

Appendix I: Stakeholder and Local Officials Meetings

Contents:

February 3, 2014 First Local Officials Meeting

May 12, 2014 Second Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting

MINUTES
First Local Officials Meeting
US 231 – Warren County – Item # 3-8702.00
KYTC District 3 Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
February 3rd, 2014
8:00 AM CST

A local officials meeting for the US 231 Scottsville Road Scoping and Traffic Operations Study (Warren County) was held at 8:00 a.m. CST on Monday, February 3rd, 2014, in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the preliminary data collected, relevant project issue and the alternatives for US 231. Participants in the meeting represented the local officials, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 3 and Central Offices, and the consultant firm, CDM Smith. Meeting attendees included the following members of the project team:

Greg Meredith	KYTC, District 3 Chief District Engineer
Deneatra Henderson	KYTC, District 3 Planning
Joe Plunk	KYTC, District 3 Design
Wes Watt	KYTC, District 3 PIO
Jon Whitaker	KYTC, District 3 Traffic
Shane McKenzie*	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Steve Ross*	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Mikael Pelfrey*	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Brad Johnson*	CDM Smith
Ashley Sells*	CDM Smith

**Joined by conference call/teleconference*

The following local officials were also in attendance:

Senator Mike Wilson	Kentucky Legislature
Representative Jody Richards	Kentucky Legislature
Mayor Bruce Wilkerson	City of Bowling Green
Judge Mike Buchanan	Warren County Judge-Executive

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

Welcome and Introductions: Deneatra Henderson, KYTC Co-Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees and asking for formal introductions from all.

Study Corridor: Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, briefly outlined the project limits and environmental considerations. Brad noted that the project runs from Lovers Lane/Campbell Lane to Three Springs Road/Ken Bale Road. This currently includes 6 signalized and 3 unsignalized intersections.

Existing Conditions: Brad provided an overview of the existing conditions for the study corridor; including HIS data, traffic data, and crash analysis. The crash data was collected from November 1, 2008 to October 31, 2013 and includes the interchange as well as the frontage road. Key discussion items and decisions include:

- Since presenting the crash data at the First Project Team Meeting, CDM Smith has added the frontage road crashes to the crash map by mapping them using their longitude and latitude.
- Traffic volumes were presented and it was noted that the PM peak was from 4:30 to 5:30 pm. According to the V/C calculations and factoring in signal delay, US 231 is approaching capacity.
- Brad noted that there have been seven previous studies/projects related to this area, including the I-65/Scottsville Road Interchange Study, I-65 Interchange Design and Construction, District 3 ID Meeting, SR 884 Three Springs Road widening, Shive Lane extension improvements and Cemetery Road reconstruction. Traffic along Scottsville Road reduced after the I-65/Cemetery Road interchange opened, but volumes have since recovered to previous levels.

Purpose and Need: Brad presented a bullet-style draft purpose and need statement. Since the last meeting there have been changes; it now reads “improve safety and mobility of Scottsville Road.”

Improvement Options: Brad provided an overview of the design considerations including utilities, multimodal considerations and typical sections. The multimodal considerations include transit, truck access to businesses, and pedestrian and bicycle accommodation. In order to establish a typical section, decisions will need to be made on whether the corridor is a rural or urban section, the required number of lanes and what, if any, changes should be made to the frontage road.

Brad provided an overview of the five alternatives for US 231 for the group’s consideration including:

- Alternative 1 - Widen to six lanes and intersection improvements.
- Alternative 2 – Maintain four lanes with a 42-foot median and convert 4 intersections to right-in, right-out, left-in.
- Alternative 3 – Widen to six lanes with a 30-foot median and convert 4 intersections to right-in, right-out, left-in. There was also a bulb-out option presented to accommodate truck U-turns, but would create a pedestrian crossing challenge and longer signal clearance areas.
- Alternative 4 – Widen to six lanes with a wide median to accommodate truck U-turns and other intersection modifications. These include removing the signal at Kroger.
- Alternative 5 – Intersection spot improvements such as extending and/or adding turn lanes and providing dual lefts at major intersections.

It was noted CDM Smith will be using a simulation model, currently under development, to test the two future alternatives.

Public Involvement and Project Schedule: Deneatra explained that the study will include one more meeting of the project team and one more meeting with local officials and stakeholders. Report writing will occur in early spring of 2014. The next meeting will be in March 2014 and will be with the local officials and stakeholders. Subsequent to the meeting, the next Local Officials and Project Team Meeting were scheduled for May 12, 2014. The report will be finalized in early summer.

Discussion: In addition to those noted above, a number of questions and comments were discussed.

- In response to a question about signal timing, it was noted three timing plans are currently used along the corridor. Based on current conditions and equipment, additional changes would likely not have a significant impact.
- It was noted that the area around Shive Lane and Bryant Way is congested, particularly as a result of the frontage road operations. It was asked if access to the frontage road can be restricted. The Project Team noted this is still an option and will be considered as the

alternatives are further developed. One of the goals of this project will be to balance mobility through the corridor versus access.

- When asked if the officials in attendance were open to the elimination of the frontage on the east side of the project corridor, they noted it would help eliminate questions and complaints about them.
- It was noted the Kroger signal disrupts progression along the corridor and it is the desire of the District for it be removed. CDM Smith will review turning movements at the Kroger/Kmart signal to determine if there is a spike in left turns outside the peak hour that may make eliminating turn movements at this location a challenge.
- It was asked if Alternative 5 could be constructed quickly. The District noted Alternative 5 would still need to be funded before it could move forward. Currently \$5 million is programmed for construction, which would likely be enough to fund Alternative 5, but not the others. Updated planning-level cost estimates would be developed in advance of the next set of meetings.
- It was asked if Wall Street could be connected to Ken Bale Boulevard at or near the proposed Cabela's. This could be considered, but it was noted Wall Street does not line up directly with the Scottsville Road access point and may not be desirable as a cut through connection to Scottsville Road.
- A connection from Cave Mill Road to Pasco Road was discussed to improve backage connections. The Mayor noted the city has one option under consideration, but it isn't ideal.
- The District staff acknowledged that dual lefts at Cave Mill, removal of Kroger/Kmart signal, and improvements at Pasco Blvd would make a big difference to current operations and could still complement future major widening.
- Interest was expressed to extend the widening improvement north and south of the project corridor.
- A discussion of the Somerset US 27 Corridor occurred comparing it to Scottsville Road. It was noted the difference is that in Somerset many of the businesses have direct access to US 27 and/or connections to frontage or backage roads.
- Greg Meredith, KYTC District 3 Chief District Engineer, asked if US 231 follows the Somerset US 27 approach what would happen to the east frontage road. Would it need to be removed? This will be reviewed in more detail following the meeting, but there is a possibility there isn't enough room to widen the corridor and maintain frontage in certain areas.
- It was noted that Alternative 4A shouldn't move forward as one of the preferred two alternatives.
- It was noted pedestrian improvements were needed, particularly to cross Scottsville Road.
- The discussion returned to Alternative 5. It was noted this was a short-term best case scenario. There was acknowledgment the ultimate fix best alternative could take a number of years to complete. The concern was that the long-term solution would not be programmed if short-term solutions were pursued. One recommendation was to use the available monies, but still keep the project a priority.
- It was asked if the lanes could be narrowed and six lanes put within the existing edge of pavement. The District noted they had safety concerns with this solution and others noted reservations as well.
- One final question was whether three lanes could be implemented on only a portion of the corridor with the remaining staying a four lane section. This could be revisited as the project progresses.

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned around 10:00 am CST.

MINUTES
Second Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting
US 231 – Warren County – Item # 3-8702.00
Barren River Area Development District Office
Bowling Green, Kentucky
May 12, 2014
10:00 AM CDT

A local officials/stakeholders meeting for the US 231 Scottsville Road Scoping and Traffic Operations Study (Warren County) was held at 10:00 a.m. CDT on Monday, May 12, 2014, in Bowling Green, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to review existing conditions, gather input on potential alternatives, and discuss next steps. Participants in the meeting represented local officials and stakeholders, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 3 and Central Offices, the consultant firm, CDM Smith, and sub-consultant firm, American Engineers. The following members of the project team were in attendance:

Greg Meredith	KYTC, District 3 Chief District Engineer
Deneatra Henderson	KYTC, District 3 Planning
Jeff Moore	KYTC, District 3 Planning
Joe Plunk	KYTC, District 3 Design
Wes Watt	KYTC, District 3 PIO
Shane McKenzie	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Steve Ross	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Barry House	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Eileen Vaughan	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Scott Thomson	KYTC, Central Office Planning
Brad Johnson	CDM Smith
Steve De Witte	CDM Smith
Kenneth Cox	American Engineers
Peter Overmohle	American Engineers

The following local officials were in attendance:

Senator Mike Wilson	Kentucky Legislature
Representative Jody Richards	Kentucky Legislature
Representative Jim DeCesare	Kentucky Legislature
Melissa Cansler	Bowling Green City Engineer
Doug Hawkins	Bowling Green Police Chief
Kevin Wiles	Bowling Green Police
Bruce Wilkerson	City of Bowling Green
Meredith Robinson	Bowling Green Area Chamber of Commerce
Ron Bunch	Bowling Green Area Chamber of Commerce
Jennifer Tougas	Western Kentucky University
Ken Merideth	Go BG Transit
Donna Tooley	Go BG Transit
Ronnie Pearson	Warren County Emergency Management

J.M. Yowell
Amy Scott
Rodney Kirthey
John Odom
Miranda Clements

Warren County Public Works
Bowling Green MPO/BRADD
BRADD
Warren County Schools
City-County Planning

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

Welcome and Introductions: Deneatra Henderson, KYTC Co-Project Manager, began the meeting, welcoming attendees and asking for introductions from all.

Existing Conditions Review: Brad Johnson, CDM Smith Project Manager, briefly outlined the project limits and environmental considerations. Brad noted that the project limits are from Lovers Lane/Campbell Lane (M.P. 10.453 to Three Springs Road/Ken Bale Road (M.P. 9.455). This mile long corridor currently includes 6 signalized and 3 un-signalized intersections.

Brad explained that there is a higher incidence of crashes along Scottsville Road than on similar roads across the state. This indicates that crashes cannot be attributed to random chance. The alternatives were developed to be cognizant of the safety issues along Scottsville Road.

Brad also explained that traffic volumes are consistent along the corridor – vehicles turning off Scottsville Road are soon replaced. Currently, Scottsville Road is approaching capacity.

Purpose and Need: Brad presented a bullet style draft purpose and need statement. It reads “The purpose of the project is to improve safety and mobility of Scottsville Road while providing reasonable access along the corridor. This need is demonstrated by the proximity of the frontage road as well as the relatively high crash rates, which raise concerns about vehicle safety.” Alternative development proceeded with the overall goal of satisfying the purpose and need.

Design Considerations: Brad provided an overview of the design considerations including utilities, multimodal considerations and typical sections. The multimodal considerations are auto, transit, truck access to businesses, pedestrians and bicyclists. The typical sections decisions were rural/urban, the number of lanes and consideration of the frontage road.

Initial Alternates: Brad provided an overview of the five alternatives which were originally under consideration:

- Alternative 1 - Widen to six lanes and intersection spot improvements.
- Alternative 2 – Convert select intersections to right-in/out, left- in to aid mobility and safety.
- Alternative 3 – Combination of Alternates 1 & 2 with 3 lanes in each direction and convert select intersections to right in/out, left- in.
- Alternative 4 – Widen to three lanes, permit U-turns for all vehicles, and intersection modifications.
- Alternative 5 – Intersection spot improvements such as extending turn lanes, dual lefts, and the removal of the signal at the Greenwood Square Shopping Center.

Alternatives 1 and 3 were selected for further study. Both incorporate the spot improvements designated in Alternative 5.

Cost Estimates: Brad presented preliminary cost estimates for spot improvements, Alternative 1, and Alternative 3 (rural and urban typical sections). He noted that these were construction costs only; utility and right-of-way estimates are ongoing and would need to be added. He also noted that the costs for Alternatives 1 and 3 include the spot improvements.

Traffic Analysis: Brad presented traffic analysis from two software packages, Synchro and VISSIM. The measures presented included vehicle delay, Level of Service, through travel time, and volume moving through the intersection.

Questions and Comments: The following summarizes the questions, answers, and comments from the meeting:

- An attendee asked if the \$5 million already programmed would be sufficient for the spot improvements. Brad responded that some of the spot improvements could be constructed, but widening will require more funds.
- Representative Richards asked what the timetable for spot improvements and widening is. Brad answered that the spot improvements can move forward now, but it's up to the government to fund further widening.
- An attendee asked if future traffic considered the Ken Bale 5-lane extension to Shive Lane. Brad explained that it had.
- Jeff Moore asked if it was safe to consider the spot improvements as "Phase I" of future widening. The median is slightly wider in Alternative 3, so considerations should be made when considering the spot improvements.
- Jeff also asked if all the spot improvements needed to be constructed together. Brad responded that a couple spot improvements are smaller, and it wouldn't be critical if they were not constructed before future widening. It was also noted that the spot improvements may appear to be "overbuilt" (i.e. containing a median), but these improvements are designed to tie in to future widening.
- An attendee asked if dual lefts and the associated turn lanes and tapers would impact the signal at Greenwood Square (Kroger/K-Mart). Brad responded that it would be close, and impacts are possible.
- Melissa Cansler asked if it was possible to coordinate the Mall/Kroger signal on Cave Mill with the Scottsville Road/Cave Mill/Shive Lane signal. Brad wholeheartedly endorsed the idea.
- An attendee asked if the right turn lane from Cave Mill onto Scottsville Road could be lengthened. Brad responded that the lane would encroach on the entrance to Fazoli's; but this option could be explored in Phase I design.
- Chief Hawkins noted that the Shive Lane/Frontage Road intersection was the city's worst crash location. He commented that the existing turn radius is not sufficient for truck traffic turning onto Shive Lane. Brad stated that the radii shown were preliminary; turning templates in the design phase will ensure proper radii.
- Joe Plunk noted that due to the terrain challenges near the frontage road, an urban typical section may be necessary at certain locations.
- An attendee asked if the project team considered an alternative which incorporated "Michigan Lefts" in lieu of signalized left turns at intersections. Brad responded that the corridor does not have adequate spacing for a Michigan Left system. Turn restrictions are being considered at Greenwood Square and Pedigo Way in Alternative 3. U-turns could be accommodated in Alternative 3, but would need to occur at existing intersections.

- Representative DeCesare asked if improvements would be made to Scottsville Road north of the project limits. Greg Meredith replied that this project addresses the highest need. Greg also remarked that District 3 would look at other improvements along Scottsville Road as a whole, including traffic management and a possible smart signal system. Joe Plunk also noted that the concepts shown by the project team could be applied to the north.
- Donna Tooley asked if 11' lanes would still satisfy the safety component of the purpose and need. Brad replied that it would in his opinion. Donna remarked that she is also in favor from a transit standpoint, as it would be less expensive and pedestrians would have a shorter distance to cross and there would be less of a stormwater impact.
- Ken Merideth noted that the current plan sheets show sidewalks on the west side of the frontage road, which would be opposite the bus door following a south-north route. He also expressed concerns about ADA accessibility. Greg Meredith explained that all pedestrian and transit improvements would be ADA compliant. Brad surmised that sidewalk and transit decisions could be made in Phase I design.
- Brad Johnson noted that Spot Improvements alone will not impact thru traffic considerably. Individual intersections operate better, but the issue of overall congestion is not fully addressed.
- Donna Tooley noted a pedestrian refuge island is feasible in Alternative 3.
- Chief Hawkins vocalized that the city's five highest collision points were on Scottsville Road between I-65 and Lovers Lane, mostly due to driver inattentiveness. He expressed that if safety is the concern, capacity must be improved.
- Greg Meredith explained that an ideal schedule would see spot improvements in place in two years, and in a perfect world widening completed in a further four years. He noted that utility work would be very expensive, and called attention to AT&T's fiber optic conduit (large duct banks) alongside Scottsville Road as an example.
- Ronnie Pearson noted that medians and islands had been installed before and asked if simply striping the median was an option. Brad noted that vehicles may still ignore signage and striping – a physical barrier forces all traffic to oblige. Bollards may be used as a physical barrier – permanent bollards are an acceptable option.
- Ken Merideth asked if a backage road could be constructed behind Wendy's to avoid fiber optics in US 231. Greg Meredith answered that there is a danger in disturbing the drainage basins back there. Additionally, there is no clear direct path for a backage road to take.
- Miranda Clements expressed her joy that sidewalks were included, but asked if more could be done to accommodate cyclists. She will provide a report to the project team detailing survey results collected by the Greenways organization. Brad noted that a bike lane or shared use path could be explored in Phase I design. It was noted that if a rural typical section is used, cyclists could take advantage of the shoulder. Shane McKenzie speaking on behalf of Troy Hearn noted that Scottsville Road was not listed as a cycling corridor in either a Local Area Plan or Bike Plan. However, a shared use path separated from vehicular traffic may be desirable. Additionally, Troy would not recommend adding bike lanes to this corridor due to safety. Greg added that the corridor has a posted speed of 45 mph.
- Jeff Moore wanted to clear up the misconception that since the 2040 forecast volumes were used, 2040 is the build year. In fact, 2020 was the assumed build year with a 20-year design life.

Next Steps: Brad explained that this is the final instance of public involvement for this study, and that further comments should be directed toward Deneatra Henderson.

- CDM Smith will continue the writing of the report, with hopes of a completed draft report for review in June.

- The final project team meeting will occur on May 12, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. CDT.

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned around 12:15 p.m. CDT.