

**Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team/
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – July 18, 2006
Frazier International History Museum, Louisville, Kentucky**

Opening Remarks: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC

Mr. Vlach welcomed everyone to the dual HPAT meeting. A list of the IHPAT and KHPAT members in attendance is attached to this summary. Prior to formally opening the meeting, Mr. Vlach asked those in attendance to view the display boards and scale models of the proposed bridge types in the Downtown and East End, which were located in the adjoining rooms.

Following this initial period, Mr. Vlach again welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked those present to identify themselves and the entity they represented. Registration brochures had been made available to attendees for the Smart Growth Conference to be held in Louisville September 18 – 20, 2006.

Meeting Welcome: Mr. Bart Bryant, KYTC, Mr. David Morgan, KHC/KY SHPO and Mr. John Carr, IN SHPO Office

The Co-chairs opened the meeting. Both Mr. Bart Bryant and Mr. John Carr thanked the IHPAT and KHPAT members for joining together to participate in the joint review of the bridge types developed by Section Design Consultants (SDCs) 2 and 5 through the four - step bridge type selection process. Mr. David Morgan welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Bridge Type Selection Process (BTSP): Mr. JB Williams, SDC 2 and Mr. Dan Carrier, SDC 5

Downtown Bridge Section 2

Mr. JB Williams was introduced and he provided an overview of the three structure types advanced for the Downtown Bridge. The bridge types under consideration are a three span thru arch bridge, a single tower cable stayed bridge, and a three-tower cable stayed bridge.

Project Parameters

The Downtown Bridge will be adjacent to the Kennedy Bridge on the east side (up river). The Kennedy Bridge will be six lanes with shoulders carrying southbound traffic; the new bridge will be six lanes with shoulders and will carry the northbound traffic only.

East End Bridge Section 5

Mr. Dan Carrier was introduced and he provided an overview of the three structure types advanced for the East End Bridge. SDC 5 architect Miguel Rosales was introduced to give a more detailed explanation of the three recommended bridge alternatives. All three structures are variations of a cable stayed bridge type: a diamond tower cable stayed bridge, a median tower cable stayed (outside cables) bridge and a median tower cable stayed (center cables) bridge.

Project Parameters

The East End Bridge would connect Indiana SR 265 to KY 841. The bridge would be six lanes with shoulders and would carry northbound and southbound traffic; a pedestrian path would be located adjacent to the southbound lanes.

After the presentations of the bridge types, open discussion ensued. A summary of the comments and responses follows.

Questions/Comments	Responses
Section 2 (Downtown Bridge) Presentation	
How were impacts to historic properties or precedents considered? Did you consider historic impacts in any way in the Bridge Type Selection Process (BTSP)?	These specific impacts and details will be considered in the next phase. We are still in the “stick figure” phase of design. Presentations to HPATs were made throughout the BTSP process to discuss the guidelines, concepts and alternatives. The real work of the HPAT will come in the next phase of design. We are only at the 10-15% stage of design at this point. The Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is being addressed appropriately at this point.
Where does the creativity come into the process? It has not been considered to this point.	Opinion duly noted.
Can we make a determination of bridge type without analysis of impacts to historic districts? We have not even seen drafts of HPPs for Indiana yet.	There are certain things that are not set and some that are. Some pier locations are set by navigation and some are set by required engineering design parameters. Waterfront Park and Rose Hill have been considered in the pier type; other details are to be studied in the next phase.
Mr. Bryant’s description of the presentation indicates that all that the historic preservation analysis is simply a review by the HPAT. Is this all? What is the outcome of today’s meeting? Will we be voting today?	INDOT and KYTC are charged with certain requirements in the MOA – the HPATs are charged with providing recommendations to the BSHCT. That is what is being sought today. We are here to summarize and solicit comments and input from the HPAT teams.
What is the HPAT role in the BTSP? Will the HPAT be represented on the Executive Selection Committee? The MOA says that the HPAT should have input in the BTSP.	The HPATs will not be on the Executive Selection Committee. The role of the HPAT is advisory to make recommendations to the BSHCT. The information gathered from this group is taken as recommendations, not as decisions.
Do all of these bridges exist somewhere else?	We have not created a new bridge type, but we have added some originality to these three. The three-tower bridge is fairly unique, as is the three-arch span in succession.

Section 5 (East End Bridge) Presentation	
Will the HPAT be involved in helping to	The list of specific design items in the

define bridge(s) color and texture? Is this the first involvement of the HPAT?

presentation is not in any specific order. These are examples of things that will be considered in the next phase of design. The aesthetic lighting examples are just that – examples.

General Discussion

How will the HPATs be involved in the future?

From an engineering standpoint, it's hard to convey what the BTSP is about. We wanted it to be very public, so we did things, like renderings, to show ideas. These show details that may or may not be included in the final bridge type. We are at the beginning of the design process, the process that will determine the type of bridge to be advanced in the design. The detailed discussions are still to come.

The HPAT will be solicited for their input for color, texture, and many other aesthetic elements. These will be discussed further as the design progresses.

You cannot talk about design unless you talk about bridge type, so this process is in violation of the MOA. The role of the HPATs is to assess the impacts of the bridge types. We are at a disagreement in the MOA. What process are we going to follow?

The process is for the Co-chair to bring this issue to the BSHCT. This is the beginning of the process for the HPATs to provide important input to the SDCs.

How will the Executive Selection Committee make a decision?

The group will set its own criteria. They hopefully will take into consideration all of the information provided by the SDCs.

River Fields offered a resolution: River Fields, Phoenix Hill, Butchertown and the National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP) officially object to the BTSP process and move to table any further design activities until MOA stipulations are met (as outlined in the NTHP letter of July 10, 2006).

We will carry those comments forward. The next BSHCT is scheduled for August 1, 2006.

Three HPAT members "voted" for the resolution (not a majority of those in attendance); however, the concerns of the HPAT members will be noted and presented to the BSHCT for consideration.

We ought to be coming together, rather than creating divisions. We should sit down and have real consultation to address these issues – before it goes to Executive Committee. Creating a division does not help anyone in this process.

Opinion duly noted.

Additional studies must be done in order to move forward in this fashion.

Comment duly noted.

Is there a more specific time schedule than Summer or Fall for a selection of a bridge type?

We are not trying to force a decision, because it is such an important decision. The schedule set forth is a guideline.

Who is the Bridge Type Selection

This is still being assembled by both states at this

Committee? Who is making the decision?

time – both state agencies are deciding this. It would probably consist of 14 - 16 members at this time. This will be announced as soon as it is finalized.

The graphics and renderings should show the connection between Sections 1 and 2, with views of one from the other.

Comment duly noted.

Following the open discussion, Mrs. Runyon made a motion that the BTSP utilized by SDC 2 and SDC 5 be dismissed until the Memorandum of Agreement stipulations outlined in a July 10, 2006 letter from the National Trust on Historic Preservation (NTHP) were met. Mr. Segrest seconded the motion and it was put to a vote of the attending HPAT members. There were three votes for the motion and three votes against with Louisville Metro Government abstaining. Therefore, the motion was not carried. Mr. Nouri urged that consultation continue and Mr. Morgan stated that additional studies were required from the historic preservation perspective. Mr. Sekula urged that joint IHPAT – KHPAT consultation continue.

Final Comments: Mr. Bart Bryant, KYTC

Mr. Bryant indicated that there is a 15-day comment period after the meeting for any additional comments for consideration by the Co-chairs. He asked that all comments be made in writing by the close of business on August 2, 2006. Mr. Bryant thanked everyone from attending and closed the meeting.

**Louisville - Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project
Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team/
Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team
Meeting – July 18, 2006
Frazier International History Museum, Louisville, Kentucky**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT)

Co-chairs: John Carr – Indiana State Historic Preservation Office Staff

Historic Landmarks Foundation of Indiana: Greg Sekula, Laura Renwick

Kentucky Historic Preservation Advisory Team (KHPAT)

Co-chairs: Bart Bryant – Kentucky Transportation Cabinet
David Morgan – Kentucky Heritage Council/Kentucky State Historic
Preservation Office

City of Prospect: Ann Simms

Louisville Metro Planning and Design: Mohammad Nouri, Aida Copic

Louisville Metro Historic Preservation: Richard Jett

Butchertown Neighborhood Assoc., Inc.: Jim Segrest

Phoenix Hill: Steve Kersey

River Fields, Inc.: Meme Sweets Runyon

Federal Highway Administration: George Jones, William Hanson

CTS – GEC: John Sacksteder, Jim Hilton, Steve Nicaise, Jeff Vlach, Christa Turner and
Chad Costa

SDC 2: JB Williams

SDC 5: Dan Carrier, Miguel Rosales