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A. INTRODUCTION

The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) has undertaken development of Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan (CMBPP) to provide historic and engineering documentation of the forty-four (44) movable bridges located within the City of Chicago (City). This movable bridge preservation plan is intended to encourage the ongoing maintenance and rehabilitation (i.e., preservation) of bridges that are eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places. The intent is to outline goals, objectives and recommendations for the management of this group of important movable bridges. The plan provides guidance on the identification and evaluation of these resources from both a historic and engineering perspective. The plan builds upon existing practices, policies and programs within CDOT and IDOT to assist with the development of projects that provide treatment for historic structures.

As directed by the Illinois Department of Transportation Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) and in concurrence with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), this document will serve two specific commitments:

1. As a mitigation measure for the removal and replacement of the following bridges: Chicago Avenue over the North Branch of the Chicago River (S.N. 016-6008), and West Division Street over the North Branch of the Chicago River Canal (S.N. 016-6015).
2. As a resource management plan to assist CDOT and consulting parties in evaluating existing movable bridges for preservation or replacement based on historical significance, structural condition, functionality and adverse effect.

This document will assist agencies under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in implementing, monitoring, and at such agreed upon time, amending the Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the City and the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) regarding the preservation of the City-owned and maintained movable bridges.

Of the current forty-four (44) movable roadway bridges within the City limits, the City owns forty-two (42). The other two (2) bridges are State owned and maintained by IDOT. The State owned bridges are the Kennedy Expressway Feeder Bridge at Ohio Street, crossing the North Branch of the Chicago River and the I-290 (Congress Parkway) Bridge crossing the South Branch of the Chicago River. Refer to Table 1 below for a summary of the bridge locations by waterway feature crossed and the corresponding number of bridges to be preserved at each location. All bridges are currently open to vehicular traffic. A map of the bridge locations is provided as Attachment 1.
Table 1: Summary of the 44 Movable Bridges in Chicago

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number of Bridges</th>
<th>Bridges on the Main Branch of the Chicago River</th>
<th>Bridges on the North Branch of the Chicago River</th>
<th>Bridges on the South Branch of the Chicago River</th>
<th>Bridges on the Calumet River</th>
<th>Bridges on the Sanitary and Ship Canal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDOT Owned Bridges</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDOT (State) Owned Bridges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operable Bridges</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoperable Bridges</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Bridges to be Preserved</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. HISTORIC BACKGROUND

Developed at the turn of the century (early 1900s) by the City’s Bridge Division under the leadership of City Engineer John Ernst Ericson, the Chicago Type Bascule Bridge was the culmination of a study to determine the most suitable type of movable bridge based on the conditions and navigational needs of the Chicago River and its branches as well as cost and practicality. The main feature of the design was the bridge rotates around a fixed shaft or trunnion located at the design center of gravity of the movable span or leaf. In opening, the bridge rotates about this shaft and raises its leaves to a nearly vertical position, giving a clear, open passage for river vessels.

Table 2 lists all the movable bridges in the City and for the purposes of this report provides each bridge with a corresponding consecutive identification number from 1 to 44 (shown in the second column from the left). The table also identifies the bridges that are currently operable.

A majority of the movable bridges in the City are the Chicago Type Bascule Bridges. The following bridges are not Chicago Type Bascule Bridges:

- Cermak Road (Bridge ID No. 3) (rolling lift)
- Torrence Avenue (Bridge ID No. 30) (vertical lift)
- South Western Avenue (Bridge ID No. 31) (vertical lift converted to fixed bridge)

Definitions of movable, fixed, operable and inoperable bridge types are provided in Appendix A along with Definition of Historic Preservation Terms and Glossary of National Register Terms.

Only bridges located within the City limits are included in this plan. The following bridges are not included:
• Division Street over the North Branch of Chicago River Canal: This bridge has been demolished.
• Northbound and Southbound Harlem Avenue: These bridges are outside the limits of the City of Chicago.

Two of the bridges included in this plan are within the City limits, but they are State owned, and therefore the City does not have authority to propose them for preservation. These two bridges are:
• I-290 Expressway (Congress Parkway, Bridge ID No. 35)
• Kennedy EV Feeder (Ohio, Bridge ID No. 39)

The Illinois Department of Transportation has provided lists of all steel vertical lift bridges and bascule bridges in the State of Illinois. These lists and documentation provided for bascule bridges located outside of the Chicago city limits are included in Appendix B for reference only, to provide a larger context for bridges in the City. This preservation plan does not include privately owned structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Bridge ID No.</th>
<th>IDOT Structure No.</th>
<th>Bridge Name</th>
<th>Operable</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation (1900 – 1910)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>016-6011</td>
<td>Cortland Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>016-6016</td>
<td>W. Division Street (River)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>016-6007</td>
<td>Cermak Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>016-6028</td>
<td>Kinzie Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>016-6053</td>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>016-6021</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>016-6008</td>
<td>Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>016-6037</td>
<td>Ewing Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>016-6026</td>
<td>Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>016-6057</td>
<td>Webster Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>016-6029</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>016-6036</td>
<td>W. Monroe Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>016-6035</td>
<td>Michigan Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>016-6020</td>
<td>Franklin-Orleans Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>016-6054</td>
<td>N. Wells Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>016-6034</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>016-6005</td>
<td>S. California Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sanitary and Ship Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>016-6009</td>
<td>S. Cicero Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sanitary and Ship Canal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>016-6001</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>016-6042</td>
<td>100th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>016-6047</td>
<td>Roosevelt Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>016-6032</td>
<td>N. LaSalle Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>016-6010</td>
<td>N. Clark Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>016-6043</td>
<td>106th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF HISTORIC MOVABLE BRIDGES

The National Register of Historic Places provides a mechanism for evaluating the significance of historic resources. In order to be eligible for listing on the National Register, a resource must retain sufficient integrity, be at least 50 years old (with rare exceptions), and have significance in one of the following areas:

**Criterion A**: A resource may be eligible under this criterion if it is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

**Criterion B**: A resource may be eligible under this criterion if it is associated with the lives of significant persons in our past.

**Criterion C**: A resource may be eligible under this criterion if it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

**Criterion D**: Resources having significance under this criterion are ones that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>River/River Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>016-6052</td>
<td>Wabash Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>016-6024</td>
<td>S. Halsted Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>016-6002</td>
<td>N. Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>016-6030</td>
<td>Outer Lake Shore Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>016-6003</td>
<td>S. Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>016-6050</td>
<td>Torrence Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>016-6056</td>
<td>S. Western Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sanitary and Ship Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>016-6006</td>
<td>Canal Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>016-6048</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>016-6023</td>
<td>N. Halsted Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>016-2445</td>
<td>I-290 (Congress Parkway)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>016-6051</td>
<td>Van Buren Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>016-6038</td>
<td>95th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>016-6025</td>
<td>Harrison Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>016-0202</td>
<td>Kennedy EV Feeder (Ohio)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>016-6014</td>
<td>Dearborn Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>016-6017</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>016-6033</td>
<td>Loomis Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>016-6101</td>
<td>Columbus Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>016-6102</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 IDOT owned bridges
Bridges are typically eligible under either Criterion A or Criterion C. The primary consideration for eligibility is integrity, which has seven distinct elements. Integrity is comprised of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Alterations that adhere to the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and do not significantly change the character defining features of the bridge will not disqualify it from being potentially eligible for listing on the National Register.

Structures may have significance at one of three levels: national, state, or local. Often bridges serve as a vital link with a local transportation network, but may have significance on a broader scale for their engineering or aesthetics, or as a critical connection along a highway corridor, or as a rare type.

Based on their rare movable design and the large collection of these movable bridges in the City of Chicago, it has been determined that all 44 movable bridges in the City of Chicago are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A and C.

C.1 Inventory of Chicago’s Movable Bridges

Chicago’s 44 movable bridges are summarized in a chart for easy reference, provided as Attachment 2. The bridges are listed in the order of the generation in which it was designed and/or constructed, with each generation given a color designation:

- First Generation: 1900-1910 (red)
- Second Generation: 1911 – 1930 (orange)
- Third Generation: 1932-1949 (blue)
- Fourth Generation: 1952-1967 (green)

Column Headings
Within each generation, basic identifying data about each bridge is provided in each column:

- Bridge number, bridge name: IDOT structure number, construction date, bridge type, operability, and reference photos of the bridge houses and an overall view of the bridge.
- Based upon bridge type, designer, historical information and review of construction drawings, a column was created to list other bridges that “compare to” each bridge.
- Short summary statements regarding the significance of each bridge are listed – which fall in to one or more of three categories: Structural Significance, Historical Significance or Architectural Significance.
- A column is provided to illustrate or describe exceptional features.
- Three columns are provided to indicate Landmark Status: National Register Listed, National Register Eligible (yes/no) and Landmark Status (City, National or Contributing within a Historic District)
In conjunction with the development of this preservation plan, a concise history of each bridge was developed, and formatted to fit the Historic Illinois Engineering Record (HIER) Level III format. These HIER reports for each bridge include the physical history, historical context, engineering information, sources of information and historic photographs. Bridge histories are organized in numerical order by their Bridge ID number. These stand-alone documents have been reviewed and filed by the Illinois SHPO. These completed draft HIER documents will facilitate future SHPO coordination for rehabilitation and repair projects on Chicago’s 44 movable bridges.

D. BRIDGE MAINTENANCE AND PRESERVATION REQUIREMENTS

D.1 Technical Considerations

In evaluation of a movable bridge for programming capital work, there are a number of technical considerations that are considered while determining the course of action. Each adds a perspective to the project and the scope of the improvement. CDOT will consider:

- Safety Concerns: A comparison of the structure features to current standards will be made to determine deficiencies in structure features and identifying design exceptions. Consideration of accident data, sight lines, design speed and geometrics would be given.
- Structural Condition: Bridge inspections occur at a regular interval to comply with National Bridge Information Standards. Some of the existing movable bridges are inspected more frequently than NBIS standards due to the nature of the structure or potentially the condition. Safety of Life is a priority and a consideration of the structural assessment of the bridge.
- Transportation Needs/Site Conditions: Economic development, housing trends and rejuvenation of areas can place greater demand on existing infrastructure, raising concerns and need for evaluation. Increased Average Daily Traffic demands or load requirements due to factory locations can be cause of evaluation of these structures.
- Replacement Cost: Consideration of the economic feasibility of rehabilitation versus replacement will be a contributing factor to bridge evaluation. Available funding programs and the Return on Investment will be evaluated in programing projects.
- Testing: Material testing of individual components of the structure may be required to further evaluate the potential for rehabilitation and preservation.
D.2 Maintenance

The Chicago Department of Transportation inspects its bridges and viaducts in accordance with all NBIS, FHWA, and IDOT requirements. The inspection program is managed by the Agency Program Manager, and the inspections are performed by qualified consultants. These qualifications are determined by the Chicago Department of Transportation and are at least as strict as those outlined in CFR 650.309.

The movable bridges in the City of Chicago are complex as defined by CFR 650.305. In accordance with CFR 650.313(f), each bridge has a Complex Bridge Inspection Plan which provides specialized inspection procedures. Each bridge receives a routine inspection at 24-month intervals. Bridges that have fracture critical members receive fracture critical inspections at 24 or 12-month intervals depending on age, traffic characteristics, and known deficiencies. Bridges that are located on the National Highway System receive element level inspections at 24-month intervals. Each bridge requiring an underwater inspection as defined in CFR 650.305 receives underwater inspections at 60-month intervals. Additionally, bascule bridges receive mechanical and electrical inspections of their systems which enable movement at 60-month intervals.

As the owner of all its 42 movable bridges CDOT's bascule bridge maintenance and rehabilitation program consists of:

- Routine maintenance consists of minor structural repairs, bridge pit cleaning and pumping, bridge deck washing, scupper cleaning, maintenance of electrical and machinery components of the movable span, and maintenance of the operator’s bridge house. Maintenance is mostly performed by CDOT crews of iron workers, carpenters, cement finishers, electricians and machinists. Maintenance on the Calumet River bridges is performed yearlong, as the bridges are operated around the clock. Maintenance on the Chicago River bridges is performed as needed, prior to and during the recreational boat run season in Spring and Fall. Selective bridge painting projects are executed each year. The scope consists of sandblasting, cleaning, and painting the structures. The sandblasting removes built-up rust and existing lead-based paint from the steel. A three-coat paint system is then applied to protect it from future corrosion. This work increases the lifespan of a structure considerably.
- Major rehabilitation/reconstruction projects are planned by CDOT’s Capital Improvement Program. CDOT’s goal is to restore bascule bridges to their original structural and architectural conditions. Such projects require federal funds and are conducted through a rigorous review process by IDOT and FHWA.
D.3 Chicago Department of Transportation Mid-Term Rehabilitation Plan

Following is a list of intended bridge improvements anticipated to occur within the next 10 years.

Table 3. Planned Work to Chicago’s Movable Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Structure Number</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Within 5 Years</th>
<th>Within 10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>016-6011</td>
<td>Cortland Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>016-6016</td>
<td>W. Division Street over River</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>016-6053</td>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>016-6021</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>016-6008</td>
<td>Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>016-6037</td>
<td>Ewing Avenue</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>016-6026</td>
<td>Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>016-6057</td>
<td>Webster Avenue</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>016-6029</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>016-6035</td>
<td>Michigan Avenue</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>016-6020</td>
<td>Franklin Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>016-6009</td>
<td>Cicero Avenue</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>016-6042</td>
<td>100th Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>016-6032</td>
<td>LaSalle Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>016-6010</td>
<td>Clark Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>016-6043</td>
<td>106th Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>016-6024</td>
<td>South Halsted Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>016-6048</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>016-6051</td>
<td>Van Buren Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>016-6038</td>
<td>95th Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>016-6017</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>016-6033</td>
<td>Loomis Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D.4 Treatment Options

Approaches to ongoing Maintenance and Repair, based upon the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:

1. USE: Every reasonable effort shall be made to continue a historic bridge in useful transportation service. Primary consideration shall be given to rehabilitation of the bridge on site. Only when this option has been fully exhausted shall other alternatives be explored.

2. ORIGINAL CHARACTER-DEFINING QUALITIES: The original character-defining qualities or elements of a bridge, its site, and its environment should be respected. The removal, concealment, or alteration of any historic material or distinctive engineering or architectural features must be avoided.
3. PRODUCTS OF THEIR OWN TIME: All bridges shall be recognized as products of their own time. Alterations that have no historical basis and that seek to create a false historical appearance shall not be undertaken.

4. CHANGES OVER TIME: Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. DISTINCTIVE ENGINEERING: Distinctive engineering and stylistic features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.

6. DOCUMENTED IN-KIND REPAIR/REPLACEMENT: Deteriorated structural members and architectural features shall be retained and repaired, rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive element, the new element should match the old in design, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

7. CHEMICAL OR PHYSICAL TREATMENTS: Chemical or physical treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.

8. EFFECTS TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES: Significant archaeological and cultural resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. ALTERATIONS/STRUCTURAL REINFORCEMENTS: Exterior alterations, structural reinforcements, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. NEW ADDITIONS AND NEW CONSTRUCTION: New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Options for long-term preservation and future re-use

1. Rehabilitation for continued vehicular/pedestrian use on-site (ongoing continued use)
2. Rehabilitation for less demanding use on-site (reduce transportation requirements)
   a. Re-route heavy truck traffic
   b. Consider one-way traffic
3. Relocation and rehabilitation for less demanding or adaptive use (re-use at a different location)
   a. Transfer Ownership (off-site)
   b. Re-use as a bicycle/pedestrian bridge
4. Closure and stabilization pending future use
5. Major alteration while preserving substantial historic fabric
   a. Incorporate improvements that allow bridge to fulfill transportation need
6. Document, dismantle and retain for DOT or Adaptive Use
7. Document and Salvage Elements and/or Demolish

E. CONCLUSIONS

Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan (CMBPP) is not intended to supersede or replace existing regulatory requirements. It is the intent of CDOT and IDOT that the following regulations continue to be met throughout the life of the bridges:

1. Section 106 – National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), 1966 (as amended)
2. Section 4(f) – U.S. Department of Transportation Act (DOT Act), 1966
3. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)
4. Title 23 of U.S. Code, Section 144
5. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties

Critical to the preservation of these movable bridges is the City of Chicago’s commitment to maintenance of the bridge elements, prolonging the life and usefulness of these structures. A Programmatic Agreement between CDOT, IDOT and the FWHA is in development that will call out the procedures for long-term maintenance and preservation of the 44 movable bridges in the City of Chicago.

F. CONSULTING PARTIES AND THE PUBLIC

As part of the process whenever an adverse effect has been proposed for a bridge structure, a period of public comment will be established. Public notice will be given, and the following bridge/advocacy groups will be invited to review and comment on this preservation plan and futures projects with the potential to affect any of the 44 movable bridges:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District (https://www.lrc.usace.army.mil/)
- U.S. Coast Guard Atlantic Area; Ninth District; Sector Lake Michigan (https://www.atlanticarea.uscg.mil/Our-Organization/District-9/Ninth-District-Units/Sector-Lake-Michigan/Units/Calumet-Harbor/)
- Federally recognized Tribes (Note: There are no federally recognized tribes in the State of Illinois)
- Landmarks Illinois (http://www.landmarks.org/)
- Preservation Chicago (https://preservationchicago.org/)
- Friends of the Chicago River (https://www.chicagoriver.org/)
- Chicago Historic Bridge Foundation (http://historicbridgefoundation.com/)
- Historic Bridges.org (http://historicbridges.org/)
- The Chicago History Museum (http://www.chicagohistory.org)
CDOT will upload to their website, the latest Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan (CMBPP) and ratified Programmatic Agreement (PA), which will be available to the public.

G. PROJECT TEAM

Data was collected for Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan by T.Y. Lin International for the City of Chicago Department of Transportation. The team was comprised of:

CDOT, Division of Engineering: Soliman Khudeira, PhD, PE, SE, Section Chief, Major Projects
T.Y. Lin International: Paula Pienton, PE, SE, Sr. Vice President, Project Manager
Phillip Frey, PE, SE, Chief Structural Engineer
Sullivan | Preservation: Anne T. Sullivan, FAIA, FAPT, Consulting Historic Architect
Jean L. Guarino, PhD, Consulting Architectural Historian
CHICAGO MOVABLE BRIDGE PRESERVATION PLAN

APPENDIX A

Definitions

A) Bridge Types  
B) Historic Preservation Terms  
C) Glossary of National Register Terms
A) **DEFINITIONS OF BRIDGE TYPES**

**Movable Bridge** – Highway bridge structure originally designed with power, drive, control, safety and other necessary equipment to lift vertically, rotate vertically around a horizontal axis, or roll away to clear a waterway navigation channel for passage of ships and boats.

**Fixed Bridge** – Highway bridge structure spanning a waterway that was not designed to move and clear a navigation channel for passage of ships and boats.

**Operable Bridge** – Movable bridge with power, drive, control, safety and other necessary equipment in place and functional. Can be operated to clear channel.

**Inoperable Bridge** – Movable bridge with some or all of the power, drive, control, safety and other necessary equipment not in place or not in functional condition. Cannot be operated to clear channel in present state.
B) DEFINITION OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION TERMS
per the Department of the Interior National Park Service
(https://www.nps.gov/nhl/apply/glossary.htm)

Three key concepts – Historic Significance, Historic Context, and Historic Integrity – are used by the National Register program to decide whether a property qualifies for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

**Historic Significance** is the importance of a property to the history, architecture, archeology, engineering, or culture of a community, State, or the nation. It is achieved in several ways:
- Association with events, activities or patterns
- Association with important persons
- Distinctive physical characteristics of design, construction or form
- Potential to yield important information

**Historic Context**: A historic context provides the political, social, cultural and economic background for a particular idea, event, movement, or individual. Historians place historic events within a “historic context” to understand the meaning of an event or a property within a specific culture and/or time period. Placing an event in its context enables historians to better understand if an event was unique or typical of the period, and/or how it may have impacted a culture or period. The historic context enables the NPS to determine if a property being nominated is the best, or among the best, illustration(s) of a historic event or movement. The historic context also enables the NPS to understand the role the property played in American history overall.

**Historic Integrity**: Historic integrity is the ability of a property to convey its historical associations or attributes. The National Historic Landmark (NHL) and the National Register of Historic Places (NR) programs use the same seven aspects of integrity to evaluate properties: location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.

**Location**: Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred. The relationship between the property and its location is often important to understanding why the property was created or why something happened. The actual location of a historic property, complemented by its setting, is particularly important in recapturing the sense of historic events and persons.

**Setting**: Setting is the physical environment of a historic property. Whereas location refers to the specific place where a property was built or an event occurred, setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role. It involves how, not just where, the property is situated and its relationship to surrounding features and open space.

Setting often reflects the basic physical conditions under which a property was built and the functions it was intended to serve. In addition, the way in which a
property is positioned in its environment can reflect the designer's concept of nature and aesthetic preferences.

**Design:** Design is the combination of elements that create the historic form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property. It results from conscious decisions made during the original conception and planning of a property (or its significant alteration) and applies to activities as diverse as community planning, engineering, architecture, and landscape architecture. Design includes such elements as organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation, and materials. It also applies to the way in which buildings, sites, or structures are related: for example, spatial relationships between major features; visual rhythms in a streetscape or landscape plantings; the layout and materials of walkways and roads; and the relationship of other features, such as statues, water fountains, and archeological sites.

**Materials:** Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property. The choice and combination of materials reveal the preferences of those who created the property and indicate the availability of particular types of materials and technologies. Indigenous materials are often the focus of regional building traditions and thereby help define an area's sense of time and place.

**Workmanship:** Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history. It is the evidence of artisans' labor and skill in constructing or altering a building, structure, object or site. It may be expressed in vernacular methods of construction and plain finishes or in highly sophisticated configurations and ornamental detailing. It can be based on common traditions or innovative period techniques.

**Feeling:** Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character. For example, a rural historic district retaining original design, materials, workmanship, and setting will relate the feeling of agricultural life in the 19th century.

**Association:** Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. Like feeling, association requires the presence of physical features that convey a property's historic character.

Because feeling and association depend on individual perceptions, their retention alone is never sufficient to support eligibility of a property for the National Register.
Considerations when evaluating Integrity:

Comparing similar properties: For some properties, comparison with similar properties should be considered during the evaluation of integrity. Such comparison may be important in deciding what physical features are essential to properties of that type. In instances where it has not been determined what physical features a property must possess in order for it to reflect the significance of a historic context, comparison with similar properties should be undertaken during the evaluation of integrity. This situation arises when scholarly work has not been done on a particular property type or when surviving examples of a property type are extremely rare.

Rare Examples of a Property Type: Comparative information is particularly important to consider when evaluating the integrity of a property that is a rare surviving example of its type. The property must have the essential physical features that enable it to convey its historic character or information. The rarity and poor condition, however, of other extant examples of the type may justify accepting a greater degree of alteration or fewer features, provided that enough of the property survives for it to be a significant resource.

Determining the relevant aspects of Integrity:

Each type of property depends on certain aspects of integrity, more than others, to express its historic significance. Determining which of the aspects is most important to a particular property requires an understanding of the property's significance and its essential physical features. These are called the Criteria for National Register Evaluation.

Criteria for National Register Evaluation: The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

Criteria A: That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history

Criteria B: That are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past

Criteria C: That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction

Criteria D: That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines
The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties are common sense historic preservation principles in non-technical language. They promote historic preservation by practices that will help to protect our nation’s irreplaceable cultural resources. The Standards offer four distinct approaches to the treatment of historic properties—preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction.

**Preservation** focuses on the maintenance and repair of existing historic materials and retention of a property’s form as it has evolved over time.

**Rehabilitation** acknowledges the need to alter or add to a historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property’s historic character.

**Restoration** depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.

**Reconstruction** re-creates vanished or non-surviving portions of a property for interpretive purposes.

The choice of treatment depends on a variety of factors, including the property’s historical significance, physical condition, proposed use and intended interpretation.

The Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines offer general design and technical recommendations to assist in applying the Standards to a specific property. Together with the Standards, they provide a framework and guidance for decision-making about work or changes to a historic property.

The Standards and Guidelines can be applied to historic properties of all types, materials, construction, sizes, and use. They include both the exterior and the interior and extend to a property’s landscape features, site, environment, as well as related new construction.

Federal agencies use the Standards and Guidelines in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities. State and local officials use them in reviewing both Federal and nonfederal rehabilitation proposals. Historic district and planning commissions across the country use the Standards and Guidelines to guide their design review processes.

**Using the Standards as an Approach to the Treatment of Historic Properties**

The Standards are a series of four concepts about maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations.

1. **Preservation**
   Preservation is defined as the act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work,
including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction. New exterior additions are not within the scope of this treatment; however, the limited and sensitive upgrading of mechanical, electrical and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a preservation project.

Preservation as a Treatment
When the property's distinctive materials, features, and spaces are essentially intact and thus convey the historic significance without extensive repair or replacement; when depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate; and when a continuing or new use does not require additions or extensive alterations, Preservation may be considered as a treatment.

Standards for Preservation
1. A property will be used as it was historically, or be given a new use that maximizes the retention of distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships. Where a treatment and use have not been identified, a property will be protected and, if necessary, stabilized until additional work may be undertaken.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The replacement of intact or repairable historic materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve existing historic materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. The existing condition of historic features will be evaluated to determine the appropriate level of intervention needed. Where the severity of deterioration requires repair or limited replacement of a distinctive feature, the new material will match the old in composition, design, color and texture.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.

2. Rehabilitation
Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.
Rehabilitation as a Treatment
When repair and replacement of deteriorated features are necessary; when
alterations or additions to the property are planned for a new or continued use;
and when its depiction at a particular period of time is not appropriate,
Rehabilitation may be considered as a treatment.

Standards for Rehabilitation
1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that
   requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and
   spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The
   removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial
   relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and
   use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as
   adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not
   be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own
   right will be retained and preserved.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or
   examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the
   severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new
   feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible,
   materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by
   documentary and physical evidence.
7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the
   gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials
   will not be used.
8. Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such
   resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
9. New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy
   historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the
   property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be
   compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion,
   and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in
    such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity
    of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

3. Restoration
Restoration is defined as the act or process of accurately depicting the form,
features, and char5acter of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by
means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction
of missing features from the restoration period. The limite4d and sensitive
upgrading of mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems and other code-required work to make properties functional is appropriate within a restoration project.

**Restoration as a Treatment**
When the property's design, architectural, or historical significance during a particular period of time outweighs the potential loss of extant materials, features, spaces, and finishes that characterize other historical periods; when there is substantial physical and documentary evidence for the work; and when contemporary alterations and additions are not planned, Restoration may be considered as a treatment. Prior to undertaking work, a particular period of time, i.e., the restoration period, should be selected and justified, and a documentation plan for Restoration developed.

**Standards for Restoration**
1. A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that interprets the property and its restoration period.
2. Materials and features from the restoration period will be retained and preserved. The removal of materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize the period will not be undertaken.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Work needed to stabilize, consolidate and conserve materials and features from the restoration period will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection and properly documented for future research.
4. Materials, features, spaces and finishes that characterize other historical periods will be documented prior to their alteration or removal.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the restoration period will be preserved.
6. Deteriorated features from the restoration period will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials.
7. Replacement of missing features from the restoration period will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. A false sense of history will not be created by adding conjectural features, features from other properties, or by combining features that never existed together historically.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.
9. Archeological resources affected by a project will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
10. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

4. **Reconstruction**
Reconstruction is defined as the act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

Reconstruction as a Treatment
When a contemporary depiction is required to understand and interpret a property's historic value (including the re-creation of missing components in a historic district or site); when no other property with the same associative value has survived; and when sufficient historical documentation exists to ensure an accurate reproduction, Reconstruction may be considered as a treatment.

Standards for Reconstruction
1. Reconstruction will be used to depict vanished or non-surviving portions of a property when documentary and physical evidence is available to permit accurate reconstruction with minimal conjecture, and such reconstruction is essential to the public understanding of the property.
2. Reconstruction of a landscape, building, structure or object in its historic location will be preceded by a thorough archeological investigation to identify and evaluate those features and artifacts that are essential to an accurate reconstruction. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.
3. Reconstruction will include measures to preserve any remaining historic materials, features and spatial relationships.
4. Reconstruction will be based on the accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color and texture.
5. A reconstruction will be clearly identified as a contemporary re-creation.
6. Designs that were never executed historically will not be constructed.

C) GLOSSARY OF NATIONAL REGISTER TERMS
Per National Register Bulletin Appendix IV
(https://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/nrb16a.pdf)

Accompanying documentation—USGS map, photographs, and sketch maps that accompany completed registration form.

Acreage—area of a historic property measured in acres.

Amendment documentation—provided on a new registration form or continuation sheets for a property already listed in the National Register officially changing the significance, boundaries, name, or other aspect of the listing.
Antiquities Act—enacted in 1906, the first legislation in the United States to preserve American antiquities, including the designation and protection of national monuments on federally owned land.

Archeological district—a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites important in history or prehistory.

Architectural classification—item on registration form calling for the entry of an architectural style or other term by which property can be identified.

Architectural significance—importance of a property based on physical aspects of its design, materials, form, style, or workmanship, and recognized by criterion C.

Area of significance—aspect of historic development in which a property made contributions for which it meets the National Register criteria, such as agriculture or politics/government.

Association—link of a historic property with a historic event, activity, or person. Also, the quality of integrity through which a historic property is linked to a particular past time and place.

 Associative characteristic—an aspect of a property's history that links it with historic events, activities, or persons.

Boundaries—lines delineating the geographical extent or area of a historic property.

Boundary description—a precise description of the lines that bound a historic property.

Boundary justification—an explanation of the reasons for selecting the boundaries of a historic property.

Building—a resource created principally to shelter any form of human activity, such as house.

Certification—process by which a nominating authority signs a National Register form or continuation sheet to verify the accuracy of the documentation and to express his or her opinion on the eligibility of the property for National Register listing; also, the signature through which the authority nominates a property or requests a determination of eligibility; also, the process and signature by which the Keeper of the National Register acts on a request for listing, a determination of eligibility, or other action.

Certified Local Government (CLG)—a local government officially certified to carry out some of the purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended.
Certifying official---SHPO or FPO who initiates and supports a nomination or requests other official action related to National Register listing.

CLG---see "certified local government."

Commenting official---any official whose comment is required or requested on the nomination of a property to the National Register or other action related to National Register listings.

Contributing resource---a building, site, structure, or object adding to the historic significance of a property.

Criteria---general standards by which the significance of a historic property is judged; see National Register criteria.

Criteria Considerations---additional standards applying to certain kinds of historic properties.

Cultural Affiliation---archeological or ethnographic culture to which a collection of sites, resources, or artifacts belong.

Cultural resource---building, site, structure, object, or district evaluated as having significance in prehistory or history.

Current function---purpose that a property, or portion of it, currently serves or will serve in the near future.

Design---quality of integrity applying to the elements that create the physical form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.

Determination of eligibility---an action through which the eligibility of a property for National Register listing is decided but the property is not actually listed; nominating authorities and federal agency officials commonly request determinations of eligibility for federal planning purposes and in cases where a majority of private owners has objected to National Register listing.

Description---section of the registration form where the historic features and current condition of a property are described.

Discontiguous district---a historic or archeological district containing two or more geographically separate areas.

District---a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.
Documentation—information that describes, locates, and explains the significance of a historic property.

Documentation standards—requirements for describing, locating, and stating the significance of a property for listing in the National Register.

Eligibility—ability of a property to meet the National Register criteria.

Evaluation—process by which the significance and integrity of a historic property are judged and eligibility for National Register listing is determined.

Evaluation methods—steps through which the eligibility of a historic property is determined.

Event—an occasion, circumstance, or activity that occurred within a particular period of time, or continued over an extended period of time.

Federal Preservation Officer (FPO)—official designated by the head of each Federal agency to be responsible for coordinating the agency’s activities under the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, including nominating properties to the National Register.

Feeling—quality of integrity through which a historic property evokes the aesthetic or historic sense of past time and place.

Function—(or use) purpose for which a building, site, structure, object, or district is used. (See also current and historic function.)

Geographical area—an area of land containing historic or archeological resources that can be identified on a map and delineated by boundaries.

Historic context—an organizing structure for interpreting history that groups information about historic properties which share a common theme, common geographical location, and common time period. The development of historic contexts is a foundation for decisions about the planning, identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment of historic properties, based upon comparative significance.

Historic district—see "district."

Historic function—use of a district, site, building, structure, or object at the time it attained historic significance.

Historic property—any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object.

Historic significance—importance for which a property has been evaluated and found to meet the National Register criteria.
Historic Sites Act—enacted in 1935, the legislation providing for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, including the designation of National Historic Landmarks and historic units of the National Park System.

Identification---process through which information is gathered about historic properties.

Identification methods---steps through which information about historic properties is gathered.

Important person---an individual who has made significant contributions in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture.

Information potential---ability of a property to provide important information about history or prehistory through its composition and physical remains; importance recognized by criterion D.

Integrity---authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic or prehistoric period.

Level of significance---geographical level local, State, or national at which a historic property has been evaluated and found to be significant.

Local significance---importance of a property to the history of its community, such as a town or county.

Location---quality of integrity retained by a historic property existing in the same place as it did during the period of significance.

Materials---quality of integrity applying to the physical elements that were combined or deposited in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.

Multiple property documentation form---official National Register form (NPS 10-900-b) used for documenting the contexts and property types for a multiple property listing.

Multiple property listing---a group of historic properties related by common theme, general geographical area, and period of time for the purpose of National Register documentation and listing.

Multiple property submission---format through which historic properties related by theme, general geographical area, and period of time may be documented as a group and listed in the National Register.

Multiple resource submission---format previously used for documenting and listing groups of historic properties located within the same general geographical area; see "multiple property submission."
**National Historic Landmark (NHL)**---a historic property evaluated and found to have significance at the national level and designated as such by the Secretary of the Interior.

**National Historic Preservation Act, as amended**---1966 legislation establishing the National Register of Historic Places and extending the national historic preservation programs to properties of State and local significance.

**National Register criteria for evaluation**---established criteria for evaluating the eligibility of properties for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

**National Register Information System (NRIS)**---computerized data base of information on properties included in the National Register of Historic Places.

**National Register of Historic Places**---official federal list of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering and culture.

**National significance**---importance of a property to the history of the United States as a nation.

**Nominating Authority**---Federal or State official authorized to nominate properties to the National Register of Historic Places.

**Noncontributing resource**---a building, site, structure, or object that does not add to the historic significance of a property.

**Notification**---process through which property owners, public officials, and the general public are notified of nominations to and listings in and determinations of eligibility for the National Register.

**Object**---a construction primarily artistic in nature or relatively small in scale and simply constructed, such as a statue or milepost.

**Owner objection**---a notarized written statement from a property owner disapproving the nomination and listing of his or her property in the National Register.

**Ownership**---legal status in which an owner holds fee simple title to a property, or portion of it.

**Period of significance**---span of time in which a property attained the significance for which it meets the National Register criteria.

**Physical characteristics**---visible and tangible attributes of a historic property or group of historic properties.
Potential to yield information—likelihood of a property to provide information about an important aspect of history or prehistory through its physical composition and remains.

Preservation planning—series of activities through which goals, priorities, and strategies for identification, evaluation, registration, and protection of historic properties are developed.

Preservation planning process—process by which goals, priorities, and strategies for preservation planning activities are set forth and carried out.

Property—area of land containing a single historic resource or a group of resources, and constituting a single entry in the National Register of Historic Places.

Property type—a grouping of properties defined by common physical and associative attributes.

Public notice—notification made through a public notice in a local newspaper or public place.

Public participation—process by which the opinions of property owners, public officials, and the general public are considered prior to making a decision to nominate or list a historic property in the National Register.

Registration—process described in 36 CFR Part 60 which results in historic or archeological properties being listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register.

Registration requirements—attributes of significance and integrity qualifying a property for listing in the National Register.

Resource—any building, structure, site, or object that is part of or constitutes a historic property.

Resource type—the general category of property—building, structure, site, district, or object—that may be listed in the National Register.

Setting—quality of integrity applying to the physical environment of a historic property.

Significance—importance of a historic property as defined by the National Register criteria in one or more areas of significance.

Significant date—date of an event or activity related to the importance for which a property meets the National Register criteria.

Site—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
possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.

**State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)**---the official designated by the Governor to administer the State's historic preservation program and the duties described in 36 CFR Part 61 including nominating properties to the National Register.

**State historic preservation office**---office in State or territorial government that administers the preservation programs under the National Historic Preservation Act.

**State preservation plan**---document that sets forth the process by which a State develops goals, priorities, and strategies for preservation planning purposes.

**State review board**---a board, council, commission or other collegial body appointed by the SHPO to review the eligibility of nominated properties and the adequacy of nomination documentation.

**State significance**---importance of a property to the history of the State where it is located.

**Statement of significance**---section of the registration form where the reasons a property is significant and meets the National Register criteria are stated and explained.

**Structure**---a functional construction made for purposes other than creating shelter, such as a bridge.

**Thematic resource submission**---format previously used for documenting and listing a group of historic properties related by a common theme; see multiple property submission.

**Theme**---a trend or pattern in history or prehistory relating to a particular aspect of cultural development, such as dairy farming or silver mining.

**UTM reference**---a set of coordinates (easting and northing) that indicates a unique location according to the Universal Transmercator Grid appearing on maps of the United States Geological Survey.

**Verbal boundary description**---a statement that gives the precise boundaries of a historic property, such as a lot number, metes and bounds, or township and range.

**Workmanship**---quality of integrity applying to the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture, people, or artisan.
APPENDIX B

Movable Bridges in Illinois

A) List of Movable Lift Bridges in Illinois
B) List of Bascule Bridges in Illinois
C) Bascule Bridges Outside of the City of Chicago
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>District/Mains/Consty</th>
<th>Facility Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Sufficiency Maint Res</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0069908</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3 315 1904</td>
<td>Pedestrian Only</td>
<td>Hennepin Canal</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.5 MI NE MINERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0069952</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3 315 1904</td>
<td>Park Access Rd</td>
<td>Hennepin Canal</td>
<td>46.3 01</td>
<td>0.75 MI W OF WYANET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166050</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 315 1938</td>
<td>Torrence Ave</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
<td>52.4 04</td>
<td>12440 S Torrence Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166571</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>1 315 1938</td>
<td>Torrence Ave Byp</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12440 S Torrence Av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0310001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 315 1930</td>
<td>Ill 100</td>
<td>Ill Rv &amp; Tr 423</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>At Hardin Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0373016</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>2 315 1904</td>
<td>Pedestrian Only</td>
<td>Hennepin Canal</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>6 MI. W. OF GENESEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0860001</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>6 315 1929</td>
<td>Il 100/106</td>
<td>Illinois River</td>
<td>22.6 01</td>
<td>E Edge Florence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First 3 digits of Structure Number
Indicate County:

006 = Bureau
016 = Cook
031 = Green
037 = Henry
086 = Scott
099 = Will
# B) LIST OF MOVEABLE BASCULE BRIDGES IN ILLINOIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Main</th>
<th>Constr</th>
<th>Facility Carried</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Maint Res</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>016020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>OHIO ST JFK FE</td>
<td>N BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>0.5 M E HALSESTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0160315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>HARLEM AVE N SAN &amp; SHIP CANAL</td>
<td>57.01</td>
<td>0.1 M N I-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0160991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>IL 43 SB HARLE SAN &amp; SHIP CANAL</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>0.1 M N I-55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0162445</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>I-290 I-60</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>71.01</td>
<td>1500 W FRANKLIN AVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166001</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>ADAMS ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>46.54</td>
<td>100 S &amp; 380 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>ASHLAND AVE</td>
<td>N BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>2201 N &amp; 1600 W PSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>ASHLAND AVE</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>74.54</td>
<td>2601 S ASHLAND PSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>S CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>SANITARY &amp; SHIP CA</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>3300 S &amp; 2800 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>CANAL ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>500 W &amp; 2021 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>CERMAK RD</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>76.04</td>
<td>501 W CERMAK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>CHICAGO AVE</td>
<td>N BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>622 W CHGO AVE P5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>CICERO AVE</td>
<td>SANITARY SHIP CAN</td>
<td>46.04</td>
<td>4000 S &amp; 4800 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>N CLARK ST</td>
<td>MAIN BR CHICAGO</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>307 N CLARK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>CORTLAND ST</td>
<td>N BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>1440 W CORTLAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>DEARBORN ST</td>
<td>MAIN BR CHICAGO</td>
<td>62.04</td>
<td>100 W &amp; 307 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>DIVISION ST (RI)</td>
<td>N BR CHI RIVER</td>
<td>65.04</td>
<td>1129 W DIVISION PSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>18TH ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>301 W 18TH ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166020</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>FRANKLIN ORL</td>
<td>MAIN BR CHICAGO</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>302 N FRANKLIN ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166021</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>GRAND AVE</td>
<td>N BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>24.04</td>
<td>462 W &amp; 900 N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166023</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>HALSTED ST</td>
<td>N BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>81.94</td>
<td>847 HALSTED ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>HALSTED ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>67.24</td>
<td>2404 S 800 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166025</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>HARRISON ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>600 S &amp; 322 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>JACKSON BLVD</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>375 W &amp; 300 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>KINZIE ST</td>
<td>N BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>45.04</td>
<td>423 W KINZIE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>LAKE ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>356 W LAKE ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>LAKE SHORE D</td>
<td>MAIN BR CHICAGO</td>
<td>62.04</td>
<td>402 N &amp; 320 E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166032</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>N LASALLE ST</td>
<td>MAIN BR CHICAGO</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>307 N LASALLE ST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>LOOMIS ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>2470 S 1400 W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>MADISON ST</td>
<td>S BR CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>76.04</td>
<td>373 W MADISON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>MICHIGAN AVE</td>
<td>MAIN BR CHICAGO</td>
<td>47.04</td>
<td>305 N MICHIGAN AVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Constr</td>
<td>FacilityCarried</td>
<td>FeatureCrossed</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>MaintRes</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166036</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>W MONROE ST S BR, CHICAGO RIV</td>
<td>64.6 04</td>
<td>378 W &amp; 100 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166037</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>EWING AVE US CALUMET RIVER</td>
<td>60 04</td>
<td>3331 E. 92ND STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166038</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>95TH ST CALUMET RIVER</td>
<td>32.3 04</td>
<td>3258 E. 95TH STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>100TH ST CALUMET RIVER</td>
<td>47.2 04</td>
<td>3300 E 100TH STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>105TH ST CALUMET RIVER</td>
<td>65.8 04</td>
<td>3228 E 106TH STREET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166047</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>ROOSEVELT RD S BR, CHICAGO RIV</td>
<td>72.3 04</td>
<td>230 W. ROOSEVELT RD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166048</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>STATE ST MAIN BR, CHICAGO</td>
<td>39.5 04</td>
<td>309 N STATE P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>VAN BUREN ST S BR, CHICAGO RIV</td>
<td>45.7 04</td>
<td>400 S &amp; 361 W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166052</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>WABASH AVE MAIN BR, CHICAGO</td>
<td>62 04</td>
<td>44 E &amp; 326 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>WASHINGTON S BR, CHICAGO RIV</td>
<td>44.2 04</td>
<td>384 W WASHINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166054</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>N WELLS ST MAIN BR, CHICAGO</td>
<td>63 04</td>
<td>400 W &amp; 309 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166057</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>WEBSTER AVE N BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>39 04</td>
<td>1600 W WEBSTER P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>COLUMBUS DR MAIN BR, CHICAGO</td>
<td>81 04</td>
<td>347 N &amp; 301 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166102</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>RANDOLPH ST S BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>76 04</td>
<td>375 W &amp; 150 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00990101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>US 30 WB S. BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>17.7 01</td>
<td>0.8 M W OF IL 171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00990106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>US 30 EAST BO S. BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>15.5 01</td>
<td>0.8 M W OF IL 171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00990239</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>JACKSON ST S. BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>41.3 01</td>
<td>1.5 M N. OF I-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00999010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>IL 53 S. BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>48.5 01</td>
<td>1.2 M S IL 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00999030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>BRANDON RDP S. BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>61.8 01</td>
<td>BRANDON ROAD &amp; DEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00999040</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td>US 6 S. BR, CHICAGO RIVE</td>
<td>64.2 01</td>
<td>0.25 M W IL 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First 3 digits of Structure Number
Indicate County:
006 = Bureau
016 = Cook
031 = Green
037 = Henry
086 = Scott
099 = Will
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C) Illinois Movable Bascule Bridges outside of the City of Chicago

The following list of bridges have been identified as additional movable bascule bridges in Illinois (outside of Chicago city limits) per IDOT’s Bureau of Bridges & Structures Bridge Database. These bridges were not documented as part of Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan because they lie outside the City of Chicago limits.

**COOK COUNTY**

016-0315: (lat/long: 41.80138409,-87.80218016)
Northbound IL 43 (Harlem Ave.) over the Sanitary and Ship Canal, Berwyn, Cook Co., IL; 1931 Steel Movable Bascule

**COOK COUNTY**

016-0991: (lat/long: 41.80138409,-87.80218016)
Southbound IL 43 (Harlem Ave.) over the Sanitary and Ship Canal, Berwyn, Cook Co., IL; 1966 movable bascule (further description not available)

**WILL COUNTY**

099-0101: (lat/long: 41.52774683,-88.08563694)
wesbound US 30 (Jefferson St.) over the Des Plaines River, Joliet, Will Co., IL; 1933 movable bascule (further description not available)

**WILL COUNTY**

099-0166: (lat/long: 41.5248919,-88.0870708)
Jefferson Street: eastbound US 30 (Jefferson St.) over the Des Plaines River, Joliet, Will Co., IL; 1932 Steel Movable Bascule

**WILL COUNTY**

099-0239: (lat/long: 41.53150519,-88.08383591)
Jackson Street: Jackson St. over the Des Plaines River, Joliet, Will Co., IL; 1932 Steel Scherzer rolling lift double leaf Bascule

**WILL COUNTY**

099-9901: (lat/long 41.53691041,-88.08396123)
Ruby Street: IL Rt. 53 (Ruby St.) over the Des Plaines River, Joliet, Will Co., IL; 1935 Double leaf trunnion bascule with two pony trusses

**WILL COUNTY**

099-9903: (lat/long 41.50238746,-88.10453393)
Brandon Road over the Des Plaines River, Joliet, Will Co., IL; 1932 movable bascule (further description not available)

**WILL COUNTY**

099-9904: (lat/long 41.51627098,-88.08899034)
US 6 over the Des Plaines River, Joliet, Will Co., IL 1934 movable bascule (further description not available)
COOK COUNTY
016-0315: (lat/long: 41.80138409, -87.80218016)
Northbound IL 43 (Harlem Ave.) over the Sanitary and Ship Canal, Berwyn, Cook Co., IL; 1931 Steel Movable Bascule
APPENDIX C

Agency Correspondence and Meeting Minutes
Minutes of the
May 23, 2018
Consultation Meeting on
the Chicago's Movable
Bridges Preservation Plan
Chicago's Movable Bridge Preservation Plan

The following is a summary of the information presented, discussions held, and action items identified during this meeting:

Attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Agency/Company</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Burke</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>312-744-3520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliman Khudeira</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>312-744-9605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Dyson</td>
<td>IDNR/SHPO</td>
<td>217-524-0276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Leibowitz</td>
<td>IDNR/SHPO</td>
<td>217-785-5031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Bryjka</td>
<td>IDNR/SHPO</td>
<td>217-558-8918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Brydl</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>217-492-4632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahman M. Jafari</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:b.jafari@dot.gov">b.jafari@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Paul Kohler</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>217-492-4988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Piland</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>217-492-4989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Skvarla</td>
<td>IDOT/BLRS(C)</td>
<td>847-705-4520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zubair Haider</td>
<td>IDOT/BLRS</td>
<td>847-705-4206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James K. Klein</td>
<td>IDOT- Bridges</td>
<td>217-782-5928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Koldehoff</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brad.koldehoff@illinois.gov">brad.koldehoff@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky Roman</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elizabeth.roman@illinois.gov">elizabeth.roman@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sherrill</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.sherrill@illinois.gov">john.sherrill@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Stitt</td>
<td>IDOT/BRE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.stitt@illinois.gov">scott.stitt@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Sullivan</td>
<td>Sullivan Preservation</td>
<td>773-592-9064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Pienton</td>
<td>T.Y. Lin International</td>
<td>312-777-2868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Frey</td>
<td>T.Y. Lin International</td>
<td>312-777-2869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Byars*</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>312-886-1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Holt*</td>
<td>IDOT/BLRS</td>
<td>847-705-4201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On Phone

Introduction

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) opened the meeting by summarizing the history of the need for and production of the Movable Bridge Preservation Plan (BPP) being produced by the Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT). Consultation with the SHPO and FHWA for Chicago Ave. Bridge replacement (June 2012) resulted in the mitigation measure to document and commit to a preservation plan for the bascule bridges within the City of Chicago limits. FHWA's engagement on the matter was initiated in December 2013 at the request of the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO).
Due to the continuing deterioration of the Division Street Bridge over the North Branch Chicago River Canal (SN 016-6015), the Section 106 process was followed and resulted in a May 9, 2014 Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with CDOT, FHWA, IDOT, and the SHPO, which included the stipulation to complete the BPP before the Division Street Bridge can be permanently replaced. Submittals, comments and responses have been ongoing through the subsequent years, including the SHPO’s statement that no demolition or other adverse effects may occur to any other bascule bridge until this plan is approved. In 2015 the City submitted an “In-progress draft” BPP document. Following an in-person meeting in November 2017, further revisions to the BPP document sections were produced and submitted, comments made and a coordination call occurred amongst all interested parties on April 25, 2018. This meeting is a result of that call.

The goal of this meeting was to resolve SHPO, FHWA and Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) comments and set a path to completion.

Division Street Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)

CDOT suggested that the extended timeline for delivery of the Plan should not change any stipulations of the original MOA for the Division Street Bridge over the North Branch Chicago River Canal (SN 016-6015). The MOA called for development of a Bridge Preservation Plan (BPP) to determine “which bascule bridges are worthy of preservation, which ones need replacement and detail the requirements for continued maintenance of the bridges to be preserved”.

Before the Division Street Bridge (SN 016-0615) can be permanently replaced, the BPP must be reviewed and approved by the SHPO in writing.

Bridge Preservation Plan

On July 6, 2017 the SHPO determined all 44 bridges eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP); therefore, any work or replacement with federal funds would require that the Section 106 process be followed. Although SHPO has identified all 44 bridges as being eligible for NRHP, this does not mean the City cannot perform any work on these bridges. However, any proposed federally funded work on these bridges will be subject to the Section 106 process. The process of implementing the BPP formalized in a Programmatic Agreement (PA) among CDOT, IDOT, FHWA and the SHPO.

BDE requested that CDOT determine which bridges will be preserved and which bridges require replacement. CDOT presented that at this time, they are seeking replacement of 2 bridges, Chicago Ave. and Division Street over the Chicago River (SN 016-0616). Other rehabilitation/preservation projects are currently being held pending approval of the BPP. It is the City’s position that this was not the intent of the original MOA; preservation of these bridges should be advanced. The City is requesting immediate release of the hold on reviewing bascule projects for the City. A copy of the City’s 15 year bridge construction list was shared which identified projects scheduled within the next 5 years (attached). Many have already been reviewed and then put on hold. Release of these projects was requested so that the City can proceed with design on these improvements.
BDE offered that if CDOT committed to the concept of preserving 44 bascule bridges, given that 2 are in serious condition, and CDOT is requesting replacement for those, CDOT can go forward with the Section 106 application for those. FHWA and the SHPO agreed the City may advance Chicago Avenue for Section 106 review and approval, as long as the BPP is finalized in Draft form and published for public comment. Concurrently, development of the PA should occur.

The Section 106 paperwork for Chicago Ave. will be re-submitted immediately for consideration and advancement of immediate repairs. CDOT expressed appreciation for understanding the nature of the degradation on Chicago Ave. FHWA stated that if a bridge is in a condition that is unsafe for the public to drive on, it would need to be closed to traffic.

To complete the BPP, the Executive Summary is to be revised to commit to preserving 44 bascule bridges, with the understanding that their condition over time may require replacement or other adverse effect, which will be considered under the standard Section 106 process. The narrative should include potential reasons that a bridge would require removal. Discussion might include Safety, Structural condition, transportation needs, etc. Functional obsolescence on its own will not be an accepted justification for replacement. The BPP is not intended to be a substitution for consultation for bridge rehabilitation activities. CDOT confirmed that the 106 Process would be adhered to. Additionally, a discussion of CDOT’s Maintenance Plan is to be included.

The Bridge List (chart) was intended as a reference tool. It was agreed this is a useful piece of the BPP. Color coding of the bridges to be preserved is to be removed, as all are now categorized as NHRP eligible. A request for a larger font size was made.

Upon edits being accepted, the Draft Plan will be made available for public comment.

Programmatic Agreement

Development of the Programmatic Agreement (PA) is to be advanced by the TYLI Team. IDOT BDE will advance an example agreement to be used as the basis for developing a Draft PA for review. Intent is for bridges to be evaluated on individual merit, and the process and methodology for evaluating the bridges will be laid out in the PA. The City’s process for preservation, replacement and typical maintenance work on the bridges in the BPP will be detailed in the PA so that future projects will have a clear path for approval going forward.

The PA should include details on:

- When maintenance is scheduled
- Frequency of Inspection
- Activities that can be performed without SHPO coordination (will not result in an adverse effect)
- Activities to be performed that may cause an adverse effect and require BDE and SHPO coordination
- Actions required if adverse affects are anticipated or identified in coordination with BDE and SHPO
Details of SHPO consultation and what will be required for consideration of a bridge replacement are to be included. It is anticipated that a streamlined process can be attained. Much of the content will be taken from the BPP. Having a PA does not negate the need for Public Notification regarding any changes to the BPP.

TYLI team to work from provided template to draft agreement PA for review. CDOT, IDOT, FHWA and SHPO all have review and comment periods on the PA, it will ultimately be signed by CDOT, IDOT, FHWA and SHPO.

Goal is to have a Draft PA prepared by July 2nd. SHPO will have 30 days to review the Draft PA after IDOT releases it. Hope to have a PA ready for execution by mid-August.

Consultation/Public Outreach

A contact list for notification of the Draft BPP needs to be developed. This list can be coordinated between the agencies represented here. The City will need to determine the manner with which public comment will be collected, through public meetings, posting to a website, advertisement, etc.

Each time a bridge is considered for replacement or other activity that would result in a potential adverse effect, as opposed to preservation, this public comment process will need to be enacted. Some of the consulting parties include Army Corps of Engineers, Coast Guard, Chicago Preservation District, Chicago Landmarks, SHPO, Federally recognized Tribes, Historic Bridge Foundation (Austin, TX), Historicbridges.com (Nathan Holt), etc. These parties will be invited to sign the PA; it is not mandatory that they sign, but acknowledging their participation in the process is needed.

23 USC 144(g) under the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program requires that structures eligible for NRHP and slated for removal must be made available for donation to an entity that commits to preserving it. Marketing of bridges programmed for demolition will need to be part of the City's public notification process.

Suggestion that the Chicago History Museum be considered as a partner for public outreach and comment on the BPP.

Action Items/Next Steps

- CDOT to revise and resubmit BPP executive summary and other revised/new pages to IDOT by June 18th
- IDOT to provide a template for the PA to CDOT
- Contact List for interested parties to the Draft BPP to be developed
- CDOT to resubmit Chicago Ave. Section 106 application with a cover letter to SHPO affirming compliance with original mitigation measures and what has occurred in the past 5 years with regard to the bridge and the permit application
- CDOT to develop Plan for Public Review period on BPP
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- CDOT to proceed on rehabilitation of 3 bridges already reviewed and determined to have no adverse affects (Grand Avenue, Webster Avenue, and LaSalle Street) and Cortland Street documents to be submitted for review.
- Submit Draft PA by July 2\textsuperscript{nd}

We believe the above to be an accurate summary of the major items discussed. Please forward any comments or corrections to the attention of the writer within five working days of receipt of these minutes.

Minutes prepared by Paula Plenton, T.Y. Lin International

cc: Attendees
## CDOT's Short-Term and Long-Term Capital Program
### Movable Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>SNs</th>
<th>BRIDGE</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Construction Anticipated within...</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>016-6011</td>
<td>Cortland Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>016-6016</td>
<td>W. Division Street over the River</td>
<td>Bridge Proposed to be Removed &amp; Replaced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>016-6007</td>
<td>Cermak Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>016-6028</td>
<td>Kinzie Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>016-6053</td>
<td>Washington Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>016-6021</td>
<td>Grand Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>016-6008</td>
<td>Chicago Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Proposed to be Removed &amp; Replaced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>016-6037</td>
<td>Ewing Avenue Bridge (92nd Street)</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>016-6026</td>
<td>Jackson Blvd Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>016-6057</td>
<td>Webster Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>016-6029</td>
<td>Lake Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>016-6036</td>
<td>W. Monroe Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>016-6035</td>
<td>Michigan Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>016-6020</td>
<td>Franklin Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>016-6054</td>
<td>N. Wells Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>016-6054</td>
<td>Madison Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>016-6005</td>
<td>California Avenue (S) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>016-6009</td>
<td>Cicero Avenue (S) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>016-6001</td>
<td>Adams Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>016-6042</td>
<td>100th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>016-6043</td>
<td>Roosevelt Road Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>016-6032</td>
<td>LaSalle Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>016-6010</td>
<td>Clark Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>016-6043</td>
<td>106th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>016-6052</td>
<td>Wabash Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>SNs</td>
<td>BRIDGE</td>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>Construction Anticipated within...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>016-6024</td>
<td>S. Halsted Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>016-6002</td>
<td>N. Ashland Avenue Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>016-6030</td>
<td>Lake Shore Drive Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>016-6003</td>
<td>S. Ashland Avenue Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>016-6050</td>
<td>Torrence Avenue Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>016-6056</td>
<td>S. Western Avenue Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>016-6006</td>
<td>Canal Street Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>016-6048</td>
<td>State Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>016-6023</td>
<td>N. Halsted Street Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>016-2445</td>
<td>1-290 (Congress Parkway) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Owner: IDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>016-6051</td>
<td>Van Buren Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>016-6038</td>
<td>95th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>016-6003</td>
<td>Harrison Street Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>016-0202</td>
<td>Kennedy EV Feeder (Ohio) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Owner: IDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>016-6014</td>
<td>Dearborn Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>016-6017</td>
<td>18th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>016-6033</td>
<td>Loomis Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>016-6101</td>
<td>Columbus Drive Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>016-6102</td>
<td>Randolph Street Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Received on the
January 2018
PreFinal Draft
Chicago Movable Bridges
Preservation Plan
March 9, 2018

Brad Koldehoff
Illinois Department of Transportation
Bureau of Design and Environment
2300 S. Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62764

Dear Mr. Koldehoff:

Thank you for requesting comments from our office concerning the possible effects of the project referenced above on cultural resources. Our comments are required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 470), as amended, and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR 800: "Protection of Historic Properties."

In general, the Plan is a thoroughly researched document and many of its components, especially the survey and individual bridge documentation, will be of great use for all consulting parties in the future.

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) comments and concerns are as follows:

1. Eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) should be updated throughout the document to reflect the SHPO determination of eligibility dated July 6, 2017 (all 44 bridges). The Executive Summary, bridge chart, and the individual bridge documentation all should be revised to include that information.

2. SHPO staff disagrees with the statement to not preserve any of the 4th or 5th generation bridges. All of the 4th generation bridges are over 50 years old (1952-1967). All 44 bridges were determined eligible for listing on NRHP by SHPO (see Item 1).

3. SHPO staff have concerns over the criteria chosen for not preserving bridges—structural deficiency, functional obsolescence, and lower level of historic significance as compared to its counterparts—and their inconsistent and subjective application throughout this Plan.
   a. We wholly reject the criterion of "lower level of historic significance," especially as explained in the bridge chart. Relative location of the bridge (i.e., downtown or outside of downtown), is not a determinant of historic significance, merely of prominence. The
significance, rarity, and very finite number of the historic resources do not permit a
subjective ranking of significance as undertaken in the bridge chart. SHPO has determined
all 44 bridges eligible for listing on the NRHP (see Item 1), and, to be clear, it is not possible
that some bridges are “more eligible” than others.

b. We believe that the criterion of “functional obsolescence” is not applied uniformly in order
to determine preservation priorities. As evidenced in the bridge chart, many bridges that are
proposed to be preserved share the same functional obsolescence ratings with those that are
not, raising questions as to the validity of this criterion when applied to significant historic
resources. Furthermore, low functional obsolescence rankings make the bridges eligible for
funding for rehabilitation or replacement projects under the Highway Bridge Program,
which in turn could enable preservation of the bridges. Of critical importance to this issue, it
must be stated that the entire concept of “functional obsolescence” is inherently biased
against historic resources—whether bridges or buildings—whose functionality is evaluated
against contemporary preferences or current standards. However, many laws (e.g., the
Americans with Disabilities Act) and codes (e.g., the Illinois Accessibility Code or the
International Building Code) recognize this disparity and provide alternative measures for
historic resources to achieve compliance. Safety concerns aside (these are addressed below in
Item 3b), SHPO staff expect many historic resources to have a lower ranking for functional
obsolescence than newer resources, but do not in most instances accept it as justification for
demolition. Instead of using this criterion to dismiss historic resources, this Plan should
propose alternative treatments and corrective measures to alleviate functional obsolescence
concerns for all 44 NRHP-eligible historic bridges (see Items 1 and 7).

c. In our evaluation, serious “structural deficiency” is a better criterion in order to prioritize
the preservation of the bridges. However, like its “functional obsolescence” counterpart, it
also appears to be applied inconsistently with both “preservation” and “non-preservation”
bridges sharing many of the same ratings and evaluations. Similarly to functional
obsolescence, a low ranking in this category appears to make the bridges eligible for
funding for rehabilitation or replacement projects under the Highway Bridge Program,
which presents an opportunity to correct the measures and preserve the resource. While
SHPO always is concerned with safety, we believe that the structural deficiency must be
severe enough and must be clearly demonstrated and documented before it can be used as a
factor towards bridge demolition.

d. Many of the bridges on CDOT’s long term capital program are labeled with the statement
that “no improvement is currently required,” yet two of the bridges (S.N. 016-6016 and 016-
6008) are slated for demolition. If “structural deficiency” and/or “functional obsolescence”
are such overriding factors towards bridge retention, it seems unlikely that CDOT would not
make plans within the next 15 years to address them. The long term capital program
schedule should, at a minimum, be updated to reflect currently proposed demolitions.

4. The executive summary states incorrectly that this Plan serves “as a mitigation measure for the
removal and replacement of the following bridges: Chicago Avenue over the North Branch of the
Chicago River (S.N. 016-6008), and West Division Street over the North Branch of the Chicago River (S.N. 016-6016)" (Section A, page 2).

a. The Plan serves as a mitigation measure for the removal and replacement of only the Division Street Bridge over the North Canal of the Chicago River (S.N. 016-6015), as per the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for replacement of this bridge executed in May 2014.

b. On August 13, 2013, SHPO did accept the adverse effect of removal and replacement of S.N. 016-6008, provided that certain stipulations were met, including preparation of the Bridge Preservation Plan. However, this consultation was never finalized and, since then, the Bridge Preservation Plan became a mitigation item for the removal of S.N. 016-6015, which is a separate undertaking. Therefore, the Plan cannot serve as a mitigation for removal of any other bridge, and mitigation items for the removal and replacement of S.N. 016-6008 will have to be reevaluated once Section 106 consultation is reinitiated.

c. Other than an initial Section 4(f) report from 2011, SHPO cannot locate any other consultation regarding S.N. 016-6016. We do not have a record of accepting the adverse effect of its removal. Once Section 106 consultation is initiated, and if the adverse effect is accepted, mitigation will have to be considered as part of that separate undertaking.

5. While we understand that two of the bridges included in this Plan are IDOT-owned (S.N. 016-2445 and 016-0202), and, therefore, the City does not have authority to propose them for preservation, we believe that the Plan should not dismiss these two resources and, at a minimum, we recommend coordination and consultation with IDOT regarding their preservation. As stated in the Executive Summary and in the MOA, the Plan is not only for City-owned bridges nor only for the use of the City—it is to address all 44 bridges and serve “as a resource management plan to assist consulting parties in evaluating existing movable bridges for preservation or replacement based on historical significance, structural condition, functionality and adverse effect.’’

6. The Plan does not elaborate on what specific planning decisions, activities, or actions constitute preservation of the bridges, as required by the MOA ("The plan will [...] detail the requirements for continued maintenance of the bridges to be preserved"). The "Definition of Historic Preservation Terms" included in Appendix B, while helpful, does not define the specific actions planned by CDOT towards maintaining the bridges; it is merely a glossary of general preservation terms. In order for this document to be useful as a planning tool for all parties and to meet the requirements of the MOA, this Plan must define the maintenance activities to be implemented to preserve each of these bridges—or it should clearly state that preservation of a particular bridge is not planned for specific, documented reasons.

7. The “Correspondence and Meeting Minutes” section of the Plan should be updated to include all additional relevant consultation documents, which include (at minimum) the executed MOA for the replacing of S.N. 016-6015 and the July 6, 2017, letter by SHPO that determines all 44 bridges to be eligible for the NRHP.

8. While the Plan does include an agreement by CDOT to revisit and update the Plan as needed on a five (5) -year interval, the expected updates are not defined. The document also should state if the expectation is that the entire Plan will be produced anew every five years, or state which sections of the Plan will be updated—map, bridge chart, long term capital program, individual bridge
assessments and structural reports, correspondence. The document does not clarify what the
milestones/maintenance plans are for implementation and comparison to be reviewed and updated
at each interval. This should be well defined in the Plan so all consulting parties can expect the
same deliverables at each interval.

9. Regardless of CDOT’s commitment within the Plan to preserve specific bridges, SHPO will
consider any future demolition of each NRHP-eligible bridge (all 44 bridges, see Item 1) to be a
separate undertaking with an adverse effect, which will have to be mitigated separately from any
ongoing undertakings related to the Plan, such as rehabilitation work. In other words, SHPO’s
acceptance of the Plan—when it is ready to be finalized as agreed upon by the parties—does not
constitute SHPO acceptance of future adverse effects nor does it absolve CDOT from fulfilling its
cultural resource management duties.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 217/785-5031.

Sincerely,

Rachel Leibowitz, Ph.D.
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
March 2018 Comments of Dan Byrdl, FHWA

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I have reviewed exec summary & like the overall concept. Preserving 23 is reasonable. Others are too far gone.

See comments in red

• We no longer use terms "Structurally Deficient" or "Functionally Obsolete".
• We no longer utilize Sufficiency Rating.
• We don’t have the HBP program anymore. But State (CDOT) can use on their own if they want.
The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) has undertaken development of this Movable Bridge Preservation Plan (Plan) to provide historic and engineering documentation of the forty-four (44) Movable bridges located within the City of Chicago (City). As directed by the Illinois Department of Transportation Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) and in concurrence with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), this document will serve two purposes:

1. As a mitigation measure for the removal and replacement of the following bridges:
   - Chicago Avenue over the North Branch of the Chicago River (S.N. 016-6008), and
   - Division Street over the North Branch of the Chicago River (S.N. 016-6016).
2. As a resource management plan to assist consulting parties in evaluating existing Movable bridges for preservation or replacement based on historical significance, structural condition, functionality and adverse effect.

This document will assist agencies under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in implementing, monitoring, and at such agreed upon time, amending the Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the City and the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) regarding the preservation of the City-owned and maintained Movable bridges.

Of the current forty-four (44) Movable roadway bridges within the City limits, the City owns forty-two (42). The other two (2) bridges are owned and maintained by IDOT. The IDOT owned bridges are the Kennedy Expressway Feeder Bridge at Ohio Street, crossing the North Branch of the Chicago River and the I-290 (Congress Parkway) Bridge crossing the South Branch of the Chicago River. Refer to Table 1 below for a summary of the bridge locations by waterway feature crossed and the corresponding number of bridges to be preserved at each location.

Table 1: Summary of the 44 Movable Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Bridges</th>
<th>Bridges on the Main Branch of the Chicago River</th>
<th>Bridges on the North Branch of the Chicago River</th>
<th>Bridges on the South Branch of the Chicago River</th>
<th>Bridges on the Calumet River</th>
<th>Bridges on the Sanitary and Ship Canal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDOT Owned Bridges</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Owned Bridges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operable Bridges</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inoperable Bridges</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Bridges to be Preserved</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. BACKGROUND

Developed at the turn of the century (early 1900s) by the City’s Bridge Division under the leadership of City Engineer John Ernst Ericson, the Chicago Type Bascule Bridge was the culmination of a study to determine the most suitable type of Movable bridge based on the conditions and navigational needs of the Chicago River and it branches, cost and practicality. The main feature of the design was the bridge rotates around a fixed shaft or trunnion located at the design center of gravity of the Movable span or leaf. In opening, the bridge rotates about this shaft and raises its leaves to a nearly vertical position, giving a clear, open passage for river vessels.

Table 2 lists all the Movable bridges in the City in order of construction date and provides each bridge with a corresponding consecutive identification number from 1 to 44 (shown in the third column from the left). The table also identifies the bridges that are currently operable, and those that are proposed for preservation.

A majority of the Movable bridges in the City are the Chicago Type Bascule Bridges. The following bridges are not Chicago Type Bascule Bridges:

- Cermak Road (Bridge ID No. 3)
- Torrence Avenue (Bridge ID No. 30)
- South Western Avenue (Bridge ID No. 31)

Only bridges located within the City limits are included in this plan. The following bridges are not included:

- Division Street over the Canal: This bridge has been demolished.
- Northbound and Southbound Harlem Avenue: These bridges are outside the limits of the City of Chicago.

Two of the bridges included in this Plan are within the City limits, but they are IDOT-owned, and therefore the City does not have authority to propose them for preservation. These two bridges are:

- I-290 Expressway (Congress Parkway, Bridge ID No. 35)
- Kennedy EV Feeder (Ohio, Bridge ID No. 39)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Proposed for Preservation</th>
<th>Bridge ID No.</th>
<th>IDOT Structure No.</th>
<th>Bridge Name</th>
<th>Operable</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation (1900 – 1910)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>016-6011</td>
<td>Cortland Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>016-6016</td>
<td>W. Division Street (River)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>016-6007</td>
<td>Cermak Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>016-6028</td>
<td>Kinzie Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>016-6053</td>
<td>Washington Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>016-6021</td>
<td>Grand Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>016-6008</td>
<td>Chicago Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>016-6037</td>
<td>Ewing Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>016-6026</td>
<td>Jackson Boulevard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>016-6057</td>
<td>Webster Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>016-6029</td>
<td>Lake Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>016-6036</td>
<td>W. Monroe Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>016-6035</td>
<td>Michigan Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>016-6020</td>
<td>Franklin-Orleans Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>016-6054</td>
<td>N. Wells Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>016-6034</td>
<td>Madison Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>016-6005</td>
<td>S. California Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sanitary and Ship Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>016-6009</td>
<td>S. Cicero Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sanitary and Ship Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Generation (1911 – 1930)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>016-6001</td>
<td>Adams Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>016-6042</td>
<td>100th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>016-6047</td>
<td>Roosevelt Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>016-6032</td>
<td>N. LaSalle Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>016-6010</td>
<td>N. Clark Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>016-6043</td>
<td>106th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>016-6052</td>
<td>Wabash Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Generation (1932 – 1949)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>016-6024</td>
<td>S. Halsted Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>016-6002</td>
<td>N. Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>016-6030</td>
<td>Outer Lake Shore Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>016-6003</td>
<td>S. Ashland Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>016-6050</td>
<td>Torrence Avenue</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>016-6056</td>
<td>S. Western Avenue</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sanitary and Ship Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>016-6006</td>
<td>Canal Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>016-6048</td>
<td>State Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Generation (1952 – 1967)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>016-6023</td>
<td>N. Halsted Street</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>016-2445</td>
<td>I-290 (Congress Parkway)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>016-6051</td>
<td>Van Buren Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>016-6038</td>
<td>95th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Calumet River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>016-6025</td>
<td>Harrison Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>016-0202</td>
<td>Kennedy EV Feeder (Ohio)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>North Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>016-6014</td>
<td>Dearborn Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>016-6017</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Generation (1976 – 1984)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>016-6033</td>
<td>Loomis Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>016-6101</td>
<td>Columbus Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Main Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>016-6102</td>
<td>Randolph Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>South Branch Chicago River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. IDOT owned bridges
C. FORMAT OF THE REPORT

The Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan is formatted in the following manner.

Section 1.0: Executive Summary (this document)

Section 2.0: Map of Chicago’s Movable Bridges: Aerial maps locating and identifying each bridge in the City of Chicago.

Section 3.0: List of Chicago’s Movable Bridges Chart: A spreadsheet has been developed for easy reference to each Movable bridge in the City of Chicago. The table is organized by generation. Similar bridges within each generation are grouped together, and are listed by level of significance (see chart key). Historical significance is based upon research of the history of the bridge and understanding of the level of historic integrity (degree of remaining original material). Within each generation, a bridge’s apparent level of historical significance is indicated by a darker or lighter hue (darker hues indicate greater historical significance – see chart key). See Section D of this Executive Summary for further explanation.

Section 4.0: Individual Bridge Documentation: Historical and structural information gathered for each bridge, organized by bridge based upon construction date. The data provided for each bridge are:

a. Bridge History: Each bridge history was formatted to fit the Historic Illinois Engineering Record (HIER) Level III format, and includes the physical history, historical context, engineering information, sources of information. See Section E of this Executive Summary for further explanation.

b. Photo Data Pages: Each bridge was photographed in Fall 2016 to document the bridge superstructure and abutments, bridge houses, and bridge features, including balustrades, rails, vehicular and pedestrian deck, and approach as well as available historic photographs of each bridges. These pages are intended for use as an easy reference to identify key features of each bridge, particularly architectural. See Section F of this Executive Summary for further explanation.

c. Bridge Structural Data and Bridge Drawing: General information is provided on the Structural Data Sheets as well as photographs, bridge dimensions, present use, National Bridge Inspection Standard (NBIS) ratings, structural deficiency, functional obsolescence, sufficiency rating, Highway Bridge Program (HBP) eligibility and rehabilitation history. See Section G this Executive Summary for further explanation.

Section 5.0: Correspondence and Meeting Minutes: correspondence and meeting minutes
D. LIST OF CHICAGO’S MOVABLE BRIDGES CHART

The bridges are summarized in a spreadsheet for easy reference, listed in the order of the generation in which it was designed and/or constructed. Refer to Section 3.0 for the “List of Chicago’s Movable Bridges Chart”, which includes a key to explain the color coding.

Each generation was given a color designation:
- First Generation: 1900-1910 (red)
- Second Generation: 1911 – 1930 (orange)
- Third Generation: 1932-1949 (blue)
- Fourth Generation: 1952-1967 (green)

Column Headings
Within each generation, basic identifying data about each bridge is provided in each column:
- Bridge number (in order of construction date), IDOT structure number, bridge name, construction date, bridge type, operability, and reference photos of the bridge houses and an overall view of the bridge.
- Based upon bridge type, designer, historical information and review of construction drawings, a column was created to list other bridges that “compare to” each bridge.
- Short summary statements regarding the significance of each bridge are listed – which fall in to one or more of three categories: Structural Significance, Historical Significance or Architectural Significance.
- A column is provided to illustrate or describe exceptional features.
- Three columns are provided to indicate Landmark Status: National Register Listed, National Register Eligible (yes/no)\(^2\) and Landmark Status (City, National or Contributing within a Historic District)
- The next two columns indicate the National Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) number (if applicable), and the State of Illinois Historic Illinois Engineering Record (HIER) number assigned to each bridge.
- Two columns summarize the Structural Condition Assessment for each bridge, as described on the Structural Data Sheets, indicating NBIS ratings, structural deficiency, functional obsolescence, sufficiency rating, Highway Bridge Program (HBP) eligibility and rehabilitation history.
- Two columns indicate CDOT’s Proposed Action: commitment to preserve each bridge, and the justification for not preserving, as applicable.

\(^2\) National Register Eligibility as known to CDOT prior to submission of this report.
Row color designations
Similar bridges are grouped together within each generation. They are further differentiated by their apparent level of significance based upon research conducted, and understanding of level of historic integrity (degree of remaining original material).

- Darker hue indicates bridge presenting higher level of significance (structural, historical or architectural) combined with higher level of historic integrity (higher percentage of original material) as compared with the bridges in lighter hued rows immediately below which are similar in type.
- Lighter hue indicates bridges that are similar in type to their counterpart positioned in a darker hued row above. They usually exhibit less historic integrity (lower percentage of original material) as compared with the bridge in the darker hued row above.
- Rows that have been encircled with a red box are bridges proposed for preservation.

CDOT COMMITTS TO PRESERVING these bridges.

The remaining bridges that CDOT has NOT COMMITTED TO PRESERVE are categorized as outlined below:

- Grey boxes indicate bridges that CDOT has identified as not committed to preserve based on a bridge meeting one of more of the following criteria:
  1. Structurally Deficient
  2. Functionally Obsolete
  3. Lower Level of Historic Significance as compared to its counterparts

- White boxes encircled with a blue box indicate an IDOT-owned bridge, which the City does not have authority to propose for preservation.

E. BRIDGE HISTORY
A concise history of each bridge, with the exception of the 5th Generation Modern Bridges, was developed, and formatted to fit the Historic Illinois Engineering Record (HIER) Level III format. These reports include the physical history, historical context, engineering information, sources of information and historic photographs. Bridge histories are organized in numerical order by their Bridge ID number (in order of construction date).

For the 5th Generation Modern Bridges, there is not enough publically available archival data to support the full HIER format. A short narrative for each bridge was developed to provide basic physical data and background information.
F. PHOTO DATA PAGES

Each bridge was photographed in the fall of 2016 to document the bridge superstructure and abutments, bridge houses, and bridge features, including balustrades, rails, vehicular and pedestrian deck, and approach as well as available historic photographs of each bridges. These pages are intended for use as easy reference identifying key features of each bridge, particularly architectural.

G. BRIDGE STRUCTURAL DATA

Included with each bridge are the Structure Information List and Data Sheets.

The Structure Information List indicates each bridge number, IDOT structure number, facility carried by each bridge, feature that is crossed, location of each bridge, structure type, Structure Information and Management System (SIMS) database historic significance codes, group designation, construction date, and reconstruction date if applicable.

General information is provided on the Structural Data Sheets as well as photographs, bridge dimensions, present use, National Bridge Inspection Standard (NBIS) ratings, structural deficiency, functional obsolescence, sufficiency rating, Highway Bridge Program (HBP) eligibility, and rehabilitation history.

The National Bridge Inspection Standards are federal regulations that establish requirements for inspection procedures, frequency of inspections, qualification of personnel, inspection reports and preparation and maintenance of a state bridge inventory.

The sufficiency rating is a numeric value that is a result of calculating and evaluating the following four factors: structural adequacy and safety, serviceability and functional obsolescence, essentiality for public use, and special reductions based on limiting features. The resulting percentage calculated from evaluating those four factors is indicative of the bridge's sufficiency to remain in service. One hundred percent represents an entirely sufficient bridge, and zero represents an insufficient or deficient bridge.

The Highway Bridge Program is a Federal Highway Act which funds, regulates and prioritizes improvements to the nation's bridges. Only bridges that are classified as "structurally deficient" or "functionally obsolete" and have a sufficiency rating of 80.0 or less are eligible for funding for rehabilitation or replacement projects under this program. See Table 3 for more detail on these ratings.
### Table 3. Structural Data Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NBIS RATINGS</th>
<th>STRUCTURALLY DEFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N - Not Applicable</td>
<td>1. A condition rating of 4 or less for deck, superstructure, substructure, or culvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Excellent (New) Condition</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Very Good Condition</td>
<td>2. An appraisal rating of 2 or less for structural evaluation or waterway adequacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Good Condition</td>
<td>No longer as of January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Satisfactory Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Fair Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Poor Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Serious Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Critical Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Imminent Failure Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - Failed Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTIONAL OBSOLESCENCE</th>
<th>HBP SUFFICIENCY RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. An appraisal rating of 3 or less for deck geometry, under clearance, or approach roadway alignment</td>
<td>80-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>50-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An appraisal rating of 3 for structural evaluation or waterway adequacy.</td>
<td>0-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structural evaluation and rating of a bridge is based on the physical condition of the materials included in the deck, superstructure and substructure. The condition is typically determined by a visual examination. A bridge is designated as Structurally Deficient if the condition rating of one of those elements is a 4 or less. The Illinois Highway Information System provides general descriptions of these condition ratings:

**4: Poor Condition** – Advanced section loss, deterioration, concrete spalling or scour (up to 30% section loss on primary member(s) in critical areas).

**5: Serious Condition** – Loss of section, deterioration, concrete spalling or scour (up to 50% section loss on primary member(s)). Local failures are possible. Fatigue cracks in steel or shear cracks in concrete may be present.
Critical Condition – Advanced deterioration of primary structural elements (greater than 50% section loss of primary member(s) in critical areas). Fatigue cracks in steel or shear cracks in concrete may be present. It may be necessary to close the bridge until corrective action is taken. Special inspections may also be required.

Structures are functionally obsolete if they have deck geometry, load carrying capacity, clearance or approach roadway alignment that no longer meet the criteria for the roadway system of which the structure is part.

Appraisal ratings for the structural evaluation are generated from the condition ratings for the superstructure and the substructure and the load carrying capacity. A rating of 3 is considered basically intolerable requiring a high priority of corrective action. Ratings lower than 3 require replacement or bridge closure.

Appraisal ratings for deck geometry are determined based on the measured roadway width, number of lanes and traffic volumes. Ratings range from 0 to 9 with lower ratings indicating the roadway width/number of lanes is not sufficient for the traffic volumes. A rating of 3 is considered basically intolerable requiring a high priority of corrective action.

Approach roadway alignment ratings are used to identify bridges that do not function properly or adequately due to the alignment of the approaches. For example, if there is substantial reduction in the vehicle operating speed from that on the roadway section, the rating would be a 3.

Under clearance ratings apply to bridges over roadways, so they do not apply to the structures within this study.
The revised “Pre-Final” pages of the draft Movable Bridge Preservation Plan and the overall November 2017 draft plan has been reviewed and commented on by Emilie Land of the IDOT Cultural Resources Unit. There are still numerous errors and omissions that need to be corrected. Please see the attached list of specific comments in a memorandum from Ms. Land to myself and IDOT Architectural Historian Elizabeth L. (Becky) Roman.

You should have received or soon receive comments from FHWA and the IL SHPO. Please make the edits and changes noted in the collective comments and forward the final version of the report to IDOT’s Cultural Resources Unit when it becomes available.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions.

Brad H. Koldehoff, RPA
Cultural Resources Unit
Bureau of Design and Environment

BK:br
To: Becky Roman & Brad Koldehoff  
From: Emilie Land  
Subject: Chicago Moveable Bridges Preservation Plan, PreFinal Resubmittal  
Date: March 5, 2018

Cook County  
City of Chicago

Please see below my comments on the above referenced submittal.

Revised Sheets of Pre-Final Submittal - 3/5/2018

Executive Summary Title Page (Pg. 5 of PDF document) – Shouldn’t the TOC listed under the Executive Summary be included on the full Table of Contents on Pg. 2?

Executive Summary – A. General

1. Pg.6 #1 (lines 5-8) – To clarify, this plan was a mitigation measure for SN 016-6008 (Chicago Ave. Bridge over N., Branch of Chicago River) and SN 016-6015 (W Division St. Bridge over the N. Branch of Chicago River Canal), not SN 016-6016 (W. Division St. Bridge over N. Branch Chicago River). This mitigation was clearly noted in the Adverse Effect letters regarding SN 016-6008 and SN 016-6015 (which also notes the mitigation in an MOA). Due to its critical status, SN 016-6015 was allowed to be removed and replaced prior to the completion of its MOA stipulations.

2. Pg. 6 lines 3, 10, 15, 17 and elsewhere throughout document – When not referring to the report title, please make “Movable” lowercase.

3. Pg. 6 #2 – Please reword to: As a resource management plan to assist consulting parties in evaluating the NRHP eligibility of the City’s existing movable bridges based on historical significance, structural condition, and functionality of these bridges to better plan for their preservation, maintenance, and/or replacement.

4. Pg. 6 Table 1 – Please change second row label to read “IDOT (State) Owned Bridges,” as they are referred to as IDOT-owned in the paragraph above.

5. Pg. 6 – Move B. Background to top of following page so it’s not hanging by itself at the bottom of the first page of the Executive Summary.

6. Please include the basic definitions of bascule, vertical lift, Scherzer, rolling lift, etc. with other bridge term definitions in Appendix B.
Executive Summary – B. Background
1. Top Pg. 7 – Please use "...turn of the twentieth century by the City’s...." instead of "turn of the century (early 1900s) by the City’s...."
2. Top Pg.7 line 4 – This line is confusing as it is currently worded. Please delete the comma after branches and insert "as well as" before cost.
3. Pg. 7, 2nd paragraph – Add “for purposes of this report” before “provides each....”
4. Pg. 7, 3rd paragraph – It is noted that the Cermak Rd., Torrence Ave., and South Western Ave. bridges are not bascules, but are a rolling lift, vertical lift, and vertical lift converted to fixed bridge, respectively. The basic description for a bascule bridge is included in paragraph 1 on this page; however, no basic description is provided for these other types of movable bridges. If not fully described here, please add a basic summary of each bridge type in Appendix B with the other definitions and add mention of these bridge types definitions in the following paragraph.
5. On Pg. 8, Table 2 – The thick divider line between 2nd Generation bridges and 3rd Generation bridges is missing, as well as the thick divider line between 4th and 5th Generation bridges.

Executive Summary – C. Format
1. Please remove "(this document)" from Section 1.0.
2. Section 4.0 – Please change the last sentence of this paragraph to say “The data provided for each bridge includes:...” instead of “data....are:....”
3. Section 4.0 (a) – The word "and" was omitted from the third line of this subsection. The sentence should read “…includes the physical history, historical context, engineering information, and sources of information.”
4. Please remove the second mention of “correspondence and meeting minutes” from Section 5.0. I believe this subsection can simply be called out by its title like Section 1.0.

Executive Summary – D. List of Chicago’s Movable Bridges Chart
1. Column Headings section – As the bridges in this chart are not listed in chronological order by construction date and are instead grouped by type within each generation, please change the information in the parentheses to (assigned by construction date) instead of (in order of construction date) as this is misleading as these bridge ID numbers are all out of order in the chart.

Executive Summary – G. Bridge Structural Data
2. Table 3 (Pg. 13 of PDF) – Please centralize the “OR” between the two options for Functional Obsolescence so it matches the one under Structurally Deficient.
3. Also, is the header for HBP Sufficiency Rating centralized like the three other headers? It appears to be right-aligned or close to it.

Revised Photo Data Pages for Bridge Numbers 35-44 (starting Pg. 18 of PDF)
1. The headers on all of these data pages call the document the “CDOT Vehicular (Bascule) Bridge Preservation Plan” when it should be Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan. Please verify that the correct title is used throughout.
2. On some Photo Data Pages, such as 35 – West Congress Parkway Bridge and 36 – Van Buren Street Bridge, bridge house is used in the significance/descriptions on the cover pages as two words. However, the detail photos, such as those for the Van Buren Street Bridge and 95th Street Bridge, are labeled as bridgehouse (single word). Please use uniform spelling throughout.
3. 38 – Harrison Street Bridge (Pg. 33 of PDF) – On Pg.3 of these Photo Data Pages, “Midcentury Modern” is used to describe the bridge house (this is also used for 41 – 18th Street Bridge Pg. 45). However, on Pg. 3 of 40 – Dearborn Street Bridge Photo Data Pages (Pg. 40 of overall PDF), “Mid-Century Modern” is utilized. Please change all to Mid-Century Modern.
4. 41 – 18th Street Bridge (Pg. 43 of overall PDF) – The first page lists this bridge type as a Scherzer rolling lift bridge, yet the chart in the full 11/2017 draft states that it is a single-leaf, trunnion type bascule. Under the Cermak Rd. Bridge in that chart, it states that the Cermak bridge is one of only two Scherzer rolling lift bridges in Chicago (the other being a railroad bridge). Please identify the correct bridge type on the first page of the 18th Street Photo Data Pages.

5. 42 – Loomis Street Bridge (Pg. 48 of PDF) – The Chart from the 11/2017 full draft shows this bridge as having a HAER number (IL-139), yet on this page, it says “None” under HAER documentation.

Appendix C (Pg. 84-86 of overall PDF)
1. Please alter the header at the top of these three pages to say “Movable” instead of “Moveable” in order to be consistent with the rest of the document.
2. Why were the photos and data sheets omitted for the movable lift bridges detailed in the spreadsheet on Pg. 84 at the beginning of the Appendix? Please include.

Comments on 11/2017 full draft of CMBPP

List of Chicago’s Movable Bridges Chart (starting on Pg. 21 of full draft)
1. As they are listed from the top of this chart, ID # 1, 4, 3, 13, & 9 have the incorrect acronym “HRHP” in the National Register Eligible column instead of NRHP.
2. Check throughout this chart for consistencies spelling, spacing, word capitalizations, using all caps, random periods after yes/no, use of shorthand (like DT), etc. Example: ID # 1, 4, 3, 13 & 9 have “YES” in the National Register Eligible column, yet all the others have “Yes”. It switches back and forth throughout the columns of the chart. Also, check the Structurally Deficient column. Sometimes “Advanced deterioration” is correctly used but sometimes “Advance deterioration” is used instead (like on ID # 22, 23, 25, 18, 20, 24, 26, 31, 28, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, & 42).
3. ID # 14, 19, 15, and 23 are bounded in a thick red line noting it for preservation; however, nothing is listed in any of the historic significance columns. This makes it hard to ascertain why it is proposed for preservation or not.
4. ID # 5 – Washington Street Bridge
   a) While this is the oldest downtown bridge with pony trusses and has unique bridge houses, this bridge is not marked for preservation. Please explain. Is this solely based on condition?
   b) It is noted that this bridge is similar to ID # 6 (Grand), 7 (Chicago), 8 (Ewing) and 10 (Webster). Washington is the only one marked the darker color, and therefore, more significant, yet of these similar bridges, only the Grand Ave. Bridge is proposed for preservation. Why Grand and why only one?
   c) ID # 5 Washington Street Bridge - The column for Historical Significance – Architectural has “APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN REBUILT” in all caps. Per the HIER report in the next section, work was done in 1943, 1957 and the early 1960s. However, does that need to be mentioned here? Some rows mention later construction work, but not all do.
5. ID # 11 Lake Street Bridge - The column for Historical Significance – Structural has shorthand for concrete abutments which should be spelled out, but also notes tender houses. Are these the same as bridge houses (the term used throughout the rest of the report)?
6. Why does is text in Architectural and Exceptional Features columns in the Historic Significance section of the chart doubled for ID # 26, 29, 33 & 27? It should be in one column or the other or the information split depending on what it is.
7. Under ID # 26 S. Halsted St. Bridge, why does it have photos of a bridge house detail found on ID #33 State Street Bridge? And vice versa. These columns for ID #33 State St. Bridge note that the photo of the design feature is from ID # 26 S. Halsted.
8. ID #25 – Wabash Avenue Bridge
a) As noted on Page 14 of the HIER, this bridge won the American Institute of Steel Construction’s Most Beautiful Steel Bridge Award in 1930, yet this is not mentioned on the Chart.

b) Also, the Wabash Bridge has a HAER number that is not noted in the Chart. The Library of Congress website says there is a HAER: IL -48.

9. ID # 17 (California Avenue) and 18 (Cicero Avenue): These are the only two like this and were significant for their Strauss design, yet neither are proposed for preservation. Why?

10. ID # 31 for S. Western Ave. Bridge: What does “possible significance re: Del Campo” mean under?

11. Why are no 4th Generation bridges proposed for preservation? The ID # 36 Van Buren St. bridge is noted as the earliest most significant structure.

12. ID # 40 Dearborn St. Bridge – The HIER # is listed as CK-2017-39 (same as the Kennedy Feeder Bridge line below it). It should be CK-2017-40.

13. ID # 42 – Loomis Street Bridge – Please delete the HAER number indicated in the row for this bridge. IL-139 is assigned to the Grand Avenue Bascule Bridge. There is no HAER for the Loomis Street Bridge.

Section 4.0 - Individual Bridge Documentation - General

1. Make sure the May 2017 FWHA & BDE corrections on the Photo Data Pages have been addressed.

2. Please include the UTM coordinates for each bridge under “Location” on the first page of each HIER report.

3. Please check spacing throughout all the HIER documents

4. Please verify correct dates of construction throughout documentation. Examples: Just as the Grand Ave. Bridge, the Jackson Blvd Bridge says it was built 1914-1916 on the Chart and in the HIER document, but says 1915-1916 on the Photo Data Pages. For the Webster Ave. Bridge, HIER and Chart say it was built 1913-1916; while the Photo Data Pages say 1915-1916. Please verify for all the bridges.

5. Please add the IDOT Structure Number in parentheses behind “Present Use: Vehicular Bridge” in each HIER report. As it is now, there is no mention of the IDOT Structure Number in any of the HIER reports. Example: Present Use: Vehicular Bridge (IDOT Structure No. 016-6011) for the Cortland Street Bridge (report’s first HIER report).

Section 4.0 - HIER CK-2017-1 Cortland Street Bridge

1. Please mention that the bridge was the recipient of the National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark in 1982 in the Significance statement on the first page. As there are only 266 such landmarks worldwide, it makes this significant.

2. Under Original plans and construction on Pg. 2 of this HIER, please add details regarding how the Pratt trusses differ from the standard, as is mentioned in this section for the Division St. Bridge (CK-2017-2).

3. Pg. 4 of the HIER notes the acronym CDOT, but never spells out what it stands for previously in this HIER report.

4. A space is missing between paragraphs on Pg. 15 of HIER document.

5. As was noted in the July 2017 comments on the May 2017 draft, the Photo Data Pages for this bridge still incorrectly say that this bridge is not included on IDOT’s Historic Bridge List. It is a primary structure on the HBL. See bolded comment above.

Section 4.0 HIER CK-2017-3 Cermak Rd. Bridge

1. Shouldn’t the steel arches over the pedestrian walkway and the bridge houses be listed under the Exceptional Features of the Historic Significance section of the overall Chart?

Section 4.0 - HIER CK-2017-5 Washington Street Bridge

1. In the Significance statement on the first page, it is mentioned that this bridge is similar to the Chicago Ave., Grand Ave. and Ewing Street bridges, yet the Chart also notes
Webster Ave. bridge. This also pertains to this statement in the HIERs for CK-2017-6 (Grand Avenue), CK-2017-7 (Chicago Avenue), and CK-2017-8 (Ewing Avenue).

2. Fix footnote spacing on Page 13 of HIER.
3. Photo Data Pages for Washington Street Bridge – First page says that the bridge houses are classical, yet Page 3 states that they are Post-Modern or Historicist. The HIER said nothing about them being rebuilt, so how could they be Post-Modern?

Section 4.0 - HIER CK-2017-6 Grand Avenue Bridge
1. "M.&D. fir intermediate" is crossed out but was left in the document. Please remove.
2. Part I of the HIER report says the date of construction is 1912-1913. However, the overall Chart lists the date of construction as 1912-1914 and the Photo Data Pages list the date of construction as 1911-1914. Bridge Structural Data Sheet says it was built in 1913. Which is correct? Please make necessary corrections so dates are consistent.

Section 4.0 - HIER CK-2017-8 Ewing Avenue Bridge
- Under General Data’s National Register Status on the Photo Data Pages, please change wording for this bridge and others like it not on the HBL or determined eligible to read “Not listed; no official eligibility designation” instead of “…not determined eligible.” The current wording implies that it is not eligible (yet that is not known at this time). Please change this wording for non-HBL bridges on all Photo Data Pages.

Section 4.0 - HIER CK-2017-24 106th Street Bridge
- Please fix spacing on Page 4 of HIER (space missing between 2nd and 3rd paragraphs), Page 6 (space needs to be inserted before First Generation description) and Page 7 (space needed between top two paragraphs and also between the bottom two paragraphs)

Section 4.0 - HIER CK-2017-25 Wabash Avenue Bridge
- □ Also has spacing issues on Page 4, 6 & 7.

Appendix A – Structure Summary Reports
- For clarification, please insert a text box on each page with the Bridge ID number that was assigned for this report

Emilie Land
Historic Architectural Compliance Specialist
Cultural Resources Unit
Bureau of Design and Environment
CDOT submittal of PreFinal Draft Chicago Movable Bridges Preservation Plan January 2018
January 5, 2018

Mr. Christopher J. Holt, P.E.
Bureau Chief of Local Roads and Streets
Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT)
Division of Highways/District One
201 West Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Attn: Mr. Zubair Haider, P.E.

Subject: **Chicago’s Moveable Bridge Preservation Plan (BPP)**
**Pre-final Re-Submittal**

Dear Mr. Holt:

In response to comments received in the meeting held on November 30, 2017 at the FHWA offices in Springfield, we are re-submitting electronically only pages of the BPP that are revised, updated, or added, as agreed in the meeting.

The following is a list of the modifications, as included in the file named “BPP Pre-Final Re-submittal”:

- Revised Table of Contents. New Appendix B and Appendix C were added.
- Revised Executive Summary.
- Movable Bridges Overall Location Map. New map will be added to Section 2.0.
- Revised Photo Data Pages for bridge numbers 35-44.
- New Appendix B. This Appendix includes: “Definition of Bridge Types”, "Definition of Historic Preservation Terms" & "Glossary of National Register Terms".
- New Appendix C. This Appendix includes: "List of Movable Lift Bridges in Illinois", "List of Movable Bascule Bridges in Illinois" & “IDOT Documentation of Bascule Bridges Outside of City of Chicago”.

A disposition of the comments from the meeting is included with this letter as Attachment 1. A copy of the meeting minutes is included with this letter as Attachment 2.
The following is a summary of the action items from the above referenced meeting:
1. CDOT to revise and re-submit updated or new pages (which is this re-submittal).
2. All involved agencies to review and provide comments on the revised BPP.
3. IDOT to close the MOA for the Division Street Bridge over the Canal.
4. SHPO/IDOT (in consultation with FHWA) to prepare a Programmatic Agreement.
5. CDOT to Prepare the Final BPP, which will address all agency comments.

The Programmatic Agreement will include:
- A summary of the BPP.
- A list of bridges to be removed (Chicago Avenue Bridge and Division Street Bridge over the River).
- A list of bridges to be preserved (23 bridges are currently proposed).
- The statement that the BPP will be revisited every 5 years, and updated as needed.

Please forward this re-submittal to the agencies below:
- IDOT/BDE
- IIHPA
- FHWA

We will forward this re-submittal to City of Chicago DPD.

Also, the Long Term Capital Program Table presented in the meeting has been modified to show all the movable bridges in Chicago. The revised table is included with this letter as Attachment 3.

Please contact Soliman Khudeira at 312-744-9605 or Soliman.Khudeira@cityofchicago.org should you have any questions or require additional information.

Very Truly Yours,

Dan Burke, S.E., P.E.
Deputy Commissioner/Chief Engineer
Division of Engineering

Originated By:

Soliman Khudeira, Ph.D., S.E., P.E.
Section Chief of Major Projects

Attachment 1: Disposition of Comments
Attachment 2: Coordination Meeting Minutes – November 30, 2017
Attachment 3: Long Term Capital Program Table

cc: D. Burke, CDOT S. Khudeira, CDOT TYLI
### Disposition of Comments

**Chicago's Movable Bridge Preservation Plan - Comments from Meeting Held on 11/30/2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PAGE NO.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE BY (Name &amp; Company)</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS (Open/Closed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Definitions of operable vs. movable vs. fixed are needed. Inoperable and potentially operable may also need to be defined.</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. A &quot;Definition of Bridge Types&quot; section added in new Appendix B.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Clarify terms related to preservation, restoration, maintenance, and rehabilitation.</td>
<td>AS - Sullivan Preservation</td>
<td>Agreed. A section called &quot;Definition of Historic Preservation Terms&quot; added in new Appendix B of the Plan.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Provide a glossary of terms.</td>
<td>AS - Sullivan Preservation</td>
<td>Agreed. A section called &quot;Glossary of National Register Terms&quot; added in new Appendix B of the Plan.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Identify if any bridges are not open to vehicular traffic.</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. All bridges are currently open to traffic. Text added to Executive Summary.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Show Chicago city limits on Aerial Map of bridge locations. An overall key plan with dots at bridge locations.</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. Overall Key Plan with Chicago City Limits added to Section 2.0.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Include Harlem Avenue bridges on map. (outside of Chicago city limits)</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. Harlem Avenue bridges added to Overall Key Plan.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Include mention of Harlem Avenue bridges and multiple Joliet bascule bridges in the Executive Summary. IDOT will supply information about these bridges for inclusion in an Appendix.</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. Bascule bridges outside of City of Chicago are mentioned in Executive Summary and reference is made to IDOT information provided (Appendix C).</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Mention that there are movable railroad bridges over rivers in the Chicago area but these are not included in the BPP.</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. Privately owned railroad bridges mentioned in Executive Summary.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Not all CDOT bridges identified in the executive summary were included in the Long Term Capital Program (LTCP). Agencies would like to know proposed treatment (maintenance commitment) of remaining bridges.</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. The LTCP table has been revised to include all the bridges in the BPP, and included with this letter as Attachment 3.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Mention in executive summary that stand-alone IL HIER reports are provided for each bridge (facilitating future use during SHPO coordination)</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. Stand-alone IL HIER reports mentioned in Executive Summary</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>After discussion, it was agreed that the BPP should be revisited every 5 years. This can be identified in the executive summary.</td>
<td>TYLI</td>
<td>Agreed. Revisitation of BPP occurring every 5 years is mentioned in Executive Summary.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Comments copied from November 30, 2017 meeting minutes prepared by Phillip Frey. All response summaries written by CDOT for the responder.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>SNs</th>
<th>BRIDGE</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Construction Anticipated within...</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>Proposed to be Preserved (per the BPP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>016-6011</td>
<td>Cortland Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>016-6016</td>
<td>W. Division Street over the River</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>016-6007</td>
<td>Cermak Road</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>016-6028</td>
<td>Kinzie Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>016-6053</td>
<td>Washington Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>016-6021</td>
<td>Grand Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>016-6008</td>
<td>Chicago Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>016-6037</td>
<td>Ewing Avenue Bridge (92nd Street)</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>016-6026</td>
<td>Jackson Blvd Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>016-6057</td>
<td>Webster Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>016-6029</td>
<td>Lake Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>016-6036</td>
<td>W. Monroe Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>016-6035</td>
<td>Michigan Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>016-6020</td>
<td>Franklin Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>016-6054</td>
<td>N. Wells Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>016-6034</td>
<td>Madison Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>016-6005</td>
<td>California Avenue (S) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>016-6009</td>
<td>Cicero Avenue (S) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>016-6001</td>
<td>Adams Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>016-6042</td>
<td>100th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>016-6047</td>
<td>Roosevelt Road Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>016-6032</td>
<td>LaSalle Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>016-6010</td>
<td>Clark Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>016-6043</td>
<td>106th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on most recent bridge inspection reports, no improvement is currently required.
** IDOT Owned Bridge - not under CDOT jurisdiction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>SNs</th>
<th>BRIDGE</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Construction Anticipated within...</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>Proposed to be Preserved (per the BPP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>016-6052</td>
<td>Wabash Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>016-6024</td>
<td>S. Halsted Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>016-6002</td>
<td>N. Ashland Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Minor rehab scheduled in 2018</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>016-6030</td>
<td>Lake Shore Drive Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>016-6003</td>
<td>S. Ashland Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>016-6050</td>
<td>Torrence Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>016-6056</td>
<td>S. Western Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>016-6006</td>
<td>Canal Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>016-6048</td>
<td>State Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>016-6023</td>
<td>N. Halsted Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Received &quot;No Adverse Effects&quot; clearance in 2014</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>016-2445</td>
<td>I-290 (Congress Parkway) Bridge</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>016-6051</td>
<td>Van Buren Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>016-6038</td>
<td>95th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>016-6025</td>
<td>Harrison Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>016-0202</td>
<td>Kennedy EV Feeder (Ohio) Bridge</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>016-6014</td>
<td>Dearborn Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>016-6017</td>
<td>18th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>016-6033</td>
<td>Loomis Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>016-6101</td>
<td>Columbus Drive Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>016-6102</td>
<td>Randolph Street Bridge</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on most recent bridge inspection reports, no improvement is currently required.
** IDOT Owned Bridge - not under CDOT jurisdiction.
Minutes of the
November 20, 2017
Consultation Meeting on
the Chicago's Movable
Bridges Preservation Plan
Chicago's Movable Bridge Preservation Plan

The following is a summary of the information presented, discussions held, and action items identified during this meeting:

Introduction

(Please see attached sign in sheet for list of attendees.)

The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) submitted a Prefinal Movable Bridge Preservation Plan (BPP) to Agencies (FHWA/IDOT/IDNR(SHPO)/Chicago DPD) for review in May 2017. The document is part of the mitigation contained in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) regarding the demolition of the Division Street Bridge over the North Branch of the Chicago River Canal.

Agency comments were received and a revised BPP and Disposition of Comments were provided for Agency review on November 21, 2017.

Supplemental CDOT Exhibits

CDOT presented Exhibits 1 and 2 (attached). Exhibit 1 identifies past bascule bridge removals, 4 total (1998-2016), and 2 proposed removals pending Agency approval (Division Street and Chicago Avenue over the North Branch of the Chicago River). Exhibit 2 presents CDOT’s Long Term Capital Program (LTCP) for Movable Bridges. The program includes rehabilitation of 25 bascule bridges (14 identified for preservation in the BPP) over a 15 year time period.

Review/Discussion of November 2017 BPP Document

Sullivan Preservation and CDOT presented the contents of the revised BPP Executive Summary. The following Agency comments were received:

- Definitions of operable vs. movable vs. fixed are needed. Inoperable and potentially operable may also need to be defined.
- Clarify terms related to preservation, restoration, maintenance, and rehabilitation.
- Provide a glossary of terms
- Identify if any bridges are not open to vehicular traffic.
- Show Chicago city limits on Aerial Map of bridge locations. An overall key plan with dots at bridge locations.
- Include Harlem Avenue bridges on map. (outside of Chicago city limits)
- Include mention of Harlem Avenue bridges and multiple Joliet bascule bridges in the Executive Summary. IDOT will supply information about these bridges for inclusion in an Appendix.
- Mention that there are movable railroad bridges over rivers in the Chicago area but these are not included in the BPP.
- Not all CDOT bridges identified in the executive summary were included in the LTCP. Agencies would like to know proposed treatment (maintenance commitment) of remaining bridges.
- Mention in executive summary that stand-alone IL HIER reports are provided for each bridge (facilitating future use during SHPO coordination)
After discussion, it was agreed that the BPP should be revisited every 5 years. This can be identified in the executive summary.

**Action Items/Next Steps**

- CDOT to revise and resubmit executive summary and other revised/new pages to IDOT as soon as possible.
- IDOT will close the Division Street over North Branch Canal MOA.
- Agencies will provide comments on consolidated, updated, BPP.
- CDOT will then prepare Final Draft BPP including disposition of agency comments.
- A Programmatic Agreement (PA) will be prepared by the SHPO in consultation with IDOT and FHWA. This document is intended to include the details of the BPP, allow removal of the two bridges proposed, agree on the number of bridges to be preserved, etc. PA to be revisited/updated every 5 years.

We believe the above to be an accurate summary of the major items discussed. Please forward any comments or corrections to the attention of the writer within five working days of receipt of these minutes.

Minutes prepared by Phillip Frey, T.Y. Lin International

cc: Attendees
City of Chicago
Movable Bridges: Removed Bridges and to be Removed (Pending Approval)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNs</th>
<th>PAST BRIDGE REMOVAL</th>
<th>REMOVAL YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>016-6527</td>
<td>Damen Ave. Bridge</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016-6148</td>
<td>Halsted St. Bridge over Canal</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016-6015</td>
<td>Division St. Bridge over Canal</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNs</th>
<th>FUTURE BRIDGE REMOVAL</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>016-6016</td>
<td>Division St. Bridge over the River</td>
<td>Section 106 to be resubmitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016-6008</td>
<td>Chicago Ave. Bridge over the River</td>
<td>Section 106 to be resubmitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Long Term Capital Program

#### Movable Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Sns</th>
<th>BRIDGE</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Construction Anticipated within...</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>016-6051</td>
<td>Van Buren Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Received &quot;No Adverse Effects&quot; clearance in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>016-6032</td>
<td>LaSalle Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Received &quot;No Adverse Effects&quot; clearance in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>016-6011</td>
<td>Cortland Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Section 106 drafted but never submitted (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>016-6021</td>
<td>Grand Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Received &quot;No Adverse Effects&quot; clearance in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>016-6057</td>
<td>Webster Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Received &quot;No Adverse Effects&quot; clearance in 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>016-6029</td>
<td>Lake Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>016-6009</td>
<td>Cicero Avenue (S) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>016-6033</td>
<td>Loomis Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>016-6037</td>
<td>Ewing Avenue Bridge (92nd Street)</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>016-6028</td>
<td>Kinzie Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>016-6038</td>
<td>95th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>016-6042</td>
<td>100th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>016-6043</td>
<td>106th Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>016-6052</td>
<td>Wabash Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>016-6053</td>
<td>Washington Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>016-6005</td>
<td>California Avenue (S) Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>016-6010</td>
<td>Clark Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>016-6014</td>
<td>Dearborn Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>016-6020</td>
<td>Franklin Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>016-6035</td>
<td>Michigan Avenue Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>016-6030</td>
<td>Lake Shore Drive Bridge (minor rehab scheduled in 2018)</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>016-6017</td>
<td>18th Street</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>016-6024</td>
<td>S. Halsted Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>016-6026</td>
<td>Jackson Blvd Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>016-6048</td>
<td>State Street Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SIGN-IN SHEET

**Project Name:** Chicago's Bridge Preservation Plan  
**Date:** 11/30/2017  
**Re:** Meeting with FHWA/IDOT/IHPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soliman Khudeira</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td>312-744-9605</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Soliman.khudeira@cityofchicago.org">Soliman.khudeira@cityofchicago.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Raffensperger</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td>217-785-1670</td>
<td><a href="mailto:william.raffensperger@illinois.gov">william.raffensperger@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sherrell</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:John.Sherrell@illinois.gov">John.Sherrell@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Snavely</td>
<td>IDOT(CD)</td>
<td>847-705-4520</td>
<td><a href="mailto:James.Snavely@illinois.gov">James.Snavely@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zubair Haider</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td>847-705-4240</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Zubair.Haider@illinois.gov">Zubair.Haider@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emilie Land</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td>708-346-3824</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Emilie.Land@illinois.gov">Emilie.Land@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Dyson</td>
<td>IDNR</td>
<td>217-524-0276</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Carol.Dyson@illinois.gov">Carol.Dyson@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius Bryna</td>
<td>IDNR</td>
<td>74-558-8912</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Darius.Bryna@illinois.gov">Darius.Bryna@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Frey</td>
<td>TTYLN INTL</td>
<td>312-777-2869</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Phillip.Frey@TTYLN.com">Phillip.Frey@TTYLN.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Piland</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>217-492-4989</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Janis.piland@dot.gov">Janis.piland@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Sullivan</td>
<td>SULLIVAN PRE$'N</td>
<td>773-592-9067</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ASULLIVAN@SULLIVAN.PRE">ASULLIVAN@SULLIVAN.PRE</a>$'N.COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Byars</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>312-886-1606</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chris.byars@dot.gov">chris.byars@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Koldenhoff</td>
<td>IDOT</td>
<td>217-785-7833</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brad.koldenhoff@illinois.gov">brad.koldenhoff@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Lebarras</td>
<td>STP/CDR</td>
<td>217-785-8036</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rachel.lebarras@illinois.gov">rachel.lebarras@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CDOT submittal
of Revised Draft
Chicago Movable Bridges
Preservation Plan
November 2017
November 16, 2017

Mr. Christopher J. Holt, P.E.
Bureau Chief of Local Roads and Streets
Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT)
Division of Highways/District One
201 West Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Attn: Mr. Zubair Haider, P.E.

Subject:  
Chicago’s Moveable Bridge Preservation Plan
Pre-final Re-Submittal

Dear Mr. Holt:

The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) is re-submitting the pre-final Chicago’s Moveable Bridge Preservation Plan (Plan) for your review. This re-submittal incorporates comments received from:

- Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA),
- IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment (IDOT/BDE),
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and
- City of Chicago Department of Planning and Development (DPD)

Disposition of these comments are included with this letter as Attachment 1. Copies of the comments received are included as Attachment 2.

Please forward this re-submittal to the agencies below:

- IDOT/BDE
- IHPA
- FHWA

We will forward this re-submittal to City of Chicago DPD.
As requested by IHPA, a meeting between IHPA, IDOT, FHWA and CDOT is scheduled for November 30th, 2017 to discuss this pre-final document. Any comments raised during this meeting will be incorporated into the final submittal.

Please contact Soliman Khudeira at 312-744-9605 or Soliman.Khudeira@cityofchicago.org should you have any questions or require additional information.

Very Truly Yours,

[Signature]

Dan Burke, S.E., P.E.
Deputy Commissioner/Chief Engineer
Division of Engineering

Originated By:

[Signature]

Soliman Khudeira, Ph.D., S.E., P.E.
Section Chief of Major Projects

Attachment 1: Disposition of Comments
Attachment 2: Copies of Comments Received

cc: D. Burke, CDOT
    S. Khudeira, CDOT
    TYLI
# Disposition of Comments

**Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan - Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHRA) Review Comments**

**Document:** Chicago’s Movable Bridge Preservation Plan  
**Date:** May 2017  
**Status:** Open  
**Closed:** July 6, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DWG NO./SPEC NO./SECTION NO., ETC.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS (Open/Closed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td>Only 11 of the 44 bridges have been identified for preservation, and IHPA will consider each demolition as an adverse effect as per Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 36 CFR 805.3. The eleven bridges selected were deemed the &quot;best candidates&quot; for preservation based on several criteria, including: 1) a representative example from each generation and structure type, 2) historic significance, 3) integrity of original construction and character, 4) exceptional or unique features, and 5) landmark status. This list was intended to be a starting point, and the City has expanded the list.</td>
<td>S. Khudiera, CDOT</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td>IHPA requests a meeting to discuss the preservation criteria and tour the bridges.</td>
<td>S. Khudiera, CDOT</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The above are comments from the July 6, 2017 letter from IHPA (see Attachment 2).
### Disposition of Comments

**Chicago's Movable Bridge Preservation Plan - FHWA and IDOT/BDE Review Comments**

**Document:** Chicago's Movable Bridge Preservation Plan  
**May 2017**  
**May 28, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>PAGE NO.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSE BY (Name &amp; Company)</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS (Open/ Closed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Use either “moveable” or “movable” throughout the document.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Executive Summary changed to &quot;movable&quot;. TYLIN to modify the rest of the document.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 1</td>
<td>In Table 3, the time span for the fifth generation is 1979-1984. Which is correct?</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Correct time span for the 5th generation is 1976-1984. Document has been updated.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 1</td>
<td>There is an enormous amount of information in this document, so it would be helpful to state its purpose - how will it be used as a resource? We thought the purpose is to determine eligibility of each structure, and then evaluate each one to determine if it should be preserved or not? In addition, development of this plan is a mitigation measure stipulated in the Division 5 Memorandum of Agreement.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Information has been added. See page 2 of Executive Summary.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 1</td>
<td>I agree with Ian that this Executive Summary does not effectively summarize all of the information in this document. More details are required. For example, it'd be helpful if the types of moveable bridges are defined, from what I can tell, it appears that Steel Movable Basculs bridges and Steel Movable Lift bridges were included.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Summary language has been revised to include other types of bridges other than Chicago bascules.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 1</td>
<td>Bridge Corresponding Identification number. Where is this number in the left column?</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Bridge ID number can be found on the third column of Table 2.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 1</td>
<td>BDE is concerned that only 23 out of 44 bridges are considered the best for preservation.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Total of 23 bridges are considered for preservation. See Table 1.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 2</td>
<td>Why do the time spans for the 3rd and 4th Generation bridges overlap?</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>3rd generation time span is changed to 1932-1949.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 2</td>
<td>How was it decided to list the bridges as they are in each section and assign them the corresponding bridge ID number? Within each generation, are the bridges listed chronologically starting with the oldest?</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Concur. The bridge ID number corresponds to the chronological order of construction dates.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 2 of 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 2</td>
<td>When I searched for movable bridges in Chicago in the SIMS database, I found 46 bridges (44 bascules and 2 movable lifts in Cook County). Per SIMS, only two Cook County bridges are categorized as Steel Moveable Lift bridges: 016-6050 &amp; 016-6571. However 016-6571 is an unused railroad bridge. Therefore, excluding the railroad bridge as neither the City nor IDOT maintains it, there should be 45 bridges on this list. However, one bridge listed on this page, 016-6056 Western, is not included as a movable bridge in SIMS. 016-6056 is categorized as a Steel Girder and Floorbeam System bridge. Furthermore, 016-0935 (NB Harlem Ave over Sanitary &amp; Ship Canal) is categorized as a bascule in SIMS (and is even included on the Illinois Historic Bridge List as such), as is 016-0991 (SB Harlem Ave over Sanitary &amp; Ship Canal).</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>44 bridge structures have been identified within the Chicago city limits. 2 of these structures are owned by IDOT. Western was originally a movable bridge, but has been converted to a fixed structure recently. Structures 016-0935 (NB Harlem Ave over sanitary &amp; Ship Canal), and 016-0991 (SB Harlem Ave over Sanitary &amp; Ship Canal) are outside Chicago city limits, hence they were not considered for preservation.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 3</td>
<td>On Page 1, it is noted that of the 44 on this document’s overall list, 42 of them are owned/maintained by the City, while 2 are owned/maintained by IDOT. The two IDOT bridges noted on that page are the Kennedy Expressway Feeder Bridge at Ohio St and the I-290/Congress Pkwy Bridge. Yet both of these bridges are listed in Table 3 (bridge ID # 35 &amp; 39) even though the header specifically states that it’s a list of City-owned operable bridges.</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>Footnote added identifying IDOT owned structures.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 4</td>
<td>Sentence above says &quot;Bridges or bridge houses indicated to have greater historic significance will be preserved.&quot; and those 13 are listed with a 'Yes' on tables. But on Table 3 it says 11 to be preserved.</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>Table 1 has been updated.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 5</td>
<td>There seems to be a lot of history information repeated in these - I assume they are intended to stand alone?</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>Concur - see comment 13 below.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 5</td>
<td>SME - SIPDO changed the name of the recreation at the request of the Library of Congress (who houses National HABS documents). It is now Historic Illinois Engineering Record.</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>Concur.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 5</td>
<td>Should there be a section at the end of each individual documentation that summarizes why or why not each bridge is recommended for preservation?</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>The list of chicago movable bridges chart in section 3.0 has been updated to include the justification for not preserving.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 5</td>
<td>Shouldn’t this description be under the &quot;Individual Bridge Documentation&quot; since it’s more than just the history?</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response how 22.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 5</td>
<td>Why are bridge houses and bridge features capitalized?</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>Document has been updated.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 5</td>
<td>As noted on the Table of Contents, this time span given differs from that given in Table 2. I’ve noticed inconsistencies throughout the document concerning these generation time spans. Please verify each generation’s correct span and make the necessary changes throughout the document.</td>
<td>RH, TY, L</td>
<td>Generation time spans have been confirmed and updated.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 6</td>
<td>Why is commitment to preserve unknown for IDOT-owned bridges?</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Statement has been updated with the following: “White boxes encircled with a blue box indicate an IDOT-owned bridge, which the City does not have authority to propose for preservation.”</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 6</td>
<td>In the tables described, there are three columns under &quot;Landmark Status,&quot; which include National Register status, whether the structure has been determined NRHP-Eligible, and whether it is a Chicago or other landmark. Please add here for clarification.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Concurs.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 6</td>
<td>...IDOT-owned bridge where IDOT's ...</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>See response to comment 1B.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 7</td>
<td>Legend indicating rating significance missing.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Text has been updated.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 7</td>
<td>It should be noted that ISDs does not go by the codes in the SIMS database as they are very outdated. We do not believe this ranking should be a key factor in determining eligibility.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Concurs.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pag. 8</td>
<td>This statement that &quot;Only structures that carry a highway receive sufficiency ratings&quot; is incorrect. Nearly all structures from interstate bridges to highway bridges to township road bridges all have sufficiency ratings, which are provided in SIMS.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Statement removed.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Exec. Sum., Pg. 8</td>
<td>Sourcing for the HBP Sufficiency Rating header needs to be centralized like the others. Also, the 1st and 4th boxes are aligned to the left while the 2nd and 3rd are centrally-aligned. To make things uniform, please use one format.</td>
<td>S. Khutiel, S. GOOT</td>
<td>OK. The table has been modified.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Section 3.0</td>
<td>To help navigate this lengthy report, suggest having some kind of index, BEIR number, page number, etc. to find each bridge’s documentation. Then at the end of each individual bridge’s documentation, include a section (Part VI?) that clearly states if the bridge and/or housing will/will not be preserved and why/why not. Agree with Jan, There needs to be a clear reasoning/methodology provided as to why bridges were determined to warrant preservation and why they weren’t so the reader doesn’t have to sifting through this huge report. Also, no clear or detailed guidelines were provided as to how these decisions on preservation worthiness were made. How strict were the guidelines? Reading through the BEIR reports confused me on this score.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>RDF document contains bookmarks that allows for navigation of the documents and links to all bridge documents.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.0</td>
<td>Based on Note B above that says that the bridges are &quot;organized within each generation by their apparent level of significance based upon research conducted and understanding of level of historic integrity.&quot; If this is the case, why is Cermak bridge listed at the bottom of this generation table? As Corliss and Cermak are the only two outlined in red, shouldn't both be at the top of the table, per said note? Furthermore, as the tables do not easily appear to be organized in the fashion outlined in Note B, the tables are confusing and appear to be in no particular order. It would be much easier to follow if the bridges are listed in the same order that they are given in Table 2 with the ascending Bridge ID numbers you assigned to them.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Section 3.0 | For clarification, can this column be changed to Chicago Local Landmark or Other Designation for these 10 pages of spreadsheets? | RH, TYLIN | No action taken. Chicago landmark or other designations identified on spreadsheet column. Open |

| Section 3.0 | Please incorporate the eligibility information I gave you in this spreadsheet into the Photo Data Pages after each INER report. | RH, TYLIN | In Progress Open |

| Section 3.0 | To add context, perhaps a column should be added on adjacent historic resources (at least those on the NRHP). For example, those over the NRHP-listed Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal? Or like the Chicago Ave bridge, which is directly adjacent to the buildings of a National Historic Landmark? Thoughts? | RH, TYLIN | No action taken. Topic for discussion at review meeting. Open |

| Section 3.0 | Yes | The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998. | RH, TYLIN | Concurs. List has been updated. Closed |

| Section 3.0 | Yes | This bridge along with its sister structure 016-6015, which is no longer standing, were determined eligible for the NRHP by the SHPO sometime end of 2010/early 2011. | RH, TYLIN | Concurs. List has been updated. Closed |

| Section 3.0 | Yes | The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998. | RH, TYLIN | Concurs. List has been updated. Closed |

| Section 3.0 | Yes | This bridge is located in a NRHP-listed historic district (Cermak Road Bridge Historic District); which was listed in 2010. | RH, TYLIN | Concurs. List has been updated. Closed |

<p>| Section 3.0 | Yes | The bridge itself was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998. | RH, TYLIN | Concurs. List has been updated. Closed |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998.</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998.</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998.</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bridge is not in the National Register</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the SHPO during coordination for a previous project.</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>HIER document, it says others like it are Grand, Chicago &amp; Eastern with no mention of Webster. Also, why are none of this particular type recommended for preservation?</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998.</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bridge is not on the National Register</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the SHPO during coordination for a previous project.</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>This bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the SHPO during coordination for a previous project.</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bridge is not on the National Register</td>
<td>RH, TY, UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 Lake Street: The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 Lasalle Street: There are none comparable to this one and the ratings look good in SMS, why is this one not worthy of preservation? RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. CDOT committed to preserve. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 Lasalle Street: Bridge is a contributing resource within the NRHP-listed West Loop - Lasalle Street HD (2013). RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25 Washington Street: The bridge itself was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>17 California Ave: Bridge is not on the National Register. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30 Cicero Ave: Bridge is not on the National Register. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pg. 2: Please remove red line from bottom of this row, if possible. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 Old Lake Shore Drive: The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the Keeper of the National Register in 1998. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>35 (0-290) Congress Parkway: Photo missing of other bridge house. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Photo has been added. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>35 (0-290) Congress Parkway: Per the federal exemption, no interstate bridges can be determined to be historic. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36 Van Buren Street: The bridge was determined NRHP-Eligible by the SHPO during previous project coordination. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kennedy Ev Feeder: Photos missing for this bridge's two bridge houses. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Photos have been added. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Kennedy Ev Feeder: Bridge is not on the National Register. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. List has been updated. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Section 4.5: Make sure generated dates are consistent in the &quot;Individual Bridge Documentation&quot;. RH, TY, UN</td>
<td>Concur. Individual Bridge Documents have been revised. Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street Pg. 7</td>
<td>Everywhere previously in this report, it notes the First Generation as being 1900-1910, yet this says to 1909. Which is it? *Same question on each of the following HIEF documents that note this.</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street Pg. 10</td>
<td>Everywhere noted previously in this report, it states that the time span for the Second Generation is 1911-1930, *Same question on each of the following HIEF documents that note this.</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street Pg. 11</td>
<td>Do you mean 1911? *Same question on each of the following HIEF documents that note this.</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street Pg. 13</td>
<td>Assuming that Third Generation bridges built between 1930 and 1949, not 1932 and 1955 as previously stated in this report.</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street pg. 14</td>
<td>What project does this refer to that Anne needs to insert?</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Section 4.0, &quot;Photo Data Pages&quot; Pg. 1</td>
<td>Why state it this way? Is this the same as &quot;determined eligible&quot;? Some bridges say this, and others say &quot;not determined eligible&quot; - confusing.</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street &quot;Photo Data Pages&quot; Pg. 1</td>
<td>Do all of these Photo Data Pages have this header with a different title for the overall document? If so, please change all to be consistent throughout report.</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street &quot;Photo Data Pages&quot; Pg. 1</td>
<td>Federally determined MRIP-eligible by the Keeper</td>
<td>RH, TYLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street &quot;Photo Data Pages&quot; Fig. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, Cortland Street &quot;Photo Data Pages&quot; Fig. 6</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, W. Division Street Bridge, Fig. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, W. Division Street Bridge, Fig. 4</td>
<td>Information added to Section 4.0, West Division Street Bridge, Page 11.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, W. Division Street Bridge, Fig. 4</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, W. Division Street Bridge, Fig. 4</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, W. Division Street Bridge, Bridge Structural Data, Fig. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, W. Division Street Bridge, Bridge Structural Data, Fig. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4.0, W. Division Street Bridge, Bridge Structural Data, Fig. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TYLIN</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Section 4.0, 22nd Street (Cermak Road) Bridge, Pg. 17</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Section 4.0, 22nd Street (Cermak Road) Bridge, Photo Data Pg. 1</td>
<td>Added to Page 12</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Kinzie Street Bridge, Pg. 10</td>
<td>Quotation marks were added.</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Kinzie Street Bridge, Photo Data Pg. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Kinzie Street Bridge, Photo Data Pg. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Washington Street Bridge, Pg. 13</td>
<td>Confirmed.</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Washington Street Bridge, Pg. 16</td>
<td>Fitzsimons, Confirmed.</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Washington Street Bridge, Photo Data Pg. 1</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
<td>RH, TVILN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Section/District/Location</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Washington Street Bridge, Photo Data Pg. 1</td>
<td>Determined eligible but not proposed for preservation?</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Grand Avenue Bridge, Pg. 5</td>
<td>Better explanation is needed for the phrase: &quot;The bridge was reclassified with 6x12 inch transverse slabs, laid solid, supporting 36x36 inch M. &amp; D. 50 intermediate plantings and longitudinally.&quot;</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Grand Avenue Bridge, Photo Data Pg. 1</td>
<td>See spreadsheet for rest of these data pages on eligibility/NHRP status too. It reflects accurate information on the following report pages.</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Michigan Avenue Bridge, Pg. 5</td>
<td>No. By 1939, the old rubber pavement installed in 1927 had become badly work, uneven, and costly to maintain. By the word &quot;work, did you mean warped? Cracked? Weakened? Deteriorated?&quot;</td>
<td>Won't be the correct term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Michigan Avenue Br., Pg. 20</td>
<td>The bridge itself is not individually listed, as implied by this text. This text should be revised to say it is a contributing resource to this historic district.</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Washington Avenue Br., Photo Data Pg. 1</td>
<td>Should this say &quot;eligible&quot;, so there is no question? Table on p. says it is eligible:</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Congress Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Van Buren Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Section 4.0, 69th Street Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Harrison Street Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
<td>In progress. Will provide response Nov. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Kennedy Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Dearborn Street Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Toumiki ST. Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Columbus Dr. Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Section 4.0, Randolph St. Br., Photo Data Pg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Table says &quot;Text text&quot; - Is additional information yet to be included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Section 5.0, Meeting Min 12-14-16, Pg. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please explain to the reader the significance or effect of this change in designation in the introduction material. The Division St MOA stipulated HARP documentation for that bridge - why the change for the remainder of the bascules?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Section 5.0, CDOT letter to CDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please summarize in the introductory text that this Plan was initiated as an initiation stipulated in the Division St Bridge MOA, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Section 5.0, DHED letter to CDOT</td>
<td></td>
<td>This letter explains the purpose of the Preservation Plan - please use some of this language in the introductory text. See comment p. 4 for Purpose of Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Section 4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Update HER numbers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above are comments from the electronic document which was submitted May 2017. A summary of comments was received in a July 26, 2017 letter from DOT/RDE (see Attachment 2).
## Disposition of Comments

**Chicago's Movable Bridge Preservation Plan - City of Chicago DPD Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DWG NO./ SPEC NO./ SECTION NO., ETC.</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSES BY (Name &amp; Company)</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS (Open/Closed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td>Beyond the bridges which CDOT commits to preserve, most, if not all, of the remaining bridges will likely be deemed eligible for the National Registry and that any proposed demolition or alteration will be subject to Section 106/4(f) review. The recent rehabilitation of the Wells Street bridge offers an excellent example of the type of project that could result from Section 106/4(f) review as the rehabilitation preserved the historic character of the bridge while addressing structural deficiencies due to deterioration.</td>
<td>S. Khudiera, CDOT</td>
<td>Agreed.</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General Comment</td>
<td>We understand time is of the essence, though we recommend that CDOT initiate public participation in this plan to assure broad acceptance of it.</td>
<td>S. Khudiera, CDOT</td>
<td>A meeting with IHPA, IDOT/BDE, FHWA and Chicago DPD has been scheduled for November 30, 2017. After the meeting, when an agreement has been made to finalize the plan, the Bridge Preservation Plan will be shared with other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The above are comments from the September 12, 2017 letter from City of Chicago DPD (see Attachment 2).
Comments Received on the May 2017 Draft Chicago Movable Bridges Preservation Plan
September 12, 2017

Dan Burke, SE, PE  
Deputy Commissioner/Chief Engineer  
Chicago Department of Transportation  
30 N. LaSalle St. #1100  
Chicago, IL 60602

Dear Mr. Burke,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on CDOT’s pre-final draft of “Chicago’s Movable Bridges Preservation Plan” issued in May, 2017. We understand that this draft preservation plan originated in 2012 when the IDOT and CDOT presented plans to demolish the Chicago Avenue bridge over the North Branch of the Chicago River. To mitigate the adverse effect of the demolition under Section 106 / 4(f), the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in 2012 called for a “bridge preservation plan, making commitments to preserve a good representative sampling of them.” The Department of Planning and Development encouraged and supported this collaborative approach to preserve Chicago’s bridges.

The resulting draft preservation plan identifies all forty-four (44) bascule bridges in the City of Chicago, and articulates their historic context identifies 11 bridges as representative examples to be preserved. The plan categorizes the bridges into five distinct categories, or “generations”, based on age. The sample of bridges to be preserved is in the first three “generation” categories, which were built before 1955. No bridges in the latter two generations are proposed for preservation in the plan, though with the passage of time these bridges will need to be evaluated for preservation in the future.

Beyond the bridges which CDOT commits to preserve, most, if not all, of the remaining bridges will likely be deemed eligible for the National Register and that any proposed demolition or alteration will be subject to Section 106 / 4(f) review. The recent rehabilitation of the Wells Street bridge offers an excellent example of the type of project that could result from Section 106 / 4(f) review as the rehabilitation preserved the historic character of the bridge while addressing structural deficiencies due to deterioration.

We understand that time is of the essence, though we recommend that CDOT initiate public participation in this plan to assure broad acceptance of it. Please let me know if you have any questions. Any future correspondence should be sent to Matt Crawford of my staff at the: Department of Planning and Development, Planning, Design & Historic Preservation Division, City Hall, 121 N. LaSalle St., Room 1006, Chicago, IL 60602.
Sincerely,

Eleanor Esser Gorski, AIA
Deputy Commissioner
Planning, Design and Historic Preservation Division
Department of Planning and Development

cc: Soliman Khudeira, CDOT
    Rachel Leibowitz, IHPA

Originated by:

Matt Crawford
Coordinating Planner
Planning, Design and Historic Preservation Division
Department of Planning and Development
Cook County
Chicago
Movable Bridge Preservation Plan
IDOT Seq. # 12687B & 14190

The “Pre-Final” draft Movable Bridge Preservation Plan has been reviewed and commented on by the FHWA and IDOT BDE Cultural Resources Unit. Both FHWA and BDE comments have been entered into the document and below key issues to be addressed are outlined. The “Pre-Final” draft plan is incomplete and corrections are required:

- A more detailed Executive Summary or Introduction is required, which will provide the project history and explains why this study is being done.
- A methodology or better defined explanation as to how the top bridges were selected would aid in our understanding of the reasoning behind each selection.
- Explain why were only 11 out of 44 bridges and/or bridge houses considered worthy of preservation.
- In Table 2, which lists all the bridges studied, why is one bridge that is not categorized in the bridge database (SIMS) as a movable bridge included in the study (SN 016-6056)?
  - Furthermore, SIMS shows two other bascule bridges that are not included in this study (SN 016-0315 & 016-0991, both carrying Harlem Ave. over the Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal). Why weren’t they included in the study?
- The spreadsheet that details all bridges requires modifications and clarifications to serve as a better and clear summary of the bridge review.
- Bridges included on the Illinois Historic Bridge List, including those that were formally determined National Register-eligible, were not entered into the report even though there were specific places calling for that information.
- HIER documents need to be completed and finalized.

Please forward a new draft of the report to IDOT’s Cultural Resources Unit when it becomes available. After FHWA and BDE comments have been addressed, a meeting with the SHPO will be scheduled.

Brad H. Koldehoff, RPA
Cultural Resources Unit
Bureau of Design and Environment

BK:el
July 6, 2017

Brad Koldehoff  
Illinois Department of Transportation  
Bureau of Design and Environment  
2300 S. Dirksen Parkway  
Springfield, IL 62764  

Dear Mr. Koldehoff:

Thank you for requesting comments from our office concerning the possible effects of the project referenced above on cultural resources. Our comments are required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 470), as amended, and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR 800: "Protection of Historic Properties".

We are in receipt of the prefinal Chicago's Moveable Bridge Preservation Plan (Plan) submitted as partial mitigation for the demolition of the West Division Street Bridge. In our opinion all 44 bridges addressed in the Plan are individually eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places or as a Multiple Properties Listing. The bridges are eligible under Criterion A because they are iconic features of the Chicago landscape and because the development and construction of these bridges was necessary for the economic development of the city during the twentieth century. The bridges also are eligible under criterion C for their architectural and mechanical attributes.

We are troubled by the fact that only 11 of the 44 structures have been identified for preservation and will consider each demolition an adverse effect as per 36 CFR 800.5.

Instead of a conference call, we believe that it would be productive for CDOT to have the authors present the bridges during a meeting with CDOT, IDOT, and the other consulting parties so that we may better understand the criteria employed to make the decisions as to which bridges will be preserved and which will be demolished. The meeting should be followed by a bridge tour so that we may see the bridges in person.

If you have questions, please contact Cultural Resources Manager, David J. Halpin, at 217/785-4998 or at david.halpin@illinois.gov.

Sincerely,

Rachel Leibowitz, Ph.D.  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer  

RL: djh

For TTY communication, dial 888-440-5009. It is not a voice or fax line.
CDOT submittal
of Draft
Chicago Movable Bridges
Preservation Plan
May 2017
May 4, 2017

Mr. Christopher J. Holt, P.E.
Bureau Chief of Local Roads and Streets
Illinois Department of Transportation
Division of Highways/District One
201 West Center Court
Schaumburg, IL 60196-1096

Attn: Mr. Zubair Haider, P.E.

Subject: Chicago’s Moveable Bridge Preservation Plan
Prefinal Submittal

Dear Mr. Holt:

The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) is submitting the Chicago’s Moveable Bridge Preservation Plan. This is a Prefinal Submittal for review and comment, in order to obtain feedback to ensure that the overall content and historic documentation are consistent with agency expectations.

This Plan is being developed to assess the level of historic significance of the forty-four (44) movable bridges within the City of Chicago. This Plan addresses the mitigation of the adverse effect of multiple movable bridge replacements currently under planning or design by CDOT. Documentation of previous correspondence on this matter is included in Section 5 of the referenced document.

As requested, this Plan is submitted to you electronically. Please forward the link provided in the email to the agencies listed below, with the exception of the Chicago Department of Planning and Development, as CDOT will be submitting to them separately.

- IDOT Bureau of Local Roads
- IDOT Bureau of Design and Environment
- Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
- Federal Highway Administration
- Chicago Department of Planning and Development – Planning, Design & Historic Preservation Division

30 North Lasalle Street, Suite 1100, Chicago, Illinois 60602
This collection of historic documentation along with relevant engineering data is intended to serve as a historic resource management plan for the forty-four (44) existing moveable roadway bridges within the City of Chicago.

The report contains the history of each bridge conforming to the Historical Illinois Engineering Record (HIER) Level III format. Photographs documenting the bridge structures, the bridge houses, and other notable features are also provided. The historical data compilation for each bridge is essentially complete. Any missing items, such as the HIER numbers, which will be assigned by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA), are highlighted in the report and will be finalized before the final submittal.

This data compilation was used to develop the List of Chicago's Moveable Bridges (see Section 3 of the Plan). The List is a comprehensive matrix grouping bridges by order in which they were designed and/or constructed. Within each grouping, certain bridges were identified as historically significant, and are preliminarily recommended for historic preservation.

A conference call will be held at a date to be determined to discuss comments and reach a consensus on the proposed plan.

Please contact Soliman Khudeira at 312-744-9605 or Soliman.Khudeira@cityofchicago.org should you have any questions or require additional information.

Very Truly Yours,

Dan Burke, S.E., P.E.
Deputy Commissioner/Chief Engineer
Division of Engineering

Originated By:

Soliman Khudeira, Ph.D., S.E., P.E.
Section Chief of Major Projects

Attachment

cc: D. Burke, CDOT
S. Khudeira, CDOT
TYLI
December 2016
CDOT Meeting with IDOT & FHWA to discuss Chicago's Movable Bridges Preservation Plan
OUTSTANDING ISSUES

1. Schedule and Submittals
   1.1 Submittal of the Pre-Final report is scheduled for late February 2017. Copies should be submitted to the FHWA, IDOT, and IHPA.
   1.2 Final submittal is scheduled for May 2017 pending resolution of review comments.
   1.3 IDOT and FHWA were notified of this schedule at the last coordination meeting with CDOT.

2. Report Format
   2.1 Data for each bridge will be compiled as follows:
       2.1.1 Structure Data – Short summary of bridge geometry, current National Bridge Inspection Standard ratings, Rehabilitation history, aerial photographs and existing plans.
       2.1.2 Resource Data Sheet – Included general data and features, architectural significance and photographs.
       2.1.3 Historical Data – HAER format report.

3. Comments/Discussion
   3.1 Report should include an appendix summarizing the structural rating values.
      (D. Halpin)
3.2 Change Historic American Engineering Record to Historic Illinois Engineering Record to differentiate between the national scale and the State of Illinois. (D. Halpin)

3.3 The analysis matrix should prioritize bridges for preservation based on integrity and historical significance. (B. Koldehoff) CDOT concurred, and reiterated the goal of the study was to categorize the bridges based on structural integrity, functionality and historical significance. Initial emphasis will be historical perspective.

3.4 A context statement has been developed for each bridge based on the specified time periods.

3.5 The amount of information/data provided for each bridge in the representative samples is sufficient. All bridges are eligible under National Register Criterion A and some bridges are eligible under National Register Criterion C. (D. Halpin)

ACTION ITEMS

After reviewing the February 2017 submittal of the report, a meeting will be scheduled with CDOT, IHPA, IDOT, Chicago Landmarks Division and consultants to evaluate the bridges and develop preliminary recommendations for preservation. Once the draft preservation list is determined, the report will be released for review and comment to additional parties and interest groups as determined by the FHWA. It shall be emphasized to the participants that the list is not final and is open to comments and discussion.

We believe the above to be an accurate summary of the major items discussed. Please forward any comments or corrections to the attention of the writer within five working days of receipt of these minutes.

Submitted by: Anna Dukes, T.Y. Lin International

cc: All in attendance
# BRIDGE PRESERVATION PLAN
## ATTENDANCE ROSTER

**MEETING LOCATION:** CDOT

**Date:** December 14, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIALS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>REPRESENTING</th>
<th>TELEPHONE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soliman Khudeira</td>
<td>Chicago Department of Transportation</td>
<td>(312) 744-9605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anna Dukes</td>
<td>TY Lin</td>
<td>(312) 777-2920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Sullivan</td>
<td>Sullivan Preservation</td>
<td>(773) 857-3433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brad Koldchoff</td>
<td>Illinois Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>(217) 785-7833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emilie Land</td>
<td>Illinois Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>(217) 558-7223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Halpin</td>
<td>Illinois Historic Preservation Agency</td>
<td>(217) 785-4998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project to replace the Division Street Bridge over North Branch of Chicago River

Correspondence from 2014 pertaining to the proposed Movable Bridges Preservation Plan
LOCAL ROADS AND STREETS
State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Consultation
City of Chicago
Location: Division Street at the North Branch Canal of the Chicago River
Section No.: 01-E1022-00-BR
Project No.: M-6000(155)
Job No.: P-88-014-03
Existing Structure No.: 016-6015
Proposed Structure No.: 016-6209
CDOT Project No.: E-1-022
Cook County

March 4, 2014

Mr. Daniel F. Burke, P.E., S.E.
Deputy Commissioner
City of Chicago
Department of Transportation
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 400
Chicago, IL 60602-2570

Attn: Mr. Luis D. Benitez, P.E., S.E.

Dear Mr. Burke:

Enclosed is the memo we have received from the Bureau of Design and Environment (BDE) relative to their coordination with the SHPO for the above-referenced project.

The SHPO concurs with the Department's plan to mitigate the adverse effect by:

1. Recording the current bridge according to Level III Standards of the Illinois Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), which must be approved by SHPO before the removal; and

2. Creating a Chicago Bascule Bridge Preservation Plan, in coordination with the Department, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and SHPO as per the enclosure.

This mitigation will be conducted under a Memorandum of Agreement to be developed between the Department, FHWA and SHPO.
If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact M. Zubair Haider, Field Engineer, at (847) 705-4206 or via email at Zubair.Haider@illinois.gov.

Very truly yours,

John Fortmann, P.E.
Deputy Director of Highways,
Region One Engineer

By:
Christopher J. Holt, P.E.
Bureau Chief of Local Roads and Streets

Enclosures
Cook County
Chicago
FAU 1394 / W. Division St.
Bridge over North Branch Chicago River Canal
Structure # 016-6015
Section # 01-E1022-00-BR
IDOT Sequence # 12687B

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the planned superstructure replacement of the Division Bridge over the North Branch of the Chicago River Canal in Chicago (SN 016-6015) will cause an Adverse Effect to the bridge, which has previously been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, as well as being included on the IDOT Historic Bridge List.

The Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurs with IDOT's plan to mitigate the Adverse Effect by 1) recording the current bridge according to Level III standards of the Illinois Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), which must be approved by the SHPO before the removal, and 2) creating a Chicago bascule bridge preservation plan, in coordination with the IDOT, FHWA and SHPO (see attached). This mitigation will be conducted under a Memorandum of Agreement to be developed among IDOT, FHWA and SHPO.

Brad H. Koldehoff, RPA
Cultural Resources Unit
Bureau of Design and Environment

BK:ee

Attachments
February 21, 2014

Chicago, Cook County
FAU 1394 / W. Division Street
Bridge over North Branch Chicago River Canal
Structure #016-6015
Section #01-E1022-00-BR
IDOT Sequence #12887B

FEDERAL 106 PROJECT

ADVERSE EFFECT – HISTORIC BRIDGE

Ms. Anne Haaker
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
Springfield, Illinois 62701

Dear Ms. Haaker:

In accordance with ongoing project coordination, please find enclosed the IDOT Environmental Survey Request Addendum form for the above referenced project. The IDOT originally proposed to replace two bridges: Structure #016-6015 and #016-6016. This project addendum has been submitted in regards to only one bridge: Structure #016-6016. The superstructure of this bridge is in an advanced stage of deterioration and its replacement is now considered an emergency. The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) proposes to replace it with a temporary two-truss structure until the original project is approved and the bridge can be replaced in its entirety.

However, this Division Street Bridge (#016-6015) is a bascule bridge and a primary on IDOT’s Historic Bridge List, and therefore, has previously been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. For that reason, in accordance with the established procedure for coordination of IDOT projects, we request the concurrence of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in our determination that this project addendum will constitute an adverse effect on a historic property (#016-6015), which is subject to protection under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

Furthermore, we request SHPO concurrence with the following proposed mitigation measures: (1) the CDOT, in coordination with IDOT and FHWA, will ensure the bridge (#016-6015) undergoes Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) recordation and that the bridge is not removed until the HAER documentation has been reviewed and approved by the SHPO; and (2) a Chicago bridge preservation plan, focusing on bascule bridges, will be developed by CDOT in coordination with the IDOT, FHWA, and SHPO; however, the Division Street Bridge (#016-6015) can be removed before this plan is reviewed and approved by the SHPO. A Memorandum of Agreement stipulating these mitigation measures will be submitted to your office for review and comment.

Very truly yours,

Brad H. Koldehoff, RPA
Cultural Resources Unit
Bureau of Design & Environment

CONCUR

By: [Signature]
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Date: 2.25.14
The purpose of a new historic bridge preservation plan for Chicago’s Bascule bridges was to update and make current information concerning the historic significance and structural integrity of the moveable bridges in the Chicago area. Both components of the study need to be completed before mutual decisions are arrived at concerning preservation opportunities for extant bridges. The current study completed by CDOT makes conclusions about which bridges the city is committed to preserving based solely on transportation strategies and does not take into account current historic status. The new bridge document must be undertaken by an historian, architectural historian or person of closely related discipline that meets the Secretary of the Interiors’ Professional Qualifications found at 36 CFR part 61 and that demonstrates previous experience in applying the various National Park Service standards and guidelines for performing such studies.

All bridges, regardless of control or ownership, then need to be assessed in terms of eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. This needs to be done regardless of any previous designation or finding due to the fact that structural condition and comparable integrity have changed. This is due to the fact that these bridges have not been looked at as a thematic group in over a quarter of a century. Concurrently, additional information should be gathered to complete our understanding of the current status of this resource group such as IDOT structures summary reports, locating any plans or survey materials that might exist HAER documentation, etc.

The consultant will then make recommendations for our consideration about which bridges, based on both historic significance, integrity of materials and structural condition are the best candidates for preservation in accordance with the approaches of the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for Rehabilitation (36 CFR part 68). Recommendations for how to best accomplish that should be outlined or provided in a spreadsheet with materials conservation recommendations.

Once this is compiled, it will be discussed amongst the various governmental entities and then when we are all satisfied it is correct and complete, we will make it available for a public comment period. Once public comment is addressed, we will have final discussions to arrive at which bridges will be preserved and how that will be achieved based on cyclical maintenance approaches.
Project to replace the Chicago Avenue Bridge over North Branch of Chicago River

Correspondence and Meeting Minutes from 2012 & 2013 pertaining to the proposed Movable Bridges Preservation Plan
Cook County
Chicago
Chicago Avenue Bridge over North Branch of Chicago River
Structure # 016-6008
Section # 05-E5013-00-BR
IDOT Sequence # 14190

The attached letter from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) details their Adverse Effect determination for the bridge replacement project. The bridge is considered eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, its removal and replacement would constitute an adverse effect to the historic structure.

The SHPO will accept the adverse effect provided a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is entered into by the consulting parties with the following stipulations:

- The existing Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) report is supplemented with additional plans, specifications and photos.
- The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT), in consultation with Friends of the River and other consulting parties, undertakes a survey and Historic Resource Management Plan for preservation of Chicago's Movable Bridges that conforms to the approaches of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- The bridge machinery is retained in place and made available for public viewing along the pedestrian river walk.

It is also noted in the SHPO letter that the report and this letter should be made available for public comment and to identified consulting parties. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) should also provide the same information to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and ask if they would like to participate in the consultation process.

Please forward any new information or comments regarding this project to the Cultural Resources Unit when it becomes available.

Brad H. Koldehoff, RPA
Cultural Resources Unit
Bureau of Design and Environment
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Cook County
Chicago
Bridge Replacement (SN 016-6008)
Chicago Ave. over North Branch of Chicago River
IDOT-P-88-068-06, IDOT 2-05-E5013-00-BR, IDOT Seq #-14190
IHPC Log #006021910

August 13, 2013

Brad Koldehoff
Illinois Department of Transportation
Bureau of Design and Environment
2300 S. Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62764

Dear Mr. Koldehoff:

We have reviewed the most recent draft of the Section 106 report for replacement of
the Chicago Avenue Bridge over the North Branch of the Chicago River. This bridge
is considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. We will accept
the adverse effect of the demolition of the bridge provided that a Memorandum of
Agreement is entered into by the consulting parties with the following stipulations:

1. The existing HAER report is supplemented with additional plans, specifications
   and photographs.
2. The Chicago Department of Transportation, in consultation with Friends of the
   River and other consulting parties, undertakes a survey and Historic Resource
   Management Plan for preservation of Chicago’s Movable Bridges that conforms to
   the approaches of the Standards of the Secretary of the Interior.
3. The bridge machinery is retained in place and made available for public viewing
   along the pedestrian river walk.

The report along with this letter should be made available for public comment and to
identified consulting parties. The Federal Highway Administration should also
provide the same information to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation asking
if they would like to participate in the consultation process.

Sincerely,

Anne E. Haaker
Deputy State Historic
Preservation Officer

A teletypewriter for the speech/hearing impaired is available at 217-524-7126. It is not a voice or fax line.
January 23, 2013

Daniel Burke
Deputy Commissioner
Division of Engineering
Chicago Department of Transportation
30 N. LaSalle St., Suite 1100
Chicago, IL 60602

Re: Chicago Avenue Bridge – Section 106 / 4(f) report

Dear Mr. Burke:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed demolition and replacement of the Chicago Avenue Bridge over the North Branch of the Chicago River. These comments are in response to the Section 106 / 4(f) report on the bridge submitted by CDOT in a letter dated October 24, 2012.

Our comments concern the proposed mitigation of the bridge demolition and replacement as proposed in Section 6.0 (page 7) of CDOT’s Section 106 / 4(f) report. CDOT proposes, as a mitigation measure for the demolition of the bridge, that the City of Chicago “develop a Bascule Bridge Preservation Plan in order to maintain a representative sample of these types of structures.” CDOT correctly notes that the bascule bridge type is a distinctive and significant bridge type in the history of Chicago, and the preservation of historic bascule bridges should be a priority for the City as rehabilitation or replacement of such bridges are considered. A Preservation Plan should identify surviving bascule bridges in the City of Chicago, group them by important categories such as age and bridge subtype, rank bridges according to importance, and provide recommendations on which bridges are the best and most important for the City to preserve.

Such a Preservation Plan would provide a clear and rational basis for such rehabilitation / replacement efforts as the Chicago Avenue Bridge replacement. We believe that, before the demolition of the Chicago Avenue Bridge is approved and undertaken, that the Preservation Plan should be completed by CDOT and accepted by the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA), and that the Plan confirms that other bascule bridges of the same age and subtype as the Chicago Avenue Bridge exist and are good candidates for preservation and rehabilitation. With the plethora of information available concerning historic bascule bridges in Chicago, such a Preservation Plan could, in the opinion of Historic Preservation Division staff, reasonably be undertaken within a year, including the selection of a consultant if used, the identification and
ranking of the City's surviving bascule bridges, and the development of rehabilitation / replacement goals and protocols for these bridges.

We believe that CDOT, as the City agency proposing this undertaking, should be the lead in a Bascule Bridge Preservation Plan, working under IHPA's guidance. The Historic Preservation Division of HED would be pleased to assist CDOT as it undertakes such a study.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Any future correspondence should be sent directly to Terry Tatum of my staff at the following address: Historic Preservation Division, Department of Housing and Economic Development, 33 N. LaSalle St., Room 1600, Chicago, IL 60602.

Sincerely,

Eleanor Esser Gorski, AIA
Assistant Commissioner
Historic Preservation Division
Bureau of Planning and Zoning

Originated by:

Terry Tatum
Coordinating Planner I
Historic Preservation Division
Bureau of Planning and Zoning

cc: Anne Haaker, IHPA
SHPO COORDINATION MEETING
CHICAGO AVENUE BRIDGE OVER THE NORTH BRANCH OF THE CHICAGO RIVER

Monday, September 10, 2012, 1:00 p.m.
IDOT – Local Roads and Streets (Executive conference room)
201 W. Center Court, Schaumburg, IL

MEETING MINUTES

A discussion was held pertaining to the following issues raised in the Cultural Resource Memorandum from the Bureau of Design and Environment and specifically, several issues raised by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

1. Rehabilitation Option

The feasibility of this option was discussed. Rehabilitation would address the structural deficiencies the bridge currently exhibits, but it cannot address the need to accommodate current and future traffic volumes on Chicago Avenue. Based on the traffic volumes, four travel lanes are needed in accordance with Illinois DOT Design Guidelines. The existing structure can only accommodate two lanes of traffic and does not allow for any roadway widening on the existing bridge. The only option to obtain the required number of roadway lanes is to replace the existing bridge.

Further information on the traffic volumes and the impact they have on the structure type will be incorporated into the re-submittal of the 106/4(f) Report.

2. Mitigation

SHPO expressed concern that the Chicago Area bascule bridges are becoming an endangered cultural resource, and requested that mitigation measures be taken in order to preserve bascule bridges in the Chicago Area.

The Chicago Department of Transportation (CDOT) noted that movable bridges south of Chicago Avenue will remain so in order to accommodate river navigation. It was proposed that CDOT develop a technical report, independent of this project that would detail a preservation plan for the bascule bridges in order to maintain a representative sample of these types of structures. CDOT agreed to move forward with plans to develop this technical report and will coordinate this work with SHPO. It was also agreed that the future plans to develop this technical report would serve as a mitigation measure for the demolition of the Chicago Avenue Bridge.
3. **Section 106/4(f) Report**

A revised report will be re-submitted along with a disposition to the comments raised in the Cultural Resource Memorandum. The revised report will be submitted to Region One Bureau of Local Roads and Streets as well as the following organizations:

- Landmarks Illinois
- Preservation Chicago
- Friends of the Chicago River

We believe the above to be an accurate summary of the major items discussed. Please forward any comments or corrections to the attention of the writer within five working days of receipt of these minutes.

Submitted by: Anna Dukes, T.Y. Lin International
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>E-MAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Holt</td>
<td>IDOT - DI - BLRS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Christopher.Holt@illinois.gov">Christopher.Holt@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaina Bridges</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alaina.bridges@chicago.gov">alaina.bridges@chicago.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Brumke</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbrumke@chicago.gov">dbrumke@chicago.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soliman Khudeira</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sKhudeira@chicago.gov">sKhudeira@chicago.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Dukes</td>
<td>TV Lin</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anna.dukes@tvlin.com">anna.dukes@tvlin.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Morales</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnny.morales@cityofchicago.com">johnny.morales@cityofchicago.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sadler</td>
<td>CDOT - DE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johns.sadler@cityofchicago.com">johns.sadler@cityofchicago.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Kuba</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.kubly@cityofchicago.com">scott.kubly@cityofchicago.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Woods</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.woods@cityofchicago.com">michelle.woods@cityofchicago.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uphill Treat</td>
<td>CDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:uphill.treat@chicago.gov">uphill.treat@chicago.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahad Aqueel</td>
<td>IDOT - DJ - Geometric</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Fahad.Aqueel@illinois.gov">Fahad.Aqueel@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Stitt</td>
<td>IDOT - BDE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scott.stitt@illinois.gov">scott.stitt@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Hine</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mike.Hine@dot.gov">Mike.Hine@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Byars</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Chris.Byars@dot.gov">Chris.Byars@dot.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salmon DAVINCE</td>
<td>IDOT - CBLR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salmon.davince@illinois.gov">salmon.davince@illinois.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: James K. Klein  
From: John D. Baranzelli
Attn: Salmon O. Danmole  
By: Brad H. Koldehoff
Subject: Further SHPO Coordination  
Date: August 20, 2012

Cook County  
Chicago  
Chicago Ave. over North Branch Chicago River  
Bridge Replacement  
Section #00-B0259-00-PV  
Structure #016-6008  
IDOT Sequence #14190

Further coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) is required for the above referenced project. The draft Section 106/4(f) report requires further work to address concerns expressed by the SHPO, see attached letter.

The SHPO has determined that the Chicago Avenue Bridge is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion “C” because it is a good representative example of a Chicago bascule bridge. Therefore, the Section 106/4(f) report must explore preservation options in greater detail:

- Structural deficiencies could be addressed through rehabilitation.
- Width problems could be handled through restriping of pavement, disallowing parking, and redirecting through traffic.
- River clearance issues need to be discussed with the U.S. Army Corps as they have Section 106 responsibilities as well.

Moreover, the SHPO is concerned that bascules bridges, an iconic bridge type in the Chicago area, are becoming an endangered cultural resource. The SHPO has requested a meeting to discuss the preservation of bascule bridges.

Please forward the revised Section 106/4(f) report to this office for further coordination with the SHPO, and please provide preliminary plans for scheduling a meeting.

Brad H. Koldehoff, RPA  
Cultural Resources Unit  
Bureau of Design and Environment
June 28, 2012

Brad Koldeshoff
Illinois Department of Transportation
Bureau of Design and Environment
2300 S. Dirksen Parkway
Springfield, IL 62764

Dear Mr. Koldeshoff:

We have reviewed this report and find that the proposal needs more study in terms of compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. The Chicago Avenue bridge over the North Branch of the Chicago River meets Criterion "C" of the National Register of Historic Places as a good representative example of a bascule bridge. We performed an onsite of this project and the two bascule bridges at Goose Island (several years ago) and we are very concerned that we will lose this historic bridge type through attrition. Therefore we think that the Chicago Avenue bridge needs more study and we need to look at this bridge type and its future in whole. The 106 report brings up three points:

1. structural problems (which are probably similar to all bascules)
2. width problems
3. river clearance

We believe that the report needs to more fully explore these issues through the following:

1. Structural deficiencies could be addressed through rehabilitation. This needs to be seriously addressed.
2. Width problems could possibly be handled through restiping of pavement, disallowing parking and redirecting through traffic to Ohio which is already 6 lanes wide.
3. River clearance issues need to be discussed with the Corps as they have 106 responsibilities as well.

Once these alternatives (and others that the IDOT Environment section may come up with) are discussed in a report we will consult further. As far as mitigation goes, the present plan is inadequate. A HAER report is mentioned but did HAER ever accept that report? It was done by the I and M Canal Commission when they did a major boundary revision study in the late 90’s and I do not know what ever happened to documentation officially. We will need to check that out.

A tactual writer for the speech/hearing impaired is available at 217-524-7126. It is not a voice or fax line.
Also, I do not want to discuss this bridge and one or two bascules per year until they all vanish. I think we need to take a look at the Bridge condition reports for all the bridges and sit down and do an agreement document that is broadly encompassing of a bridge preservation plan, making commitments to keep a good representative sampling of them. This should be done in consultation with the local landmarks commission and bridge affinity groups.

Let me know if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Anne E. Haaker
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
CHICAGO MOVABLE BRIDGE PRESERVATION PLAN

APPENDIX D

Programmatic Agreement
Copy of Programmatic Agreement
to be included once Ratified