

## 12.0 LEVEL 1 EVALUATION – INITIAL SCREENING

### 12.1 Level 1 Evaluation Summary

The following pages present the results of the Level 1 Initial Screening analysis. For the alternatives advanced to Level 2, a brief summary is given. However, for the alternatives set aside from further consideration in Level 1, a more in-depth discussion is provided to clearly illustrate the reasons for not pursuing those alternatives further. Refer to Table 21 (Appendix A) for a list of the preliminary alternatives and the corresponding ratings for each in the following five evaluation categories:

- *Implementation / Construction Feasibility*
- *Project Goals*
- *Community Impacts*
- *Environmental Impacts*
- *Public Support*

#### Alternative 1 – No-Build

The No-Build Alternative involves no new construction and is therefore rated GOOD for both *Implementation / Construction Feasibility* and *Environmental Impacts*. However, with regard to *Project Goals*, the No-Build Alternative is rated POOR. While the No-Build limits negative impacts, it offers no benefits to safety, traffic flow, highway geometry, and truck traffic conditions. In fact, the current traffic safety issues may intensify if traffic volumes grow. The No-Build is rated FAIR for *Community Impacts*. Again, it limits physical impacts to the community but it also offers no community benefits. It also does nothing to change the impact of truck traffic on the community. The initial meetings in the community and the first public meeting revealed moderate support for doing nothing, giving it a rating of FAIR for *Public Support*.

Although the No-Build Alternative may not improve the transportation system or address the transportation deficiencies identified in the study, it was carried forward to Level 2 (and throughout the study) both as a possible alternative, as well as to provide a baseline for comparing the potential build alternatives.

#### Alternative 2 – Spot Improvements

The spot improvements are rated GOOD for *Implementation / Construction Feasibility* because they require the least amount of new construction of any build alternative, minimizing cost and construction complexity. The spot improvements may achieve a number of project goals such as enhanced traffic flow and safety, improved geometry, and better truck traffic operations. However, they are not expected to provide the same traffic benefits as complete reconstruction of the highway or a new highway. They do leave traffic flowing through town, providing continued visibility for existing businesses on US 51. They are rated FAIR for *Project Goals*. The spot improvements may have minimal impacts on the community (both positive and negative), giving a rating of GOOD for *Community Impacts*. They are also unlikely to have significant negative

environmental impacts, yielding a GOOD rating for *Environmental Impacts*. Based on initial meetings in the community and on results from the first public meeting, the spot improvements had considerable support, with nearly a third of all comment form respondents supporting this alternative. It is rated GOOD for *Public Support*.

Alternative 2 (Spot Improvements) has the potential to achieve many project goals with minimal cost and impact. It also has local support. Therefore this alternative was recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 3 – Reconstruct US 51 as a Two-Lane Roadway with Center Two-Way Left Turn Lane**

Improving the existing highway is feasible, but may be complicated and costly, especially given the expected utility and right-of-way issues through town. It is rated POOR for *Implementation / Construction Feasibility*. Improving the current highway addresses many project goals including improved traffic flow, safety, and truck traffic operations. The benefits in these areas are expected to be greater for Alternative 3 than for Alternative 2. Visibility for existing businesses on US 51 is also maintained. Overall, it is rated GOOD for *Project Goals*. Alternative 3 is expected to support current businesses through continued visibility and enhance the aesthetics of the existing developed community. It may have some physical or right-of-way impacts on businesses and properties along US 51. Overall it is rated GOOD for *Community Impacts*. Improving the current highway may have minor impacts on the natural environment, and may potentially impact historic resources in a number of locations in town. However, these would be avoided or minimized to the greatest extent possible. Alternative 3 is rated FAIR for *Environmental Impacts*. There appears to be support for Alternative 3, with almost one-third of comment form respondents at the first public meeting supporting this alternative. It is rated GOOD for *Public Support*.

Alternative 3 is likely to achieve a number of the key project goals, while minimizing most negative community and environmental impacts. It also has local public support. Therefore this alternative was recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 4A – Western Bypass Option A**

Existing development (businesses and homes), the railroad, streams, utilities, and potential hazardous materials sites in the corridor may all make the implementation of Alternative 4A more difficult and expensive. However, keeping the corridor close to the railroad may minimize the impact to existing businesses, residents and development. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Implementation / Construction Feasibility*. A new western bypass along the railroad may meet the traffic related goals of the study by providing greater safety, and a more efficient route for both trucks and other vehicles. Alternative 4A shifts some traffic away from downtown, but will not bypass the business community near KY 780 north. As Alternative 4A is fairly close to downtown, there may be limited new land opened up for economic development opportunities. Overall, it is rated GOOD for *Project Goals*. While impacts to the community may be minimized through the use

of some existing public right-of-way, there may still be some minor impacts on businesses and residents including a potential environmental justice community located along the corridor. Economic concerns are minimized by the proximity of the bypass to downtown as well as the fact that the businesses near KY 780 north are not bypassed. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Community Impacts*. This alternative may have several potential areas of environmental impacts including streams, wetlands, floodplains, hazardous material sites, and possible impact to the Clinton Seminary Site (a potential historic structure) located on Dunlora Lane at West Jackson Street. As a result, Alternative 4A is rated POOR for *Environmental Impacts*. There has been moderate support for this alternative. Approximately one-fifth of comment form respondents at the first public meeting supported this alternative, indicating that it was favored by the public over the eastern bypass alternatives. It is rated GOOD for *Public Support*.

Alternative 4A is likely to achieve a number of the key project goals, limits impacts to existing businesses, and has a moderate level of local public support. Therefore Alternative 4A was recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 4B – Western Bypass Option B**

*Implementation / Construction Feasibility* - Alternative 4B may have many of the same construction and cost issues as Alternative 4A, but they are expected to be more severe since Alternative 4B runs through the town instead of following the railroad tracks. Constructing Alternative 4B may be difficult given the development that currently exists in town. Alternative 4B may require the acquisition of more privately owned, developed right-of-way than Alternative 4A. Traffic control, property access during construction, and utility relocations are also expected to be more problematic, with more disruptions to the local community. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Project Goals* - While Alternative 4B could improve traffic flow on the current US 51, it may not mitigate the effects of heavy trucks through town, because the trucks would continue through town on another street. Essentially Alternative 4B shifts the truck traffic, safety, and traffic issues to the west side of the town. Regarding local businesses and economic development, Alternative 4B may have benefits and drawbacks similar to Alternative 4A, however even less new land would be opened for development. Property impacts could be considered similar or even greater for Alternative 4B, with traffic impacts to properties along the street alignments to be used in town. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Community Impacts* - The construction of Alternative 4B may have minimal impacts to the businesses north of town along KY 1728 (Farmers Gin Road), but property impacts are likely when the roadway enters town. One of the most significant community impacts of Alternative 4B may be increased traffic on the existing streets used for the new bypass. Traffic increases along the predominantly residential streets could be detrimental to the community. There is also a potential impact to an environmental justice community on the west side of town. The highway would isolate part of the community by confining it between a major two-lane highway and the existing railroad

line. With regard to existing businesses, Alternative 4B may be fairly similar to Alternative 4A by maintaining US 51 near the existing downtown business, and not bypassing the new businesses south of town near KY 780 north. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Environmental Impacts* - There are several environmental issues to be expected with this alternative including impacts to streams, wetlands, floodplains, and potential hazardous materials sites. Alternative 4B may also result in cultural historic impacts including a potential impact to the Clinton Seminary site. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Public Support* - There has been moderate public support for an alternative in this area of town. At the initial public meeting, Alternative 4A (Western Bypass) was presented and received the support of approximately one-fifth of those who filled out public comment forms. It is not clear that all of these people would support Alternative 4B, which was a variation of Alternative 4A that came out of the meeting. However, it does show public support for a western bypass of some type and therefore, Alternative 4B is rated GOOD in the area of public support.

Alternative 4B might achieve some of the project goals, but it is expected to cause more harm than benefit to the community and environment. Specifically, it may have negative traffic, environmental, and community impacts that outweigh any project benefits. It also will leave the truck traffic going through town, simply on a new street. Therefore this alternative was NOT recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 5A – Near Eastern Bypass Option A**

Construction of Alternative 5A may be easier than for the previous alternatives because it is located on the eastern edge of town where there is less existing development. Overall, it is rated GOOD for *Implementation / Construction Feasibility*. Alternative 5A could improve safety, traffic flow and mobility in the area, including improved access between US 51 and KY 58 / KY 123 east of town. Also, it could mitigate the negative effects of truck traffic in town and decrease travel times because of higher posted speeds. It may draw traffic away from downtown and from the commercial center near KY 780 (north), but new land would be opened up for potential development. It is rated FAIR for *Project Goals*. Alternative 5A is the closest bypass on the eastern side of town without significant impact on the community. It avoids the more developed areas of the town thereby limiting residential and business property impacts and traffic increases on residential streets. Required new right-of-way will be taken from a combination of farmland, vacant land and some developed (residential) land. It may have an impact on downtown businesses, especially those that are dependent on pass-by traffic. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Community Impacts*. Alternative 5A crosses a floodplain, at least one stream, may impact a few small wetlands and runs through an area of potential maternity (summer) Indiana Bat habitat located between US 51 and KY 58. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Environmental Impacts*. There is some limited support for an eastern bypass near Clinton. (Approximately 7 percent of comment form respondents at the first public meeting favored Alternative 5.) Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Public Support*.

Alternative 5A is likely to achieve a number of the key project goals, especially in the area of improved safety and mobility. It is expected to have only moderate community and environmental impacts; however it may reduce traffic through town. It has a limited level of public support. Given the mix of positive and negative indicators for Alternative 5A it was recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 5B – Near Eastern Bypass Option B**

*Implementation / Construction Feasibility* - Alternative 5B constructs a bypass close to Clinton similar to Alternative 5A, but ties back into US 51 further to the north. Many of the expected implementation issues are therefore similar. The increased length could however increase the cost of the alternative and may lead to more potential impacts and complications. The longer corridor does not appear necessary or beneficial. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Project Goals* - Similar to Alternative 5A, Alternative 5B meets certain project goals through improved mobility, improved roadway geometry, enhanced safety, and by mitigating the impact of heavy truck traffic on the town (by transferring the traffic to the bypass). It also has the conflicting result of offering the potential for new development outside the town but reduced through traffic in the town. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Community Impacts* - The potential community impacts for Alternative 5B are similar to those for Alternative 5A with the exception that additional right-of-way may be required and therefore there may be more property acquisition (though the additional area in the north is sparsely developed). Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Environmental Impacts* - There are several potential environmental impacts with Alternative 5B. It has the same environmental issues in the south as Alternative 5A such as at least one floodplain, a stream crossing and the crossing of a potential Indiana Bat habitat area. In the northern extension it may cross one or two additional streams and is likely to have additional wetland impacts. It could also impact a potential historic site in the northern section. Overall, Alternative 5B could have more negative impacts than Alternative 5A and is therefore rated POOR.

*Public Support* - The limited public support for an Alternative 5 corridor was discussed for Alternative 5A. Approximately seven percent of comment form respondents were in favor of an Alternative 5 option. Therefore, it is rated FAIR in this category.

Alternative 5B may achieve some of the same benefits as Alternative 5A, but at a higher cost and with the potential for increased impacts. Therefore Alternative 5B was NOT recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 6A – Far Eastern Bypass Option A**

Alternative 6A may be the easiest alternative to construct of those discussed thus far because the corridor is through undeveloped land on the far eastern side of Clinton. It is however, the longest proposed route and therefore costs may increase for this alternative. Substantial right-of-way acquisition may be necessary, likely requiring the most acreage of any of the alternatives. Overall, it is rated GOOD for *Implementation / Construction Feasibility*. The alternative achieves some key project goals, including improved safety, mobility, connectivity to KY 58 and KY 123, and efficiency for through traffic in the corridor. Heavy truck traffic could also be diverted to the bypass. Because it is the longest bypass, travel time could be longer than for Alternatives 5A and 5B. The highway would be constructed through crop/pasture land, with the potential for opening new areas to economic development. However, the land is distant from the current town center and the other main areas of economic activity, and may divert traffic away from town thereby impacting economic development downtown. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Project Goals*. Most of the required right-of-way is crop/pasture land, with minimal impact to other businesses and residences. However, the economic development and indirect business impacts are a concern. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Community Impacts*. Minimal impacts to the natural environment are expected since this alternative follows an eastern ridgeline, but it does cross the eastern edge of a potential maternity (summer) Indiana Bat habitat and it may have scattered wetland impacts. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Environmental Impacts*. There has been very limited public support for this alternative (approximately five percent of comment form respondents supported this alternative). It is rated FAIR for *Public Support*.

Alternative 6A is likely to achieve certain project goals such as mobility and safety, but with an uncertain cost. Other goals such as economic development are mixed and/or uncertain. Given the uncertainty, Alternative 6A was recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 6B – Far Eastern Bypass Option B**

*Implementation / Construction Feasibility* - This alternative may have many of the same construction and cost issues as Alternative 6A. It is slightly shorter than Alternative 6A because it rejoins US 51 closer to town. Therefore, the required right-of-way and construction costs might be less, but they are unlikely to be significantly less. More importantly, the terrain for the southern end of Alternative 6B (crossing two streams and some low areas) is not as good as that for Alternative 6A, which follows the ridgeline. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Project Goals* - Alternative 6B is very similar to Alternative 6A in how it meets or does not meet the various project goals including traffic flow, safety, truck traffic mitigation, and economic development. One difference is that the geometry for Alternative 6B is not as good as the geometry for Alternative 6A at the southern end. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Community Impacts* - The community impacts for Alternative 6B are essentially the same as those discussed for Alternative 6A above. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Environmental Impacts* - There are several impacts to the natural environment associated with Alternative 6B. While Alternative 6A crosses the eastern edge of the potential maternity (summer) Indiana Bat habitat, Alternative 6B would go directly through this area. Furthermore, Alternative 6B diverges from Alternative 6A in the south and crosses two streams and some low areas before rejoining US 51. Overall, it is rated as POOR.

*Public Support* - Again, as was stated for Alternative 6A, there is very limited support for an Alternative 6 option, with approximately five percent of the comment form respondents indicating support for the Alternative 6 corridor. Based on this response, the alternative is rated as FAIR.

Alternative 6B has many similarities to Alternative 6A, but it is likely to have more impacts with similar or even less benefit. Therefore Alternative 6B was NOT recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 7 – Bypass Immediately East of Town**

*Implementation / Construction Feasibility* - The construction of Alternative 7 could be quite complicated due to the encroachment on developed land. The impact on homes, schools and possibly churches could be high since this alternative goes through residential neighborhoods on the eastern side of town. Because this alternative goes through town, right-of-way costs, utility costs, maintenance of traffic costs, and connections back to the existing street system may all increase the total cost of the alternative. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Project Goals* - Alternative 7 meets some project goals, but not others. It may improve safety and mobility, but it leaves truck traffic on the edge of town, impacting homes and schools along the route. It does not adequately satisfy the goals of preserving downtown business, minimizing property takings, or improving regional connections. Alternative 7 would go through residential neighborhoods on the eastern side of town, impacting these residents with regard to property loss, construction impacts and traffic impacts. While through traffic remains close to town, it may reduce the visibility of downtown businesses. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Community Impacts* - There are several community impacts associated with Alternative 7 including right-of-way acquisition required in the developed area of Clinton. Significant portions of right-of-way may come from existing residential areas, including some property acquisitions. The corridor passes by a number of homes and two schools. This means that through traffic including the heavy truck traffic may pass directly by those homes and schools. It is the shortest of the eastern bypass alternatives, thereby keeping traffic close to downtown. The new highway would reroute through traffic to the bypass, reducing drive-by traffic for downtown businesses.

Furthermore, because of its proximity to downtown and developed areas, it may not open new land for economic development. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Environmental Impacts* - There are potential impacts to the natural environment associated with Alternative 7 including potential impacts to wetlands, streams, and a floodplain area. In addition, the alternative follows the western edge of an area of potential maternity (summer) Indiana Bat habitat. Furthermore, the alternative may impact a historic site located near KY 123. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Public Support* - Public support for Alternative 7 is expected to be minimal. A member of the public raised Alternative 7 as an option at the first public meeting, but few if any others have expressed subsequent support for it. (Based on the comment form responses, approximately a third of the respondents were opposed to the construction of a bypass around Clinton.) Of the respondents that supported a bypass, the majority were in favor of a western bypass. Overall, Alternative 7 is rated POOR.

Alternative 7 is unlikely to meet many of the project goals, is expected to have significant impacts, and is not supported by the public. The residential and school impacts in particular are significant. Therefore this alternative was NOT recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 8A – One-Way Street System Using Existing Streets**

This alternative could be difficult to construct as the new US 51 southbound uses existing local roads, which are not designed for an increased traffic load. It may have significant property acquisition and utility issues, as well as maintenance of traffic and access issues. Retaining walls and significant grading may also be required in the vicinity of the courthouse. The cost and amount of construction could be less for this alternative than for alternatives that involve constructing a new highway, but there may still be construction difficulties with all of the improvements occurring downtown. Overall, it is rated POOR for *Implementation / Construction Feasibility*. This alternative may meet some of the projects goals, including improved through traffic flow and improved geometry for truck turning movements, but may not improve delays or noise associated with heavy truck traffic since trucks would remain in town. While downtown businesses could be preserved, visibility would be split for northbound and southbound traffic. With regard to safety, one-way streets can improve safety by decreasing conflict points for vehicles and pedestrians and by improving lines of sight<sup>4</sup>. However, safety could be decreased if drivers become impatient and use the wrong one-way street to reduce travel time. Furthermore, drivers may be inclined to drive faster on the one-way streets. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Project Goals*. This alternative may impact the greatest number of properties of all the alternatives (including a potential environmental justice community), through a combination of property acquisition, traffic impacts, noise impacts, and other impacts. In particular the residential areas located along the

---

<sup>4</sup> There are some researchers that contend that one-way streets are less safe for pedestrians. (*Downtown Streets – Are We Strangling Ourselves on One-Way Networks?*, Walker, Kulash and McHugh, TRB Circular E-C109: Urban Street Symposium, F-2/p.10) December 2000.

southbound route (Jefferson Street and Moss Drive) could be impacted by the change from a quiet, low volume street to a moderately busy main street. It provides increased business visibility along Jefferson Street and a decline in visibility along the current US 51 through town. Overall, it is rated POOR for *Community Impacts*. There are minimal environmental impacts; therefore it is rated GOOD for *Environmental Impacts*. There is moderately strong public support associated with this alternative, with over one-fifth of the survey respondents supporting a one-way alternative of some kind. Overall, it is rated GOOD for *Public Support*.

Alternative 8A is likely to achieve a number of the key project goals, while minimizing environmental impacts. It offers improved traffic flow but may have some negative safety issues. It has mixed results in terms of cost and community impacts but it has moderately strong local public support. Alternative 8A was recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 8B – One-Way Street System Using Mainly New Highways**

*Implementation / Construction Feasibility* - The construction of this alternative could require the acquisition of new right-of-way similar to that required for Alternative 4A to construct a new US 51 southbound-only highway. Alternative 8B is therefore similar in nature for implementation and construction to Alternative 4A. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Project Goals* - This alternative may meet some of the project goals including improved traffic flow, but it does not completely address the impacts of heavy truck traffic, as half of that traffic will still use the current US 51 through Clinton. However, the geometry could be improved for truck traffic in both directions. In terms of mobility, improvements are made in terms of travel speed but this may be restricted due to the one-way nature of the system. The proposed north and south streets are also too far removed from each other, being many blocks away at certain points, and sometimes without good connections between the two streets. This may cause reduced mobility and frustration on the part of many drivers, especially given the low traffic volumes during most of the day. It may also cause cut through traffic on other local streets. (This is a difference from Alternative 8A where the streets are parallel and only one block away.) By building a new roadway similar to Alternative 4A, the southbound traffic is removed farther from the northbound traffic, decreasing the visibility and ease of access to downtown businesses, but providing visibility to those businesses located along the southbound route. With regard to safety, this alternative is similar to Alternative 8A; meaning that safety could be increased through less potential conflict points, but decreased by potential misuse of the one-way streets. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Community Impacts* - The community impacts associated with Alternative 8B are similar to those for Alternative 4A. This includes the potential for environmental justice impacts. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Environmental Impacts* - There are some impacts to the natural environment related to this alternative including possible impacts to hazardous materials sites, streams, wetlands, and the floodplain. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Public Support* - Based on public comments and the public meeting comments forms, it appears that there is moderately strong public support for this alternative. Overall, it is rated GOOD.

Alternative 8B is likely to achieve some of the project goals, but it may not achieve others. It is also expected to have significant negative environmental impacts. Furthermore, while the alternative may have local public support, it is anticipated to function poorly and both confuse and frustrate many drivers. Alternative 8B was NOT recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 8C – One-Way Street System Using a Combination of Existing and New Streets**

*Implementation / Construction Feasibility* - The construction of this alternative may be difficult because the corridor encroaches upon the developed areas of Clinton and in some cases may traverse through city blocks. Impacts to properties, property access, and utilities may be issues with this alternative. It has many similarities with Alternative 4B. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Project Goals* - This alternative may meet some project goals (similar to Alternatives 8A and 8B) such as improved geometry for truck traffic turning movements, and preserving the visibility of downtown business. However, it may not fully address the issues of mitigating the negative effects of truck traffic on US 51, or certain community issues such as property impacts and property access. Similar to Alternatives 8A and 8B, safety and mobility are also issues for this alternative since safety is increased with the possibility of fewer conflict points, but decreased though the possible misuse of one-way streets and higher speeds. The corridor of the one-way street pairs is also somewhat similar to Alternative 8B in that they are too far removed from each other and do not provide good connection points in some locations. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Community Impacts* - Alternative 8C is similar to Alternative 4B with regard to community impacts. Impacts include the acquisition of additional right-of-way in the downtown area and possible bisection of city blocks. Similar to the previous two alternatives, this alternative would split the downtown business visibility between two main streets, thereby enhancing the businesses along the southbound route, and detracting from the businesses along the northbound route. Also, this alternative has the potential for impact to an environmental justice community. Overall, it is rated POOR.

*Environmental Impacts* - The environmental impacts associated with this alternative are similar to those for Alternative 4B and include stream impacts, crossings of areas

designated as wetlands or floodplains, and minor potential for impacts to historic or hazardous material sites. Overall, it is rated FAIR.

*Public Support* - As discussed previously, there is public support for a one-way alternative. Overall, it is rated GOOD.

Alternative 8C has the potential to achieve some project goals, and there is public support for a one-way alternative. However, Alternative 8C is expected to function similar to Alternative 8B and may negatively impact traffic flow and safety instead of providing improvements. Therefore Alternative 8C was NOT recommended for further study in Level 2.

### **Alternative 9 – Western Bypass (West of Railroad)**

Alternative 9 is the longest of the proposed western routes, and could lead to more construction and higher construction costs because of the length. Roadway construction may be less complicated than for many of the other alternatives since the corridor goes through undeveloped crop/pasture land, but it does cross the railroad twice, thereby requiring the construction of two railroad overpass bridges. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Implementation / Construction Feasibility*. Alternative 9 could enhance vehicular safety, mobility, and traffic flow and provide an alternate route to remove heavy truck traffic from the town. It may decrease visibility for the downtown businesses but would not bypass the commercial area just south of Clinton. New areas of land may be opened for potential economic development. Also, depending on the corridor of the bypass, there is the potential for good connections to KY 58 and KY 123 on the western side of Clinton. Overall, it is rated GOOD for *Project Goals*. The community impacts related to Alternative 9 include a potential decline in downtown business if economic development shifts to the new bypass. With regard to property impacts, this alternative may have a minimal impact since most of the land that this alternative would cross is crop/pasture land. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Community Impacts*. There is the potential for impact to known wetlands, floodplains, streams, a possible maternity (summer) Indiana Bat habitat and a potential historic site near KY 123 and KY 1037. Overall, it is rated FAIR for *Environmental Impacts*. Based on comment forms received at the first public meeting, approximately one fourth of the respondents support a bypass with approximately 80% of those respondents in favor of a western bypass. Therefore it is rated GOOD for *Public Support*.

Alternative 9 has the potential to achieve several key project goals. Impacts to the community and the environment may be modest. While the cost may be higher than for some other alternatives, this is offset by fewer impacts. Therefore this alternative was recommended for further study in Level 2.

## **12.2 Level 1 Analysis Summary**

Of the fourteen (14) initial alternatives, eight (8) were recommended for further study in Level 2. These included Alternatives 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5A, 6A, 8A, and 9. It was recommended that the six (6) remaining alternatives (4B, 5B, 6B, 7, 8B, and 8C) be removed from further consideration. The reasons for discarding these six alternatives

included anticipated issues with implementation and construction costs, potential for significant negative community and environmental impacts, minimal expected benefit (including not meeting key project goals), and a lack of local support. Also, some alternatives were set aside from further consideration because a similar alternative in a pair had more advantages and / or fewer disadvantages.