

MINUTES
Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting
KY 32 –Rowan and Elliott Counties - KYTC Item # 9-192.00
Laurel George Cultural Heritage Center – Sandy Hook, Kentucky
June 6, 2008

The second of two early Local Officials/Stakeholders Meetings for the KY 32 Alternatives Study in Rowan and Elliott counties was held at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, June 6, 2008, at the Laurel George Cultural Heritage Center in Sandy Hook, Kentucky. The purpose of this initial meeting was to present information and get input on the project purpose and history, the scope of work, preliminary data and analysis, project issues, and public input strategies. Attendees included:

Rocky Adkins	State Representative
David Blair	Elliott County Judge Executive
Barry Stevens	Elliott County, Deputy Judge Executive
Brian Dillon	Elliott County, Magistrate
Gwenda Adkins	Elliott County, Extension Agent
John C. Williams	Superintendent, Elliott Co. Board of Education
Billy J Montgomery	Sandy Hook, City Council
Judy Stern	Sandy Hook Water District
Kevin Winkleman	Sandy Hook Water District
John M. Clevenger	Sandy Hook, Resident
Kyle Clevenger	Grayson RECC
Beverly Faulkner	Grayson Lake State Park
Alex Ford	Little Sandy Correctional Complex
Paul Holbrook	Little Sandy Correctional Complex
Kay Harris	Laurel George Cultural Heritage Center
Flora Whitley	Laurel George Cultural Heritage Center
Rick Pelfrey	Mountain Telephone
Allen Gillum	Mountain Telephone
Dale Kemper	Resident
Ted Withrow	KY Division of Water
Russell Brannon	FIVCO ADD
Brent Wells	KYTC District 9, Planning
Rachel Catchings	KYTC District 9, Design
Allen Blair	KYTC District 9, Public Information
David Martin	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Thomas Witt	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Carl Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Amanda Spencer	Wilbur Smith Associates

A summary of the key components and discussion items for this meeting is provided below, which follows the agenda outline (attached).

1. Welcome and Introduction

Thomas Witt convened the meeting at approximately 2:00 p.m., welcoming all participants and asking for formal introductions.

2. Purpose of Meeting

Thomas Witt indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss a planning study of KY 32 in Rowan and Elliott Counties from KY 504 in Elliottville to KY 7 in Newfoundland. He explained that Wilbur Smith Associates had been retained as the consultant for this project and introduced Carl Dixon to lead the discussion, using a PowerPoint presentation.

3. Project History

Regarding the history of the project, Carl Dixon explained that funds for improvements to KY 32 were included in the last Six Year Highway Plan and are currently included in the 2008 Recommended Six Year Highway Plan. He explained that design funds are currently programmed for Year 2010, Right of Way and Utilities for year 2012, and Construction for Year 2014. He asked if Representative Adkins would like to add anything. Representative Adkins mentioned that the process could be sped up if design goes well. He also added that construction costs will increase. Last, he shared that state transportation funds are limited, but options may be available in the future, such as bond issues, to move projects forward.

One attendee asked if the improvement would be two lanes. Carl answered that this would be determined as part of the study, but was unknown at this point.

The attendee then asked if the improvement being studied was part of the proposed KY 645 corridor. Representative Adkins responded that the KY 32 project is entirely separate and was intended to improve access into and out of the county and safety along KY 32. He went on to say that the KY 645 project cost was estimated as \$400 million dollars, if it were built. He said that state funds are limited and construction costs have increased considerably, so building the KY 645 project could be difficult.

An attendee remarked that between 6 a.m. and 8 a.m., as well as 4 p.m. and 6 p.m., a four-lane KY 32 might be needed between Newfoundland and Elliottville to carry the heavy traffic volumes.

Another attendee remarked that the improvement is needed for the Little Sandy Correctional Complex and MSU employees.

4. Scope of Work

Carl reviewed the tasks in the Wilbur Smith Associate scope of work, referencing a summary handout provided to attendees. This includes public involvement activities, analyzing existing conditions, conducting an environmental overview, development of alternatives, evaluation of alternatives, and recommendations. He stressed the importance of defining the project purpose since this would guide all future decisions for the project. He explained that the basic KY 32 "build" alternatives would probably include reconstruction of the roadway along the existing alignment, relocation of KY 32 on new alignment, and spot improvements at key problem areas along the existing roadway.

Carl mentioned that a public meeting will be held in late July. He said that another round of local meetings will be held after the alternatives are developed

to get input from local officials, stakeholders, and the public, which would probably be sometime in the November 2008 to January 2009 timeframe. Carl said that the study would be completed in approximately one year.

5. Preliminary Data/Exhibits

Amanda Spencer presented an overview of the preliminary data and exhibits, including the following:

- Adequacy Rating Map;
- Highway Crash Map
- Existing ADT and LOS Map;
- Future ADT and LOS Map; and
- Environmental Footprint Map.

Attendees were provided with a copy of each of the maps referenced.

Some of the major information and data related to KY 32 are as follows:

- Rural Major Collector
- Speed Limit 55 mph
- Geometrics
 - Two 10 foot lanes, 2 to 4 foot shoulders (Rowan County)
 - Two 9 foot lanes, 2 foot shoulders (Elliott County)
- Adequacy Rating Percentile
 - 11.9 - 42.7 (Rowan County)
 - 14.9 (Elliott County)
- Existing Traffic: Carries 470 to 3,670 Vehicles per Day
- Future Traffic: Projected to Carry 730 to 3,730 vehicles per day by Year 2030 with No Improvements
- Crash History: March 04-December 07
 - 48 crashes (1 fatal crash, 15 injury crashes)
 - 2 "high crash spots" (Elliott County)

Based on the adequacy ratings, Amanda noted that KY 32 is rated as poor, primarily because of safety issues. She also noted that there were two high crash locations located along KY 32 in Elliott County.

6. Project Issues

Carl Dixon began the group discussion of project issues by summarizing those identified to date, as follows:

- Safety
- Roadway Geometrics
- Travel Time
- Access to Morehead and Lexington
- Access to Little Sandy Correctional Complex
- Tourism and Recreation Access
- Truck Traffic
- Motorcyclists

He also noted that the study team needs input from the attendees on the following:

- Project Goals – What is the Problem?
- Problem Locations
- Environmental and Cultural Resources
- Community Impacts, including Environmental Justice
- Economics
- Utilities
- Engineering Issues

Carl then asked for input from attendees. Key reasons for the project made by attendees during the discussion include:

- Many Morehead State University employees use KY 32
 - Improve for employee safety
- Many Little Sandy Correctional Complex employees use KY 32
 - Improve for employee, visitor, inmate transfer, and vendor safety
 - Inclement weather of particular concern
- Once KY 519 (currently under construction) is completed, people will use it - some are already using KY 519 along with KY 7 and KY 801
- Elliott County has a strong workforce
 - Many employees use KY 32 to get to the interstate and to Lexington
- You cannot get industry without roads
- Improvements to KY 32 would save lives (due to travel time savings to hospitals)
- Many people travel in RVs from I-64 to the area
- Maintain the scenic vistas
- Provide for bicycle transportation to improve the health of area residents and visitors
 - Consider health issues in all decisions
- Consider incorporating lighting, bike accommodations, and other amenities as is done in other scenic areas
- There are numerous sensitive environmental resources in the study area
- The road should be improved in such a way as to support the local goal of achieving Scenic Byway status for KY 32
- Balance the need to improve access and safety with the need to protect and enhance environmental and scenic resources
- There are dangerous working conditions along KY 32 for utility workers – no place to pull off and park vehicles

Carl then led the discussion on the sensitive environmental and community resources. He stated that the goal is to avoid those resources. Where that is not possible, Carl explained that minimization and/or mitigation efforts would be made. He mentioned that cemeteries, churches, historic properties, farmlands and farm ponds stand out as important and sensitive resources.

Carl then introduced Ted Withrow with the Kentucky Division of Water to start the discussion of sensitive environmental resources, noting that Mr. Withrow had contacted the Cabinet prior to the meeting and asked to speak. Key points from his presentation are as follows:

- Big Caney and Laurel Creeks are very special
 - Represent two of only twenty water bodies with “cold water”, “exceptional”, and “reference reach” designations
 - Sensitive to any disturbance
 - Well known for trout
- Kentucky Heritage Land Council is in the process of buying large tracts of Laurel Gorge for preservation
- Elliott County is the third fastest growing county for tourism in Kentucky
 - Agricultural tourism and Eco-Tourism
 - Locally driven
- Efforts should be made to make KY 32 a Scenic Byway
 - Any road construction should have as little impact as possible on the rural character of the roadway
 - The road should have tourist pull-offs and signs that highlight the special environmental resources and cultural background of the area and explain the road’s special features
 - Elliott County should be included as a tourist destination
 - KY 32 could be a showcase for what can be done, when proper planning is accomplished in a holistic manner
 - This would protect rare natural resources for future generations

Carl Dixon then asked for further input on sensitive environmental and community resources.

One attendee mentioned the remarkable trout fishing in the area north of KY 32 near KY 649.

Another attendee expressed concern over bringing too much traffic through Sandy Hook, noting that widening could not be done through town.

It was noted that previous attempts to install and maintain a traffic light had been undone by vandalism. One attendee remarked that not having a traffic light is an attraction to many tourists because it represents a lost small town atmosphere.

7. Public Involvement

Carl asked for input on public meeting locations. The new performing arts center at Sandy Hook Elementary was suggested. It was also suggested that the first public meeting be held in Rowan County and the second be held in Elliott County. Another attendee mentioned having both rounds of public meetings out of either county, in, for example, West Liberty.

8. Q. & A.

With no further questions, Carl asked attendees to complete a survey form. Three attendees returned their forms at the meeting. The form included the KYTC address so attendees could mail the completed forms later. Once the survey forms are received, they will be summarized and included as part of the project records.

The meeting was adjourned at about 4:00 p.m.



AGENDA
Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting
KY 32 Alternatives Study, Rowan and Elliott Counties
KYTC Item No. 9-192.00
Elliott County – Laurel Gorge Heritage Center
June 6, 2008 2:00 PM

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC |
| 3. Project History | KYTC/WSA |
| a. Origin | |
| b. Purpose | |
| c. Group Discussion | |
| 4. Scope of Work | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Tasks | |
| b. Responsible Parties | |
| c. Schedule | |
| 5. Preliminary Data/Exhibits | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Study Area | |
| b. Geometry | |
| c. Adequacy Ratings | |
| d. Existing and Future ADT and LOS | |
| e. Highway Crashes | |
| f. Environmental Footprint | |
| 6. Project Issues | Group Discussion |
| a. Project Purpose/Goals | |
| b. Local Issues | |
| i. Environmental | |
| ii. Community | |
| c. Environmental Justice | |
| 7. Public Involvement | Group Discussion |
| a. Local Officials/Stakeholders Meetings | |
| i. Meeting 1: Early Input | |
| ii. Meeting 2: Presentation of Alternatives | |
| b. Public Meetings | |
| i. Purpose and Format | |
| ii. Location and Time | |
| c. Public Involvement Tasks and Schedule | |
| 8. Q & A | Group Discussion |