

Appendix A
Stakeholder and Project
Team Minutes



MEETING MINUTES

Groundbreaking by Design.

Project: Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway
Corridor Study for Interstate Deficiencies
1-24 to I-69 / Western Kentucky Parkway
Christian and Hopkins Counties

Purpose: Project Team Meeting #1

Place: Pennyrile Area Development District - Madisonville

Meeting Date: April 29, 2014 (9:00 a.m.)

Prepared By: Annette Coffey

Attendees:

Steve Ross	KYTC C.O. Planning	steve.ross@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Eileen Vaughan	KYTC C.O Planning	eileen.vaughan@ky.gov
Kevin McClearn	KYTC- D2	kevin.mcclearn@ky.gov
John Rudd	KYTC- D2 P.D	john.rudd@ky.gov
Nick Hall	KYTC – D2 Planning	nick.hall@ky.gov
Jason Orange	KYTC C.O. Planning	jason.orange@ky.gov
Shane McKenzie	KYTC C.O. Planning	shane.mckenzie@ky.gov
Craig Morris	PADD	craig.morris@ky.gov
Daniel Hulker	KYTC – Planning	daniel.hulker@ky.gov
Taylor Kelly	QK4	tkelly@qk4.com
Tom Clouse	QK4	tclouse@qk4.com
Annette Coffey	QK4	acoffey@qk4.com

The Project Team Meeting began at 9:10 am with introductions by Nick Hall. He explained that the this project study was to identify deficiencies that would potentially have to be corrected in order to designate the Edward T. Breathitt Parkway (ETB) from I-24 (MP 0.000) in Christian County north to I-69/Western Kentucky Parkway Interchange in Hopkins County (MP 34.271) as an interstate. He then turned the meeting over to Annette Coffey, Qk4's Project Manager.

Each team member was given an agenda, and two handouts containing the following:

- Five Years of crash locations, high crash segments, and supporting crash type information,
- 0.3 mile high crash spots,
- Items that do not meet interstate criteria according to interstate criteria accepted by AASHTO,
- 2013 and 2040 No Build and Build Traffic, and
- Summary table of categories that do not meet interstate criteria.

MEETING MINUTES

Groundbreaking by Design.

Project: Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyriple) Parkway
Corridor Study for Interstate Deficiencies
I-24 to I-69 / Western Kentucky Parkway
Christian and Hopkins Counties

Purpose: Stakeholders Meeting #1

Place: Pennyriple Development District – Madisonville

Meeting Date: April 29, 2014

Prepared By: Annette Coffey

Attendees:

William Jackson	City of Madisonville	bjackson@madisonvillegov.com
David Jackson	City of Madisonville	mayor@madisonvillegov.com
Ted Adkins	Hopkins Co. Joint Planning Commission	tadkins@hopkinscounty.net
Nate Pagan	City of Hopkinsville	npagan@hopkinsvilleky.us
Guy Howie	City of Hopkinsville	ghowie@hopkinsvilleky.us
Thomas wolf	City of Hopkinsville	twolf@hopkinsvilleky.us
Mike Franklin	City of Madisonville	mfranklin@madisonvillegov.com
Mike Workman	Hopkinsville Fire	mworkman@hompkinsvilleky.us
Freddie Montgomery Jr.	Hopkinsville Fire-EMS	fmontgomery@hopkinsvilleky.us
Michael Duncan	Hopkins County	mkduncan@hopkinscounty.net
Jason Vincent	PeADD	jason.vincent@ky.gov
Amy Frogue	PeADD	amy.frogue@ky.gov
Patricia Wiles	Madisonville-Hopkins Co. Chamber	patricia@madisonville-hopkinschamber.com
Kevin McClearn	KYTC – D2	kevin.mcclearn@ky.gov
John Rudd	KYTC – D2	john.rudd@ky.gov
Nick Hall	KYTC – D2	nick.hall@ky.gov
Jason Orange	KYTC – D2	jason.orange@ky.gov
Steve Ross	KYTC C.O. Planning	steve.ross@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfry@ky.gov
Eileen Vaughan	KYTC C.O. Planning	eileen.vaughan@ky.gov
Shane McKenzie	KYTC C.O. Planning	shane.mckenzie@ky.gov
Daniel Hulker	KYTC C.O. Planning	daniel.hulker@ky.gov
Craig Morris	PADD	craig.morris@ky.gov
Taylor Kelly	QK4	tkelly@qk4.com
Tom Clouse	QK4	tclouse@qk4.com
Annette Coffey	QK4	acoffey@qk4.com

Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway
Corridor Study for Interstate Deficiencies
I-24 to I-69 / Western Kentucky Parkway
Christian and Hopkins Counties
Stakeholders' Meeting #1
April 29, 2014
Page 2

Stakeholders meeting 10:35 start time

Kevin opened meeting - penny rile study I 69 to I 24. Told of current projects under way. Told study would tell what doesn't comply with interstate standards and what it would cost to bring it up to standard. Told FHWA would be involved with project.

P&n to have interstate connectivity from I69 to I24.
Parkway to interstate doesn't appear to generate traffic.
Went around room for introductions.

Kevin stated that the District had close ties to QK4.

Kevin told group that there may be issues with work previously done on Breathitt from Hopkinsville south.

Annette began by passing out agenda and placemat, and asking group to sign sign in sheet.

Told that purpose is to connect interstates, look at deficiencies to be considered inter

July improvement options and cost
Sept draft report
December Final report.

Interchange issues, highway issues (median, shoulders,), interchange ramps, bridges clearance, environmental to be addressed after decision made on where improvements are to be made.

P&N what are we trying to do and why. Will say system connectivity (interstate connectivity), will investigate use of "economic development" in p&n.

Gave background on Crash history on corridor. 42 - 0.3 mile high crash spots. 77% single vehicle accidents. 19 wet road, 31 collision with animals. 4 head on crashes.

12 lanes, 10 paved outside, 4 paved inside, 36' median width. 27 miles of narrow shoulders.

Clear zone issues.

Superelevation issues 13 locations

Sight distance 8 locations don't meet

Bridges 39 and culverts, 8 (???) inadequate pier protection locations and 1 vertical clearance location.

2 bridges with rail, 4 narrow bridges.

Guardrail end treatments replaced.

Interchanges - interchange spacing an issue at 2 locations.

Question was asked if spacing too close, would one be closed? General answer was didn't think so, but discussion would have to be held with FHWA.

Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway
Corridor Study for Interstate Deficiencies
I-24 to I-69 / Western Kentucky Parkway
Christian and Hopkins Counties
Stakeholders' Meeting #1
April 29, 2014
Page 3

Interchange ramp crash on US 41. Was pointed out that ramp was reconstructed. Question asked about spike during construction.

11 deficient interchange ramps. Costs will be provided for each.

Curbs present on ramps that will have to be removed.

Some Guardrail end treatments will need to be replaced.

3 interchanges for possible reconstruction, exit 11, exit 30, exit 34. Possibly exit 1 at I24.

Access control issues 100' urban , 300' rural - 8 instances where it doesn't meet.

Traffic forecast. 9,000 - 17,000 current adt. Making it interstate won't add to traffic.

Question was asked about how flexible FHWA is.

Taylor explained that conversion agreement not put in place until closer to construction. John Rudd told that funding strip would likely need to be in place prior to having conversion agreement. Taylor told that the "conversion agreement" is the last step, and that dialog is held with FHWA prior to this final agreement.

Lengthy Discussion took place about lack of growth if we brought up to interstate standards. Concern raised about businesses that say they won't relocate unless it is interstate.

Concern about term parkway is thought as scenic route, not direct route as interstate does.

Annette said next meeting would be between July and August.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 am.



MEETING MINUTES

Groundbreaking by Design.

Project: Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway
Corridor Study for Interstate Deficiencies
1-24 to I-69 / Western Kentucky Parkway
Christian and Hopkins Counties

Purpose: Project Team Meeting #2 (1:00 p.m. Local Time)

Place: Pennyrile Area Development District Office

Meeting Date: August 5, 2014

Prepared By: Tom Springer

Attendees:

Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Deanna Mills	KYTC C.O. Planning	deanna.mills@ky.gov
Nick Hall	KYTC – D2 Planning	nick.hall@ky.gov
Jason Orange	KYTC – D2 Planning	jason.orange@ky.gov
Shane McKenzie	KYTC C.O. Planning	shane.mckenzie@ky.gov
Daniel Hulker	KYTC C.O. Planning	daniel.hulker@ky.gov
Tom Clouse	QK4	tclouse@qk4.com
Bruce Siria	QK4	bsiria@qk4.com
Annette Coffey	QK4	acoffey@qk4.com
Tom Springer	QK4	tspringer@qk4.com

Following introductions, Annette provided an overview of the meeting, noting that our goal was to review the status of the project and prepare for the afternoon's Stakeholder's meeting. The overall goal of the project is to determine what is needed to upgrade the Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyrile) Parkway, from I-24 north to the Western Kentucky Parkway/I-69, to Interstate standards.

The handouts identified the "deficiencies" with the existing parkway as it compares with current interstate standards, and identified associated costs so that it could be named an interstate spur. The associated costs were presented as construction costs only. Right of way and Utilities estimates were not included and were to be provided by KYTC.

Tom Springer addressed several questions from the first Project Team Meeting by providing an overview of indirect and cumulative impacts, and economic development as part of the purpose and need of the project. Because economic development is difficult to measure or compare with other alternatives, it is best for this project to include it as part of a goal. Specifically, the goal would be to help make Hopkinsville more economic competitive by being connected to the future I-69 with an interstate spur, built to interstate standards, rather than the current parkway standards. Regarding indirect and cumulative impacts, Tom noted

that disclosure of such impacts is required with all NEPA document, but where it becomes more involved is when specific developments are reasonably foreseeable to occur only if the road project happens. In other words, the development would not happen but for the road project. No such known developments are known to occur with the proposed conversion of the Parkway to interstate standards.

Ms. Coffey explained that at the first Project Team Meeting, the EBT Parkway was studied at a high level to identify possible deficiencies. When the number of items narrowed to a smaller list, a more in-depth study of each item was done and a possible improvement option was identified in between the first and second Project Team Meeting. Annette provided an overview of the updated list of items along the parkway that would possibly require an upgrade and need to be addressed if no design exceptions are approved. Other items that vary from normal AASHTO practice but are not considered design exceptions were also identified. The 13 controlling list of design exceptions are as follows:

- Design Speed
- Lane Width
- Shoulder Width
- Bridge Width
- Structural Capacity
- Horizontal Alignment
- Vertical Alignment
- Grade
- Stopping Sight Distance
- Cross Slope
- Superelevation
- Vertical Clearance
- Horizontal Clearance (not including clear zone)

That summary list and their associated costs (minus Right of Way and Utilities Costs) are provided in the attached exhibit. The exhibit has a number/symbol key that is illustrated on the exhibits locating each “deficiency.” The following addresses explanations that were given in the presentation (also attached) beyond the associated costs.

- **Mainline horizontal curves and superelevation.**

Initially, the tables in the "Green Book" for maximum superelevation indicated that 13 horizontal curves did not meet superelevation criteria. However given the friction factor for the area (.10), the radius for each particular curve, and the superelevation at that curve, the actual calculations show all design speeds are well above the posted speed limits and design speed with the exception of one curve that meets 67 mph. The 67 mph horizontal curve located at MP XX is in an urban area, therefore, meets the minimum criteria of 50 mph criteria. For this reason, at our previous meeting 13 horizontal curves were noted as deficient; however, based on this more detailed analysis, each horizontal curve does meet current interstate design standards.

- **Mainline vertical curves.**

According to the as-built plans, there are two sag curves that do not meet headlight sight distance, and are recommended for improvement.

- **Mainline inside shoulders.**

AASHTO requires a paved inside shoulder width of four (4 feet). The inside shoulder widths (3 feet) are substandard for the entire length of the older portion of the parkway, from the Breathitt Parkway Extension north.. The major cost associated with an additional 1-foot of shoulder width is constructability. In order to achieve acceptable compaction, the existing inside shoulder will be removed and approximately five (5) feet of new shoulder would be added.

- **Side slopes within the clear zone.**

The median slopes are 1V:3V from MP 29.568 to MP 32.861 the ditch widths and slopes are eight (8) feet with 1V:3H foreslopes from MP 7.5 to MP 32.861. Defining the exacting criteria that could be used for determining whether a roadway slope “meets interstate standard” was challenging. Seeking to document a hard and fast rule proved difficult using the *Roadside Design Guide*, because this publication was written to allow for flexibility in the design decision making process.

AASHTO’s publication *A Policy on DESIGN STANDARDS INTERSTATE SYSTEM* January 2005 provides the clearest direction for sideslopes as they pertain to the interstate system. This publication states “Foreslopes within the clear zone should not be steeper than 1V:4H and desirably should be 1V:6H or flatter. Where steeper slopes are used within the clear zone, roadside barriers shall be installed where warranted by the criteria in the current edition of AASHTO’s *Roadside Design Guide*.”

Using this guidance, all median, roadway ditch, and fill slopes should be a minimum of 4:1 if they are located within the clear zone, or otherwise provide barriers if called for by the *Roadside Design Guide*. The *Roadside Design Guide* states that the clear zones for a design speed of 65-70 mph, with an ADT>6000 and foreslopes of 1V:4H should be 38-46 feet.

The above definition points out that roadway ditch slopes steeper than 4:1 should be analyzed to see if barrier protection is warranted. Figure 3-6 in the *Roadside Design Guide* clearly shows that 3:1 to 3:1 AND 4:1 to 4:1 median slopes are not preferred. Section 3.3.5 goes on to state that “Drainage channel cross sections that are considered preferable in Figures 3-6 and 3-7 are not obstacles and need not be constructed at or beyond the suggested clear-zone distance for a specific roadway.” One can infer from that statement that cross sections considered not preferable are obstacles and should be constructed at the clear zone distance.

However, the same *Roadside Design Guide* also states in section 3.2.2 that “If the foreslope between the roadway and the base of the backslope is traversable (1V:3H or flatter) and the backslope is obstacle-free, it may not be a significant obstacle, regardless of its distance from the roadway.”

The conclusion we arrived to is that all slopes on the interstate should be a minimum of 1V:4H, including the median slopes. However, if corrections are being made to the slopes, they should likely be corrected to a more desirable 1V:6H slope. Therefore, the costs presented are for conversion from a 1V:3H to a 1V:6H slope (desirable).

- **Interchange spacing.**

AASHTO's publication *A Policy on DESIGN STANDARDS INTERSTATE SYSTEM* January 2005 states that as a rule, minimum spacing should be one (1) mile in urban areas and three (3) miles in rural areas, based on crossroad to crossroad spacing. In urban areas, spacing of less than one (1) mile may be developed by grade-separated ramps or by collector-distributor roads. There are two places where the spacing between the cross roads do not meet that criteria: in the North, between the WKP and US 62 at Nortonville, and in the south between Lovers Lane and US 68B. However, due to the low ramp volumes and the fact that the interchanges were just recently open to traffic, a cost was not provided nor recommendations made for reconstruction.

The Lovers Lane and US 68B interchanges were recently constructed and the ramps meet the spacing requirements (even though the bridge-to-bridge spacing does not), so no changes are recommended. The southbound exit ramp at Lovers Lane was even designed as a "flopped" loop so to provide additional spacing. This ramp also is projected to have 400 vpd in the design year 2040.

- In the north the ongoing reconstruction of the I-69/WKP parkway will a CD system with the Exit 30 interchange in Nortonville very expensive (\$25M), which is excessive for the low traffic volumes which currently operation at a LOS of A.

Both interchanges locations operate at LOS for the mainline and for the merge and diverge movements.

- **Interchange reconstruction.**

- **Exit 11** is the former toll booth interchange at KY 1682, which will be reconstructed to a traditional diamond. This type of interchange has been reconstructed on nearly every parkway in Kentucky removing the weave area between entrance and exit ramps.
- **Exit 30** at US 62 is a partial interchange, and where the parkway used to end. FHWA does not usually support partial interchanges; therefore an option to make the partial interchange a full interchange was studied. With the railroad next to the existing interchange, and the configuration of the exiting ramps, the recommendation is to place the three ramps (SB exit, SB entrance, and NB exit

ramps) several hundred feet to the south, along with a new connector over to US 41A. The northbound entrance ramp is proposed to stay in place because of the length, and the fairly long bridge. This option is estimated to be \$10.4M. Another option is to close this interchange.

- **Exit 33** would be a \$25M construction to be directional for the I-69 to Interstate Spur movements with each movement meeting a design speed of 70 mph.

The following comments were made:

- Add a cost for a southbound CD/auxiliary lane between Lovers Lane and the US 68 Bypass to the summary of costs
- On the summary of costs, add the direction for the line items e.g. Drakes Creek Bridge is identified as deficient in both the northbound and southbound directions, just add that notation.

Due the time, the Access Management issues were covered as a part of the Stakeholders' Meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30.



MEETING MINUTES

Groundbreaking by Design.

Project: Edward T. Breathitt (Pennyriple) Parkway
Corridor Study for Interstate Deficiencies
1-24 to I-69 / Western Kentucky Parkway
Christian and Hopkins Counties

Purpose: Project Stakeholders' Meeting #2

Place: Pennyriple Area development District Office

Meeting Date: August 5, 2014

Prepared By: Tom Springer

Attendees:

Nate Pagan	City of Hopkinsville	npagan@hopkinsvilleky.us
Guy Howie	City of Hopkinsville	ghowie@hopkinsvilleky.us
Thomas wolf	City of Hopkinsville	twolf@hopkinsville.ky.us
Freddie Montgomery Jr.	Hopkinsville Fire-EMS	fmontgomery@hopkinsvilleky.us
Michael Duncan	Hopkins County	mkduncan@hopkinscounty.net
Dan Kemp	City of Hopkinsville	dkemp@hopkinsville.ky.us
Louis Sumner	Hopkinsville PD	lsumner@hopkinsvilleky.us
David Herndon	Community and Development Services	dherndon@comdev-services.com
Steve Bourne	Community and Development Services	sbourne@comdev-services.com
William Corum	C-Link and Bridgelink	wcorum@twc.com
John Mahre	Christian County & PADD	mahres@aol.com
Steve Tribble	Christian Fiscal Court	cjst@hopkinsville.net
Marian Mason	Christian Co. Chamber	mmason@christiancountychamber.com
Jason Vincent	PeADD	jason.vincent@ky.gov
Deanna Mills	KYTC C.O. Planning	Deanna.mills@ky.gov
Nick Hall	KYTC – D2 Planning	nick.hall@ky.gov
Jason Orange	KYTC – D2	jason.orange@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Shane McKenzie	KYTC C.O. Planning	shane.mckenzie@ky.gov
Daniel Hulker	KYTC C.O. Planning	daniel.hulker@ky.gov
Tom Clouse	QK4	tclouse@qk4.com
Bruce Siria	QK4	bsiria@qk4.com
Annette Coffey	QK4	acoffey@qk4.com
Tom Springer	QK4	tspringer@qk4.com

Ms. Coffey provided an overview of the project; and highlighted the goal, which is to identify what improvements would be necessary to upgrade the existing Edward T. Breathitt Parkway from I-24 in Christian County to I-69/WKP/Edward T. Breathitt interchange in Hopkins County (34 miles) to interstate standards so that it could become an interstate spur. When presenting the summary of costs, Ms. Coffey

noted the total costs did not include Right of Way and Utility costs, and the totals could either increase or decrease based on whether or not design exceptions are allowed.

The purpose and need for this project is to improve interstate connectivity and improve safety. Enhancing the potential for economic development is a goal (not part of the purpose and need) of the project.

The Mayor of Hopkinsville asked what type of design exceptions have been granted in the past for I-69. Mikael Pelfrey noted that various exceptions have been granted in the past, but it is not a guarantee, and cannot be pursued until this phase concludes. The objective of this report is to address all potentially needed changes without any design exceptions. Ms. Coffey noted that all design exceptions are site-specific, and would be addressed during the next phase of this project.

Annette Coffey provided the following overview of exhibits and tables, which identify the deficiencies that do not meet current interstate standards. The presentation that identifies this list is included in the attached presentation and handouts. The same presentation was given to the Project Team earlier in the afternoon.

Ms. Coffey explained that at the first Project Team Meeting, the EBT Parkway was studied at a high level to identify possible deficiencies. When the number of items narrowed to a smaller list, a more in-depth study of each item was done and a possible improvement option was identified in between the first and second Project Team Meeting. Annette provided an overview of the updated list of items along the parkway that would possibly require an upgrade and need to be addressed if no design exceptions are approved. Other items that vary from normal AASHTO practice but are not considered design exceptions were also identified. The 13 controlling list of design exceptions are as follows:

- Design Speed
- Lane Width
- Shoulder Width
- Bridge Width
- Structural Capacity
- Horizontal Alignment
- Vertical Alignment
- Grade
- Stopping Sight Distance
- Cross Slope
- Superelevation
- Vertical Clearance
- Horizontal Clearance (not including clear zone)

That summary list and their associated costs (minus Right of Way and Utilities Costs) are provided in the attached exhibit. The exhibit has a number/symbol key that is illustrated on the exhibits locating each “deficiency.” The following addresses explanations that were given in the presentation (also attached) beyond the associated costs.

- **Mainline horizontal curves and superelevation.**
 - Initially, a high level of deficiencies were examined on 34 miles of roadway. 13 horizontal curves did not meet superelevation criteria. However, based on this more detailed analysis, each horizontal curve does meet current interstate design standards.
- **Mainline vertical curves.**
 - According to the as-built plans, there are two sag curves that do not meet headlight sight distance. If actual conditions are the same in the field those curves are recommended for improvement.
- **Mainline inside shoulders.**
 - AASHTO requires a paved inside shoulder width of four (4 feet). The inside shoulder widths (3 feet) are substandard for the entire length of the older portion of the parkway, from the Breathitt Parkway Extension north. The major cost associated with an additional 1-foot of shoulder width is constructability. In order to achieve acceptable compaction, the existing inside shoulder will be removed and approximately five (5) feet of new shoulder would be added.
- **Side slopes within the clear zone.**
 - Median and ditch slopes are steeper than desired. There are two options to improve those steeper slopes. If corrections are being made to the slopes, they should likely be corrected to a more desirable 1V:6H slope. Therefore, the costs presented are for conversion from a 1V:3H to a 1V:6H slope (desirable).
- **Interchange spacing.**
 - AASHTO's minimum spacing should be one (1) mile in urban areas and three (3) miles in rural areas, based on crossroad to crossroad spacing. There are two places where the spacing between the cross roads do not meet that criteria: in the North, between the WKP and US 62 at Nortonville, and in the south between Lovers Lane and US 68B. However, due to the low ramp volumes and the fact that the interchanges were just recently open to traffic, a cost was not provided nor recommendations made for reconstruction for the spacing at Lovers Lane.
 - The Lovers Lane and US 68B interchanges were recently constructed and the ramps meet the spacing requirements (even though the bridge-to-bridge spacing does not), so no changes are recommended. The southbound exit ramp at Lovers Lane was even designed as a "flopped" loop so to provide additional spacing. This ramp also is projected to have 400 vpd in the design year 2040.
 - In the north the ongoing reconstruction of the I-69/WKP parkway would require a CD system to meet spacing with the Exit 30 interchange in Nortonville which would be very expensive (\$25M), and may be excessive for the low traffic volumes which currently operate at a LOS of A.

Both interchanges locations operate at LOS A for the mainline and for the merge and diverge movements.

- **Interchange Reconstruction.**

- **Exit 11** is the former toll booth interchange at KY 1682, which will be reconstructed to a traditional diamond. This type of interchange has been reconstructed on nearly every parkway in Kentucky removing the weave area between entrance and exit ramps.
- **Exit 30** at US 62 is a partial interchange, and where the parkway used to end. FHWA does not usually support partial interchanges; therefore an option to make the partial interchange a full interchange was studied. With the railroad next to the existing interchange, and the configuration of the exiting ramps, the recommendation is to place the three ramps (SB exit, SB entrance, and NB exit ramps) several hundred feet to the south, along with a new connector over to US 41A. The northbound entrance ramp is proposed to stay in place because of the length, and the fairly long bridge. This option is estimated to be \$10.4M. Another option is to close this interchange.
- **Exit 33** would be a \$25M construction to be directional for the I-69 to Interstate Spur movements with each movement meeting a design speed of 70 mph.

- **Access Control on Crossroads.**

(i.e., driveways or entrances should be no closer to the ramp terminal than 100 feet in an urban area and 300 feet in a rural area). The following do not meet those criteria.

- US 62 NW quadrant
- Lovers Lane access to the subdivision in the NW quadrant and a portion of Ella McReynolds Lane would need to be realigned.
- Fort Campbell Memorial Park in the US 41A interchange. A concept plan for changing the parking and access to the park was presented. The concept includes constructing a new Fort Campbell Memorial Park visitors parking lot at the rear of the Best Western hotel. This parking lot would require an easement purchase to access the parking lot.

The following facilities would be provided:

- Sidewalks would be constructed from the parking lot to the intersection of the NB ramp terminal,
- A crosswalk would be provided at the signal of the NB ramp terminal.
- A sidewalk would be provided in the NE quadrant to the park.
- A question was raised as to whether if the Kroger parking lot was considered as a location for parking... This option was not recommended

because visitors of the park would have to cross an entrance ramp with traffic accelerating onto the Parkway, rather than an exit ramp with Parkway traffic slowing down to stop at US 41.

Additional questions:

Several stakeholders asked if items could be removed from the list to reduce costs. It was explained that when maintenance issues were conducted, some of these issues may be addressed. Another suggestion was the Exit #11 (KY 1682) old tollbooth interchange could be a standalone project that could be pursued now.

Steve Borno asked if there was a requirement to address spots that have a critical rate factor of >1 . Ms. Coffey stated there was not, it is data that is a tool used as an indicator that crashes may not be occurring at random and that a review of the roadway characteristics is warranted.

The meeting concluded at 4:00 p.m. local time.