

Community Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Feb. 17, 2016, 9 a.m.

Madison City Hall, Council Chambers

CAC members in attendance: Andrew Forrester, Whitney Wyatt, Jim Olson, John Galvin, John Staicer, Bev Armstrong, Mark Cash, Lindsay Bloos, Matt Wirth

Team members in attendance: Eric Arthur, Adam Burns, Jerry Bollinger, Cassie Reiter, Michelle Allen, Chris Wahlman, Whitney Carlin, Erin Pipkin, Rickie Clark

Visitors: Michelle Curran, Peggy Vlerebome, Jan Vetrhus, Vickie Young

1) Introductions

2) Recap of CAC, CP and public meetings in December

We took the feedback and it provided the framework for what you'll review today. There are 9. We're taking your input to evaluate the alternatives as we move forward. We've studied each alternative, but we're interested in the voice of the community. After this week, we'll narrow the nine down to alternatives more representative of what the community wants to see. We'll come back again with that narrowed list. The narrowed list will include Alternative 1, no build, because it is required to be brought forward throughout the NEPA process. Once we select the alternative, we'll begin design. We plan to have preferred alternative by late summer. Planning phase will be complete by end of 2016. 2017-2018 - Design and land acquisition, construction in 2019 and 2020.

3) Today's agenda

You're here today to look at the alternatives. Please be sure you're speaking for your organization.

Small-group discussions

The alternatives are grouped together at the tables: existing alignment, alignment change, at-grade alignment and grade-separated. Team members at the table can answer questions.

- Alternative 1 - No build; provides a benchmark to evaluate all other alternatives. No cost, no impact. Doesn't solve the goals.
 - Doesn't address to meet the needs. Traffic through residential, still have environmental impacts, difficult intersections.
 - Surface water accumulates at Main St. at Victorian Inn in is eliminated through culvert, replaced by INDOT in 2006.
- Alternative 2 - Existing alignment with intersection upgrades for trucks.
 - Increase the radii for trucks to turn through existing route. Lowest cost of the "do something alternatives." Still routes thru residential, multiple stops; 2 displaced homes. Still doesn't help the noise.
 - The intersection of Main St. and Baltimore St. is dangerous with poor sight distance.
- Alternative 3 - Reroute traffic down Jefferson to 2nd to go through the residential neighborhood. This alternative breaks down quickly from a traffic perspective.
 - Traffic comes off Baltimore. Moves traffic over the 2nd St. Impacts properties in different areas. Trucks can turn safely, but the stops create emissions and noise. Traffic is worse than current alignment.

- Alternative 4 – Grade-separated. Bridge over 2nd St. Allow US 421 traffic to flow freely between river and Main St.
 - North of 2nd St, the road would be elevated. S.R. 56 tees into US 421 north of 2nd St. Impacts to dry dock, white structure, used car lot/produce store because US 421 is elevated. If INDOT buys all three parcels, it could be available for a gateway/visitors center.
 - Unsure about the road house in this alternative; they would be facing a wall.
 - Liquor store and lawn mower repair would both be purchased.
 - Impacts seven parcels completely, and several other partials.
 - Eliminates access from US 421 to 2nd Street.
- Alternative 5- Also grade-separated. Similar, except US 421 tees into SR 56.
 - This creates a smaller impact on the ROW. Traffic performs a little worse.
 - Many cars cut through 1st St to Baltimore to avoid the trucks. City installed speed bumps.
 - Traffic will still stop and back up toward the bridge
- Alternative 6 – Cuts through the bluff to minimize the grade difference between Main St. and 2nd St. SR 56 ties into the intersection at 2nd St.
 - 6a – Stop signs at 2nd St. Traffic numbers do not warrant the traffic signal.
 - 6b – Signalized intersection
 - There are six properties affected in these alternatives
 - Five-foot buffer between curb and trail. Pedestrians will be routes along 2nd St. There's an access road at the north end. There is a retaining wall because we have to cut into the bluff. 2nd north has a vertical grade at 4-5%. Dedicated left-turn lane for trucks heading east to continue along SR 56. There would be more noise in those homes where SR 56 connects to 2nd St. Cul-de-sac in alley for trash pick-up.
 - There's a concern about how a retaining wall will fit into the context of the historic district. Can we use materials that keep in the aesthetics?
 - Have you considered keeping the gateway area right off the bridge?
 - Can the signal be installed at the time of construction even if INDOT doesn't warrant it?
- Alternative 7- Grade-separated, US 421 tees in to SR 56. Interchange @ 2nd.
 - Larger ROW impact.
 - There would be a retaining wall in the area between 1st and 2nd along US 421. Will block the view of the neighborhood looking east. Or, instead of walls, would you be open to bridge piers? 20 feet at the north end and 3-4 at the south end.
- Alternative 8 – Roundabout; addresses resident requests to remove traffic from the neighborhoods altogether. Ferry and SR 56 roundabout. Connector up to 2nd for local traffic.
 - There's a mountable apron for the truck traffic.
 - Did you consider the tunnel option?
 - How would the south east area get to the commercial district?
- Alternative 9 – Bridge over 2nd St. 56 traffic routed along 2nd St to Baltimore.
 - This alternative is not preferred because it adds a bridge but doesn't solve the 2nd St. to Baltimore St. traffic issue.

Group Discussion

- Trucks may try to avoid the tolls in Louisville and use US 421 much more frequently.

- I like the routes that are direct for traffic moving across the bridge. The less turns, the better for semis. But I defer to the residents who live in the area.
- We liked some alternatives for traffic, but not pedestrian and bikes. The change in elevation is keeping us from getting exactly what we want. Is there a way to merge 4 and 6 in some way? Pedestrian may feel less safe at night with the bridge.
- Alternative 8 – we were wondering about the people in the southeast quadrant walking into the commercial district. What happens when there is an accident at US 421 and SR 56? Does it essentially close the bridge until it's cleaned up? It's definitely something we want emergency services to weigh in on.
- Alternative 6 – would it be possible to get the signal installed at the time of construction even if it isn't warranted from INDOT's view?
- The bridge over 2nd St. would keep traffic moving away from the neighborhoods. People east of US 421 could enter the neighborhoods safely under the bridge along 2nd. There's a concern about people congregating under the bridge.
- What can we do to soften the bridge and make it more palatable for the neighbors? Materials should reflect the historic nature: limestone instead of stamped concrete. Brick arches might also work.
- We like the trail connection to the bridge on almost all of them. We'd like that to continue. We also want to give a focus to green space and a welcome center/gateway.
- Could the acquired parcels along the east side of Harrison be used for a visitor's center or parking lot for the trail system?
- One of the goals of this project should be to drive business into Madison. The project should be beautiful and impactful at the same time.

4) Summary

- Please fill out the community impact survey and submit it in the next two weeks, either paper or electronic. Your comments will be entered into the public record. Encourage others as well.

Observers' comments

- The impact of noise and pollution – is an elevated structure increasing or decreasing the vibrations? We can construct it in a way that mitigates the vibrations.
- What do the retaining walls look like? Do they block views? Open bridge over 2nd St., retaining walls along the other areas. We'll look at ways to soften the presentation and make the historic nature of Madison. The 12-15 foot concrete would be hard to visualize.

5) Meeting adjourned at 11 a.m.

NOTE: Please advise in writing of any corrections/additions to the minutes. If no written response is received within seven (7) days of these minutes, they will be considered approved as written.