2.1.1 KICKOFF MEETING
The process began with a kickoff meeting, held on March 2, 2012, that included Metro Parks staff, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) staff, and representatives from the Consultant team (HDR Inc., Corn Island Archaeology, and Redwing Environmental). During this meeting, the project’s scope, goals, and schedule were discussed. A study area tour provided the project team with an initial orientation of the corridor and helped identify some initial path corridors for future study.

2.1.2 BASE MAP PREPARATION
Base maps were developed using the Louisville/Jefferson County Information Consortium (LOJIC) database of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) information. Base map information included aerial photography, topography, water bodies, floodplains, wetlands, parcel lines, public lands, golf courses, and cemeteries.

2.1.3 PUBLIC MEETING #1 (PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING)
The first public meeting was held on April 16, 2012, at the Okolona Christian Church, with approximately 34 people in attendance. Metro Parks released a press release to notify the public of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was twofold 1) to inform the community of the proposed project (its goals, purpose, and scope); and 2) to gather initial public input regarding path routes to consider, routes to avoid, and key opportunities and constraints within the study area. The meeting was divided into three parts—a preliminary open house, a formal presentation, and a final open house.

Meeting materials included:
- An Overall Board illustrating the study area and project limits.
- Four scroll maps that showed the study area in more detail and included the location of existing roadway/bicycle/pedestrian projects within the study area. Each scroll map covered a quarter of the study area.
- A handout describing the process and a map of study area.
- A comment form that could be filled in during the meeting or mailed to Metro Parks.
- A PowerPoint presentation describing the path planning process.

Please review Appendix A for presentation materials and public comments from Public Meeting #1.

2.1.4 DEVELOPMENT OF INITIAL SUB ROUTES
Following Public Meeting #1, initial path segments were identified using a combination of the following: public input, consultation with Metro Parks, and an analysis of aerial photography and GIS information. These initial path segments (referred to as sub-routes) are short path segments that connect intermediate destinations within the study area; they are the building blocks of the preliminary routes.

2.1.5 FIELD WORK SESSION
Once the initial sub-routes were identified, each route was evaluated during a field session from May 23–May 25, 2012. Routes were evaluated based upon the following criteria: type of trail potential (bike lane, off-street, or soft surface), safety, user experience, connectivity, available right of way, and topography. The fieldwork session also identified several additional sub-routes, not originally identified in the initial analysis of path segments. Following the field work session, the sub-routes were named and mapped.

2.1.6 INTERAGENCY OPEN HOUSE AND PUBLIC MEETING #2 (PRESENTATION OF THE SUB ROUTES)
An interagency open house was held on July 31, 2012, at the Metro Public Works office, with representatives from Metro Parks, Metro Public Works, Metro Code and Regulations, Bike Louisville, the Office of the Mayor, Transit Authority of River City (TARC), Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), and USACE. The goals of the interagency open house were to make the different agencies aware of the project, identify how this project could tie into other projects, and to get input on the sub-routes and general direction of the project.
A public meeting, held at the Okolona Christian Church, followed the interagency open house and included a presentation on the opportunities and constraints of the study area and an overview of the initial sub-routes. Two open house sessions, before and after the presentation, were held for the public to offer input on the sub-route maps. A press release, by Metro Parks served as the advertisement for the meeting, and approximately 55 people attended.

Meeting materials included:

- An Overall Board that illustrated the location of the sub-routes with short descriptions of the locations. See Figure 2.3.
- A Typical Sections Board that keyed the sub-routes to illustrative typical path sections.
- An Opportunities and Constraints Board that included photographs and short descriptions of the existing opportunities and constraints within the study area.
- Four scroll maps that showed the sub-routes in detail.
- Character photo sheets that accompanied each scroll map – the photos were keyed to the sub-routes.
- A handout describing the planning process and map of sub-routes.
- A comment form with questions that could be filled in during the meeting or mailed to Metro Parks.
- A PowerPoint presentation describing the planning process, opportunities and constraints, and sub-routes.

Please review Appendix A for presentation materials and public comments from Public Meeting #2.

### 2.1.7 Development of Preliminary Routes

Three distinct preliminary shared-use routes (connecting National Turnpike/Fairdale Road to Bardstown Road/Little Spring Boulevard intersection) and soft surface path routes were developed based upon feedback from the second public meeting, Metro Parks staff input, and additional fieldwork. Each preliminary shared-use path route and soft surface path route was developed to take a different approach to the opportunities and constraints of the study area. Once the preliminary shared-use routes and soft surface path routes were determined, the Preliminary Fairdale to Floyds Fork Shared-Use Path and Ecological Restoration Plan was created. This preliminary plan detailed each of the three preliminary shared-use routes and soft surface path routes and presented an inventory of cultural-historic and ecological resources within the corridors of the preliminary routes. A detailed discussion of the three preliminary shared-use routes and soft surface path routes can be found in Chapter 4.

#### 2.1.8 Cultural Resources Evaluation Methodology

The purpose of the cultural resources evaluation for the Fairdale to Floyds Fork Shared-Use Path and Ecological Restoration Plan is to identify the potential for cultural resources within the study area and to determine the need for avoidance mitigation measures or potential interpretive opportunities (see Figure 2.4). The following actions were performed to address cultural resources within the study area:

1. Identify the relative presence, property types, and status of previously identified cultural resources
2. Evaluate cultural resources with regard to interpretative potential, management strategy, and distribution pattern.
3. Evaluate cultural resources within temporal, cultural, and planning contexts.
4. Identify interpretation considerations (these may pertain to individual resources, family heritage, or themes).
5. Identify preservation and management considerations.

#### DATA GATHERING

Data pertaining to cultural resources were gathered from varied sources. Data requests were submitted to state agencies. Archaeological site information was obtained from the Office of State Archaeology in Lexington. Information on the historic above-ground resources such as buildings, structures, and objects were obtained from the Kentucky Heritage Council in Lexington and Louisville Metro Planning and Design Services. Information on cemeteries may be scattered at each of these locations. For this project, cemetery data came from Louisville Metro Planning and Design Services. Additional information on each of these resources was obtained through site visits, correspondence with associated family members and local historians, historic map reviews, aerial photograph reviews, and archival research. This research examined census records, genealogical data, and data maintained at the Louisville Metro Archives and Louisville Metro Parks Archives. Additional resources, such as the following sources, also may be consulted.

- Louisville Free Public Library (LFPL)
- Jefferson County Public School Archives and Records Center (JCPS-ARC)
- The Filson Historical Society
- The Courier-Journal
- Other local newspaper articles
- The Encyclopedia of Louisville
- Kentuckiana Digital Library (KDL)
- Published books and journal articles
- Internet sources
- Personal interviews
- Old photographs
Cultural landscape categories are as follows:

- **Building** – A building is a structure created to shelter any form of human activity such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar structure. Buildings may refer to a historically related complex, such as a courthouse and jail or a house and barn.

- **District** – A district is a geographically definable area, urban or rural, possessing a significant concentration, linkage or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects which are united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical development. A district may also be comprised of individual elements which are separated geographically but are linked by association or history.

- **Site** – A site is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself maintains historical or archaeological value regardless of the value of any existing structures.

- **Structure** – A structure is a work made up of interdependent and interrelated parts in a definite pattern organization. Constructed by man, it is often an engineering project large in scale.

- **Object** – An object is a material thing of functional, aesthetic, cultural, historical, or scientific value that may be, by nature or design, related to a specific setting or environment.

The NRHP also recognizes four cultural landscape categories, which are not mutually exclusive. These categories may be used to determine if a landscape is a historic resource and how it should be treated, managed, and interpreted. Additional information may be accessed at the following website: http://www.nps.gov/history/hps/tps/briefs/brief36.htm. Cultural landscape categories are as follows:

- **Designed Landscape** is a landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition.

- **Vernacular Landscape** is a landscape that evolved through use by the people whose activities or occupancy shaped that landscape. Through social or cultural attitudes of an individual, family, or community, the landscape reflects the physical, biological, and cultural character of those everyday lives.

- **Historic Site** is a landscape significant for its association with a historic event, activity, or person.

- **Ethnographic Landscape** is a landscape containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that the associated people define as heritage resources.

Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) were considered for this analysis, but no formal coordination was performed. According to the NRHP Bulletin 38, Guidelines for Documenting and Evaluating Traditional Cultural Properties, the term traditional refers to:

…the body of beliefs, customs, and practices of a living community of people that have been passed down through the generations, usually orally or through practice. The traditional cultural significance of a historic property derives from the role the property plays in a community’s historically rooted beliefs, customs, and practices.

In order to identify TCPs, the intangible cultural rituals, beliefs, and traditions of a cultural group must be understood. Although only the tangible cultural property may be recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP, it is the intangible attributes associated with the property that make the property significant. The identification of TCPs relies on consultation with the cultural communities in question. As recommended by the National Register Bulletin, cultural groups may include Native American groups, rural communities, ethnic groups, urban neighborhoods, a socioeconomic community, or an artist community. No formal consultation was performed for the Fairdale to Floyds Fork Shared-Use Path and Ecological Restoration Plan.

### CULTURAL RESOURCE DISTRIBUTION, INTERPRETIVE POTENTIAL, AND SURVEY/MITIGATION NEED

Cultural resources distribution was determined by mapping the cultural resources by sub-route and identifying the frequency of occurrence. The interpretive potential of each cultural resource was scored to present a view of each route. These were assigned a value 1 through 3 with 1 being the highest interpretive potential. Also scored was the potential need for additional survey or mitigation of adverse effects during construction of the route. These were assigned values between 1 and 3 with 1 attributed to resources that may present additional management considerations during construction—those within previously unsurveyed areas, those that may require additional survey for other reasons, and those that may be adversely impacted by additional traffic.

#### 2.1.9 ECOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The ecological assessment used an existing data review to identify potential resources along the alternative alignments. These locations were then field-checked to document local conditions (see Figure 2.5). The existing data used was:

- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangle maps for blue-line streams, dashed-blue-line streams, lakes, and ponds
- Aerial photographs for large wooded areas
- National Wetlands Inventory maps and Jefferson County Soil Survey maps for potential wetlands
- Correspondence from the Kentucky State Nature Preserves Commission (KSNPC) for records of protected species occurrences
- The 2010 303(d) list prepared by the Kentucky Division of Water (KDDW) for impaired streams and water bodies.

The majority of the potential resources identified by the data review were field-checked; however, some resources on private property far from public roads and rights-of-way could not be evaluated. The major inaccessible areas were the South Park Hills at the west end of the Preliminary Route C, a cross-country route through rural pasture and woodlands on the eastern Preliminary Route A, and the Cedar Creek corridor north and south of Independence School Road on Preliminary Route B. A field assessment of potential ecological resources along the three preliminary routes was conducted. In addition, data and photographs previously collected for Louisville Metro Parks at McNeely Lake Park were employed to document ecological resources in this area. The following methods were used to document natural resources in the Louisville Loop corridor:

- Waters and Wetlands: Areas identified during data review as having streams, lakes, or ponds were documented to record physical characteristics of the water body, the type of riparian corridor, the quality of the resource, and the potential actions for ecological restoration. Named perennial streams, and some representative tributary streams, were evaluated for stream quality using Rapid Ecological Assessment (REA) techniques.

### FIGURE 2.5 STUDY AREA ECOLOGICAL RESOURCE - FISHPPOOL CREEK
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Bioassessment Protocol (RBP) sheets developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). A total of 17 RBP were performed. Potential wetland areas were investigated at the reconnaissance level by looking for areas dominated by wetland vegetation and exhibiting wetland hydrology indicators. No formal wetland delineation was conducted.

- Natural Habitats: Areas identified as having potential woodlands or other natural habitats were documented to record the general maturity of the overstory, the dominant native species, the invasive species, the quality of the habitat, and the potential for ecological restoration.
- Protected Species: Records of protected species observations were obtained from KSNPC through a project consultation request. In a letter dated March 14, 2012, KSNPC provided habitat information and coordinates for protected species that were previously recorded within the study area. KSNPC notes that these data are sensitive, and the exact location of plants, animals, and natural communities may not be released in any document or correspondence. Some additional protected species occurrences were documented in McNeely Lake Park during previous ecological studies for Louisville Metro Parks in 2011 and 2012. In addition, lists of protected species known to occur in Jefferson County and within the USGS topographic quadrangles for the project were obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources (KDFWR), respectively. Potential habitat for the listed species was evaluated within the proposed alignments.

- Ecological Restoration: Opportunities for ecological restoration were evaluated throughout the three preliminary routes. Major opportunities for restoring and enhancing natural habitats include: restoration of native forested riparian corridors through control of invasive plants, planting native species, and trash removal; streambank stabilization along high erosional areas; and enhancement and restoration of threatened and endangered species habitat. These ecological restoration activities will serve to benefit water quality and wildlife habitat, as well as increase aesthetics and outdoor recreation and education opportunities for the public.

2.1.10 INTERAGENCY OPEN HOUSE AND PUBLIC MEETING #3
(PRESENTATION OF THE PRELIMINARY ROUTES)

A second interagency open house was held on November 13, 2012, at the Metro Public Works office, with representatives from Metro Parks, Metro Public Works, Metro Economic Growth and Development, KIPDA (Kentuckiana Regional Planning and Development Agency), KYTC, and USACE. The goal of the second interagency open house was to get input on the three preliminary shared-use routes and soft surface path routes. A third public meeting, held at the Okolona Christian Church, followed the second interagency open house. The meeting included a presentation of the preliminary shared-use path and soft surface path routes, as well as two open house sessions (before and after the presentation) for the public to offer input regarding the path routes. A press release, by Metro Parks, served as the advertisement for the meeting and 36 people attended Public Meeting #3.

Meeting materials included:

- An Overall Board that illustrated the location of the three preliminary shared-use path routes and soft surface path routes (see Figure 2.6). Summary tables, included on the Overall Board, highlighted key aspects of each route, such as, length, cost, land acquisition, and significant advantages and disadvantages.
- Four scroll maps that showed the preliminary shared-use path routes and soft surface path routes in detail.
- A handout describing the planning process with a map of preliminary shared-use path routes and soft surface path routes.
- A comment form with questions that could be filled in during the meeting or mailed to Metro Parks.
- A PowerPoint presentation describing the planning process and locations of the preliminary shared-use path routes and soft surface path routes.

Please review Appendix A for presentation materials and public comments from Public Meeting #3.

2.1.11 DEVELOPMENT OF RECOMMENDED ALIGNMENT

The three preliminary shared-use path routes were broken down into segments and analyzed. Segments of each route were compared against each other, using the following criteria: path type, length, cost, available right of way, crossings, user experience, opportunities for cultural-historic interpretation, opportunities for ecological restoration, and connectivity. This analysis, in addition to public input, and Metro Parks consultation was used to determine the recommended shared-use path alignment. A detailed discussion of the recommended shared-use route path alignment can be found in Chapter 5.

2.1.12 PUBLIC MEETING #4
(PRESENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDED ALIGNMENT)

The recommended shared-use path and soft surface path alignments were presented at a fourth public meeting, held on Feb. 26, 2013; 40 people attended this final public meeting. In addition to a press release, meeting invitations were mailed to all addresses adjacent to the recommended alignment – approximately 3,000 invitations were mailed out (see Figure 2.7). The final public meeting format matched the three previous public meetings – a formal presentation and two open house sessions. The presentation focused on the highlights of the recommended shared-use path and alignment – its approach to connectivity, safety, user experience, crossing locations, and cultural-historic/ecological opportunities.

Meeting materials included:

- An Overall Board that included a map of the recommended shared-use path and soft surface path alignments, project goals, and summary tables (the tables included alignment highlights, ecological restoration opportunities, and cultural-historic interpretation opportunities)
- A Typical Sections Board that keyed the recommended shared-use path and soft surface path alignment to illustrative typical path sections
- An Ecological Restoration Board that illustrated potential restoration techniques for three different areas along the corridor
- Four scroll maps that showed the recommended shared-use path and soft surface path routes in detail
- A handout describing the planning process, goals and objectives, and a map of the recommended shared-use path and soft surface path alignments
- A comment form that could be filled in during the meeting or mailed to Metro Parks
- A PowerPoint presentation describing the planning process and highlights of the recommended shared-use path and soft surface path alignments

Please review Appendix A for presentation materials and public comments from Public Meeting #4.