

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

**Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT) Meeting  
April 15, 2009 – 10:00 AM at McCauley – Nicolas Centre**

The following summarizes the discussions of the IHPAT meeting held in the Community Room of the McCauley – Nicolas Centre on April 15, 2009 for the Louisville – Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project (Project). An agenda was provided to meeting attendees by mail on March 30, 2009.

**Welcome and Introductions: 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: Mr. Patrick Carpenter, INDOT and Mr. John Carr, IN SHPO Office**

In regard to the formal motion made by the IHPAT at the meeting of February 18, 2009 to hold a second public meeting to inform the general public of the content of the Old Jeffersonville Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) and to allow public comment on it, Mr. Carpenter stated that the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) considered the request and did not approve it. He directed CTS-GEC to meet with the city of Jeffersonville to review the plan and to post a public notice of said meeting. Mr. Sacksteder stated that this opportunity would be afforded to the city as requested.

**Swartz Farm Rural Historic District MOA Amendment: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

Mitigation defined in the Swartz Farm Rural Historic District (HD) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) Amendment could include the relocation of the Central Passage House (CPH) including measures to make the house habitable after the move. As a part of this proposed relocation, the historical significance of the CPH was to be revisited by the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (IN SHPO), including an inspection of the interior (of the CPH). This would allow the IN SHPO to assess the extent to which the original floor plan was intact and would provide the information about the interior integrity needed to make a decision on individual eligibility. On April 6, 2009, the property owners agreed to the inspection in the afternoon of April 15, 2009.

Mr. Sekula indicated that he and Ms. Burke had inspected the CPH during the week of April 6, 2009. He provided copies of photographs taken of the interior including doors and moldings, door knobs and latches and the fireplace. They stated that original house appeared to have had a central hall and three rooms. There have been additions to the house including an enclosed back porch and kitchen. Mr. Sekula stated that in his opinion, the CPH retained integrity for eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). *(Subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Vlach met with Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Carr and Mr. David Kroll and the inspection was completed. A formal response on the eligibility of the CPH to the NRHP is pending from the IN SHPO and the INDOT.)*

Mr. Sacksteder stated that the Wards, the owners of the CPH, had requested hardship acquisition from the INDOT. The INDOT has reviewed this request and asked for additional information prior to approving this request.

### **Historic Preservation Plan Status - Utica Limekilns: Mr. Kevin Senninger, CTS-GEC**

Mr. Senninger began this discussion by updating the IHPAT members of the recent research done on the limekilns. Mr. Charles Hockensmith had presented a preliminary draft of his research to CTS-GEC on April 14, 2009. Mr. Senninger detailed some preliminary findings/results.

- Mr. Hockensmith has conducted a thorough amount of research on the lime industry and the four specific kilns. The current draft is approximately 200 pages with approximately 19 pages of reference material. His research included a number of resources such as the Indiana Archives, the Filson Museum, deed research in Clark and surrounding counties, and oral research with Utica residents.
- Research indicates Kiln #48004 may be the oldest of the four and Kiln #48001 is the second-oldest.
- The Utica Lime Company was one of the major companies in the lime industry during the early- to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century. The company typically leased land for quarrying and lime production rather than purchasing it. Once the company ceased operations, the land and any structures reverted back to the original property owner.
- Lime production and associated limekilns typically had their own quarry within close proximity to the kiln(s). Based on site visits, Mr. Hockensmith noted there were indications of quarrying activities around all four kilns, although not to the scale found near Kiln #48002.
- Based on oral history/research, there was a small railroad spur leading from Kilns #48002 and #48003 to the Ohio River.
- Based on this research, the initial lease of the land where Kilns #48002 and #48003 are located dates from June 16, 1868. Mr. Hockensmith's professional opinion is that the Utica Lime Company was fully operational by 1870 (*the State of Indiana date pertaining to archaeological resources that fall under state protection/law*).
- Although the lime industry/production began to decline in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Utica Lime Company continued to quarry stone and gravel from the (Kilns #48002 and #48003) site through the decade of 1920. His research indicates the last lease document was from 1925.
- Based on Mr. Hockensmith's preliminary findings/research of the limekilns, his professional opinion is that they are eligible for the NRHP under Criteria D, sites that have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Mr. Sekula asked about recent site activity and ground disturbance around Kilns #48002 and #48003. Mr. Sacksteder noted that the Project team was aware of the recent activities and had asked that the IN SHPO draft a letter informing the owners of the kilns about potential legal protections under the state archeology law. Mr. Carr stated that Mr. James Glass (IN SHPO) sent a letter dated April 2, 2009 to the Hughes Development Group (the representative of the owner) of the possibility that the kilns and associated sites could fall under state law (IC 14-21). To date, there has been no response from the developer or the property owner.

Mr. Sekula again expressed his concerns about the lack of protection for these resources because they are under private ownership. He also expressed his concern about the limitations of planning and zoning in Clark County and/or the town of Utica to influence the proposed residential subdivision. He stressed the need for recommendations in the HPP to provide relevant solutions to preserve these limekilns. Although the town of Utica has expressed an interest in protecting the kilns, it is unknown (to anyone on the Project team or the IHPAT) if there have been any discussions between the town and property owners about this issue. Mr. Senninger stated he would continue to coordinate with Mr. Hank Dorman (Utica Town Council) about possible discussions with the Hughes Group and/or the property owners.

Mr. Senninger noted that the next step is to review and summarize the historic research for incorporation into the draft HPP. CTS-GEC would proceed with the HPP under the assumption that the kilns pre-date 1870 and fall under state law (IC 14-21). It is proposed to present the next draft of the HPP at the June 17, 2009 IHPAT meeting for review and discussion.

### **Historic Preservation Plan Status - Old Jeffersonville Historic District: Mr. Kevin Senninger**

With distribution of the HPP to the IHPAT on March 30, 2009, Mr. Senninger also sent a memorandum, which summarized the updates in the plan. The general updates included:

- Revisions to the Table of Contents and the recommendations chapters to be more user friendly. This included making it easier to locate specific MOA recommendations/stipulations throughout the HPP.
- Revisions pertaining to the language in the HPP to stress the solutions rather than simply pointing out problem areas.
- Updates to appropriate titles throughout the HPP that specifically reference MOA stipulations.
- Relocation of Chapter 5 to the end of the HPP to summarize previous recommendations; this necessitated the re-numbering of Chapter 6, 7, and 8 Sections.
- Updates to a number of graphics to enhance readability and to clarify the distinctions between MOA Stipulations and general HPP recommendations.

Mr. Senninger reviewed a number of specific revisions to the plan, as follows:

#### **Chapter 1:**

1. Updated plan process language in Section 1.3 to reflect most recent time frames/schedule.
2. Removed Section 1.5 (title) as well as first paragraph. Revised second paragraph and incorporated into Section 1.4.

#### **Chapter 2:**

1. Added introductory language (rationale for the historic context) relating to the purpose of the historic context relevant to the MOA (Stipulation II.F.1.f).

**Chapters 3:**

1. The *Areas of Influence* section was revised to reflect the closing of Colgate Palmolive and the proposed mixed-use redevelopment plans for the site.
2. Information was added to reflect recent developments regarding the proposed convention center project and design changes to the Big Four (pedestrian) Bridge.
3. Updated the *Zoning and Design Guidelines* section to reflect the completion of the Comprehensive Plan by the city of Jeffersonville and economic development initiatives.

**Chapters 4:**

The content of this chapter is unchanged. However, at the conclusion of the chapter a “Summary of Findings” was added that summarizes the land use and circulation analyses and provides an overview of Chapters 5-8, inclusive.

**Chapter 5:**

The content of this chapter centers on MOA Stipulations specific to the interstate corridor and Context Sensitive Design Solutions. The language in this chapter is more specific in the types of stipulations made (i.e. “The HPP recommends that...”). Design recommendations refer to appropriate materials, colors and/or design elements found within the Old Jeff HD. The Country Estates/River Road HPP was referred to for similar language/style.

**Chapter 6:**

The content of this chapter centers on MOA Stipulations specific to the Old Jeff Historic District. Language in this chapter is more specific in the types of stipulations made (i.e. “The HPP recommends that...”). This would refer to appropriate materials, colors and/or design elements found within the Old Jeff HD. The Country Estates/River Road HPP was referred to for similar language/style.

1. The title of Section 6.1 was changed to Historic District *Considerations*.
2. The illustration(s) for the pedestrian bridge design proposed for the Big Four Bridge were removed as a result of recent changes proposed by the city of Jeffersonville.

**Chapter 7:**

The content of this chapter centers on additional recommendations (outside the scope of the Project) that address secondary effects or changes to downtown Jeffersonville and/or the historic district as a result of the Project.

1. Section titles avoided the term “redevelopment”. The chapter title was revised to read *Downtown Recommendations*.
2. The introductory paragraph(s) were revised to clearly state that the recommendations in this chapter were beyond the scope and funding of the Project.

**Chapter 8:**

This chapter (formerly Chapter 5) is the summary chapter requested by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The language was revised and condensed in order to reflect this change. It provides a summary of both the Project Stipulations in Chapters 5 and 6 and the general recommendations in Chapter 7.

**Appendix:**

1. The appendix items have been divided/labeled into appropriate sections.

2. A third section has been created for a MOA Summary.

Mr. Fogle stated that the city of Jeffersonville had recently contracted with a consultant to develop a new design for the Big Four Bridge. Mr. Sacksteder and Mr. Hilton requested that the city keep the Project team apprised of the progress of design to avoid potential conflicts with federal regulations. Mr. Hilton also stated that the Section 106 process had been conducted by the Corps of Engineers for the Bridge, but the cities of Jeffersonville and Louisville were responsible to complete the Section 106 process for the approaches (to the Bridge). Mr. Sacksteder noted that FHWA had initially expressed concerns about the design of the approach in Louisville Waterfront Park. The design was eventually approved, but was noted as meeting the minimum standards. The city of Jeffersonville should strictly adhere to federal ADA guidelines. Mr. Fogle stated that the city is aware of the situation in Louisville and the need to comply with the federal standards. Mr. Sacksteder indicated that after it has been determined that both approaches comply with federal standards, federal funding could be considered for the Big Four Bridge, and utilizing the Big Four Bridge as a replacement for the pedestrian crossing on the new interstate bridge can be considered. *(Subsequent to the meeting, comments were received from the city of Jeffersonville for revision of the HPP. These comments will be incorporated into the final revision of the document.)*

Ms. Burke noted that the old City Cemetery in Colston Park was discontinued in 1862, and not 1838 as stated in the HPP. Mr. Sekula suggested that the ongoing discussions about the proposed convention center possibly locating on or near Colston Park should be discussed in *Section 7.1 - Downtown Opportunities*. The HPP should also note the importance of retaining the existing residences along Market Street. Mr. Senninger noted the revisions.

Ms. Renwick stated that throughout the HPP, the local historic district review board is referred to as the Historic District Board of Review. The correct title is Historic Preservation Commission, requiring a change. Mr. Sekula also stated that the HPP should refer to the city of Jeffersonville demolition delay ordinance for structures within the historic district(s). This ordinance requires public notice prior to the demolition of any buildings in an historic district. Mr. Senninger noted these comments to update the HPP.

Mr. Sekula questioned incorporation of the HPP into the city of Jeffersonville comprehensive plan as stipulated in the MOA. Mr. Fogle stated that it appears unlikely that the city would adopt the HPP into the plan since it (the comprehensive plan) has been officially adopted. He indicated that the city could incorporate portions of the HPP into any future updates to the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Sekula suggested that the Project provide the city with a copy of the HPP once it has been approved by the BSMT. Mr. Sacksteder agreed to provide the city with an electronic copy of the final plan.

**Final Comments: Mr. John Sacksteder, CTS-GEC**

Mr. Hilton stated that he had attended the rezoning hearing for the Swartz Farm property. At the hearing, there was no mention of the historical significance, nor was it communicated to the plan commission as a part of the rezoning petition. The property was subsequently rezoned to its highest and best use, light industrial. He also indicated that CTS-GEC was working with SDC 6 to define the right-of-way requirements for a redesign of the interchange at SR 62.

On April 22, 2009, the Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board is to consider the NRHP nomination for the Ohio Falls Car and Locomotive Company HD. Presently, there are objections from the property owners for listing of the property on the NRHP. *(Subsequent to the meeting, the Preservation Review Board voted unanimously to approve the nomination for the HD and forward it on to the NRHP for official listing. Dependent upon the number of objections from the property owner, the district would be listed on either the NRHP or the State Register of Historic Sites. Further details are pending.)*

Mr. Sacksteder asked that any additional comments be provided to CTS-GEC by April 30, 2009 for inclusion in the record of the meeting. The next scheduled IHPAT meeting is June 17, 2009 at 10:00 AM in the Community Room of the McCauley – Nicolas Centre. The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM.

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

**Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT) Meeting  
April 15, 2009 – 10:00 AM at McCauley – Nicolas Centre**

IN SHPO:	John Carr
INDOT:	Patrick Carpenter
Clark County Commissioners:	Carl Kramer
Clark County Historian:	Jeanne Burke
HLFI:	Greg Sekula
Jeffersonville Historic Preservation Commission:	Laura Renwick
Rose Hill:	Joe Rafferty
City of Jeffersonville:	Brian Fogle
Indiana Ombudsman:	Carl Percy
CTS-GEC:	John Sacksteder Jim Hilton Jeff Vlach Kevin Senninger Bob Lauder