

Appendix E – Meeting Minutes

US 62 Corridor Planning Study

Hardin County, KY
May 19, 2023

US 62 Project Team Meeting #1 Meeting

10:00 AM Friday, November 18th, 2022 | District 4 Office & Microsoft Teams

Attendees

Name	Representing	Email
Kevin Blain	KYTC D4	Kevin.Blain@ky.gov
Dave Heil	KYTC	Dave.heil@ky.gov
Joe Reverman	City of Elizabethtown	Joe.reverman@elizabethtownky.gov
Aaron Hawkins	City of Elizabethtown	Aaron.hawkins@elizabethtownky.gov
Michael Page	City of Elizabethtown	Michael.page@elizabethtownky.gov
Chris Hampton	KYTC D4	Chris.hampton@ky.gov
Jacob Riggs	KYTC D4	Jacob.riggs@ky.gov
Justin Wallace	KYTC D4	Justinp.wallace@ky.gov
Jared Clemons	KYTC D4	Jared.clemons@ky.gov
Benjamin Warren	KYTC D4	Bowo.warren@ky.gov
Brad Bottoms	KYTC D4	Bradley.bottoms@ky.gov
Ed Poppe	City of Elizabethtown	Ed.Poppe@elizabethtownky.gov
Ashley Willoughby	HDR	Ashley.willoughby@hdrinc.com
Jonathan West	HDR	Jonathan.west@hdrinc.com
Travis Thompson	HDR	Travis.alan.thompson@hdrinc.com
Doug Smith	WSP	Douglas.Smith@wsp.com
Elizabeth Farc	WSP	elizabeth.farc@wsp.com
Steve De Witte*	KYTC	Steve.dewitte@ky.gov
Mike Skaggs*	Lincoln Trail ADD/Radcliff- Elizabethtown MPO	muskaggs@ltadd.org
Adam Ulrich*	KYTC	Adam.ulrich@ky.gov
Jared Jeffers*	KYTC	Jared.jeffers@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey*	KYTC	Mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Kevin Young*	KYTC	Kevin.young@ky.gov
Jayalakshmi Balaji*	KYTC	Jayalakshmi.Balaji@ky.gov
Rob Frazier*	HDR	Robert.frazier@hdrinc.com
Austin Obenauf*	WSP	Austin.obenauf@wsp.com
Philip Bischof*	HDR	Philip.Bischof@hdrinc.com

*Indicates attendance via MS Teams

Introduction

The meeting started with Kevin Blain, the KYTC District 4 project manager, introducing the purpose of the meeting, the background of the study, and went through introductions. Jonathan West, the consultant team project manager, presented the agenda, the purpose of the project, and the study area.

Study Background, Objective, and Goals

Jonathan presented the objective and goals for the study and opened the floor for any comments. He also shared a schedule. The study is anticipated to wrap up in May to keep the momentum of attention on the corridor going. The City of Elizabethtown asked if the study would determine design. The consultant team will bring several concepts to the recommendation stage. The interchange concepts will need to be submitted to FHWA for an Interchange Modification Report (IMR) after the study as part of the preliminary design phase of the project.

Existing Conditions

Previous Studies and Planned Projects

Travis Thompson, HDR, presented CHAF and 2022 -2028 6-Year Highway Plan projects on and near the study corridor, as well as two roundabouts listed in the MPO's MTP and TIP. He listed previous studies that are relevant, particularly the East Elizabethtown Connectivity Study (EECS). There was discussion about the status of the trail project south of the corridor and the widening of Commerce Dr. It was noted that a roundabout is planned for Commerce Dr. / Executive Dr. intersection and there is a project under design to extend Commerce Dr. south to US 31W.

The City of Elizabethtown noted that the city has optioned land at the current termini of Commerce Dr. for an event venue – an amphitheater with potential seating of 7000+. The event traffic will need to be considered in the improvement concepts.

KYTC also noted that several mini roundabouts have been let to construction that will be near the corridor, but the timing of opening to traffic is uncertain (2023 or 2024).

Geometrics

Travis presented the existing geometrics along the corridor, including typical sections and the number of intersections and access points.

Travis noted the presence of lighting was unique for an arterial. KYTC stated the lighting is by permit and maintained by the City, and any improvement work should be coordinated with the City, and plan to keep the lighting. Travis also asked if there were any maintenance or drainage issues with the grass medians and double left turns. There was no recollection of flooding. The City mows the grass and trims trees around the railroad.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Activity

Travis presented pedestrian and bicyclist activity obtained from StreetLight. He asked if the count magnitude seemed high based on local observation. The City of Elizabethtown noted that they have seen higher activity than would be expected, especially given there is little/no pedestrian infrastructure. They attributed this to the proximity of the high school on the western end of the study area and the hotels and restaurants near Executive Dr. Many sports teams visit from March – October and people walk from the hotels and restaurants to the Swim and Fitness Center on Dolphin Dr. City staff also noted

pedestrian activity east of the interchange, where people walk from the residential areas to the convenience stores, often on the street in the dark. There is not lighting in this area. There is also evidence of pedestrian activity by paths parallel to US 62 worn into the grass. Austin asked how significant the railroad bridge seems to pedestrian movement. It is a significant barrier, but changes are unlikely. Doug stated that the new KYTC Complete Streets Manual will help guide what should be done here to accommodate pedestrians.

Further discussion was had regarding cyclist activity. The City of Elizabethtown notes the nearby trails attracts cyclists. Mountain biking has been getting more popular. People may be riding from Buffalo Lake to Freeman Lake Park, but other than that they do not see much road biking.

Traffic

Travis presented origin-destination graphs with StreetLight data, existing signal controllers and timing, AADT, and intersection level of service. It was noted that Ring Rd to I-65 seems to be a priority based on intersection level of service. Speed is not a major factor. There was discussion about the speed of vehicles that are traveling through intersections on green lights. It was also noted that although several signals are coordinated, KYTC has received complaints about wait times on side streets.

Environmental

Travis listed environmental considerations on the corridor from the EECS and noted that these would likely need to be updated for any design phase.

Safety

Austin presented the crash trends for the US 62 study area. The data covers the last six years from 2016-2021. One fatality occurred. Serious injury crashes are concentrated near intersections. Austin noted that there is a mid-day crash peak and asked if the land use likely contributed to that. The many restaurants in the area are lunch time destinations.

Buffalo Creek Dr/Executive Dr had the highest density of crashes of any intersection. There was discussion about the need to slow down vehicles exiting the interstate at high speeds and using the right turn lane as a merging lane. It was noted that the downgrade in the westbound direction from the ramp exit west may be contributing to some crashes. The team also noted the intersection with Main St. has been observed as an issue. It does appear to be a hotspot in the data as well.

The corridor has a high crash rate, but the EEC is low. The consultant team will continue to look at the types of crashes at these hot spot locations.

LEO/Stakeholder Meeting

Travis will send a stakeholder list to Kevin for the project team to review. The meeting should take place the second week of December or the first week of January. There should be a presentation and open discussion. There was discussion of who to include on the stakeholder list. Pending meeting room space availability, the preferred location for the LEO/Stakeholder meeting will be the Elizabethtown Tourism & Convention Bureau on US 62.

Public Survey

Travis asked how the team would like to engage the public. There is a survey in the scope. The team liked the ArcGIS story map format.

Next Steps

- The consultant team will send a list of potential stakeholders to KYTC for review.
- The consultant team will schedule a LEO/Stakeholder meeting for December/January.

The meeting concluded at 11:35 AM ET.

US 62 Project Team Meeting #2 | Initial Concept Development & Evaluation

1:00 PM Monday, February 6th, 2023 | District 4 Office & Microsoft Teams

Attendees

Name	Representing	Email
Kevin Blain	KYTC D4	Kevin.Blain@ky.gov
Chris Hampton	KYTC D4	Chris.hampton@ky.gov
Jacob Riggs	KYTC D4	Jacob.riggs@ky.gov
Justin Wallace	KYTC D4	Justinp.wallace@ky.gov
Jared Clemons	KYTC D4	Jared.clemons@ky.gov
Benjamin Warren	KYTC D4	Bowo.warren@ky.gov
Brad Bottoms	KYTC D4	Bradley.bottoms@ky.gov
Joseph Ferguson	KYTC D4	Joseph.ferguson@ky.gov
Tate Harris	KYTC D4	Tate.harris@ky.gov
Chris Jessie	KYTC D4	Chris.jessie@ky.gov
Joe Reverman	City of Elizabethtown	Joe.reverman@elizabethtownky.gov
Aaron Hawkins	City of Elizabethtown	Aaron.hawkins@elizabethtownky.gov
Jonathan West	HDR	Jonathan.west@hdrinc.com
Travis Thompson	HDR	Travis.alan.thompson@hdrinc.com
Anne Warnick	WSP	Anne.warnick@wsp.com
Austin Obenauf	WSP	Austin.obenauf@wsp.com
Steve De Witte*	KYTC Central Office	Stephen.dewitte@ky.gov
Dave Heil*	KYTC Central Office	Dave.heil@ky.gov
Adam Ulrich*	KYTC Central Office	Adam.ulrich@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey*	KYTC Central Office	Mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Jayalakshmi Balaji*	KYTC Central Office	Jayalakshmi.Balaji@ky.gov
Rob Frazier*	HDR	Robert.frazier@hdrinc.com
Adam Hedges*	HDR	Adam.hedges@hdrinc.com
Elizabeth Farc*	WSP	elizabeth.farc@wsp.com
Cameron Manley*	WSP	Cameron.manley@hdrinc.com
Michael Page*	City of Elizabethtown	Michael.page@elizabethtownky.gov
Mike Skaggs*	Lincoln Trail ADD/Radcliff-Elizabethtown MPO	mkskaggs@ltadd.org

*Indicates attendance via MS Teams

Introduction

The meeting started with Jonathan West, the consultant team project manager, conducting introductions then presenting the agenda, goals and objective of the study, and the study area.

- The final report is to be submitted by the end of May 2023.

- The Design Phase of the project is currently scheduled to advertise in summer 2023.

Existing and Future Traffic Volumes

An update on traffic growth in the study area and traffic volumes was presented to the team.

- A study area traffic growth rate of 0.5% is being used to forecast traffic out to the design year.
- Primary intersections currently operate at Level of Service (LOS) C or better in the AM and PM peak hours, with the exception of the Ring Road (KY 3005), which operates at LOS D in the PM peak.
- The primary intersections continue to operate at LOS C or better in the AM and PM peak hours except Ring Road (KY 3005), which continues to operate at LOS D in 2045.

Corridor Concepts

Each of the five corridor-wide concepts were discussed using a combination of Typical Section displays and a Google Earth .kml file. Two options for each concept were given, depending on the type of pedestrian and bicycle facilities are proposed.

Concept 1

This concept adds pedestrian and bicycle facilities to the existing roadway but does not improve roadway infrastructure.

- Concept 1.A

Provides a 10-foot shared use path on the north side of US 62 and a 5-foot sidewalk on the south side of US 62, both at the edge of right-of-way.

- Concept 1.B

Converts the existing 10-foot paved shoulder to a 6-foot-wide bike lane with a 4-foot striped buffer between the bike lane and the driving lane. Provides a 5-foot sidewalk on both sides of US 62 at the edge of right-of-way.

Concept 2

This concept maintains the existing location of through lanes and manages access by adding additional depressed grass median and creating Restricted Crossing U-turns (RCUT). Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are also added to this concept. It was discussed that this concept serves as the base concept that meets the study's goals and objectives.

- Concept 2.A

Extends the depressed grass median and adds RCUTs to manage access. Provides a 10-foot shared use path on the north side of US 62 and a 5-foot sidewalk on the south side of US 62, both at the edge of right-of-way.

- Concept 2.B

Extends the depressed grass median and adds RCUTs to manage access. Converts the existing 10-foot paved shoulder to a 6-foot-wide bike lane with a 4-foot striped buffer between the bike lane and the driving lane. Provides a 5-foot sidewalk on both sides of US 62 at the edge of right-of-way.

Concept 3

This concept pushes the through lanes slightly into the median and converts it to a raised grass median behind curb. The outside shoulder is still maintained, and access is managed by creating RCUTs. 11- or 12-foot lanes could be provided. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are also added to this concept.

- **Concept 3.A**

Adds a raised grass median and RCUTs to manage access. Provides a 10-foot shared use path on the north side of US 62 and a 5-foot sidewalk on the south side of US 62, both at the edge of right-of-way.

- **Concept 3.B**

Adds a raised grass median and RCUTs to manage access. Converts the existing 10-foot paved shoulder to a 6-foot-wide bike lane with a 4-foot striped buffer between the bike lane and the driving lane. Provides a 5-foot sidewalk on both sides of US 62 at the edge of right-of-way.

Concept 4

This concept converts US 62 to an urban curb and gutter section and pushes the through lanes slightly into the median. A raised grass median 20 feet to 24 feet wide behind curb is provided and access managed by RCUTs. 11- or 12-foot-wide lanes could be provided. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are also added to this concept.

- **Concept 4.A**

Converts the corridor to urban curb and gutter, provides a raised grass median, and RCUTs to manage access. Provides a 10-foot shared use path on the north side of US 62 and a 5-foot sidewalk on the south side of US 62, both behind curb and gutter.

- **Concept 4.B**

Converts the corridor to urban curb and gutter, provides a raised grass median, and RCUTs to manage access. Adds a 6-foot-wide bike lane (4-foot pavement + 2-foot gutter) to both sides of US 62 and 5-foot sidewalks on both sides of US 62 behind curb and gutter.

Concept 5

This concept converts US 62 to an urban curb and gutter section and pushes the through lanes slightly into the median. A raised grass median 20 feet to 24 feet wide behind curb is provided. Roundabouts are located at key intersections throughout the corridor to provide access, thus removing traffic signals. 11- or 12-foot-wide lanes could be provided. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are also added to this concept.

- **Concept 5.A**

Converts the corridor to urban curb and gutter, provides a raised grass median, and roundabouts at key intersections. Provides a 10-foot shared use path on the north side of US 62 and a 5-foot sidewalk on the south side of US 62, both behind curb and gutter.

- **Concept 5.B**

Converts the corridor to urban curb and gutter, provides a raised grass median, and roundabouts at key intersections. Adds a 6-foot-wide bike lane (4-foot pavement + 2-foot

gutter) to both sides of US 62 and 5-foot sidewalks on both sides of US 62 behind curb and gutter.

Corridor-wide Comments and Decisions

- The Project Team decided to remove Concepts 1.A and 1.B from further consideration since these concepts did not meet the study goals and objectives.
- The Project Team decided to remove Option B (bike lane) from further consideration.
- Concepts 2.A, 3.A, 4.A, and 5.A will move forward for additional analysis and cost estimating.
- Update the remaining concepts to show an option with shared use paths on both sides of US 62.
- A comment was received that the Hardin County School Board does not allow school buses to use RCUTS. The Elizabethtown School Board should be consulted to find out if they allow this or not.
- A comment was received asking how turning traffic can be handled if Buffalo Creek Drive is not extended west to Commerce Drive. Restricted turns could still be included, but travel patterns will be different.
- An agreement between KYTC and the City would be needed specifying the City is to maintain the sidewalks/shared use path and mow grass.
- A question was asked if trees could be planted in either the median or along the roadside. This will be investigated further.
- A question was asked how cyclist progress through loons. Typically the bike lane is carried through the loon.
- The Current Highway Plan project description only funds US 62 from N. Main Street through the I-65 interchange.

CSX Railroad Crossing

Four concepts were developed to provide pedestrian and bicycle accommodations across the CSX railroad. The CSX Public Projects Manual was consulted when developing these railroad crossing concepts.

New Railroad Bridge

This concept replaces the existing railroad bridge with a new structure that provides pedestrian and cyclist accommodations. The minimum vertical clearance under the bridge would be 16 feet 6 inches. Drainage of the underpass would need to be further investigated.

- The project team decided to keep this concept for further analysis.

Tunnel Under Railroad

This concept constructs a pedestrian/cyclist tunnel under the railroad. The tunnel would need to be 10 to 14 feet wide and provide a minimum of 10 feet of vertical clearance. Lighting should be provided in the tunnel.

- The project team decided to eliminate this concept from further analysis due to the high costs, difficulties obtaining approval from the railroad for a new crossing, potential issues draining the tunnel, and difficulties locating the tunnel near US 62.

Pedestrian Overpass

This concept constructs a pedestrian/cyclist overpass of the railroad. The overpass would need to be 10 to 14 feet wide and be fully enclosed by fencing. CSX regulations state that the overpass must span the entire railroad right-of-way and provide a minimum clearance of 23 feet from the top of rail to the lowest part of the overpass.

- The project team decided to eliminate this concept from further analysis due to the high costs, low probability of usage due to the extra distance a pedestrian or cyclist would need to travel, and difficulties placing the overpass near US 62.

Modify Existing Typical Section

This concept adds a 4-foot sidewalk separated by barrier wall under the existing railroad bridge by narrowing travel lanes to 11 feet and reducing shoulder width to 2 to 2.5 feet. The reduced shoulder width may require a design variance. The 4-foot sidewalk meets ADA minimum clearance width but would need to be less than 200 feet in length before a 5-foot passing section is required. 10-foot minimum vertical clearance is needed above the sidewalk under the bridge.

- The project team decided to keep this concept for further analysis.
- The consultant team will investigate removing a travel lane under the railroad bridge to provide more room for pedestrian accommodations.

I-65 Interchange Concepts

Four concepts were developed to improve the I-65 interchange.

Improve Existing Diamond Interchange

This concept improves the existing interchange by lengthening turn lanes, providing dual turn lanes where warranted, and eliminating the westbound weave between the southbound exit ramp and Buffalo Creek Drive. The existing bridge is reused, and a pedestrian path separated by barrier wall is provided across I-65. It is anticipated this concept can be constructed within existing right-of-way.

- The project team decided to keep this concept for further analysis.

Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)

This concept replaces the existing diamond interchange with a SPUI interchange. A new bridge across I-65 is needed. This interchange increases spacing between the ramp's intersection and adjacent intersections. It is anticipated this concept can be constructed within existing right-of-way.

- A question was raised concerning maintaining traffic during construction of the new SPUI bridge. This will be analyzed further.
- The project team decided to keep this concept for further analysis.

Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI)

The DDI concept repurposes the existing bridge to accommodate this new interchange design. Pedestrian accommodations could be provided in the median across I-65. The DDI is anticipated to

provide the greatest safety benefits compared to the other interchange concepts, but the operations of adjacent intersections need to be evaluated to reduce congestion in the interchange.

- The project team decided to keep this concept for further analysis.
- A comment was received that vehicles on the southbound ramp commonly do not slow down enough to safely traverse the curve closest to the intersection. Look to reduce the degree of curvature.

Roundabout Interchange

This concept converts the signalized ramp terminal intersections to roundabouts. The existing I-65 bridge is kept and pedestrian access is provided across the bridge. The median is extended east of the interchange and an adjacent roundabout provided at the new hotel entrance, with Howell Drive being relocated to this intersection. Roundabouts are designed to accommodate a WB-67 truck.

- The project team decided to keep this concept for further analysis.
- Investigate shortening the distance between roundabouts at ramp intersections while still not impacting existing bridge.
- Investigate the advantages and disadvantages of individual roundabout intersections at the ramp termini versus a dog bone type interchange.

Intersections

In addition to corridor-wide and interchange concepts, individual intersections were also evaluated for possible improvements. A spreadsheet describing multiple improvement concepts for each intersection was shared. Below is a summary of concepts removed from further consideration by the project team.

Brook Street

- Remove Concepts 1 and 2 from further consideration.

N. Main Street

- Remove Concepts 3 and 5 from further consideration.

Ring Road (KY 3005)

- Remove Concept 1.

Commerce Drive

- Remove Concepts 2 and 3 from further consideration.

Buffalo Creek Drive

- Remove Concept 5 from further consideration.
- When showing concepts to the Stakeholders and public, show Buffalo Creek Drive as a right-in, right-out.

Medley Lane

- Remove Concept 1 from further consideration

Next Steps

- The consultant team will set up a call with CSX to discuss the railroad crossing.
- Update the graphics to be more easily readable by the stakeholders and public.
- Develop 4 or 5 full-corridor options that combine logical cross-section, intersection, and interchange concepts to show at the upcoming LEO / Stakeholder Meeting.
- Schedule a meeting date and time for the LEO / Stakeholder Meeting at the Tourism Office.

The meeting concluded at 3:15 PM ET.

US 62 Project Team Meeting #3 | Final Recommendations

2:00 PM Thursday, April 20th, 2023 | District 4 Office & Microsoft Teams

Attendees

Name	Representing	Email
Kevin Blain	KYTC D4	Kevin.Blain@ky.gov
Chris Hampton	KYTC D4	Chris.hampton@ky.gov
Jacob Riggs	KYTC D4	Jacob.riggs@ky.gov
Justin Wallace	KYTC D4	Justinp.wallace@ky.gov
Benjamin Warren	KYTC D4	Bowo.warren@ky.gov
Brad Bottoms	KYTC D4	Bradley.bottoms@ky.gov
Kevin Young	KYTC D4	KevinM.young@ky.gov
Chris Jessie*	KYTC D4	Chris.jessie@ky.gov
Stephen De Witte	KYTC Central Office	Stephen.dewitte@ky.gov
Dave Heil	KYTC Central Office	Dave.heil@ky.gov
Catherine Davis	KYTC Central Office	Catherine.davis@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey*	KYTC Central Office	Mikael.Pelfrey@ky.gov
Joe Reverman	City of Elizabethtown	Joe.reverman@elizabethtownky.gov
Ed Poppe	City of Elizabethtown	ed.poppe@elizabethtownky.gov
Aaron Hawkins	City of Elizabethtown	Aaron.hawkins@elizabethtownky.gov
Jake Zimmerer*	Lincoln Trail ADD	jake@ltadd.org
Jonathan West	HDR	Jonathan.west@hdrinc.com
Travis Thompson	HDR	Travis.alan.thompson@hdrinc.com
Ashley Willoughby	HDR	Ashley.willoughby@hdrinc.com
Adam Hedges*	HDR	Adam.hedges@hdrinc.com
Zheng, Liu*	HDR	Zheng.liu@hdrinc.com
Rob Frazier*	HDR	Robert.frazier@hdrinc.com
Anne Warnick	WSP	Anne.warnick@wsp.com
Austin Obenauf*	WSP	Austin.obenauf@wsp.com
Elizabeth Farc*	WSP	elizabeth.farc@wsp.com

*Indicates attendance via MS Teams

Introduction and Schedule

The meeting started with Kevin Blain providing an introduction on the importance of this project. Brief introductions were made then Travis Thompson presented the agenda for the meeting and where the study has progressed to in the overall schedule.

Stakeholder Meeting Results

A summary of the stakeholder meeting results was presented and discussed.

- 93% preferred curb and gutter
- 86% preferred providing a shared use path on both sides of US 62
- 66% preferred the roundabout corridor
- 93% were in favor of managing access by providing U-turns and/or roundabouts
- 86% preferred a new railroad bridge
- The roundabout interchange was the most preferred

Public Survey Results

The public survey, available at www.drive62.com is currently accessible to the public. For this meeting, preliminary results were tabulated with approximately 53 responses being recorded at the time of the meeting. Below is a brief summary of the results.

- There is not a clear preference between curb and gutter and providing shoulders
- Providing shared use paths on both sides of US 62 was preferrable
- The Reduced Conflict U-Turn (RCUT) corridor is preferred over the roundabout corridor
- The improved diamond and the diverging diamond interchange types were preferred
- A new railroad bridge was preferred

Comments

- There was discussion about extending the public comment period to allow more time. It was decided to extend the public survey to remain open until April 30th.
- The City and other local government entities have promoted the public survey on social media.
- Given that new roundabouts have just been open near the study area, the public's views may be skewed given the timing.

Concept Evaluation

Anne Warnick presented the process used for evaluating the concepts. This process is in the order of selecting a typical section (curb and gutter or shoulder), then selecting the intersection control types (RCUT or roundabout), and finally selecting an interchange option and a railroad crossing.

Future No-Build (2045) intersection levels of service were shown. All intersections are expected to operate at level of service C or better except Ring Road in the PM peak. The average travel time through the corridor in 2045 is estimated to be 5.5 minutes with greater travel times experienced in the PM peak.

Typical Sections

Four typical sections (three RCUT and one roundabout) with two pedestrian/bicycle options each were retained from Project Team Meeting #2. For each typical section, cost and predicted safety performance were discussed. The cost estimates do not include interchange or railroad crossing costs.

- **Concept 1: RCUT Shoulders with Depressed Median**
 - Sidewalk and Shared Use Path: \$7,200,000 total cost
 - Two Shared Use Paths: \$7,100,000 total cost
 - Vehicular CMF = 1.00 east of Ring Road, 0.77 west of Ring Road
 - Pedestrian CMF = 0.33 for separated walking area
- **Concept 2: RCUT Shoulders with Raised Median**
 - Sidewalk and Shared Use Path: \$7,500,000 total cost
 - Two Shared Use Paths: \$7,500,000 total cost
 - Vehicular CMF = 1.00 east of Ring Road, 0.78 west of Ring Road
 - Pedestrian CMF = 0.33 for separated walking area
- **Concept 3: RCUT Curb and Gutter with Raised Median**
 - Sidewalk and Shared Use Path: \$9,100,000 total cost
 - Two Shared Use Paths: \$9,200,000 total cost
 - Vehicular CMF = 0.90 east of Ring Road, 0.69 west of Ring Road
 - Pedestrian CMF = 0.33 for separated walking area
- **Concept 4: Roundabout Curb and Gutter with Raised Median**
 - Sidewalk and Shared Use Path: \$12,100,000 total cost
 - Two Shared Use Paths: \$12,100,000 total cost
 - The cost of the roundabout concept includes purchasing gas station at Commerce Drive
 - Vehicular CMF = 0.90 east of Ring Road, 0.69 west of Ring Road
 - Pedestrian CMF = 0.33 for separated walking area

Comments

- o It was asked if the sidewalks and/or shared use paths can be pushed further back in the curb and gutter options. This is possible. The location of these facilities in the typical section are based on typical KYTC sidewalk location practice and AASHTO Bike Guide minimum offsets for shared use path facilities.

Intersection Concepts

Two types of intersection control were developed and applied as a corridor-wide improvement.

- **RCUT Intersections**
 - With this intersection option, traffic signals remain at W. French St., Ring Road, and Commerce Drive. U-turns are provided at certain signalized intersections and between signalized intersections.
 - In general travel times decreased from the no-build condition for the RCUT options, with the exception of the PM peak in the eastbound direction.
 - Right-of-way needs for the RCUT intersections are mostly at the loon locations and east of the I-65 intersection.
 - Utility conflicts for the RCUT intersections are mostly at the intersections, loon locations, and east of the I-65 interchange.
 - Over a 20-year period, the RCUT intersections are expected to reduce about 50 crashes.
 - Green T Option at Ring Road

- With the dual left turn lanes from Ring Road to eastbound US 62 having the merge before the railroad bridge this option may be confusing for the driver
 - This option will lower the level of service at the Commerce Drive intersection and turn the intersection across from Ring Road into right-in, right-out access.
- **Roundabout Intersections**
- Due to the high opposing volumes entering the roundabout at Ring Road, this intersection is expected to operate at level of service E in the PM peak.
 - In general, travel times decreased from the no-build condition for the roundabout options, with the exception of the PM peak in the eastbound direction.
 - Right-of-way needs for the roundabout intersections are mostly at the intersection corners of the roundabouts, at the U-turn loon locations in the middle of the corridor, and east of the I-65 intersection.
 - Utility conflicts for the RCUT intersections are mostly at the intersections, loon locations, and east of the I-65 interchange.
 - There is conflicting research into the safety performance of multilane roundabouts. In general, a multilane roundabout can be expected to increase overall crashes, but possibly decrease fatal and injury crashes.
 - There are ways to mitigate or minimize these crashes at multilane roundabouts, such as enhanced signage and striping, and considering the use of turbo roundabouts, which have a reduced number of conflict points.

Comments/Questions

- Do RCUTS lean more towards a rural section? Not necessarily as long as there is enough U-turn space provide for the design vehicle in the urban setting.
- There was concern if vehicles exiting the car wash (next to the N. Main St. intersection) could try to turn left into the channelized turn into N. Main St. In Preliminary Engineering, proper channelization can be investigated.
- The curb and gutter concepts provide the largest reduction in crashes, but also are the highest cost.
- The City prefers the raised median over depressed since there is not much difference from a safety standpoint.
- Can the bicycle and pedestrian facilities be added as parcels are redeveloped? This is possible but may take a very long time for redevelopment to occur.

Interchange Concepts

All four interchange concepts from the previous project team meeting were retained. For each interchange type, cost and predicted safety performance were discussed.

- **Improved Diamond Interchange**
 - \$3,800,000 total cost
 - 20-year crash saving \$784,400
- **Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)**
 - \$22,200,000 total cost
 - 20-year crash saving \$551,200

- **Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI)**
 - \$4,500,000 total cost
 - 20-year crash saving \$1,823,200
- **Roundabout Interchange**
 - \$5,300,000 total cost
 - 20-year crash saving \$8,056,000
 - The roundabout interchange option does not work well until the Buffalo Creek Drive extension is provided.

Comments/Questions

- The Buffalo Creek Drive extension included the cost for UST cleanup and removal and structures over the creek.
- The curb and gutter concepts provide the largest reduction in crashes, but also are the highest cost.

Railroad Concepts

This concept converts US 62 to an urban curb and gutter section and pushes the through lanes slightly into the median. A raised grass median 20 feet to 24 feet wide behind curb is provided and access managed by RCUTs. 11- or 12-foot-wide lanes could be provided. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are also added to this concept.

- **Replace with New Railroad Bridge**
 - Two track bridge \$24,600,000 total cost
 - Three track bridge \$27,700,000 total cost. The third track reflects the possibility that the railroad company requests that a future track be considered.
 - KYTC will likely pursue a grant application to replace this railroad bridge
- **Narrow Lanes and Provide Sidewalk**
 - \$600,000 total cost not including railroad company coordination
 - The project team decided to keep this concept for further analysis.

Recommendations

- Recommend using a curb and gutter typical section with shared use paths on both sides of US 62. Investigate pushing the shared use paths further away from the roadway in Preliminary Engineering.
- Recommend roundabouts as intersection traffic control over RCUTS. Intersection types at Ring Road can be further investigated in Preliminary Engineering.
- All four interchange types were recommended for further analysis in Preliminary Engineering.
- Recommend including the extension of Buffalo Creek Drive, but consider phased construction in Preliminary Engineering.
- Keep both railroad crossing options, the new bridge option as a preference for a possible future grant application and reducing lane widths and providing sidewalk as an interim way to provide better pedestrian connectivity.

Next Steps

- Include the presentation with the draft meeting minute submittal
- Consultant team to submit the draft report by May 19th
- KYTC can advertise the project for preliminary engineering using the draft US 62 corridor planning study report and replace with the final report when ready.

The meeting concluded at 4:15 PM ET.