



EAST END BRIDGE

Kentucky Approach & Indiana Approach

Area Advisory Team & Regional Advisory Committee Meeting

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2005

McCauley Nicolas Centre, Jeffersonville, IN

6:30 PM - 8:30 PM

MEETING SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

As the Kentucky Approach (Section 4) and the Indiana Approach (Section 6) Area Advisory Team (AAT) and Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) members arrived and signed in, each was presented with new and updated handout materials for their notebooks. Nine members who did not receive their notebook at the September 15th meeting were given theirs at this meeting. The AAT and RAC members were directed to take a seat where a polling device and comment sheet had been placed. They were told they would be seeing a number of bridge design concepts.

As reflected in the sign-up sheets, 44 people attended the meeting, including members of the bridges project team. 18 AAT/RAC members took part in the polling.

110 invitations were mailed to the AAT/RAC membership list two 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/RAC 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 show the AAT/RAC members various bridge design concepts and record their preferences and comments. It was explained that these were only concepts and not detailed bridge designs. The input gathered will be factored into the development of bridge type alternatives in Step 3 of the Bridge Type Selection Process.

Dan briefly reviewed the Bridge Type Selection Process, that this was Step 2 (Concept Development) of a 4-step process.

Dan then took a few minutes to update the attendees on the bridge types being considered for the East End Bridge. Since the last AAT/RAC meeting September 15, 2005, further study had determined that a suspension bridge was no longer feasible. Dan explained that a suspension bridge would not fit within the project's budget and that suspension bridges generally are constructed for greater span lengths than the footprint

for the East End Bridge. That leaves three bridge types being considered for the East End Bridge:

- ❖ Arch
- ❖ Cable-stayed
- ❖ Truss

Dan then introduced Ted Grossardt, Program Manager of the University of Kentucky Transportation Research Center, to conduct the polling. Ted explained that there would be two rounds of polling – one after a quick run-through of the 15 concepts (grouped randomly and identified by type with an A, C or T) and another following a presentation on the concepts from architect Miguel Rosales. Each of the 15 concepts depicted a view from the Indiana bluff and a driver's view and was rated on a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 the highest. During the polling process and afterwards, the participants were invited to ask questions, make comments and share their views about what they liked and didn't like about each of the concepts. A synopsis of that communication is included at the end of this report.

At the conclusion of the polling, attendees were thanked for their participation, invited to provide further comment at any time and reminded of Open Houses scheduled for December 13th in Utica and December 15th in Prospect.

General Discussion Items:

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
The box girder was added back in for the downtown bridge. Is that applicable here in the East End?	Box girders could be used for side spans, but not for main span – it is too long.
East end has no precedent, so matching other bridges, like in downtown, is not necessary	
What about cost?	We are not to the costing stage. We need to get to the alternatives level to do costs. We are showing you bridges that fit within the budget we have been given.
What about maintenance?	Maintenance will be considered in life-cycle costs.
Which one is more cost prohibitive?	All of the concepts we are showing will fit within the budget.
For the styles of piers in the water, are any of the styles safer for impact from tugs?	They will be designed to sustain impact from ships. As we go through the samples, you can point out substructures you like and we can incorporate those

	<p>ideas.</p> <p>Some of the structures do have the additional pier in the 500-foot span, which gives additional superstructure options.</p>
<p>A lot of the options do not look rural, like the setting is. When you are coming onto the bridge from IN, it is a surprise. On the KY side, what is the approach like?</p>	<p>Context sensitive design will be considered for the approach from the KY and IN sides. The KY approach is on a structure well before you get to the river – we will coordinate these two structures to be compatible.</p> <p>View will be framed by tall trees on both sides of the river.</p>
<p>As for the KY approach in the floodplain, do any of the bridge types have any different impacts based on the pier arrangement?</p>	<p>We are not putting enough structures in the river to impede flow, but this will be verified through the hydraulic analysis. The size of the approach piers does not depend on the main span – so it doesn't really vary based on the superstructure type.</p>
<p>Will the piers be built perpendicular to the river?</p>	<p>They will be perpendicular to the bridge itself, about 30 degrees skewed to the river.</p>
<p>Will bicycles be allowed in the bridge?</p>	<p>Yes, in the walkway. The railings will be designed to be safe for cyclists.</p>
<p>Will the rail obstruct the view of the driver?</p>	<p>The railings can be transparent, since they do not have to be designed to take the impact of cars. This can be done with panels or with steel rods and railings.</p>
<p>Can the walkway be lowered relative to the roadway?</p>	<p>It is possible; however, if you lower the walkway, it may be less safe for the peds/cyclists since they are not visible.</p>

C1

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Like the high arches and cables.	
There is an airiness to this that is nice. If you group the cable-stayed together in the slide show, it would be easier to evaluate them.	Miguel will be doing this in the next step.
This is too stark for a rural neighborhood with trees all around. It is a radical design.	
Looks like two sailboats, very smooth and light.	
I would rank this as a 10. I like the open feeling I would get driving across. This design would give users a great view of the river and shorelines. I think this also gives	

a feeling of modern or high-tech. Looks futuristic. This could also be too stark for an area with nothing but trees on both shorelines.	
Very unique, very attractive for the east end of town.	

A1

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Looks similar to the I-65 bridge in Columbus, IN. It is appealing.	
Graceful appearance.	
Does not look as nice in the context as the higher bridges do.	
Very unique and attractive.	

T1

Looks like a railroad bridge.	
Blocks all views.	
Not attractive from the shoreline.	
Forget it.	
Can see the paint peeling already.	
I dislike the confined feeling and look of this bridge.	
Too much hardware. Too much to maintain.	

C2

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Very graceful and almost invisible.	
Open view.	
Smaller piers and not as bulky.	
Blends into surroundings.	
Looks modern in a good way.	
What are the towers made of?	It is more common to use concrete, but could use steel as well. Shapes can differ too.
What would the nighttime view look like?	We will be showing that in Miguel's discussion.
Are the towers 300 feet above the deck?	No, from the water.
I would give this a 10. It has open view and looks modern/progressive.	
Too open, feels insecure.	

A2

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Like the unobstructed view.	
Like the curve better than the linear.	
Nice to have structure in the median, so your view of the river is not obstructed as a driver	
The piers look bulky.	
How does the height compare with the towers?	This is slightly lower than the towers
Will aircraft clearance be a concern for the tower types?	Not in our location, plus lighting will be required.
There is a lot of low-flying air traffic over the river.	
Modern, open and good view – a 10.	
Very attractive, peaceful.	

T2

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Another train bridge.	
Can you put the truss under the bridge?	You would not have the clearance to do this. This is called a through truss. We looked at a deck truss, but it puts the deck too high in the air and the approach is too steep to the tunnel.
We already have a bridge like this. Again, too confining. Rate this as a 2.	
Not attractive.	

C3

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
What is the difference between this and the previous cable bridges shown?	Miguel can talk about the difference in these in his discussion.
I think the cables detract from the view.	
Too airy.	

T3

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Not as confining, but does not convey a modern, progressive feeling.	

A3

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Piers are bulky.	
The piers don't look proportional to the top.	
It is uncomfortable looking.	
Looks "squished".	

C4

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Round piers instead of square – like them both the same.	
Like the single line of cables down the center of the bridge.	

C6

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Looks stubby.	
Does not have the grace that the others do.	
Seems out of proportion with some cables spread and some grouped.	
Would the walkway really be like that? What do you do to keep people from jumping off?	Put a railing taller than regular height, but also make it transparent. It is a 17' wide walkway, and will not be caged.
Is it 3-lanes plus full shoulders?	Yes, shoulders inside and out, plus walkway.

T4

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
This is just a better looking train bridge.	

A4

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
It is out of proportion to the columns and approaches.	
Piers too bulky.	
This is definitely a 10. Again, open views. It looks progressive like KY and IN are looking to the future in terms of business and transportation.	

C5

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Does not have the grace of the taller towers.	
The cable bridges keep more bulk and piers out of the water. Gives a more open view of the river.	
Like the cables in the center of the bridge, rather than the outside of the lanes.	
Having the cables in the middle precludes future use of median for other modes of travel in the future, such as transit.	
Is this a two pier bridge?	Yes – just the two towers in the water.

C7

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members
Like the openness on the sides.	
The cables don't match – confusing to see the angled and straight cables.	Similar to the Brooklyn Bridge in NY.
Like the suspension piece in the center, but looks like too many cables.	
Looks like it is more cluttered in the middle.	
What is the height of the towers here?	You can reduce to about 220' with the variations in cables and suspension

ATTENDEES

(AAT/RAC Members)

Mark Adams
Saeed Assef
Leslie Barras
Tonya Fischer
Matt Graves
Sandra Leonard
Joan Lindop
Jim McCoskey
Robert Miller
Stewart Prather
Ray Rissler
Ann Simms
Ron Teaford
Debbie Wanke
Ted Wathen
Jim Witten
Mache' Rendas Wright
Robert Wynkoop
Tony Yates

REPRESENTING

Metro Public Works
Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD)
River Fields
So. Ind. Chamber
River Ridge Commerce Center
City of Prospect
Sierra Club
Fox Run Homeowners Association
City of Jeffersonville
Louisville Bicycling Club
City of Green Spring
City of Prospect
Brownsboro Road Area Defense, Inc.
Fox Run Homeowners Association
Louisville Sailing Club
Charlestown Chamber of Commerce
Metro Louisville Public Works
Wolfcreek Homeowners Association
Wolfpen Woods Community Association

(Visitors)

Sandra Blaser
Darnell Farris
William McCullen
Fernando Messier
Juan Messier
Jeff Wilson
Zac Wilson

Brownsboro Farms
Metro Louisville Government
Sierra Club
Messa Inc.
Messa Inc.
Citizen
Citizen

ATTENDEES***(Project Representatives/Staff)*****REPRESENTING (cont.)**

Paul Boone	Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)
Bart Bryant	Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)
Mary Lou Hauber	Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency
Brian James	Community Transportation Solutions – General Engineering Consultant (CTS-GEC)
George Jones	Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
Kristen Jordan	CTS-GEC
Tim Lawson	CTS-GEC
Jozi Legner	JY Legner Associates
Jerry Leslie	HW Lochner and Associates
Steve Nicaise	CTS-GEC
Pat Osbourne	Michael Baker Corporation
John Sacksteder	CTS-GEC
Aaron Stover	Michael Baker Corporation
Debbie Taylor	Lochner
Lee Walker	KY Ombudsman
JB Williams	Michael Baker Corporation
Debbie Williams	Michael Baker Corporation
Sharon Williams	CTS-GEC