

## **Appendix F: Project Team Meetings**

### Contents:

August 13, 2013 Project Team Meeting #1 Minutes

October 3, 2013 Project Team Meeting #2 Minutes

December 20, 2013 Project Team Meeting #3 Minutes

**MINUTES**  
**Project Team Meeting #1**  
**KY 30 – Breathitt & Owsley Counties**  
KYTC District 10 Office  
Jackson, Kentucky  
August 13, 2013  
1:30 PM EST

A project team meeting for the KY 30 Planning Study in Breathitt and Owsley Counties was held at 1:30 p.m. EST on Tuesday, August 13<sup>th</sup> in Jackson, Kentucky at the KYTC District 10 office. 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 10 and Central Offices, the Kentucky River Area Development District (ADD), the consultant firm, CDM Smith, and subconsultant firm, HMB. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Jason Blackburn	KYTC, District 10 Planning
Brent Weddington	KYTC, District 10 Design
Min Jiang	KYTC, District 10 Design
Darren Back	KYTC, District 10 Design
Aric Skaggs	KYTC, District 10 Project Development
Sreenu Gutti	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Steve Ross	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Shane McKenzie	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Jonathan Reynolds*	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Jayalakshmi Balaji*	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Eunice Holland	Kentucky River ADD
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Len Harper	CDM Smith
Steve De Witte	CDM Smith
Rob Dowler	HMB

*\*Joined by video conference.*

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

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Jason Blackburn, KYTC Project Manager, began the meeting and welcomed attendees to the first project team meeting. He then asked for formal introductions from all attendees.

## **2. Project Approach and Schedule**

Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, briefly outlined the meeting materials and explained the project approach and schedule. There will be three project team meetings, two stakeholder/local officials meetings, and a public meeting in each county. He noted a minor change to the schedule where the second stakeholder meeting will be moved from coinciding with the public meeting to instead coincide with the third and final project team meeting. This change was made due to the quick turnaround between the stakeholder meetings as originally scheduled. No objection to the change was raised.

## **3. Draft Purpose and Need**

Brad Johnson introduced a draft purpose and need statement and outline. This statement elaborated on a separate statement found in the scoping minutes. The new statement focuses more on geometric concerns after safety analysis showed fewer concerns. Jason Blackburn noted the purpose statement should include a regional connection between London and KY 15 in Jackson, not Salyersville as was originally stated.

## **4. Existing Conditions**

CDM Smith noted areas of potential project issues (see handout) and the group had an open discussion about these and other project issues as follows:

- Aric Skaggs noted that resurfacing has occurred on KY 30 in Breathitt County within the last two years. This is likely why we are not seeing pavement breaks/slides in this area.
- Discussion as to whether Section 9 needs to be looked at since it is already improved followed. It was explained that a new connection to KY 15 might be considered as part of an off-alignment alternative.
- Brad Johnson asked about the status of traffic counts along the route. Updated counts have been completed and KYTC will complete traffic forecast by September 15. The future year will be 2040.
- Brad Johnson remarked that there were very few vehicles making through trips along the study corridor. The most recent traffic counts verify this.
- Jason Blackburn wants the design guidelines to be based on the worst case scenario traffic projections. This coincides with the goal to create a regional roadway between London and Jackson. Will likely use two 11 ft lanes and 8 ft Paved (10 ft Graded) shoulders.
- Brad Johnson drew attention to the community resources map. He remarked that a field review took place that morning and CDM Smith will update the map accordingly. He also asked about KY 30 Waterline Extension Project Signs. Jason Blackburn confirmed that new water lines are being constructed along KY 30 between Breathitt and Owsley Counties. Eunice Holland from the Kentucky River ADD confirmed that there are waterlines along KY 30 in both counties. The only foreseen work would be a rehab and that would be far in the future. The work that CDM Smith observed last week was either a repair or they were tying in the lines from KY 315 and KY 28. There is a project to install waterlines along KY 315 and KY 28 that is currently underway.

- Jason Blackburn noted that if feasible, all alternatives should tie into the ongoing bridge replacement project at KY 30 over the Middle Fork of the Kentucky River. The typical section of that bridge provides two eleven (11) foot driving lanes with six (6) foot shoulders. The contract for the replacement is expected to be let in April 2014.
- Eunice Holland presented a preliminary Environmental Justice (EJ) report to the group. She explained that a full EJ draft report will be completed before the first stakeholder meeting.
- Len Harper presented the geometric analysis. He explained that while the cross section may have been improved in spots, the horizontal and vertical alignment has not deviated from as-built plans from the 1930s. Overall, 72% of horizontal curves, 45% of crest vertical curves, and 29% of sag vertical curves do not meet KYTC or AASHTO design guidelines. Jason Blackburn noted that 11 foot lanes could be used to align with the bridge project.
- Brad Johnson clarified HMB's role as a sub-consultant to develop alternatives.
- Brad Johnson presented the crash analysis. Crash data was requested from Nathan Dean a KYTC Geoprocessing Specialist and confirmed using data accessed via the Kentucky State Police Database. No high crash segments were identified, but 5 high crash "spots" were noted. Brad attributed this low number to drivers taking extra precautions while on the road due to the poor roadway geometrics. It was noted that the KYTC interactive map defines a spot as having a CRF greater than 0.9 – CDM Smith should also define their spot this way.

## **5. Other Local Projects in Six Year Plan**

Brad Johnson noted several projects in the area have funding in the six year plan, including the bridge replacement project at KY 30 over the Middle Fork of the Kentucky River. Jason Blackburn informed the group that \$1.5 million was made available to add four foot shoulders to KY 30 in Owsley County.

## **6. Project Evaluation/Identification**

Brad Johnson explained that HMB would help to provide four alternatives:

- Along the existing KY 30 alignment using a 55 mph design speed. "Best-case" scenario;
- Along the existing KY 30 alignment using "practical solutions" with a reduced design speed at locations;
- Off-alignment using a 55 mph design speed; and,
- Spot improvements

## **7. Next Steps**

The first stakeholder meeting should be scheduled within the next two weeks to meet the project milestone. The second project team meeting will be held in the morning, with the stakeholder meeting in the afternoon. Both meetings will be held at the KYTC District 10 office. The group discussed which stakeholders should be invited, and District 10 will provide Central Office with a list of names. CDM Smith will work with Jason Blackburn to finalize a meeting date. Sreenu Gutti expressed his wish that the letters be sent by early September. CDM Smith will provide Sreenu with the sign-in sheet from this meeting.

## 8. Q&A

Brad Johnson asked the group if there were any questions. A summary of the discussion is provided:

- Darren Back noted that an off alignment alternative should be developed so that it can be constructed in segments. It should veer off, and then tie back in with existing KY 30 every 3-6 miles. KYTC is looking for \$25-30 million sections.
- Sreenu Gutti expressed that the Purpose and Need Statement should contain “the need for the project”. Brad Johnson said the “need” bullet points would be developed into a cohesive statement which will be found in the final report.
- Discussion occurred as to whether drainage issues are severe enough to be addressed separately from geometric concerns. Jason Blackburn noted that a large storm in 2009 overtopped portions of the road. This was not a normal event. It was agreed drainage issues could be addressed as part of the geometric concerns.

With no further questions, the meeting adjourned at 3 p.m. EST.

**MINUTES**  
**Project Team Meeting #2**  
**KY 30 – Owsley/Breathitt Counties**  
KYTC District 10 Office  
Jackson, Kentucky  
October 3, 2013  
10:00 AM EDT

A Project Team Meeting for the KY 30 Planning Study in Breathitt and Owsley Counties was held at 10:00 a.m. EDT on Thursday, October 3, in Jackson, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the purpose and need of the project, existing and future traffic conditions, preliminary alternative development and evaluation methodology, and to prepare for the Stakeholder Meeting #1 in the afternoon. Participants in the meeting represented the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 10 and Central Offices, the Kentucky River Area Development District (ADD), the consultant firm, CDM Smith, and sub-consultant firm, HMB. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Corbett Caudill	KYTC, District 10 Chief District Engineer
Aric Skaggs	KYTC, District 10 Project Development Manager
Jason Blackburn	KYTC, District 10 Planning
Brent Weddington	KYTC, District 10 Design
Min Jiang	KYTC, District 10 Design
Sreenu Gutti	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Eunice Holland	Kentucky River ADD
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Steve De Witte	CDM Smith
Joey Mosley	HMB

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

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Jason Blackburn, KYTC Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees and dispensing with formal introductions.

**2. Project Approach/Schedule**

Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, outlined updates since the first project team meeting on August 13. HMB, working as a sub-consultant, has been developing preliminary alternatives which will be presented to the Project Team and Stakeholders. The schedule calls for public meetings to be held in November – discussion on possible dates will be addressed later in the meeting.

**3. Draft Purpose and Need Update**

Brad Johnson drew attention to an update in the Purpose and Need for this project. This project should improve regional connectivity between the Hal Rogers Parkway and I-75 in London and KY 15 in Jackson. Additionally, the criteria for deficient horizontal and vertical curves are being adjusted – the generic placeholders of “numerous” and “several” have been added for the time being.

#### **4. Traffic Map**

Brad Johnson discussed the sole figure in the handout, a map showing existing and future traffic. CDM Smith was provided 2013 counts at three stations along the corridor and 2040 volumes for those three sections. A more detailed forecast for all nine sections is not necessary because it will not impact cross section decisions. Two-lane analysis using Highway Capacity Software was completed using these volumes; the entire corridor operates at LOS D based on 2040 volumes. The volume/capacity ratio did not indicate a future congestion problem – the low LOS is strictly due to current geometrics.

#### **5. Environmental Justice Update**

Eunice Holland explained that a draft Environmental Justice report has been submitted to KYTC for review. Sreenu Gutti will provide the report to CDM Smith.

#### **6. Initial Long Term Improvement Options / 7. Initial Spot Improvements**

Joey Mosley introduced the alternatives developed by HMB. A fly-through of the corridor showing the alternatives using Google Earth was presented. An open discussion regarding the alternatives and other issues followed:

- Joey explained that the alternatives were developed using a typical section of 11' lanes and 10' shoulders (8' paved). This cross section matches previous work on KY 30 toward London.
- Joey mentioned the first section near Booneville would be the most economical to improve. There would be maintenance of traffic issues, however.
- Aric Skaggs asked if the corridor should bypass Booneville. Brad Johnson responded that the option had not been looked at, and asked if KYTC would like to utilize the existing bridge, which curves toward the courthouse square. Jason Blackburn noted that the bridge is very young, and would be difficult to justify its removal. Several team members noted the difficulty of maintaining a cohesive corridor when traffic is forced through the courthouse square. Further discussion ensued, which resulted in consensus that a survey question would be presented to the public ("Should KY 30 be routed to avoid the Booneville courthouse square?").
- Joey noted the difficulty of maintaining a 55 mph design speed through the existing alignment near Highland Turner Elementary School. Two off-alignment alternatives were presented at this location.
- Jason pointed out that the segments between Shoulderblade Hill and Belcher Fork contained the highest crash factor locations and that cutting the corner would have many benefits; including safety and travel time.
- Joey asked if truck climbing lanes and turning lanes should be included in the alternatives. Jason responded that, most likely, the traffic would not justify either. Insert turning lanes at intersections such as with KY 708, just to have the cost.
- Joey explained that HMB developed 6-8 spot improvements at a 55 mph design speed.
- Jason noted that improvement from 35 mph to 45 mph would make a world of difference. A lengthy discussion on alternative definition followed, resulting in the following consensus:
  - Alternative 1: 55 mph Design Speed along existing alignment, except for the areas near Highland Turner Elementary (Alternative 3C) and Shoulderblade Hill (Alternative 4D) which follows the existing alignment at a 45 mph design speed.
  - Alternative 2: 55 mph Spot Improvements only, which the public could rank.
  - Alternative 3A/3B/3C: Where "A" and "B" are 55 mph design speed off-alignments near Highland Turner Elementary School and "C" follows the existing alignment at a 45 mph

design speed. Alternative 1 along remainder of corridor. Alternative 3C still needs to be developed.

- Alternative 4A/4B/4C/4D: Where “A”, “B”, and “C” are 55 mph design speed off-alignments near Shoulderblade Hill, and “D” follows the existing alignment at a 45 mph design speed. Alternative 1 along reminder of corridor. Alternative 4D still needs to be developed.
- Corbett Caudill noted that spot improvements should be fixed with the typical section to allow easy tie-ins to potential corridor-wide improvements. Aric expressed concern that the project team was putting in too much thought at this stage with design questions. Brad asked for input from those representing KYTC Central Office. Mikael Pelfrey affirmed that the project team was on the right track, as spot improvements are most likely to get funding first.
- Jason stressed that the 45 mph design speed alternatives should only be developed where a 55 mph design speed is infeasible. Brad commented that there may be decent impacts even with a 45 mph design speed which may justify off-alignment alternatives.

### **8. Alternative Evaluation Methodology**

Brad Johnson drew attention to the Alternative Evaluation Methodology handout. The categories and individual criterion were pulled from past planning studies. These categories could be used to develop a decision matrix for alternative evaluation. Jason Blackburn noted that there may be too many categories as presented. Joey Mosley inquired as to how KYTC wished to address ROW impacts. Jason responded that KYTC preferred acreage and number of houses affected.

Min Jiang brought up the cost of environmental impacts, and that they could be quite high in this area. Jason responded that they are difficult to quantify, especially if improvements are made along the corridor. Ditches could become streams. Jason asked Brad how much detail would be provided. Brad cautioned that this is a planning study, but mentioned that planning studies in general are becoming more detailed. Aric Skaggs said that the detail provided should be proportional to the information available.

Jason wished that the facilitation of economic development be removed from the matrix category list. The most important category is regional connectivity, and a large factory, for example, is not anticipated to be developed in the project area in the foreseeable future. Brad noted that economic development in the form of smaller parcels such as gas stations may go hand-in-hand with regional connectivity.

Sreenu Gutti asked if the-matrix should include purpose and need items. There is a danger that the alternatives would answer yes to all criteria in the matrix; however, it is still important to review. Brad responded that the spot improvement-only alternative would show potential differentiation in the matrix.

### **9. Stakeholder Meeting #1 Agenda**

Brad Johnson brought attention to the stakeholder meeting agenda and asked the team for suggestions. Jason Blackburn stressed the need to involve the stakeholders and ask for input. Brad thought of potential questions to ask the stakeholders, such as whether the crash data and geometric data made sense and if there were other spots the project team should examine.

### **10. Next Steps**

Discussion turned to public meeting preparations. Particular discussion items are noted below:



- Jason noted that the typical cross section provided by HMB showed a clear zone of 24'. Joey remarked that this matched previous sections of KY 30. Jason believed the clear zone can be reduced at some point to save funds. Aric commented that this is a lot of detail for planning.
- Joey Mosley asked if figures detailing the deficient curves should be prepared. Jason stated that the number of deficient curves should be highlighted for the report.
- Brad looked for ideas from the team regarding when and where the public meetings should be. Jason remarked that only one meeting may be necessary – ideally at Highland Turner School. The project team agreed. Mikael Pelfrey inquired about possible turnout. Jason replied that 30-40 would be expected. Mikael recommended the use of a variable message board located at the school to inform corridor drivers about the meeting. Jason agreed to coordinate the setup of the board and to find an acceptable date and time for the meeting.
- Jason recommended two displays, one typical section, and an 11x17 handout be created for the meeting. Joey offered to print a roll plot similar to the one presented today for use at the meeting. Joey's Google Earth tour would also be presented on a loop, with the ability to pause and zoom as necessary.
- CDM Smith will put together a public meeting plan with potential exhibit boards, survey, and handout options for KYTC to review one-two weeks prior to the meeting.

Following the public meeting, a third project team meeting and second stakeholder meeting will be held, likely on the same date in December.

## **11. Q&A**

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned by Jason Blackburn at 11:55 a.m. EDT.

**MINUTES**  
**Project Team Meeting #3**  
**KY 30 – Owsley/Breathitt Counties**  
KYTC District 10 Office  
Jackson, Kentucky  
December 20, 2013  
10:00 AM EDT

A Final Project Team Meeting for the KY 30 Planning Study in Breathitt and Owsley Counties was held at 10:00 a.m. EDT on Friday, December 20th, in Jackson, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the input from the public meeting, project recommendations, and to prepare for the Stakeholder Meeting #2 in the afternoon. Participants in the meeting represented the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 10 and Central Offices, the Kentucky River Area Development District (ADD), the consultant firm, CDM Smith, and sub-consultant firm, HMB. Meeting attendees included the following persons:

Jason Blackburn	KYTC, District 10 Planning
Brent Weddington	KYTC, District 10 Design
Brandon Baker	KYTC, District 10 Environmental
Min Jiang	KYTC, District 10 Design
Jeff Allen	KYTC, District 10
Steve Ross	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Sreenu Gutti	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Eunice Holland	Kentucky River ADD
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Len Harper	CDM Smith
Joey Mosley	HMB

A summary of the key discussion items and decisions from this meeting are provided below, following the agenda outline. Additionally, maps of the Long Term Improvement Options and Spot Improvements are attached for reference.

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Jason Blackburn, KYTC Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees and dispensing with formal introductions.

**2. Purpose of Meeting**

Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, gave a brief overview of the purpose of the meeting. The purpose is to discuss the project findings and gather input on the consultant recommendations. At 1:30 pm EDT there will be a second Stakeholder Meeting to get their input on the recommendations.

Brad also presented the schedule. Project Team Meeting #3 is one month behind the schedule noted in the 2013 Contract Documents. Based on this schedule the Draft Report is due January 24<sup>th</sup>. If CDM Smith cannot meet this deadline they will communicate this with District 10 and Central Office and submit a revised schedule. In the meantime if District 10 needs project sheets for a recommended improvement

so that information can be presented to the Legislature they will notify CDM Smith. At this time, that additional information is not needed.

### **3. Public Input Summary**

Brad presented an overview of the input received from the KY 30 Public Meeting held at Highland-Turner Elementary School on November 7, 2013.

There were 78 surveys returned from the Public Meeting. The following are some key results from the surveys:

- 97% of respondents indicated the route should be improved.
- 78% of respondents preferred the corridor be improved to 55 mph, following new alignment at times and widening the shoulders.
- For Segment 1; 70% of respondents preferred Alternate 1A and 80% of respondents felt that KY 30 should be routed to avoid the Booneville courthouse.
- For Segment 2; 74% of respondents preferred Alternate 2A.
- For Segment 3; 38% of respondents preferred Alternate 3A, 24% of respondents preferred Alternate 3B, and 17% of respondents preferred Alternate 3C.
- 70% of the respondents do not think bicycle/pedestrian facilities should be included along the corridor.
- Spot Improvements H, G, A, I, and F were most often selected as the top priority spot improvements.

### **4. Long Term Improvement Recommendations**

Brad Johnson discussed the consultant recommendations for the Long Term Improvements. An overview matrix was provided to the project team which included the Purpose and Need, Number of Potential Relocations, Potential Environmental Impacts, Public Meeting Survey Results, and Estimated Total Cost for each Alternate. CDM Smith used this matrix to compare the alternates and determine the consultant recommendations. Brad noted the Long Term Improvement recommendations will be combined with the Spot Improvement recommendations to form the overall Project Recommendations.

The following consultant recommendations were made:

1. Segment 1: Alternate 1A is the recommended alternate.
  - This is the only alternate that improves the corridor to 55 mph.
  - The alternate meets the purpose and need and 70% of respondents from the public meeting surveys preferred this alternate.
  - The Project Team agreed with this recommendation.
2. Segment 2: Alternate 2A is the recommended alternate.
  - The alternate meets the purpose and need, reduces impacts to the natural environment, it is the cheapest of the alternates that improves the corridor to 55 mph, and 74% of respondents from the public meeting surveys preferred this alternate.
  - The number of potential home relocations is a concern. This will need to be looked at in more detail in the future phases of the project. A lower design speed may need to be considered in some locations to reduce the number of potential relocations.
  - In-Lieu fees from stream impacts are a concern and will need to be looked at in more detail in the future phases of the project.
  - The Project Team agreed with this recommendation.
3. Segment 3: Alternate 3C is the recommended alternate.

- The alternate meets the purpose and need, reduces impacts to the natural environment, it is the least expensive of the alternates that improves the corridor to 55 mph.
  - 79% of respondents from the public meeting surveys preferred the alternates that went off-alignment, bypassing the deficient geometrics between Shoulderblade Hill and Combs and Perry Road. Alternate 3C is the cheapest of the off-alignment alternates and it has the smallest amount of anticipated impacts to the natural environment.
  - Jason Blackburn expressed concern with the off-alignment alternates because the old road would still have to be maintained by the county and local residents would still have to navigate the sharp curves. Jason thought Alternate 3D, which maintains a 55 mph design speed while following as much of the existing alignment as possible, was worth consideration. Two issues with Alternate 3D are the high number of potential home relocations and the stream impacts. Jason is ok with the consultant recommendation; both alignments would likely be considered in future phases of the project.
  - The Project Team decided to accept the consultant recommendation (Alternate 3C). Additional cost should be added to Alternate 3C to account for a connection back to KY 397. This connection should also be represented on the Final Recommendations Maps.
4. Booneville Bypass
- Brad Johnson and Joey Mosley presented some potential bypass alternates for Booneville Courthouse Square.
  - 80% of respondents from the public meeting surveys felt that KY 30 should be routed to avoid the Booneville Courthouse Square.
  - More input is needed from the Stakeholders before a recommendation can be made. In addition, the existing courthouse is old and a new courthouse could be built off-site in the future, negating the need for this project. *Note: The Stakeholders preferred the 55 mph dark blue alignment with an additional bypass loop south of Booneville.*
  - The consultant recommends showing the Stakeholder preferred alternate graphically in the report as one potential solution. But the bypass will be discussed more conceptually in the report with the recommendation that all solutions be looked at in more detail in the future phases of the project. The Project Team agreed with this approach.
5. Construction Sections
- The cost of Segment 1 is less than the desired \$25 to \$30 million dollar construction section. This segment may be constructed all at once.
  - Segment 2 should be split into two construction sections to achieve the desired \$25 to \$30 million dollar construction sections. From a maintenance of traffic and constructability standpoint, the segment would be split at mile point 5.0 where the proposed alternate goes off-alignment.
  - Because the majority of Segment 3 is off-alignment, it may not be prudent to subdivide this segment into multiple construction sections. The consultant recommendation is that this segment be constructed all at once even though the estimated cost is above the desired \$25 to \$30 million dollar construction section.
  - The consultant recommendation is that Segment 3 be constructed first, Segment 2 second, and Segment 1 last. These priorities are based on the deficient geometrics and crash history, with the worst geometrics and crash history being in Segment 3, followed by Segment 2, and then Segment 1.

## 5. Spot Improvement Recommendations

Brad Johnson reviewed the top five spot improvement priorities from the Public Meeting surveys.

- **Spot H**, a sharp curve near Shoulderblade Hill, was the 1<sup>st</sup> choice of 27% of respondents and was chosen by 59% of respondents overall.
- **Spot G**, a sharp curve near the intersection of KY 1114 near Turkey, was the 1<sup>st</sup> choice of 26% of respondents and was chosen by 58% of respondents overall.
- **Spot A**, where KY 30 narrows east of the South Fork of the Kentucky River, was the 1<sup>st</sup> choice of 17% of respondents and was chosen by 24% of respondents overall.
- **Spot I**, an S-curve near Robinson Fork, was the 1<sup>st</sup> choice of 15% of respondents and was chosen by 51% of respondents overall.
- **Spot F**, a sharp curve in Turkey, was the 1<sup>st</sup> choice of 9% of respondents and was chosen by 40% of respondents overall.

Brad noted that the Spot Improvements do not meet the overall Purpose and Need of the project. The Project Team agreed and decided that the Long-Term Improvements should be the priority. The Spot Improvements will be included in the report in case money becomes available for a lower cost safety improvement.

## 6. Overall Project Recommendations

Brad Johnson noted that 78% of respondents preferred the corridor be improved to 55 mph. Only 10% of respondents preferred Spot Improvements over a Long-Term improvement. The Project Team agreed that the Spot Improvements do not meet the Purpose and Need of the project and that the Long-Term Improvement Options should be the priority and the overall project recommendation. The overall project recommendations listed in order of priority are as follows:

1. Segment 3: Alternate 3C is the recommended alternate including a connection to KY 397.
2. Segment 2: Alternate 2A is the recommended alternate.
3. Segment 1: Alternate 1A is the recommended alternate including the potential for a new Booneville Bypass.

## 9. Stakeholder Meeting #2 Agenda

Brad Johnson brought attention to the stakeholder meeting agenda and asked the team for suggestions. Jason Blackburn stressed the need to involve the stakeholders and ask for input on the overall project recommendations.

## 10. Next Steps

Referencing the project schedule, Brad explained that the next step was to complete the draft report.

## 11. Q&A

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned by Jason Blackburn at 11:55 a.m. EDT.