

MINUTES

Project Team Meeting

Alternatives Study to Relocate/Reconstruct KY 163 from KY 90 to Nunn Parkway Metcalf County Item 3-129.00

KYTC District 3 Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
March 15, 2007
10:00 AM

A project team meeting for the KY 163 Alternatives Study in Metcalfe County was held at 10 a.m. CDT on Thursday, March 15, 2007, in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to review the input received at the first public meeting, review the existing conditions information, refine the purpose and need statement, and evaluate the initial alternatives prepared by Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA).

Participants in the meeting came from the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD), the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 3 Office, and the consultant firms, WSA and Third Rock Consultants. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Amy Scott	BRADD, Regional Transportation Planner
Bruce Siria	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Keirsten Jaggars	KYTC District 3, Public Information Officer
Jeff Moore	KYTC District 3, Planning
Misti Wilson	KYTC District 3, Planning
Steve James	KYTC District 3, Preconstruction
Phil Carter	KYTC District 3, Construction
Deneatra Hack	KYTC District 3, Design
Scott Pedigo	KYTC District 3, Traffic
Gerry Fister	Third Rock Consultants
Carl Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Bill Gulick	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Ramsey	Wilbur Smith Associates

A summary of the key discussion items for this meeting is provided below.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Jeff Moore began the meeting by welcoming the participants and asking the project team members to introduce themselves. He then provided a brief project description.

2. Purpose

Bruce Siria briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting. This included a review of the information gathered by WSA up to this point, but the main purpose was to discuss the purpose and need and review the potential alternatives to select a smaller set for further development.

3. Public Input

Rebecca Ramsey presented a summary of findings from the first public meeting, held in December 2006. The primary concerns of community members were:

- Preserving homes and farmlands;
- Addressing the congestion issue at the intersection of KY 163 and US 68-KY 80;
- Improving safety at key points along the route, primarily curves and narrow bridges; and
- Facilitating truck traffic, especially at the KY 163 intersection with US 68-KY 80.

Summary handouts for the public meeting were provided. Two maps showed the results of the map-drawing exercise at the public meeting to identify specific areas of concern (sharp curves, narrow bridges, cemeteries, etc) and possible alternatives suggested by residents for consideration. Another handout showed results from the public survey, which stressed the importance of farmlands and homes as sensitive areas and identified the main problems with the existing route: sharp curves, large trucks, and narrow lanes and shoulders that limit passing opportunities. Carl Dixon reiterated the importance of farmlands to the community from the discussion with the attendees at the meeting.

Responses received to date from resource agencies were also reviewed. Thirteen replies have been received. According to the Kentucky Geological Survey, there is a high karst potential in the area and some of the stone may be usable for construction purposes. The Construction Division of KYTC recommends a route west of the existing alignment as the easiest to construct.

4. Environmental Overviews

Gerry Fister presented an overview of the environmental assessment performed by Third Rock. Karst topography is found at both the north and south ends of the project area. Air quality impacts should not be a major issue, though traffic traveling through downtown Edmonton may increase depending on the selected alternative. There are many streams in the study area which would potentially be impacted by the project; the stream running behind the stockyards would be a good candidate for mediation efforts. There is a known cave – Harvey Cave – at the southern end of the area and two known endangered species of bats. There are three parks in Edmonton, several hazardous waste sites, and many underground storage tanks. There is also an Agricultural District on the existing KY 163 alignment, but lands could be reassigned with a hearing.

Carl Dixon summarized the other environmental data collected. A noise analysis presented no major concerns. There are several historic properties within Edmonton and along KY 163, including two National Register sites downtown. Also, known archaeological sites were identified immediately east of downtown, so this will impact the selection of alternatives.

The Geotechnical Overview found that karst features were the main issue, including major karst areas at the southern terminus and in the northeast corner of the study area near the KY 2399-Nunn Parkway intersection, as well as a sizeable sinkhole south of the bend in KY 861. Bill Gulick elaborated: the soil and rock types found in the area should be usable for construction. Steve James expressed concern about split rock slopes previously encountered in the area. Cut slopes would probably be limited to 10 to 15 feet maximum height.

Bruce Siria asked if any flooding issues were associated with the south fork of Little Barren River. Because of the steepness of the watershed, flows are fast moving and don't tend to pool in this area.

A discussion followed about the limits of the project area regarding the following:

- The existing Industrial Park requires fast access to the Parkway, located nearby.
- The study area limits are from KY 90 in the south to the Nunn Parkway.
- The feasibility of an additional interchange will be considered. There is a prior expectation from the public that should be addressed, and the traffic patterns at the KY 163 intersection with US 68-KY 80 necessitate the investigation of an additional interchange to address local issues.
- The project, as it advances, could be broken into multiple design projects.

5. Environmental Justice

Amy Scott provided a summary of environmental justice issues in the area. Two census tracts lie in the study limits; demographics were discussed by race, income levels, and age groups:

- The percentage of minorities in the area was below state and national averages, but no concentrations of minority groups were identified.
- Statistics rank Metcalfe County as 32nd in Kentucky having the highest poverty rates. This rural depressed county does not show any specific concentrations of low income communities which would be considered environmental justice areas.
- Similarly, no concentrations of persons 65 years and older were identified in the area; percentages are comparable to state and national averages.

Gerry Fister pointed out that there are two mobile home parks within the study area that could create Environmental Justice problems. Although a relatively large portion of the population may be considered low income, infringing on the mobile home parks will likely generate extra concern from FHWA.

Economic generators for the area include the northern Industrial Park, farmlands, and the timber industry to the south and east. This is a key reason that taking farmlands from the community would be detrimental. Bruce Siria explained the perception of community pride and the aversion to change expressed by many participants at the public meeting.

6. Existing Conditions

Bill Gulick and Rebecca Ramsey shared information on the KY 163 existing conditions, specifically traffic and level of service (LOS), crash history, and geometric deficiencies.

From a capacity standpoint, there are not any existing (2006) problems within the study area. Assuming a low growth rate, some congestion can be expected to occur by 2030 at the KY 163 intersection with US 68-KY 80, primarily in the PM peak hour. LOS restrictions in the rural portions of KY 163 are related primarily to the absence of passing opportunities.

The crash history identifies multiple high crash spots and segments in the study area. Concentrations appear at the two main intersections in Edmonton: US 68 with KY 80 and US 68-KY 80 with KY 163. No crashes are recorded on two narrow bridges along KY 163, despite reports of incidents at the public meeting. The existing interchange with the Nunn Parkway has a high crash spot. The HES project (currently seeking additional funds, according to Steve James) should address the concentration of crashes on US 68-KY 80 west of downtown. The realignment of KY 90 will likely address the high crash spot occurring at the KY 163 intersection with KY 90.

WSA also reviewed existing plans to identify possible geometric deficiencies. Although plans for the existing roadways are extremely dated (1929 to 1947) and some changes may have occurred since then, the alignment on the ground should be consistent with the details laid out in the plans. Along KY 163, the deficiencies form a continuous line of grade issues, sight distance restrictions, and minimum radius violations, in addition to the narrow lanes and shoulders. This will make it challenging to identify spot fixes along the existing route. Efforts to identify a correlation between geometric deficiencies and crash history trends yielded no definite conclusions.

Bill Gulick also presented an overview to the cost estimation methodology. Base rates per mile were developed based on unit costs; \$2.9 million per mile of two-lane section and \$3.6 million per mile of three lane section were assumed. Major structure costs were added to these base rates, where needed.

7. Purpose and Need of Project

A discussion followed, focusing on the actual purpose of this KY 163 Alternatives study. At present, KY 163 is a rural road with typical rural travel characteristics.

The traffic using this route is composed of primarily local trips, so users familiar with the facility can anticipate the curves and problem spots. However, the network changes occurring in the area (improvements to KY 163 farther south and KY 90 to the west, additional truck traffic on KY 90, and the eventual designation of I-66) will likely change the character of the traffic traveling along this route, and quickly magnify existing capacity, geometric, and safety issues. This study provides an opportunity to anticipate and address these needs. Jeff Moore explained that these issues all work together, giving the project purpose both regional and local elements.

Carl Dixon presented an overview of the draft purpose and need statement developed by WSA. The primary purpose has been identified as improving safety and mobility.

Phil Carter presented the project from an opposite point of view. Metcalfe County has a small population and is not likely to get significant funding. This project could be intended to provide a direct connecting corridor for Monroe County and Tompkinsville to reach the parkway. From this view, a straight link from KY 90 to the existing interchange would best meet the project needs, although it provides no benefits for Metcalfe County or the city of Edmonton. A similar situation occurring in Smith's Grove, where local needs were ranked second to regional, is currently creating complications. Not specifically helping the city could likely damage Edmonton's economy. Increasing the roadway mileage to be maintained by the state in this area where traffic is adequately served by the existing route would increase costs without justification.

Carl Dixon indicated that it may be possible to meet the stated purpose of improving safety and mobility, while also providing improved connectivity and meeting other goals, and WSA has prepared some alternatives to address all of these issues.

8. Proposed Alternatives

Due to time limitations, the purpose and need discussion was not fully resolved. It was agreed that WSA would work with the Project Managers to determine if further refinement is needed. However, as indicated, alternatives exist which address both local and regional issues.

Bill Gulick began the alternatives presentation by discussing four alternative interchange locations.

- Existing US 68-KY 80 – Costs associated with improving the existing toll booth style interchange come to around \$10 million.
- US 68 (D) – A standard diamond interchange on US 68, with small rerouting of KY 3524 (Industrial Park entrance) costs around \$13 million
- KY 3524 (E) – An interchange located at rear of Industrial park, either conventional diamond or trumpet layout to KY 80, would cost approximately \$14 million

- KY 2399 (F) – Several smaller roads converge here though surface terrain minimizes earthwork at this location. A conventional diamond interchange would cost around \$15 million at this location.

To help with deciding which alternatives should not move forward, WSA provided an evaluation matrix focusing on Purpose and Need and on environmental and community impacts.

Rebecca Ramsey gave an overview of traffic projections anticipated for different sets of alternatives, based on the KY Statewide Traffic Model:

- A direct connection to the far west or east (e.g., Alternative AB or AF) would create minimal benefits for traffic within Edmonton and carry less traffic: 1,000 to 1,500 vehicles per day.
- A connection west of downtown Edmonton with an interchange at US 68 north of town (Alternative A2D) had the greatest impact on the KY 163 intersection with US 68-KY 80 and can be anticipated to serve 2,100 to 2,500 trips per day.
- Creating an interchange at D with no other improvements would change the traffic patterns at the four-way stop intersection, removing the need for large trucks to make the tight turns to and from US 68-KY 80 westbound to access the parkway.
- Eastern and western bypasses were also considered without an additional interchange; a bypass to the west would provide greater benefits and carry more traffic.

Carl Dixon presented the “Build” highway improvement recommendations prepared by WSA, plus three Interchange Only alternatives at US 68 north of Edmonton (D), KY 3524 which serves the existing industrial park (E), and KY 2399 (F). He then summarized WSA’s evaluation and recommendations:

- Alternatives passing to the far west of the city (e.g. AB, A1B, A2B, A2C) do not adequately address the purpose and need of the project since they do not address local needs.
- These alternates also consume more farmland and appear to only carry minor traffic volumes, although the impacts for A2B and A2C are not as severe as those for AB and A1B.
- These alternates would also add additional lane-miles for the state to maintain.
- Alternatives passing to the far east of the city (i.e., AE, A3E, AF, A3F) also do not adequately address the purpose and need of the project since they do not address local needs. These alternates also consume more farmland and appear to only carry minor traffic volumes
- A2C is located near the schools along US 68-KY 80 and, therefore, could have 4f implications, which – coupled with the other issues – makes it unsuitable for further consideration.
- Historic sites and archaeological sites east of downtown create potential 4f concerns for both eastern (outer) bypasses, and they may also be

hampered by stream problems near the stockyards, so these are also unsuitable for further consideration.

- Improvements along the existing alignment (e.g. A5D, A5E, A5F) could create some right-of-way and relocation impacts for area homes and businesses. The only reason to include these would be to provide better access for alternates that terminate at the E or F interchanges.
- Given the karst and constructability problems at Interchange Location F, and the constructability problems and potential negative impacts on the existing industrial park at Interchange Location E, it was agreed that none of the E and F alternatives were suitable for further consideration.

Improvements to the existing interchange on US 68-KY 80 are not included in any of the alternates, but this will be addressed as a separate issue in the study.

It was agreed that the No Build alternate and recommendations for spot improvements along the existing route would be included for further analysis.

With these factors in mind, the following alternatives were dismissed by the Project Team from further consideration: AB, A1B, A2C, A5E, A5F, all inner & outer bypass options, A3E, AE, A3F, AF, as well as interchanges at E or F.

Consequently, the following alternatives were selected by the Project Team for further consideration in the study: A2B, A2G, A2D, A4G, A4D, A5D, Interchange Only at D, Spot Improvements, and No Build.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:15 p.m. CDT.

AGENDA
KYTC Project Team Meeting
KY 163 Alternatives Study
KY 90 to Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Metcalfe County
KYTC District 3 Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
March 15, 2007
10 a.m. CDT

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC District 3 |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC Division of Planning |
| 3. Public Input | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Comments from December Public Meeting | |
| b. Survey Responses | |
| 4. Environmental Overview
(Aquatic/Terrestrial/Socioeconomic/Air/UST/Hazmat) | Third Rock Consultants |
| 5. Environmental Overview
(Noise/Cultural Resources) | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 6. Geotech Overview | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 7. Environmental Justice | Barren River ADD |
| 8. KY 163 Existing Conditions | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Traffic and LOS | |
| b. Crash History | |
| c. Geometric Deficiencies | |
| 9. Purpose and Need of Project | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 10. Proposed Alternatives | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Review of Alternatives | |
| b. Cost Estimates | |
| c. Traffic Analysis | |
| d. Evaluation of Alternatives | |
| e. Recommendations | |
| 11. Discussion by Project Team | KYTC District 3/
Division of Planning |
| 12. Next Steps | KYTC/WSA |
| 13. Adjourn | KYTC |

MINUTES

Project Team Meeting

Alternatives Study to Relocate/Reconstruct KY 163 from KY 90 to Nunn Parkway Metcalf County Item 3-129.00

KYTC District 3 Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
April 17, 2007
10:00 AM

A project team meeting for the KY 163 Alternatives Study in Metcalfe County was held at 10 a.m. CDT on Tuesday, April 17, 2007, in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to review the Level 2 Screening of the proposed Corridor Alternatives, review proposed spot improvements, and establish the materials and format for the upcoming local officials, stakeholders, and public meetings. The meeting agenda is attached.

Participants in the meeting came from the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD), the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) Central and District 3 Offices, and the consultant firms, WSA and Third Rock Consultants. Meeting attendees included the following:

Amy Scott	BRADD, Regional Transportation Planner
Bruce Siria	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Keirsten Jagers	KYTC District 3, Public Information Officer
Jeff Moore	KYTC District 3, Planning
Misti Wilson	KYTC District 3, Planning
Steve James	KYTC District 3, Preconstruction
Deneatra Hack	KYTC District 3, Design
Todd Morrison	KYTC District 3, Operations
Allen Cox	KYTC District 3, Permits
Scott Pedigo	KYTC District 3, Traffic
Virginia Goodman	Third Rock Consultants
Carl D. Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Ramsey	Wilbur Smith Associates

A summary of the key discussion items for this meeting is provided below.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Jeff Moore began the meeting by welcoming the participants and asking the project team members to introduce themselves.

2. Purpose

Jeff Moore briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting. The meeting provides an opportunity to present an overview of the information prepared by WSA up to this point and to prepare for the upcoming meetings with local officials, stakeholders, and the public.

3. Scheduled Meetings

A local officials meeting is scheduled for 10:00 AM on April 26. A stakeholders meeting is scheduled for 1:30 PM the same day. Both meetings will be held at the Metcalfe County Judicial Center.

A public meeting is scheduled from 4:00 – 7:00 PM on May 17, 2007, in the Metcalfe County High School cafeteria.

4. Public Meeting Format

The format of the public meeting is anticipated to be an open-house meeting similar to the December meeting. A PowerPoint presentation will be given by members of the project team at 4:30 to allow time for participants to arrive. If necessary, the presentation may be repeated later in the meeting.

The project team agreed that three sets of corridor maps on aerials would be placed on tables to give attendees a better opportunity to view how the corridor alternatives are located.

5. Handouts/Exhibits for Future Meetings

Carl Dixon explained the concept for the upcoming meeting exhibits: the displays should step viewers through the alternatives development process. Officials, stakeholders, and the public will be able to see the existing conditions, the project purpose statement, the alternatives, and the screening process outlined through the tables and maps displayed.

Meeting Exhibits: Some of the display boards prepared for the upcoming meetings were presented to the project team, showing:

- Environmental footprint
- Geometric deficiencies map
- Crash history information
- Purpose and need statement
- Level 1 Corridor Map and Evaluation Matrix
- Level 2 Corridor Map and Evaluation Matrix

Presentation strategies aimed at adding clarity to various exhibits were discussed. It was agreed that the overall corridor maps would be supplemented by “key maps” to better illustrate each corridor alternative instead of just on a single map. A “key map” would be available at each location where the corridor alternatives map is used.

Level 2 Evaluation: Information obtained during the secondary screening process for the remaining Level 2 corridors was then presented by Third Rock, BRADD, and WSA staff. The project team was invited to review the exhibits and provide feedback prior to the upcoming local officials/stakeholders meetings.

Virginia Goodman presented the environmental overview for the remaining alternatives. Each corridor has some environmental issues associated with its alignment, but none are severe enough to merit dismissing the alternative. Forty units of Section 8 housing, several UST sites, and major grading issues are present for corridors passing between points I and G, at the end of Bushong Lane. The segment between points 2 and B has the most potential impacts on wetlands and farmlands. The segment between 4 and I could potentially impact three cemeteries, located on Dunham and Murrell Streets. The existing Industrial Park entrance and nearby stream could be impacted by any alternative with an interchange at D. There is a park located near the stockyard at the US 68-KY 80 split. Missionary Mound Church, located along KY 163, may be associated with a potential for archaeological sites. Homes are scattered along KY 163 with clusters near Larry Hurt Road, Cedar Flats, and within Edmonton. These and other conclusions from the Level 2 Environmental Overview are summarized in the Level 2 screening matrix.

Amy Scott explained the environmental justice impacts associated with the Level 2 Corridors. There is a minor concentration of elderly persons in block group 9603003. Block group 9603002 also has a higher concentration of persons 65 and older, perhaps due to the nursing home within Edmonton. There is a slightly higher percentage of low income persons in this group and several mobile home clusters. Block group 9603001 has a minor concentration of low income populations as well. None of these populations qualify as having significant environmental justice impacts. Alternatives A2B and Interchange at D are preferable from an EJ viewpoint.

Bruce Siria asked about the increased population of Indian/Alaskan Natives in Block Group 9603001. According to BRADD investigations, this population is focused nearer Edmonton and would not be impacted disproportionately by any construction at D.

Carl Dixon presented summaries of the Cultural Resources and Geotechnical findings for the remaining corridors. There are several cemeteries and historic properties near the corridors. The Metcalfe County Court house and the Beauchamp property are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, but neither is expected to be impacted by any of the corridors. Three rack-sided barns with inward sloping sides lie along KY 163 which may have historical significance. Sections 2B, 2D and 2G may have the highest number of archaeological sites simply based on the fact that it is a completely new alignment, and using the existing corridor of KY 163 would be likely to affect the most historic structures

From a geotechnical perspective, karst issues are the predominant issue. There are large sinkholes near the US 68-KY 80 split and along A2B which could present challenges. Segments of alluvium lie along each of the 6 corridor alternatives. These could require groundwater and soft soil mitigations. Based solely upon the geotechnical data, the ranking of the best three alternatives are A4G, A4D, and A2B.

Rebecca Ramsey gave an overview of the remaining existing conditions data. The traffic, safety, and deficiencies maps and cost estimates have been presented to the project team at a previous meeting; similar displays would be used for the upcoming meetings.

A discussion followed about what the “Address Geometry” score on the Evaluation Matrix reflects. A newly designed roadway would meet current standards and therefore should receive a “high” rating regardless of its alignment. Alternately, leaving long sections of the existing roadway unaddressed to build a new alignment does not improve the existing geometry. It was decided that the screening matrix should reflect corrections to the existing geometry and the language in the matrix should be revised to clarify this point.

Projected traffic volumes for each of the Level 2 Alternatives were summarized. Alternatives within Edmonton are anticipated to carry higher traffic volumes. The format of this exhibit (a single corridor per page) was recognized as an effective “key map” tool to illustrate the overlapping corridor locations to the public.

Spot Improvements: Rebecca Ramsey then gave a brief presentation of the potential Spot Improvements identified by WSA. These included:

- Adding a truck climbing lane north of the KY 90 intersection;
- Widening the two bridges on KY 163;
- Addressing the vertical alignment at Missionary Mound;
- Adjusting curves and grades at Cedar Flats;
- Reconfiguring the KY 163/US 68-KY 80 intersection to remove parking and add a northbound left turn lane;
- Adding turning lanes at both entrances to the Industrial Park;
- Adding turning lanes at Bowling Park; and
- Reconfiguring the US 68-KY 80 split intersection.

The project team was asked for recommendations or additions to the spot improvements list. Scott Pedigo mentioned that the parking configuration at the KY 163/US 68-KY 80 intersection has been studied previously. Adding a turning lane northbound could restrict the movement of trucks turning right from the eastbound approach. There are also drainage problems at this intersection, which lies at the bottom of a hill. Runoff pools there and runs into the sidewalks and adjacent businesses just uphill at the bank on KY 163. A retirement home

on KY 163 within Edmonton relies upon a crosswalk across KY 163 to access the sidewalk network. Warning signs have been installed.

An additional spot identified was the existing Nunn interchange. Preliminary investigation suggests the existing structure could remain in service. Thus, changing the ramps to a diamond configuration would be a relatively low-cost alternative to improve safety.

The project team requested that cost estimates be available for the upcoming meeting with local officials and stakeholders. Jeff Moore mentioned the importance of segmenting the project to keep components within manageable costs. Carl Dixon affirmed that WSA would do this with the final study recommendations, presented at a project team meeting in June 2007.

Public Input Survey: Carl Dixon also indicated that a public input survey would be developed for the May 17th public meeting. No draft has been prepared yet, but it was anticipated that the following questions will be asked:

- Which Alternative(s) do you prefer? Why?
- Which Spot Improvement(s) do you prefer? Why?
- Are there any additional spots you would add?

A draft of the survey should be prepared and presented at the local officials and stakeholders meetings the upcoming week.

6. Project Team Discussion/Approval

The project team requested modifications to the color-coded maps showing the alternatives to make them easier to read and easier to reference in discussions.

With the modifications discussed in this meeting, the project team agreed that the exhibits presented by the consultant should be used for the upcoming meetings with local officials, stakeholders, and the public.

7. Next Steps

Carl Dixon indicated that the next steps in the project would be the Local Officials and Stakeholders meetings on April 26th, the Public Meeting on May 17th, the presentation of the Public Meeting Notebooks by early July, another Project Team meeting probably in mid-June, and the submittal of the Draft Report for the study by the end of July.

It was noted that there would not be a final Public Meeting to present the results of the study. This would be handled with a news release and presentations to the fiscal court, city council, and/or Barren River ADD by the District staff, with assistance from WSA as needed.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:15 p.m. CDT.

AGENDA
KYTC Project Team Meeting
KY 163 Alternatives Study
KY 90 to Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Metcalfe County
KYTC District 3 Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
April 17, 2007
10 a.m. CDT

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC District 3 |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC Division of Planning |
| 3. Scheduled Public Meetings | KYTC |
| a. Local Officials/Stakeholders: April 26, 2007 | |
| b. Public Meeting: May 17, 2007 | |
| 4. Public Meeting Format | Discussion |
| 5. Handouts/Exhibits for Future Meetings | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Purpose and Need | WSA |
| b. Evaluation of Preliminary Corridors | WSA |
| c. Evaluation of Final Corridors | WSA, et al. |
| i. Environmental Review | Third Rock |
| ii. Environmental Justice | Barren River ADD |
| iii. Historic | WSA |
| iv. Geotech | WSA |
| v. Traffic/Safety | WSA |
| vi. Geometric Deficiencies | WSA |
| vii. Cost | WSA |
| d. Spot Improvements | WSA |
| e. Public Input Survey | WSA |
| 6. Project Team Discussion/Approval | |
| 7. Next Steps | KYTC |
| a. Public Meeting Notebooks: c. July 2, 2007 | |
| b. Draft Report to Planning: c. July 30, 2007 | |
| 8. Adjourn | KYTC |

MINUTES

Local Officials Meeting

Alternatives Study to Relocate/Reconstruct KY 163 from KY 90 to Nunn Parkway Metcalfe County Item 3-129.00

Judicial Center
Edmonton, Kentucky
April 26, 2007
10:00 AM

A local officials meeting for the KY 163 Alternatives Study in Metcalfe County was held at 10 a.m. CDT on Thursday, April 26, 2007, in Edmonton, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to present an update of the study information and the alternatives development. A copy of the agenda is attached. Participants in the meeting came from Metcalfe County, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 3 Office, and the consultant firm, Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA). Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Judge Greg Wilson	Metcalfe County Judge Executive
Barry Gilley	Metcalfe County Attorney
Tommy A. Garrett	Metcalfe County Circuit Court
Bruce Siria	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Jeff Moore	KYTC District 3
Misti Wilson	KYTC District 3
Carl Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Ramsey	Wilbur Smith Associates

A summary of the key components and discussion items for this meeting is provided below, following the agenda outline.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Bruce Siria began the meeting, welcoming the participants and providing a summary of the project history over the past six months.

2. Purpose

Bruce Siria briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting: to show the local officials what the project team has been developing and to seek their input. Over the last months, the project team has been looking at possible improvements to KY 163 between KY 90 and the Nunn Parkway. Other improvements have been occurring along KY 163 further south. In November and December, the first round of meetings with the community provided initial input for the project team. From here, more than 25 potential alternatives were developed, which were narrowed to 8 build alternatives.

At this meeting, the project team presents its findings and solicits comments and preferences from the local officials. There is a public meeting on May 17th when the public will have an opportunity to provide feedback as well. The results of this input will help in making a study recommendation, which will be fed into the KYTC six year planning process this fall.

3. Existing Conditions

Carl Dixon reviewed the steps WSA has taken over the past months. Preliminary data was assembled for presentation at the first round of meetings. From input received at these meetings and more detailed data collected about the study area, WSA identified existing problems with the roadways and created alternatives to address these. The strategy was to think of all possible alternatives to be sure the best solution was available for selection.

Rebecca Ramsey presented the existing conditions data. Capacity analysis based on existing traffic volumes shows levels B and C throughout the project area. Volumes projected to 2030 with a 1.9% growth rate indicate some delay will occur by the design year, degrading level of service in Edmonton around the KY 163/US 68 intersection to unacceptable levels. Despite this, capacity does not appear to be the controlling problem. This data did contribute to the development and analysis of alternatives.

Officials present indicated that traffic problems at the KY 163/US 68 intersection are driven by large trucks. People have to stop a significant distance behind the stop bars to allow trucks to make tight turns. At 3 pm, traffic from the industrial park lets out, also causing long delays for a period of time in the afternoon, especially on the southbound approach. Carl Dixon affirmed that these issues were taken into consideration, though they do not show up in the traffic analysis.

Rebecca Ramsey presented an overview of the crash history and geometric deficiency data. Concentrations of crashes occur along US 68-KY 80 between the parkway and KY 861 and at the two primary intersections within Edmonton: KY 163 with US 68 downtown and US 68 with KY 80 on the east side. Based on the as-built plans for KY 163, the existing roadway geometrics were compared to current design standards and geometric deficiencies were identified. Narrow lanes, narrow shoulders, sharp curves, poor passing sight distance, and steep hills are the primary concerns, spanning the length of the roadway and making it difficult to improve KY 163 by only fixing portions of the roadway.

An environmental overview was also presented for the project area. Historic structures and cemeteries occur throughout the project area. Karst features, grading issues, streams, and wetlands are common, as well. As with many other projects, any improvement selected could involve trade-offs between the natural and the human environment.

4. Input from the Public Meeting

Rebecca Ramsey presented the results from mapping exercises and the survey distributed at the public meeting. Existing roadway problems and environmental features in the area were identified and included in the alternatives analysis. Suggested

alternatives from the public meeting were mapped and considered in a Level 1 corridor screening process. Results from the survey identified sharp curves, large trucks, no passing opportunities, and narrow shoulders as issues with the existing KY 163 alignment. Homes and farmlands were most frequently identified as sensitive areas to be considered.

5. Purpose and Need

One of the most important parts of the study is to establish the purpose and need for the proposed project. This helps to determine what should be done and helps evaluate to see how well any proposed alternative solution meets the purpose. Based on the existing conditions data and public input, the project team developed a project purpose and need statement. Carl Dixon summarized the purpose and need: to improve safety and mobility within Edmonton, Metcalfe County, and the region. Perhaps the biggest issue is that all traffic must now go through the 4-way stop at the KY 163-US 68 intersection in downtown Edmonton, which already has some inherent safety and operational problems. Other goals were also developed which the project should try to achieve, although they are not the primary purpose. These include:

- Improving connections between highways;
- Fixing the geometric deficiencies;
- Helping move trucks through Edmonton;
- Improving access to goods and services within Edmonton; and
- Helping the economy.

6. Initial Alternatives

Carl Dixon explained the initial alternatives and screening process: with these project goals in mind, initial alternatives were developed. Corridors were drawn on a map to get from point A (at KY 90) to somewhere along the parkway going east of the city, through the city, around the city, west of the city, and far west of the city. Alternatives considered using the existing interchange or a number of potential new interchanges nearby. The screening process evaluated how well each alternative performed compared to one another in addressing the project purpose and avoiding negative environmental issues. Based on this, several alternatives were removed. Routes far west of Edmonton don't impact local traffic and would take a larger amount of farmlands; A2B was retained for Level 2 screening to provide a comparison point. Bypass routes within Edmonton east of the existing alignment were dismissed due to known archeological sites and stream impacts. The far eastern alternatives were associated with low elevations and would have potential flooding concerns; less traffic would use these routes. A route along the existing alignment (A5D) was included to demonstrate the extent of impacts to downtown development.

7. Final Alternatives

Carl Dixon presented the remaining Level 2 Alternatives following this screening process. There are 6 corridors, 1 interchange only option, spot improvements, plus a no build scenario. Routes on the existing alignment have greater impacts on community resources, whereas routes off the existing alignment have greater impacts on environmental resources. Jeff Moore explained the color and naming conventions used on the alternatives maps.

Bruce Siria reviewed the larger context of the project. KY 163 is part of a larger connection between I-40 in Tennessee and the future I-66 corridor to I-65 in Kentucky. This project could run a straight line from KY 90 to the existing interchange and totally bypass Edmonton, but that wouldn't address any of Edmonton's local problems. This study is designed to help the local transportation network in Edmonton, specifically addressing problems reported at the KY 163-US 68 intersection downtown. Since there is no practical way to redo this intersection where it stands, other alternatives look at removing traffic from it or changing the flow characteristics by adding an interchange to the north.

Examining the potential alternatives, the local officials in attendance made the following comments:

- An interchange at D would provide direct access to the industrial park.
- Reconstructing KY 163 in Metcalfe County may divert trucks from KY 90 trying to reach the parkway via Glasgow. Carl Dixon pointed out that these volumes are difficult to anticipate.
- The work on KY 163 in Monroe County has already increased traffic and trucks on KY 163 in Metcalfe County.
- Trucks coming off the parkway at the existing interchange will turn the wrong way and have to try turn around. The Dripping Springs Church parking lot catches a lot of these turns and is in bad condition because of it. Bruce Siria explained that this may be due in part to the toll ramp configuration.
- A crash study on KY 1243 is underway; this area will be affected by a new interchange on US 68 if this alternative is selected.
- Alternative A2B is likely to meet with more public opposition and doesn't look like it will meet Edmonton's needs.
- Alternative A2D seems like a good fit; the Interchange at D should be a priority.

8. Spot Improvements

Rebecca Ramsey presented the spot improvements. Ten spots were identified, as shown on the display maps. Associated costs and crash histories were presented for each location.

9. Cost Estimates

Carl Dixon presented cost estimates for each of the build alternatives. Costs range from \$13 million for the interchange only to \$45 million for the longer distance builds. These costs include only construction, right-of-way and utilities will significantly affect these values. It assumes a two lane section, with three lane portions for truck climbing lanes or turning lanes where needed.

Bruce Siria put these values in perspective. Although the costs sound really high, they are feasible for highway projects. Lower cost projects do have an advantage though. Jeff Moore explained that any recommendations which come out of this study will be broken into separate projects and put in the Six Year Plan. Currently, the US 68 interchange project is on the unscheduled projects list. This study will help expand on the concept and advance the project(s) to the Six Year Plan to be scheduled with funding. From here, the next phase would be design, followed by right-of-way

acquisition, utility relocations, and eventually construction. Without any delays, this process would take 8 years or more.

10. Public Meeting

A public meeting is scheduled for May 17th, 2007 from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the Metcalfe County High School cafeteria. A slide presentation will be made around 4:30 to allow people time to come in. With an open house format, it is not necessary to get there at 4:00 or stay until 7:00. There will be displays, maps to draw on, and one-on-one discussion as well.

The local officials were invited to review and complete the attached survey. A set of exhibits will be left at the courthouse after the public meeting, along with some blank surveys, for anyone who could not make it to the public meeting.

With no further questions, the meeting adjourned at about 11:45 a.m.

AGENDA
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)
KY 163 Alternatives Study, Metcalfe County
KY 90 to Nunn Parkway
KYTC Item No. 3-129.00

April 26, 2007
Metcalfe County Judicial Center
Edmonton, Kentucky

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC |
| 3. Existing Conditions Overview | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Traffic | |
| b. Safety | |
| c. Geometry | |
| d. Environmental | |
| 4. Input from Public Meeting and Survey | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 5. Purpose and Need | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 6. Initial Alternatives | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 7. Final Alternatives | |
| a. Environmental Overview | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| b. Geotechnical Issues | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| c. Cultural Resources | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| d. Environmental Justice Concerns | Barren River ADD |
| 8. Spot Improvements | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 9. Cost Estimates | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 10. Public Meeting: May 17, 2007 | KYTC |
| a. Advertisement | |
| b. Meeting Agenda | |
| c. Alternatives Survey | |
| 11. Next Steps | KYTC |
| 12. Q & A | Group Discussion |
| 13. Adjourn | KYTC |

MINUTES

Stakeholders Meeting

Alternatives Study to Relocate/Reconstruct KY 163 from KY 90 to Nunn Parkway Metcalf County Item 3-129.00

Judicial Center
Edmonton, Kentucky
April 26, 2007
1:30 PM

A stakeholders meeting for the KY 163 Alternatives Study in Metcalfe County was held at 1:30 p.m. CDT on Thursday, April 26, 2007, in Edmonton, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to present an update of the study information and the alternatives development. A copy of the agenda is attached. Participants in the meeting came from the cities of Edmonton and Glasgow, the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD), the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 3 Office, and the consultant firm, Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA). Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Harold Stilts	City of Edmonton
Austin Bragg	City of Edmonton
Captain Travis	Glasgow Police Department
Amy Scott	Barren River ADD
Bruce Siria	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Jeff Moore	KYTC District 3
Misti Wilson	KYTC District 3
Carl Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Ramsey	Wilbur Smith Associates

A summary of the key components and discussion items for this meeting is provided below, following the agenda outline.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Jeff Moore began the meeting, welcoming the participants and providing an opportunity for everyone present to introduce themselves.

2. Purpose

Jeff Moore briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting: to show the local officials what the project team has been developing and to seek their input. Over the last months, the project team has been looking at possible improvements to KY 163 between KY 90 and the Nunn Parkway. In November and December, the first round of meetings with the community provided initial input for the project team. Since then, potential alternatives have been developed and the project team would like to get feedback from community members about each of them.

3. Existing Conditions

Carl Dixon reviewed the steps WSA has taken over the past months. Preliminary data was assembled for presentation at the first round of meetings. From input received at these meetings and more detailed data collected about the study area, WSA identified existing problems with the roadways and created alternatives to address these. The strategy was to think of all possible alternatives to be sure the best solution was available for selection.

Rebecca Ramsey presented the existing conditions data. Planners looked at traffic, safety, and geometric data to help identify what the problems are along KY163 today. Capacity analysis based on existing traffic volumes shows levels B and C throughout the project area. Volumes for the year 2030 indicate some delay will occur and level of service in Edmonton around the KY 163/US 68 intersection to unacceptable levels. Even though it does not show up in the analysis, reported traffic problems at the KY 163 intersection with US 68 were taken into account as well.

Concentrations of crashes occur along US 68-KY 80 between the parkway and KY 861 and at the two primary intersections within Edmonton: KY 163 with US 68 and US 68 with KY 80. Based on the as-built plans for KY 163, geometric deficiencies based on today's design standards were identified. Narrow lanes, narrow shoulders, sharp curves, poor passing sight distance, and steep hills are the primary concerns, spanning the length of the roadway and making it difficult to improve KY 163 by only fixing portions of the roadway.

4. Input from the Public Meeting

Rebecca Ramsey presented the results from mapping exercises and the survey distributed at the public meeting. Existing roadway problems and environmental features in the area were identified and included in the alternatives analysis. Suggested alternatives from the public meeting were mapped and considered in a Level 1 corridor screening process. Results from the survey identified sharp curves, large trucks, no passing opportunities, and narrow shoulders as issues with the existing KY 163 alignment. Homes and farmlands were most frequently identified as sensitive areas to be considered.

5. Purpose and Need

One of the most important parts of the study is to establish the purpose and need for the proposed project. This helps to determine what should be done and helps evaluate to see how well any proposed alternative solution meets the purpose. Based on the existing conditions data and public input, the project team developed a project purpose and need statement. Carl Dixon summarized the purpose and need: to improve safety and mobility within Edmonton, Metcalfe County, and the region. Perhaps the biggest issue is that all traffic must now go through the 4-way stop at the KY 163-US 68 intersection in downtown Edmonton, which already has some inherent safety and operational problems. Other goals were also developed which the project should try to achieve, although they are not the primary purpose. These include:

- Improving connections between highways;
- Fixing the geometric deficiencies;
- Helping move trucks through Edmonton;
- Improving access to goods and services within Edmonton; and

- Helping the economy.

6. Initial Alternatives

Carl Dixon explained the initial alternatives and screening process: with these project goals in mind, initial alternatives were developed. Corridors were drawn on a map to get from point A (at KY 90) to somewhere along the parkway going east of the city, through the city, around the city, west of the city, and far west of the city. Alternatives considered using the existing interchange or a number of potential new interchanges nearby. The screening process evaluated how well each alternative performed compared to one another in addressing the project purpose and avoiding negative environmental issues. Based on this, several alternatives were removed. Routes far west of Edmonton don't impact local traffic and would take a larger amount of farmlands; A2B was retained for Level 2 screening to provide a comparison point. Bypass routes within Edmonton east of the existing alignment were dismissed due to known archeological sites and stream impacts. The far eastern alternatives were associated with low elevations and would have potential flooding concerns; less traffic would use these routes.

7. Final Alternatives

Carl Dixon presented the remaining Level 2 Alternatives following this screening process. There are 6 corridors, 1 interchange only option, spot improvements, plus a no build scenario. Routes on the existing alignment have greater impacts on community resources, whereas routes off the existing alignment have greater impacts on environmental resources.

Similar to the Level 1 process, these corridors were compared against each other to see which would best meet Edmonton's needs with the fewest negative impacts. At this point, WSA has identified potential issues within each of the corridor sections. Next, public input is needed to determine which issues are more important locally and what the community would like to see happen. After selecting one or two recommended corridors, an actual alignment within the corridor would be developed, avoiding as many impacts as possible.

Some of the issues within the project area include historic structures (e.g., rack sided barns which are unique to this area of the state), National Register Historic Places, cemeteries, streams, the industrial parks, prime farmland, and an Agricultural District.

Amy Scott gave an overview of the environmental justice data available. The Barren River ADD used census data to look at minority, elderly, and low income populations for each segment of the suggestion alternatives. Within Edmonton, there was a larger concentration of each of these groups, due in part to mobile home parks and a nursing home. From an environmental justice viewpoint, alternatives A2B and D have the fewest impacts on populations. Jeff Moore explained that these statistics are used not just to avoid negative impacts, but to identify special populations that could be helped.

8. Spot Improvements

Rebecca Ramsey presented the spot improvements. Ten spots were identified, as shown on the display maps. Associated costs and crash histories were presented for the locations.

Improvements at the KY 163-US 68 intersection were investigated but it is difficult to make improvements without losing the buildings on three of the four corners. Various signal studies have been undertaken in the past, but having a four-way stop control improves safety and actually helps the truck flow.

9. Cost Estimates

Rebecca Ramsey presented cost estimates for each of the build alternatives. Costs range from \$13 million for the interchange only to \$45 million for the longer distance builds. The total cost for all spot improvements is \$17 million. These costs include only construction, but right-of-way and utilities could significantly affect these values. It assumes a two lane section, with three lane portions in heavy turning areas.

Jeff Moore explained how the projects will be staged. Any recommendations from this study will be divided into smaller projects and built in sections. He went over an example of how this process might look for an alternative. Carl Dixon added that the spots would be prioritized as well.

The stakeholders expressed concern about the value of public input. Members of the project team affirmed that no solution has been selected or preferred. Public input was used to develop the initial alternatives. The concept of a second interchange for Edmonton came from community input; it was not something the project team was looking at initially. Additional input is going to be necessary to help determine which alternative moves forward to be recommended as a result of the study.

Meeting participants discussed the alternatives. A2B will have the most impacts to farmlands and higher construction costs but would be easy to construct. It remained in the Level 2 Corridors to provide a comparison point for the other alternatives; stakeholders anticipate a negative reaction from the public to this alternative. The alternatives on the east side of Edmonton did not pass the Level 1 screening because there was an increased likelihood to encounter archaeological artifacts and a concern about the floodplain. However, this area has fewer utilities to relocate. The Interchange at D option is difficult to distinguish as an option since it does not appear as a separate item on the displays; this will be addressed for the public meeting. Alternatives with an interchange at D help the emergency services to respond, making it unnecessary for responders to wait in traffic at the KY 163-US 68 intersection twice. It would also help reduce traffic volumes and remove a portion of the cattle trailers accessing the stockyard from downtown.

10. Public Meeting

A public meeting is scheduled for May 17th, 2007 from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. at the Metcalfe County High School cafeteria. A presentation of this data will be made around 4:30 to allow people time to come in. With an open house format, it is not necessary to get there at 4:00 or stay until 7:00. There will be displays, maps to draw on, and one-on-one discussion as well. The stakeholders were asked to review and complete the attached survey. A set of exhibits will be left at the courthouse after the public meeting, along with some blank surveys, for anyone who could not make it to the public meeting.

11. Next Steps

This study should be finished by October for inclusion into the KYTC six year planning process. Recommendations will enter this process for funding and scheduling, moving through design, right-of-way, utility, and construction phases in a minimum of 8 years.

In the next phase, the recommended corridor would be narrowed down to a single alignment. This involves a deeper level of detail to identify issues and impacts.

The stakeholders expressed a concern that the interchange at D should be a top priority. Its benefits to Edmonton should be more clearly explained at the public meeting. There is a Statewide Planning meeting scheduled for Monday afternoon at the judge's office for district staff to determine local priorities.

With no further questions, the meeting adjourned at about 2:45 p.m.

AGENDA
Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC)
KY 163 Alternatives Study, Metcalfe County
KY 90 to Nunn Parkway
KYTC Item No. 3-129.00

April 26, 2007
Metcalfe County Judicial Center
Edmonton, Kentucky

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC |
| 3. Existing Conditions Overview | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Traffic | |
| b. Safety | |
| c. Geometry | |
| d. Environmental | |
| 4. Input from Public Meeting and Survey | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 5. Purpose and Need | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 6. Initial Alternatives | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 7. Final Alternatives | |
| a. Environmental Overview | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| b. Geotechnical Issues | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| c. Cultural Resources | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| d. Environmental Justice Concerns | Barren River ADD |
| 8. Spot Improvements | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 9. Cost Estimates | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| 10. Public Meeting: May 17, 2007 | KYTC |
| a. Advertisement | |
| b. Meeting Agenda | |
| c. Alternatives Survey | |
| 11. Next Steps | KYTC |
| 12. Q & A | Group Discussion |
| 13. Adjourn | KYTC |

Public Involvement Meeting

**KY 163 Corridor Alternatives Study
Metcalfe County
Item No. 3-129.00
Metcalfe County High School
Edmonton, Kentucky
May 17, 2007 – 4:00–7:00 p.m.**

A public involvement open house meeting was held on Thursday, May 17, 2007, from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at Metcalfe County High School in Edmonton, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to communicate the study process with attendees and receive feedback about the developed build alternatives from community members. The following Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC), Area Development District (ADD), and consultant staff were in attendance:

Amy Scott	Barren River Area Development District
Steve James	KYTC, District 3
Jeff Moore	KYTC, District 3
Andy Stewart	KYTC, District 3
Deneatra Hack	KYTC, District 3
Misti Wilson	KYTC, District 3
Keirsten Jaggars	KYTC, District 3
Bruce Siria	KYTC Central Office, Division of Planning
Thomas Witt	KYTC Central Office, Division of Planning
Carl D. Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Ramsey	Wilbur Smith Associates
Virginia Goodman	Third Rock Consultants

The public involvement meeting was arranged in auditorium style with several informational display boards located in one area of the meeting area. KYTC, ADD, and consultant staff were available to provide information, answer questions, and discuss issues. As attendees entered the meeting room, they were invited to participate in the following areas:

- **Sign-In and Survey**

Upon arrival, attendees were greeted at the door and asked to sign the attendance list. At this station, attendees were given a survey questionnaire with attached maps, and a postage paid envelope to return the questionnaire. Attendees were encouraged to view a slide presentation prior to walking through the project exhibits.

- **KY 163 Alternatives Study Presentation**

A PowerPoint slide presentation was given at approximately 4:30 p.m. to provide information on the current KY 163 Alternatives Study. The presentation included information on the existing roadway conditions, public input received at the December meeting, the project purpose, the alternatives development and evaluation phases, the initial and final proposed corridor alternatives, and proposed spot improvements on KY 163, US 68, and KY 80. This

slide show was played continuously during the public involvement session, with a seating area provided nearby for viewers.

- Exhibit Boards

A section of the room was set up with a semi-circular arrangement of project exhibits, including the following displays:

- Summary of December Public Involvement Survey and Meeting Responses (2 exhibits)
- 2006 and 2030 Traffic Volumes and LOS
- Crash History and Analysis
- Geometric Deficiencies
- Environmental Resources and Issues (5 exhibits)
- Project Purpose and Need
- Level 1 Alternative Corridors Map
- Level 1 Screening Matrix
- Level 2 Corridor Alternative Map (showing all corridor alternatives)
- Level 2 Corridor Alternatives Maps (displayed individually with traffic projections)
- Level 2 Screening Matrix
- Spot Improvements Map
- Spot Improvements Data Table (including cost of each spot improvement)
- Cost Estimates for All Build Alternatives

Attendees were invited to view the project exhibits and discuss any questions or concerns with KYTC, ADD, and/or consultant staff. Comments and concerns made during the meeting could also be recorded on one of the flip charts in this area of the room or drawn directly onto the display boards.

- Map Drawing Exercise

Three tables were set up with two exhibits showing the seven potential build corridors for attendees to draw on or write comments, one with all alternatives together on an environmental footprint aerial map and one showing a map of each alternative to clarify the location. Markers were provided for attendees to identify any concerns or sensitive areas.

- Survey Area

Tables were available to attendees to fill out their survey form and read over the project materials.

A total of 40 persons registered their attendance at the three-hour public session (this number includes the staff members listed above).

Comments received during the session verified previously input regarding opposition to impacts to homes and farmlands. Suggestions for spot improvement modifications were also given. Additional comments were anticipated through the public comment surveys, which were distributed at the meeting to be returned during the meeting or by mail to KYTC within two weeks after the meeting. Seven (7) questionnaires were returned at the meeting, and several attendees took surveys and envelopes to return later. Additional surveys and copies of the corridor alternatives and spot improvements maps were to be left at the court house to provide additional opportunities for involvement. Once all of the questionnaires are received by KYTC, these comments will also be included in the official meeting record.

The meeting closed at 7:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Project Team Meeting

Alternatives Study to Relocate/Reconstruct KY 163 from KY 90 to Nunn Parkway Metcalf County Item 3-129.00

KYTC District 3 Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
July 13, 2007
10:00 AM CDT

A project team meeting for the KY 163 Alternatives Study in Metcalfe County was held at 10 a.m. CDT on Friday, July 13, 2007, in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to review the input received during the second round of community involvement meetings, present the final evaluation and cost estimates for recommended alternatives, and discuss the final study recommendations. The meeting agenda is attached.

Participants in the meeting came from the Barren River Area Development District (BRADD), the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) Central and District 3 Offices, and Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA). Meeting attendees included the following:

Amy Scott	BRADD, Regional Transportation Planner
Steve Ross	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Boday Borres	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Keirsten Jagers	KYTC District 3, Public Information Officer
Jeff Moore	KYTC District 3, Planning
Misti Wilson	KYTC District 3, Planning
Steve James	KYTC District 3, Preconstruction
Andy Stewart	KYTC District 3, Design
Scott Pedigo	KYTC District 3, Traffic
Carl D. Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rebecca Ramsey	Wilbur Smith Associates

A summary of the key discussion items for this meeting is provided below.

1. Welcome and Introduction

Jeff Moore began the meeting by welcoming the participants and asking the project team members to introduce themselves.

2. Purpose

Jeff Moore briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting: to review public input received during the second public involvement session and discuss final study recommendations.

3. Review of Alternatives

To frame the upcoming recommendations discussion, Carl Dixon briefly outlined the study process leading up to this meeting. He reviewed the project purpose and need and the debate accompanying this issue: whether the KY 163 Alternatives study in Metcalfe County is intended as a regional connection to the future I-66 corridor or as a local route serving Edmonton. One overwhelming theme from the past discussion with the community is that Metcalfe County is a rural community and its population is committed to preserving this character.

Carl Dixon noted that the Cabinet already has plans to improve KY 163 south of KY 90 to Tompkinsville and KY 90 from KY 163 to Glasgow to meet regional transportation needs. This seems to be consistent with current and anticipated traffic demand, especially for trucks traveling between I-40 and the future I-66 (Louie B. Nunn Parkway) and on to I-65. Therefore, no overriding need appears to exist for improving all of KY 163 north of KY 90 as a major regional or statewide facility for trucks and other traffic.

Traffic conditions, crash history information, Level 1 Alternatives, and the Final (Level 2) Alternatives were presented as well.

4. Public Meeting Survey Results

Rebecca Ramsey gave an overview of the results of the public input survey completed in May/June 2007. Public votes favored Alternatives A2D and A4D; 73% of respondents preferred an alternative including a new interchange. The narrow bridges over Rogers Creek and Black Rock Creek along KY 163 were the favored spot improvements. The public opposition to home and farmland impacts encountered during the initial round of public input was also apparent during this phase; citizens prefer that new routes utilize existing alignments.

Rebecca Ramsey also presented a synopsis of the resource agency responses.

5. Study Recommendations

Carl Dixon explained WSA's preliminary recommendations to the project team.

- No Build – This alternative did not meet the project purpose and need and so this alternative was dismissed.
- A2B – Because of sizeable farmland impacts and low impacts on local traffic, this alternative was dismissed.
- A2D – Despite public preference, this alternative has major impacts to farmlands and the Agricultural District. It also increases mileage for the state to maintain and does not address the project purpose and need better than alternatives which have fewer farmland impacts or require fewer new miles of roadway. This alternative was dismissed.
- A2G – This route also has large farmland and Agricultural District impacts and only moderately addresses the project purpose and need; this alternative was dismissed.

- A5D – Cutting through the center of downtown Edmonton on the existing alignment, impacts to businesses and homes would be extensive for this alternative; it was dismissed.

He then presented the final major recommendations and the priorities assigned to them.

6. Project Priorities

The primary recommendation, based on public input and technical analysis, was an interchange at D (on US 68 north of Edmonton). Carl Dixon noted that the interchange would present some special design challenges, including the need to relocate some other roads in the immediate vicinity, especially KY 1243 north of the Parkway and the entrance to the Industrial Park on KY 3524 south of the Parkway. This project may require an Interchange Justification Study for FHWA approval since the Nunn Parkway is designated as a future interstate route. The cost for this project is about \$19 million, largely due to the relocation of the additional roads.

The new interchange would improve truck movements by removing the necessity for them to turn at the existing KY 163-US 68/KY 80 intersection. It also provides better access for both Industrial Parks and the Stockyard. It would also help any north-south truck traffic since they could go straight through town and not face the difficulty of turning onto US 68-KY 80 (Stockton Street).

Also recommended for future consideration was a new route within Edmonton west of the existing KY 163 alignment (4 to G). The total cost of the northern and southern sections of this connector is about \$11.5 million. If the IJS is not approved or funds are not available for the interchange, the Edmonton Bypass (4G) should move up as the primary recommendation.

WSA does not recommend reconstruction of the rural portion of the route south of Edmonton (A4). Instead, a number of spot improvements were recommended to correct additional deficiencies and safety issues at other places along the route. This seems to be consistent with input received from the public.

Rebecca Ramsey then presented the prioritized recommendations for the spot improvements.

The bridge widening projects received the highest public support, and these were assigned the top priority among the spot improvements. The bridge projects may be eligible for bridge replacement funding. Two options were discussed for the project limits of the realignment at Cedar Flats.

Two of the proposed spot improvements were not recommended at this time:

- Fixing the existing interchange ramps was not recommended at this time; future consideration as part of an I-66 Corridor upgrade may be warranted.
- Turn lanes into the Industrial park on US 68 would be included in the Interchange at D Alternative, so it should be dismissed; however, it could be resurrected as a stand-alone spot improvement if the interchange is not implemented.

Typical cross sections were presented for rural and urban segments.

7. Potential Issues

Some special issues were noted:

- Karst topography is common in the study area, especially at the northeastern project limits near the proposed new interchange.
- There are multiple historic structures which may require further investigation.
- The Agricultural District along the existing KY 163 alignment will require special procedures and possible mitigation if it is impacted.

8. Group Discussion

Steve James pointed out the high cost associated with the new interchange, noting that this seems like a large expense for a small, rural community that already has an interchange. The less expensive bypass option may help just as much for a lower cost. Due to resource constraints, it may be more realistic to make the bypass the first priority. This recommendation received approval from the project team.

In support of making the bypass as the primary recommendation, Carl Dixon mentioned that a gap currently exists in the development patterns around US 68-KY 80 which would be a good site for the bypass. Without planning and zoning, this gap may not be there if the KYTC waits for very long; moving forward with the bypass while relocation impacts would be minimal is advisable.

Carl Dixon also recommended that consideration be given to changing the official US 68 and KY 163 routing over the new northern and southern sections, respectively, of the new bypass/connector. Each route through downtown Edmonton could possibly be designated as a business route.

The project team agreed that the second interchange should still be considered as a priority, and it should be evaluated as part of any Future I-66 upgrades. It will be included on the Unscheduled Projects List at this point, which should address the public expectation.

The spot improvement on US 68-KY 80 was also discussed. It was decided that this project should tie into the existing widening project underway in the vicinity. (*The existing project extends from MP 7.0 – 7.7 on US 68.*)

A group consensus was reached that the final recommendations approved by the project team are as follows:

- The western bypass of Edmonton should be defined as Priorities 1A (north of US 68-KY 80) and 1B (south of US 68-KY 80), rather than Priorities 2 and 3.
- The Interchange at D would be dropped from Priority 1 to Priority 2.
- Spot improvements 1-9 should be completed in concert with Priorities 1A, 1B, and 2 (maps showing final spot improvement recommendations should show priority number rather than ID number):

- The right-turn lane at the existing industrial park on US 68 should be included if funding is not provided for the new US 68-Nunn Parkway interchange at D in the near future.
- The 3-lane section along US 68-KY 80 should be extended to meet the project limits of the existing widening project.
- The Cedar Flats improvement should be extended north to also address the intersection with C. Faulkner Road.
- The rural portions of KY 163 are not recommended for full reconstruction.

WSA will prepare and submit a draft report to KYTC by the end of July. After a 30-day period for KYTC review, the final report should be submitted in early September.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:05 AM CDT.

AGENDA
KYTC Project Team Meeting
KY 163 Alternatives Study
KY 90 to Louie B. Nunn (Cumberland) Parkway
Metcalf County
KYTC District 3 Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
July 13, 2007
10 a.m. CDT

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC |
| 3. Review of Alternatives | WSA |
| 4. Public Meeting Survey Results | WSA |
| 5. Study Recommendations | WSA |
| 6. Project Priorities | WSA |
| 7. Potential Issues | WSA |
| a. General Environmental | |
| b. Agricultural District | |
| c. Historic Structures | |
| d. Community Resources | |
| e. Environmental Justice | |
| 8. Group Discussion | KYTC |
| 9. Adjourn | KYTC |