MEETING SUMMARY

Section 106 Consultation Meeting
Louisville Southern Indiana Ohio River Bridges Project (LSIORB)
McCauley-Nicolas Building
Jeffersonville, Indiana
June 1, 2011 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

ATTENDEES

Section 106 Consulting Parties

- City of Prospect: Ann Simms
- Clark's Landing (former Colgate-Palmolive): Dr. Jay Sheth, Andy Tandar
- Eastern Shawnee Tribe: Robin DuShane (by phone)
- Indiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO): John Carr
- Jeff Historic Preservation Commission: Laura Renwick
- Jeffersonville Historic Preservation Commission: Peggy Hagerty Duffy
- Jeffersonville Office of Planning and Development: Brian Fogle
- Kentucky Ombudsman: Lee Douglas Walker
- Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), Division of Environmental Analysis: Amanda Abner
- Louisville Metro Historic Preservation Officer: Richard Jett
- National Trust for Historic Preservation (NTHP): Elizabeth Merritt (by phone), Honor Keeler (by phone)
- Southern Regional Office Indiana Landmarks: Greg Sekula
- St. Francis in the Fields Episcopal Church: Reverend Robert Jennings, Chris Zimmerman (by phone)
- [1]Indiana Ombudsman: Carl Pearcy
- [1]Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO): Mark Dennen (by phone), Craig Potts (by phone), Vicki Birenberg (by phone)

State/Federal Agencies

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation: Carol Legard (by phone)
- Federal Highway Administration: Mary Ann Naber, Janice Osadczuk, Duane Thomas, Anthony Goodman
- Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT): Paul Boone, Patrick Carpenter, Laura Hilden (by phone), Jennifer Jansen (by phone)
- Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC): Gary Valentine, Tim Foreman, David Waldner, Ann Gibson, Chuck Wolfe, Tim Hagerty, John Mettille, Samantha Wright

[1] Response letter has not been returned to CTS by this invited consulting party.

Project Team Members

- Community Transportation Solutions (CTS): Jeff Vlach, John Sacksteder, Kevin Senninger, David Kroll, Bob Lauder, Rich Glasser
- Section 4 Consultant: Debby Taylor (HW Lochner)
- Section 5 Consultant: Steve Slade (Parsons Brinckerhoff)

Public Attendees

- Courier-Journal: Marcus Green

PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION

1. **Welcome**

   John Mettille and Janice Osadczuk welcomed attendees to the meeting.

2. **Introductions**

   John Mettille asked for introductions from the folks in the room and on the phone. He explained that the Bi-state Historic Consultation Team (BSHCT) and the Historic Preservation Advisory Teams (HPATs) are other groups that will continue to meet separately from the Section 106 process.

3. **Consulting Party Expectations**

   Mary Ann Naber gave an overview of the Section 106 process and explained the role of the Section 106 consulting parties. John Mettille reviewed some ground rules for the meeting.

4. **Project History**

   John Sacksteder gave a brief overview of the LSIORB project and the commitments in the 2003 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that have been implemented so far.

5. **Potential Changes to the Project**

   Gary Valentine described the potential changes to the project that will be considered during the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) process. Questions and comments included the following:

   - Dr. Jay Sheth: On the East End Bridge, will both the bridge and the tunnel be reduced to 4 lanes?
   - Gary Valentine: Yes, if that alternative is selected, both would be 4 lanes with the potential to widen to 6 lanes in the future.
   - Greg Sekula: Is tolling off the table for the 2nd St Bridge and the Sherman Minton Bridge?
   - Gary Valentine: Yes, leaders in both states have committed to this. Tolling is only being considered for the I-65 and I-265 bridges.
   - Elizabeth Merritt: For the East End Bridge, will the overall width of the non-tunnel portion be reduced from 6 lanes to 4 lanes, or will it still be the same width and just striped as 4 lanes?
   - Gary Valentine: If that alternative is selected, the overall width will be reduced.

6. 2003 Area of Potential Effect (APE)

John Mettille provided a brief description of the 2003 Broad APE, the 2003 Alternative-Specific Downtown APE, and the 2003 Alternative-Specific East End APE. Kevin Senninger described the recent efforts to update the property information within the 2003 Downtown and East End APEs. Kevin also discussed additional property surveys recently taken outside of the 2003 APE boundaries. Questions and comments included the following:

- Peggy Hagerty Duffy: Will a list of the additional notable properties be provided to the consulting parties?
- Kevin Senninger: We have started to map the properties on the Indiana side, but have not started on the Kentucky side.
- Elizabeth Merritt: So there are hundreds of properties beyond what were identified during the previous process?
- Kevin Senninger: The recent property surveys have not yet been cross-referenced with the list of contributing resources from 2003.
- Mary Ann Naber: Are the majority of the new properties considered to be contributing to existing districts?
- Kevin Senninger: This is true for the Indiana side. We have not yet completed the research on the Kentucky side.
- John Mettille: We will be providing more information on the property surveys in the next meeting. Once the APE has been established, then we will cross-reference the property updates with what was in the 2003 APE.
- John Carr: For the delineation of the APE for the SEIS, tolling will introduce factors that we were not called upon to consider previously. If you toll the Downtown and East End Bridges, this may serve as a disincentive to use those bridges, and divert traffic to US 31 Clark Bridge and Sherman Minton Bridge. Are you considering this factor in revising the APE?
- John Mettille: There will be ongoing consultation with both SHPOs on the APE as we continue studies on the project, including traffic modeling and diversion studies.
- Carol Legard: I would like more information on the traffic modeling and diversion studies. Is there a modeling plan or proposal on this?
- John Sacksteder: The project team has placed cameras throughout the area, measured the traffic data, developed economic data, and fed all of this into the travel demand model. For example, if a person is coming from New Albany into Louisville, the model uses what it will cost them, how long it will take, etc... to predict the trip routing. It is a very large model, progress is being made, and we should have more answers soon.
- John Carr: Will the consultation with the SHPOs on possibly revising the APE take place prior to the next Section 106 meeting?

- John Mettille: Yes, revision of the APE will be in consultation with the KY and IN SHPOs. If there is additional information already available on the existing APE, we will be glad to consider it. Then we would need input on any new areas after the APE is refined, if needed.

7. Next Steps

John Mettille provided an overview of the next steps in the Section 106 process.

8. Comment and Discussion Period

Additional questions and comments included the following:

- Elizabeth Merritt: The slide presentation says comments are due by June 30th. What specific types of comments are you seeking? It seems like we won't have specific types of comments until the next meeting.
- John Mettille: Any information or comments you have at this time would be appreciated.
- Elizabeth Merritt: Will you circulate minutes of this meeting?
- John Mettille: We will send out a meeting summary with a list of attendees.
- Reverend Robert Jennings: Is the cost of gasoline included in the traffic model?
- Gary Valentine: Yes, the operating costs are built into the model.

With no further questions or comments, the meeting was dismissed at 11:00 a.m.