

Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – May 20, 2004
SUMMARY

Opening Remarks:

William Gulick, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet

Mr. Gulick introduced himself, the Assistant State Highway Engineer and Project Manager for the Louisville Bridges Project, and Mr. Morgan the State Historic Preservation Officer, with them also being the Co-chairs for the Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team (KHPAT). He welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for their attendance. He then asked everyone at the table to introduce themselves and the organization they represent. He introduced Mr. Vlach to give updates since the last meeting.

Project Updates: Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**HPAT Charter:**

The Charter has been revised per the comments from the last meeting and the updated document was dispersed. This version has been approved by the Co-chairs and any additional comments concerning this matter must be made in writing to the KHPAT P.O. Box.

HPAT Membership Request:

Since the last meeting, there was one request for membership into the KHPAT. The request is from Mr. O'Leary of the Clifton Community Council, and is still under consideration by the Co-chairs.

Stakeholder Meetings:

In April, five individual Stakeholder meetings were held in Kentucky to receive local input on the development of the various draft scopes of work for the HPPs. More detailed summaries of these meetings will be given later in the meeting.

Change in Agenda:

The format of the meeting will vary from the agenda and will proceed in the following order:

Consultant Selection Qualifications – David Kroll

HPP Work Process Flowchart – Jeff Bergman

Summary of Stakeholder Meetings – Michael Matts

HPP Draft Scopes of Work – Dawn Hein

Consultant Selection Qualifications: David Kroll, Director of Preservation

In conjunction with the draft scopes of work for the three historic districts, the qualifications of consultants that will be required to prepare the HPPs were discussed. In preparation for this discussion a list of the disciplines that are identified by the National Park Service for Professional Qualifications for Preservation Work was prepared and handed out as a worksheet for the interactive participation of the Advisory Team members. The identified disciplines are listed below and their significance represents the consensus of the Advisory Team for each specific historic district. (A list of HPP Qualifications with definitions for each was mailed out with the agenda prior to this meeting.) It was emphasized that the consultants will also have to meet national and state requirements.

Butchertown Historic District

Archaeologist (prehistoric and historic) – secondary
 Architectural Historian – primary
 Conservationist – not required, other disciplines will cover this area
 Cultural Anthropologist – secondary
 Curator – not required
 Engineer – secondary, this person will be a support role in the HPP process
 Folklorist – not required, joint with anthropologist with an appropriate skill set for this HPP
 Geography/GIS Mapping – secondary
 Graphic Designer – secondary
 Historic Architect – primary
 Historic Landscape Architect – secondary
 Historic Preservation Planner – primary
 Historic Preservationist – primary
 Historian – primary
 Urban Planner – primary, vehicle and pedestrian access will be significant issues
 Transportation Planner (additional discipline added by the Advisory Team) – primary

Phoenix Hill Historic District

Archaeologist (prehistoric and historic) – secondary
 Architectural Historian – primary
 Conservationist – not required, other disciplines will cover this area
 Cultural Anthropologist – secondary
 Curator – secondary, with architectural salvage needing to be emphasized
 Engineer – secondary, this person will be a support role in the HPP process
 Folklorist – secondary, with an appropriate skill set for this HPP
 Geography/GIS Mapping – secondary
 Graphic Designer – secondary
 Historic Architect – primary
 Historic Landscape Architect – secondary
 Historic Preservation Planner – primary
 Historic Preservationist – primary
 Historian – primary
 Urban Planner – primary
 Transportation Planner (additional discipline added by the Advisory Team) – primary

Country Estates Historic District / River Road Corridor

Archaeologist (prehistoric and historic) – secondary
 Architectural Historian – primary
 Conservationist – not required, other disciplines will cover this area
 Cultural Anthropologist – primary
 Curator – not required
 Engineer – secondary, this person will be a support role in the HPP process
 Folklorist – primary, with an appropriate skill set for this HPP
 Geography/GIS Mapping – secondary
 Graphic Designer – secondary
 Historic Architect – primary
 Historic Landscape Architect – primary
 Historic Preservation Planner – primary
 Historic Preservationist – primary
 Historian – primary
 Urban Planner – primary, with special focus on indirect and cumulative effects

Several questions were raised about the HPP consultants. At this point, it is expected to have a “Project Director” for each individual historic preservation plan to ensure proper coordination among all the entities involved. It was determined that the consultant selection process has not been determined, and Mr. Morgan asked for the Advisory

Team members to submit their preferences on this process with their written comments for this meeting. Mr. Gulick noted the following possible selection options: 1) Have the HPP consultants added to the CTS-GEC team by a change order. 2) Have the HPP consultants added to the Section Design Consultant (SDC) team through a change order. 3) Professional Procurement through the state, which is a lengthy process. It was noted that there is a legislative bias to select in-state consultants through the Kentucky formal procurement process, but it is not uncommon for in-state firms to branch out across the country. He explained the selection committee is made up of five individuals: two people selected from the Secretary of Transportation's pool of active employees, one volunteer from the Governor's pool who is not a Transportation Cabinet employee, and two people from the Labor Division to represent expert fields on the committee. The selection committee reviews the submitted resumes where each one is scored on set criteria and then voted on forming a ranking of the top three firms/consultant teams, with the firm ranked as first being offered the opportunity to negotiate for the job.

It was noted that the archeology component called for in the MOA is separate from the archaeology called for in the HPP process.

Concern was shown for the safe keeping of historic artifacts during the process. It was determined that there will need to be a short-term and long-term plan for this process and that the city will be contacted for acquiring the space for this curation.

The Folklorist, Cultural Anthropologist, and Historian were identified as the roles that would look into the African American heritage and the Underground Railroad history in the area of the historic districts.

HPP Work Process Overview: Jeffrey Bergman, Urban Planner

Mr. Bergman disseminated copies of the PowerPoint Presentation prepared for this discussion. The following information is an evolution of the conversation that was held at the previous meeting and will expand on how the HPP process should work. This is a general overview of the current thinking on this process and as the components are finalized there will be some differences in the individual districts as they each have unique characteristics in addition to the many common elements.

Step 1 – Education (of HPP procedures for the Advisory Team members)

Step 2 – Scope of Work

Step 3 – Qualifications of Contractor

Step 4 – Selection of Contractor

Step 5 – Development of HPPs

5a. Development of a Draft HPP

Task 1. Project Start-Up & Organization

- Coordinate content and schedule with local representatives
- Establish a public input strategy
- Collect data
- Conduct a local HPP kick-Off meeting

Task 2. Research, Documentation, & Analysis

- Profile historic significance
- Profile area conditions and trends
- Profile future opportunities and limits
- Define Mitigation Issues
- Define long-term preservation planning issues

Task 3. Public Input

- Meet with key stakeholders
- Coordinate with local government

- Facilitate public input
- Provide educational material

Task 4. HPP Draft Outline

- Finalize mitigation issues and identify goals/objectives
- Prepare HPP pre-draft outline
- Facilitate BSHCT (Bi-State Historic Consultation Team) review and revise pre-draft outline
- Facilitate HPAT review and prepare HPP draft outline

Task 5. HPP Draft Document

- Apply “Best Practices”
- Develop and evaluate options
- Identify required Project mitigation
- Identify long-term recommendations and action steps
- Identify long-term funding and implementation options
- Prepare HPP pre-draft document
- Facilitate BSHCT review and revise pre-draft document
- Facilitate HPP review and prepare HPP draft document

5b. Development of a Final HPP

Task 1. Public Review of HPP Draft Document

- Facilitate key stakeholder review
- Facilitate local government review
- Facilitate public review.

Task 2. HPP Final Document

- Facilitate BSHCT consideration of public comment
- Facilitate HPAT consideration of public comment.
- Facilitate comment, review, and concurrence (HPAT Co-chairs, BSHCT, and BSMT[Bi-State Management Team])
- Prepare HPP final document

5c. Information for Specific Mitigation Measures

Considerations for the Advancement of the HPP Tasks

- Likely date of preliminary field check
- Information required by Section Design Consultants
- Clarification of specific Project-funded mitigation
- BSMT considers BSHCT recommendations

Step 6 – Implementation of Final HPP

Implementation Tasks

- Distribute HPP to local governments
- Produce public literature
- Provide local training

Outstanding Process Questions

- Coordination of HPP tasks at the local level in each HPP area
- The identification of additional mitigation measures as noted by the MOA
- Any concerns created by the need to advance certain HPP elements to provide the needed information to the section designers

Ms. Weeter, of Louisville Metro Government, asked about the timing of the completion of the HPPs because staffing issues could be a problem for the government representatives if all three of the plans are turned in

simultaneously. It was determined that the completion of the HPPs will be staggered since there are different issues and a different complexity that will have to be addressed for each of the historic districts. The exact timeframe for completion of the HPPs has yet to be determined, but it is one of the next steps in this process. However, the MOA states that the HPPs must be finished before the design consultants reach the "Preliminary Field Plan Check Inspection" relevant to each section of the Project, so speed is a preference in the timeframe.

Concern was raised about the potential conflict of priorities between the government and neighborhood groups. It was emphasized that a part of the HPP process is consensus building between these groups to come up with common short term and long term goals to produce a practical plan that can benefit the neighborhood and be implemented at the local government level.

It was asked to clarify the role of the Advisory Council MOA signatories in the HPP process and the agency involvement in this process. These individuals are the primary recommenders to the Bi-State Management Team and are identified for dispute resolution and consideration of possible amendments. However, they can be involved at whatever capacity they choose because their participation is at their own discretion, not mandatory. It was noted that Ms. Laura Dean is on the HPAT mailing list and receives the same CTS-GEC mail correspondence as the Advisory Team members.

Summary of Stakeholder Meetings: Michael Matts – Director of Historic Preservation and Planning:

The following is a summary of each of the stakeholder meetings that were held since the last KHPAT meeting. Mr. Matts highlighted these summaries and encouraged anyone who attended these meetings to feel free to add comments as he went through them.

Butchertown:

Date/Time: 04-12-04 (9:00am)

Held at: Stock Yards Bank Boardroom

Participants: David Brooks, Stock Yards Bank; Tom Sherman, Vendome Copper; Norman Tasman, Tasman Industries; Bill Freidlander, Neighborhood Development Corp.; Jim Segrest; Michael Matts, Gray & Pape; Christa Turner, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Christa Turner with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team and Butchertown Neighborhood Association. She provided a short explanation of the purpose of this meeting as an informational gathering session for the Historic Preservation Plans (HPP) scope of work. David Kroll began the discussion with the Annotated Table of Contents.
2. Jim Segrest explained that Butchertown became a local district in 2003 with design guidelines and presented a map showing the boundaries. The boundaries for the district and the ones designated in the National Register Nomination of 1976 are the same with the exception of Mellwood Avenue. The district has two levels of guidelines; four areas with tight guideline control and the remaining area with a less strict set of guidelines.
3. Michael Matts inquired as to the extent of the district resurvey for the guidelines. Photographic documentation has not been completed for the district since the 1976 National Register Nomination.
4. The Association presented a discussion of the new traffic patterns for the new Witherspoon extension, Mellwood, Story, Clay, and Frankfort, which centered on the need to prevent, as much as possible, commuter traffic from driving through the historic neighborhood and instead remain on the main thoroughfares. A separate project that will widen I-71 will also affect this traffic pattern. The Butchertown neighborhood group recommended that Mellwood and Story become two-way streets and the new interchange for I-71 be located on Mellwood. The Beargrass Creek Study (2000) and the Frankfort Ave Study (2003) are adopted/recommended plans for traffic patterns in the area. Butchertown Redevelopment Analysis was completed in 1998.

5. The current zoning plan was adopted in 1966. There was no consensus as to if this plan had been updated. A neighborhood plan was adopted by the city in 1965 and updated in 1980 and 1990.
6. Several infrastructure items mentioned by the Association include:
 - A new floodwall beyond the current one to protect the new acreage to be developed once spaghetti junction is moved. This would allow limited access past the new wall.
 - New zoning to allow the removal of the Concrete plants.
 - Bury the overhead power and telephone lines in the historic district.
 - Bring water feature into the historic district within a park – the Association provided a conceptual sketch for this idea.
 - Streetscape continuity with iron fences, brick sidewalks, historic lighting (like those in Butchertown Greenway Park – possibly in storage?).
 - Solve parking issues for Swift and Butchertown Market.
 - Neighborhood signage to include way-finding and historic markers.
 - Walking paths along the Ohio River.
7. Archaeological sites that are within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) are Geiger Mill and Bear Grass Creek.
8. Bill Segrest asked Christa Turner to research where a sum of \$400,000 is identified for mitigation efforts.
9. The Grocers Ice & Cold Storage Building currently has a viable ice sculpting and restaurant business. If this building will be demolished, the Butchertown Neighborhood Association would like the façade preserved.
10. Butchertown has a youth related area with the Extreme Park, Home of the Innocents, Wesley House and the Edison House. Edison House has plans to expand including a visitor's center and activity area.
11. Noise Abatement: The Association requested noise mitigation particularly for Bakery Square Sound Studio on Washington and Webster Streets. They also mentioned that other businesses would possibly require the same.
12. The Association discussed the need to assist the property owners along the New Witherspoon extension adapt to the new frontage created by the change. The Association also claims that the Wesley House and Thomas Edison House will suffer losses and adverse impacts from the Project and should be compensated by contributions to their plans for the future.
13. David Kroll wrapped up the meeting explaining that the next step will be for Ratio to revise the Annotated Table of contents to reflect this discussion and it would be given to the Association for review. The next KHPAT meeting will be on May 20, 2004.

City of Prospect:

Time: 04-12-04 (1:00pm)

Held at: City Hall, Mayor's Office

Participants: Lonnie Falk; Mayor of Prospect; Ann Simms, Prospect City Administrator; Michael Matts, Gray & Pape; Christa Turner, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Christa Turner with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team and the leadership for the City of Prospect. She provided a short explanation of the purpose for this meeting as an informational gathering session for the Historic Preservation Plans (HPP) scope of work. David Kroll began the discussion with the Annotated Table of Contents.

2. The Allison-Barrickman House was a major concern for the City of Prospect. A barn, family and slave cemeteries, as well as a summer kitchen are associated with the house. However, they are not under the same ownership. Gary and Marilyn Warenskjold own the house. The Mayor expressed his concern that appropriate landscaping would be provided to mitigate the impact of the Project on the house and its associated structures and preserve the viewshed as much as possible.
3. The Mayor discussed the new Prospect Small Area Plan that is currently at the Planning Commission for review. He also mentioned the US 42 River Road Corridor Study as a reference. There is no commercial development on the south side of River Road.
4. The Mayor and Ann Simms discussed the need for improvement to the Upper River Road Bridge over Harrods Creek. This one lane bridge causes traffic congestion during rush hour. If the Project closes the Gene Synder Freeway (841) the congestion would get serious.
5. The current City limits do not include Drumanard, however the City of Prospect would be willing to hold the easement on the property and become the caretaker.
6. Cultural landscapes concerning the city would include Drumanard.
7. David Kroll wrapped up the meeting explaining that the next step will be for Ratio to revise the Annotated Table of contents to reflect this discussion and it would be given to the City for review. The next KPAT meeting will be May 20, 2004.

Phoenix Hill:

Date/Time: 04-21-04 (1:00pm)

Held at: Steve Kersey's office, 839 E. Gray Street

Participants: David Brown Koulod, Phoenix Hill Association; Richard Sutherland, American Consulting Engineers; Steven Kersey, Kersey & Kersey, Inc. & Phoenix Hill Association; Doug Magee, Phoenix Hill Association; Michael Matts, Gray & Pape; Christa Turner, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Jeff Bergman, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Christa Turner with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team and the Phoenix Hill Association members. She provided a short explanation of the purpose of this meeting as an informational gathering session for the Historic Preservation Plans (HPP) scope of work. David Kroll began the discussion with the Annotated Table of Contents.
2. The neighborhood and Historic district boundaries were the first discussion point. Steve Kersey provided a detailed land use map of the entire Phoenix Hill neighborhood dated 2002, which is larger than the National Register Historic district. Ratio was provided with a copy. It was also noted that the National Register District extended to a triangular area on the opposite side of Bear Grass Creek. Steve Kersey explained that the district was nominated in 1983 and since that time many buildings have been demolished and many are not included that should be. A new inventory of the neighborhood is desired as well as an expansion of the Historic district boundaries. The Association also expressed their desire to have a local district, especially to prevent demolitions from occurring. The Association voiced an immediate need for demolition notification.
3. The HPP is the key to the local district and could provide needed photos and documentation. The neighborhood takes pride in its mixture of land use, incomes and ethnicities. The Association would like to maintain this mixed-use quality of the neighborhood but prevent one use from overtaking another. Their objective is to maintain and identify characteristics of the neighborhood.
4. The Association sees a need to preserve the single-family portions of the neighborhood. These areas are particularly impacted by the pressures on the neighborhood, specifically (1) expansion of the medical center, (2) expansion of Market Street commercial uses, and (3) expansion of

industrial areas. It was noted that the Medical Center Development Corporation, the University of Louisville, and Jewish Hospital were primary players in the medical center expansion. The medical center expansion seemed to be encouraged by the City of Louisville.

5. Various aspects of the neighborhood were discussed. The list included:
 - a. Phoenix Place Apartments: is the reason for the historic district – they made use of tax credits during development. The apartments interrupted Shelby Street and hurt businesses along that corridor.
 - b. Traffic Flow: Traffic through the area is often a liability due to inappropriate traffic volumes in residential areas. The association would recommend changing many of the one-way streets such as Campbell, Gray, Shelby and Story and re-opening closed streets. There is a proposed change of access from Muhammad Ali Street to the interstate. Modifying the ramp here would cause major traffic congestion during rush hour and would not be recommended by the Association.
 - c. Home-Ownership: There is only 7% home ownership in the neighborhood in part due to the many apartment complexes. Owner-occupancy rates for single-family homes are not known. The Association has been working to change this trend and has built 30 single homeowner residences. There is no other program available to assist in increasing home ownership in the area.
 - d. Clarksdale: is being demolished and re-developed as a TND through a Hope 6 project. The Association hoped that the HPP would include recommendations for unifying this development with the rest of the neighborhood.
 - e. Vacancies: There are numerous vacancies and empty lots throughout the neighborhood.
 - f. Utility Corridors: underground, modernized utility corridors exist west of I-65 and should be extended east into Phoenix Hill.
 - g. Industrial Base: is evolving in the neighborhood. True industrial uses are moving out and being replaced with new uses. The HPP should provide guidance for these adaptive re-use developments.
 - h. Hospital Medical Organizations: The hospital/medical organizations do not actively communicate with or provide money to the neighborhood.
 - i. Lincoln Elementary School: Serves the neighborhood and is within walking distance for neighborhood school children. It has been threatened with closure due to its small size. The neighborhood fought to keep it open.
 - j. Asset: Train Station at Baxter Ave.
6. Several other items mentioned by the Association include:
 - Bury the overhead power and telephone lines in the historic district
 - Streetscape continuity and repair of sidewalks
 - Parking issues for expanding church communities results in demolition pressures on historic structures – however parking space in general is not a problem in the neighborhood.
 - Neighborhood signage to include way-finding and historic markers (Bloody Monday Riots, Brewery Heritage)
 - Bear Grass Creek – currently concrete culvert for efficient drainage, used to be wetlands that could be an asset if restored.
 - Traffic Flow issues
 - Evolution of the Industrial base – many are moving or closing and the area is changing to commercial. The plan will need to address this conversion process and how best to facilitate it. (Adaptive reuse)
 - Proposed light rail to run along Preston to Main from the Airport to Downtown – currently on hold due to funding limitations.
 - Develop commercial/retail corridors along Broadway and Main
 - The neighborhood's connection to the Ohio was minimal indicated only by Campbell Street when it extended past Shelby.

- The participants noted a need for new development to compliment and blend with the existing historic character; they sought an identifiable character for the Phoenix Hill neighborhood that includes the Broadway area, the "triangle" area, and the residential areas as clear components as a whole.
7. Noise Mitigation issues in the area includes several churches. (St. John's and the Refuge in Kentucky)
 8. Zoning issues include: Mitigation of industrial and retail uses into residential areas, recent introduction of warehouse uses, the East End Development Plan contains key planning information.
 9. The Association mentioned very few possible archaeological issues. There are cisterns on every lot that were at one time used for refuse.
 10. David Kroll wrapped up the meeting explaining that the next step will be for Ratio to revise the Annotated Table of Contents to reflect this discussion and it would be given to the Association for review. The next KHPAT meeting will be on May 20, 2004.

River Fields:

Date/Time: 04-21-04 (3:00pm)

Held at: River Fields Office

Participants: Meme Sweets Runyon, River Fields; Leslie Barras, River Fields; Heidi Saunders, River Fields; Chuck Craycraft, H.W. Lochner; Richard Sutherland, American Consulting; Christa Turner, CTS-GEC; Michael Matts, Gray & Pape; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Jeff Bergman, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Christa Turner with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team, River Fields and the approach designers. She provided a short explanation of the purpose of this meeting as an informational gathering session for the Historic Preservation Plans (HPP) scope of work. David Kroll indicated that the discussion would cover Country Estates Historic District/River Road Corridor, Butchertown and Phoenix Hill. Ratio briefly discussed the points mentioned by the City of Prospect, Butchertown and Phoenix Hill Associations in their meetings.
2. River Fields expressed concern about the I-71 interchange at Frankfort in Butchertown causing land use and traffic pattern/level changes and the resulting effects on Clifton and Butchertown. The Clifton neighborhood is a National Register Historic district and a locally designated district, which was established in 2003. The neighborhood is currently trying to be added to the KHPAT.
3. River Fields expressed concern that the Butchertown cultural landscape is not well defined and will need recommendations. River Fields specifically noted the Mary Alice Hadley Pottery Company and its kilns located on Bear Grass Creek at Frankfort & Story. They felt that the traffic pattern changes at Mellwood & Story may impact this resource.
4. River Fields gave a brief background of their organization responding to Ratio's question concerning the basis for their close connection to Country Estates Historic District/River Road Corridor. River Fields stated that they work within a fifty-mile area and want to be involved with all the properties in Kentucky and Indiana. They described their work with HLF and the Waterfront Park. They provide information and support to different neighborhoods, organizations and government entities.
5. River Fields suggested to the team that they review several source documents that have been created during the process of the Project including the Section 106 correspondence. CTS will provide the PMMA and River Fields will provide the electronic copy of their memos to the team. The Ohio River Corridor Master Plan was created by MSD, Jefferson County and River Fields and is included within the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan. They stated that the key concepts of

the Corridor Master Plan are especially important. They noted that the Corridor Master Plan calls for special regulations along the River Road corridor and that current zoning documents reserve a space for such standards. Other documents suggested for review include: Draft Environmental Impact Memos, Scenic By-Way 10 most public visual points, US 42 Corridor Plan, and the DEIS or NEPA stand-alone document concerning visual aesthetics by JJR/Smith Group. Building upon existing work was recommended as the best way to approach the project by River Fields.

6. River Fields stated that the legal implications of planning/zoning and preservation were part of the CTS environmental scope but were not satisfactorily completed.
7. River Fields comments concerning The Country Estates Historic District/River Road Corridor include:
 - a. This area is unique within the country due to the high level of landscape design, the intact collection of uninterrupted landscapes, and the open viewshed all representing an important period of landscape design.
 - b. The Interurban railroad history, Upper River Road Bridge over Harrods Creek and the concentration of African-American settlement contribute to the context.
 - c. The Historic area delineation should be much larger than the current boundary. A cultural landscape district should be considered and could include the Louisville Park system.
 - d. River Road itself is a state and federally designated Scenic By-Way. River Fields stated that the road could be considered an Olmstead Parkway.
 - e. Olmstead was only one of several nationally important landscape designers that worked in the area and all should be considered in the preservation plan.
 - f. River Fields, describing the area as pastoral and of historical rural settlement, stressed the fact that agriculture was the original basis for the development of the Country Estates Historic District. They felt that a profound relationship exists between the rural geography and the estates. They noted that the Project would introduce an "urban-ness" that would be potentially harmful.
 - g. Archaeological sites might include the mouth of Harrods Creek where Indian settlements were known to be located.
8. In general, River Fields expressed concern about the truck, water and people traffic created by the Project as well as other physical, construction process, and long-term Project impacts.
9. David Kroll wrapped up the meeting explaining that the next step will be for Ratio to revise the Annotated Table of Contents to reflect this discussion and that it would be given to River Fields for review. The next KHPAT meeting will be on May 20, 2004.

Louisville Metro Government:

Date/Time: 04-23-04 (9:00am)

Held at: Louisville Government Center, Suite 900

Participants: Tom Creasey, American Consulting Engineers; Richard Jett, Planning & Design Services; Joanne Weeter, Planning & Design Services; Aida Copic, Planning & Design Services; Michael Galbraith, H.W. Lochner; Mohammad Nouri, Planning & Design Services; Barry Alberts, Downtown Development Corp.; Christa Turner, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Jeff Bergman, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Christa Turner with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team, Metro Government Staff and the approach designers. She provided a short explanation of the purpose of this meeting as an informational gathering session for the Historic Preservation Plans (HPP) scope of work. David Kroll indicated that the discussion would cover Country Estates Historic District/River Road Corridor, Butchertown and Phoenix Hill. Ratio briefly discussed the points mentioned by the city of Prospect, Butchertown and Phoenix Hill Associations in their meetings.

2. The group inquired if the CTS team was involved with the I-71 project, which they are not. The group also asked if the Clifton Neighborhood Association had been accepted as an interested party for the KHPAT. CTS responded that this decision was up to the KHPAT co-chairs and had not been made. The next KHPAT meeting would be held May 20th and would most likely include a discussion of Clifton's request.
3. The Planning and Design Services team mentioned that Butchertown requested to have their neighborhood plan updated and that land use and transportation issues were key. They stressed that the HPPs must coordinate with Neighborhood Plans and other Louisville Metro Planning documents such as Cornerstone 2020. They noted that the HPPs should recognize the roles of each area as a part of the larger community. They suggested that with the new government organization (city/county) that the HPPs can now be a part of the Comprehensive Plan for Louisville and not just a reference document. A new section in the Planning and Design Services department has been initiated specifically for neighborhood plans. Additional research for Butchertown may need to be conducted further what has already been gathered during the local designation process.
4. The Planning and Design Services team noted that the neighborhood plans should include land use evaluations and recommendations for traffic patterns. The historic preservation information should inform the planning aspects of the plan.
5. Butchertown Neighborhood Association had mentioned in their meeting a sum of money they thought was associated with the MOA. The group was asked about this issue and replied that this money was a separate undertaking for a Master Plan of the 45 acres near spaghetti junction. Fifteen acres are to be added to the park and the land use of the other 30 acres is yet to be determined. The Downtown Development Corp. is in charge of developing master plans this area.
6. Ratio asked about the process for designating a local district in Louisville in response to Phoenix Hill's interest in pursuing this recognition. The Planning and Design Services team acknowledged that the ordinance had changed since the Butchertown designation. The process now included a \$1500 fee for legal notices, signed neighborhood petitions, and digital photographs. Specific information could be found on the Louisville Metro Government web site. The participants indicated that need to resurvey the resources present in Phoenix Hill and then identify which tools were available to match the resources. They noted that a local designation may not be the best option.
7. A short discussion about Country Estates Historic District/River Road Corridor was conducted by Ratio informing the group about the meetings with the City of Prospect and River Fields. Consensus in the group was formed that, as a general rule, new National Register nominations will not be sought for those properties already listed in a district.
8. The Planning and Design Services team asked about the purpose for the approach designer's presence at the meetings. American Consulting Engineers responded that the design process would begin in the fall and they are in the process of creating a scope of work. In order to be better informed, they requested to be present to gather pertinent information. The HPPs will inform design for the Project.
9. Archaeological issues will be an important component to the HPPs; Bear Grass Creek was mentioned as a potential archaeological site.
10. The Planning and Design Services team made clear to the section designers that Louisville required roads to have a five-foot marked bike path as well as a five-foot sidewalk on each side. This requirement varies from that adopted by KYTC.

11. Ratio inquired about the plans and research for the proposed light rail system running from the airport into downtown. The group indicated that Gray & Pape conducted a study, but that detailed plans are not yet available.
12. Diane Comer in the State Preservation Office is in charge of the schedule for all meetings pertaining to the National Trust conference to be held in Louisville this fall.
13. David Kroll wrapped up the meeting explaining that the next step will be for Ratio to revise the Annotated Table of Contents to reflect this discussion and that it would be given to the Louisville Metro Government for review. The next KHPAT meeting will be on May 20, 2004.

Mr. Segrest asked about the Project engineering for spaghetti junction and how it would be coordinated with the I-64 interchange redesign that has still not been determined. Mr. Gulick stressed that the Project section design consultant for the interchange is still in negotiation, but coordination between the HPPs and the SDCs is mandated in their contract and the MOA. At this time, mid-June is the estimated date for getting the contract in place for the interchange section design consultant and the coordination between these groups will begin at that point as a part of the startup process. He also raised a question about the 40 acres where spaghetti junction is currently located and how that state right of way will be used following the relocation of this interchange and how it will relate to the Butchertown Historic District. It was determined that there is a legal and Section 106 process that has to be followed in the disposition of right-of-way, which will include an environmental element prior to moving the boundaries.

Mr. Segrest also showed concern for the \$400,000 that will be given to the Downtown Development Corporation to do planning that involves Butchertown. It was concluded that this contract will be the city's to handle as they see fit, but it is expected that there will be set parameters for how the money will be distributed.

Desire was displayed for an overall Project flowchart that can be updated as the design moves forward so it will be easy to track engineering decisions and shifts in priorities. A very preliminary version of this flowchart is under construction now, but a finalized, overall Project tracking mechanism can not be published until all of the section designers are under contract.

HPP Draft Scopes of Work: Dawn Hein, Historic Preservation Specialist

The National Park Service has adopted standards to guide historic preservation planning, the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation Planning*. These principles apply to the study and development of preservation plans in order to establish the value of historic properties, goals for preserving them, and a process that can be integrated into a broader planning process. This discussion will refer to the Annotated Table of Contents provided for each historic district, which have been updated since the stakeholder meetings, and will focus on two major items related to the HPPs – the objectives and recommendations. Mrs. Hein encouraged discussion, comments, and questions during the presentation.

Butchertown Historic District

Objectives/Goals

- Mitigate the impact of the Project upon the Butchertown Historic District.
- Retain and preserve historic and architectural significance within the district and its context.
- Develop a thematic context study to assist in future nominations in the area.
- Develop guidelines for infill construction, signage, demolition, and moving buildings.
- Establish the necessary background information, analysis, policies, goals, objectives, and action steps to provide for the long-term vitality of area land use, transportation, urban design features, and infrastructure in the context of its historic resources.

Recommendations

Building Conditions – Make recommendations for repair/stabilization and context sensitive design according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* and archaeological guidelines.

Archaeological Resources – Report with recommendations for mitigation, an assessment of effects and recommendations for treatment. Possible areas to include: Geiger Mill and Bear Grass Creek.

Land Use – Make recommendations for the Butchertown Historic District future land use plan that recognized historic development trends, anticipates new development trends, minimizes land use conflicts, identifies desired design characteristics, and contributes to the mixed-use, diverse characteristics of the area. Review the Neighborhood Plan adopted by the city and subsequently updated. Identify desired area land use and development patterns that best support the long-term viability of the neighborhood as a historic resource. Provide background material, analysis, goals, objectives, policy statements, and action steps appropriate for incorporation as part of a Neighborhood Plan and Louisville's Cornerstone 2020 Plan.

Zoning & Design Guidelines – Make recommendations for revisions as necessary to the preservation district's guidelines. Identify and provide sample zoning district language, standards, and/or procedures appropriate to the goals of the HPP.

Infrastructure – Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic district appropriate to the character of the district. Look at possibilities to bury the telephone and electrical wires in the district. Research the possibility of bringing a water feature to the Butchertown side of Spaghetti Junction; also consider walking paths along the River. Recommend infrastructure conditions necessary to sustain a modern community consistent with the need to preserve historic resources and character.

Noise Mitigation – Consultants report including suggested policy and procedures to achieve noise mitigation where it affects historic properties, specifically to identified significant architectural features. The properties included in the MOA are: Edison House, Wesley House, St. Joseph's Church, Franklin Street Baptist Church, Marcus Lindsay Methodist Church, and Grace Immanuel United Church of Christ.

Preservation Easements – Recommendations for easements if approval received from the property owners for the Edison House and Wesley House.

Interpretive signage – Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic district regarding interpretive content, material selection and style selection appropriate to the character of the district.

Streetscape Improvements - Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic district appropriate to the character of the district in accordance with provisions of the Kentucky Heritage Council's streetscape design guidelines. Include fencing, sidewalks, landscaping, and lighting

Connectivity to the Ohio River – Make recommendations to attempt to reestablish Butchertown's connectivity to the Ohio River in a manner appropriate for the historic context and in accordance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Parking – Make recommendations for parking situations in the district and particularly for the following locations: Swift and Butchertown Market.

Traffic Alignments – Recommend measures that will assist in easing traffic flow through the district, while maintaining historic integrity. Relating to the recommended measures for Butchertown (Witherspoon Extension, Mellwood & Story, Clay Street, Frankfort Ave). The I-71 project, its expansion and impact will need to be considered for this plan.

Adaptive Reuse Plan - Grocers Ice and Cold Storage Company Building.

Architectural and Design Guidelines – It is important to identify and retain building and landscape features, which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. The following guidelines based upon the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* are meant to assist in determining the appropriateness of the new development and landscaping: Recommended Procedures with examples and Not Recommended Procedures with examples.

Additional comments added at the meeting:

Ms. Barras asked if these recommendations will fit into both the construction schedule and the post-construction implementation to deal with the impacts that will be changing due to construction. It was concluded that these items will be addressed by the design consultants and the MOA will direct how to best keep the context of the long-term goals.

Mr. Nouri asked how Butchertown will relate to the rest of the community in the respect of access. There were comments about this at the Butchertown stakeholder meeting relating to the access through the interstate to the Ohio River and where those points of access could be. There has also been conversation regarding thoroughfares in the areas of Story and Mellwood to connect the far east with downtown and for the possible rebirth of commercial activities in those areas. Mr. Segrest noted that his community is recommending making Mellwood Ave. a two way access street that will connect their community with Clifton. They would like to keep the current access under the interstate at Clay St. and the extension of Witherspoon to the Frankfort Ave. interchange by the Project will allow a

tunnel for bike and pedestrian access to the waterfront. It was also noted that the current I-71 project needs to be addressed because of the impact added by this expansion.

Phoenix Hill Historic District

Objectives/Goals

- Mitigate the impact of the Project upon the Phoenix Hill Historic District.
- Retain and preserve historic and architectural significance within the district, and its context.
- Develop a thematic context study to assist in future National Register nominations in the area.
- Develop strategies for rehabilitation and reuse of the buildings and grounds within the historic district.
- Develop guidelines for infill construction, signage, demolition, and moving buildings.
- Establish the necessary background information, analysis, policies, goals, objectives, and action steps to provide for the long-term vitality of area land use, transportation, urban design features, and infrastructure in the context of its historic resources.
- Identify the best means for Phoenix Hill historic preservation and development goals to be expressed and implemented considering its role in the City of Louisville.

Recommendations

Building Conditions – Make recommendations for repair/stabilization and context sensitive design according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.

Archaeological Resources – Report with recommendations for mitigation, an assessment of effects and recommendations for treatment based upon the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitation, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* and archaeological guidelines.

Treatment and Adaptive Reuse Plans – Vermont American Building, Baer Fabrics Company. Create treatment and adaptive reuse plans in compliance with Secretary of Interior's *Standards*.

Infrastructure – Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic district appropriate to the character of the district. Recommend infrastructure conditions / improvements necessary to sustain a modern neighborhood consistent with the need to preserve historic resources and character.

Land Use – Identify desired area land use and development patterns that best support the long-term viability of the historic district. Provide background material, analysis, goals, objectives, policy statements, and action steps appropriate for incorporation into a Neighborhood Plan and Louisville Metro Planning documents such as the Cornerstone 2020 Plan.

Zoning & Design Guidelines – Make recommendations for historic districts guidelines. Identify and provide examples of zoning district language, standards, and/or procedures as necessary to provide support the goals of the HPP.

Parking – Make recommendations for future parking situations that coordinate with overall land use and development recommendations. In particular, the parking recommendations should ensure necessary parking facilities for commercial and industrial development, should serve to protect residential areas, and should suggest remedies for pressures placed on institutions to demolish historic structures in support of facility expansions.

Noise Mitigation – Consultants report including suggested policy and procedures to achieve noise mitigation where it affects historic properties. St. John's Church, Refuge in Kentucky Church

Interpretive Signage – Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic district regarding interpretive content, material selection and style selection appropriate to the character of the district.

Streetscape Improvements - Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic district appropriate to the character of the district in accordance with provisions of the Kentucky Heritage Council's streetscape design guidelines. Include Main & Market Streets, Floyd Street to Clay Street and the road way under the I-65 Bridge.

Gateway Elements - Propose specific measures to define the gateways of the district.

Traffic Alignments – Recommend measures that will assist in easing traffic flow through the district, while maintaining historic integrity. Specific routes to consider include: Main, Baxter, Broadway, Muhammad Ali & Story.

Additional comments added at the meeting:

It was noted that there are various public and private (hospitals) projects being undertaken right now that need to be accounted for in this process and it was suggested that the National Register Nomination for this area be a short-term goal. It was mentioned that University Hospital is state supported so they do not have to go through the same permitting process for items such as demolition of buildings, however the University is also federally funded which brings up the possibility of a Section 106 process.

Concern was shown for the inability of Phoenix Hill to be represented at all of the KHPAT meetings and it was asked if the Ombudsmen will possibly be a follow-up mechanism for the Advisory Team. Mr. Gulick confirmed that resumes have been submitted and additional candidates are being sought for the position of Ombudsmen, but this person has not been hired and brought on board yet, but this is a possible duty that this person could assume.

Country Estates Historic District/River Road Corridor

Objectives/Goals

- Mitigate the impact of the Project upon the Country Estates Historic District/ River Road Corridor Historic District.
- Retain and preserve historic architecture, cultural landscapes and pastoral settings as well as and historic context.
- Develop a thematic context study to assist in future National Register nominations in the region.

Recommendations

Building Conditions – Make recommendations for repair/stabilization and context sensitive design according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* and archaeological guidelines.

Cultural Landscapes – Make recommendations and implementation procedures to preserve and mitigate adverse effects pertaining to viewsheds and cultural landscapes significantly affected by the Project. Recommendations will be based upon the *Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*, which apply the *Secretary of Interior's Standards* to cultural landscapes.

Archaeological Resources – Report with recommendations for mitigation, an assessment of effects and recommendations for treatment.

Land Use – Identify desired area land use and development patterns that best support the long-term viability of the historic district and individual historic resources. Provide background material, analysis, goals, objectives, policy statements, and actions steps appropriate for incorporation into Louisville's Metro Government planning documents such as Cornerstone 2020. Particular emphasis should be placed on the impacts of the introduction of the Project on the rural character of the area.

Zoning – Make recommendations for zoning revisions as necessary and coordinate with the Louisville/Jefferson County Metro Government. Identify and provide examples of required zoning ordinances revisions as necessary to provide zoning districts, standards, and/or procedures appropriate to the goals of the HPP.

Infrastructure – Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic properties appropriate to the character of the district. The HPP should also provide recommendations for the design and arrangement of roads, utilities, and other infrastructure serving development in the area to minimize future impacts on the historic properties.

Preservation Easements – Assess key historic elements to be protected in a historic easement for the following properties as stipulated in the MOA: Drumanard, Allison-Barrickman House, and Rosewell.

Noise Mitigation – Consultants report including suggested policy and procedures to achieve noise mitigation where it affects historic properties.

Blasting and Vibration Plan – Recommendations to avoid damage to historic properties.

No-Work Zone – Define a no-work zone within the National Register boundaries of the listed and eligible properties; include maps and written justification.

Interpretive Signage – Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the historic district regarding interpretive content, material selection and style selection appropriate to the character of the district include gateway elements.

Traffic Patterns – Make recommendations based upon the possible impact of the Project, both during and after construction, in the area while retaining historic integrity.

Vicinity Development Guidelines – Future development in the vicinity of the district will influence the value as a historic resource. General design guidelines for new development in the area of the district should suggest best practices for maintaining a context that preserves the historic value of the resources.

Architectural and Design Guidelines – It is important to identify and retain building and landscape features, which are important in defining the historic character of the setting. The following guidelines based upon the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are meant to assist in determining the appropriateness of the new development and landscaping: Recommended Procedures with examples and Not Recommended Procedures with examples.

Additional comments added at the meeting:

Ms. Simms asked when the historic preservation easements will be addressed in this process. It was concluded that there will be more in-depth discussion on this topic as the HPPs are being drafted, but at this point it is only necessary to make sure that the easements are included in the scope of work. Mr. Gulick added that the actual execution of the historic preservation easements and acquisition of this property is another matter that will possibly be proceeded with in 2006.

Closing Comments: William Gulick, KYTC

Mr. Gulick invited any representatives of FHWA to comment at this time.

John Ballantyne, FHWA

Mr. Ballantyne commented that he is impressed with the professional manner that the historic preservation process is progressing in. He also reported to the Advisory Team that a FHWA Project Manager for the Project has yet to be selected.

Mr. Gulick then invited non-KHPAT members to speak. No Comments were made.

Ms. Weeter made the general comment that the National Trust Conference will be offering a two day introductory Section 106 class that will be led by the Feds, if anyone would like to attend that \$450 session. Also, she distributed scholarship applications for Kentucky and Indiana residents to submit for possible waiver of the fee to attend the entire National Trust Conference this fall.

Ms. Barras asked for the status of the procurement of the Bridge design consultants and how the design guidelines will be addressed for the bi-state bridges. Mr. Gulick made the following updates.

The Section 2 (downtown bridge) and Section 5 (east end bridge) procurement will be done by Kentucky, with one Indiana person on each selection committee. There has been preliminary discussion on the selection process of the bridge design consultants with two main suggestions. 1) Have the CTS-GEC team develop a design concept and turn it over to the consultant for final design. 2) Have the CTS-GEC team oversee a public involvement process that will be executed by the bridge design consultants. The advertisement and selection for this consultant will be held in the June/July timeframe. The first order of business will include putting together the public input process for the bridge type selection. He explained that the roadway geometry will be set and the bridges will be designed to those specifications. The bridge design will have to follow the MOA percentage structure for public input to keep the MOA and ROD requirements

A list of meeting dates through October was passed out with the next meeting being June 17th at 10:00 am at the Camberley Brown Hotel, with the other upcoming meeting dates as follows: July 15, August 26, September 16, and October 28. The Co-chairs will be discussing and considering the comments, questions, and suggestions that were raised at this meeting and they will pass them on to the Bi-State Historic Consultation Team who will consider them further and ultimately the State agencies will make the final decisions. Mr. Gulick thanked everyone for their participation.

**Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – March 10, 2004
TEAM ATTENDEES**

FHWA: John Ballantyne

Co-chairs: William Gulick – Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
David Morgan – Kentucky Heritage Council

City of Prospect: Ann Simms

Kentucky SHPO: Craig Potts

Butchertown Neighborhood Assoc., Inc.: Jim Segrest

Louisville Metro Planning and Design: Mohammad Nouri

Louisville Metro Historic Preservation: Joanne Weeter and Richard Jett

River Fields, Inc.: Leslie Barras

CTS – GEC:

Jeff Vlach
Chad Costa
Christa Turner
Kerri Cokeley
David Kroll
Jeff Bergman
Dawn Hein
Michael Matts
Mike Striker
Charles Raymer
Tom Creasey (American Consulting Engineers)
Jerry Leslie (Lochner Team)
Carl Dixon (Wilbur Smith Assoc.)
Jana Bean (Wilbur Smith Assoc.)