

Minutes

Citizen's Advisory Committee - Meeting #4

US 25 – Item No. 8515.00

US25/25E/25W – KY 1006

Meeting Location: Laurel County Judge Executive's Conference Room

Meeting Date: April 26th, 2013

- 1) Introduction: The meeting began at 1:30 pm. Mr. Gregory welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for attending. The following individuals attended the meeting:

Jessica Blankenship	Cumberland Valley ADD
Delford McKnight	Tourism
JL Lewis	HDI
Maiko Hoshino	Aisin Automotive Casting
Larry Corum	London-Corbin Airport
David Westerfield	Laurel County Judge Executive
Rick Brown	Laurel County Fiscal Court
Willard McBurney	City of Corbin Mayor
Roy Caudill	Citizen Representative
Joseph Mosley	KYTC-District 11
David Fields	KYTC-District 11
Jonathan Dobson	KYTC-District 11
Dean Croft	KYTC-District 11
Erika Smith	KYTC-District 11
Phillip Howard	KYTC-District 11
Charles Pennington	LLCIDA
Paula Thompson	LLCIDA
Mitch Green	HMB Professional Engineers
Rob Dowler	HMB Professional Engineers
Doug McDaniel	Municipal Engineering Co.
Randy Gnau	Municipal Engineering Co.
Brad Gregory	Municipal Engineering Co.

Several meeting attendees did not sign the meeting attendance list. Each member of the group introduced themselves and told who they were representing.

Mr. Gregory outlined the goals for the meeting:

- a) Brief project history
 - b) Recap the project goals and objectives
 - c) Present the alternate designs that have been developed
 - d) Present a comparison summary of the alternates
 - e) Establish the remaining steps in the project
- 2) Mr. Gregory briefly described project limits, upcoming milestones for the project, and where we are in the process.
 - 3) The overall project goals and objectives identified in previous meetings and from public comments were presented once again as a reminder of the things we want to accomplish with this project. The "Purpose

and Need” statement generated from these goals was presented to the group, “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 emergency alternative route during incidents or closures of I-75”. The Committee was reminded to keep these objectives forefront in their mind as the proposed alternates were presented.

- 4) Mr. Gregory then discussed various issues relating to each of the specific goals and objectives stated above relating to increasing capacity, increasing safety, and providing an emergency alternative to closures on I-75.
- 5) In order to increase capacity, the total number of lanes will need to be increased, an unobstructed connection between London and Corbin will need to be established, delay is to be minimized by increasing the free-flow speed, and the number of vehicles stopped in the roadway waiting to turn needs to be reduced. Several of the alternate lane configurations that were developed in the previous Citizen Advisory Committee meetings were presented and discussed.
- 6) To stress the need to increase safety along the corridor, Mr. Gregory presented several media excerpts from recent stories about crashes along the route. Most group members were familiar with the crashes. Mr. Gregory noted that since his involvement with the project, there has been at least one major crash along the route each month resulting in a fatality or major injury that was reported by the media. Mr. Fields noted the updated crash statistics were 73 crashes, 62 injuries and 2 fatalities since May 30th, 2012. The consensus of the group was that we could not move fast enough to prevent more deaths along the route.
- 7) Mr. Gregory presented the various ways the Group suggested to increase safety such as separating the traffic using a divided highway, decreasing the number of stopped and turning motorist by using auxiliary turn lanes, and reducing the number of access points. The group also noted that speed and the existing intersection configurations were significant contributors to safety in the area. Mr. Gregory presented several specific models that had been presented to the Committee in past meetings about consolidating and combining entrances.
- 8) Mr. Gregory noted that many of the safety and traffic issues coincide with the need for an emergency I-75 alternative. The intent with the I-75 traffic is to move them through our project as efficiently and safely as possible. Several Project Team members relayed that they have heard several comments from members of the community about this being the only reason for the widening of US 25. Mr. Gregory and the KYTC staff dispelled this rumor and reiterated the safety and capacity issues that are evident along the route and the Committee agreed.
- 9) Next Mr. Gregory presented the main ideas and conclusions based on the previous meetings that the Committee developed as a result of the information they had been given. These conclusions were the basis for the development of alternatives the Project Design Team used during preliminary design. The following is a summary of those conclusions:
 - a. Even though they did not prefer to use a five lane with two way left turn lane configuration, the group felt we needed to use this as a basis of comparison to the four lane depressed median template. This five lane template represented the narrowest template that we would consider for this route and the four lane is only 13 feet wider on each side. This would stand as a useful tool to explain the impacts to adjacent property when presenting the alignment to the public.
 - b. The five lane template is limited to a 45 mph design and that does not agree with the overall project goals and the four lane achieves the traffic separation desired.
 - c. The four lane section helps restrict future access to the new roadway.

- d. A cross country alternate needs to be investigated where possible in an effort to improve certain geometric sections, be less intrusive on adjacent parcels, and give the Team a chance to use “Partial Access Control” to establish new access locations that are safer than having to accommodate so many existing access points. This cross country alternate would also enhance at least a portion of the corridor for bicycle traffic by reducing traffic along the existing US 25 and would provide more capacity by adding a new roadway and leaving the old one in place.
- 10) Mr. Gregory then displayed each of the alternates that have been developed for the project in Google Earth. This display included the lane lines, shoulders, construction limits and right of way limits. Also included were the existing right of way and property lines. Several items were discussed by the Committee during the presentation of alternates.
 - 11) One gentleman expressed concern over the placement of the interchange alternates. His question was why we had not chosen to locate the interchange to the east of the existing intersection. Mr. Gregory responded that the location had been looked at early in the project however the grade differences between the adjacent area and US 25E would mean that US 25 would have to be tunneled under US 25E thus creating several issues. Also it was noted that the existing grade difference between the current proposed interchange location and US 25E develops the grade separation needed for a bridge over US 25E. This is also the currently least developed quadrant of the intersection.
 - 12) One participant, a representative of a Home Health agency located along the northern section of existing US 25, stated that she was concerned about the amount of traffic using KY 1189 to access KY 229 from US 25. She stated that many of her employees use this route and asked why the Team had not looked at relocating the roadway on the east side of the existing and creating a tie to existing KY 229 near the KY 1189 corridor. The District personnel responded that the idea was outside the scope of this project and that many of the concerns about the KY 1189 intersections and KY 229 will be corrected or eliminated when this US 25 project is complete.
 - 13) Overall, the Committee had very few questions about the specific location of the improvements and seemed to be relatively supportive of the project.
 - 14) After presenting the graphics of each of the alternatives, Mr. Gregory presented a summary of the vital statistics for the various alternates. The most significant items on the summary were the reduction of the number of access points along the corridor. Along the existing roadway in the interchange area, the number of entrances and intersections was reduced from 30 to 10. In the middle section of the project from Campground Road to Roaden Lane, the number of access points is reduced from 141 to 57 left or right accesses for the five lane alternative and 13 left/right and 33 right only for the four lane. In the northern section from Roaden lane to KY 1006, the number of access points is reduced from 132 to 51 left/rights for the five lane, 12 left/rights and 37 right only’s for the four lane, and 14 left/rights and 2 right only’s for the Fariston cross country alternate.

The summary also included the number of parcels, types of buildings that are impacted, and the total proposed right of way associate with each alternate. The number of parcels, total right of way, and number of buildings taken is nearly the same for the four and five lane alternatives. The exception is the Fariston cross country alternate. The total right of way required for this alternate was roughly double the amount needed along the existing for the four and five lane alternates, however this right of way is primarily vacant farm land and wooded areas compared to the developed right of way along the existing US 25. In addition, the Fariston alternate requires the taking of roughly half the number of residential buildings and one third the number of commercial buildings as compared to either alternate along existing US 25.

The Group was very receptive to the reduction in the number of impacted residences and commercial buildings along the Fariston Cross country alternative.

- 15) Mr. Gregory then presented the Project Life Cycle shown in previous meetings that explains the life of a highway design project and updated our current location in the cycle. We are now approximately 3-5 years from being able to begin construction on some portion of the project.
- 16) The next steps for the project is to conduct a Public meeting where basically this same information will be presented to the public. This meeting will be held in the evening at a location along the project, most likely Hunter Hills Elementary School. Several advertising methods were discussed and Mr. Gregory appealed to the Committee to try and attend the meeting to help facilitate the general public in understanding the project issues. Mr. Gregory also expressed that he and the KYTC staff are available to meet with anyone on an individual basis to discuss particular concerns over the project.

Other future steps such as promoting the project and the development of a formal access management plan were outlined briefly also.

Mr. Gregory thanked those in attendance and invited anyone that would like to discuss the project to meet with him after the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 pm.