

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

**Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT) Meeting  
June 5, 2013 – 10:00 a.m. at Mountjoy Chilton and Medley**

The following summarizes the discussions of the IHPAT meeting held in the Community Room at Mountjoy Chilton and Medley on June 5, 2013 for the Louisville – Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project. An agenda was provided to meeting attendees by mail on May 22, 2013.

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

Neither Mr. Carpenter nor Mr. Carr had any opening comments or remarks.

**Utica Limekilns MPDF and NRHP Nomination Status: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) nominations for the Utica limekilns were revised in accordance with the Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (IN SHPO) comments of April 15, 2013 and a subsequent meeting with the IN SHPO of May 2, 2013. The revised nominations were received by CTS-GEC on May 20, 2013. Upon review, the nominations will be advanced to the IN SHPO for final review and processing for the NRHP. *(Subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Vlach reviewed the nominations and submitted them to the IN SHPO on June 7, 2013.)*

Mr. Sekula inquired if the nominations would be available for IHPAT review. It was agreed that the nominations would be provided to the IHPAT for an expedited review following the IN SHPO technical review. *(Subsequent to the meeting and in coordination with the IN SHPO, it has been discovered that FA MOA Stipulations II.I. and III.H.8. do not indicate that the HPATs have a role in the review of NRHP nominations. Additionally, Indiana Code IC 14-21-1-32, 16 U.S.C. 470-w-3, and 16 U.S.C. 470hh address confidentiality of archaeological site information. In regard to archaeology, the IN SHPO would only disclose archaeological locational information to qualified professional archaeologists. Furthermore, because the IN SHPO already has thoroughly reviewed the nominations, allotting additional time for IHPAT review would delay the forwarding of the nominations to the Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board by at least three months. Therefore, the NRHP nominations will not be provided to the IHPAT for review as originally stated.)*

**Spring Street Freight House Interpretive Signage: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

Mr. Vlach distributed a revised draft of the interpretive sign to be placed at the Spring Street Freight House (Freight House). The initial draft of the sign was presented at the BSHCT of March 19, 2013

and at the IHPAT on March 27, 2013. At the IHPAT meeting, Ms. Jeanne Burke, Clark County Historian, had comments on the sign, and agreed to assist in finalizing the text. The sign had been revised in cooperation with Ms. Burke. Mr. Vlach was asked to prepare a letter for BiState Management Team (BSMT) approval of the sign. On May 23, 2013, the BSMT approved the interpretive sign in accordance with Stipulation III.A.5 of the First Amended Memorandum of Agreement (FA MOA).

A question was asked about the date of erection and placement of the sign, which was favored near the public sidewalk. Mr. Boone replied that a metal stand had been placed on-site for the placement of the sign. This stand is next to the entrance walk to the Freight House, and this location was shown in the rehabilitation plans for the building, which had been reviewed by the IHPAT.

#### **Popular Report: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

A Popular Report was prepared in accordance with Stipulation II.P.2 of the FA MOA. A draft report was submitted to CTS-GEC for review on April 15, 2013; comments were returned on April 26, 2013. Draft B was received and reviewed; comments were returned on May 30, 2013. Draft C was received for submittal to the BSHCT on June 3, 2013. After internal review, it is to be submitted to the Bi-State Historic Consultation Team (BSHCT) for review. *(Subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Vlach reviewed Draft C and submitted it to the BSHCT for a 15-day review on June 14, 2013.)*

#### **Requests for Blasting and Vibration Monitoring East End: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

At the combined Historic Preservation Advisory Team (HPAT) meeting of April 18, 2013, the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) solicited the opportunity for HPAT members to submit technical documentation in support of a request for blasting and vibration monitoring plans for additional historic structures. The deadline for receipt of the technical documentation was May 31, 2013. Three requests were received by this deadline for the Robinson Brown House, the Todd House and the Wolf Pen Branch Mill Farm. All three requests are under review by the Indiana Finance Authority (IFA) with a decision pending. These requests to submit technical documentation for additional resources are only applicable to the East End Procurement. *(Subsequent to the meeting, all three requests were approved by IFA on June 10, 2013.)*

#### **Pre-construction Surveys to the IHPAT: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

At the combined Historic Preservation Advisory Team (HPAT) meeting of April 18, 2013, a request was made for a listing of those historic structures that would have pre-construction surveys performed. A commitment was made to supply this listing when ready. Mr. Vlach noted that the surveys were sent to the HPAT members on the following dates:

Downtown Kentucky	April 22, 2013
Downtown Indiana	May 20, 2013
East End (Indiana and Kentucky)	May 17, 2013

**Colgate – Palmolive NRHP Nomination: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

Stipulation III.B. of the FA MOA for the Colgate – Palmolive Historic District (HD) mandates that since the property has changed ownership, the BSMT will develop documentation and seek NRHP nomination with property owner consent. If consent is denied, no further action is required since a documentation report was previously prepared and approved by the IN SHPO. In seeking to complete the activities associated with these stipulations, CTS-GEC contacted the Boston Development Group (BDG) via certified letter on April 24, 2013 to inquire of their interest in development of the NRHP documentation. A coordination meeting was held on May 17, 2013 to discuss the nomination with BDG.

During the coordination meeting, the BDG requested that the pros and cons of listing a property, an explanation of the viability of delisting a property once it has been placed on the NRHP and clarification of the \$100,000 cap per project limit on the Indiana tax credit. BDG questioned the mitigation that been designated for the property, how it was considered acceptable mitigation, and the possibility of reopening consultation. Mr. Carpenter explained that no direct impacts would occur to the property, and that the mitigation of listing a property on the NRHP was typical for this type of impact. Subsequent to the (May 17, 2013) meeting, Mr. Vlach consulted with an individual of the CTS-GEC team that had worked on the development of this stipulation for mitigation. It was indicated to Mr. Vlach that the mitigation was set forth in part because, at the time (2001 – 2002), the property owners had other plans to close or sell the property. If mitigation was anything more than listing and placement of an interpretive sign, it may sway new buyers away from a possible purchase, if the mitigation was too stringent.

On May 21, 2013, Mr. Vlach was directed by the BSHCT to prepare a letter to BDG indicating that consultation to address additional stipulations for the mitigation of Project effects on the property would not be reopened. It was the position of the BSHCT that the effects of the Project on the property have been appropriately analyzed and the mitigation proposed is deemed sufficient. In seeking to complete the activities associated with this stipulation, Mr. Vlach was directed to inquire again of their continued interest in the development of the NRHP documentation. This letter was prepared and sent via certified mail on May 28, 2013; a response was requested by June 11, 2013. The IHPAT members requested a copy of this letter that was sent by CTS-GEC to BDG; it was forwarded via e-mail on June 6, 2013. *(Subsequent to the meeting on June 10, 2013, BDG indicated their interest in listing of the property on the NRHP.)*

Mr. Sekula indicated that Indiana Landmarks (IL) is working with BDG to develop a master plan for the Colgate – Palmolive HD. At present, the plan is defining site characteristics; it is the intent of BDG to list the HD on the NRHP based on the completed site plan. He further stated that BDG is working with the City of Jeffersonville to resolve a sanitary sewer issue. In discussions, the City has committed to improvements to the sanitary sewer line along South Clark Boulevard.

**Utica Limekilns Pamphlet: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

In accordance with Stipulation III.H.1 of the FA MOA, a pamphlet is under preparation for public distribution presenting the results of the lime industry Context Study. The Context Study was a part of the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) that was prepared for the Utica Limekilns. Mr. Carpenter was contacted on April 19, 2013 to define INDOT expectations for the contents of the pamphlet.

Although a draft is under development for review by May 31, 2013, it was urged that the pamphlet not be finalized until the NRHP nominations are completed and the kilns are listed. A placeholder in the pamphlet will be included for the listing date on the NRHP.

Mr. Sekula stated that IL has been in contact with the owners of three of the limekilns in hopes of preserving them. One property contains one kiln, and the other property contains two kilns. Mr. Sekula questioned if funds could be made available from the Historic Preservation Enhancement Fund (HPEF) for preservation of Kilns #48001 and #48002. Contrary to previous thoughts, Kiln #48001 has not been destroyed by the property owner.

#### **Utica Limekilns Condition Report: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

A Condition Report was prepared in accordance with Stipulation III.H.2 of the FA MOA as a baseline to measure any construction related damage that may occur to the limekilns. A draft report was submitted to CTS-GEC for review on May 17, 2013. As a part of the report, survey points were set to take additional readings during or after construction to define any damage. Comments are pending from CTS-GEC. *(Subsequent to the meeting, minor comments were returned for revision. The condition report for the kilns is to accompany a (to-be-prepared) condition report for the quarries for submittal to the BSHCT.)*

#### **Big Four Bridge Approach Ramp Landscaping Plans and House Relocation: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

In accordance with Section II.C.3 of the Settlement Agreement (SA), INDOT is to facilitate discussions between historic preservation groups and the City of Jeffersonville regarding the relocation of the five historic homes within the Jeffersonville Historic District planned for demolition in connection with the landscaping for the area surrounding the approach ramp to the Big Four Bridge. A meeting was held with INDOT, the City of Jeffersonville, Indiana Landmarks and Jeffersonville Main Street on May 23, 2013 to discuss this relocation proposal. The relocation of the five historic homes is eligible for grant funding from the HPEF as part of the SA.

Mr. Sekula presented a proposal from IL, Jeffersonville Main Street (Main Street) and the Clark County Museum to relocate four of the five homes planned for demolition. The consensus of this team is that the structure at 227 Pearl Street would not be pursued for preservation. Main Street is working on purchase agreements for relocation of the houses: one parcel is secured and one offer has been tendered to the current property owner. It is anticipated that HPEF grant funds for would be used for the house relocations.

A local resident has agreed to remove aluminum from several of the houses in exchange for the salvage value of recycling. He has commenced this task. The City of Jeffersonville agreed to provide a dumpster for the aluminum.

#### **2014 – 2016 IHPAT Meeting Dates: Mr. Jeff Vlach, CTS-GEC**

In accordance with Stipulation I.A.9.a of the FA MOA, and Stipulation II.C.2.a of the SA, the dates for the quarterly HPAT meetings for 2014 – 2016 were scheduled and posted to the Project website on May 6, 2013. Mr. Vlach also distributed a listing of the meeting dates to all attendees.

**Aesthetics and Enhancement Plan for the Downtown Procurement: Mr. Richard Sutherland, Stantec**

Mr. Sutherland presented a Power Point (PP) of the Aesthetics and Enhancement Plan for the Downtown Procurement. This presentation was also made to Jeffersonville City Pride on March 19, 2013, at the HPAT meetings of March 27, 2013, March 28, 2013 and June 5, 2013 and to the Area Advisory Team (AAT) meetings of March 21, 2013 and April 25, 2013. He indicated that the PP had been extensively revised in accordance with comments received since it was first prepared.

Mr. Sutherland stated that a downtown committee had been formed in Jeffersonville of residents with diverse backgrounds. The committee is to review the various gateway treatments into the city and make recommendations for signage by the end of 2014. Signage is to be placed at Court Avenue, 6<sup>th</sup> Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The City of Jeffersonville is raising funds for the gateway at Court Avenue; City Pride has volunteered to install low maintenance plantings at Court Avenue and 10<sup>th</sup> Street and massing of trees at Stansifer Avenue.

Mr. Sutherland indicated that the AEI was presented to the BSMT and received approval on May 23, 2013. Once the final report is completed, it will be provided to the IHPAT. It is possible that additional enhancements may be added to the AEI; a process would be developed to amend any future enhancements to the plan.

Mr. Kramer questioned the level of aesthetic treatments provided by the Project between Indiana and Kentucky in the East End. Mr. Sutherland assured Mr. Kramer that the treatments were similar. He also stated that the City of Jeffersonville had committed to raising additional funding to devote to aesthetics.

Mr. Sekula questioned if the aesthetics could include areas for public art at the underpasses. Mr. Sutherland indicated that the Project included streetscaping in accordance with the FA MOA, which would be completed after the construction phase was near completion.

**George Rogers Clark Memorial Bridge - Railing and Pylons, Stone Wall: Mr. Jim Hilton, CTS-GEC**

Mr. Hilton distributed a cross-section drawing for treatments at the George Rogers Clark Bridge. It showed a modified concrete barrier at the edge of the roadway and an historic rail at the back of the sidewalk. At the BSHCT meeting of May 21, 2013, consensus was reached by the BSHCT Co-chairs on the selection of this cross-section. On May 23, 2013, the BSMT approved the modified concrete barrier at the edge of the roadway and an historic rail at the back of the sidewalk.

Mr. Hilton presented two options for the construction of the stonewall (retaining wall) adjacent to US 31. Option 1 proposed the surface installation of existing limestone blocks on one side of US 31 with the opposite side to be formliner. Option 2 would split the limestone blocks equally between the two sides with the remaining portion of each wall to be formliner. CTS-GEC recommended Option 1 with the limestone blocks to be placed on the west side of US 31. After discussions, the IHPAT voted to select Option 1 with the limestone blocks on the east side of US 31 and adjacent to the Administration Building.

Stipulation III.D.2 of the FA MOA mandates that in the event displacement of the bridge pylons cannot be avoided, a Treatment Plan (TP) is to be prepared to include measures to minimize damage to the original contributing elements to the structure, including retaining walls and administration building. The Treatment Plan shall include documentation on the original bridge pylons, retaining walls and other features within the Project limits and include recommendations for historically appropriate lighting. Comments were sought from Mr. Carr on May 30, 2013 as to his expectations for completion of the TP and the historically appropriate lighting. Those comments from an e-mail of June 4, 2013 are attached.

#### **Project Roadway Lighting – Downtown: Mr. Jim Hilton, CTS-GEC**

Mr. Hilton indicated that roadway lighting concepts are under development by the DBT (Walsh) near the historic districts. In accordance with the FA MOA, roadway lighting within the viewshed of historic properties is to be designed and constructed to minimize light dispersion beyond the highway right of way and is to include full cutoff optics. He stated that the existing lights along the US 31 approach to the Clark Memorial Bridge would be replaced without full cutoff optics. Light may intrude into the Ohio Car and Locomotive Historic District. The design of the replacement lighting is to be maintained at the current level. The Co-chairs concurred with this approach.

#### **Closed Circuit Television Towers and Effect on Historic Districts: Mr. Tom Springer, Qk4**

A report entitled *ORBDC – Visual Effects of CCTV Towers* examined the effects of construction of four, 80-ft closed circuit television (CCTV) towers on the historic districts of Butchertown and Phoenix Hill in Kentucky, and Old Jeffersonville in Indiana. The tower construction is proposed as a part of the intelligent transportation system (ITS) communications architecture for the Project. Two of the towers will be located in Kentucky, and two will be located in Indiana. These towers will consist of a single triangular lattice frame. Small cameras or other small ITS devices will be mounted near the tops of the towers, which will be freestanding with no lateral supports or guy wires. The report recommended that a No Adverse Visual Effect finding be issued. The report was submitted on May 14, 2013 to each SHPO by INDOT and KYTC, respectively, for concurrence in the finding. It was requested that each SHPO provide their concurrence by May 31, 2013. Each SHPO concurred in this finding on May 23, 2013.

Discussion of the use of the lattice towers elicited the following comments from the IHPAT:

- Will lighting be placed at the top of the towers?* It is possible due to the existing location of the helipad at the Holiday Inn.
- Were monopoles studied in lieu of the lattice towers?* Yes, originally three monopoles were proposed, but were replaced with the lattice towers.
- Can the location of the tower at the bridge be shifted to the west?* No, the tower is located for camera views down the bridges to monitor the traffic flow. If the tower is shifted to the west, it would not view traffic down the bridge.
- The No Adverse Effect finding was questioned.* In the SFEIS, monopoles were proposed and evaluated as an Adverse Effect. It is not felt that the towers would generate this level of impact.
- Will the lattice towers become cluttered with other attachments?* No, the towers are to support the small cameras or other small ITS devices and are 80 feet tall.

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

Mr. Sacksteder indicated that two of the contributing resources in the Old Jeffersonville HD had been relocated to new lots. The remaining three houses are to follow by June 30, 2013. Mr. Sekula expressed dismay at the loss of the mature vegetation required to move the first houses. He requested additional discussions on the replanting of replacement vegetation, favoring canopy type trees to ornamental trees. Mr. Sekula suggested replacement of the trees in-kind or with a 3:1 replacement ratio with smaller trees. As part of the houses relocations, INDOT coordinated with the City of Jeffersonville regarding tree trimming and removal. Currently, INDOT is coordinating with the City about replacing the removed trees and any maintenance/pruning required on the trimmed trees.

The deadline for the receipt of comments is June 20, 2013. The next IHPAT meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2013 in the Community Room at Mountjoy Chilton and Medley. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM.

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

**Indiana Historic Preservation Advisory Team (IHPAT) Meeting  
June 5, 2013 – 10:00 a.m. at Mountjoy Chilton and Medley**

FHWA:	Jeff Schmidt
IN SHPO:	John Carr
INDOT:	Ron Heustis Patrick Carpenter Paul Boone Mary Kennedy (Telephone)
Indiana Ombudsman:	Carl Percy
Indiana Landmarks:	Greg Sekula
Jeffersonville HPC:	Laura Renwick
Clark County:	Carl Kramer
Jeffersonville Main Street Association:	Jay Ellis
Rose Hill Neighborhood Association:	Joe Rafferty
National Trust for Historic Preservation:	Elizabeth Merritt (Telephone)
Kentucky Ombudsman:	Lee Walker
CTS-GEC:	John Sacksteder Jim Hilton Jeff Vlach
Stantec:	Richard Sutherland
Qk4:	Tom Springer Jane Wehner



**From:** Carr, John [<mailto:JCarr@dnr.IN.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 04, 2013 12:04 PM  
**To:** Jeff Vlach  
**Cc:** Jim Hilton; John Sacksteder; Jones, Rick; Slider, Chad (DNR)  
**Subject:** RE: George Rogers Clark Memorial Bridge

Jeff,

I have a few thoughts on the Treatment Plan:

- As for the documentation of the “original bridge pylons, retaining walls and administration building,” I would recommend that photographs be taken of those features, and their context, including, ideally, a few photos, from the Indiana side, that include the cantilever-truss spans of the bridge. I recommend that the documentation be done in accordance with standards 1. and 2. of the attached copy of the “Indiana DNR—Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology Minimum Architectural Documentation Standards” (*Adopted by Indiana Historic Preservation Review Board, July 27, 2011; Minor editorial clarifications July 20, 2012*).
- I don’t know exactly how the pylons would be moved and re-set. I would ask, in general, however, that instruction be included in the specifications or other guidance given to the engineers and demolition and construction contractors to move and re-set the pylons as carefully as possible in order not to damage them or other significant features of the historic property, including the Administration Building.
- Regarding the limestone blocks, which, as I understand the situation, constitute most or all of the retaining wall, I would ask that guidance be given the engineers and demolition and construction contractors to remove the limestone blocks as carefully as possible and to reuse as many of them as practicable in the new north approach. I seem to recall that the top tier or tiers of blocks are cut at an angle because of the existing slope of the approach, which might would it impractical to reuse them. Also, I recall from the most recent BSHCT meeting that either CTS-GEC or the relevant section design team was going to obtain an estimate from a limestone supplier for the cost of providing new limestone blocks for the east retaining wall of the new approach, on the assumption that the existing blocks would be re-used in constructing the west retaining wall.
- I do not know what to recommend regarding “historically appropriate lighting.” The lighting on the George Rogers Clark Bridge north approach would not necessarily have to match than on the I-65 Kennedy Bridge or the new parallel bridge or their approaches. However, I would be cautious about recommending a style of lighting that might stand in stark contrast with the lighting on the south approach of the George Rogers Clark Bridge, if the existing lighting there is historic or represents an earlier attempt at installing historically appropriate lighting. However, the photographs from the early 1980s in our National Register file and those in the June 26, 2002, *Louisville—Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project Historic Properties Final Determination of Eligibility* show one or more cobra-head lights on both ends. My best suggestion at this point is that compatible

(but not necessarily historically-appearing) lighting be installed on the new approach, rather than using cobra-head lighting again, as long as it doesn't "clash" with the lighting on the south approach.

- I can't recall whether this has been covered in previous discussions of the north approach, but I noticed in some of the early 1980s photos in our NR file that the rail on the lower part of the north approach, north of the current location of the pylons, appears to be a solid, paneled concrete (or possibly carved limestone), rather than the historic metal railing used farther south on the bridge. I know that the metal rail has been discussed, but I can't recall what is planned for the concrete (or limestone) part of the rail. Although the widening of the north approach and northward shifting of the pylons will change the configuration of the north approach, I think it would be appropriate if some part of the lower (northernmost) rail of the new north approach also used paneled concrete or limestone. I took a quick look back at the plan and cross-section drawings that were provided to us earlier this year, but I can't tell what kind of rail, if any, will extend north of the new locations of the pylons.

John L. Carr  
Team Leader for Historic Structures Review  
Division of Historic Preservation and Archaeology  
Indiana Department of Natural Resources  
402 W. Washington St., Room W274  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
Ph. No.: 317-233-1949 Fax No.: 317-232-0693