Coordination Plan

Louisville – Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project

Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

April 2011

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Coordination Plan

The purpose of the Coordination Plan is to define the process by which the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), and the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) will carry out the environmental review process for the the LSIORB Project. The document will further define how information will be solicited from the agencies and the public and how the gathered information will be considered in the environmental review process. This document will be included with the agency invitation letters, which are to be sent by the FHWA.

1.1 Applicability of Section 6002

The Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, or SAFETEA – LU, was enacted on August 10, 2005. Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU establishes an environmental review process ("Section 6002 process") that is applicable to all highway and transit projects for which an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is prepared by the U.S. Department of Transportation. The Section 6002 process requires a Coordination Plan.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has issued guidance regarding the implementation of Section 6002.[1] Under that guidance, the Section 6002 process is not required when an SEIS is prepared for an EIS that was approved prior to the enactment of SAFETEA-LU, if the SEIS "does not involve the reassessment of the entire action." If the SEIS does involve reassessment of the entire action, then compliance with the Section 6002 process is required.

The Record of Decision for the LSIORB Project was issued on September 6, 2003, prior to the enactment of SAFETEA-LU. On February 15, 2011, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) published a Notice of Intent to prepare a Supplemental EIS for the LSIORB project. As described in the NOI, this SEIS involves an examination of specific modifications to the selected alternative; it does not involve a re-assessment of the entire action.

Under FHWA's Section 6002 guidance, compliance with the Section 6002 process is not required for this Project. However, FHWA has decided to follow the Section 6002 process in order to expedite completion of the SEIS and related environmental requirements. The Section 6002 procedures will be adapted to the circumstances of this project, taking into account the scope of the issues under consideration in the SEIS.

[1] FHWA, "SAFETEA-LU Environmental Review Process Final Guidance" (Nov. 15, 2006), available at: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep/section6002/section6002.pdf.

2. Project Overview

2.1 The Selected Alternative

On April 8, 2003, the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the LSIORB Project was completed, which identified the Two Bridges/Highway Alternative as the Preferred Alternative. The Record of Decision (ROD) was subsequently approved on September 6, 2003, which identified the Two Bridges/Highway Alternative as the Selected Alternative.

The Selected Alternative includes two new bridges over the Ohio River. One is located in Downtown Louisville, crossing into Jeffersonville, Indiana; the second is located in the East End area (approximately six miles upstream from the downtown bridge) in northeastern Jefferson County, Kentucky and crossing into Clark County, Indiana.

- In the downtown area, the Selected Alternative was Alignment C-1, which included the reconstruction of the Kennedy Interchange to the south, the addition of a new northbound six-lane bridge for I-65 just east of the Kennedy Bridge, and a reconfiguration of the lanes and ramps on northbound I-65 in Indiana.
- In the East End area, the Selected Alternative was Alignment A-15, which included a new freeway alignment connecting the Gene Snyder Freeway at I-71 in Kentucky northwestward through a tunnel under the Drumanard Property, a new bridge crossing over the Ohio River, and a connection to SR 265 at US 62 and Port Road in Clark County, Indiana. It also included the reconstruction of a half-diamond interchange at US 42 in Kentucky, a new interchange at Salem Road in Indiana, and a reconstruction of the Port Road – US 62 interchange in Indiana.

2.2 The SEIS

The lead agencies (FHWA, KYTC, and INDOT) issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) on February 15, 2011 by publication in the *Federal Register*. The NOI provided a short project description, a discussion of the proposed action, an expected project schedule, and contact information.

The lead agencies are preparing an SEIS for the Project because of the passage of time since the approval of the original FEIS/ROD, the present need for tolling revenues to assist in funding the project as determined through the Metropolitan Transportation Planning process, and the need to evaluate cost saving measures in the design of the Selected Alternative. The lead agencies intend to examine three alternatives in the SEIS:

- The Selected Alternative, as approved in the FEIS/ROD, with tolls.

- A modified version of the Selected Alternative with tolls. The modified Two Bridges/Highway Alternative will include reducing the East End Bridge, roadway and tunnel from six lanes to four lanes with the option to add two lanes when traffic demand warrants; reconstructing the Kennedy Interchange in-place; and removing the pedestrian/bikeway from the Downtown Bridge, as announced by The Governors of Kentucky and Indiana and the Louisville Mayor. Other alternatives might also be included in the design alternatives.

- No Build

There are no changes to the P & N to be advanced in the SEIS other than updating of the supporting information due to the passage of time. The purpose of the LSIORB Project is to improve cross-river mobility between Jefferson County, Kentucky and Clark County, Indiana. Specific factors demonstrating this need for action include:

- Inefficient mobility for existing and planned growth in population and employment in the Downtown area and in eastern Jefferson and southeastern Clark Counties;

- Traffic congestion on the Kennedy Bridge and within the Kennedy Interchange;

- Traffic safety problems within the Kennedy Interchange and on the Kennedy Bridge and its approaches;

- Inadequate cross-river transportation system linkage and freeway rerouting opportunities in the eastern portion of the Louisville Metropolitan Area;

- Locally approved transportation plans that call for two new bridges across the Ohio River and the reconstruction of the Kennedy Interchange.

2.3 Tolling

Title 23 United States Code (USC) Section 129 provides the basis for FHWA to authorize tolling for the LSIORB Project. As a part of the tolling analysis, the traffic forecasts for the two build alternatives will be based on the same toll rate structure, referred to as the 'baseline toll scenario.' The baseline toll scenario would not be a single number (e.g., $1.00 toll); it would consist of a rate schedule that includes toll rates for different vehicle classes, such as passenger cars, light trucks and freight trucks. It is also possible that the rate schedule could include other elements - e.g., (1) different toll rates during peak and off-peak hours, which would help to maximize revenue while minimizing diversion, and (2) discounts for frequent users.

In addition to the baseline toll scenario, the SEIS will also include a 'sensitivity analysis', which will evaluate the potential effects of toll rates that are higher or lower than the toll rates in the

baseline toll scenario. This analysis would not be as detailed as the forecasts of the baseline toll scenario, but would contain enough information to determine how traffic volumes and traffic-related impacts would change if toll rates were higher or lower than those included in the baseline toll scenario.

3. Agency Coordination

3.1 Early Coordination Packet

An Early Coordination Packet will be distributed to the agencies, organizations and individuals that were involved in the initial EIS and/or in the subsequent project development stage. The packet will include a transmittal letter explaining the present action and will provide current project information and exhibits. The transmittal letter will request comments on the proposed action and statements of any new issues that might warrant evaluation during the development of the SEIS. A list of agencies that will receive this packet is included in Attachment B.

3.2 Lead Agencies

Federal Lead Agency – FHWA will serve as the Federal lead agency in this environmental review process. FHWA has authority over this project because the project requires FHWA's approval of the use of federal funds, as well as FHWA approval for Interstate access modifications. If a tolled alternative is approved, tolling also would require FHWA's approval.

Joint Lead Agencies – KYTC and INDOT will serve as joint lead agencies in this environmental review process. KYTC and INDOT are required to serve as joint lead agencies because they are the direct recipients of federal funds for this project.

Bi-State Management Team. The lead agencies (FHWA, KYTC, and INDOT) will carry out their responsibilities in the environmental review process through the existing Bi-State Management Team (BSMT), which consists of representatives from INDOT, KYTC, and FHWA.

Responsibilities of the Lead Agencies. The Lead Agencies are responsible for leading the environmental review process. Their responsibilities include:

1) Taking the necessary actions to facilitate the expedited review of the environmental process;

2) Ensuring that the SEIS and all accompanying documents required under NEPA are completed in accordance with SAFETEA-LU and other applicable federal laws;

3) Identifying and inviting appropriate agencies to participate in the Section 6002 process;

4) Providing this plan to Participating and Cooperating Agencies;

5) Collaborating with participating agencies in determining methodologies and the level of detail for the analysis of alternatives;

6) Managing the process and resolving issues.

3.3 Participating Agencies and Cooperating Agencies

Participating Agencies – Federal, state, tribal, regional and local agencies that may have an interest in the project will be invited to serve as participating agencies. Federal agencies are required to accept the invitation, unless they inform the lead agency that they (1) have no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project, (2) have no expertise or information relevant to the project, *and* (3) do not intend to submit comments on the project. Other Agencies that receive the invitation can accept or decline the invitation. The roles and responsibilities of the participating agencies include:

1) As early as practicable, identify any issues of concern regarding environmental, cultural and socioeconomic impacts;

2) Provide meaningful input into any identified concerns that could delay the approval of the necessary permits or approvals;

3) Participate in the timely resolution of any identified issues of concern;

4) Respond in writing within 30 days to letters of invitation or receipt of any relevant materials;

5) Participate as needed in an issues resolution process.

Please refer to Exhibit B for a list of the agencies that will be invited to serve as Participating Agencies in this environmental review process.

Cooperating Agencies – Participating Agencies also can serve as Cooperating Agencies. An agency will be invited to serve as a Cooperating Agency if (1) it has jurisdiction by law or (2) it has special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved in the proposed action. Federal, State, and local agencies can be designated as cooperating agencies.

In general, Cooperating Agency status indicates a higher degree of authority, responsibility and involvement in the environmental review process. Cooperating Agencies may, at the request of the Lead Agency, assume responsibility for the development of information or prepare analyses on portions of the SEIS for which they may have a special expertise. A Coordinating Agency may adopt without re-circulating the EIS of a Lead Agency when, after an independent review of the EIS, the Cooperating Agency concludes that its comments have been satisfied. This provision is important to permitting agencies, which often adopt US DOT environmental documents.

Please refer to Exhibit B for a list of the agencies that will be invited to serve as Cooperating Agencies in this environmental review process.

Bi-State Historic Consultation Team. The 2003 Record of Decision established a Bi-State Historic Consultation Team (BSHCT) consisting of representatives from FHWA, INDOT, KYTC and each state's State Historic Preservation Office) (SHPO). Under the ROD, the BSHCT's role is to advise the BSMT as to appropriate design and construction approaches so as to comply with the terms and historic commitments required for the Section 106 process and any other applicable federal or state laws. During the SEIS process, the SHPOs will be designated as Participating Agencies and will participate in Section 106 consultation with the Lead Agencies.

4. Public Involvement

The Public and Non-Governmental Agencies will be invited to participate and provide comment in the public involvement process for the project, which will include participation in public meetings and public hearings.

4.1 Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) Meetings

Meetings will be held with the public and private officials to explain the process being undertaken, the potential schedule for its completion, and how it fits within the current project direction. Contacts with these individuals might be individual or group settings. During the EIS process, a Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) was initiated to reach community leaders and to obtain quick input on region-wide aspects. The membership of the RAC that met during the EIS process and the early design stages is listed in Section 7.1.2 of the original EIS.

The RAC may be modified to include additional groups or to eliminate groups that are no longer operational. Two meetings will be held with the RAC, one in the Spring of 2011 to introduce the proposed design changes and present the SEIS process and a second after the publication of the Draft SEIS to present the contents, including the design results and environmental impacts.

4.2 Area Advisory Teams (AATs)

Four Area Advisory Teams (AATs) were also created pursuant to the 2003 ROD. The AATs to focus on local concerns and specific issues in the four main areas of the project – Kentucky Downtown, Indiana Downtown, Kentucky East End and the Indiana East End. The two Downtown AATs occasionally meet together to discuss issues related to the proposed Downtown Bridge and related work. A list of the membership of the AAT's is provided in Section 7.1.3 of the original EIS. As part of this SEIS process, the AATs' membership may be modified to include additional groups or to eliminate groups that are no longer operational. Meetings will be held at times determined as appropriate by the lead agencies in consultation

with members of the AATs. The AAT meetings will be used to create project awareness and to gain a public perspective on issues related to the specific areas represented.

While the AAT and HPAT meetings are held for the involvement of the members of those specific committees, they are open to the public and traditionally are opened for public comment at the conclusion of business at the end of each session.

4.3 Historic Preservation Advisory Teams (HPATs)

The 2003 ROD required INDOT to establish an Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT) and required KYTC to establish a Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team (KHPAT) "to ensure the Project is designed in a manner that respects the historic qualities, landscapes, historic buildings and features" of the project. The IHPAT and KHPAT provide for both government and public and non-government groups to assist the Bi-State Historic Consultation Team and the Bi-State Management Team in developing Project design details to implement the measures stipulated in the MOA.

The IHPAT and KHPAT have been meeting on a bi-monthly basis, on even numbered months. During the SEIS process, the IHPAT and KHPAT will continue to meet on that schedule, and additional special meetings will be called as necessary to gain the input of the HPATs into timely resolution of identified issues. The members of the HPATs will be designated as consulting parties in the Section 106 consultation process for the SEIS. Membership of the HPATs is shown in the 2003 ROD.

4.4 Public Meetings and Hearings

Public Meetings. The lead agencies will hold public meetings early in the process to provide opportunities for the general public to provide input into the development of the SEIS. The lead agencies intend to hold one public meeting in each State during the first half of 2011. At these meetings, the lead agencies will introduce the proposed design changes to the public, present the SEIS process, and provide the public the opportunity to comment on the project.

Public Hearings. Following the completion of the Draft SEIS and during the 45-day comment period, the lead agencies will hold one public hearing in each State. The public hearings will provide the public an opportunity to comment on the Draft SEIS document. The format for the public hearings will be determined prior to the announcement of the hearings. Visual displays and copies of the Draft SEIS will be on display for public comment and discussion. Project team members will be available to respond to questions regarding the general project information or the environmental document. The announcements of the public hearings will be published in the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and *The Jeffersonville Evening News* and will be advertised on the project web site. Other media contacts will be utilized to further advertise the hearings.

4.5 Media Relations

Television, radio and local newspapers will be utilized to advertise the time, location and purpose of each public meeting or hearing. The first newspaper notice for a public hearing shall be advertised no less than 30 days prior to the established deadline or date. The second newspaper notice shall be advertised no less than 7 days prior to the established deadline or date.

4.6 Project Website

A project web site (www.kyinbridges.com) has already been established for this project. The website contains contact information for all major project activities. It will also be utilized for the announcement of all public events associated with the development of the SEIS.

5. Section 106 Consultation

Since the 2003 ROD was signed, the States have been actively engaged in carrying out their commitments under the Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement. This involves bi-monthly meetings with the BSHCT, IHPAT, and KHPAT as previously discussed in this document. As noted these groups were formed to assure that design and construction comply with the terms and commitments of the current project MOA and will continue to be utilized to assure that any additional 106 issues resulting from the SEIS development are resolved. The current IHPAT and KHPAT members will continue to be engaged in the review of the original project MOA Commitments in their regularly held meetings.

The Lead Agencies will send out invitations to the consulting parties of record from the original consultation process. Other parties might also be engaged, as determined necessary by the lead agencies. The letter will explain the SEIS process and will request interested parties to respond if they wish to be included in further consultation during the environmental update.

Three meetings of the 106 Consultation Team are presently anticipated, although additional meetings might be held, if determined necessary. The key meetings identified are for the Introduction and general discussion of the APE and identified eligible properties; effects coordination; and mitigation coordination. An approximate date is shown for the first meeting on the timeline provided as Attachment A. The remaining meeting dates will be determined as the Draft SEIS process develops.

The Section 106 Consulting Parties will be responsible for:

1) Attending and participating in meetings as part of the Section 106 process;

2) Providing input on the identification, eligibility, effects, and mitigation of effects on historic resources, to the extent that such analyses are conducted as part of the SEIS process;

3) Providing input in writing after receipt of all presented materials or letters of invitation within time periods established by the Lead Agencies and in accordance with the federal regulations for Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800);

4) Providing input into the development and execution of a revised MOA, if necessary, in conjunction with the development of the SEIS.

6. Project Schedule and Milestones

6.1 Schedule

Opportunities for input from the Cooperating Agencies, Participating Agencies, and the public will be provided during the development of the SEIS. The dates presently shown in Attachment A reflect the introduction of direction and materials to each of these groups. Further dates will be provided as the project progresses. Some of the initial materials to be presented include the Draft Purpose and Need and a Draft Screening Report. Events shown in the schedule as To Be Determined (TBD) will be added later based on the comments received from these initial meetings.

6.2 Milestones

The SEIS was initiated with the publication of the Notice of Intent in the Federal Register on February 15, 2011. The lead agencies have developed a schedule for the SEIS, as shown in Appendix A. Some dates will be determined as the project progresses. Key milestones within the schedule are summarized below.

<u>Invitation Letter</u>. A letter will be sent by the Joint Lead Agency to all Cooperating and Participating Agencies following the format outlined in Appendix B of the FHWA's SAFETEA-LU Environmental Review Process Final Guidance. The letter will provide an overview of the project, an invitation to become a Participating/Cooperating Agency and a summary of the responsibilities of coordinating agencies under Section 6002. Agencies will be requested to respond to this invitation within 30 days.

<u>Opportunity for Involvement on P&N and Range of Alternatives.</u> As part of the Section 6002 process, the lead agencies will provide an opportunity for involvement by other agencies and the public regarding the Purpose and Need and the range of alternatives to be considered in the SEIS. A document will be prepared that will (1) update the data in the P&N statement and

(2) review the original screening process utilized in the 2003 EIS to determine whether the decisions made in that document are still valid, and advise of any new alternatives that are to be considered as the result of modification of the project design or resulting from the use of tolling. This report (the P&N/Alternatives report) will be made available to all participating agencies for review; the agencies will be asked to respond to these materials within 30 days of receipt of the materials. The agency meeting will be held during that 30-day period. Within 14 days of the meeting, a summary of the issues discussed will be prepared and transmitted to the Agencies for review. After a 21-day period for comments on the meeting summary, the final summary of the meeting will be prepared. This report also will be made available to the public on the project website and in an initial public meeting. The public also will be given 30 days to submit comments.

Draft SEIS Comments. It is expected that sections of the Draft SEIS pertinent to the Agencies' responsibilities will be distributed to the agencies as they are produced and an administrative draft will be provided to the Agencies, as approved by the Lead Agencies. When the Draft SEIS is completed, a copy of the document will be submitted by the Lead Agencies to the Cooperating and Participating Agencies, along with members of the public, for review and comment. It is presently intended that a Preferred Alternative will be selected at the time of the submittal of the Draft SEIS. The Draft SEIS will be available for public and agency review and comment following the approval of the document by FHWA. Unless otherwise required by regulation or policy, the agencies and the public will have 45 days to provide comment.

Final SEIS and ROD. The project team will consider and address all comments received during the Draft SEIS comment period and hearings. The lead agencies anticipate that the Final SEIS, followed by the Record of Decision (ROD) will be issued in 2012.

Planning Process, Fiscal Constraint, and Conformity:

- *Base the project schedule on the assumption that an amendment to the MPO's long-range plan will be needed.* The project has been included in the MPO's long-range plan for many years. Until recently, it was included as a non-tolled project. In 2010, the MPO (KIPDA) amended the long-range plan and TIP to include the LSIORB project as tolled facility. The traffic modeling and financial analysis for that amendment assumed a toll rate of $3 for passenger vehicles. The SEIS will likely assume a lower toll rate. In addition, the SEIS will consider potential changes to the project design, and may approve changes such as a four-lane East End bridge and reconstructing the Kennedy Interchange in place rather than relocating the interchange. The project as approved in the ROD (or in this case, the revised ROD) must be consistent in design concept and scope with the project as defined in the MPO's long-range plan. In light of the changes being considered in the SEIS, an amendment to the MPO's long-range plan (and TIP) will be needed prior to issuance of the revised ROD.

- *Prepare a financial analysis showing that the project can be funded with the 'baseline toll scenario' that is assumed in the SEIS.* As noted above, the analysis in the SEIS will be based on a set of toll-rate assumptions – known as the 'baseline toll scenario.' It is expected that the baseline toll scenario will include a much lower toll rate than was assumed in the MPO's long-range plan – e.g., $1 per passenger car for frequent users. To satisfy the fiscal constraint requirement, the project record should include an analysis showing that toll rate assumed in the SEIS has the potential to generate sufficient funding to pay for the project. This analysis would take into account a range of potential funding sources, including but not limited to toll revenues. In the planning process, it would provide a basis for determining that the fiscal constraint requirement has been met. In the NEPA process, it would help to show the reasonableness of the SEIS's assumptions regarding toll rates.

- *Ensure that air-quality conformity determinations are made, and ensure that conformity analyses are consistent with the assumptions in the SEIS*. The project is located in a maintenance area for ozone (8-hour standard) and a nonattainment area for PM 2.5. (Both of these designations were made after the issuance of the 2003 ROD.) Therefore, air quality conformity requirements will apply to this project.

    - A regional conformity determination will be needed for any amendment to the MPO's long-range plan and TIP. The regional analysis will be performed by the MPO as part of its work on the long-range plan and TIP. The States' role will be to provide input to the MPO, so that the assumptions in the MPO's analysis are consistent with the project as approved in the NEPA process.

    - A project-level conformity determination will be needed as part of a revised ROD. The project-level conformity determination will rely upon the regional conformity determination made by the MPO for the plan and TIP; in addition, the project-level conformity determination will require a hot-spot analysis for PM2.5. This analysis was not required in the original EIS because the region was not designated as non-attainment for PM2.5 until 2005.

Permitting

Permits must be received from several agencies. Coordination has previously occurred with both the Coast Guard and the Corps of Engineers, as well as with some local agencies. It is anticipated that the coordination with these Agencies regarding the permit requirements, as well as with the other involved Agencies, will be initiated during the early coordination stages previously discussed in this document; however it is noted that the permit approval from the federal agencies cannot be received until after receipt of the ROD. A list of the major permits expected for this project include:

- FAA Tower Height Permit
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- Coast Guard Section 9 Permit
- USACE 404 Permits
- USACE Floodwall Permit
- IDEM Rule 5 Construction Stormwater Permit
- Indiana DNR Flood Plain Permit
- MSD Flood Plain Permit
- Kentucky EEC Flood Plain Permit
- Kentucky EEC Stormwater Permit

7. Changes to the Coordination Plan

It is recognized that as the development of the SEIS progresses, some revisions to this plan might be required. These revisions will be documented as they occur and approved by the Bi-State Management Team.

8. Contacts regarding the Coordination Plan

Any questions or comments regarding this Coordination Plan may be directed to the individuals listed in the Lead Agency Contact list at the top of Attachment B or through the web contact form on the project web site at www.kyinbridges.com .

Attachment A
(Dates updated October 2011)

SEIS Schedule

Notice of Intent published in *Federal Register*	February 15, 2011
Resource Agency Coordination Letter/Packet	April 8, 2011
Resource Agency Meeting	May 26, 2011
Regional Advisory Committee Meeting	June 15, 2011
Area Advisory Team Meetings (4)	June 16 - June 23, 2011
Indiana/Kentucky Public Involvement Meeting (2)	June27 and 28, 2011
Resource Agency Meeting #2	December 7, 2011
Publish DSEIS Availability	November 25, 2011
Regional Advisory Committee Meeting #2	TBD
Resource Agency Coordination Meeting #3	TBD
Indiana/Kentucky Public Hearings (2)	December 12 and 13, 2011
Publish FSEIS	February 10, 2012
Publish ROD	March 16, 2012

Section 106 Consultation

Introduction	June 1, 2011
Identification of Properties	September 29, 2011
Effects	November 15, 2011
Mitigation	December 15, 2011

Planning Process, Fiscal Constraint, Conformity

Initiate Interagency Consultation (Air Quality Conformance)	TBD*
Air Quality Consultation and Reviews	TBD*
Initiate Air Quality Public Participation	TBD*
Transportation Policy Committee (TPC) Approval of MTP/TIP	TBD*
Initiate Federal Conformity Review	TBD*
FHWA Conformity Signature	TBD

*The Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency (KIPDA) will be responsible for these processes, which will occur simultaneously with the SEIS process.

Attachment B
Agency Contact Lists

Lead Agencies

Lead Agency	Contact Person/Title	E-Mail Address
FHWA	Janice Osadczuk Team Leader, Environmental Sevices	Janice.Osadczuk@DOT.gov
INDOT	Paul Boone Project Manager	Pboone@indot.in.gov
KYTC	Gary Valentine Project Manager	Gary.Valentine@ky.gov

Cooperating Agencies (Invited)

Cooperating Agency	Contact	Telephone/E-mail
US Army Corps of Engineers	Michael Turner, Louisville District Planning, Programs and Project Management Division	(502)-315-6900
US Coast Guard	Mary E. Landry, District 8 Commander	(504)-589-6225
US Fish & Wildlife Services	Lee Andrews, Field Supervisor	502-695-0468
US Fish and Wildlife Services	Scott Pruitt, Bloomington Field Office - Field Supervisor	(812)-334-4261

Participating Agencies (Invited)

Participating Agency	Contact	Telephone/E-mail

Participating Agency	Contact	Telephone/E-mail
US Environmental Protection Agency	Gwendolyn Fleming, Division Administrator, Region 4	404-562-8357
US Environmental Protection Agency	Susan Hedman, Division Administrator, Region 5	(800)-621-8431
US Department of the Interior – National Park Service,	George Turnbull, Regional Director, Midwest Support Office	(402)-221-3456
US Department of Agricultural – Indiana, Natural Resources and Conservation Service	Jane Hardisty, State Conservationist	(317) -290-3200
US Department of Agricultural, Kentucky, Natural Resources and Conservation Service	Timothy Hafner, Acting State Conservationist	(859)-224-7350
US Department of Homeland Security, Indiana Division	Joe Wainscott, Executive Director	TBD
US Department of Homeland Security, Kentucky	Thomas Preston, Executive Director	(502)-564-2081
Federal Aviation Administration	Barry Cooper, Great Lakes Region Administrator	(847)-294-7294
Federal Aviation Administration	Douglas R. Murphy, Southern Region Administrator	(404)-305-5000
US Department of Housing and Urban, Development, Field Policy and Management	Patricia Hoban-Moore, Director	202-708-1112

Participating Agency	Contact	Telephone/E-mail
US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Environmental Staff	Steve Vahl, Midwest Office Regional Environmental Officer	(312)-913-8728
Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians	Russell Townsend, THPO	russtown@nc-cherokee.com
American Indian Movement – Mobile Chapter	Maria Mulford	By mailing address only
Cherokee Nation	Dr. Richard Allen, THPO	rallen@cherokee.org
United Keetoowah	Lisa Stopp, Historic Preservation Coordinator	lstopp@unitedkeetoowahband.org
Shawnee Tribe	Jodi Hayes, Tribal Administrator	shawneetribe@neok
Absentee Shawnee of Oklahoma	Henryetta Ellis, Cultural/Historic Preservation Department	hellis@astribe.com
Eastern Shawnee	Robin Dushane, Cultural Preservation Director	RDushane@estoo.net
The Delaware Nation	Kerry Holton, President	405-247-2448
Miami	Joshua Sutterfield, Cultural Resources Officer	jsutterfield@miamination.com
Peoria	John P. Froman, Chief	jfroman@peoriatribe.com
Indiana Department of Natural Resources	Robert Carter, Jr., Director, Executive Office	(317)-232-1646
Indiana Department of Natural Resources – Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology	James A. Glass, Deputy SHPO	jglass@dnr.in.gov
Indiana Department of Environmental Management	Thomas W. Easterly, Commissioner	(317)-232-8603
Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet – Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources	Dr. Jonathan W. Gassett, Commissioner	(800)-858-1549

Participating Agency	Contact	Telephone/E-mail
Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet – Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Waste Management	Anthony Hatton, Director	(502)-564-6716
Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Cabinet – Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Water	Sandy Gruzesky, Director	Sandy.gruzesky@ky.gov
Kentucky State Nature Preserves Commission	Donald, Dott, Jr., Director	(502)-573-2886
Kentucky Heritage Council, State Historic Preservation Office	Mark Dennen Executive Director	Mark.Dennen@ky.gov
Jefferson County Public Works	Ted Pullen Director of Planning and Design	Ted.pullen@lousvilleky.gov
Transit Authority of River City	Barry Barker	jbarrybarker@ridetarc.org
City of Jeffersonville, Division of Planning and Zoning	Brian Fogle Director	bfogle@cityofjeff.net
Louisville and Jefferson County, Metropolitan Sewer District	Arnold Celentano, Chairperson	(502)-540-6204
City of Prospect	Todd Eberle Mayor	cityadm@prospectky.com
Louisville Waterfront Development Corporation	David Karem Executive Director	davidkarem@louisville.gov
Clark County, Indiana Board of Commissioners	Edward Meyer, President	(812)-285-6275