

**Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – May 19, 2004
SUMMARY**

Opening Remarks:

Mary Crowe, Indiana Department of Transportation

Ms. Crowe welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending. Name cards were provided for each entity designated as an Advisory Team member. To make this meeting and future meetings run more efficiently, both the representative and the alternate from each of these groups will be allowed at the table; however, one person will be designated speaker for their particular group.

John Carr, IN State Historic Preservation Office Staff

Mr. Carr introduced himself and identified that he and Ms. Crowe are the Advisory Team Co-chairs and that they represent the State SHPO and the INDOT, respectively. The meeting today will focus on the preparation for the Historic Preservation Plans (HPPs), as required by the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). As recommendations are made for the plans, it is important to remember that not all aspects of the HPP will be funded by the Project. Only the items listed in the MOA have a commitment from FHWA and INDOT to be funded by the Project. Additional recommendations that come out of this process will require implementation by other entities such as local governments, citizen groups and non-profit organizations. At this time, Mr. Carr asked that everyone in the room introduce themselves and the organization they represent.

Project Updates: Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

HPAT Charter:

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

HPAT Membership Request:

Since the last meeting, there was one request for membership into the IHPAT from Maxine Brown, representative of the Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana's African American Advisory Committee. The Co-chairs carefully reviewed her request and determined to deny her admission onto the IHPAT. Mr. Vlach stated that Ms. Brown was notified of this decision on April 29, 2004.

Stakeholder Meetings:

In April, there were four individual Stakeholder meetings held in Indiana to get 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.

James A. Smith Rural Historic Farmstead NRHP Eligibility: John Carr, IN SHPO Staff

Nearly a year ago the house at the James A. Smith Farm, which is the subject to mitigation in the MOA, caught fire. This unfortunate event affects its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), which is a requirement for the mitigation. After a site visit this spring, Chief of Registration and Survey Frank Hurdis, prepared the following Department of Natural Resources - Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology (DHPA) Staff Opinion on the Continued National Register Eligibility of the James A. Smith Farm:

"In the initial cultural resource reconnaissance and analysis for the Louisville/Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges project, The Westerly Group (WGI) identified and evaluated the James A. Smith Farm (IE-HC-45024). WGI came to the conclusion that the property was eligible for listing in the NRHP under

Criterion A for significance to the early settlement of Utica Township and for significance in agriculture. WGI also concurred with the conclusion of ASC Group, Inc., archaeological consultants, that the property was eligible under Criterion D for information it could yield about the early history of the area.

DHPA reviewed WGI's conclusions and concurred that the Smith Farm was eligible under NR Criteria A and D. Having looked at the property more carefully for purposes of this opinion, DHPA staff believes, in retrospect, that the property also would have been eligible under Criterion C for its significance in architecture despite its deteriorated condition. The house was a remarkable example of the I-house form with a high level of workmanship both in the masonry work and in interior detail. Doorways, windows, their surrounds, mantles, wainscoting, built-in cupboards all exhibited a high level of refinement that was particularly notable given the c. 1830 date of the house.

The DHPA staff also agreed with WGI's assertion that the Smith Farm was eligible for its direct connection to the early settlement of Utica Township. Not only was the house a good representative of a settlement type, but the cemetery with graves dating to 1835 confirmed the connection to the early settlement of the area. However, again in retrospect, the staff probably should have voiced concern about the case for agricultural significance of the property. Given the limited number of out-building resources – a shed, a collapsed shed, a cistern, a springhouse, and several concrete pads in addition to the house – a case for agricultural significance as an intact farmstead would be problematic at best. Also, given the overgrowth of much of the farm land and the lack of any information about significant crop production, a case for agricultural significance on the basis of farm activity would have been very difficult.

The almost total destruction of the house by fire has, obviously, damaged the integrity of the property. Only about 80% of the exterior shell survived; none of its remarkable wood detail did. Consequently, the DHPA staff no longer believes the Smith Farm is eligible for the National Register under Criterion C for its architectural significance. Even if the house were completely reconstructed in every detail, the loss of integrity of materials, workmanship, feeling, and association would render it not eligible under Criterion C.

Similarly, the DHPA staff believes that the loss of integrity of the house has so seriously damaged the property's ability to convey its association with early settlement, that it would no longer meet National Register Criterion A. Although the cemetery, various sheds, and the springhouse remain, the house was the primary resource conveying the connection to the early settlement of the area. The house's virtual destruction has irrevocably damaged that connection and reconstruction with modern materials and workmanship would not salvage it. The cemetery, sheds, and springhouse lack sufficient substance to convey the connection to settlement on their own. In no case in Indiana has a cemetery been listed by itself for its association with early settlement. In every case where a cemetery has been listed for a connection to early settlement, there has been a church, residence, or district to support the connection.

Finally, the DHPA staff believes that the property may remain eligible for listing for its archaeological significance under Criterion D. Despite the destruction of the house and aggressive clearing in the immediate vicinity of the house, the property as a whole appears undisturbed and presumably retains the deposits that the initial recommendation were based upon. However, it might be advisable, in light of those changes that have occurred, for ASC Group, Inc. to re-evaluate the site."

HPP Work Process Overview: Jeffrey Bergman, Urban Planner

Mr. Bergman distributed 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 we finalize the components there will be some differences in the individual districts as they each have unique characteristics in addition to many common elements.

Step 1 – Education (of HPP procedures for the HPAT 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 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 HPAT 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

Mr. Sanders asked that since the plan itself will include suggestions for future measures that have no commitment from the MOA to fund, can the HPP identify possible funding sources for the non Project-funded items. He noted that the preparation of the HPPs is a great opportunity to pull all the current projects such as the Big Four Bridge and the Greenway Project together into one comprehensive plan. It was confirmed that the HPPs will identify possible funding sources for long-term goals and that it will take into account current projects.

Ms. Renwick asked for a clarification of what type of things can be considered “additional mitigation measures” noted under the “Outstanding Process Questions.” Mr. Bergman replied that we need to come up with a process for dealing with things as they come up in the HPP Process. An example of this would be the possible relocation of boundaries for the cemetery, which would require additional mitigation.

Summary of Stakeholder Meetings: Michael Striker, Archaeology Principal Investigator

This is a summary of each of the stakeholder meetings that were held since the last IHPAT meeting. Mr. Striker encouraged anyone who attended these meetings to feel free to add comments on the summary as he went through them.

Town of Utica:

Date/Time: 04-12-04 (3:30pm)

Purpose: Town of Utica Stakeholder Meeting

Held at: Town Hall, Utica

Participants: Jim Carter, President of Town Board; Gregory Morison, Town Board member; Ann Graham, Town Board member; Ruel Harris, Town Board member; Michael Striker, ASC Group; Kerri Cokeley, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Kerri Cokeley with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team and the leadership for the Town of Utica. She provided a short explanation of the purpose for this meeting as an informational gathering session for the HPP scope of work. David Kroll began the discussion with the Annotated Table of Contents.
2. Michael Striker and David Kroll mentioned the need for an archaeological investigation at the lime kiln sites. The board will forward a list and address for the Lime Kiln property owners to Michael Stricker. The owners include the Clayborne-Manley family, the Hughes Construction Company, and James Gilmore. James Gilmore owns the land where the groundhog kiln is located.
3. The Utica town limits reach to Quarry Bluff Road. An interchange for the Project will be located at Old Salem Road. The Town Board recognized that this interchange will spark development of the area.
4. Land is being developed for a residential community in the right of way for the Project. Greg Morrison mentioned the interest of the developer for annexation of this development by the Town of Utica.
5. The Town Board expressed their interest in preserving the kilns and working with the CTS team to achieve these goals. Utica Pike was elevated about 7'-0" where a perpetual kiln lies in the right of way of the road and the Project. If this kiln cannot be kept in situ then the board expressed their interest in rebuilding it in a local park.

6. 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 Town for review. The next IHPAT meeting will be on May 19, 2004.

City of Jeffersonville:

Date/Time: 04-19-04 (10:30am)

Purpose: Mayor of Jeffersonville Stakeholder Meeting

Held at: City-County Building

Participants: Rob Waiz, Mayor of Jeffersonville; Chris Padgett, City of Jeffersonville; Jim Becker, City of Jeffersonville; Les Merkley, Attorney City of Jeffersonville; Michael Striker, ASC Group; Lori Thursby, ASC Group; Kerri Cokeley, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Jeff Bergman, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Kerri Cokeley with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team and the Mayor and his team. 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. Archaeological sites that will need investigation include: the location of Fort Finney/Fort Steuben, the sites of the four homes to be relocated and the Old City Cemetery. Michael Striker described the work necessary to investigate the location of the Old City Cemetery beneath the Colston softball field. A state permit as well as permission from the City of Jeffersonville would be necessary, after a scope of work is submitted. Les Merkley stated that the Parks Board runs the park and approval from them would also be necessary. The timeline was discussed and the Mayor's team asked if the work could wait until the softball season was completed.

3. The City currently enforces design guidelines for a local historic district that includes portions of Spring Street and Riverside Drive. Design guidelines for the entire National Register Historic District of Jeffersonville will be developed through the HPP. The City expressed concern about the impact the new guidelines would have on staffing, as the remaining area is large and could require a large increase in time and effort to enforce. David Kroll discussed Conservation Districts as a way to ease the transition for the public and City. The County survey would also be revised relative to the portion of the district that will be physically affected by the project.

4. Chris Padgett noted that the City of Jeffersonville Zoning Ordinance was updated in 2001. He also provided a copy of the Downtown Action Agenda, which was approved in 2002. He noted that the City is considering an update of its Comprehensive Plan and hoped that the HPP would be designed to inform the Comprehensive Plan Project. The HPP could address historic preservation and downtown comprehensive plan components.

5. It was noted that the train depot on Spring Street has been considered for a project office during construction. Chris Padgett noted that the area around the depot is an important gateway for the downtown and the City as a whole.

6. Chris Padgett presented the River View plans that are in the approval process. This project is a new residential/commercial high rise located along Market and Wall Street in the Historic District.

7. Ratio explained that the MOA stipulates the preparation of National Register Nominations for the Colgate-Palmolive Plant and the Ohio Falls Car and Locomotive Company. The Colgate-Palmolive Plant is located in Clarksville and the Ohio Falls Car and Locomotive Company is partially located in Clarksville and in Jeffersonville.

8. 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 IHPAT meeting will be on May 19, 2004.

Clark County Commissioners, Historic Landmarks of Indiana, and Clark County Historian:

Date/Time: 04-19-04 (1:30pm)

Purpose: Clark County Commissioners, Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana (HLFI) and Clark County Historian Stakeholder Meeting

Held at: City County Building, Room, 308

Participants: Jan M. Paddocks, Jeffersonville Historic Commissioner; Jay Ellis, Jeffersonville Main Street; David Lewis, Clark County Commissioner; David Ross Stevens, Clark County Planning Commission; Laura Renwick, HLF; Jeanne M. Burke, Clark County Historian; Greg Sekula, HLF; Keith Strayton, Jeff-Clark Preservation; Jill Schimpff, Jeffersonville Historic Commission; Warren Schimpff, Downtown Business Owner; Tom Lindley, Carnegie Foundation; Michael Striker, ASC Group; Lori Thursby, ASC Group; Kerri Cokeley, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Jeff Bergman, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Kerri Cokeley with CTS began the meeting with general introductions for all participants. 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 for Jeffersonville, Swartz/Smith Farms, and the Utica Lime Kilns. Members were asked to explain what they see as priorities for their neighborhood.
2. Ratio explained what specific items were included in the MOA concerning Jeffersonville, what documents exist and how the Annotated Table of Contents was organized. Boundaries for the Historic District were discussed first and HLF expressed support for reviewing the boundary delineation of the District. Support was expressed for creating new residential guidelines and expanding the locally designated district. The participants asked if the National Register Boundary could be adjusted as part of the HPP or if only a recommendation for adjustment would be made.
3. Concern was raised that this document would become a shelf document and not implemented. HLF inquired about the City's level of commitment. The group felt that an implemental document would include: (1) clear action steps, (2) expanded design guidelines, and (3) a review and update of the existing design guidelines.
4. Five houses are slated for relocation within the neighborhood; Ratio discussed how recommendations would be made determining new locations. This process would require the proper context for the houses and the ability to purchase the lots. HLF asked that the HPPs identify specified location options for each home to be moved.
5. The following were the specific issues for Jeffersonville raised by the group:
 - a. The residential high rise, the River View, is progressing and concerns about how this project would affect the community in general, loss of historic buildings, and additional growth spurred by the development were expressed. The HPP should address the need to encourage the City to realize the pressure this type of construction puts on the community for other supporting development. There are numerous vacancies and available properties for rehabilitation and the group questioned the need for this new project. The participants noted that this kind of development increased land values and felt the need for an analysis of the demand for high-rise buildings in the historic district. They felt the HPP should preserve low-rise buildings and local historic character.
 - b. HLF suggested that the CTS team have discussions with the local churches about their expansion plans. Their expansion and parking needs often requires the demolition of historic homes. Don Summerfield, as the head of the local ministers group, would be a good contact for the churches.
 - c. This discussion led to the expressed need for demolition notification within the Historic District before action is taken. The plan should identify vulnerable properties as well as those that would be prime for an easement. – Ms. Renwick added that there is a 30 day Demolition Delay Ordinance that applies to the entire National Register District.
 - d. Tom Lindley expressed his concern that most of the historic fabric has been taken from Jeffersonville, and the need for the community to turn this trend around by supporting preservation efforts. The remaining resources should be used to reflect the Jeffersonville that has already been lost.
 - e. Jeanne Burke spoke about the concern of inappropriate infill throughout the community and especially at the gateway to the City. The plan should include gateway elements and recommendations for change in this area to create a sense of arrival that includes compatible development. This could also include elements of interpretive signage and streetscape design. The participants noted that Old Jeffersonville has many interruptions to its historic fabric and that unity is needed. Gateways need to be enhanced and new development needs to reflect the character of existing historic resources.
 - f. Interpretive and directional signage is needed throughout the community – including a marker for the State Prison, the Old City Cemetery, Fort Finney, and the Colonel Samuel Patterson House. The African-American resources in Jeffersonville should be researched, recognized, and indicated in some way. The Larkin Nickelson House on Utica Pike may have been part of the Underground Rail Road. Pam Smith

has conducted research in this area. The Irish and German heritage should also be indicated, recognized and researched.

g. The Schimpff's spoke about the need for general signage during construction to indicate the Historic District was open for business as well as the need for permanent highway signage directing drivers to the Jeffersonville Historic District. The participants felt that the HPP should also address road noise, lighting, signage and billboards.

h. HLFi discussed the Big Four Bridge and how this would be connected to Jeffersonville through the Greenway Project. The Greenway Project will eventually connect the communities of New Albany, Clarksville, and Jeffersonville as well as provide a walkway to Louisville. The participants felt that the HPP should consider the Big Four Bridge and Greenways Project. Pedestrian linkages between these projects and the historic district will be important. The group also noted the significance of the Ohio River Scenic Byway.

i. The Schimpff's mentioned that surface parking is taking up space in the historic district, specifically along Spring Street and that a garage may be a better solution. The plan should include location identification and design guidelines for a garage and examples of how other communities have solved this problem.

j. The plan should identify sources for façade improvement grant funds.

k. The group mentioned the possible relocation of City Hall to the Historic District. HLFi expressed concern that this idea may not be feasible or appropriate for the District, as it would require large amounts of parking and property to meet the requirements necessary for City Hall.

6. The Swartz Farm was discussed next and Jay Ellis expressed the need to protect the rural area from growth that will follow the bridge. He mentioned the inclusion of the Central Passage House within the rural historic district. HLFi asked if an amendment would be possible to the MOA to move the house instead of destroying it completely. Ratio explained that an amendment was possible but difficult. Concern was raised about the possibility of the Swartz Farm not being occupied by the Gothbreth family and what possible uses the Farm could have. Commercial development is not desired.

7. HLFi inquired about the status of the Smith Farm's eligibility determination by the SHPO's office. CTS indicated that no decision had been made but would be discussed at the next HPAT meeting. The group discussed the MOA inclusions for this property as well as proposed best uses. Any work is contingent upon the donation of the property to the Project. The general consensus was that the best use of the property was as open recreational space. Several participants mentioned funding issues for the county, and were concerned that costs would be too high. They did feel that the HPP could provide a comprehensive master plan for the property and hoped that it could help the county identify sources of start-up money for park uses on the site.

8. The participants felt that there was a need to promote investment and development in downtown not in rural areas. Sprawl was a significant concern and the group felt that careful land use planning along the east end bridge route was important for the long term viability of the Smith Farm, Swartz Farm and Lime Kilns as historic resources. They will look to the HPP to raise a flag about land usage issues and the relationship between land use choices and historic resource preservation. Clark County is currently in the process of updating its comprehensive plan and land use ordinances. The HPP should be integrated into these documents. David Lewis inquired if a cost of service analysis for new development could be included in the HPP. David Lewis also inquired about a \$300,000 planning grant that he had understood INDOT was to provide for Clark County.

9. The participants discussed their hope that the HPP for the Utica Lime Kilns would identify possible uses for the property and options for private owners who wanted to donate their kiln property.

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 distributed for review at the next IHPAT meeting. The next IHPAT meeting will be on May 19, 2004.

Rose Hill Neighborhood Association:

Date/Time: 04-19-04 (4:00pm)

Purpose: Rose Hill Neighborhood Stakeholder Meeting

Held at: Henry Sanders' Residence

Participants: Henry Sanders, Rose Hill Neighborhood Association; Joe Rafferty, Rose Hill Neighborhood Association; Judy Travis, Rose Hill Neighborhood Association; Phyllis Croce, Rose Hill Neighborhood

Association; Michael Striker, ASC Group; Lori Thursby, ASC Group; Kerri Cokeley, CTS-GEC; David Kroll, Ratio Architects; Jeff Bergman, Ratio Architects; Dawn Hein, Ratio Architects

1. Kerri Cokeley with CTS began the meeting with introductions of the CTS team and the Rose Hill Neighborhood 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 and asked the members to explain what they see as priorities for their neighborhood.
2. Discussion began with the Rose Hill Neighborhood boundaries. The five houses that are slated for relocation are within the neighborhood, as well as the Old City Cemetery beneath the Colston park. Ratio discussed the house moving process to the group. A concern discussed by the Association was the integration of the park into the neighborhood
3. Judy Travis explained that the Association has been working on general beautification of the neighborhood and asked if the schedule for the streetscape portion of the project could be moved up. Henry Sanders will mention this idea at the next HPAT meeting.
4. There was concern within the Association about the view from the neighborhood to the bridge and the actual design of the bridge. CTS explained that there would be public workshops to discuss such issues, but at later date. The Indiana approach designers and the bridge designers have not been selected. Phyllis Croce suggested having a workshop before the public meetings to better inform the general public about the Project. She felt that the HPP process would benefit from a workshop that included working groups for the streetscape, Big Four Bridge connections, etc...
5. Noise Abatement was discussed as an issue to be included in the HPP. The Association asked about the increase in noise due to the construction and new traffic. Ratio and CTS spoke about the possible use of new materials for the bridge that could assist in keeping the noise to a minimum.
6. ASC discussed the archaeological efforts that will occur to determine the location of the Old City Cemetery and Fort Finney/Fort Steuben.
7. The Association would like to see the neighborhood identified in some fashion, with signage or streetscape features. Landscape plantings were requested to be native to the region and flood plain tolerant. Joe Rafferty spoke about the historic post card collection of Bill Whittaker and how it might assist in research for the HPPs. The participants felt that a clear identity was needed for the Rose Hill neighborhood that went beyond typical signs and streetscape improvements. They felt that area had many "loose ends" in terms of historic resources that needed to be unified.
8. The Greenway project, which is directed by the Army Corps of Engineers, was discussed as another consideration for the HPPs. Bike and walking paths will be created along the River connecting three towns: New Albany, Clarksville, and Jeffersonville. The Association suggested moving the bike paths from along the river due to flood issues. In addition to the Greenway project, The Big Four Bridge will become a pedestrian walkway between Louisville and Jeffersonville. A significant issue concerning the project is how to transition between the bridge and Riverside Drive. Elevators and circular ramps have both been suggested as options. Indiana and Kentucky are still in the process of studying and reviewing options.
9. Judy Travis asked if the footings for the bridge that are located within the neighborhood on private property could be removed and if there was funding to do so. If they must stay could signage be created to explain their significance? Ratio stated that there was no particular funding for this and that the property owners could remove them at will.
10. Another request made by the Association was the general improvement of infrastructure (sidewalks, curbs, etc...) and relocation of overhead electrical and telephone wiring underground along the Ohio River.
11. Henry Sanders mentioned that he would like the Jeffersonville HPP to include features like those found in the DePauw and Evansville Studies available at CTS. Ratio mentioned that they produced these studies and that the Jeffersonville study could definitely have similar features.

12. 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 IHPAT meeting will be on May 19, 2004.

At this time, Mr. Carr asked if there were any general questions before breaking for lunch.

Mr. Sanders brought up that at the Jeffersonville stakeholder meeting concern was raised about the lack of studies on the African American heritage in this area. In light of this issue, Mr. Sanders questioned why the request from an African American organization to be included on the IHPAT was denied. Mr. Carr stated that Maxine Brown's request focused on two points. The first point referred to her involvement on the Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana's (HLFI) African American Advisory Committee; however, HLFI is already represented on the IHPAT and they are free to name whomever they wish to serve as the representative and the alternate. The second point referred to her involvement with an organization that is looking to preserve Taylor High School, which was named as "City School" in the Section 106 process. Although this school was identified as a historic property within the Area of Potential Effect, it was determined that there was no adverse effect from the Project, resulting in no mitigation for this property. While Ms. Brown's request shows her interest in the Project, and that is appreciated, it was determined that her request did not merit inclusion considering the effort put into the designation of IHPAT members in the MOA. As the Co-chairs will entertain requests for membership, they are cautious about broadening the size of the group too much as the groups that are directly affected should have more influence in how the mitigation measures set forth in the MOA are implemented.

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.

Old Jeffersonville Historic District

Objectives/Goals

- Mitigate the impact of the Project upon the district.
- Retain and preserve historic and architectural significance within the district.
- Develop guidelines for infill construction, signage, demolition, and moving buildings.
- Establish the necessary background information, analysis, policies, and viability of area land use, transportation, urban design features, and housing 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, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* and archaeological guidelines.

Relocation of Historic Buildings – Provide guidelines for deciding on this course of action as well as recommended and not recommended procedures. Five identified structures: 115 Fort Street, 116 Fort Street, 502 West Market Street, 432 West Riverside Drive and 502 West Riverside Drive. This should include specific location options for the re-location of each structure.

Preservation Easements – Recommendations for easements if approval received from the property owners for the relocated houses.

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

Infrastructure – Recommendations to mitigate adverse Project effects or to improve the quality of life in the historic district appropriate to the character of the district. The infrastructure recommendations should also address the overall set of infrastructure available to the area, any generally required upgrades, and other related items related to the design and functionality aspects of the long-term vitality of the area.

Land Use – Make recommendations for the future land use plan that anticipates new development trends, minimizes land use conflicts, identifies desired design characteristics, and contributes to the enhancement of the physical unity of the area. Provide background material, analysis, goals, objectives, policy statements, and action steps appropriate for incorporation into the City of Jeffersonville Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning & Design Guidelines – Make recommendations as for the protection of the historic resources and their context through the use of zoning and design guidelines. This includes the provision of sample zoning district language, standards, and/or procedures as appropriate to the goals of the HPP. It also includes the revision of the current design guidelines as appropriate and the creation of additional guidelines for the possible future expansion of the area of local review beyond the current Spring Street / Riverside Drive area.

Noise Mitigation – Consultants report including suggested policy and procedures to achieve noise mitigation where it affects historic properties, specifically to identified significant architectural features.

Interpretive & Directional 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. Include pedestrian friendly facilities, artwork and lighting under new bridge and the existing John F. Kennedy Bridge.

Gateway Elements – Propose specific measures to define the gateways of the City. Example: The Train Depot and Spring Street.

Parking – Make recommendations for existing parking area and the accommodation of future parking facilities.

No-Work Zones – Define areas for each property/district, include maps and justification.

Demolition – Only in extreme cases can demolition of any historically and /or architecturally important building in Jeffersonville be justified. Just as important as the finest and most impressive buildings are the typical and background building whose demolition would create damaging gaps in the neighborhood fabric and context. The following guidelines are intended to assist in determining whether or not demolition is justified: Significance, Location, Potential for Restoration, Condition, and Economics. Demolition notification methods will be outlined for the National Register Historic District.

Mr. Sanders said that he did not see an item in the list of objectives for the Old Jeffersonville Historic District for the coordination of Project mitigation with the other current projects and recommendations for the long-term goals. It was determined that this would be resolved in the “Archaeological Resources” section.

Mr. Sekula asked if “Building Conditions” will take into consideration the level of deterioration within the district, modifications to buildings that would render them ineligible, or lead to the loss of integrity within the district. It is anticipated that there will be a survey of resources within the district with an analysis of determination to be developed that will identify any loss of integrity or changes that would render a building ineligible or that would warrant boundary adjustment. Some of the building conditions may also play into “Land Use” or “Zoning” issues, but the design guidelines will be for the overall commercial and residential portions of the district with “Building Conditions” being more specific.

Mr. Sekula recommended adding ways to document and identify cultural resources that we may not be aware of within the community and historic district. He suggested that by adding this information into the Statement of Significance, including it in the evolution of the district, and by researching and identifying these types of resources with an inventory process the significance of these resources will be understood in case they are threatened by the Project.

Mr. Sanders recommended adding light mitigation to the list of recommendations because of glare and light pollution that will be added by the Project. It was added that suggestions for light fixtures can be included in the HPPs.

Mr. Sekula asked how this plan will address the secondary and cumulative effects on the historic district resulting from the Project. It was determined that many of these issues will be addressed in zoning regulations and design guidelines as well as the possible recommendation that the city create a larger local district so there is a mechanism that will require historic preservation be addressed when pressures result as a part of the Project. Mr. Sekula recommended a marketing plan component be included to encourage people to continue to visit the historic district during construction so there is a continued investment in the downtown during this period. Mr. Kroll added that signage is a part of the plan and that possible language could be used that would discourage disinvestments to businesses in the historic districts. Additionally, coordination with the Main Street organization and the local Chamber of Commerce would be necessary to implement a marketing plan.

Mr. Sanders added that measures to account for sprawl in the east end should also be included in addition to the Jeffersonville area since all these areas interrelate.

Lime Kilns, within the Utica Lime Industry Multiple Property Listing Standards & Guidelines for Preservation Planning

Objectives/Goals

- Mitigate the impact of the Project upon the kilns and their context;
- Retain and preserve historic archaeological and engineering significance.
- Develop a context study focusing on the lime industry in the region, identifying significant lime industry structures and recommendations for preservation of the history of the lime industry in Utica Township/Southern Indiana; and
- Successfully produce a National Register nomination for the Lime Kilns.

Recommendations

Structure Conditions – Make recommendations for repair/stabilization according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for The Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* and archaeological guidelines.

Archaeological Conditions – Provide recommendations based on the finding during the Archaeological investigation. Make recommendations according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings* as well as The Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology's Indiana Archaeological Guidelines.

National Register Nomination – Complete a Multiple Property Listing Nomination (MPL) for the Lime Kilns, including photographs.

Land Use – Make recommendations for the use of these resources applicable for public and educational use. Identify desired area land use and development patterns that best support the long-term viability of the lime kilns as historic resources. Provide background material, analysis, goals, objectives, policy statements, and action steps appropriate for incorporation into the Town of Utica and/or Clark County Comprehensive Plan relative to the lime kiln properties.

Zoning – Make recommendations for the protection of the lime kilns and coordinate with the Town of Utica and Clark County zoning ordinances. Identify and provide examples of required zoning ordinance revisions as necessary to provide zoning districts, standards, and/or procedures appropriate to the goals of the HPP.

Preservation Easements – Recommendations for easements if approval received from the property owners for the donation.

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

Infrastructure – Make recommendations for improvements/changes. The HPP should identify the road, utility, and other infrastructure appropriate for the lime kilns as an historic resource. 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 lime kiln resources.

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

No-work Zones – Define areas for each property, include maps and justification.

Mr. Sanders showed concern for the current condition of the northern most kiln considering the road work that has occurred. Additionally, Mr. Sanders mentioned that light pollution is not taken into consideration on this list of recommendations.

Mr. Striker was asked to go into detail about the archeological component of this resource. He said that of the four kilns that were identified in this District, one of them will not have an archeological component because of the change in significance due to road construction. The "groundhog" kiln will require limited investigations as its function was for personal use rather than industrial use. The final two kilns will have a larger archeological component because there are remnants of buildings and unidentified items may be significant to the regional lime industry as well as their significance as an engineered structure. It was also noted that, with the exception of the northernmost kiln, the kiln sites are privately owned, so any investigation will require approval of the property owners.

Swartz Farm Rural Historic District

Objectives/Goals

- Mitigate the impact of the Project upon the farmhouse, its associated buildings, and the rural farmland context.
- Retain and preserve historic and architectural significance of the property.
- Develop guidelines for preservation, demolition, and the moving of buildings.

- Preserve the fragmented section of rural agricultural land resulting from the Project and identify uses for the property that are both appropriate for the historic resources present and viable in the long-term given the development happening in the area.
- Develop a context study for agriculture in Clark County, Indiana and surrounding counties to assist in future National Register nominations in the region.
- Successfully produce a National Register nomination for the Swartz Farm, boundaries as defined by the MOA.

Recommendations

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

Historic Landscape – Develop a landscaping plan that provides measures to minimize the visual impact of the Project and protect the historic landscape.

Archaeological Resources – Report with recommendations for mitigation, an assessment of effects and recommendations for treatment. Phase Ia investigations should be conducted to determine whether there are intact archaeological deposits on the property to be included in the HPP.

Preservation Easements – Recommendations for easements if approval received from the property owners for the donation.

National Register Nomination – Complete nomination for the Swartz Farm Rural Historic District including photographs.

Land Use – Make recommendations for the continued use of these resources. Identify desired area land use and development patterns that best support the long-term viability of the Swartz Farm as a historic resource. Provide background material, analysis, goals, objectives, policy statements, and action steps appropriate for incorporation into the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning – Make recommendations for the protection of the historic resource and coordinate with the Clark County zoning ordinances. Identify and provide examples of zoning districts, 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.

Noise Mitigation – Consultants report including suggested policy and procedures to achieve noise mitigation where it affects historic properties, specifically to identified significant architectural features.

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.

No-work Zones – Define areas for each property/district, include maps and justification.

Mr. Sekula asked for the status of the Central Passage House and if the MOA can be amended to require the house to be moved rather than documented and destroyed. Mr. Carr stated that the HPP will focus on the Swartz Farmstead since moving the Central Passage House would destroy the context, even if it is moved onto a portion of the farm property. It was noted that even though there is no provision in the MOA for moving the house, it doesn't mean that there can't be a provision made for an outside source to move it; however, a resource other than the Project will have to fund it. It was made apparent that an amendment to the MOA will have to be initiated by a principal signatory.

The comment was raised that there are three portions of this Historic District and that the portion that is actually being nominated for the NRHP is on the west side of the project which includes the "Swartz Farmstead" and consists of the farm house, barn, and other outbuildings. The eastern side will no longer be considered historic once the alignment is constructed, so there will not be further measures to protect this area within the HPPs.

Mr. Sekula clarified that there will be a preservation easement put on this property because the above language "Preservation Easements – Recommendations for easements if approval received from the property owners for the donation" suggests that it is only a recommendation when the MOA states that it will be done, without stipulating donation from the owners.

There was various other discussion and concern displayed from the IHPAT members in relation to the larger amount of funds provided for the eastern Kentucky side of the project as compared to the amount provided for the eastern Indiana side.

Smith Farm, within the Swartz Farm Rural Historic District

Objectives/Goals

- Mitigate the impact of the Project upon the Swartz Farm, its associated buildings, and the rural farmland context. (The Smith Farm is not directly affected by the Project but was included as part of the mitigation for the Swartz Farm.)
- Retain and preserve the historic and architectural significance of the property.
- To develop guidelines for preservation, demolition, and the moving of buildings.
- Develop a thematic context study for agriculture in Clark County, Indiana, including the Smith Farm as part of the Swartz Farm Rural Historic District.
- Successfully produce a National Register nomination for the Smith Farm.
- Create a master plan for the property with the main goal being preservation and continued use. The master plan should identify uses for the property that are both appropriate for the historic resources present and viable in the long-term given the development occurring in the area.

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.

Land Use – Provide recommendations for possible area land uses taking into consideration the implications of the Project and the significance of the Smith Farm as a historic resource. Provide background materials, analysis, goals, objectives, policy statements, and action steps appropriate for incorporation into the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

Zoning – Make recommendations for revisions as necessary to the current Clark County zoning ordinances taking into account the recommended land use and preservation objectives. Identify and provide examples of zoning districts, standards, and/or procedures appropriate to the goals of the HPP.

Historic Landscape – Provide measures to minimize the visual impact of the Project and protect the historic landscape.

Infrastructure – Recommendations to mitigate adverse effects to the property appropriate to its character and intended long-term use.

Noise Mitigation – Consultants report including suggested policy and procedures to achieve noise mitigation where it affects historic properties, specifically to identified significant architectural features.

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

Preservation Easements – Recommendations for easements if approval received from the property owners.

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

No-Work Zones – Define areas for the property/district, include maps and justification.

National Register Nomination – Complete nomination for the Smith Farm, including photographs.

Mr. Sekula reported that the stabilization of the house is moving forward and that they hope to have it under cover this summer. He also stated that since the property is eligible for nomination, the objectives for this property don't reflect the MOA's obligation in Section III Site Specific Mitigation I. 9 c. "Prior to the sale or donation of the property, INDOT shall fund the exterior rehabilitation of the structure to a level consistent with the Secretary of Standards."

Consultant Selection Qualifications: David Kroll, Director of Preservation

In conjunction with the draft scopes of work for the four historic properties, 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 IHPAT members. The identified disciplines are listed below and their significance represents the consensus of the IHPAT for each specific historic property. (A list of HPP Qualifications with definitions for each was mailed out with the agenda prior to this meeting.)

Old Jeffersonville Historic District

Archaeologist (prehistoric and historic) – primary

Architectural Historian – primary

Conservationist – not required, other disciplines will cover this area

Cultural Anthropologist – secondary

Curator – not required, if artifacts are discovered INDOT will curate them

Engineer – secondary, this person will be a support role in the HPP process
 Folklorist – not necessary
 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
 Market Analyst/Economist (additional discipline added by the Advisory Team) – secondary

Swartz Farm Rural Historic District

Archaeologist (prehistoric and historic) – primary
 Architectural Historian – primary
 Conservationist – not required, other disciplines will cover this area
 Cultural Anthropologist – secondary
 Curator – not required, if artifacts are discovered INDOT will curate them
 Engineer – secondary, this person will be a support role in the HPP process
 Folklorist – secondary, an agricultural history component is important
 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, community planner due to development pressures

James A. Smith Rural Historic Farmstead

Archaeologist (prehistoric and historic) – primary
 Architectural Historian – primary
 Conservationist – secondary
 Cultural Anthropologist – secondary
 Curator – secondary, INDOT will accommodate curation of Project-related items
 Engineer – secondary, this person will be a support role in the HPP process
 Folklorist – secondary
 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 – secondary

Township of Utica Historic Lime Industry

Archaeologist (prehistoric and historic) – primary
 Architectural Historian – primary
 Conservationist – secondary
 Cultural Anthropologist – secondary
 Curator – secondary
 Engineer – secondary, this person will be a support role in the HPP process
 Folklorist – primary
 Geography/GIS Mapping – secondary
 Graphic Designer – secondary
 Historic Architect – primary
 Historic Landscape Architect – primary, site design capabilities are needed

Historic Preservation Planner – primary
Historic Preservationist – primary
Historian – primary
Urban Planner – secondary

Closing Comments: John Carr, IN SHPO Staff

Mr. Carr asked if there were any additional comments or concerns before adjournment of the meeting. A list of meeting dates through October was disseminated with the next meeting being June 16th at 10:00 am (which has since been canceled) and the other upcoming meeting dates as follows: July 14, August 25, September 15, and October 27. All of the meetings will be held at Kye's. The Co-chairs will be discussing and considering the comments, questions, and suggestions that were raised at this meeting. They will pass them to the BSHCT who will take the comments under advisement. Ultimately, the BSMT will make the final decisions. Ms. Crowe thanked everyone for their participation.

**Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – May 19, 2004
TEAM ATTENDEES**

Co-Chairs: Mary Crowe – Indiana Department of Transportation and
John Carr – Indiana Department of Natural Resources, SHPO Staff

City of Jeffersonville: Chris Padgett

Clark County Historian: Jeanne Burke

Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana: Greg Sekula and Laura Renwick

Jeffersonville Main Street, Inc.: Jay Ellis

Rose Hill Neighborhood Association: Henry Sanders and Joe Rafferty

CTS – GEC:

Jeff Vlach
Chad Costa
Christa Turner
Kerri Cokeley
David Kroll
Jeff Bergman
Dawn Hein
Mike Striker
Charles Raymer