

**Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – August 2, 2007
TARC**

Opening Remarks: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

Mr. Vlach opened the meeting and thanked everyone for attending. Agendas were disseminated to the attendees. The members in attendance were asked to identify themselves and their affiliation.

Mr. Vlach turned to the Co-chairs, Ms. Amanda Abner, KYTC and Donna Neary KY-SHPO. Ms. Abner noted she was sitting in as the alternate for Ms. Roach.

The meeting was turned over to the members of SDC 5 who began the first round of a three workshop session with discussions of architectural design details of the East End Bridge.

East End Bridge Design: Steve Slade, Miguel Rosales; SDC 5

Mr. Steve Slade, SDC 5 Project Manager, and Mr. Miguel Rosales presented three aesthetic themes for consideration by the KHPAT. The KHPAT was requested to provide input on how each theme fit into the historic context of the area. The KHPAT was also given comment forms so they could take the information back to their respective groups and review. Mr. Ted Grossardt facilitated the discussion. The following summarizes the comments received by the KHPAT members and SDC 5 responses.

Overall, the KHPAT agreed to not give support to Theme 1. Themes 2 and 3 are preferred.

You have done a great job. Really like the cantilevered look. Theme 1 is bold and rigid. Themes 2 and 3 fit the context better. Theme 2 and its angular shape is the favorite.

Theme 2 makes you think of the water tower and other historic references in the area. Themes 2 and 3 are preferred.

Is the deck lower in Theme 2? (in the bridge plan and profile document pages 2, 3, 4). *The decks are the same. It is the treatment of the tower that makes the tower appear more slender in Theme 2.*

Theme 2 is the cleanest.

There was a lot of thought put into the themes. The elements of Theme 3 present a softer appearance – top of tower, pier shape and fewer details at the bottom. Theme 1 was much more harsh than Theme 3.

Theme 3 and its lighting will give a nice interaction with the cables. This meets the Secretary's guidance for light playfulness.

With the roadway sloped away from the median, you will not need any barrier to keep the water from the deck openings? *There will be a median barrier for safety.*

What about the aesthetic lighting? *We have only worked on the roadway lighting at this point – there will also likely be additional lighting for the walkway. The aesthetic lighting will be discussed in one of our other workshops.*

Why are there footers in the river? *There was a major cost difference between putting the tower all the way down vs. having an island pier. It was a cost issue with respect to the budget established for the bridge.*

Below the island, does the tower go all the way down to the bottom? *No, there will be foundation piers under the island.*

What are the dimensions of the island pier? *It looks as wide as the bridge itself. About 112' by 160' shaped as an ellipse. We can discuss treatment for the island such as texture.*

Has the BSMT signed off on the open railing? *Yes, they have seen the themes and we have discussed this throughout. We will also seek input from the KYTC District 5 maintenance for things like the lights and other items that affect their maintenance of the bridge.*

For the walkway drainage, that is coming towards the road? *It will be a 1.5% slope toward the roadway barrier. It will be very subtle on the walkway.*

For emergencies, will there be access to turn around by the towers? *No, there will be a barrier at the tower.*

If there is an incident on one side, the road will be blocked? *There is a shoulder inside and out for both directions. There will also be option to climb over to the walkway from the southbound side.*

For the cyclists, is this barrier high enough? *Yes, it follows the guidelines for 54 inches in height. FHWA has regulations for access control to the interstate – they may require more stringent restriction between the walkway and the road.*

For the additional walkway lighting, what are you thinking about? *Poles would probably make the walkway too busy, so something low along the walkway may be better. We will be working on this.*

The biggest concern is the footers on the towers. They are pretty massive. What about navigation? *These islands are not within the navigation channel. The Coast Guard will determine the lighting requirements for this, if any.*

What about people pulling up to picnic? *The islands will only be under water during high water, which produces fast currents and recreational boaters will not likely be on the river. The commercial pilots are professionals that will have knowledge and necessary equipment to stay within the navigation channel.*

What controls the size of the islands? *The loads of the tower.*

Historically this area is developed because of the river. The commercial pilots are professional and don't need lights. *The Coast Guard will define the navigational lighting.*

The recreational traffic will be endangered by the islands. What is the cost difference between doing the islands and not? *We will be glad to provide this information but do not have the specifics here today.* The islands are an intrusion on the context of the landscape and do not fit within the historic context. There is no precedent for this type of treatment along the river.

It would be a bad idea to try and make the bridge look old. The themes are appropriate for the area.

What is the size of the island? *160' by 112' in an elliptical shape.*

Will any of the island be visible from the pedestrian walkway? *No.*

As far as the lighting design, if there were more light poles could the wattage be lower? It would be best to minimize the ambient light. *That is one reason the poles were placed in the median. The height of the lights can be changed to control this. We will be modeling the light and night scenarios to show in a future workshop. The light spacing shown today is symmetrical along the bridge. The lamps will be designed to direct the roadway lighting down to the pavement.*

What is the clearance under the bridge? *71' is specified by the Coast Guard.*

The leaders of the recreational boating community should be contacted about the islands. *They could be invited to the AAT workshop coming up. This should be recommended to the BSMT and a decision will come from them. We will also try and meet to get input from them directly.*

A lot more work needs to be done on the lighting and the light pollution in the area. *We concur.*

How does the elevation relate to Section 4? What is the height? Has the height changed? *The bridge slopes from 90' at the top of the deck to about 70' at Section 4. The profile has not changed since the NEPA document. We will be doing some views from Transylvania Beach Road when we discuss the approaches to the bridge.*

How do you access the walkway on the Kentucky side between the bridge and the tunnel? *In the Country Estates plan, the walkway is to come down to River Road. On the Indiana side, it will connect at Old Salem Road.*

Who will be developing this? *Section 6 team will be handling the Indiana touchdown of the walkway, and Section 4 will be handling the Kentucky touchdown.*

It will not be as important to consider the texture and appearance of the pier islands as Indiana suggested.

Could you provide some additional views of the island piers? *Yes. We will have additional views for the next workshop.*

River Fields says the island is something new, it creates an intrusion in the river, it adds an industrial look, it reminds them of the Philadelphia waterfront. *The islands were included in the last three finalist bridge types and shown in the physical models and renderings.*

Could you provide the square footage and difference in cost for the islands? *Yes. We will provide this information in the next workshop.*

What about when the water fluctuates? What happens to the island then? If these pictures are not at normal pool, then we need to see them and renderings of different water levels. *We can provide renderings of the island at normal pool and other levels.*

Downtown Bridge Design: JB Williams, Skip Smallridge; SDC 2

Mr. J.B. Williams, SDC 2 Project Manager, and Mr. Skip Smallridge presented various aesthetic concepts, listed below, for consideration by the KHPAT. The KHPAT was requested to provide input on how the elements discussed fit into the historic context of the area. Mr. Ted Grossardt facilitated the discussion.

Overview of Subjects Discussed:

1. Bridge Approach
2. Approach Piers
3. Pier Caps
4. Tower Shapes
5. Tower Tops

Bridge Approaches: 3 Basic Alternatives

Steel Girder – 8 ft deep (7' web actual)

Concrete Girder – 12 ft deep (9'-3" actual)

Steel Box Beam – 8 ft deep (7' web actual)

Overall Preferences

- A flat bottom with smooth surface underneath is appealing
- Not monolithic, however
- Consistency is important
- Components need to work together
- Bridge designers should work with Section 1 and integrate their bridge design with the Section 1 components (both approach and bridge)

PREFERENCES:

Box Girder design in keeping with the elements decided by Section 1 for bridge approach and piers

Approach Piers/Pier CapsDesign and Historic Preferences

- Looks better without the middle column (preferred 2 columns to 3 on approach piers)
- Would like to see integrated pier caps
- Would like to see elliptical piers similar to Section 1 "Egyptian-style" piers

PREFERENCES:

Follow the design vocabulary of the Section 1 piers

Tower Forms: 3 Basic Alternatives

Plain

Some Architectural Elements

Heavy Architectural Focus

Design and Historic Preferences

- Stay close to the original Three Tower Cable-Stayed design that was chosen during the Bridge Type Selection Process
- Where the cables touch the tower is important; One end of the cable should inform the other end
- Consistency with Section 1 structure; use similar language - perhaps use oval towers to match the piers?
- Would like to see the motifs carried from one pier type to the other
- Lighting is okay on tops

PREFERENCES:

Same vocabulary as Section 1; simplicity and continuity are key elements

FEEDBACK FOR NEXT ROUND OF WORKSHOPS:

Fewer pieces; more refined next time

Written Comments Received During Comment Period:

The comments noted below are comments that have not previously been stated earlier in the KHPAT summary.

A joint HPAT meeting should be held for all discussions about the two river crossings.

Additional information of the foundation costs of the bridges

Final Comments: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

Mr. Vlach noted any comments for consideration by the Co-chairs should be made in writing by the close of business on June 29, 2007. All written comments should be sent to CTS-GEC, 305 N. Hurstbourne Ln. Ste. 100, Louisville, KY 40222.

**Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – August 2, 2007
TEAM ATTENDEES**

Co-chairs: Amanda Abner – Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Donna Neary – KY-SHPO

City of Prospect: Ann Simms, Sandra Leonard

Louisville Metro Planning and Design: Mohammad Nouri, Aida Copic

Louisville Metro Historic Preservation: Richard Jett

Phoenix Hill Neighborhood Association: Steve Kersey, Doug Magee

River Fields, Inc.: Leslie Barras, Meme Runyon

National Trust for Historic Preservation: Betsy Merritt (on telephone)

CTS – GEC: Jeff Vlach
Christa Turner
Chad Costa
Jim Hilton
Wisam Raies

SDC 2: JB Williams
Skip Smallridge
Patrick Osborne

SDC 5: Steve Slade
Miguel Rosales
John Carr
Gary Elder
Samantha Wright
Ruchu Hsu
Ernest Fernandez

Audience: Jadie Tomlinson
Matt Bullock
George Jones
Gordon Glass
Kristen Leggett

Ombudsman: Lee Douglas Walker

