



Architecture

Engineering

Construction

## MEETING MINUTES

**Project:** New I-64 Interchange with a Connector Road, Alternatives Planning Study  
**Item Number:** 05-8200  
**Purpose:** Project Team Meeting #2  
**Place:** Louisville, Kentucky, District 5 Main Conference Room  
**Meeting Date:** July 18, 2006  
**Prepared By:** William Crawford  
**In Attendance:**

John Callihan	KYTC, D5, Pre-Construction & Design
David Martin	KYTC, CO, Planning
Tala Quinio	KYTC, D5, Design (Project Manager)
Kevin Dant	KYTC, D5, Environmental
Bernie Roach	KYTC, D5, Construction
Charlie Bird	KYTC, D5
Rob Harris	KYTC, D5
Brian Meade	KYTC, D5, Traffic Operations
Andrea Clifford	KYTC, D5, PIO
Harold Tull	KIPDA
Mary Murray	FHWA
David Smith	Qk4, President
Albert Zimmerman	Qk4, Project Engineer
Tom Springer	Qk4, Transportation Planner
William Crawford	Qk4, Transportation Planner

Ms. Quinio, KYTC, D5, Project Manager, welcomed everyone to the meeting, and requested all attendees introduce themselves. She provided a brief project explanation, and then turned the meeting over to Mr. Smith, who facilitated the project team meeting.

**Project Overview.** The project is an alternatives planning study investigating the feasibility of constructing a new I-64 interchange between the Gene Snyder Freeway (I-265, Exit 19) and Simpsonville (KY 1848, Exit 28), with a north-south connector road between Taylorsville Road (KY 155/KY 148) and Shelbyville Road (US 60). The I-265 and KY 1848 interchanges are separated by about 9 miles, while US 60 and KY 155/KY 148 are about 3.2 miles apart in the study area. The existing regional roadways and interchanges are heavily congested, and provide very limited north-south and east-west travel opportunities. The study will examine improvement strategies and evaluate alternative corridors to address both current and future needs. A new interchange would provide improved interstate access, and the connector road would improve the local road network.

**Meeting Agenda.** Mr. Smith explained the purpose of the meeting, and reviewed the agenda items for discussion. The purpose of the meeting was to review the environmental footprint/overview results, the key person interview results, the preliminary project goals, and prepare for the first public information meeting. Large-scale exhibits of the study area were used, including: an aerial photograph with existing and planned developments; environmental overview (*i.e.*, historic sites and districts, surface waters, floodplains, wetlands,

## Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2006

Page 2

ponds, hazardous materials sites); and traffic, crash, and Levels of Service (LOS) data. Attendees were provided a handout containing the meeting agenda, key person interview list, a summary of interview comments, draft project goals, a draft public meeting comment form, and documents for the first resource agency coordination mailing (project fact sheet, preliminary project goals, and two 11x17 exhibits).

Status of Study. Mr. Crawford reviewed the status of the study. Completed elements include overview studies of: cultural resources (historic and archaeological), ecological assessment (terrestrial, aquatic, threatened and endangered species), traffic (volume, crash, and LOS data), and hazardous materials sites. The only public involvement task completed is the key person interviews. Two Eastwood planning documents were also consulted: *Eastwood Neighborhood Plan*, adopted November 2005, and *Eastwood Village Transportation Planning Study*, draft May 2006. We are now at the preliminary study goals development/review stage, and preparing for the first public information meeting.

Review Environmental Footprint. Mr. Crawford reviewed the study area's environmental footprint using the exhibit and briefly addressing known environmental features, including:

- 5 NRHP sites, but 2 had been torn down (circumstances unknown); 48 potential NR eligible sites consisting of 13 individual properties and 2 potential historic districts. Fisherville historic district consists of 1 NRHP property and 12 contributing properties. Eastwood historic district includes 23 contributing properties.
- 38 archaeological sites from previous surveys, most in the western portion, with no NRHP eligibility evaluations conducted. The overview noted the previous surveys may be geographically and chronologically biased, and more sites could be expected throughout the study area. Sites are most likely to be found in floodplains and terraces of major streams.
- 5 perennial streams, about 57 intermittent streams, and about 37 ephemeral streams. Numerous potential wetlands and small ponds (mostly for livestock and aesthetic uses) are present. Floodplains are associated with the larger streams.
- 13 listed endangered species, with no known occurrences in the area.
- 6 hazmat sites were listed in the database, most located in a light industry land use area in the southwest corner. Potentially could also encounter local dumping sites, PCB's in transformers, asbestos containing building materials, and agricultural chemicals (fertilizers, pesticides).

Review Traffic and Crash Information. Mr. Smith used the exhibit to review the study area's existing and projected traffic volumes, LOS's, and crash analysis. While crash analysis identified several high crash locations, only one is present within the study area boundaries (*i.e.*, vicinity of US 60 and Eastwood-Fisherville Road). Traffic volumes and congestion on roadways within the study area boundaries, as well as outside the study area and existing I-265 interchanges with KY 155, I-64, and US 60 were discussed. It was noted that a limited amount of traffic data is available for the roadways south of I-64. Previous traffic studies conducted in the area probably did not envision the possibility of the project extending to Taylorsville Road. Additional traffic data will be required. Qk4 is to prepare a letter requesting the additional traffic data needed based upon the scope of the current study. Discussions occurred concerning the *Eastwood Village Transportation Planning Study* and its assumption of a potential new interchange location and connector road alternatives. Existing and planned developments in and surrounding the study area were reviewed and discussed. Questions regarding projected demographic growth and potential impact on traffic were made. A commitment to invite representatives from Louisville Metro Public Works, and Planning and Design to the next project team meeting was made.

Review Key Person Interview Comments. Mr. Crawford reviewed the list of people identified for interviews, and a summary of interview comments. Eighteen people were selected for interviews, with 16

## Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2006

Page 3

completed. Some interviewees included their key staff members in the sessions. He briefly discussed key responses for the 11 talking points/questions. In general, there was consensus among interviewees that traffic congestion is already a serious problem, will only become worse in the future, and a new interchange is needed. Shelby County officials preferred an alternative corridor located inside the Jefferson County line. All expressed an interest in minimizing impacts to residential property, historic resources, natural resources, and preserving the existing rural atmosphere.

Review Draft Project Goals. Mr. Crawford presented the preliminary draft project goals developed from comments and concerns expressed during the previous project team meeting, and key person interviews. The 8 draft goals were generally accepted as stated, with some “wordsmithing” recommendations, and a request to make the second bullet more specific.

Public Information Meeting Requirements. Mr. Springer led the discussion concerning preparing for the first public information meeting. Two meetings are planned, with the first focusing on informing the public of the project and receiving their input. (The second would present alternative solutions for public comment.) The first public meeting should be used to inform the public of the project, educate them on the constraints, and obtain input on their desires for the road network. The large graphic exhibits presented at this meeting were cited as examples to show the public. D5 noted the public generally does not understand “blank map” presentations, and they prefer to see “lines on a map” (even if no alternatives have been identified).

Various alternatives concerning meeting format and time were discussed. It was decided to conduct the meeting from 6:00-8:00 pm, with an expectation people will begin arriving 30-minutes early. The meeting would begin with a single formal presentation at 6:15 pm, no question/answer session, and immediately followed by an open house type format with work groups. The formal presentation would consist of KYTC starting the meeting and welcoming everyone, then turning it over to Qk4 for the formal program. Several locations for the meeting were suggested, with the preferred site being Highview Baptist Church near Beckley Station Road. Other suggestions included Eastwood Christian Church, Eastwood Fire Station (limited parking and meeting space), Christian Academy, and Eastern High School (outside the study area). D5 will drive the area for other potential meeting sites and coordinate for the site itself. Dates for the public meeting were discussed, with a preferred date sometime after public school classes resume. The meetings would be held on Tuesday and Thursday, with the earliest date being late August or early September. D5 will investigate/coordinate meeting dates, accounting for facility availability and advertising lead-times. Qk4 will provide D5 a black and white PDF study area map for the public meeting newspaper ads.

A draft public comment form was presented for review and comment. Initial comments recommended changing the format so the citizen has something to take home with them, and a separate page to submit comments on. The public comment handout will consist of two pages: (1) a double-sided page to keep, with an aerial exhibit of the study area on one side, and an explanation of the project and draft goals on the other side; and (2) a double-sided questionnaire comment form for submission. Other recommended changes included using the Unbridled Spirit logo, KYTC D5’s physical address, and including their fax number. Team members were asked to review the draft public comment form and provide any additional comments/suggestions in the next few days.

Resource Agency Coordination/Involvement. Mr. Crawford presented the enclosures proposed for sending with the first of two resource agency coordination mailings. The enclosures consist of a one-page fact sheet briefly explaining the purpose of the study, existing conditions, and a list of project goals; one 11x17 inch environmental footprint exhibit, and one 11x17 inch aerial exhibit. The fact sheet project goals will include the updates/changes discussed above. Central Office had already provided a mailing list database for resource agency coordination letters. Central Office and D5 will coordinate to edit the mailing list and mail the letters. Qk4 will develop and provide the exhibits to attach to the letters.

## **Meeting Minutes**

July 18, 2006

Page 4

Follow-up and Next Steps. Mr. Springer concluded the meeting by discussing the next sequence of events in the study. The next step is to hold the first public information meetings. Based upon the public comments, and any resource agency comments received, Qk4 will develop preliminary alternatives for review by project team members. KIPDA is to provide the environmental justice study. Project team meeting #3 will be scheduled to review the alternatives and recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

**END OF MINUTES**



Architecture

Engineering

Construction

# MEETING MINUTES

**Project:** New I-64 Interchange with a Connector Road, Alternatives Planning Study  
**Item Number** 05-8200  
**Purpose:** Project Team Meeting #3  
**Place:** Louisville, Kentucky, District 5 Main Conference Room  
**Meeting Date:** March 26, 2007 1:30 pm EST  
**Prepared By:** William Crawford  
**In Attendance:**

Tala Quinio	KYTC, D5, Design (Project Manager)
John Callihan	KYTC, D5, Pre-Construction & Design
David Martin	KYTC, CO, Planning
Scott Thomson	KYTC, CO, Planning
Ananias Calvin III	KYTC, CO, Design
Kevin Dant	KYTC, D5, Environmental
Mary Ann Bond	KYTC, D5, Planning
Glenda Luster	KYTC, D5, Right of Way
Jennifer Hall	KYTC, D5, Utilities
Brian Meade	KYTC, D5, Traffic Operations
Andrea Clifford	KYTC, D5, PIO
Jeff Schaefer	KYTC, D4
Harold Tull	KIPDA
Mary Murray	FHWA
Bill Hanson	FHWA
David Smith	Qk4, President
Tom Springer	Qk4, Transportation Planner
William Crawford	Qk4, Transportation Planner

Ms. Quinio, KYTC, D5, Project Manager, welcomed everyone to the meeting, explained the purpose of the proposed project, and the purpose of today's meeting. She requested all attendees introduce themselves. She then turned the meeting over to Mr. Springer, who facilitated the project team meeting.

The proposed project is an alternatives planning study investigating the feasibility of constructing a new I-64 interchange between the Gene Snyder Freeway (I-265, Exit 19) and Simpsonville (KY 1848, Exit 28), with a north-south connector road between Taylorsville Road (KY 155/KY 148) and Shelbyville Road (US 60). The I-265 and KY 1848 interchanges are separated by about 9 miles, while US 60 and KY 155/KY 148 are about 3.2 miles apart in the study area. The existing regional roadways and interchanges are heavily congested, and provide very limited north-south and east-west travel opportunities. The study examines improvement strategies and evaluates alternative corridors to address both current and future needs. A new interchange would provide improved interstate access, and the connector road would improve the local road network.

Project Status. Mr. Springer briefly reviewed the meeting's agenda items and the main purpose for the meeting, which was to review the latest traffic information and forecasts, and select screening criteria for the

## Meeting Minutes

March 26, 2007

Page 2

numerous alternatives. He briefly reviewed the last project team meeting and events that occurred since that meeting. The meeting was conducted using handouts and a power-point presentation. Attendees were provided a folder containing the meeting agenda, public meeting comment form summary, resource agency response summary, traffic forecast projects for various connector road corridors, typical section design standard, an aerial photo with preliminary alternative corridors, and a survey form for ranking corridor location determinates. A large scale area photo was also available.

Public Involvement. Mr. Crawford used a handout summarizing the first public informational meeting held August 29, 2006, with 69 people signing-in and 20 written comments received. Generally, the public supported the project by a ratio of about 3-4 to 1 (favor vs. oppose), almost unanimously identifying traffic congestion on area roadways and intersections as a serious problem. Sometimes even those opposed acknowledged the heavy traffic congestion and inadequate roadways. Other concerns expressed involved narrow roads, safety, and emergency response times, especially if the area continues to grow and congestion increases. Those opposed frequently cited concerns of continued/increased development in the area, particularly around intersections/interchanges; and potential impacts to environmental resources and existing communities, frequently citing examples well outside the project study area. Areas commonly mentioned to avoid included waterways (especially Floyds Ford) and existing/planned park areas. Suggested new connector road tie-in points to US 60/Shelbyville Road covered almost its full length in the study area. While in the south, the KY 155/KY 148 intersection was the most frequently suggested connection point. Mr. Crawford summarized and reviewed representative written comments from all comments submitted.

Resource Agency Coordination. Mr. Crawford used a handout to review resource agency responses from the first mailing. Requests for comments were mailed to about 80 agencies, and 21 agencies responded. No objections or areas of significant concern to the proposed project were expressed. Several agencies were highly supportive of the project, citing benefits of reduced congestion, improved safety, and community benefits. State Senator Julie Denton and State Representative Ron Crimm both expressed concerns about the increasing traffic congestion, and wanted the project expedited.

Study Area and Alternative Corridors Overview. Mr. Springer briefly reviewed the project study area, its boundaries, roadways, environmental features, and other significant elements. Existing residential and community developments were reviewed, and other planned residential developments. The planned Floyds Fork Greenway development — located immediately west of the study area and a key component of the planned Louisville Metro Greenway Trail — was discussed, and land/property already reserved for the park's future use was reviewed. The planned park development is further encouraging private development in this already rapidly growing area.

Mr. Springer presented the preliminary alternatives developed for consideration by the project team. The alternatives developed represent all alternatives considered practical for the study area. Additionally, the project study area was expanded to the south — for traffic forecasting only — to consider an alternative connecting to KY 155/Taylorsville Lake Road. Because the various alternatives frequently intersect, numerous opportunities exist for combining portions of two or more alternatives into a new alternative. Therefore, to facilitate management and evaluation of all the possible combinations, each alternative was divided into numbered segments between intersection points.

Review Traffic Data and Forecasts. Mr. Springer briefly reviewed the study area's forecasted 2030 no-build and build traffic volumes. Since it was impractical to attempt traffic forecasts for each possible alternative, the study area was divided into logical areas containing "conceptual" alternative corridors for traffic forecast modeling. The conceptual alternatives are modeled to draw traffic from a particular area, simulating other potential alternatives in that particular portion of the study area. The conceptual alternative corridors also have intersection points (nodes), creating segments, which can be combined in varying arrangements. The

conceptual alternative corridors are believed to accurately represent future traffic patterns within their portion of the study area.

The “conceptual” corridors are located north and south of I-64, and oriented from west to east in the study area. Corridors in the western portion of the study area are identified with a “W,” those in the central portion with a “C,” and those in the east with an “E.” Corridor segments north of I-64 are identified with the letter “a”; and those south of I-64 with “b,” “c,” or “d” as the segments progress south from an intersection node. Using this labeling nomenclature, Mr. Springer reviewed the forecasted traffic volumes for the various conceptual alternative corridors throughout the study area.

Mr. Thomson developed the traffic model for the project study area, and performed the detailed traffic modeling forecasts and analysis. Using a series of detailed tables, he reviewed the anticipated traffic volume effects (increases and decreases) on area roadways with implantation of a particular conceptual alternative. He noted that, in general, a growth rate of 3-4% annually is considered normal. However, the Gene Snyder Expressway is experiencing a 5% annual growth rate, the Eastwood area a 7% growth rate, and a 7% growth rate in traffic from Spencer County onto KY 155. The traffic-forecasting model attempts to trend demand over time, and does not incorporate any road capacity changes or other road improvements. He also noted that data indicates a lot of growth (commercial and residential) is occurring outside the project study area boundaries, especially between the Gene Snyder Expressway and the study area. Future roadway improvements cannot be anticipated, but traffic from the developing area will need to flow either north or south to access existing major roadways. Growth curves traditionally demonstrate exponential growth over time. However, the model reveals US 60 has a growth trend which is a fairly flat curve. The Gene Snyder Expressway and KY 155 had an unusual “decreasing curve,” which is an indication of excessive congestion and drivers seeking out other routes of travel to avoid the congestion.

Typical Section. Mr. Springer provided as an example a copy of a typical section from the current Land Development Code. The typical section consisted of a four-lane divided roadway, with a median, a bike lane, and sidewalks for pedestrians. Because a new connector road would probably be expected to integrate smoothly and aesthetically with the Floyds Fork Greenway initiative, the ultimate typical section could have a park-like, boulevard, or parkway type appearance.

Mr. Springer briefly discussed the *Eastwood Village Transportation Planning Study*, May 2006, and its assumption/recommendation of a potential new interchange location and connector road alternatives. He used a page from the study showing recommended alternatives in the Eastwood area. No traffic study or traffic volumes were considered in the study. The preliminary alternatives developed for the new I-64 interchange and connector road include similar alignments as those in the Eastwood study.

Range of Alternatives. Mr. Springer discussed the broad range of preliminary alternatives developed, which included those alternatives suggested at the public information meeting. As explained previously, the large number of alternatives developed, and their potential combinations, became impractical to manage as complete alternatives. It was decided instead to evaluate alternative segments rather than complete alternatives. Each segment could potentially be used in more than one complete alternative, and evaluating them individually as “not recommended” or “recommended to carry forward” could facilitate the alternative screening process. During the discussion, a new segment (#28) was identified for consideration, and intended to minimize potential residential and waterway impacts.

Screening Determinants and Criteria. To help in the evaluation process, Mr. Springer asked each project team member to complete a survey sheet, ranking each of 13 items in terms of importance for locating a new interchange and connector road. The results of the survey are attached.

## **Meeting Minutes**

March 26, 2007

Page 4

Follow-up and Next Steps. Mr. Springer concluded the meeting by discussing the next sequence of events in the study.

Qk4 will tally the screening determinants and conduct a review of the preliminary alternatives developed, identifying those recommended to be carried forward for review by the entire project team. Qk4 will meet with D5 representatives (target is within two weeks) to discuss and agree upon the alternatives/segments recommended to be carried forward and presented to the entire project team.

Qk4 will forward the results of the alternatives pre-screening with D5 to the other project team members.

Schedule another project team meeting to identify the alternatives/segments to be carried forward and presented to the public for comment.

Schedule the second public information meeting after the full project team identifies the alternatives/segments to be carried forward. It was recommended an exhibit showing all alternatives/segments considered by the project team be shown at the public information meeting to indicate the thoroughness of the alternatives study.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.

**END OF MINUTES**

attachment: Location Determinate Ranking Results



### Results Summary of Location Determinate Survey

Location Determinate Question		Average Score*	Rank
1	Connectivity / Linkages to Existing Arterials and Collectors	4.80	1
2	Connectivity to Town Centers	2.67	12
3	Compatibility with Major Parks Initiative	4.07	5
4	Compatibility with Existing and Planned Subdivisions	3.93	6
5	Attracts High Volumes of Forecasted Traffic	4.13	3
6	Minimizes Costs of Construction	2.90	11
7	Allows for Future East-West Connectivity	2.97	10
8	Relieves Demand on Existing Rural Roads	3.87	7
9	Minimizes Further Demands on Existing Rural Roads	3.87	7
10	Minimizes Right-of-Way Impacts on Existing Residences	4.33	2
11	Minimizes Crossings of Existing Streams and Natural Areas	4.10	4
12	Minimizes Effects to Historic Resources	3.53	9
13	In Concert with Community/Public Input	3.80	8

### Individual Responses to Location Determinate Survey

Response Sheet	Location Determinate Question Scores*													Comments
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		
1	5	3	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	
2	5	3	4	5	3	1	4	2	3	5	2	4	5	
3	5	4	4	4	4	3	5	3	3	5	5	3	4	
4	5	2	4	3	4	3	2	4	4	3	3	3	3	
5	5	3	4	3	3	4	1	4	4	5	4	3	3	#1-No Old Henry! Improve existing or new road. #4-With number of homes for sale, will these become reality
6	5	3	4	5	3	2	2	5	4	5	5	2	4	#1-Do not follow example of Old Henry interchange. #4-Have developers contribute/donate ROW.
7	4	3	4	4	5	4	2	5	5	5	4	3	4	
8	5	2	5	4	3	3	3	4	4	5	5	5	4	
9	5	3	4	4	5	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	3	
10	5	3	4	4	5	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	
11	4	1	4	3	3	4	2	4	4	4	4	3	4	#2-Eastwood connection undesirable. #3-Avoid Floyds Fork. #5-Account for future growth in Shelby Co. Avoid future interchange. #11-Avoid Floyds Fork.
12	5	3	4	4	5	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	
13	4	2	4	3	5	3.5	3.5	4	4	3	3.5	3	2	
14	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	
15	5	2	4	4	5	2	3	4	4	5	4	3	4	#4-Avoid existing only.
Sum	72	40	61	59	62	43.5	44.5	58	58	65	61.5	53	57	
Ave Score	4.80	2.67	4.07	3.93	4.13	2.90	2.97	3.87	3.87	4.33	4.10	3.53	3.80	
Ranking	1	12	5	6	3	11	10	7	7	2	4	9	8	

\*Scored according to importance, with 1 = not too important, and 5 = very important.



# MEETING MINUTES

**Project:** New I-64 Interchange with a Connector Road, Alternatives Planning Study  
**Item Number** 05-8200  
**Purpose:** Project Team Meeting #4  
**Place:** Louisville, Kentucky, District 5 Main Conference Room  
**Meeting Date:** May 21, 2007 09:30 am EST  
**Prepared By:** William Crawford  
**In Attendance:** Tala Quinio KYTC, D5, Design (Project Manager)  
 John Callihan KYTC, D5, Pre-Construction & Design  
 David Martin KYTC, CO, Planning  
 Jeff Schaefer KYTC, D5, Environmental  
 Mary Ann Bond KYTC, D5, Planning  
 Chris Poe KYTC, D5, Construction  
 Brian Meade KYTC, D5, Traffic Operations  
 Andrea Clifford KYTC, D5, PIO  
 Harold Tull KIPDA  
 Tom Springer Qk4, Transportation Planner  
 William Crawford Qk4, Transportation Planner

Ms. Quinio, KYTC, D5, Project Manager, welcomed everyone to the meeting, explained the purpose of the proposed project, and requested all attendees introduce themselves. She then turned the meeting over to Mr. Springer, who facilitated the project team meeting.

The proposed project is an alternatives planning study investigating the feasibility of constructing a new I-64 interchange between the Gene Snyder Freeway (I-265, Exit 19) and Simpsonville (KY 1848, Exit 28), with a north-south connector road between Taylorsville Road (KY 155/KY 148) and Shelbyville Road (US 60). The I-265 and KY 1848 interchanges are about 9 miles apart, while US 60 and KY 155/KY 148 are about 3.2 miles apart in the study area. The regional roadways and interchanges are heavily congested, and provide very limited north-south and east-west travel opportunities. The study examines improvement strategies and evaluates alternative corridors to address both current and future transportation needs.

Project Status and Area. Mr. Springer identified the main purpose for the meeting, which was to discuss the alternative corridors already developed and agree upon the alternative corridors to carry forward for further consideration, and those not recommended for further consideration. He very briefly reviewed the project status and project area. The alternatives developed represent all alternatives considered practical for the study area. A review of the traffic forecasts resulted in expanding the project study area to the south and creating an alternative segment connecting to KY 155/Taylorsville Lake Road. Because the large number of alternatives frequently intersect, numerous opportunities exist for combining portions of two or more alternatives into a new alternative. Therefore, to manage and evaluate the possible combinations, each alternative was divided into numbered segments between intersecting points. He noted that D5 and Qk4 representatives had met earlier to “pre-screen” the alternative corridors/segments to identify those recommended to carry forward, and those not recommended.

Ranking Results from Last Project Team Meeting. Mr. Springer reviewed the voting results from the last project team meeting involving thirteen screening determinants and criteria. These rankings were considered in prescreening the alternative corridors to carry forward. The top three considerations were: connectivity/linkages to existing arterials and collectors; minimize right-of-way impacts to existing residences; and attracts high volume of forecasted traffic.

Review Alternative Corridors. Mr. Springer led the discussion concerning which alternative corridors/segments to carry forward for further discussion, and those not recommended. A large-scale aerial photograph exhibit depicting the various alternative corridors and environmental footprint was used. Also provided was a handout of two tables identifying those alternative segments not recommended for further consideration and the reasons why; and those segments recommended to carry forward with the expected advantages and disadvantages of each. Generally, all alternatives in the east were not recommended because they attracted low traffic volumes, compared to the more western alternatives. Each remaining segment was addressed individually. The project team decided to add segment 26 to the not recommended list because of the large number of potential adverse impacts. Segment 26 was considered because it was a recommendation in the *Eastwood Village Transportation Planning Study*, May 2006. Segment 12 was discussed at some length, with the project team deciding to add it to the not recommended list. Segment 12 attracted less traffic volume than the other segments under consideration; caused the Eastwood-Fisherville Road to attract a notably large traffic volume of drivers taking a “short-cut” to access the new I-64 interchange; potentially had more environmental and engineering constraints associated with it; and created the longest alternative. Segment 13 was added to the not recommended list because it only connects to segment 12. The project team made no other changes to the recommended and not recommended list.

D5 raised the question whether the focus of this alternatives study should be to recommend a series/group of alternative corridors, or recommend one preferred alternative corridor? The choice could have future implications in terms of the NEPA process and developing a preferred alternative; and also for accommodating the public’s expectations and perceptions in the public involvement process. The project team decided to defer this question until after the next public information meeting and public comments were received on the alternative corridors recommended to carry forward.

Typical Section. Mr. Springer provided an example typical section graphic developed from the current Louisville Metro Land Development Code. The typical section consisted of a four-lane divided roadway, with a median, bike lanes, sidewalks for pedestrians, and a multi-use path. Because a new connector road is expected to integrate aesthetically with the Floyds Fork Greenway initiative, the typical section was envisioned to have a park-like, or parkway type appearance with vegetation. It was noted the typical section presented had a wide footprint, depicting large vegetated areas and specific boundaries for varying uses. Several changes were requested, including removing the depicted vegetation, removing/adjusting some boundary designations, use ranges instead of exact widths, and modifying the graphic title. Mr. Callihan provided a mark-up copy with specific changes.

Operational Analysis Approach. A general discussion of Interchange Justification Study (IJS) requirements occurred. Recent coordination of D5 and Qk4 with FHWA indicated the spacing between the existing interchanges (*i.e.*, I-265 and KY 1848) is sufficient that any new interchange considered in the study area should be treated as one location for analysis purposes. The operational analysis for the interchange would use the “worse case traffic scenario” (*i.e.*, the highest traffic volume) based upon the traffic projections provided by the KYTC Division of Planning. It was noted that the public information meeting presentation should include addressing the IJS portion of this alternatives study, and that any of the alternative corridors under consideration appear feasible according to IJS requirements.

## Meeting Minutes

May 21, 2007

Page 3

Public Involvement. Mr. Springer briefly reviewed the draft power point presentation for the public information meeting to solicit project team comments. Scheduling and requirements for the next public information meeting was discussed. Target date for the next public information meeting is June 26, 2007, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m., at Highview Baptist Church. The meeting will include 2 brief presentations at 6:15 and 7:15. It was decided to use one aerial map exhibit format, which shows all alternative corridors considered — those recommended and not recommended for further consideration. However, the exhibit should be revised to more clearly differentiate the recommended and not recommended corridors from each other. It was also recommended to “turn-off” all color-coding on the handout exhibit except for the alternative corridors to make it visually less busy for the public. The draft public information meeting handout — consisting of a fact sheet, study area and alternative corridors exhibit, and a comment form — was reviewed by the project team and found acceptable, except for one addition. It was recommended to add the reasons why some alternative corridors were not recommended for further consideration to the second paragraph of the fact sheet. Qk4 is to prepare a handout sheet for staff members use listing the segments recommended and not recommended for further consideration and the reasons for that recommendation.

Follow-up and Next Steps. The meeting concluded by discussing the next sequence of events in the study.

D5 will schedule the next public information meeting and inform the project team.

D5 will mail a copy of the public information meeting notice to the appropriate elected officials and key persons interviewed.

Qk4 will prepare and revise as necessary the exhibits and handouts for the next public information meeting, and meet with D5 to review the exhibits and handouts before the public information meeting.

The project team will meet again following the public information meeting. Reviewing the public comments will assist in determining subsequent alternative corridor evaluations and selection of a preferred or recommended alternative corridor or corridors.

The final resource agency coordination mailing will occur after the next project team meeting and a decision on which alternative corridor(s) to recommend.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

## END OF MINUTES

attachment: revised alternative segments recommendation list

## **New I-64 Interchange with a Connector Road**

### **Segments Not Recommended for Further Consideration**

Corridor Segment	Reason Not Recommended for Further Consideration
11	Segment connects to Segment 17, which was not recommended, and has increased residential impacts.
12	Traffic modeling analysis indicates segment 12 would attract less traffic than the other, more western alternatives considered (but more than the eastern alternatives). Segment 12 would attract a significant traffic volume from US 60, through Eastwood (an undesirable result), to KY 1531 (Eastwood-Fisherville Rd), connecting with segment 12 and proceeding to the I-64 interchange. Segments 12 and 13 generate increased environmental concerns with more stream crossings; engineering issues associated with a stream crossing and railroad track crossing south of US 60; potentially more residential and ROW impacts; and is the longest route considered.
13	
15	Segment creates an interchange on I-64 at the Long Run crossing. It generates increased environmental concerns and engineering issues associated with co-locating the interchange and ramps at a stream crossing. Segment 16 connects to segment 17, which was not recommended.
16	
17	Segment 17 provides a connection to US 60 with increased residential impacts through existing subdivision(s).
18	Traffic analysis modeling indicated that any combination of segments in the study area's eastern portion would not attract a significant volume of traffic, as compared to the more western segments. Consequently, little to no congestion relief would be provided to existing interchanges and roadways; nor would these segments provide adequate service to the existing and planned developments in the study area. Some segments had the potential for increased residential impacts to existing and planned subdivisions when compared to the more western segments. Additionally, none of the eastern segments offer the potential for a convenient east-west connection to the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	Segment is similar to proposal in the Eastwood Transportation Planning Study recommendation. Segment 26 impacts the potential Eastwood Historic District and historic properties; introduces a large volume of traffic into the Eastwood Village Form District; effectively bisects the Eastwood community/town/village center; is potentially in conflict with the Eastwood Neighborhood Plan goals and objectives for a village concept development; and contradicts a village center definition.
29	Segment creates an interchange on I-64 at the Long Run crossing. It generates increased environmental concerns and engineering issues associated with co-locating the interchange and ramps at a stream crossing.

### **Segments Recommended to Carry Forward**

Corridor Segment	Expected Advantages	Expected Disadvantages
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Located at the existing KY 155/KY 148 intersection.</li> <li>• Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>• Provides traffic volume relief to other existing interchanges and roadways.</li> <li>• Minimizes residential impacts.</li> <li>• Minimizes potential historic district/properties impacts and issues.</li> <li>• Compatible with, and conveniently located near, the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.</li> <li>• Provides improved access for the industrial properties located to the east.</li> <li>• KY 155 (Taylorsville Lake Rd) is already improved and carries a significant traffic volume.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Railroad track is located immediately north of the KY 155/KY 148 intersection on an elevated berm/bank. The required crossing would create additional engineering considerations.</li> <li>• Positions connector road in close proximity to the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.</li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>• Located near the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system, potentially providing convenient future access.</li> <li>• Minimizes residential impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crosses Floyds Forks and the floodplain.</li> <li>• Positions connector road in close proximity to the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>• Located slightly further from the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system, but near enough to potentially provide convenient future access.</li> <li>• No residential impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crosses Floyds Forks and the floodplain.</li> <li>• Positions connector road in close proximity to the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.</li> </ul>

Segment	Expected Advantages	Expected Disadvantages
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>Provides traffic volume relief to other existing interchanges and roadways.</li> <li>Provides convenient connection to US 60 west of Eastwood, similar to US 60 connection proposed in the Eastwood Village Transportation Plan.</li> <li>Minimizes residential and commercial impacts.</li> <li>Interchange and connector road located near the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system, potentially providing convenient future access at numerous locations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positions connector road and interchange in close proximity to the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.</li> <li>Non-preferred US 60 connection location stated in the Eastwood Neighborhood Plan.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>Located near the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system, potentially providing convenient future access at numerous locations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potentially more residential impacts than segment 4.</li> <li>Positions connector road and interchange in close proximity to the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connects segments 5 &amp; 8 to segment 7.</li> </ul>	
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides convenient connection to US 60 west of Eastwood.</li> <li>Provides traffic volume relief to other existing interchanges and roadways.</li> <li>Avoids potential Eastwood Historic District and properties.</li> <li>Minimizes residential and commercial impacts.</li> <li>Similar to US 60 connection west of Eastwood proposed in the Eastwood Village Transportation Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positions connector road and interchange in close proximity to the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system.</li> <li>Non-preferred US 60 connection location stated in the Eastwood Neighborhood Plan.</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>Located slightly further from the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system, but near enough to potentially provide convenient future access.</li> <li>No/minimal residential impacts.</li> </ul>	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>Located slightly further from the planned Floyds Fork Greenway Park system, but near enough to potentially provide convenient future access.</li> <li>No/minimal residential impacts.</li> <li>Provides option of connecting to US 60 either east or west of Eastwood.</li> </ul>	
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>Provides traffic volume relief to other existing interchanges and roadways.</li> <li>Avoids potential Eastwood Historic District and properties.</li> <li>Preferred US 60 connection location stated in the Eastwood Neighborhood Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential increased residential impacts.</li> <li>Requires railroad track crossing south of US 60.</li> </ul>
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connects segment 9 to segment 7.</li> <li>Avoids potential Eastwood Historic District and properties.</li> </ul>	
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>Provides traffic volume relief to other existing interchanges and roadways.</li> <li>Provides a centrally located connector road to serve the area's existing and planned development.</li> <li>Avoids crossing Floyds Fork and the Greenway Park system.</li> <li>Avoids potential Fisherville Historic District and properties.</li> <li>Avoids residential impacts to Fisherville Woods subdivision.</li> <li>Close coordination and cooperation with planned subdivision developer could preserve a connector road corridor, minimizing any potential residential impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involves topographic constraints south of KY 148.</li> <li>Requires crossing KY 148, Brush Run, and the railroad track, all located near each other.</li> <li>Crosses Brush Run.</li> <li>Potential historic property impacts.</li> <li>Potential large number of residential impacts to a planned subdivision development.</li> <li>Requires close coordination and cooperation with the planned subdivision developer.</li> </ul>
28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modeling analysis indicates it would attract a significant amount of traffic.</li> <li>Provides a centrally located connector road to serve the area's existing and planned development.</li> <li>Minimizes potential residential impacts compared to the 27-13-12 segment combination.</li> <li>Fewer stream crossings than the 27-13-12 segment combination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crosses Long Run.</li> </ul>







Architecture

Engineering

Construction

## MEETING NOTES

**Project:** I-64 Interchange in Eastern Jefferson County, Corridor Study

**Item Numbers:** 5-8200.00

**Purpose:** Stakeholder Meeting with Metro Parks, Planning and Design, Public Works, and Development Authority to discuss both projects and their association with public parks

**Place:** Metro Parks  
1294 Trevillian Way  
Louisville, Kentucky 40209

**Meeting Date:** October 18, 2006

**Prepared By:** Tom Springer

**In Attendance:**

Lisa Hite	Metro Parks
Bruce Traughber	Metro Development Authority
Charles Cash	Metro Planning and Design
Mohammad Nouri	Metro Planning and Design
Rick Storm	Metro Public Works
John Callihan	KYTC, District-5
Tala Quino	KYTC, District-5
Paul Davis	KYTC, District-5
Kevin Dant	KYTC, District-5
Andrea Clifford	KYTC, District-5
David Smith	Qk4, Inc.
Bill Crawford	Qk4, Inc.
Tom Springer	Qk4, Inc.

The meeting included an open discussion of the issues surrounding both interchange planning studies, as follows:

A new I-64 Interchange in eastern Jefferson County has been in the local transportation plans for more than 35 years. The only aspect being advanced at this time is a corridor planning study. The planning study will analyze the needs and issues, and possible locations for a connector road from I-64 north to US 60 and south to KY 155/KY 148. Only funds for Planning and Design are in the current KYTC Six-year Highway Plan. The KYTC is managing the project since it will require Federal Highway Administration involvement in the form of an Interchange Justification Study (IJS) and NEPA environmental document. At present, the Project Team is collecting information regarding opportunities, constraints, and public concerns.

## **Meeting Notes**

Metro Parks Meeting

October 18, 2006

Page 2

In the study area's south, preliminary traffic data indicates that the greatest traffic need would be for the new connector to extend north from the existing KY 155/KY 148 (Taylorsville Lake Road) intersection. This location would require a crossing of Floyds Fork, and the proposed Floyds Fork Park system at some point north of the road and the railroad.

Metro Parks noted that in addition to acquiring land, they are currently studying various alternative concepts for extending the linear park system across the roadway (KY 155 / KY 148) and the railroad. It was agreed that a mutually-planned corridor could benefit both projects—park connectivity and the needs of the traveling public. Specifically, joint planning could allow the roadway to include multi-use facilities within the corridor to offer transportation options and improved access within and to the proposed park system.

The proposed typical section of the roadway was discussed. It was noted that some sort of access management would likely be in place, but not an interstate-type facility, nor a road with access controlled by permit only. Metro Parks expressed a desire for a Parkway type facility to enhance the park concept and feel.

It was agreed that as both KYTC and Metro Parks continue to advance with their respective plans, they will coordinate with each other and Qk4.

**End of Meeting Notes**



Architecture

Engineering

Construction

## MEETING MINUTES

**Project:** New I-64 Interchange with a Connector Road, Alternatives Planning Study  
**Item Number** 05-8200  
**Purpose:** Project Team Meeting #5  
**Place:** Louisville, Kentucky, District 5 Main Conference Room  
**Meeting Date:** October 1, 2007 10:00 am EST  
**Prepared By:** Tom Springer

Tala Quinio	KYTC, D5, Design
John Callihan	KYTC, D5, Pre-Construction & Design
Chris Poe	KYTC, D5, Construction
Brian Meade	KYTC, D5, Traffic Operations
David Martin	KYTC, CO, Planning
Jim Wilson	KYTC, CO, Planning
Bob Farley	KYTC, CO, Design
Bill Hanson	FHWA-KY
Harold Tull	KIPDA
David Smith	Qk4
Jeremy Lukat	Qk4
Helen White	Qk4
Tom Springer	Qk4

Ms. Quinio, KYTC, D5, Project Manager, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Following introduction she then turned the meeting over to Mr. Springer, who facilitated the project team meeting.

Public Comments. One of the objectives of the meeting was to review the public comments from the June 26, 2007 public information meeting. Each of the comments had been reviewed and taken into consideration. In summary, most of the comments were in support of the overall project, but differed in preference to the location options. At the public meeting, two sets of alignments were presented: alignments not recommended to be carried forward, and those that are. The public generally commented on the alignments that are recommended to be carried forward (i.e., those that link Eastwood and Fisherville). Of those comments, more like the eastern segments (27, 28, 10, etc) than the western segments (1, 2, 4, etc.). Few comments addressed the alignment options that were near the Shelby County line. Several comments noted other roadway improvements that needed to be made regardless of the alternative selected, including improvement to Eastwood-Fisherville Road, US 60 and KY 155.

Traffic Forecast. The results from the traffic model was reviewed. The traffic model addressed three corridors: a western corridor, a southwest to northeast corridor, and an eastern corridor. The model shows that significantly more traffic would use the western corridors than either the central corridor or the eastern corridor. It was noted that should the western corridor be selected, or the No Build, that the traffic volumes warrant other capacity improvements to the roadway network and that such improvement be included in the Planning Study. For example, the western corridor may necessitate the widening of I-64

## Meeting Minutes

October 1, 2007

Page 2

from six lanes to eight. KY 155 will need to be widened regardless of which alternative is selected, including the No Build. It was also noted that one map that compares the traffic forecasts for each of the corridors be prepared and included in the study.

Operational Analysis. It was stated to the Project Team that the alternative that would attract the most traffic was analyzed for the operational analysis to address a “worst case” scenario. This alternative corridor is the western options, which link Eastwood to Fisherville and is the corridor recommended to be carried forward. The operational analysis to date has included the merge and diverge analysis, including the vehicle density and LOS for the peak hours. The analysis showed that the interchanges to the east and west of the proposed new interchange would not experience an adverse effect if a new interchange was constructed. It was requested that Qk4 do the same analysis for the I-265/US 60 interchange to build the purpose and need for this project.

Cost Estimates. Preliminary cost estimates of the alignments were presented. After initial review, it was agreed that they needed to be revised to include higher cost for the interchange and consider the bridges. Qk4 will also prepare right-of-way and utility cost estimates.

Follow-up and Next Steps. A meeting will be held with Senator Denton and Representative Crimm the following week to discuss the status of the project. (Note: at that meeting, it was requested that a meeting be held with the Eastwood Council to present our preliminary recommendations. This meeting will most likely not occur until November 2007.)

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:30 a.m.

END OF MINUTES