



## **EAST END BRIDGE**

### **East End Kentucky Approach & East End Indiana Approach Area Advisory Team & Regional Advisory Committee Meeting**

**Thursday, February 16, 2006**

**Frazier Historical Arms 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) and Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) members arrived and signed in, each was presented with new and updated handout materials for their notebooks and a polling device. One member who had not received their notebook at previous meetings was given it at this meeting.

As reflected in the sign-up sheets, 38 people attended the meeting, including members of the Bridges project team. Eighteen AAT/RAC members took part in the polling.

A total of 114 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 six bridge type alternatives and record their preferences and comments. He told them they would also hear information regarding construction costs, maintenance issues and construction methods. He mentioned that architect Miguel Rosales would talk about the six alternatives and then Ted Grossardt would direct the polling.

Dan briefly reviewed the Bridge Type Selection Process, explaining that this was Step 3 (Development of Bridge Alternatives) of a 4-step process. He also reviewed the Bridge

Overview map, the East End Bridge footprint and the cross-section of the East End Bridge.

Dan explained that the six alternatives had been developed based on the 15 bridge design concepts in Step 2 and the input received from the AAT/RAC members at the November 2005 meeting and at public open houses in December 2005. He explained that three final bridge design types would be further refined in Step 4 of the Bridge Type Selection Process based on feedback on the six alternatives in Step 3 from AAT/RAC members and from the general public during open houses in March 2006. He emphasized that attendees would not be voting on their favorite bridge, but rather expressing preferences of various aspects of the six alternatives. To some extent, the designers may utilize various characteristics from one or more of the six alternatives in the three final bridge type designs.

Dan then introduced Miguel Rosales, who took the audience through the six alternatives. He explained that of the six, five were cable-stayed and one was an arch. He said that was a result of comments and polling on the 15 bridge concepts presented in Step 2, where AAT/RAC members and the general public favored many of the cable-stayed concepts. Miguel explained features of each of the alternatives before turning the presentation over to Ted Grossardt.

Ted Grossardt led the attendees through three initial rounds of preference polling on the alternatives, getting their input on each bridge from: a) bluff and aerial views b) shoreline and pedestrian views and c) drive-thru views. After each round, there was discussion about what participants did and did not like and their reasons for liking or not liking a particular view or feature. Ted then re-introduced Dan to talk about construction costs, maintenance issues and construction methods.

Dan presented charts showing the relative construction costs of each of the six alternatives, their maintenance issues and construction methods. Dan explained that the information was for each alternative in relation to the other five. For example, the construction cost of each alternative falls within the project's budget, but some of the alternatives would be closer to the full budget amount than others.

Ted then returned to poll participants on the level of importance they placed on bridge aesthetics versus construction cost, maintenance issues and construction methods. They were also polled on the level of importance they gave to each of those three items in relation to one another.

Dan then thanked the participants for attending the meeting and reminded them of the open houses scheduled for March 7<sup>th</sup> in Utica and March 9<sup>th</sup> in Prospect. With no further questions or comments, Dan closed the presentation at approximately 8:05 p.m.

## **PRESENTATION BOARDS**

There were presentation boards available for public viewing before and after the meeting. These boards showed the six alternatives and included a) bluff and aerial views b) shoreline and pedestrian views c) drive-thru views d) night views with subtle aesthetic lighting and e) details of the elevation and plan.

**General Discussion Items:**

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Response (As necessary)
<p>Question for Bi-State: The Kentucky Transportation Cabinet's 6-year plan was announced yesterday and 2/3 of the money is for the East End Bridge. How are those priorities set? Was this by Bi-State? This is relevant to this meeting, because many of the committees are spending time on the downtown meetings, too.</p>	<p>The KYTC sets the priorities. Bi-State gives budget information to the Cabinet, but does not set priorities.</p>
<p>Where are the docks shown in the images?</p>	<p>Right near Transylvania Avenue.</p>
<p>Where are you walking on the walkway? Is there protection?</p>	<p>Yes. There will be a barrier between the cars and people. There will also be a barrier between the people and the edge of the bridge.</p>
<p>Are the towers interchangeable? Which towers are the most minimal?</p>	<p>A6 is slightly more slender, but A5 and A6 are about the same area. The shaping can be different for any of the towers. In the next phase, when we are down to 3 alternatives, we will build models with details that you can view closely.</p>
<p>Will any of the 6 have the same safety measures, stability, etc...</p>	<p>Yes. They will all meet safety and stability requirements.</p>
<p>Is there any difference in construction time between the six alternatives?</p>	<p>It would take about 3.5 years for most of them and maybe 4 years for A6. It really depends on what time of year you begin construction.</p>
<p>Are any of the bridges quieter than any other?</p>	<p>Not really. We put expansion joints at much greater spacing. For this bridge there could be one at either end.</p>
<p>How much of the cost is paid for with federal money?</p>	<p>It is about 80% federal funding.</p>
<p>Do construction methods affect cost? Give us an example.</p>	<p>Construction methods for all of these bridges will not significantly impact cost.</p>
<p>Since we are not writing the checks, it makes the voting about these issues seems skewed.</p>	

### Alternative 1

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members (As necessary)
What material would the arches be made of?	Structural steel.
Would structural steel need to be painted?	Yes.

### Alternative 2

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members (As necessary)
Too massive	

### Alternative 3

Bad Star Trek movie	
More complicated shape	
Too much in the air	
Doesn't fit the surroundings at all	
Cables are on the outside – not good	

### Alternative 4

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members (As necessary)
Prefer the tower shapes on A5 or A6	
Don't like the color difference between the towers and the deck	This is just shadowing from this perspective. We haven't started talking about colors yet.
These towers look the best	
Do not like the obelisk look of the towers	

### Alternative 5

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members (As necessary)
Like the cables in the middle	
Very transparent	
Don't like these towers as well as A4	
This is the most unique, unlike A6 which has been done before	
Towers on A5 and A6 look like they need a final touch	
Like the opening where there are no cables	
Bridge almost disappears	

Like the cables better than on A6	
-----------------------------------	--

**Alternative 6**

AAT/RAC Members	PB Team Members (As necessary)
Less is more	
Like the cables in the middle	
It is more symmetrical	
Graceful, but like the shape of the towers better on A4 (seconded)	
Deck thickness is constant	
A6 is more elegant and symmetrical	
Towers on A5 and A6 look like they need a final touch	
Like that A6 looks like a suspension bridge	

**ATTENDEES**

**REPRESENTING**

**(AAT/RAC Members)**

Saeed Assef  
 Leslie Barras  
 Elaine Bordogna  
 Debbie Carroll  
 Aida Copic  
 Kelly Downard  
 John Emmerich  
 Alice Gunnison  
 Bill Kitchen  
 Sandra Leonard  
 Jim McCoskey  
 David Morris  
 Mohammed Nouri  
 Mache' Readus-Wright  
 Ray Rissler  
 Ann Simms  
 Glen Stuckel  
 Harold Tull

Metropolitan Sewer District  
 River Fields  
 Wolf Pen Preservation Association  
 Metro Council (District 16)  
 Louisville Metro  
 Metro Council (District 16)  
 Louisville Sailing Club  
 Wolfpen Preservation Association  
 Transylvania Avenue  
 City of Prospect  
 Fox Run Homeowners Association  
 Metro Development Authority  
 Louisville Metro  
 Metro Public Works  
 Green Spring  
 City of Prospect  
 Metro Council (District 17)  
 Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development  
 Association (KIPDA)

Debbie Wanke  
Wayne Wells  
Robert Wynkoop

Fox Run Homeowners Association  
Transylvania Avenue  
Wolf Creek Homeowners Association

***(Visitors)***

Roy Flynn  
Kevin Oechsli  
Chris Phillips

Metropolitan Sewer District  
Louisville Metro Department of Neighborhoods  
Metro Public Works

***(Project Representatives/Staff)***

Pat Cassity  
Kristen Jordan  
Tim Lawson  
Steve Nicaise  
John Sacksteder  
George Jones  
Milton Haskins  
Jerry Leslie  
Paul Boone  
Jozi Legner  
Lee Walker  
Bart Bryant  
Pat Osborne  
Aaron Stover  
J. B. Williams  
Barbara Micheal

Community Transportation Solutions  
Community Transportation Solutions  
Community Transportation Solutions  
Community Transportation Solutions  
Community Transportation Solutions  
Federal Highway Administration  
HDDS, Inc.  
HW Lochner & Associates  
Indiana Department of Transportation  
JY Legner & Associates  
Kentucky Ombudsman  
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet  
Michael Baker Corporation  
Michael Baker Corporation  
Michael Baker Corporation  
Parsons Brinckerhoff

A1 Aerial View



A1 Shoreline View



A2 Aerial View



A2 Shoreline View



A3 Aerial View



A3 Shoreline View



A4 Aerial View



A4 Shoreline View



A5 Aerial View



A5 Shoreline View



A6 Aerial View



A6 Shoreline View

