

APPENDIX A:

**PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM MEETING
DOCUMENTATION**

TO: Jason Blackburn, PE
Srinivasa Gutti, PE
Project Manager(s), KYTC

1792 Alysheba Way, Ste 230
Lexington, KY 40509
Direct: 859-272-5400
Fax: 859-272-6556

www.pbworld.com

FROM: Parsons Brinckerhoff

DATE: October 6, 2015

SUBJECT: District 10 Intersections Study
Minutes of Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting #1

The first Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting was held at 1:30 PM (EDT) on Tuesday, October 6, 2015, at KYTC District 10 Office in Jackson, Kentucky. The following people were in attendance:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC – C.O. Planning	Mikael.Pelfrey@ky.gov
Steve Ross	KYTC – C.O. Planning	Steve.Ross@ky.gov
Srinivasa Gutti	KYTC – C.O. Planning	Srinivasa.Gutti@ky.gov
Jason Blackburn	KYTC – District 10	Jason.Blackburn@ky.gov
Aric Skaggs	KYTC – District 10	Aric.Skaggs@ky.gov
Brandon Baker	KYTC – District 10	Brandon.Baker2@ky.gov
Brent Weddington	KYTC – District 10	Brent.Weddington@ky.gov
Min Jiang	KYTC – District 10	Min.Jiang@ky.gov
Anne Warnick	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Warnick@pbworld.com
Arlen Sandlin	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Sandlin@pbworld.com
Shawn Dikes	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Dikes@pbworld.com
Lindsay Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	WalkerLi@pbworld.com

Introductions

Jason Blackburn began the meeting by welcoming those in attendance. He noted that this was the first meeting of the PDT. He then turned the meeting over to Lindsay Walker of Parsons Brinckerhoff.

Meeting Overview

Lindsay presented a PowerPoint that included a meeting agenda, project overview, project schedule, and a select list of proposed intersection treatments to be discussed during the meeting, including intersections with multiple improvement options, intersections with design

challenges, and the top five priority intersections. In addition, there was a booklet distributed that contained all 50 intersections and draft recommendations prepared for each.

Some overall comments related to the study included the following:

- It was noted that the costs listed for each intersection do not include right of way or utility costs. Those costs, as well as cost breakdowns for improvements that can be completed independently, will be included in the draft report in the table. It was informed that there is not enough room in the individual intersection sheets to show all the costs.
- There was also a question about the Potential Crash Reduction (PCR) number that was included on each intersection sheet. The explanation is that number was given by the Kentucky Transportation Center (KTC) as the potential for crash reduction at that intersection, based on similar intersections around the state. It is not a Crash Modification Factor and is not based on the specific improvements shown on the intersection sheets.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff will provide standard drawings where applicable for intersection improvements and reference those on each intersection sheet.
- In the case where multiple options were presented for intersections (i.e. two project sheets) it was determined that both should be included in the final document as it provides a range of improvement options from which a final design can be determined by KYTC at a later date.

Following the project overview, intersections identified for review at this meeting were presented. Below is a list of the intersections reviewed and comments noted related to each.

Intersection 1-1 and 1-2

- The west approach is KY 1110, not Fish Pond Loop, and needs to be relabeled on the intersection sheet.
- The new entrance (F) in 1-2 has a grade difference and there may be permitting issues as there are two businesses (a gas station and dairy bar) operating in that space.

Intersection 18-1 and 18-2

- Delineators have not been successful in previous applications in District 10. The Dairy Queen entrance that they are placed in front of could be shown as a right in right out, instead of using delineators.
- The realignment shown on sheet 18-2 will impact a farmer's market.

Intersection 20-1 and 20-2

- The District would like to see a lower cost option. Improvement B on sheet 20-2 could potentially be separated out as a lower cost option (widening with a turn lane).

Intersection 28-1 and 28-2

- The cost for the fill should be re-evaluated, as the District indicated costs may be more per unit as the project is small. Improvement A should be evaluated to determine if there would be any excavation cost related to cutting back the hill to improve sight distance.

Intersection 36-1 and 36-2

- The District likes option 36-1; however, the right of way required for Improvement B may be an issue. It was mentioned that Coal Branch Road to Flint Street to Higgins Street could be turned into a one-way loop, if Coal Branch Road loops back around. Access should be re-evaluated and considered to minimize impacts to properties for this option.
- It may not be feasible to limit parking in front of the bank (Improvement C) for either option as it was noted that local officials were not in favor of prohibiting on-street parking in this location.

Intersection 38-1 and 38-2

- Delineators may be considered at this location but will likely not be pursued further by the District given previous issues with their application.
- Striping may be considered in lieu of the delineators.

Intersection 39-1 and 39-2

- Flooding may potentially occur on Swift Camp Creek Road with the proposed changes; however, impacts would be no different than existing conditions.

Intersection 40-1 and 40-2

- Those in attendance from the District preferred option 40-2, though either would improve intersection connections with KY 15 .

Intersection 48-1 and 48-2

- The realignment associated with either option 48-1 or option 48-2 is costly due to the amount of earth work required.
- The District had previously looked at a similar solution as option 48-2 for this intersection.

Intersection 49-1 and 49-2

- The District had previously discussed a solution similar to option 49-2 for this intersection.

Intersection 9, 11 and 27

- Improvement B on sheet 9 and similar improvements on sheets 11 and 27 needs to be reconsidered, as the gas station and car lot on the north side of the road are two separate businesses. Access needs to be maintained to both.
- There may be a way to do a lower cost / lower impact restriping – Parsons Brinckerhoff will look into this, including shifting the existing lanes north to provide additional roadway width on the south side.

Intersection 13 and 44

- KY 11/15 is a high priority corridor for the District, and they are hoping to rebuild it from the high school to KY 213.
- The District is open to closing Halls Road at KY 11/15.

Intersection 17 and 43

- In addition to the proposed recommendations, the closure of Elizabeth Drive was discussed. As Elizabeth Drive is a circulation road for school busses, it cannot be closed.

Intersection 19

- This improvement involves a local city street. KYTC would need to coordinate with the city to perform the full proposed redesign of the area.
- Newland Street is a school circulation street.

Intersection 23

- KYTC plans to close the access point to the District office from KY 15. The District office access will move to KY 3232 in the future.
- KY 15 is going to be a 5 lane section (2 lanes in each direction with center TWLTL). This is currently the District's #1 priority project.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff will further investigate the crash types at this intersection.

Intersection 26

- The District staff would be supportive of the reverse angle parking option.

Intersection 29

- Closing off the connector will likely be met with opposition, however if Parsons Brinckerhoff feels it is the best solution, then it should be included as an option.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff should look at adding a left turn lane from KY 52 to the Old KY 52 Connector. This can be accomplished via striping and reducing existing paved shoulder width.

Intersection 33

- Closing Peavley Street Connector is not a feasible option; another alternative needs to be given.

Intersection 2

- The application of delineators are still an issue. They can be proposed; however other options should be explored such as a right-in right-out to the gas station / Wendy's.

Intersection 3

- A traffic signal was found to be warranted at this intersection based on volumes. However, the District would still like to see another option if possible, such as moving the stop bar, or installing flashing beacons instead of a signal. Parsons Brinckerhoff will further investigate crash types to see if a signal would truly help reduce crashes.

Intersection 4

- The District would like to see another option besides a speed reduction.
- Some crashes may be caused by people driving under the influence.
- Parsons Brinckerhoff will look into the width of KY 2486 to determine if it is wide enough to add edge of road and center line striping.

Intersection 5

- There were no significant comments about this intersection. To further document the need the KAB information should be added to the sheet.

Next Steps

Parsons Brinckerhoff will further refine the improvement options based on the comments today. Costs specific to each improvement type will be listed and costs provided for right of way and utilities included. Parsons Brinckerhoff will include all assumptions for utility estimates. If an intersection is within a municipality, it is to be assumed there will be at least water utilities.

A draft report with all intersection improvements and detailed costs will be submitted to KYTC to review before the second PDT meeting. A draft is expected to be completed in November 2015 with a meeting scheduled in December 2015.

With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM (EDT).

TO: Jason Blackburn, PE
Srinivasa Gutti, PE
Project Manager(s), KYTC

1792 Alysheba Way, Ste 230
Lexington, KY 40509
Direct: 859-272-5400
Fax: 859-272-6556

www.pbworld.com

FROM: Parsons Brinckerhoff

DATE: December 9, 2015

SUBJECT: District 10 Intersections Study
Minutes of Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting #2

The second Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting was held at 1:30 PM (EST) on Wednesday, December 9, 2015, at KYTC District 10 Office in Jackson, Kentucky. The following people were in attendance:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC – C.O. Planning	Mikael.Pelfrey@ky.gov
Steve Ross	KYTC – C.O. Planning	Steve.Ross@ky.gov
Michael Vaughn	KYTC – C.O. Traffic Operations - HSIP	Mike.Vaughn@ky.gov
Jarrod Stanley	KYTC – C.O. Traffic Operations - HSIP	Jarrod.Stanley@ky.gov
Wendy Southworth	KYTC – C.O. Design	Wendy.Southworth@ky.gov
Jason Blackburn	KYTC – District 10	Jason.Blackburn@ky.gov
Aric Skaggs	KYTC – District 10	Aric.Skaggs@ky.gov
Brandon Baker	KYTC – District 10	Brandon.Baker2@ky.gov
Brent Weddington	KYTC – District 10	Brent.Weddington@ky.gov
Min Jiang	KYTC – District 10	Min.Jiang@ky.gov
Anne Warnick	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Warnick@pbworld.com
Arlen Sandlin	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Sandlin@pbworld.com
Shawn Dikes	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Dikes@pbworld.com
Lindsay Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	WalkerLi@pbworld.com

Introductions

Jason Blackburn began the meeting by welcoming those in attendance. He noted that this was the second meeting of the PDT. He then invited those in attendance to introduce themselves as there were several new attendees. After that he turned the meeting over to Lindsay Walker of Parsons Brinckerhoff.

Meeting Overview

Lindsay presented an overview of the meeting including an agenda. Items to be covered by the meeting included:

- Study Review
- Draft Report Format
- Project Questions
- Next Steps

Study Review

The project covered all the counties in District 10. The 50 intersections selected for evaluation by KYTC were based on the Kentucky Transportation Center's (KTC) research and included those with the most potential for improvement in terms of Potential Crash Reduction (PCR) factors. The bulk of the study's work is represented in the project sheets. Each sheet presents the background intersection data, a short summary of the existing conditions and then the improvement recommendation(s), including construction costs. The recommendations were based on field reviews, research and input from the PDT.

Jason provided some additional background on how the study was developed. In particular, a goal of this study was to identify projects the District might be able to utilize Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds to make improvements.

Draft Report Format

Lindsay described how the study documentation / DRAFT report is laid out. There is an introduction, a discussion of the project's purpose and need, and a summary of existing conditions. Next, the project sheets are included, with information on who to contact for follow up at the end. Other components included the summary sheet, which is the cost estimate including bid items, quantities and pricing. The appendices contain other details and project background information as follows:

- Appendix A – PDT Meeting Documentation
- Appendix B – Crash Distribution
- Appendix C – Signal Warrant Analysis
- Appendix D – Detailed Construction Cost Estimates
- Appendix E – Standard Drawings

Some discussion and notes related to the overall Draft Report are as follows:

- The representative from the KYTC Traffic Operations HSIP (Jarrod Stanley) remarked that he was fine with the background and layout of the sheets. He didn't feel that anything was missing from them and served as a good project summary and resource for further development.

- From the KYTC Central Office Planning division, it was noted that Mikael Pelfrey would have some comments on the narrative component. Other comments from the KYTC Central Office Planning staff may be forthcoming, with the expected deadline for receipt of comments on Friday, December 18, 2015.
- A proposed change to the project sheets would be to include the total cost estimate in a column next to the construction cost.
- The summary sheet should be moved from the report to the Appendix but left in the Executive Summary. It was further requested that the order of the costs be in the traditional project development sequences D, R U, and C.
- the KAB injury scale information may be useful to include on the project sheets for the intersections that have a high rating (includes top five intersections).
- The construction costs currently portrayed may not account for environmental permits, mitigation, fees and other costs such as needed geotech, etc. A note will be placed on the summary sheet and in the narrative describing the costs to indicate this.
- An unlocked version of the cost sheet will be provided in Appendix D. The standard drawings and which ones apply to each project with a PDF link is supplied in Appendix E.
- When noting the list of intersections, adjectives such as “worst” should be avoided. This should be changed to “poor crash locations”.
- The information contained on the project sheets is sufficient for the development of Project Identification Forms (PIFs). No additional purpose and need statements for each intersection need to be developed as part of this study. These intersection sheets can be attached to the PIF database.

Project Questions (Intersection Sheets)

- 50-2: It was asked how far the trees are recommended to be cut back. Is this on existing ROW or will encroachment be needed? This will be investigated and clearly communicated on the project sheet.
- 49-2: This sheet has purple hatching instead of purple lines. This needs to be reviewed to determine what is correct to show.
- 20-3: The two roundabouts are certainly innovative, but unlikely to happen. It is good there are other options.
- 25: This is largely done.
- 3: The warrants are met for the signal based on the crash type and potential for mitigation.



- 18-1: Delineators are now installed. More are recommended on the other approach of the intersection.

Next Steps

Parsons Brinckerhoff will address the updates, requests for changes and needed information gathered from the meeting. KYTC will provide comments on all parts of the product and the goal is to transmit those to Parsons Brinckerhoff by December 18, 2015. That will enable the project to remain on schedule with an expected delivery date of the Final Report by the end of December 2015.

With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 PM (EST).