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Integrating diverse groups and processes

To expedite the Project Delivery Process
What is Section 6002?

- **Efficient environmental reviews** for project decision-making
- Defines Agency roles & responsibilities
  - Lead Agency (FHWA, State DOT)
  - Cooperating Agency (have jurisdiction or special expertise)
  - Participating Agency (have an interest in the project)
- Defines key coordination points, outlined in a coordination plan
- Establishes 30-day review periods (60 days for DEIS)
- Establishes 180 day period to permitting

**Advantages of Section 6002:**
- Collaborative
- Incentive to reach consensus
- No need to revisit decisions
Section 6002 Coordination Points

- Initiation Notice to US DOT
- Invitation of Participating & Cooperating Agencies
- Establishment of Agency Coordination Plan
- Coordination on defining Purpose and Need (public & agencies)
- Coordination in determining the Range of Alternatives (public & agencies)
- Collaboration on determining methodologies for studying alternatives (agencies)
- Notification to Congress if permitting not completed in 180 days
US 421 Milton-Madison Bridge

- Contains two 10-foot wide lanes and no shoulders
- 3,181-foot long cantilever truss over the Ohio River
- One of only two bridges between Louisville and Cincinnati
- Built in 1929 & eligible for National Register
- Structurally deficient
- Carries 10,700 vehicles daily (4% trucks)
- Adjacent to National Historic Landmark District and three National Register Districts
Project Overview

Three year project to replace/rehabilitate US 421 bridge
Began June 2008
Builds on 1995 Planning/Environmental Study
Final product will be able to move into design phases

Main Players:
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)
Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT)
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
**Project Overview**

**Desired Outcomes:**

- A constructible & affordable bridge
- Consensus among agencies, stakeholders, public
  - Federally approved environmental document
- In the end, KYTC and INDOT will own one bridge
US 421 Milton-Madison Bridge

The bridge plays an integral role in connecting the communities of Milton and Madison
Milton, Kentucky

Founded in 1789, before Kentucky became a state
Population divided between Lower and Upper Milton, separated by 400 foot tall ridge
2005 Population was 600 persons
Environmental Justice communities
Majority of Lower Milton in 100 year floodplain
Madison, Indiana

Founded in 1809
Population divided between Lower and Upper Madison
2005 Population was 12,500 persons
Environmental Justice communities
National Historic Landmark District covers most of downtown
Residential, commercial, industrial, recreational land uses
Integrating schedules for various stakeholder groups…

creates a big, complicated schedule. To convey the larger project picture and keep everyone on the same timeline, the team developed a color-block diagram showing the interplay of the various processes.
## Project Process

**July 2008-October 2008**

- Project Kick-Off Activities
- Formation of the Project Advisory Group (PAG)
- Section 6002 Agency/Section 106 Invitations
- Data collection in the study area

### Project Process Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Kick-Off</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTS #1</strong></td>
<td>Draft Purpose &amp; Need, Initial Location Alternatives Screening Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Meeting #1</strong></td>
<td>Screen Initial Location Alternatives to Detailed Location Analysis Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTS #2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Meeting #2</strong></td>
<td>Screen Detailed Location Alternatives to Preferred Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Meeting #3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTS #3</strong></td>
<td>Final Bridge Type Selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Kick-off</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose &amp; Need/Initial Alternatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREP/Screen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Meeting #4</strong></td>
<td>Public Hearing for EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Meeting #5</strong></td>
<td>BTS #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letter Invitations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6002 Participating & Cooperating Agencies

IN SHPO
US EPA
Center for Disease Control
US Fish & Wildlife
Trimble Co Judge
Trimble Co Board of Education
Madison Police Dept
Madison Fire Dept
Madison City Council
Madison Visitor’s Bureau
KIPDA
KY Heritage Council
KY Geological Survey
KY Dept for Air Quality
KY Dept for Environmental Protection

Army Corps
Coast Guard
Park Service
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Milton City Govt
Madison City Govt
IN Dept of Agriculture
IN Dept of Health
IN Dept of Homeland Security
IN Fish & Wildlife
IN Geological Survey
Jefferson Co Board of Commissioners
Jefferson Co Council
Jefferson Co Highway Dept

Plus: 32 Section 106 Consulting Parties
THE PURPOSE AND NEED: THE BACKBONE OF ANY PROJECT!
“We have a sick bridge.”
M3T TO THE RESCUE
Project Process

November 2008: Identify Project Needs

Key Findings of Needs & Deficiencies Report

- Bridge is structurally deficient
- Bridge has narrow lanes & substandard geometrics (functionally obsolete)
- 10,700 vehicles cross bridge daily (4% trucks)
- 70% of northbound traffic on bridge stops in Upper or Lower Madison
- Crashes occur on & around bridge
Project Process

Dec 2008-Feb 2009: Purpose & Need

- Input from PAG at PAG #2-3
- Agency comment period Dec 15-Jan 15 to develop bullet outline
- Input from public at Feb public meeting
- Agency comment period Feb 4-Mar 4 & meeting Feb 25 to comment on draft document
Project Purpose & Need Statement:

- Improve or replace functionally obsolete/structurally deficient bridge
- Improve or maintain cross-river mobility and community connectivity between Milton and Madison
- Improve safety
Dec 2008-Feb 2009: Identify Alternatives

- Input from PAG at PAG #2-3
- Input from public at Feb public meeting
- Agency comment period Feb 4-Mar 4 & meeting Feb 25 to comment on initial alternatives
Initial Alternatives Identified

Do Nothing
Rehabilitation
Superstructure Replacement
New Bridge on New Alignment (shown below)
Project Process

March 2009-June 2009: Screen Alternatives
- Input from PAG at PAG #5
- Agency screening webinar April 9/13
- Development of Initial Location Alternatives Screening Report
- Agency/Section 106 comment period May 4-June 4 & meeting May 18 to comment on alternatives screening
- Public input at May open house/forum
Project Process: Screening Alternatives

Screening 1 Against:
- Purpose & Need
- Goals, Objectives
- Screening Criteria
- Technical Analyses

Screening 2 Against:
- Purpose & Need
- Goals, Objectives
- Screening Criteria
- Technical Analyses

Public & Agency Input

Detailed Development of Four Alternatives

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Previous Study

All Alternatives

Public & Agency Input
Project Process

Key Findings of Initial Location Alternatives Screening Report

- Four alternatives eliminated because they do not meet Purpose & Need
- Four alternatives eliminated because they would have major impacts or face excessive challenges (Red Flags)
- Four alternatives recommended for additional study in upcoming months:

Key Findings of Initial Location Alternatives Screening Report

- Four alternatives eliminated because they do not meet Purpose & Need
- Four alternatives eliminated because they would have major impacts or face excessive challenges (Red Flags)
- Four alternatives recommended for additional study in upcoming months:
Alternatives for Detailed Study
Project Process

Summer 2009-Fall 2009: Develop Alternatives & Impacts

Over the coming months, the project team will be collecting environmental data & working with stakeholders to identify impacts from each of these alternatives.

The Section 106 process will be one major component of this effort to identify and discuss historic resources.
Innovative tools and techniques were employed to gather input and keep stakeholders involved:

- Bridge Type Selection Polling
- Webinars & Online Forums
- Interim Documents
- Website as a public document clearinghouse
Bridge Type Selection
Live Display Polling on Aesthetic Bridge Preferences

STEP 1
DRAFT CONCEPTS
- Bridge Parameters
- 18+/-. Draft Concepts
- FHWA, INDOT & KYTC
- Bridge Type Selection Meeting #1
- Analyze Input

STEP 2
DRAFT ALTERNATIVES
- Evaluation Parameters
- 6+/- Draft Alternatives
- FHWA, INDOT & KYTC
- Bridge Type Selection Meeting #2
- Analyze Input

STEP 3
FINAL ALTERNATIVES
- Evaluation Parameters
- Up to 3 Final Alternatives
- FHWA, INDOT & KYTC
- Bridge Type Selection Meeting #3
- Bridge Type Selection Report
Bridge Type Selection

Live Display Polling on Aesthetic Bridge Preferences
Webinars & Online Forums

Web-meeting hosting services allow meeting participants to log in remotely via the internet and view documents on the presenters computer.

Open to people in more locations

Chat features available

Travel & Time cost savings
Interim Documents

A variety of reports have been published throughout the process to facilitate stakeholder reviews and document the process as it goes.

These will be combined to form the content of the final environmental document.

Needs & Deficiencies Report
Purpose & Need Statement
Environmental Overview Report
Initial Screening Report
White Papers on Traffic, Socio-economics, Ecology, Hazardous Materials, Cultural Resources, Travel Demand Model
Website Clearinghouse

The project website conveys relevant information about the project, up-to-date traffic/closure notices, and acts as a document clearing house for the interim reports.

Helps establish an open, transparent process

www.MiltonMadisonBridge.com
Lessons Learned

- Manage Expectations
- Good communications tool
- Resource Agencies new to 6002 need guidance on their responsibilities
- Some Resource Agencies lack computer skills/equipment; paper copies of documents still desired
- Be mindful of travel restrictions and budgets of Agencies
- Webinars worked better than tele- or video-conferences
- Document and keep file as part of the Administrative Record