ruth \(FHWA\)](#)
To: Amidon, Linda (FHWA)
Subject: Bridges Commission meeting Monday, Dec 19: John Sacksteder's comment

Hello Linda: Hope you and your family had a great Christmas.

Your opinion please.

I attended the *Bridges Authority's* meetings both Monday, Dec.19 and again Tuesday Dec 20. I made public comments at both meetings. On Monday, I announced the filing of my petition to de-list the 55 acre Drumanard property from the National Register, which- as stated - could conceivably lead to a \$203.7 million construction cost savings and another \$1 million per year annually savings in maintenance cost (per D.5 of the SD EIS appendices.)

Prior to my public comment, Monday afternoon at the session I discussed with John Sacksteder my petition and the overwhelming number of newly discovered historic documents supporting it.... which - in my opinion - could lead to the removal of the Drumanard property from the National Register, and the potential elimination of the \$255 million, 2000' tunnel.

After the meeting, a member of the press asked Project Manager John Sacksteder about removing the tunnel from the project which "would save nearly one-third of the cost out of the \$795 million Kentucky approach". (article is attached)

Shockingly, Sacksteder was quoted by the press the next morning (News & Tribune, Dec. 20, 2011) as saying "removing the tunnel is not an option and would actually cost the project too much time and money." In checking with the reporter, Braden Lammers about a possible misquote, I was told, "No, I taped the conversation".

My question is: Why did the FHWA require the Bridges Authority to conduct a public hearing seeking comments on its plan for the project, stating in the SD EIS that "The purpose of this analysis is to consider whether alternative construction techniques or reconsideration of that original decision in favor of a bored shaft tunnel should be pursued." which is "intended to assist KYTC, INDOT and FHWA in deciding whether any alternative construction method...warrants additional study" when in fact, John Sacksteder made it clear that the options listed on page 2 of Construction Options are "NOT AN OPTION" ?

By stating publically that "removing the tunnel is not an option" did not John Sacksteder usurp the entire intent of the Dec. 19 & 20 meetings with respect to the FHWA, the KYTC, and INDOT?

Thanks,

Denis Frankenberger (502) 648-3636
2806 Little Hills Ln.
Louisville, KY 40223