

Appendix G:

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

TO: Tom Hall, PE
Mikael Pelfrey, PE
Project Manager(s), KYTC

www.pbworld.com

FROM: Parsons Brinckerhoff

DATE: March 19, 2014

SUBJECT: US 60 Traffic Study
Item No. 5-275.00
Minutes of 1st Project Development Team Meeting

The first meeting with the Project Development Team (PDT) for the US 60 Traffic Study was held at 10:00 AM (EST) on Wednesday, March 19, 2014, at KYTC Central Office in Frankfort, Kentucky. The following people were in attendance:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC – C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Jill Asher	KYTC – C.O. Design	jill.asher@ky.gov
Robert Brown	KYTC – C.O. Traffic	robertf.brown@ky.gov
Jonathan Reynolds	KYTC – C.O. Planning	jonathan.reynolds@ky.gov
Tom Hall	KYTC – D-5 Planning	tom.hall@ky.gov
Chris Allen	KYTC – D-5 Planning	chris.allen@ky.gov
Jason Richardson	KYTC – D-5 Traffic	jasonr.richardson@ky.gov
Troy Hearn	KYTC Bike & Ped Coordinator	troy.hearn@ky.gov
Chris Chaney	BGADD	cchaney@bgadd.org
Shawn Dikes	Parsons Brinckerhoff	dikes@pbworld.com
Arlen Sandlin	Parsons Brinckerhoff	sandlin@pbworld.com
Lindsay Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	walkerli@pbworld.com
Scott Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	walkersc@pbworld.com

Welcome and Introductions

Mikael Pelfrey began by welcoming those in attendance and requesting that everyone introduce themselves. Mr. Pelfrey explained that the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) has requested that a traffic / safety study be completed for the US 60 corridor between US 460 and I-64 in Frankfort, Kentucky with an initial special emphasis on the Sunset Drive / McDonald's to Laramie Drive / Brighton Park Boulevard section / intersections. Parsons Brinckerhoff is the consulting firm assisting KYTC with the study. Mr. Pelfrey then turned the meeting over to Shawn Dikes (Project Manager) and Lindsay Walker with Parsons Brinckerhoff.

To facilitate the meeting, agendas were distributed by Parsons Brinckerhoff.

Project Background and Study Area

Mr. Dikes began the presentation portion of the meeting by providing some background information on the study, forming the context for what the study is and the purpose of this meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to brief the PDT on where the study currently stands and to preview the materials to be discussed at the local officials / stakeholders meeting scheduled for later the same day. To date, Parsons Brinckerhoff has provided review of the KYTC's design for the area of special emphasis and additional recommendations and has begun collecting existing conditions information for the entire corridor. As the schedule for this study was compressed into a six-month timeframe, the next (and final) meeting with the local officials / stakeholders will be held in the near future with a target date during the week of May 19, 2014. It was decided that a meeting with the project team be held the week before to go over the alternatives and presentation materials and allow Parsons Brinckerhoff a week to make any necessary changes prior to presenting to the local officials / stakeholders. Related to meetings, it was also discussed that some of the business / property owners should be included in the planning stage of the process and individual meetings should be scheduled to gather input on what types of corridor-wide improvements they would be supportive of. Individual meetings with these owners will be set up for the week of April 14, 2014 if possible. Troy Hearn is familiar with several of the business / property owners and will provide KYTC / Parsons Brinckerhoff with the names of those persons that it would be prudent to meet with.

Status of Initial Traffic / Design Phase

An update was requested on the initial planning / design phase for this study at the focus area intersections. No additional insight was available on where the recommendations stood for this area other than it had been submitted to the State Highway Engineer. There was some discussion that additional review / modifications should be made to the right turn pocket from US 60 onto Brighton Park Boulevard. If possible, this should be made into a full right turn lane to accommodate this turning traffic. Impacts would occur with the adjacent White Castle restaurant entrance or it may be possible to shift the lane alignments and provide enough room to accommodate this lane. It was noted that the design was conceptual in nature and that additional more-detailed design work is required where issues such as this can be better defined.

Existing Conditions Review

Ms. Walker assisted Mr. Dikes by providing a review of the existing conditions and information that has been compiled to date for the study. This included a review of environmental constraints, traffic operations, and a crash analysis. The Early Learning Village was noted as a major traffic generator / issue with few buses running to the school (4 total) since most parents prefer to drive their children to and from school. Regarding the crash data, Mr. Hearn noted that he was aware of numerous reports of collisions with animals near the US 60 / US 421 interchange.

The status of the Environmental Justice report for the study area was requested and Chris Chaney with the BGADD noted that a draft report had just been submitted to KYTC for review.

Stakeholder / Elected Officials Meeting

There was some discussion related to the preparation of the meeting to be held that afternoon with the stakeholders and elected officials. It was unknown who from the list of attendees invited would actually be in attendance. It was agreed that the full packet of project information was acceptable to share with them including the archaeological overview. As the area is mostly already disturbed and there are no identified sites that may encourage illicit digging for artifacts, leaving this information in the packet is fine.

Conceptual Alternatives

Several conceptual alternatives were presented and discussed with the group. One possible corridor-wide treatment would be to consolidate driveways where feasible and / or allow right-in / right out traffic flow to reduce the number of access points throughout the corridor. A somewhat similar treatment was noted for a corridor in Jeffersontown, Kentucky in District 5. Mr. Hall mentioned that combining access management techniques with some streetscape improvements would be a good selling point for a corridor application. Regarding the permitting process, Mr. Richardson noted that as individual development plans are submitted for approval, KYTC typically manages access through the permitting process. It thereby becomes a slow and methodical process to consolidate and / or eliminate access.

There was also some discussion related to some backage roads / connections between businesses. An easy one would be between the Kroger shopping center and the adjacent lot with Goodwill. The connection could be made near the Goodwill drive-thru.

Multimodal components will also be considered as part of this study. Mr. Hearn noted that the City of Frankfort has a comprehensive bicycle / pedestrian plan which is available online. This will show where there are currently facilities and where there are additional planned facilities. Providing connections / linking these would be highly desirable. One particular area would be connecting to the existing multi-use path along US 421. The connection would be through a neighborhood to US 60. Mr. Hearn also indicated that he felt that a shared use path off the roadway was a preferred treatment, but that sidewalks were also needed.

Next Steps

The local officials / stakeholder meeting was to be held in the afternoon at 1:00 PM later the same day. Follow-up meetings will be scheduled with the following groups:

- Individual business owners – week of April 14, 2014 – per names provided by Mr. Hearn
- Project development team – week of May 12, 2014
- Local officials / stakeholders – week of May 19, 2014

Parsons Brinckerhoff will be completing draft conceptual alternatives in preparation for the meetings in May. A draft report of the study is due June 1, 2014.

The meeting was then adjourned at approximately 11:45 AM.

TO: Tom Hall, PE
Mikael Pelfrey, PE
Project Manager(s), KYTC

www.pbworld.com

FROM: Parsons Brinckerhoff

DATE: June 30, 2014

SUBJECT: US 60 Traffic Study
Item No. 5-275.00
Minutes of 2nd Project Development Team Meeting

The second meeting with the Project Development Team (PDT) for the US 60 Traffic Study was held at 1:00 PM (EST) on Tuesday, June 24, 2014, at KYTC Central Office in Frankfort, Kentucky. The following people were in attendance:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC – C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Eileen Vaughan	KYTC – C.O. Planning	eileen.vaughan@ky.gov
Deanna Mills	KYTC – C.O. Planning	deanna.mills@ky.gov
Jill Asher	KYTC – C.O. Design	jill.asher@ky.gov
Robert Brown	KYTC – C.O. Traffic	robertf.brown@ky.gov
Steve Ross	KYTC – C.O. Planning	steve.ross@ky.gov
Tom Hall	KYTC – D-5 Planning	tom.hall@ky.gov
Chris Allen	KYTC – D-5 Planning	chris.allen@ky.gov
Cody Davis	KYTC – D-5 Planning	-
Troy Hearn	KYTC Bike & Ped Coordinator	troy.hearn@ky.gov
Chris Chaney	BGADD	cchaney@bgadd.org
Shawn Dikes	Parsons Brinckerhoff	dikes@pbworld.com
Lindsay Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	walkerli@pbworld.com

Welcome and Introductions

Mikael Pelfrey began the meeting and welcomed those in attendance. Introductions were not necessary so the meeting was turned over to Shawn Dikes (Project Manager) and Lindsay Walker with Parsons Brinckerhoff.

Summary of 2nd Stakeholder / Local Officials Meeting Feedback

Mr. Dikes provided a summary of the Stakeholders / Local Officials meeting for the project held earlier that day. He detailed the fact there were six responses received from attendees and

there was a very slight disposition to endorse Alternative 3 (six lanes with median) over Alternative 1 (access considerations) and Alternative 2 (four lanes with median). The scoring, with a low number being better was as follows:

Alternative 1 – 14

Alternative 2 – 13

Alternative 3 – 11

There was some discussion about the design details related to a potential median. This included potential landscaping treatments / concrete / aesthetics / maintenance issues. Something with no or low maintenance is preferred. Also it is desired to include options to make the median mountable for fire / police / EMS vehicles. Grass pavers may be a potential solution. The desire is to make it mountable but discourage regular vehicular traffic from driving on the median.

For the Options presented, the general preference as determined from the Stakeholders / Local Officials was as follows:

Option 3 (Kroger Shopping Center connection) – High

Option 4 (Dollar Tree Shopping Center connection) – High

Option 8 (Realign Capitol Center Drive – High

Option 1 (Access Road Extension) – Medium

Option 2 (Eastwood Shopping Center connection) – Medium

Option 7 (Realign Hanly Lane) – Medium

Option 5 (KY Teachers Retirement entrance consolidation) – Low

Option 6 (Extend access from Country Lane) – Low

Bicycle and Pedestrian connections will be considered for all alternatives as noted by the draft plan sheets for the alternatives (which include sidewalks) and the considerations provided in the bicycle and pedestrian master plan documents through the City of Frankfort and Franklin County.

Another issue discussed with the PDT was what information (if any) was to be provided to David Cobb (Executive Assistant for Senator Julian M. Carroll). He had requested copies of all meeting materials from the Stakeholder / Local Officials meeting held earlier in the day. Of particular interest was the list of Alternatives and Options as well as the associated costs. It was explained to him that these were draft documents and costs and the final report would be available in two months. However, he was still requesting the current materials to provide information to his office. It was determined by the PDT that all costs were still subject to refinement and need the right-of-way and utilities costs added in prior to distribution to anyone outside the PDT.

Study Wrap Up Direction

Steve Ross remarked that at this point, all the Alternatives are still feasible despite the slight preference for Alternative 3 which can be noted. At this point, the public at large has not been involved. During the next stage of project development, public input may help with identifying the preferred long-term corridor treatment.

The decision was then made by the PDT that pending the development and inclusion of right-of-way and utility costs, the PDT should recommend that all the alternatives be advanced at this time with emphasis on Alternative 3 given initial comments.

Additional notes for Alternatives 2 and 3 should include pedestrian improvements such as refuge medians, countdown pedestrian signals, etc. to facilitate safe access.

The Options as detailed were felt to be fine. All should be included as potential projects and prioritized based on Stakeholder / Local Officials input. It may be worth noting that these projects might be the responsibility of the City of Frankfort or Franklin County to implement since they are on private property.

Mikael Pelfrey detailed that he had been receiving agency input / feedback from the agency coordination letter. He said that there were no comments which would impact the feasibility of the Alternatives and/or Options and that he was waiting on the cutoff date to arrive before compiling and making them all available.

Next Steps

Parsons Brinckerhoff will request the right-of-way and utility costs from KYTC District 5. Mikael Pelfrey will pass along the agency feedback to Parsons Brinckerhoff. Parsons Brinckerhoff will work on a full draft report incorporating all project aspects for review. The Geotechnical Overview needs to be completed by 7-12-14 so as to incorporate into the DRAFT report. A summary of next steps and due dates is as follows:

- Mikael Pelfrey to provide Parsons Brinckerhoff with agency comments / responses shortly after 6-27-14 deadline
- District 5 will provide right-of-way and utility costs – 7-11-14
- Parsons Brinckerhoff to receive Geotechnical Overview – 7-12-14
- Parsons Brinckerhoff to provide DRAFT report – 7-18-14

The meeting was then adjourned at approximately 1:50 PM.