

**Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – March 9, 2004
SUMMARY**

Opening Remarks: Charles Raymer, CTS-GEC Deputy Project Manager

Mr. Raymer opened the meeting by noting that information for discussion would be handed out during the session and by asking everyone to sign in and check their contact information on the member list. He apologized for the late distribution of the agenda and explained that we have been resolving the absence of Indiana Co-chair Mike Hazeltine and that it has been confirmed that Mary Crowe, Architectural Historian of INDOT, is his replacement. Mr. Raymer also noted that CTS-GEC is continuing to resolve overall contract issues to get the Project moving forward and that the sub-consultants are continuing work with caution. He went over the agenda and stated that the draft Charter was requested by the Co-chairs to layout how the Advisory Teams were envisioned to function and operate. The Co-chairs were introduced for their opening comments.

Bill Gulick, KYTC Project Manager and KHPAT Co-chair

Mr. Gulick commented that the previous meeting summary indicated that we would be looking at some scope plans today, which are not on the agenda for this meeting. He stated that when this meeting was being planned the Co-chairs felt it necessary to pause to contend with team procedures, a charter, and actual goals for this group as we had to slow down for clearing up the contract issues. Mr. Gulick emphasized that we need to give this charter and team procedures some good thought and he appreciated any comments so we can get a working model in place.

David Morgan, Kentucky Heritage Council

Mr. Morgan added that the Charter is very preliminary and that the draft is a basic discussion piece with room for improvement and additions. He asked everyone to feel free to speak up during this discussion and that all thoughts, ideas, and comments were welcome. Etiquette to hone.

Charter / Team procedures:

Overview of MOA: Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

Mr. Vlach passed out packets including pages 1-12 and page 39 of the MOA for overview. He explained that since we are in the initial phases of the Project we will be reviewing the first 2 of the 14 stipulations that cover Project Coordination and Project Development which will be guiding us through the historic preservation process of the Project. Also, included in the packet was the signature page that confirmed the Section 106 regulations were satisfied. Mr. Vlach then discussed the highlights of each page in the packet.

Mr. Nouri, of Louisville Metro Government, clarified that the role of the Advisory Teams is to review and comment on presented materials and to make recommendations to the Co-chairs in each state. The Co-chairs will address those comments and return them to the Bi-State Historic Consultation Team, which will review Project recommendations for the Bi-State Management Team who has the final decision in Project design details.

Draft Charter: Kerri Cokeley, CTS-GEC

Ms. Cokeley read through the draft Charter and received the following comments and replies from Advisory Team members and the CTS-GEC team:

What is the objective of the Charter and the process for how we are going to work together? Mr. Raymer explained the objective of the charter is to organize the structure of the Advisory Teams into guiding principals for the operation of business and that the working process will continue to be defined as we move forward through the historic preservation process.

What is the established recourse or criteria for including additional Advisory Team members, of both neighborhood groups and government agencies, to avoid unseen motives? It was determined that there is no specific procedure for basing the decision for inclusion in the team, but all requests will be considered and the Co-chairs will provide an explanation to the Advisory Team for all decisions. Mr. Segrest added that Butchertown Neighborhood Association feels that as more groups become involved in the Advisory Team their ability to participate is reduced. Mr. Gulick confirmed that the only additional request for inclusion in this Advisory Team at this point was from Clifton Community Council. Mr. Morgan stated that he believes if more Advisory Team members are added, it would not diminish the role of any member because each historic preservation plan would be treated individually. On behalf of Metro Government, Mr. Nouri made it clear that they only accommodate requests of groups asking to be included in the Advisory Teams, not solicit them for participation and that the Mayor has a very keen interest in protecting and preserving all of Louisville's neighborhoods.

Of the meeting attendees, who are the Advisory Team members and who are members of the general public? At this time it was reiterated that only Advisory Team members have the opportunity to openly speak at the meetings and it was requested by the Co-chairs that CTS-GEC provide a mechanism of identification (be it seating arrangements, name tags, or another form of identification) so the Advisory Team members are clearly recognizable.

It was requested that a "reporting back mechanism" be established so the Advisory Team will be kept abreast of the decisions that were made pertaining to their recommendations.

It was suggested that the term "Privileges of Team Members" be changed to "Responsibilities of Team Members."

It was requested that members of the general public have the right to be added to the mailing list to receive notices of meetings and meeting summaries. Mr. Raymer

confirmed that this request has been made before and that CTS is awaiting guidance from INDOT about publication of mailing lists.

It was suggested that the role of the Ombudsmen within the Advisory Team be outlined in the Charter.

The comment was made regarding the “Purpose of the HPATs” section of the Charter that the term “reviewing and commenting on project details” replaces the term “developing project design details” and that the semantics are quite different.

Finally, it was discussed that the Charter is in no way meant to override the MOA and where there might be disparity, the MOA will take precedent. The draft Charter will be refined based on the Advisory Team members’ oral and written comments and will be presented again at the next meeting.

Components of the Historic Preservation Plans:

The Historic Preservation Plan: David Kroll, Director of Preservation at Ratio Architects

Objective/Goals

Historic Area Delineation

Background – History and justification for boundaries

Area Boundary – Maps indicating the proposed boundary

Architectural and Historic Significance

History

Architectural Significance

Archaeological Integrity

Photographs

Physical Description of Resources

Existing Conditions

Land Use

Zoning

Assets & Liabilities Map

Building Conditions

Infrastructure

Preservation Objectives

Recommendations

Land Use

Zoning

Building Renovation/Rehabilitation

Infrastructure

Noise Mitigation

Streetscape/Interpretive signage

Architectural and Design Standards**Historic Archaeology****Demolition/Moving Guidelines****Implementation Procedures**

Agencies

Procedures

Funding Opportunities

A question was raised about the bidding and selection process of consultants for the Historic Preservation Plans (HPPs). It was established that the first step in this process is to define the work to be accomplished so we can select the best consultants for each specific district when the time comes. Currently, we are taking advantage of CTS-GEC team members to develop these scopes because they were included in the GEC team due to their expertise in this area. The consultants that are working on the scopes of work now will not be inherently included or excluded from being selected to prepare the HPPs because of their involvement in the GEC team. Finally, it was stated that there will not be a bidding process for the selection of consultants, but rather a qualification-based selection that will be determined after the completion of the scopes of work.

The comment was made that under "Objectives and Goals" in the presentation, there is no mention about the information that is gathered in the National Register nominations and no reference to historic preservation.

Historic Preservation Plan Process: Jeffrey Bergman, Urban Planner at Ratio Architects

Process:**I. Finalize content of each HPP for both IN & KY**

Present proposed content for HPP's to advisory teams

Revise per recommendations

Approval from advisory teams

II. Meet with each neighborhood/preservation group or owner (IN & KY)**III. Research each district or property**

History / significance

Photographs / survey

Determine Preservation issues

Determine Planning issues

IV. Meet with Planning Commissions & local governments**V. Work with Cultural Landscape and Noise Abatement consultants****VI. Create Recommendations – Draft of HPP's**

- VII. Present to each neighborhood/preservation group or owner**
- VIII. Present Draft to Advisory Counsel & SHPO's**
- IX. Revise per Recommendations as necessary**
- X. Approval from Advisory Counsel & SHPO's**
- XI. Produce National Register nomination**
- XII. Produce Public literature**
- XIII. Produce HPP's**
- XIV. Present Public Workshops**
- XV. Present to city/county governments and the Kentuckiana Regional Planning & Development Agency (KIPDA)**

Mr. Bergman was asked to explain in further detail the process for profiling significance and area conditions and trends. The MOA goes into great depth about what areas of historic archeological significance are and what those specific properties are. However, it also outlines that part of the HPP process is to have an independent point of view on those items and to identify other things that are significant. The intent of the profiling is to go beyond a review of existing historic nomination literature and perform an actual analysis and independent study of land use patterns in the neighborhoods and infrastructure to better understand the overall historic significance and of specific properties. It was stressed that this process will be different for each neighborhood. Furthermore, it was noted that pages 7 and 8 of the MOA cover this topic. It was stated that the basis of these plans is historic preservation, and that needs to be emphasized.

Mrs. Sweets Runyon, of River Fields, read from the MOA, "The HPPs will provide a context to inform the implementation of specific mitigation measures..." She made the comment that the presentation doesn't describe the steps needed to feed into additional mitigation, but it appears that it describes a neighborhood plan. Also, she recommended moving the reference to "Produce National Register Nominations" from Step 7 of the presentation to an earlier step so that this data will be included in the information gathering stage. She requested detailed information about how the historic significance will be developed and how it will impact the Project, not just the future development of each Historic District. It was discussed that the key component of the HPPs is mitigation in the Project and the purpose of the HPPs is to make them available to the design consultant so they have the guidelines and information needed to prepare the plans.

The following statement from page 8 of the MOA was brought to attention, "Additional avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures identified in the HPPs which may not have been specified in the MOA, but are found by the Historic Preservation Teams to be reasonable to incorporate into the Project will be considered..." In light of this statement, it was pointed out that the presentation does not identify a process of incorporating any

additional measures into the HPPs that may be recommended by the Advisory Teams. There are two basic objectives of the HPPs, one is to provide information to the Project for development of the mitigation measures that have been identified and the second is to use each one as a mitigation tool itself so that it affects the long-term direction of development. Also, it was clarified that the HPPs will be completed prior to the preliminary field check inspections of the relevant sections of the Project. The designers will develop the overall draft scope of work based on these plans and will consult with the advisory teams for review before moving forward with the design.

It was asked if the HPPs will be developed to the Secretary of the Interior's standards. Mr. Morgan determined that those standards will be the minimum used in the design and that we hope to go beyond these requirements.

It was noted that the neighborhood associations are key to reaching the public.

Closing Comments: John Ballantyne, Federal Highway Administration - Kentucky

Mr. Ballantyne recapped that FHWA's role is to make sure the MOA is implemented and that the Co-chairs are driving this Advisory Team process. He stated that he wants a clear checkmark next to each element of the MOA as it has been fully completed. The HPPs will inform designers of the contexts they need in order to perform the mitigation and design of the Project. He said that the schedule has not yet been finalized. FHWA received a two month extension; there is adequate funding to employ the GEC and the design consultants. The states must allocate their portion of the funding to the Project as parts of this process have advanced to a point where design can start. Mr. Ballantyne thinks that we are off to a good start and he thanked the Co-chairs for that.

Charles Raymer, CTS-GEC Deputy Project Manager

At the next meeting, CTS-GEC will present more specific details for each HPP and will present a draft scope of work for review. In the meantime, Ratio Architects of the CTS-GEC team will review the comments from this meeting and meet with the individual groups concerning the specific HPPs for input on the customization of the scopes of work for each specific HPP.

June 17th was discussed as the next KHPAT meeting (since this time, May 20th has been confirmed as the next meeting). It was determined that this will most likely be an all day meeting.

Jeff Vlach will be taking over the responsibility of the Historic Preservation Advisory Teams effective March 11, 2004 and will be working with both the Advisory Teams during this process.

**Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – March 9, 2004
TEAM ATTENDEES**

FHWA: John Ballantyne

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

Kentucky SHPO: Craig Potts

Butchertown Neighborhood Assoc., Inc.: Jim Segrest and William Friedlander

Louisville Metro Planning and Design: Mohammad Nouri

Louisville Metro Historic Preservation: Joanne Weeter and Richard Jett

Phoenix Hill Association, Inc.: Steven Kersey

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

The National Trust for Historic Preservation: Mary Ruffin Hanbury

CTS – GEC:

Charles Raymer
Jeff Vlach
Christa Turner
Kerri Cokeley
David Kroll (Ratio Architects)
Jeff Bergman (Ratio Architects)
Michael Matts (Gray & Pape)
Mike Striker (ASC Group)
Richard Sutherland (American Consulting Engineers)
Sandy Stevens (Lochner Team)
Jerry Leslie (Lochner Team)

Other: Michael O'Leary, Clifton Community Council