

From: [John Sacksteder](#)
To: rpschneider@netzero.net
Cc: ["Cindy Kowalski"](#)
Subject: RE: Ohio River Bridges Project
Date: Monday, January 09, 2012 9:09:58 AM

Dear Mr. Schneider:

We thank you for your comments. They will be included in the public record for the project and responses will be provided with the Final EIS.

John Sacksteder, PE
Project Manager
Community Transportation Solutions -
General Engineering Consultant
Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio
River Bridges Project
305 N. Hurstbourne Lane, Suite 100
Louisville, KY 40223
502-394-3847

From: rpschneider@netzero.net [mailto:rpschneider@netzero.net]
Sent: Sunday, January 08, 2012 9:53 PM
To: jsacksteder@ctsgec.com
Subject: Fw: Ohio River Bridges Project

John:

On behalf of CART, I submitted the following comments by hand-delivering a letter to you at the Hurstbourne Lane office earlier on the date of this e-mail to Duane. I see no mention of them in either Appendix F.1 of F.7 of the Supplemental Draft EIS, which I find unusual, since it addresses many points which were made by other commenters whose letters were cited. I also do not remember receiving any acknowledgement. Although I am no longer with CART, please consider the above comment and the comments below as being submitted in response to the Supplemental Draft EIS, in addition to any that I may send between now and the deadline.

Thanks,
Ron Schneider

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "rpschneider@netzero.net" <rpschneider@netzero.net>
To: duane.thomas@dot.gov
Subject: Ohio River Bridges Project
Date: Tue, 12 Jul 2011 00:51:57 GMT

B.2

Mr. Thomas:

I submitted the comments below on behalf of the Coalition for the Advancement of Regional Transportation (CART). I am copying you as well.

Thanks,
Ron Schneider

The following comments are in reference to the supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) for the Ohio River Bridges Project:

1) Traffic projections for the No-action alternative through 2030 appear to be vastly overestimated. ACTUAL traffic volumes over the last decade are down on all three Louisville area bridges across the Ohio (from 85,000 vehicle crossings per day in 2000 to 82,000 in 2010 on I-64; from 26,000 to 21,900 on U.S. 31; from 133,000 to 122,300 on I-65). What, then, is the justification for predicting that the No-action alternative would see increases on these three bridges of 37%, 14%, and 27% in the number of vehicles per day respectively by 2030? The decade of 1990 to 2000 saw increases in traffic volumes on the bridges, but the most recent decade is a much better predictor for the next two decades because gasoline and diesel fuel prices are extremely unlikely to be similar to what they were in the 1990's ever again.

B.4

2) There has been no iterative analysis shown so far of the effects of the proposed tolls on traffic volumes. The higher the tolls on any bridge, the lower the traffic volumes. This must be figured into the analysis, and if the monetary figures necessary to pay for any new bridge cannot be justified by the tolls from the projected traffic volumes, then the bridges must not be built. This must be considered in addition to the effect that increased fuel prices will also have on traffic volumes.

3) There is no justification for removing the bicycle and pedestrian accommodation from the downtown bridge. The new Big Four bridge is far too far away and has far too long approach to be considered an equivalent pedestrian crossing. Removal of the bike and ped bridge is not justifiable from an economic justice perspective.

D.27

4) The revised EIS process has not even given lip service to any other option but building two bridges. Many things have changed since the Final Environmental Impact Statment (FEIS) and the Record of Decision (ROD) were issued, most notably a steep increase in fuel prices that was not predicted by the authors of either document (but which was, at the time, predicted in documents cited by CART). Given all of the changes in vehicle miles traveled, fuel prices, and the prospect of adding tolls to the proposed (and perhaps some existing) bridges, there is absolutely no justification for not examining increased transit service as an option. This possibility has been completely ignored. This process cannot be justified. From the beginning of preparation of the SEIS, both KYTC and INDOT have started from the assumption that the two bridges were the only way to go, a clear violation of how this process is supposed to work.

C.7

5) In spite of an apparently seriously flawed assumption in the FEIS that TARC service would expand as a result of the sprawl induced by an additional bridge in the east end, there is no mention of transit in the documents now being put forth. Furthermore, there is no justification for ignoring this issue now. TARC has suffered two major service cuts in the

last two years, and there is no indication that this trend will be reversed in the future. How can ignoring this fact in the SEIS be justified?

Thank you for your consideration.

53 Year Old Mom Looks 33

The Stunning Results of Her Wrinkle Trick Has Botox Doctors Worried
consumerproducts.com