

Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – April 25, 2006
SUMMARY

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 on Step 3 of the bridge type selection process.

Mr. Vlach informed those in attendance that the meeting summary for the IHPAT of December 7, 2006 was sent to all members and is also available on the Project website (www.kyinbridges.com). The summary for the IHPAT of February 15, 2006 is to be finalized and made available via the same avenues.

Project Update: Mrs. Mary Kennedy and Mr. John Carr, Co-chairs

Mrs. Kennedy advised the IHPAT that INDOT is anticipating interviewing individuals for the Ombudsmen position in the next couple of weeks. Also, INDOT is exploring different options to initiate preparation of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Nomination Forms for the Indiana properties designated in the MOA.

Mr. Greg Sekula asked if contact has been made with the property owners to initiate the NRHP nomination process. Mrs. Kennedy remarked that initiation of this coordination is in its early stages, but did recognize the sensitivity of certain properties, such as the Colgate-Palmolive Historic District given its present situation. Mrs. Kennedy also noted that the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) calls for some level of documentation regardless of whether the property owner(s) consent to its listing. It was noted that for those properties in which there is no consent from the property owner(s) INDOT would need to coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to determine the appropriate level of documentation. It was recommended that the NRHP be completed and not formally submitted to the SHPO. Mr. Sekula urged that the incentives in having a property listed on the NRHP be conveyed to the property owners. Specifically, it was indicated that from a marketing standpoint the listing of the Colgate-Palmolive Historic District could provide access to tax credits for buyers desiring to rehabilitate the buildings.

Mr. Sekula added that a state historic marker was recently unveiled providing information on the reformatory aspects of the Colgate-Palmolive Historic District. It was noted that a significant amount of base information may be available that would assist in the preparation of the NRHP nomination forms. Dr. Carl Kramer added that he is willing to provide access, barring any infringement on copyrights with Indiana University Press, to the manuscripts for his publication on the history of Clark County. These manuscripts contain information on general topics of Clark County's history, as well as specific properties. Also, Dr. Kramer indicated that he had prepared a NRHP nomination form for the American Car and Foundry Company property (Ohio Falls Car and Locomotive Historic District). This form, which was prepared over 25 years ago, was provided to Pat Hayne but was never submitted. This information is also available to those individuals preparing the NRHP nomination form for this district. Additionally, Dr. Kramer noted that he has material on the lime cement industry.

Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) Status Update: Mr. Tom Gallagher, Ratio/CTS-GEC and Chad Costa, CTS-GEC

Mr. Gallagher provided an update on the status of the HPPs to be prepared for the Indiana properties: Old Jeffersonville Historic District, Swartz Farm Rural Historic District, the Utica Lime Kiln Industry and the James Smith Farm.

Old Jeffersonville Historic District

Mr. Gallagher advised those in attendance that advancement of the Old Jeffersonville Historic District HPP is presently on schedule. A draft outline is anticipated to be submitted to the Bi-State Historic Consultation Team (BSHCT) in May 2006 and the IHPAT in June 2006. A draft HPP is currently anticipated in July 2006. The draft summary for the kickoff meeting, which was held on March 14, 2006, was disseminated to the IHPAT. It was noted that should no comments be received by the close of the comment period to be set at the conclusion of the meeting, the summary would be finalized. Copies of the final summary will be furnished to the IHPAT and those individuals that signed in at the kickoff meeting.

Swartz Farm Rural Historic District

Mr. Gallagher remarked that the HPP for the Swartz Farm Rural Historic District is also on schedule for a submittal of the draft HPP outline to the BSHCT in May 2006 and the IHPAT in June 2006. A draft HPP is currently anticipated in July 2006.

Utica Lime Kiln Industry

Mr. Gallagher indicated that the first submittal of the draft HPP outline for the Utica Lime Kiln Industry to the BSHCT is expected to occur in July 2006. The draft HPP would follow in September 2006. Mr. Costa announced that a tentative date for the HPP kickoff meeting was set for May 24, 2006. The format of this meeting is expected to consist of a site visit to each of the lime kilns, with appropriate property owner permission, followed by a work session possibly at the Utica Town Hall. Additional details are to be provided as they are firmed and/or approved.

(Subsequent to the meeting, the HPP kickoff meeting was cancelled on May 23, 2006 due to difficulties in obtaining property owner permission in accessing the kiln sites.)

James Smith Farm

Mr. Gallagher advised that should the property be donated, the HPP schedule would be comparable to the HPP to be prepared for the Utica Lime Kiln Industry. Mr. Costa added that coordination among CTS-GEC, INDOT and the IN SHPO occurred over the past month, and it was agreed that a decision about donating the historic property will be needed soon from the owners of the property, Dr. Blanche Woolls and Dr. Arthur Sutton. The options in conveying this message to the property owners were carefully weighed, and it was decided that a final letter should be drafted establishing a deadline for a decision. The letter was sent, via certified mail, to Dr. Woolls and Dr. Sutton on April 5, 2006 requesting a decision by June 14, 2006 on whether or not the approximate 8.2 acres comprising the NRHP-eligible James Smith Farm would be donated to the INDOT. Additionally, the letter indicated that should no response be received by June 14, 2006, it will be considered as a decision not to donate the NRHP-eligible portion of the property. Mr. Sekula requested that copies of the April 5, 2006 letter be furnished to the IHPAT. With concurrence from the Co-chairs, Mr. Costa indicated that copies of the letter would be supplied.

Mr. Kramer noted that there was a prominent 19th century journalist named Woolls who owned a number of newspapers. Mr. Kramer inquired as to whether there was any historical connection between Dr. Woolls and this journalist. Mr. Sekula remarked that Dr. Woolls is a descendant of the Smith family and is only associated to the Woolls family by marriage.

(Subsequent to the meeting, the April 5, 2006 letter to Dr. Woolls and Dr. Sutton was provided to the IHPAT on April 26, 2006, via e-mail.)

Bridge Type Selection Process – Step 3: Mr. J.B. Williams, SDC 2 and 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 Oversight 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 IHPAT 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. Kramer commented that he originally had thought a cable-stayed bridge would be incompatible with the Kennedy Bridge. However, Mr. Kramer noted that after seeing the renderings, he was impressed at the unobtrusiveness of the cable-stayed bridge and that it seems to have the least impact on the parks and shores. Mr. Williams indicated that there has been general support for the Single Tower Cable-Stayed Bridge.

Mr. Carr (Co-chair) inquired as to whether each alternative was equivalent in terms of safety. Specifically, the inquiry was regarding the ability of each to withstand a natural disaster, such as an earthquake. Mr. Williams acknowledged that each alternative would be designed to the same standards.

Mr. Joe Rafferty expressed concern over the possibility of the Executive Oversight Committee dismissing the final three alternatives. Mr. Paul Boone, INDOT Project Manager, remarked that the Committee, which is still being formed, would not likely go against the recommendations of the public. Also, Mr. Boone noted that all of the alternatives developed by SDC 2 and SDC 5 are within the budgetary constraints of the Project.

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.

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 IHPAT 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. A list of potential speakers consisting of approximately 17-20 individuals was recently approved by the Bi-State Management Team (BSMT). 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.

Final Comments: Mr. Vlach, CTS-GEC

Mr. Vlach brought to the attention of the IHPAT members in attendance discussions occurring at the Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team (KHPAT) regarding possible changes to the format of the KHPAT meetings. Various members of the KHPAT have requested a format structured as a work session rather than a presentation/discussion of topics. The discussion on modifications to the format is to continue at the KHPAT of April 27, 2006. However, Mr. Vlach noted that the actual change in format would be left to the discretion of the Kentucky Co-chairs. The need for a format change in the IHPAT meetings was discussed with the Indiana Co-chairs (prior to the meeting). It was noted that the consensus of the Co-chairs was that the current format as it relates to state of the Project in Indiana is acceptable. However, the discussion was opened for ideas/comments from the IHPAT members. Mr. Carr reaffirmed the position of the Co-chairs, but encouraged the members to

provide input as to any suggested changes to the format of the meetings. It was remarked by Mr. Sekula that once development of the HPPs are in similar positions as in Kentucky, discussions of modifications to the meeting format might be necessary. Mr. Sekula noted his disappointment in the sparse attendance of the IHPAT. The sentiment was acknowledged by Mr. Carr and Mr. Vlach and followed by an inquiry as to the acceptability of the logistics of the meeting. Further, it was asked of the IHPAT whether, if necessary, the appropriate time could be set aside for a half day meeting (10:00 AM – 2:00 PM). Mr. Sekula indicated that given his profession in a non-profit organization he could allot the appropriate time if sufficient notice is provided, but noted this may be difficult for other members in different lines of work. Mr. Vlach recommended that the format remain as is for the foreseeable future, subject to re-consideration as advancements in the Project are made.

As the Co-chairs had no additional comments or concerns, an opportunity for the remaining IHPAT members to comment or express concerns was afforded.

Any comments for consideration by the Co-chairs should be made in writing by the close of business on May 10, 2006. Mr. Vlach indicated that next IHPAT meeting would be held on June 21, 2006 in the Community Room of the McCauley Nicolas Building. IHPAT 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
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – April 25, 2006
TEAM ATTENDEES**

INDOT: Paul Boone
Mary Kennedy (Co-chair)

IN SHPO: John Carr (Co-chair)

Jeffersonville Main Street Assoc.: Jay Ellis

Clark County Commissioners: Carl Kramer

Rose Hill Neighborhood Assoc.: Joe Rafferty

Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana: Greg Sekula

CTS – GEC: Jim Hilton
Jeff Vlach
Chad Costa
Christa Turner
Tom Gallagher

SDC 2: JB Williams

SDC 5: John Carr