

**LOUISVILLE – SOUTHERN INDIANA
OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT**

**Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT) Meeting
October 15, 2008 – 10:00 AM at McCauley – Nicolas Centre**

The following summarizes the discussions of the IHPAT meeting held at the McCauley – Nicolas Centre on October 15, 2008 for the Louisville – Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project (Project). An agenda was provided to meeting attendees by mail on September 29, 2008.

Opening Remarks: Mr. John Sacksteder, CTS-GEC

Mr. Sacksteder welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked those present to identify themselves and the entity they represented. A list of the IHPAT members in attendance is attached to this summary.

Project Update: Ms. Mary Kennedy, INDOT and Mr. John Carr, IN SHPO Office

Ms. Kennedy indicated that Paul Boone, the INDOT Project Manager, was relinquishing his position on the Project to return to the Seymour District. The named interim Project Manager is Kevin Hetrick.

Ms. Kennedy also stated that SDC 3 (Downtown Indiana) would be brought under contract. The selected consultant, Butler-Fairman-Seufert, and CTS-GEC were reviewing the scope of work and man-hour justifications. To date, INDOT has not requested negotiation of the contract.

Swartz Farm Rural Historic District MOA Amendment

Mr. Vlach provided an overview of the status of the proposed amendment, since the initial presentation of it to the IHPAT at the meeting of June 19, 2008, as follows:

June 19, 2008 – MOA amendment presented to the IHPAT; 15 day comment period. Received comments were on retention of landscaping plan, relocation of Central Passage House (CPH) to Swartz Farm property and first right of refusal.

July 7, 2008 – Close of comment period; revisions made for presentation to the BSHCT Co-chairs at BSHCT meeting of July 15, 2008

July 15, 2008 – BSHCT meeting and discussion of IHPAT comments. Revisions included retention of landscaping plan, relocation of CPH to Swartz Farm property and first right of refusal. Coordination with INDOT Legal asked to define first right of refusal.

July 30, 2008 – Close of comment period from BSHCT Co-chairs review

August 4, 2008 – Amendment revised and resubmitted to the BSHCT Co-chairs for second review. Deleted first right of refusal due to complexity of proposal to relocate CPH to

Swartz Farm property (per INDOT Legal), refinement of preservation easement language and placement/condition of CPH on Swartz Farm property.

August 19, 2008 – Close of comment period from BSHCT Co-chairs second review

August 20, 2008 – Amendment revised and resubmitted to the BSHCT Co-chairs for third review. Continued to refine the wording for placement of preservation easement and condition of CPH after its relocation.

September 2, 2008 - Close of comment period from BSHCT Co-chairs third review

September 10, 2008 – Final draft of the amendment to MOA signatories for 15-day review. Placement of preservation easement and condition of CPH after its relocation defined.

September 16, 2008 – BSHCT meeting

September 26, 2008 – Close of comment period; no comments received; advanced to the FHWA.

Week of October 13, 2008 – Final amendment to signatories/invited signatories by FHWA for signature. Upon receipt of the executed MOA from the signatories/invited signatories by FHWA, amendment to be incorporated into then MOA replacing the original stipulation.

There were no comments offered by the IHPAT members on the status of the amendment.

Utica Limekilns Kick-off Meeting and Historic Preservation Plan

Mr. Senninger began his presentation by providing an overview of the limekilns kick-off meeting held on September 16, 2008. IHPAT members, SDC 6 and John and Cory Hughes of Hughes Development were invited to the meeting. Following a review of the Project-related stipulations, proposed HPP schedule, and general issues regarding the kilns, the group visited the four lime kiln sites.

Mr. Senninger discussed that one of the MOA Stipulations was to develop and publish an informative brochure or pamphlet about the limekiln industry for public distribution. He brought an example of a similar type of booklet that was done in Tennessee related to iron furnaces. Although this example was more detailed than that proposed for the lime kilns, Mr. Senninger wanted the IHPAT members to see an example of the type of content and/or format that the lime kilns pamphlet could be.

Mr. Senninger noted that the two primary goals of the HPP were to address the MOA Stipulations relevant to the limekilns and to work with Hughes Development to try redevelop/redesign the proposed subdivision (Lime Kiln Ridge) to incorporate the limekilns for public access into the plan. He discussed the importance of trying to create public access to the kilns from Upper River Road. The HPP would also contain a historical context section pertaining to the lime kiln industry in Utica Township and Southeastern Indiana. He referred any questions or comments of this issue to Michael Matts of CTS-GEC, who is currently developing/researching this agricultural context.

Mr. Sekula noted that it was important to document the existing conditions of the limekilns. Mr. Senninger agreed, and stated that the HPP would address the current conditions of the kilns through photos and descriptions. However, as noted in the MOA, a more detailed “Conditions Report” would be prepared prior to the initiation of any Project construction activities. Upon further discussion, Mr. Sekula and Mr. Senninger agreed that one of the key issues that would need to be addressed in the HPP is long term stabilization and maintenance. Currently, both Clark County and the town of Utica have limited resources to maintain the kilns as part of a larger public park. Mr. Senninger noted that the HPP would include potential funding sources to address this issue.

Mr. Senninger raised the issue of the HPP potentially recommending that Kiln # 48004, which is adjacent to Upper River Road, be relocated due to its proximity to the road. If a public park or some other form of public access is granted to the perpetual kilns, it might be possible to deconstruct and rebuild Kiln # 48004 in a more accessible setting. Mr. Sacksteder agreed that such an issue would be an appropriate recommendation in the HPP, but that the Project would not necessarily commit to funding the relocation.

Agricultural Development of Southeastern Indiana 1840 - 1940

Mr. Matts described the historic context of the report entitled *Agricultural Development of Southeastern Indiana 1840 – 1940*. This report addresses the agricultural development of the six-county region in southeastern Indiana from the early nineteenth century through the mid-twentieth century. The context identifies agricultural development in the region, with emphasis upon shifts in crop selection by regional farmers. The significance of the counties and of this region with Indiana’s statewide agricultural development is also addressed in the report. The context is intended to assist in the identification and evaluation of historic farm properties in the region.

A copy of the report had been forwarded to the Co-chairs for review and comment on August 28, 2008 by CTS-GEC. The report had been previously reviewed by Ms. Mary Kennedy, INDOT, and her comments had been incorporated. Additional comments had been received from the other Co-chairs by October 1, 2008. Upon revision of this report, it would be advanced from the BSHCT to the BSMT for approval at the November 18, 2008 (BSHCT) meeting.

Mr. Sekula questioned if the results of this study would be integrated into the *Clark County Interim Report – Survey Update* as defined in the MOA. Mr. Carr stated that the scope of work for the *Survey Update* was under development and that provisions could be made to include the agricultural data. Additional coordination within the IN SHPO would be required.

In a related matter, Mr. Sekula questioned if the schedule for the update of the *Clark County Interim Report* for the remainder of the county could be modified to coincide with the *Survey Update*. This *Interim Report* is over 20 years old and in need of modification. Mr. Carr indicated that he would discuss this request with Mr. Frank Hurdis of his office. Ms. Kennedy stated that the funding for each of the surveys would require close monitoring by INDOT to maintain the appropriate funding categories for the respective surveys.

**LOUISVILLE – SOUTHERN INDIANA
OHIO RIVER BRIDGES PROJECT**

**Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT) Meeting
October 15, 2008 – 10:00 AM at McCauley – Nicolas Centre**

IN SHPO: John Carr

INDOT: Mary Kennedy

Indiana
Ombudsman: Carl Percy

HLFI: Greg Sekula
Laura Renwick (also represented Jeffersonville HPC)

CTS-GEC: John Sacksteder
Jim Hilton
Jeff Vlach
Kevin Senninger
Michael Matts
Kathy Francis