

Appendix F: Project Team Meetings

Contents:

November 9, 2012 Kick-off Meeting Summary

February 25, 2013 Project Team Meeting #2 Summary

May 10, 2013 Project Team Meeting #3 Summary

August 19, 2013 Project Team Meeting #4 Summary

MINUTES
Project Team Meeting
KY 1931 – Jefferson County – Item 5-480.00
KYTC District 5 Office
Louisville, Kentucky
November 9, 2012
1:30 PM

A project team meeting for the KY 1931 Planning Study in Jefferson County was held at 1:30 p.m. EST on Friday, November 9, in Louisville, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the project purpose and history, the scope of work, the preliminary data collected, relevant project issues, and public input strategies. Participants in the meeting represented the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 5 and Central Offices, Louisville Metro, KIPDA and the consultant firm, CDM Smith. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Keith Downs	KYTC, District 5 Design
Tala Quinio	KYTC, District 5 Design
Brian Meade	KYTC, District 5 Design
Cindy Craft	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Carl Jenkins	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
A.J. Peake	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Andrea Clifford	KYTC, District 5 PIO
Judi Hickerson	KYTC, District 5 Planning
Tom Hall	KYTC, District 5 Planning
Jeff Schaefer	KYTC, District 5 Environmental
Ron Geveden	KYTC, Right-of-Way
Chuck Allen	KYTC, Design
Troy Hearn	KYTC, Bike/Ped Coordinator
Keith Damron	KYTC, Planning
Lynn Soporowski	KYTC, Planning
Amy Thomas	KYTC, Planning
Rolf Eisinger	Louisville Metro
Paula Wahl	Louisville Metro
Andy Rush	KIPDA
Lori Kelsey	KIPDA
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Amanda Spencer	CDM Smith
Len Harper	CDM Smith

A summary of the key discussion items and decisions from this meeting are provided below, following the agenda outline. A copy of the meeting materials, including the agenda, is attached.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Keith Downs, KYTC Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees and asking for formal introductions from all.

2. Purpose of the Project

Keith briefly outlined the purpose of the project and explained the work of two previous related studies, the I-264/Manslick Road Interchange Feasibility Study (December 2007) and the 3rd Street Road/St. Andrews Church Road Area Transportation Study (September 2008). He noted each study recommended a different typical section for the corridor and would like for this study to reconcile the differences.

3. Purpose of the Meeting

Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the project schedule, preliminary existing conditions findings, and plan for next steps.

4. Project Approach/Schedule

Referencing the project schedule, Brad shared that KIPDA's Andy Rush has begun traffic forecasting work. Also, CDM Smith has begun existing conditions work and will soon start collecting information for the environmental overview.

He also explained that this kick off meeting was one of four meetings of the project team and explained the schedule and purpose of each of the stakeholder, local official, and public meetings to be held for the project. The team agreed that additional focused meetings related to Parks, Transit, or Environmental Justice, for example, may be necessary. Groups could include Southwest Dream Team and TARC among others.

Andrea Clifford clarified that public meetings must be advertised 7 and 15 days in advance. The group discussed using all available resources to advertise meetings, such as KYTC, Metro, and KIPDA's websites and other social media outlets.

5. Study Area

The group agreed that the project termini are Dixie Highway and I-264. However, it is logical to extend the northern termini to Crums Lane for mapping and analysis purposes. There was some discussion of previous studies. Brad explained that the half diamond interchange concept for I-264 and KY 1931 is not the focus of this study, but will be considered in the analysis. Alternatives will be analyzed with and without the interchange.

6. Project Considerations/Issues

CDM Smith provided photographs of potential project issues (see handout) and the group had open discussion about these and other project issues, as follows:

- The group agreed that KY 1931 is fully built out. It was noted, there is limited new development along the corridor and limited opportunities for additional growth. The modeling being conducted by KIPDA will help to evaluate unmet demand, which is anticipated. Preliminary modeling results show an increase in traffic along the corridor when additional capacity is provided.
- CDM Smith will analyze available classification counts to derive the best estimate of truck traffic. Aerial photography suggests a bus storage lot exists in the southern portion of the study area. It was noted truck percents sometimes do not include buses. This should be reviewed and addressed as truck percents are developed for the corridor.
- Keith Damron asked that the data year(s) be placed on Volume to Service Flow, Adequacy, and similar maps provided.

- There were two crashes that resulted in a fatality in the study area between 2008 and 2012. CDM Smith will look at these to determine the cause and, if appropriate, potential fix.
- The group agreed that options should be adequately examined before presentation to the public. Given limited right-of-way, typical section options may be very limited. This should relate to both the number of lanes and bike/pedestrian accommodation.
- KYTC advised CDM Smith of an ongoing corridor study of Dixie Highway. CDM Smith will obtain and review the Draft Report for relevancy.
- Louisville Metro's Rolf Eisinger shared that KY 1931 is one of Louisville's priority bike corridors. He expressed its importance to the proposed "Louisville Loop" and making connections to strategic parks including Iroquois Park. There was some discussion of typical section options to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians. A "cycle path" and "cycle track" were discussed. AASHTO's bike facility guidebook was referenced.
- Louisville Metro's Paula Wahl asked what level of design would be provided in the recommendations. It was noted that an effort to bridge the gap between planning and design would be taken. The focus will be in the 2D environment providing a preliminary understanding of impacts on right-of-way; however, CDM Smith Design Engineers will try to anticipate some of the additional impacts that may occur due to change in vertical terrain. It was noted As-Built files are available for KY 1931 and LOJIC right-of-way data could also be obtained and referenced.
- Louisville has been designated a pedestrian safety focus city by FHWA. Rolf stated that Metro could help by providing bike and pedestrian crashes along the corridor.
- When considering pedestrian accommodation, the ADA Transition Plan should be referenced and recommendations from the plan need to be incorporated into the recommendations for this study.
- KIPDA's Lori Kelsey informed the group that KIPDA MPO staff, not the ADD staff, would provide the environmental justice (EJ) document for this study. She noted this has typically been the protocol for projects in the metro area. It was recommended this analysis begin immediately. Lori also offered to assist in identifying resources to better connect with and engage the disadvantaged populations. This can also help to better integrate the EJ process with the overall project.
- The Project Team will develop both short term spot improvements and long-term improvements. In addition to the No-Build, widening to three, four or five lanes will be considered. These alternatives will be considered with and without the interchange. Other alternatives may be developed as the project progresses. CDM Smith will work with the Project Team to prioritize both the short term spot improvements and long-term improvements.
- KYTC will work with CDM Smith to develop Construction, ROW, and Utility Cost estimates for the proposed alternatives. The methodology will likely incorporate per mile cost estimates from similar projects.
- Amy Thomas was noted as the Central Office point of contact for this project. Mikael Pelfrey and Steve Ross are additional resources if Amy is not available.
- Tom Hall noted the traffic summary and preliminary forecast results did not appear to include all new traffic data gathered, including ramp counts at I-264/Dixie Highway and I-264/Taylor Boulevard. CDM Smith will work with KIPDA and KYTC to determine which counts are not included and update the information accordingly.

7. Next Steps

Referencing the project schedule again, Brad explained that the next steps were to complete the existing conditions analysis and the environmental overview. Maps showing results will be distributed to the team via email for review and comment.

CDM Smith will also begin preparing for the first round of public involvement. It was agreed that the first public meeting would be an open house. The advertisements will note that no formal presentation will be given. Materials will need to be developed in December for team review and comment. These may include both handout materials detailing the existing conditions and preliminary analysis and a questionnaire. In addition to providing the questionnaire at the public meeting, consideration should be given to distributing online using Survey Monkey. Brad will work with Keith to develop a list of potential dates for the meeting with local officials and stakeholders and the public meeting. The meeting is recommended for mid January and Tuesdays and Thursdays are preferred.

8. Q&A

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned around 3:50 EST.

MINUTES
Project Team Meeting #2
KY 1931 – Jefferson County – Item 5-480.00
KYTC District 5 Office
Louisville, Kentucky
February 25, 2013
1:00 PM EST

A project team meeting for the KY 1931 Planning Study in Jefferson County was held at 1:00 p.m. EST on Monday, February 25th in Louisville, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the stakeholder/public input, draft purpose and need, alternative development, and next steps. Participants in the meeting represented the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 5 and Central Offices, KIPDA and the consultant firm, CDM Smith. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Keith Downs	KYTC, District 5 Design
Matt Bullock	KYTC, District 5
Tala Quinio	KYTC, District 5 Design
Bradley Hill	KYTC, District 5 Right-of-Way
Cindy Craft	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Andrea Clifford	KYTC, District 5 PIO
Tom Hall	KYTC, District 5 Planning
Jeff Schaefer	KYTC, District 5 Environmental
Ron Geveden	KYTC, Right-of-Way
Chuck Allen	KYTC, Design
Keith Damron	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Dorian Brawner	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Andy Rush	KIPDA
Larry Chaney	KIPDA
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Amanda Spencer	CDM Smith
Len Harper	CDM Smith

A summary of the key discussion items and decisions from this meeting are provided below, following the agenda outline. A copy of the meeting materials, including the agenda, is attached.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Keith Downs, KYTC Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees.

2. Purpose of the Meeting

Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, outlined the importance of the meeting and explained how the decisions made today would guide CDM Smith over the next couple of months as they work to finalize the Purpose and Need and Project Goals, and determine which alternatives to develop.

3. Stakeholder/Public Meeting Summary

Referencing the project presentation, Brad shared some results from the Stakeholder and Public Meeting surveys. Forty-four surveys have been received to date. 100% of the survey respondents indicated that KY 1931 needs to be improved. 82% of the respondents drive the study area daily. The

most frequent type of improvements listed were additional lanes, turn lanes, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Brad also noted that several stakeholders mentioned the importance of an I-264 interchange for St. Mary's Hospital.

The most sensitive resources (i.e., to be considered or avoided if KY 1931 is improved) were identified as homes/personal properties, churches and/or schools, and other (Hillcrest Cemetery and ambulance and fire vehicle traffic). Brad noted the public's interest in improvements but also their desire not to have a lot of impacts.

5. Draft Purpose and Need

Brad next presented draft Purpose and Need elements. He noted the importance of the Purpose and Need to the project and how it will guide the alternative development and selection process. A discussion took place about whether this project should focus on system traffic issues or local traffic issues. The preliminary traffic analysis shows the road would be at capacity in both the 3-lane and 5-lane widening scenarios. If a 5-lane were constructed, traffic from Dixie Hwy and Taylor Blvd would divert to KY 1931 adding a significant amount of traffic to the road. A number of public surveys stated they did not want KY 1931 to become another Dixie Hwy and indicated their concern of adding additional cut-through traffic. It was decided that both the 3-lane and 5-lane facilities would be examined further, but the purpose of the project should focus on the local community traffic and safety needs.

The proposed I-264/ KY 1931 interchange project was also discussed. Preliminary traffic analysis indicates that the interchange does not noticeably increase traffic along KY 1931. It was determined that the interchange would be addressed in the project goals, but it would not drive the purpose of the study. The interchange project should also be considered in prioritizing construction sections. All the alternatives will be analyzed with and without the interchange.

6. Alternative Development

CDM Smith presented a range of 3-lane, 4-lane, and 5-lane corridor improvement options and gave an overview of potential project issues. Typical Sections were also presented and the group had an open discussion about these and other project issues, as follows:

- Typical Sections with a multi-use path on one side and a sidewalk on the other is ideal, but this may not be feasible.
- If right-of-way is limited look at stopping the multi-use path at Iroquois Park and running it through the park.
- The most important segment for the multi-use path is between Dixie Hwy and Iroquois Park.
- The project team should check the latest Louisville Bike/Ped Plan for their priorities.
- It is not ideal to put bike lanes on a high volume 45 mph urban roadway. But, bike lanes are better than no bike accommodations, where bicyclists are forced to share the traffic lane with vehicles.
- Curb & Gutter will likely be needed throughout because of existing flooding issues and right-of-way constraints.
- Prefer a 3-lane or 5-lane typical section. The 4-lane typical section will not fix the safety or capacity problems because of all the access points.
- The side streets have a lot of traffic turning onto KY 1931. Palatka Rd for example has 300 vehicles turning left during the peak hour which justifies dual left turn lanes at this signalized

intersection. The capacity and traffic operations of the major side streets will be looked at as part of this study.

- The preliminary 2035 traffic forecast shows approximately 24,000 ADT under a 3-lane build scenario and 47,000 ADT for a 5-lane section. Both are over capacity for the number of proposed lanes.
- Include the new Southeast Christian Church in the traffic forecast. Most of these trips will be off-peak and on weekends.
- It does not appear to matter whether a 3-lane or 5-lane gets built from a congestion standpoint. Both will reach their relative traffic capacity.
- Urban Minor Arterials are typically less than 5-lanes.
- A number of public surveys stated they did not want KY 1931 to become another 5-lane Dixie Hwy and indicated their concern of adding additional cut-through traffic.
- At the end of the study KYTC needs a priority list and cost estimates for both the short-term and long-term improvements.
- KYTC will work with CDM Smith to develop Construction, ROW, and Utility Cost estimates for the recommended alternatives. The methodology will likely incorporate per mile cost estimates from similar projects. More detail will be needed for the short-term spot Improvements.
- Spot improvements will be focused around High Crash Spots and locations identified by the Project Team and Public.
- At the next public meeting people will be asked to prioritize both the long-term and short-term improvement options.

7. Next Steps

Referencing the project schedule, Brad explained that the next steps were to finalize the Purpose and Need and develop the short-term spot improvements and long-term corridor widening improvements. These alternatives will be presented at Project Team Meeting #3 in April. Based on input from that meeting, alternatives will be finalized for Stakeholder/Public Meeting #2 in May.

The Project Team will develop both short-term spot improvements and long-term corridor widening improvements. In addition to the No-Build, widening to three, four and five lanes will be considered. These alternatives will be considered with and without the interchange. In addition they will be considered with and without bicycle and pedestrian facilities. CDM Smith will document the *Red Flag/Fatal Flaws* (terrain issues, right-of-way constraints, safety concerns, traffic analysis, environmental impacts, etc.) to better understand the constraints of each alternative. This is not meant to be an all encompassing list of the potential impacts but rather another tool to aid the Project Team, Stakeholders, and Public in their decision making process.

Cost estimates will be created after Stakeholder/Public Meeting #2 when the preferred alternatives are identified. At this time the long-term and short-term improvement options will be prioritized based on Project Team, Stakeholder, and Public input.

8. Q&A

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned around 3:00 PM EST.

MINUTES
Project Team Meeting #3
KY 1931 – Jefferson County – Item 5-480.00
KYTC District 5 Office
Louisville, Kentucky
May 10, 2013
1:30 PM EST

A project team meeting for the KY 1931 Planning Study in Jefferson County was held at 1:30 p.m. EST on Friday, May 10th in Louisville, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the purpose and need, cultural and historic resources, roadway condition, improvement options, upcoming public meeting, agency coordination, and next steps. Participants in the meeting represented the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 5 and Central Offices, Louisville Metro, KIPDA and the consultant firm, CDM Smith. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Keith Downs	KYTC, District 5 Design
Carl Jenkins	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Carolina Justice	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Judi Hickerson	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Cindy Craft	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Andrea Clifford	KYTC, District 5 PIO
Tom Hall	KYTC, District 5 Planning
Chuck Allen	KYTC, Design
Amy Thomas	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Shane McKenzie	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Lynn Soporowski	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Dirk Gowin	Louisville Metro, Planning
Andy Rush	KIPDA
Lori Kelsey	KIPDA
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Amanda Spencer	CDM Smith
Len Harper	CDM Smith

A summary of the key discussion items and decisions from this meeting are provided below, following the agenda outline. A copy of the meeting materials, including the agenda, is attached.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Keith Downs, KYTC Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees and asking for introductions.

2. Project Schedule Update

Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, gave a brief overview of the schedule. The initial alternatives will be finalized in June. Agency coordination letters will be sent in June by KYTC (see item 9 below). The project team will consider all responses in the development of alternatives and recommendations. Public Meeting #2 and Stakeholder Meeting #2 will be held in late June or early July. Project Team Meeting #4 will be held in July. The recommended preferred alternative(s) and cost estimates will be submitted by CDM Smith in August.

3. Purpose and Need

Brad presented the updated Purpose and Need statement; the purpose of the proposed project is to improve safety and local traffic operations along KY 1931 between Dixie Highway and I-264. Improve traffic operations was changed to improve local traffic operations. Project Team input and Public input noted the need to focus on existing local problems while also taking into account future projects like the I-264 interchange.

Amanda Spencer from CDM Smith went over some of the project goals in more detail, including:

- Ensure any improvement is sufficient to accommodate additional traffic from other planned projects including the proposed I-264 interchange.
- Louisville Metro has identified an improvement along the KY 1931 study corridor as priority number 11 of 21 in their 2010 Bike Master Plan; the plan includes the addition of 5 feet of paved shoulder and restriping for a bike lane along KY 1931. Dirk Gowin from Louisville Metro noted the 2010 Bike Plan shows bike lanes so they have an apples-to-apples cost comparison between other projects. If the project team determines a multi-use path is preferable, that would be fine. The study route is an important connection for bicyclists. A sidewalk or multi-use path along this route would provide pedestrians with access to key destinations including Iroquois Park.

The Purpose and Need and Goals and Objectives narrative will be sent to the project team for review and approval in advance of Public Meeting #2.

5. Cultural & Historic Resources

Brad presented a map of the cultural and historic resources along the corridor. There are a couple of Archaeology Sites in the study area, but they are off the main corridor. No impacts are expected. This information comes from the Kentucky Office of State Archaeology and is not for public use.

No National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) structures are listed along the corridor, according to the Kentucky Heritage Council.

6. Roadway Condition

Brad went over the updated traffic analysis, geometric analysis, and crash analysis. The traffic forecast volumes came from KIPDA's model. CDM Smith analyzed the worst case scenario which includes the proposed I-264 interchange. Signal timings were also gathered from Louisville Metro. A LOS analysis was conducted for the signalized intersections. Intersections at Blanton Lane, Palatka Road, and Hazelwood Avenue are currently at LOS E. The KY 1931 roadway segments were analyzed based on the volume-to-capacity ratio. Independent of signal delay, existing V/C is less than one; however, future growth and signal delay will result in the majority of the corridor being at or above capacity.

The existing KY 1931 horizontal curves, vertical curves, grades and cross section were compared to current design standards. There is 1 deficient horizontal curve, 5 crest vertical curves with deficient sight distance, and 1 sag vertical curve with deficient headlight sight distance and deficient grade. Most of KY 1931 has deficient shoulder width.

The crash analysis was updated to include the crash type within "high crash segments" and "high crash spots". CDM Smith will look for patterns to help determine the potential cause of accidents.

7. Improvement Options

The 4-lane corridor improvement option was removed from consideration during Project Team Meeting #2 because it will not address the safety or capacity problems along the corridor. CDM Smith presented aerial graphics showing the back of curb and back of sidewalk/multi-use path for the 3-lane and 5-lane corridor improvement options and gave an overview of the potential issues. A potential evaluation matrix and a map showing the Spot Improvements was also presented. The group had an open discussion about these and other project issues, as follows:

- Some of the traffic projections look high. Particularly on Palatka and on KY 1931 between Hazelwood and Palatka. CDM Smith will check the numbers from the KIPDA model.
- CDM Smith will obtain 2035 No-Build traffic projections from KIPDA.
- CDM Smith will attempt to quantify the deficient stopping sight distance areas where As-Built plans are not available.
- The crash analysis does not take into account the severity of accidents or weather conditions.
- CDM Smith should assume a 15 ft wide utility buffer for overhead utility relocations.
- Will a 5-lane facility relieve traffic from other corridors? It could, traffic analysis shows a 5-lane will fill to capacity so additional traffic would come from other facilities like Dixie Hwy and Taylor Blvd. This is not the purpose of the study, though. This is a local road and the purpose of the study is to improve local traffic operations, not create a cut-through route to relieve other roadway facilities.
- 5-lane graphics should not be displayed at the Public Meeting. The 3-lane should be presented. And, it should be explained that the 3-lane appears to best meet the purpose and needs and goals and objectives. Public input should be solicited on all of the alternatives.
- Would a road diet or ITS improvements slow traffic and reduce accidents? Some team members were concerned that widening to 3-lanes would increase speeds and therefore injury and fatality accidents.
- The Public Meeting Survey should solicit feedback about priority construction segments and spot improvements.
- KYTC will provide construction dates for the recent intersection improvements. This will likely reduce the CRF at these locations in the future. CDM Smith should note the intersection improvements on the crash analysis maps.
- It was recommended CDM Smith look at an improved two-lane typical section. This could be a viable option where there is limited right-of-way.
- CDM Smith should add more detail to the Spot Improvement Map; how pictures or a blowup of the aerial so that citizens are able to recognize the locations at the Public Meeting.
- A detailed evaluation matrix for screening alternatives as presented at the meeting is not needed for presentation to the public or inclusion in the final report.

8. Public Meeting

The public meeting will be an open house with a brief presentation or voice over at the beginning. CDM Smith will draft an action plan for the Public Meeting for KYTC review. Brad Johnson will coordinate with Keith Downs about dates and locations. Doss High School or Trenell Elementary School may be appropriate, if they are open during the summer. KYTC will work on the Public Meeting advertisements.

9. Agency Coordination

CDM Smith will draft the letter and attachments for the Agency Coordination. This will include information about the upcoming Public Meeting. KYTC will mail the letters to the Agencies.

8. Next Steps

Referencing the project schedule, Brad explained that the next steps were to finalize the exhibits and survey for Public Meeting #2 and Stakeholder Meeting #2 in June. Draft exhibits and the survey will be submitted to the Project Team for review. Cost estimates will be created after Stakeholder/Public Meeting #2 when the preferred alternatives are identified. At this time, the long-term and short-term improvement options will be prioritized based on Project Team, Stakeholder, and Public input.

9. Q&A

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned around 4:00 PM EST.

MINUTES
Project Team Meeting #4
KY 1931 – Jefferson County – Item 5-480.00
KYTC District 5 Office
Louisville, Kentucky
August 19th, 2013
1:30 PM EST

A project team meeting for the KY 1931 Planning Study in Jefferson County was held at 1:30 p.m. EST on Monday, August 19th in Louisville, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the past public meeting, spot improvement and long term improvement recommendations, and next steps. Participants in the meeting represented the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 5 and Central Offices, KIPDA and the consultant firm, CDM Smith. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Keith Downs	KYTC, District 5 Design
Matt Bullock	KYTC, District 5 Chief District Engineer
Andrea Clifford	KYTC, District 5 PIO
Tom Hall	KYTC, District 5 Planning
Travis Thompson	KYTC, District 5 Design
Jonathan West	KYTC, District 5 TEBM
Caroline Justice	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Cindy Evensen	KYTC, District 5 Utilities
Jeff Schaefer	KYTC, District 5 Environmental
Ron Geveden	KYTC, Right-of-Way
Chuck Allen	KYTC, C.O. Design
Steve Ross	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Shane McKenzie	KYTC, C.O. Planning
Andy Rush	KIPDA
Lori Kelsey	KIPDA
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Ashley Sells	CDM Smith
Len Harper	CDM Smith

A summary of the key discussion items and decisions from this meeting are provided below, following the agenda outline. A copy of the meeting materials, including the agenda, is attached.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Keith Downs, KYTC Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees and asking for introductions.

2. Purpose of Meeting

Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, gave a brief overview of the schedule. Project Team Meeting #4 is two months behind the schedule noted in the 2012 Contract Documents. CDM Smith will work with District 5 and Central Office to submit a revised schedule. Currently District 5 does not need anything for the Six Year Plan. They will contact CDM Smith if they get a Legislative request before the draft report comes out.

3. Agency/Stakeholder/Public Input Summary

Brad presented an overview of all the KY 1931 coordination efforts; (1) two meetings with stakeholders and local officials, (2) two public meetings and (3) an agency coordination mailing.

The survey from Public Meeting #2 had 55 respondents:

- 96% of respondents indicated the corridor should be improved.
- 69% of respondents preferred the 3-Lane Widening Alternative.
- Improvements to Segments 1-3 were noted as higher priority segments than Segments 4 or 5. Segment #2 was the highest priority.
- 75% of the respondents wanted bicycle/pedestrian facilities.
- Spots A, B, D, G, and H were the locations suggested most often as top 5 priority spot improvements.

Lori Kelsey, KIPDA, will have the Environmental Justice report finished the first week of September.

4. Spot Improvement Recommendations

Brad presented a map as well as an overview table of the Spot Improvements. The following recommendations were made:

- Steve Ross, KYTC Planning, recommended changing the “not recommended” Spot Improvements to “Low” priority and showing the Spot Crash Rates where the CRF is less than 1.0. The project team agreed.
- Spot D is a high priority because it was carried over from the 3rd Street Study, the segment has a crash rate greater than one, and it was the number one priority from the Public Meeting #2 surveys. The project team agreed.
- Spot F should be a “High” priority because of the CRF. The project team agreed.
- Spot J should be a “High” priority because it has a fatality. The project team agreed.
- Matt Bullock, KYTC, expressed concern with adding any potential timeframe to the spot improvements. The project team agreed.
- Tom Hall, KYTC Planning, likes the High, Medium, Low prioritization system and does not see a reason to number the priorities. The project team agreed.
- Splitting up the tasks of dual turn lanes and access management for Spots F & J could be more beneficial in correcting the problem, i.e. crashes. CDM Smith will look into this.
- Question: What Spot Improvements are needed to accommodate the proposed I-264 interchange?
Answer: This study did not do enough detailed traffic analysis to be able to list the spot improvements needed for the interchange. That would be done as part of an Interchange Justification Study.
- The additional Spot Improvements recommended in the Public Meeting Surveys will be mentioned in the final report, but not included as Spot Improvements. All the improvements listed require further study, can be completed independent of this project or can be completed with the long-term improvement.
- Project Sheets will be created for each Spot Improvement. CDM Smith will work with KYTC District 5 on the cost estimates.
- The Project Team will continue to look through the Spot Improvements and send CDM Smith any final comments they may have.

5. Long-Term Improvement Recommendations:

Brad presented the three-lane widening segment map as well as the 8 1/2 x 11 layout sheets that will be included in the final report. Segment 2 was the public's number one priority. The following recommendations were made:

- Question: If the interchange were built, would the existing two-lane road be ok?
Answer: If no changes were made, the system would probably fail from a traffic standpoint. Even though the 3-lane widening option would be at capacity, it can better support a new interchange.
- A traffic analysis was completed with and without the proposed interchange. The project is justified with or without the interchange. That allows this project to move forward independent of the interchange project.
- Andy Rush, KIPDA, thought local residents and Louisville Metro would object to the impacts of a 5-lane section.
- The character of the area does not compliment a 5-lane section. Based on comments we received from the public, they do not want KY 1931 to turn into another Dixie Highway.
- The project team agreed the 3-lane section should be the recommended alternative in the final report. Additional lanes have been added to increase capacity at the major intersections.
- Question: Do all the alternatives include bicycle and pedestrian facilities?
Answer: Yes, they match the Greenwood typical section with a sidewalk on the west side of the road and a multi-use path on the east side of the road.
- The final report should address the inconsistencies between the two previous study recommendations.

6. Next Steps

Referencing the project schedule, Brad explained that the next step was to complete the draft report. CDM Smith will work with KYTC District 5 on the cost estimates for the Spot Improvements. The 3-lane widening alternative will be recommended long-term improvement option in the final report. The final report will address the recommendations from the two previous studies and discuss the proposed interchange at I-264.

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned around 3:15 PM EST.