

Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – April 27, 2006
TARC Administration Building

Opening Remarks: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

Mr. Vlach opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. The members identified themselves and their affiliation. Attention was called to several handouts that were disseminated at the meeting: the agenda, the latest edition of River Links (the Project newsletter), a postcard and brochure announcing the Project's Regional Smart Growth Conference to be held in September 2006, and the presentation to be made by SDC 2 and SDC 5 on Step 3 of the bridge type selection process.

Mr. Vlach informed those in attendance that the meeting summary for the KHPAT of December 8, 2005 was sent to all members and is also available on the Project website (www.kyinbridges.com). The summary for the KHPAT of February 16, 2006 is to be finalized and made available via the same avenues.

Project Update: Mr. Bart Bryant, KYTC and Ms. Janie-Rice Brother KY-SHPO

Mr. Bart Bryant noted, during the Kentucky legislative session, \$185 million was allocated in the Department's Six Year Plan to the Project during the 2007-2008 Biennium. The Co-chairs also indicated they wanted the KHPAT to become more efficient as an advisory team, and that the working sessions will be meaningful and productive to that end.

US 42 Ramp Relocation: Mr. Jerry Leslie, SDC4

Mr. Jerry Leslie explained that a 12' x 14' exploratory tunnel bore would need to be completed for the east end portion of the Project. The exploratory tunnel would provide in depth geotechnical information to assist in the design of the tunnel. Before work on the exploratory tunnel can proceed, the off ramp at the intersection of US 42 and KY 841 would be relocated to allow for an access area to the exploratory tunnel location. He indicated there would be specific construction issues that would need to be addressed. They are as follows:

- Staging Area
- Maintenance of Traffic
- Working Hours
- Noise
- Dust Control
- Blasting and Vibration
 - Pre-blasting survey
 - Post blasting survey
- Communication

Mr. Leslie also indicated that all work on US 42 and KY 841 for the ramp relocation would be done within existing right of way and the anticipated schedule would have a contract letting in May of 2006 and with completion proposed by November 30, 2006.

Ms. Betsy Merritt questioned the length of the exploratory tunnel. Mr. Leslie responded the exploratory bore would be approximately 1,800 feet and take approximately 18 months for completion. When the tunnel is completed, it will be approximately 2,000 feet in length.

Ms. Merritt questioned the cost of the ramp relocation. Mr. Leslie explained that the ramp relocation is over 3 million dollars and the exploratory bore may be approximately 8 million dollars.

Ms. Leslie Barras questioned the advancement of the ramp relocation without an approved financial plan. Mr. Bryant acknowledged that the financial plan has not been approved, but emphasized that the work was not being funded by any construction dollars. He also explained that this work component is necessary to further the design of the roadway and critical geotechnical data is needed in order to appropriately size the tunnel and continue the design phase of Section 4. This explanation was supported by Mr. George Jones, FHWA, who was in the audience.

Ms. Merritt questioned the blasting and vibration that would occur on the Allison-Barrickman Cemetery. It was explained that the ROD had a standard for the Project set at 0.2 in/sec PPV for all historic buildings and 0.12 in/sec PPV at very fragile historic buildings. It was also stated the normal standard for blasting with regard to any structure was 2.0 in/sec PPV; all other residential structures will have a stipulation of 0.5 in/sec PPV. Further Project stipulations will be also required by the contractor performing the work. These include but not limited to liquidated damages for exceeding blasting standards, work times, and partnering meetings with Project staff.

Bridge Type Selection Process -Step 3: Mr. J.B. Williams, SDC 2; Mr. John Carr, SDC 5

Mr. Williams and Mr. Carr were introduced as the representatives of SDC 2 and SDC 5, respectively. Mr. Williams and Mr. Carr presented an overview of the Bridge Type Selection Process – Step 3 for the Downtown Bridge (Section 2) and the East End Bridge (Section 5). Mr. Williams disseminated copies of the SDC 2 presentation to the IHPAT members in attendance. A copy of each presentation is attached to this summary.

Step 3 – Section 2 (Downtown Bridge)

Mr. Williams indicated that this was Step 3 in a four-step bridge type selection process resulting in six bridge alternatives to be carried forward into Step 4. The identification of the six bridge alternatives resulted from meetings with the Area Advisory Team (AAT), Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) and a number of Open Houses. A recommendation of three bridge types is expected to be made to the Executive Bridge Selection Committee in Summer 2006. The U.S. Coast Guard has indicated that for navigational requirements, the Downtown Bridge requires a primary channel width of 750 ft. and a secondary channel width of 500 ft. Mr. Williams noted that the Downtown Bridge would be one-way northbound consisting of six 12 ft. lanes and two 12 ft. shoulders with a 17 ft. pedestrian/bikeway on the upstream (east) side. Mr. Williams informed the KHPAT that the one-way traffic precludes any bridge types with supports in the middle of the structure. Alternative 1 is the Three Span Tied Arch, the spans of which is not equal, but aligns with the Kennedy Bridge. Alternative 2, the Three Span Thru Arch, provides equal span lengths with thrust blocks at the end of the arch system on the Indiana and Kentucky shoreline. Studies are continuing to ensure that the placement of the thrust blocks is most advantageous with the setting of the parks. Alternative 3 is a Hybrid Box Girder, which is supported from underneath the structure. It was noted that to maintain the required vertical

navigational clearance beneath, the grade of the structure would need to be elevated approximately 20 ft. above the deck of the Kennedy Bridge. Alternative 4 is a Single Tower Cable-Stayed, which would provide a single 350 ft. tower with a semi-fan cable arrangement. Alternative 5, the Four Tower Cable-Stayed, provides four lower (approximately 180 ft.) towers that are aligned with the Kennedy Bridge. The cables associated with this alternative would extend into the parks on both sides of the river. The last alternative, Alternative 6, is a Three Tower Cable-Stayed with a middle tower slightly higher than the end towers. Mr. Williams noted that the AAT and public have identified maintenance as the major issue surrounding the selection of a bridge type.

Mr. Segrest asked if the Project can look at the view shed from historic neighborhoods – Butchertown, Western end of Shelby Street, Eastern end of Adams Street and along Frankfort Avenue.

Step 3 – Section 5 (East End Bridge)

Mr. Carr (SDC 5) indicated the East End Bridge did not face the same complexities as the Downtown Bridge. The structure, which would cross the river at a 30-degree skew, requires a 900 ft. navigational channel perpendicular to the channel. The bridge would consist of six travel lanes with four full shoulders (two inside and two outside at 12 ft.) and a 17 ft. pedestrian/bikeway on the downstream (west) side. Mr. Carr reiterated the results of the electronic polling indicated a desire for a bridge that blended into the natural landscape, had few and slender piers, had short towers and a thin deck, was virtually transparent and lower maintenance/minimum painted steel. The six different bridge types considered in Step 3 consisted of five cable-stayed bridges and one arch bridge. Alternative 1 is a Basket Handle Arch and provides an arch element underneath the bridge to support the approach roadway. Additionally, the main arch is slanted so it connects at the top. Alternative 2 is a Cable Stayed Diamond Tower and provides for two towers that are in a diamond shape. All of the supporting cable connections are made to the outside of the bridge deck. Also, with Alternative 2, the pedestrian/bikeway is outside of the towers and cables. Alternative 3, a Cable-Stayed A Tower, is similar to Alternative 2 but incorporates more curves into the tower design providing a more ornamental look. Alternative 4 is a Cable-Stayed Single Tower and provides for two thinner towers with an ornamental point at the top. The towers are located in the median of the roadway with the cables connecting to the outside. Alternative 5, a Minimized Cable-Stayed, consists of two thin towers, but has the cable connections within the median resulting in a somewhat thicker deck. Alternative 6, the Suspension/Cable-Stayed, is the result of public interest in a concept with a suspension bridge look. In addition to the diagonal cables, this alternative is comprised of a number of perpendicular cables.

It was noted in the February KHPAT, the members would like to comment on the bridge-type selection process. Comments have been captured as follow:

Mr. Bryant explained that many of the HPAT members were also members of the AAT or RAC. He indicated to the group that he would like to hear comments from a historic perspective that would aid the designers in development of bridge types.

Janie-Rice Brother indicated as a co-chair and the KY-SHPO representative she wanted to hear the gut reaction of the bridge types that were presented.

Ms. Merritt indicated that each of the bridge types had both advantages and disadvantages in regards to historic preservation. One factor she noted was the sheer mass of the structures

themselves. For example she indicated the homes on the Jeffersonville side would be much more affected by the larger mass structures.

Ms. Merritt asked if there a possibility of pulling the bulk away from the historic houses?

Ms. Merritt noted that alternative 5 was just too chaotic and visually intrusive from Old Jeffersonville.

Ms. Brother noted the 4 tower cable-stayed was a little too chaotic from her gut reaction.

Mr. Segrest asked what could be seen from Butchertown and also if this could be illustrated.

Ms. Runyon stated she would like to see some viewshed perspectives from down in the historic districts, or from various points from the waterfront.

Ms. Runyon said she would like to repeat what the SHPO indicated in the February HPAT, both bridges would have an enormous impact on the cultural landscape. Ms. Runyon indicated the Project should not move further with out this expert. Mr. Vlach indicated the Project was in contact with a cultural landscape specialist that was recommended by Charles Birnbaum and elevated to the KY-SHPO for concurrence.

Ms. Merritt asked how visible the cables would be. Mr. Carr responded it would be based on size, color and number.

It was noted the East End Bridge should be transparent as possible and blend into the landscape.

Country Estates of River Road/River Road Corridor Draft INR: Mr. Michael Matts and Mr. Tom Gallagher, CTS-GEC

Michael Matts and Tom Gallagher presented the second iteration of the Draft INR.

Richard Jett noted on page 38 some of the areas that were shown in white were actually also bluffs of the Country Estates. Changes were requested in the INR.

An official motion of Mrs. Meme Sweets Runyon was to elevate the Drumanard boundary to the BSHCT for revision and to incorporate the individual NRHP property boundary listed on the NRHP. Richard Jett seconded the motion. *Subsequent to the meeting the BSHCT has taken this request into consideration and agreed that all maps will show the individual NRHP boundary for Drumanard.*

Butchertown and Phoenix Hill Draft HPP: Mr. Pete Fritz, CTS-GEC

Mr. Fritz presented the Draft HPP and opened the floor for discussion about the Draft HPP.

Mr. Jim Segrest had the following comments about the Draft HPP

- Too many platitudes – not enough specifics
- Utilities need to be included in the plan (when, by whom?)
- What will happen with the huge overhead lines at Spaghetti Junction

- No mention of flood protection
- Which access points go to the north
- Butchertown Neighborhood boundary is ignored
- North/South connections are noted but not East/West (Except at Witherspoon)
- Geiger Ferry was the first approved way across the river
- Delete the idea that Butchertown is a blue collar neighborhood
- Historic buildings should be brought up to code (recommendation)
- Recommendation to remove railroad from district
- Main Street should be 2 way
- Shelby/Campbell – 2 way
- Interstate ramp system on Story should be removed
- Geiger Mill needs to be noted c. 1795
- Keep traffic off of Frankfort Ave.
- Chapter 11 does not have many specifics
- More information of demographics and characteristics of people in district
- What specifically will happen with parking through out the district

Mr. Fritz also presented the Phoenix Hill Draft HPP and the following comments were made:

- Land use and zoning should be explained in more detail
- Page 22 and 43 needs to discuss truck traffic on Main Street in more detail
- Look for possible two way streets
- Page 15 – note that Shepard’s Square was predominantly white and Clarksdale was predominantly black neighborhoods.

East Louisville Access Study: Ms. Patti Claire, Downtown Development Corporation

Due to technical difficulties with the computer compatibility, this presentation was postponed until the June KHPAT.

Smart Growth Conference: Ms. Christa Turner, CTS-GEC

Ms. Turner provided an overview of planning efforts to date for the Smart Growth Conference, which is to be held at the Downtown Louisville Marriot from September 18-20, 2006. The Project is hosting the Conference in accordance with Stipulation II.O of the MOA. It was noted that information on the Conference, entitled “Bridging Boundaries – Building Great Communities,” is available on the Project website (www.kyinbridges.com). Ms. Turner informed the KHPAT that three national speakers have been secured for the Conference: Randall Arendt, Donovan Rypkema and Walter Kulash. Work is underway to secure regional and local speakers for the Conference. The Bi-State Management Team (BSMT) recently approved a list of potential speakers consisting of approximately 17-20 individuals. Efforts are underway to begin assigning these speakers to designated tracks.

The Conference format would be comprised of group and concurrent sessions commencing on September 19, 2006 and continuing through September 20, 2006. September 18, 2006 would be reserved for possible walking tours of Old Jeffersonville Historic District, Butchertown Historic District and Phoenix Hill Historic District and a Welcome Reception in the evening. It is anticipated that the mayors of Jeffersonville and Louisville would kick off the Conference the morning of September 19, 2006. Ms. Turner remarked that the website provides a link to register

for the mailing list to receive additional conference materials, such as the Conference brochure and registration packet, as they're developed and released. Additionally, a dinner cruise on The Star will be available the evening of September 19, 2006. The cost for the dinner cruise would be included as part of the Conference registration. Postcards were mailed in March 2006 as a "save the date" notification. This was followed by the mailing of the Conference informational brochure in April 2006, which provided bios on two of the three national speakers. Registration packets are anticipated to be sent out in June 2006. Also, at that time individuals would be able to register for the Conference on the website. Continuing Education Units (CEU) and Professional Development Hours (PDH) are being sought for the Conference and coordinated with appropriate entities. *Subsequent to the meeting, Professional Development Hours have been secured for engineering and planning.*

Final Comments: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

Any comments for consideration by the Co-chairs should be made in writing by the close of business on May 11, 2006. Mr. Vlach indicated that next KHPAT meeting would be held on June 22, 2006 at TARC. *Subsequent to this meeting the June KHPAT meeting was scheduled for June 8, 2006.* KHPAT members will be notified of the meeting location and supplied with materials to be discussed at least two weeks prior to the meeting.

**Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – April 27, 2006
TEAM ATTENDEES**

Co-chairs: Bart Bryant – Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
Janie-Rice Brother – Kentucky Heritage Council

City of Prospect: Ann Simms; Sandra Leonard

Butchertown Neighborhood Assoc., Inc.: Jim Segrest

Louisville Metro Planning and Design: Aida Copic

Louisville Metro Historic Preservation: Joanne Weeter; Richard Jett

National Trust for Historic Preservation: Betsy Merritt

River Fields, Inc.: Leslie Barras; Meme Sweets Runyon

CTS – GEC: Jeff Vlach
Christa Turner
Chad Costa
David Kroll
Tom Gallagher
Peter Fritz
Michael Matts

SDC 1: David Smith
Richard Sutherland

SDC 4: Jerry Leslie
Sandy Stevens

SDC 5: John Carr