

**Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – August 1, 2007
Preservation Station
SUMMARY**

Opening Remarks: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

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

Mr. Vlach turned to the Co-chairs, Mrs. Mary Kennedy and Mr. John Carr, for comments.

Mr. Carr and Mrs. Kennedy thanked Section Design Consultant (SDC) 2 and SDC 5 for taking time to present aesthetic issues pertaining to the historic context of the Project area. No other comments were offered by the Co-chairs.

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: Mr. Steve Slade and Mr. Miguel Rosales, SDC 5

Mr. Slade, SDC 5 Project Manager, and Mr. Rosales presented three aesthetic themes for consideration by the IHPAT. The IHPAT was requested to provide input on how each theme fit into the historic context of the area. Mr. Ted Grossardt facilitated the discussion. The following summarizes the comments received by the IHPAT members and SDC 5 responses.

IHPAT Comments/Questions	Team Response
Theme 1	
Could the roadway lighting fixture be more of an oval shape like the towers rather than the square?	Yes, that would be possible.
On the tower view, is there a function of the slot at the top of the tower?	No, it is just to improve the appearance of the tower top.
Will the flat top of the tower be a rest for birds?	It could be somewhat more than the other themes.
Theme 2	
Is the flare at the top of the anchor pier structural or aesthetic?	It is not completely necessary from the structural point of view.
What is the distance between the vertical posts on the pedestrian railing?	It is about 8.5 feet.
The top of the tower kind of looks like a missile, which is unattractive.	
The top does make the tower look taller, which is not necessarily better or worse.	
Having two sides to the tip of the tower, rather than 4, may look better.	

Theme 3	
Is Theme 3 based on curves?	Yes.
The curvilinear bridge is more suited to the East End context and historic context.	
Another member agreed that this is the most suited theme.	
The horizontal railing system is more suited to the context, rather than the vertical system.	
Is there a structural purpose for the notch that the cables come out of? Or could they come straight out of an oval tower?	They could come from an oval tower, but the tower would be larger in the other direction. The notch was designed to give some definition to the origin of the cables and to make the towers more slender.
What is the size of the tower at the top?	About 18' by 20'.

Downtown Bridge Design: Mr. J.B. Williams and Mr. Skip Smallridge, SDC 2

Mr. Williams, SDC 2 Project Manager, and Mr. Smallridge presented various aesthetic concepts, listed below, for consideration by the IHPAT. The IHPAT 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. Indiana Approach
2. Tower Shapes
3. Tops of Towers
4. Piers extending above deck (lighting or reflective surfaces)
5. Continuity Issues

Indiana Approaches: 3 Basic Alternatives

Steel Girder – 8' deep (7'web actual)

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

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

Overall Preferences

- Box Girder seems preferable as it would keep birds away; serious nesting problem in area bridges
- Screening?
- Boxing in (false ceiling or floor)?
- Would like to see an elegant look
- Finished appearance is important
- Need to be sure that the beams do not go down too low into the park (12' most likely too deep)
- Prefer the beam style that makes the least noise on the underside as cars pass over
- Clean underside is important
- Shallow beam depth better than deeper

Historic Preferences

- Finished look is more in keeping with the historic look of the area

- Would like to see mild architectural detail match with the historic structures in the environment
- Possibly a public art issue?
- Would like to see continuity of elements in both approaches and the bridge itself
- Color is key issue to help match historic character (***NOTE: Flagged as issue for Round 2 Workshop***)

PREFERENCES:

Beams should interfere with the park as little as possible and discourage nesting

Tower Forms: 3 Basic Alternatives

Plain

Some Architectural Elements

Heavy Architectural Focus

Design and Historic Preferences

- Heavy architectural forms are too much for the surrounding area – too busy
- Simplicity is nice
- Some architectural features are good
- Middle road between contrived and ultra simple
- Simple, leaning to architectural
- Don't want to see too many competing elements
- Purity of design could be lost with all the urban surroundings
- Having architecture towards the top of the tower is best; bottom area needs to be simpler in design
- An Art Deco look could be good for an historic environment
- Perhaps could mimic the 2nd Street Bridge
- Vertical elements are preferable to horizontal – more in keeping with urban, vertical surroundings

PREFERENCES:

The towers should have some architectural features, but they should be sparing and simple

Tops of Towers

Light Reflection

Design and Historic Preferences

- Like the idea of reflectivity
- Lights on the towers is okay

Pier Tops

Deck and Underside

Design and Historic Preferences

- Definite interest in carrying these forward
- Need to ensure that people cannot climb on them
- Nice echo of the Clark Memorial Bridge
- Public art option?
- Good to think of the gateway element; from one state to another

PREFERENCES:

Both tower and pier tops should have some architectural features, but should be sparing and simple

Continuity Issues

Should all piers retain the same look/structure?

Design vocabulary: should it be mix/match or identical?

Design and Historic Preferences

- Hiding joints is good
- Prefer an integrating look
- Consistent theme is okay providing it reflects the same architectural design throughout
- Carry through to Piers 8, 9 and 10
- Public art opportunity; maybe a mural?

PREFERENCES:

Carry simple architectural elements throughout all the piers, down to the approaches and into parks

FEEDBACK FOR NEXT ROUND OF WORKSHOPS:

- Refine number of images for the second round
- Integrate these images into a PowerPoint presentation
- Like the pictures on the table idea, as well; very collaborative and interactive; can use again

Subsequent to the meeting, additional comments were received from Mr. Carr on the design elements presented for the Downtown Bridge. The comments are attached to this summary.

Final Comments: Mr. Vlach, CTS-GEC

Mr. Vlach extended the opportunity for the Co-chairs to provide any final comments prior to adjournment. As the Co-chairs had no additional comments or concerns, an opportunity for the remaining IHPAT members to comment or express concerns was afforded. No additional comments were made by the IHPAT

Any comments for consideration by the Co-chairs should be made in writing by the close of business on August 16, 2007. Mr. Vlach indicated that the next IHPAT meeting would be held on August 15, 2007 in the Community Room of the McCauley Nicolas Centre. The agenda and materials were provided to the IHPAT members in attendance.

Written Comments Received During Comment Period:

The following comments were received by August 16, 2007.



Comments

Let Us Know What You Think!

Please leave the completed form with a Project Team member tonight or mail/fax to:

Rohena Miller
c/o Niche Marketing
815 W. Market Street
Suite 715
Louisville, KY 40202
Fax: 502.587.7243

The Downtown Bridge

Do you have any further recommendations for Historic Preservation issues that need to be addressed during the design process for the new Downtown Bridge?

As Skip Smallbridge pointed out, there is a fair amount of architectural diversity within the Old Jeffersonville Historic District, although, among the contributing buildings, the styles tend to be those that were popular in Indiana in the mid-19th - late 19th century and early 20th century.

By contrast, the three-tower cable-stayed type selected for the downtown bridge seems distinctly contemporary. Whether it ultimately leans more toward modernism or postmodernism may depend on the kinds and amount of detail. While, as one IHPAT member suggested, a steel box beam deck support system presents a cleaner, more finished image than would either steel girders or concrete I-beams, I think the steel box beam system also tends to push the overall bridge design in the direction of contemporary architecture. Given the difficulty of relating a contemporary bridge style to 19th & early 20th century architectural styles, there is probably a fair amount of leeway in the context-sensitivity of the design details, as long as the new bridge does not become so heavily ornamented as to become a distraction from, rather than an artistic addition to, the historic district.

Any other comments?

Some of the IHPAT members are leaning toward a mild Art Deco influence in the bridge detailing, citing the pylons of the 2nd Street/George Rogers Clark Memorial Louisville Municipal Bridge as a precedent. No one mentioned this, but that historic bridge actually does a few flocha outside the historic district. Little, if any, other Art Deco-influenced architecture exists within the district. That's probably OK, however, since the bridge is going to be of a

contemporary style in any case, and Art Deco does at least harken back to the 2nd quarter of the 20th century, and there is that 2nd St. Bridge precedent in the general vicinity.

I had thought previously - from an Indiana side perspective - that it would be better to build a more nearly "invisible" bridge ~~to~~ ^{at} ~~the~~ ^{the} East End. It's apparent, however, from the public input during the Bridge Type Selection Process and from the IHPAT members' comments at the 8/1/07 meeting, that the public has the opposite viewpoint. That being the case, I will defer to the wishes of those who will live or work in the shadows of those two bridges.

FOLD

John Carr
IHPAT - Co-Chair
8/2/07

(RETURN ADDRESS)

Ms. Rohena Miller
Niche Marketing
815 W. Market Street
Suite 715
Louisville, KY 40202

FOLD

**Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – August 1, 2007
TEAM ATTENDEES**

INDOT: Paul Boone
Mary Kennedy (Co-chair)

IN SHPO: John Carr (Co-chair)

Jeffersonville Preservation: Laura Renwick

Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana: Greg Sekula

City of Jeffersonville: Chester Hicks

Rose Hill Neighborhood Association: Joe Rafferty

Jeffersonville Main Street Association: Jay Ellis

CTS – GEC: Jim Hilton
Jeff Vlach
Chad Costa
Christa Turner
Jason Falls
Kristen Leggett
Sam Raies
Phil Banton

Indiana Ombudsman: Carl Percy

FHWA: George Jones

SDC 2: Steve Slade
John Carr
Gary Elder
Miguel Rosales
Samantha Wright
Ruchu Hsu
Steve Goodpaster

SDC 5: J.B. Williams
Rick Fitch
Skip Smallridge
Patrick Osborne
Aaron Stover
Gordon Glass

Kentucky Transportation Center: Ted Grossardt

Public: Leslie Barras (River Fields)