

SUMMARY OF COMMENT FORMS

Public Information Meeting

New I-64 Interchange with a Connector Road

Jefferson and Shelby Counties
KYTC Item No. 5-8200

August 29, 2006
Highview Baptist Church (East Campus)

This first public information meeting was conducted to (1) inform the public of the alternatives planning study for a new I-64 interchange with a connector road and the issues associated with it; and (2) to receive their input/comments concerning the need for a new interchange, their transportation concerns, problems to correct, issues to consider, and potential constraints. Citizens were provided a handout consisting of: a project fact sheet with the purpose of the study, draft project goals, and an aerial photograph of the project study area to retain; and a comment form to submit; and the District 5 point of contact for additional information on both.

A staffed information table with a sign-in sheet was present at the entrance, and the handout/comment forms distributed to attendees. The meeting was conducted from 6:00-8:00 pm, with about a 15-minute formal presentation followed by an open house type format with work groups. No formal oral comments were recorded or documented. Several tables were prepared with three exhibits of the study area (aerial photograph, topographical map with the environmental footprint, and traffic, level of service, and crash data). Ten staff members from KYTC and Qk4 were available, stationed at each table to answer questions, elicit comments/discussion, and encourage citizens to annotate on the maps critical areas and potential interchange and connector locations. At the table work groups, much discussion of potential interchange and connector road locations occurred, and a few drew preferences on the exhibits. Any alternatives indicated on the exhibits were incorporated into the alternative corridors considered by the project team. All attendees were asked to complete a comment form and either submit it at the meeting, or return it in the postage-paid envelop provided. Sixty-nine (69) people attended the meeting and signed the sign-in sheet. The pre-printed comment forms were returned by 20 people (one submitted with no name or address), and several other people telephoned or emailed the District 5 office to express their opinion and concerns. Summaries and representative statements of the comments received are presented below, with the number of times stated in parentheses. Text in brackets was inserted for clarity.

1. How did you hear about this public meeting?

Newspaper	7	TV	0	Friend/Family	8	Do Not Recall	1
Letter	0	Radio	0	Elected Official	1		
Flyer	0	Meeting	1	Other	4		

2. Do you feel there are problems with study area roadways that should be addressed with this project? (i.e., I-64, US 60, Taylorsville Road, other north-south or east-west roads)

Yes 16 No 4 (Note: 2 "no" voters also checked "yes" to question #3; indicated a positive benefit to question #4; and, for question #6, one provided a preferred location, the other stated start now.)

If "yes", please describe the problem, any specific locations, and types of improvements you feel are needed. (Use provided map if necessary to clarify your response.)

- "The only solutions for relieving Taylorsville Rd traffic are widening or a direct connection to I-64. The most direct route is on new alignment from the KY 155/KY 148 intersection to I-64. No development currently along such a route." [Person drew 2 possible alignments on map. From about KY 155/KY 148 intersection, due north to I-64 along west bank of Floyds Fork. From just east of C/L, due south to Taylorsville Lake Road/KY 155. Both alignments terminated at I-64, with no connector road north of I-64.]

- Traffic on KY 155/KY 148 “has increased greatly. [If it continues to increase, then] it may come to a standstill.” “We need a connector road between US 60 and KY 155.”
- Westbound US 60 to southbound I-265 “in morning takes forever.”
- Eastbound US 60 at I-265, the two traffic lights need to be timed properly to permit traffic to flow through them.
- I-265 northbound at US 60 exit “backs up past Taylorsville Rd in morning.”
- US 60 at Lake Forest “is too heavy with traffic” during Christian Academy school hours.
- “I [travel] from Long Run Rd during rush hour. The amount of traffic is unbelievably heavy.” An accident on I-64 diverts traffic onto US 60. “US 60 is too narrow for semi’s.”
- US 60 and KY 155/KY 148 are too narrow.
- Eastwood-Fisherville Rd [KY 1531] is inadequate to handle traffic. Railroad trestle at south end is one-lane.
- Traffic congestion at I-265 intersections with I-64, US 60, and KY 155.
- “The backup [from Spencer Co traffic on Taylorsville Lake Rd/KY 155] has gone over 2-miles trying to get through the Fisherville light [*i.e.*, KY 155/KY 148 intersection], and it is extremely dangerous for people trying to turn left from KY 148 to KY 155 at the [traffic] light. ...frequently going around drivers on the right shoulder at the light to get around people trying to turn left.”
- Wants two new I-64 interchanges: Clark Station and Gilliland Road.
- Existing roads are not wide enough.
- “Shelbyville Road in Eastwood is extremely congested and would benefit from having another on/off ramp to I-64. New subdivisions and businesses continue to go up in area, and being able to move traffic safely onto the interstate is critical.”
- “US 60 needs to be four-lane all the way to Shelbyville. ...traffic is getting more congested all the time....”
- Too congested on I-64 ramps to I-265, and US 60 through Eastwood.
- A new I-64 interchange “seems to be logical due to all of the development in this area.”
- “This interchange would open up a large rural area of existing substandard roads....” and “...would duplicate the public safety nightmare that the Blakenbaker Pkwy interchange created for our neighborhood.”

3. Do you think new access to I-64 is needed in eastern Jefferson County?

Yes 14 No 5 (Note. one “no” voter filled comment section with several sentences stating interchange was badly needed, long overdue, and explained why needed.)

Please explain why or why not.

- Taylorsville Rd needs relief from Spencer County traffic. (3X)
- Yes, to relieve traffic congestion. (7X)
- When accidents on I-64 or I-265 divert traffic onto other roadways, they cause extreme congestion and backups on the smaller roads. (3X)
- It would disperse some of the load off [I-265] intersections with I-64, US 60, and KY 155.
- I take KY 148 [east] to Veechdale Road to access I-64 to avoid congestion at intersections above [*i.e.*, I-265 at I-64, US 60, and KY 155].
- Improve fire and emergency response times, and safety. (2X)
- Relieve traffic on US 60 and at I-265 interchange. (3X)
- Yes. Traffic flow is now at a bottleneck during peak hours ... it is getting worse all the time. ...an interchange would help relieve this problem.”
- “...should have been done ten years ago.”

- “It will only encourage more sprawled growth....”
- “Would conflict with Greater Louisville Project Report ... weaken our urban core ... population is not growing.... Has Qk4 or state transportation received growth readiness training from state?”
- “Your projected traffic figures are outdated & inaccurate. The study area is not being developed at a rate of 4.84 houses/acre. Current subdivisions are not as dense as you project. Mayor Abramson [and EPA have] funded [studies] of how to maintain rural nature of this area. Much of this land planned for parks & habitat.”

4. How would a new interchange with a connector road positively or negatively affect communities in or near the study area?

- “I’m for the development and better access this connector would create.”
- It would help reduce traffic congestion on other roads (US 60, KY 155). (3X)
- “Derbyshire [Estates] is very concerned about any increase in traffic on Eastwood-Fisherville Road without major improvements. We have had a resident die on this road, which is too narrow to allow vehicle to safely pass in spots, has poor sight-lines, tight blind curves, and shoulders that drop off. The railroad underpass is narrow, and creates a blind driving situation” [from Board member, Derbyshire Estates Property Owners Assoc.]
- Positively. Get more people and businesses in our end of town if they have better access to main roads. (2X)
- Positive [impact].
- Help make roads safer.
- Improved access and interchange are needed, but limit/restrict/prohibit commercial development around new interchange and intersections. (3X)
- “Residents in the area are already negatively impacted ... because of the lack of insight by Planning & Zoning in Jefferson County.” If project implemented, then heavy restrictions on commercial development are needed to prevent creating more Hurstbourne Lane or Blakenbaker interchange areas.
- “...negatively affect the area by creating more sprawled development...” and cause “higher taxes for the county residents...” (2X)
- “It would destroy our rural character....”
- “Negative impact for local planning & zoning Floyds Fork Development Review Overlay.”
- “...would open more areas to development. There is way too much now. We need protected areas for wildlife.”

5. Are there areas or sites in the study area we should avoid (e.g., natural areas or habitats, recreational areas, historic or cultural sites, hazardous materials sites, scenic areas, viewsheds), or any additional environmental issues we need to address? Please identify and explain why.

- “Build the road and let God sort out the rest.”
- “No, because no consideration is made to the natural areas when they build these huge subdivisions.”
- Eastwood and the Eastwood Village area plan. Minimize any potential traffic problems in Eastwood area.
- KY 148: floodplain, railroad, waterline, Brush Run Creek.
- Floyds Fork watershed/corridor. (8X)
- Cemetery at entrance to Shakes Run.
- “...devastating impact on the Black Acre Nature Preserve.”

- Karst area. Non-point source water pollution runoff into Floyds Fork and tributaries. Habitat for hundreds of species of birds and animals. Slave cemeteries on some farms. Current agricultural activities will be destroyed by noise, traffic, light and air pollution if new interchange built.

6. Additional Comments.

- Great if a connector road between US 60 and KY 155 could be built both west and east of I-265.
- Connector road from KY 155, Taylorsville Lake Road [*i.e.*, KY 155/KY 148 intersection] north through Echo Trail corridor would be easiest and quick to build.
- Locate interchange east of Eastwood (*i.e.*, Hobbs Ln or Clark Station Rd). Respect provisions of Eastwood Village plan to protect village character. Topography and low residential densities near C/L are more attractive. [Person submitted copies of Eastwood plan pages.]
- "The roadway change is already way overdue." "... the traffic problems need to be addressed." "...the I-64 exchange that is so needed."
- "Put the I-64 interchange at Hobbs Station or Gilliland by the firehouse."
- "Extend Taylorsville Lake Road at KY 155/KY 148 across railroad, thru park area of Floyds Fork, to new I-64 exchange."
- Locate interchange further east, around Clark Station Road. Would benefit Shelby County traffic. If interchange at Gilliland Rd, then it would draw heavy trucks, which would drive to Floyds Fork or US 60 at Eastwood.
- Gilliland already improved, and it would be easier to develop into an exchange. (2X)
- Connection from KY 148/KY 155 [intersection traffic] light to Echo Trail would allow Spencer Co residents direct access to I-64 taking pressure off I-265 intersections at Taylorsville Rd [KY 155] and I-64.
- Include Spencer County in planning. [because a lot of traffic from Spencer Co and limited routes into Jefferson County]
- "We need this to go ahead and get started!!!"
- Locate the interchange east of Eastwood.
- Use the Eastwood-Fisherville Road because it "empties into the heart of Eastwood and would provide the best access off Shelbyville Road." "The sooner the better for this project. Eastwood-Fisherville Rd needs to be widened...."
- "A major consideration [for new interchange location] should be made for fire departments and emergency vehicles. ...great need for ... quicker response between Middletown and Simpsonville on I-64...." Suggests new interchange and connector road on county line.
- "More development, including roads, in this area is not good for Louisville Metro ... serving only to deflate property values elsewhere ... more roads will not help fire and rescue teams ... the less development ... the faster and less hindered by traffic their responses will be."
- "Please invite the public, association, to more meetings on this interchange. No connector road route was shown at the public meeting. Sprawl costs...."
- "Shelbyville Rd, I-64, Bardstown Rd, & the Gene Snyder carry through traffic for the area [and] should continue to do so, widening as necessary. We ... do not want urban sprawl.... 2-lane roads with tree canopies are a signature of this area. Busy highway should be kept where they are; we don't want to create new ones."
- "You need a copy of the Floyds Fork Management Plan 1981."

SUMMARY OF COMMENT FORMS

Public Information Meeting

New I-64 Interchange with a Connector Road

Jefferson and Shelby Counties
KYTC Item No. 5-8200

June 26, 2007
Highview Baptist Church (East Campus)

This second public information meeting was conducted to (1) inform the public of the alternatives planning study for a new I-64 interchange with a connector road in eastern Jefferson County (2) to receive their input/comments about possible location options. Citizens were provided a handout consisting of a project fact sheet with the purpose of the study, draft project goals, and an aerial photograph of the project study area with proposed alignments and a comment form to submit; and the District 5 point of contact for additional information on both.

A staffed information table with a sign-in sheet was present at the entrance, and the handout/comment forms distributed to attendees. The meeting was conducted from 6:00-8:00 pm, with about a 15-minute formal presentation followed by an open house type format with work groups. Several tables were prepared with an exhibit of the possible build alternative locations. Staff members from KYTC and Qk4 were available, stationed at each table to answer questions, and elicit comments/discussion.

Eighty nine (89) people attended the meeting and signed the sign-in sheet. The pre-printed comment forms were returned by 44 people, and several other people telephoned, faxed, or emailed the District 5 office. Summaries and representative statements of the comments received are presented below, with the number of times stated in parentheses.

In summary, of the alternatives recommended to be carried forward the comments disliked the western options (i.e., "1"/"2" and "7"/"4") 44 to 19 over the eastern options (27, 28, 9 and 10), and they liked the eastern options slightly more then the western options (i.e. 22 comments versus 17).

1. How did you hear about this public meeting?

Newspaper	9	TV	1	Friend/Family	19
Letter	3	Radio	0	Elected Official	9
Flyer	0	Meeting	1	Other	10

2. Do you feel there are problems with study area roadways that this project should address? (i.e., I-64, US 60, Taylorsville Road, other north-south or east-west roads)

Yes 34 No 8

If "yes", please describe the problem, any specific locations, and types of improvements you feel are needed. (Use provided map if necessary to clarify your response.)

- Traffic growth in area due to development (4x)
- Taylorsville Road should be four lanes between I-265 and KY 155 (2x)
- Taylorsville Road from 155 to the Gene Snyder Freeway is a mess of traffic (2x)
- Traffic coming out of Spencer and Shelby Counties utilizing 155 and 148 (2x)
- Fisherville Road is in dire need of repair/reconstruction and cannot handle the influx of vehicles due to ongoing development and expansion in the area (2X)
- I-265 and US 60 Intersection is in desperate need of re-configuration (2x)
- Fisherville Road has poor access for emergency vehicles
- Many of the roads are unsafe, narrow, curvy and unmarked

- US 60 from Eastwood cut-off to County Line Road should be four lanes
- Traffic at the Highway 155 and Highway 148 intersection

3. Do you think new access to I-64 is needed in eastern Jefferson County?

Yes 34 No 10

Please explain why?

- Congestion/Traffic (18x)
- Growth/Development (6x)
- There is no access to I-64 between I-265 and Simpsonville (2x)
- Poor access for emergency vehicles (2x)
- Exit 28 and Gene Snyder Freeway are separate

Please explain why not?

- There is already adequate access (4x)
- Adding another access road would displace whole neighborhoods

4. Which alternative corridor segments/new interchange location do you prefer? Why?

- 27, 28, 9, 10 (16x) - More efficient emergency service; Less impact on communities; Less impact on existing development; Preserves the historic community; Alleviates traffic; Repairs Fisherville Road in the process; Preserves Floyd's Fork; Prevents traffic from going thru Eastwood to access main roads
- 1, 2, 4 (10x) - Convenient access to the Parks; Least expensive; Helps Spencer county economy; Quickest plan/project to complete; No noise wall/barrier is necessary; Less impact on communities; Avoids shopping center project developing at location 10
- East is where any new Road projects should go (7x) - East is where the growth and development is
- 1,3,9,10 (3x) - Reduces congestion; Reduces environmental impact on Floyd's Fork; Less impact on community; Direct route to 155; Preserves "Historic Eastwood"; Provides access to areas with limited access providing potential for any future development
- None (3x) - Disturbs and destroys a peaceful, rural, two-lane road area
- 1,2,5,6,7 (2x) - Most direct alternative; Least expensive; Improved access to Parks; Less impact on communities
- 1,3,8,6,7 - Less impact on Floyd's Fork
- 12 (or) 19 - Relieves Eastwood's 'bottleneck' traffic
- 1, 2 (or 3), 4 - Addresses the most traffic
- 28 -
- 28, 9, 10 – Less residential impact; Less impact on Floyd's Fork
- 28, 13, 12 – Maintains Eastwood's rural identity
- 25, 18, 19, 20 – Less impact on property owners and streams
- 1, 3, 12, 20 – Less impact on property owners
- 1, 2 – Less impact on Floyd's Fork
- Which ever one can be finished in the shortest amount of time

5. Which alternative corridor segments/new interchange location do you dislike? Why?

- All of the Western Alternatives (8x) - Negative impact on Floyd's Fork; Negative impact on residential
- 27, 28 (5x) - Expensive; #27 goes off of a 30' cliff at Taylorsville Road; Creates more traffic congestion; Negative impact on personal property; Negative impact on Floyd's Fork

- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 (5x) - Negative impact on Floyd's Fork; Negative impact on the Historic District; No positive impact on traffic
- 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 (3x) - Negative impact on Floyd's Fork
- 27, 28, 9, 10 (2x) - Negative impact on the community; Longer and full of dangerous curves; No positive impact on traffic
- 1, 2, 4 (2x) - Too residential; Negative impact on Floyd's Fork
- 2, 4, 5 (2x) - No positive impact on traffic, Does not help limited access communities
- 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 (2x) - Divides community; Limits access to Parks and Floyd's Fork
- 9, 10 - Negative impact on the Historic District of Eastwood
- 9, 14 – Needs to be more direct
- 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 - Negative impact on the Historic Districts; Negative impact on the community
- 28, 10, 24 – Safety concern for an interchange on a two lane road
- 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 – Does not resolve traffic congestion; Negative impact on Floyd's Fork, Fisherville Road repair problems would still need to be addressed with another project; Limits the Eastwood community from the Parks
- 8, 9 – Goes right thru personal property
- 27, 28, 9, 14, 10 – Most expensive, Forces 155 traffic to make unnecessary turn
- 1, 2, 4, 5 – Negative impact on Floyd's Fork
- 8, 6, 7, - No positive impact on traffic
- 1, 3, 9, 14, 7 – Negative impact on the community; Longer and full of dangerous curves
- 1, 3, 9, 10 - Negative impact on the community; Longer and full of dangerous curves
- 27, 28, 9, 14, 7 - Negative impact on the community; Longer and full of dangerous curves
- 14, 10 – Negative impact on Eastwood Village
- 2, 5, 6 – No positive impact on traffic
- 1, 2, 5 – Too residential
- 1, 3, 8 – Too residential
- 1, 3, 9 – Too residential
- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8 – Unnecessary destruction to the neighborhoods
- All of the alternatives – Destruction to the neighborhoods
- All of the Eastern Alternatives – Too far east to help

6. Additional Comments.

- Preserve Floyd's Fork (13x)
- The proposed routes would uproot several households (7x)
- The sooner the better (6x)
- US 60 will have to be widened at Eastwood if more traffic is created by an interchange (6x)
- Poor notification of the Public Meeting/Project (6x)
- Shelbyville Road and Taylorsville Road should be widened as appropriate joining the new interchange road (5x)
- Please keep these roads rural design (no curb and gutter, fully shielded lights) (2x)
- Put flyovers at US 60/ 265, 155/265, this would reduce waiting. 155/148 take out the light and this would move traffic on to the new four lane 155
- Please include walkways, bike paths and crossing lights
- The 148/155 intersection would benefit greatly if it were designed as a true intersection rather than the 'T' design

- Make two left turn lanes or a cloverleaf and six lane freeway north and south between I-64 and US 60
- There is an illegal landfill with unknown toxic waste in the area of 8 and 9
- If Alternative 1 is chosen a bridge over the railroad is preferred over a crossing
- Emergency vehicles response time can be improved by adding Emergency lanes on I-64 and Gene Snyder Freeway
- Someone that lives in the area should design the new interchange