**Minutes**

**Citizen’s Advisory Committee - Meeting #1**

**US 25 – Item No. 8515.00**

**US25/25E/25W – KY 1006**

**Meeting Location: Laurel County Judge Executive’s Conference Room**

**Meeting Date: December 20, 2011**

1. Introduction: The meeting began at 1:00 pm. Mr. Gregory introduced himself and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The following individuals attended the meeting:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Judge David Westerfield | Laurel County Fiscal Court |
| Mayor Troy Rudder | City of London Representative |
| Simon Mortimer | AISIN Factory Representative |
| Lesli Gill | Cumberland Valley Area Develop. Dist. |
| James Hacker | Emergency Responders |
| Charles Pennington | London - Laurel Industrial Dev. Authority |
| Glen & Billie Chaney | Local Residents/ Chaney Lumber |
| Deanna Herrmann | London - Laurel Chamber of Com. |
| Chris Robinson | London Downtown Group |
| Carol Kirby | Department of Parks (Levi Jackson) |
| Larry Corum | Airport Board |
| Joseph Mosley | KYTC-District 11 |
| David Fields | KYTC-District 11 |
| Jonathan Dobson | KYTC-District 11 |
| Dean Croft | KYTC-District 11 |
| Randall Thomas | HMB Professional Engineers |
| Rob Dowler | HMB Professional Engineers |
| Randy Gnau | Municipal Engineering Co. |
| Brad Gregory | Municipal Engineering Co. |

All those in attendance introduced themselves to the rest of the group and Mr. Gregory outlined the goals for the meeting:

1. Introduction of the Committee
2. Project Background
3. Briefly Explain the Highway Design Process
4. Identify the Committee’s Role in the Project
5. 2006 Scoping Study – Mr. Gregory briefly described the study prepared by KYTC and the main categories of evaluation in the study: Highway Geometries, Facility Type (Urban/Rural), Crash History, Traffic Levels, Resource Agency Coordination, Environmental Concerns.

Established the main purpose of the Scoping Study is to set goals for future phases of the project and to identify needs along the route.

1. A summary of the crash history data from the 2006 Study was presented to the Committee. This data was for a period from 1/1/01 to 12/31/2005. The KYTC personnel indicated that some small spot improvements have been completed along the route with very little impact on crashes. It was noted in the presentation that a high percentage of the crashes are rear-end. There was some discussion as to the relationship between this type of crash to managing access along the corridor.
2. The “Purpose and Need” statement from the 2006 study was presented: “The primary goals of this project are to address highway capacity and growth needs in Laurel County, improve safety by providing an improved route that complies with current design standards, and provide an alternative route during incidents or closures on I-75.”
3. The Priority 4 & 5 Improvement Recommendations from the 2006 Study were outlined.
4. Expand US 25 between US25E & KY1006 (Levi Jackson Rd.)
5. Develop an access management plan
6. Coordinate future project phases with London and Laurel County
7. Establish an Advisory Team

Mr. Mosley briefly explained the current adjoining project near London that this project will tie to. He also touched on the recent Public Meeting for that project.

1. A 2007 Preliminary Engineering Study prepared by KYTC District 11 for the US25/25E/25W intersection was discussed. This study evaluated several proposed conventional intersection modifications, however these modifications did not appear to have any significant reduction of delay to the travelling public. Therefore, the KYTC decided to add the investigation of potentially using a grade separated interchange at this location to this Project. The feasibility of an interchange will be one of the issues the Committee will be investigating.
2. A map outlining the project limits for this preliminary engineering phase was shown to the group.
3. A diagram was presented to the group outlining the project development process from the identification of the needs of a community through the preliminary engineering and environmental process to the detailed plan preparation, right of way acquisition, and ultimately construction.

This slide outlines the fact that the overall project development process typically can take 8-10 years until construction begins.

1. Role of the Citizens Advisory Group (C.A.G.) – Mr. Gregory outlined the critical role of the CAG.
2. The CAC needs to be a conduit for information to and from the Community and the design group.
3. The Design Team needs the relationships of the members of the group to the Community to help solicit information about the existing conditions and issues along the corridor.
4. Help dispel rumors about the project. The CAG can help us let the Community know that we have not already designed the project and we truly are trying to get their input prior to the development of the design of the roadway.
5. Help maintain funding for the project. The CAG can use their relationships with their State Lawmakers to maintain funding for the development of future phases of the project. Mr Gregory explained that it is not uncommon for a project of this size to only have funds appropriated for the early phases. Typically, as the project develops, the scope of the future phases can be better defined and funded accordingly.
6. The overall flow of the public involvement for the project was outlined to the Group. Mr. Gregory explained that six Citizens Advisory Group meetings are anticipated. Each of these meetings will be either in preparation for a larger public meeting or a summary meeting from a public meeting.
7. The first public meeting will be held in February. These meetings are open format (public come and go as they please), usually last 2 hours, and will be held in the evening at a location along the project.
8. The exact layout of the meeting has not been decided yet. However, there will not be a formal presentation.
9. The goal of the first public meeting is to gather as much existing information about the corridor as we can. We want to know about things such as old gas tanks, unmarked cemeteries, sensitive environmental areas, crash concerns, and anything else the Community can think of as important. Our goal is to stimulate them to think of as many issues as we can.
10. Mr. Gregory outlined the Project Team’s desire to have the members of the CAG present at the first public meeting. The Project Team feels that we will gather much more useful data about the existing corridor from the public if we have the CAG present. Since the members of the CAG are known by the Community, they will be more approachable at the meeting and thus help facilitate the collection of information.
11. The members of the CAG will be identified at the meeting with a name badge stating what agency they are there representing and that they are a member of the CAG for this project.
12. CAG members will not have to answer technical questions, just help facilitate the collection of information.
13. The Project Team will hold a coordination meeting for the entire group (CAG, KYTC, Consultant Personnel) a couple hours prior to the start of the Public Meeting. This will allow the CAG members an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the project and the overall goals of the first meeting.
14. Project Schedule and Funding
15. Current funding is for the Preliminary Design Phase.
16. Preliminary Engineering is to be completed Fall 2013
17. A public Hearing Summer 2013
18. Environmental Document Approval – Winter 2014
19. Detailed engineering and construction plan preparation begins

The Project Team acknowledged that this is a very aggressive schedule when compared historically with other projects of this scale from around the State. However, the Project Team hopes with the continued involvement of the Citizen’s Advisory Group, this project will be successful and maintain on track.

1. Mr. Gregory closed the meeting with a word of thanks for all the participants and indicated that written minutes of the meeting will be sent to the CAG members for their review. Mr. Gregory also indicated that the majority of the communication with the CAG will be with email and that if anyone prefers another method, let him know.
2. The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:30 pm.