

Appendix H:

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM MEETING MINUTES

TO: Jason Blackburn, PE
Randy Turner, PE
Srinivasa Gutti, PE
Project Manager(s), KYTC

www.pbworld.com

FROM: Parsons Brinckerhoff

DATE: May 1, 2014

SUBJECT: I-75 to Mountain Parkway Corridor Study
Minutes of 1st Project Development Team Meeting

The first meeting with the Project Development Team (PDT) for the I-75 to Mountain Parkway Corridor Study was held at 10:00 AM (EST) on Thursday, May 1, 2014, at KYTC District 7 Office in Lexington, Kentucky. The following people were in attendance:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Jason Blackburn	KYTC – D-10	jason.blackburn@ky.gov
Aric Skaggs	KYTC – D-10	aric.skaggs@ky.gov
Brandon Baker	KYTC – D-10	brandon.baker2@ky.gov
Min Jiang	KYTC – D-10	min.jiang@ky.gov
Darren Back	KYTC – D-10	darren.back@ky.gov
Randy Turner	KYTC – D-7	randy.turner@ky.gov
Bob Nunley	KYTC – D-7	robert.nunley@ky.gov
Srinivasa Gutti	KYTC – C.O. Planning	srinivasa.gutti@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC – C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Steve Ross	KYTC – C.O. Planning	steve.ross@ky.gov
Eileen Vaughan	KYTC – C.O. Planning	eileen.vaughan@ky.gov
Keith Caudill	KYTC – C.O. Design	keith.caudill@ky.gov
Chris Chaney	BGADD	cchaney@bgadd.org
Shawn Dikes	Parsons Brinckerhoff	dikes@pbworld.com
Mac Rice	Parsons Brinckerhoff	ricem@pbworld.com
Lindsay Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	walkerli@pbworld.com
Scott Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	walkersc@pbworld.com

Welcome and Introductions

Jason Blackburn began by welcoming those in attendance and requesting that everyone introduce themselves as there were some new attendees from the scoping meeting held

October 28, 2013. Mr. Blackburn explained that the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) has requested that a corridor study be completed for the existing routes (KY 52 / KY 499 / KY 89 / KY 82) as well as looking at feasible alternate new corridors between I-75 and the Mountain Parkway. Parsons Brinckerhoff is the consulting firm assisting KYTC with the study. Mr. Blackburn then turned the meeting over to Lindsay Walker (Project Manager) with Parsons Brinckerhoff.

To facilitate the meeting, agendas were distributed by Parsons Brinckerhoff. An additional handout included plan and profile sheets detailing the existing geometrics and conditions of the existing routes in the study area.

Project Overview

Lindsay began the presentation portion of the meeting by providing some background information on the study, forming the context for what the study is and the purpose of this meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to brief the PDT on where the study currently stands and to get feedback on some key action items.

Related to the study area, Lindsay noted that the upper limits of the study area had been adjusted to include the existing bridge over the Kentucky River along KY 627 in case this was of potential use in a new route. Also, while the objective of this study is to look at connectivity between I-75 and the Mountain Parkway, the Richmond Bypass (US 25 / US 421) is not being evaluated for existing operations as improvements along this route are out of the scope of work for this study. The evaluations of existing operations begins at the KY 876 / KY 52 intersection, continues through to KY 52 / KY 499 intersection, along KY 499, then north on KY 89 to KY 82 and terminates at the Clay City exit along the Mountain Parkway. The PDT agreed that improvements could be recommended at the KY 82 interchange with the Mountain Parkway, specifically addressing flood issues, but would not be a focus of the study. Any recommendations would be auxiliary to the primary study.

A review of the project schedule showed that Parsons Brinckerhoff is generally on schedule with the study despite receiving notice to proceed (NTP) one month later than anticipated (NTP was provided at the end of January instead of January 1, 2014). The next PDT meeting is scheduled for July 2014. This meeting will be held at the KYTC D-10 office. Related to the stakeholder / local officials meetings, two are noted in the scope of work and are to occur at the same point in the later stages of the project to present and discuss alternatives. One was planned for the Madison / Clark County areas and another for the Estill / Powell County areas. It was discussed that there may not be a need to have a meeting for Estill / Powell County attendees separately as KYTC D-10 staff had few attendees identified as needing to participate in this study. It was decided that by the next PDT meeting in July the list of stakeholders / local officials will be preliminarily identified and based on the list a decision will be made on the number / location of necessary meetings.

Purpose and Need

An initial purpose statement along with identified needs were presented at the meeting. Due to scrutiny over the I-75 to US 27 Connector Project, some revisions were proposed for this study

to avoid any issues that have occurred with the other connector project. These revisions include lessening (or removing) the safety component from the purpose and need statement. Also need to remove "Richmond" and replace with I-75 so as to provide a wider range of connectivity. Given that this study encompasses different aspects with different needs (new connector project or roadway and improvements to existing roadways), it may be necessary to provide separate purpose and need statements later if the projects are found to be at odds with each other.

Related to the needs, safety needs to be more fully defined since it is mentioned in the purpose statement. In all, there needs to be more definition of the study needs. Work on the Purpose and Need statement is on-going throughout the project development process and will be modified as necessary depending on project aspects.

Overview of Existing Conditions

Ms. Walker then provided a review of the existing conditions and information that has been compiled to date for the study. This included a review of environmental constraints, traffic operations, crash analysis and existing geometrics. Discussion points are listed below.

- A potential issue to note related to Cultural-Historic resources would be the Boone Trace. This is a trail that proponents are working on trying to get it added to the National Register of Historic Places. The Boone Trace runs the length of the study area (north to south) on the western side. Any new corridors would likely intersect this trail. Impacts will be identified once alternatives are developed and a decision will be made at that time whether or not to involve someone at the stakeholder meeting in October 2014.
- The existing routes currently (and in the future) are not projected to operate over capacity. Any segments with a failing level of service is a result of geometrics and the lack of passing opportunities. It was agreed that a growth rate along the existing corridor of 0.5 to 1.5 % per year was appropriate.
- Most clusters of crashes occurred at intersections. One item to note is that numerous fatalities occurred throughout the existing corridor with the primary manner of collision being head on crashes. Parsons Brinckerhoff will explore the crash rates / types at these spots as well as look into developing a crash rate factor based on the number of fatal crashes throughout the corridor.
- At the end of the existing conditions discussion, it was also noted that Chris Chaney with the BGADD had submitted a draft report of the Environmental Justice (EJ) assessment for KYTC for review.

Preliminary Alternatives

There are three preliminary alternatives currently being evaluated as part of this study. Discussion items related to each alternative are noted below.

- 1) Improve the Existing Routes (KY 52 / KY 499 / KY 89 / KY 82)
 - a. Plan and profile sheets were developed by Parsons Brinckerhoff and distributed to those in attendance. They identify the locations of all crashes and all

- geometric deficiencies. They will be used as a resource to identify needed spot improvements along the corridor.
- b. There are areas along the corridor that could benefit from wider shoulders. Improvements to the existing typical section should consider 11-foot lanes and 8-foot usable shoulders.
- 2) New connector between KY 52 and the KY 82 / KY 89 split
 - a. Should widen or shift the corridor band northward to include KY 89 / KY 1880 intersection
 - 3) New corridor between I-75 and the Mountain Parkway
 - a. Logical termini for a new corridor would include the Clay City interchange or the new Kiddville Road interchange with the Mountain Parkway and the new I-75 connector interchange along I-75 or one of the existing interchanges along I-75.
 - b. Based on initial projected traffic volumes a new facility would likely be a two-lane facility with passing lanes (super two).
 - c. A limited access facility would result in additional cost. Currently there is not much development in the area and access is not seen as a major issue upon initial completion.
 - d. At-grade intersections would be appropriate given the traffic volumes; interchanges would be an unwarranted expense.
 - e. The preferred typical section should be based on 12-foot lanes and 8-foot usable shoulder.

Cost estimates will be provided for all alternatives. A decision matrix should be developed to aid in the review process. A range of costs may be provided in some instances for comparison purposes such as reviewing the cost difference between 6-foot and 8-foot shoulders. Parsons Brinckerhoff will use cost estimate quantities specific to each district to provide the most realistic cost estimates. Right-of-way and utility costs will be completed by the KYTC District offices respectively and will be started following the second PDT meeting in July once the alternatives are refined.

Next Steps

The next meeting with the PDT will be held in July 2014. Defined alternatives will be presented at that time. Meeting(s) with the local officials and stakeholders will be held in October 2014.

The meeting was then adjourned at approximately 11:45 AM.

TO: Jason Blackburn, PE
Randy Turner, PE
Srinivasa Gutti, PE
Project Manager(s), KYTC

www.pbworld.com

FROM: Parsons Brinckerhoff

DATE: July 31, 2014

SUBJECT: I-75 to Mountain Parkway Corridor Study
Minutes of 2nd Project Development Team Meeting

The second meeting with the Project Development Team (PDT) for the I-75 to Mountain Parkway Corridor Study was held at 1:30 PM (EST) on Thursday, July 17, 2014, at KYTC District 10 Office in Jackson, Kentucky. The following people were in attendance:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Jason Blackburn	KYTC – D-10	jason.blackburn@ky.gov
Aric Skaggs	KYTC – D-10	aric.skaggs@ky.gov
Brandon Baker	KYTC – D-10	brandon.baker2@ky.gov
Darren Back	KYTC – D-10	darren.back@ky.gov
Randy Turner	KYTC – D-7	randy.turner@ky.gov
Srinivasa Gutti	KYTC – C.O. Planning	srinivasa.gutti@ky.gov
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC – C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Eileen Vaughan	KYTC – C.O. Planning	eileen.vaughan@ky.gov
Deanna Mills	KYTC – C.O. Planning	deanna.mills@ky.gov
Shawn Dikes	Parsons Brinckerhoff	dikes@pbworld.com
Chris Barrow	Parsons Brinckerhoff	barrowcp@pbworld.com
Lindsay Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	walkerli@pbworld.com
Arlen Sandlin	Parsons Brinckerhoff	sandlin@pbworld.com

Welcome and Introductions

Jason Blackburn began by welcoming those in attendance and requesting that everyone introduce themselves as there was one new attendee from the first PDT meeting on May 1, 2014. Mr. Blackburn explained that the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) has requested that a corridor study be completed for the existing routes (KY 52 / KY 499 / KY 89 / KY 82) as well as looking at feasible alternate new corridors between I-75 and the Mountain Parkway. Parsons Brinckerhoff is the consulting firm assisting KYTC with the study. Mr. Blackburn then turned the meeting over to Lindsay Walker (Project Manager) with Parsons Brinckerhoff.

To facilitate the meeting, agendas were distributed by Parsons Brinckerhoff. Additional handouts included: a new alternatives map, spot and corridor improvement maps, and project sheets highlighting the existing conditions and the recommended improvements for consideration.

Project Overview

Lindsay began the presentation portion of the meeting by covering the agenda, reviewing the context for what the study is and the purpose of this meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to obtain feedback from the PDT on identified short-term spot improvements along the existing route, long-term improvements along the entire corridor and new corridor alternatives identified between I-75 and Mountain Parkway.

Purpose and Need

The purpose and need statement presented at the first PDT meeting was updated and the revised statement was presented at this meeting. In the purpose statement, the City of Richmond was removed from the statement and replaced with I-75 to show a more general area as the current new route alternative does not necessarily end in Richmond. Jason provided a comment about adding in some verbiage which identifies this as a southern / alternative or interim path as I-64 technically provides a connection between I-75 and Mountain Parkway. Additionally the need was updated to identify safety (relating to CCRF and Horizontal and Vertical deficiencies), travel time reliability, access density near intersections and connectivity similar to what was shown for the I-75 Connector project. Lindsay expressed the understanding that the purpose and need may continue to evolve as more details are finalized regarding the direction of a new route or improvements to the existing routes. It was noted that this project may take the form of two separate purpose and need statements so that each can be tailored to appropriately address the differences between a new route alternative and improvement(s) of the existing.

Review of New Route Alternatives

Ms. Walker then presented the new route alternatives between I-75 and the Mountain Parkway. Lindsay reviewed the team's methodology which considered logical termini, avoiding any environmental, cultural / historic, and archaeological concerns along the route, and the location for best crossing of the Kentucky River, while minimizing conflicts with terrain and avoiding additional stream and water crossings. The alternatives were presented as follows:

- Route #1 is the shorter connection between KY 52 and KY 82 which creates a more direct route to the Mountain Parkway from Waco, Kentucky. Though the new construction is shorter than the other routes, there is a major crossing of the Kentucky River to consider and additional number of streams which would need to be maneuvered around or across.
- Route #2 would tie directly into I-75 at Exit 95 and would head due east towards the Clay City Interchange on Mountain Parkway. It was again noted that this route should consider passing through KY 1880 at KY 89 to improve the vertical deficiencies.

- Route #3 identified utilizes KY 627 from I-75 and across the existing bridge over the Kentucky River before heading east to the new Kiddville interchange on Mountain Parkway. It was noted that KY 627 is in good shape and would be able to handle the additional traffic generated due to the new connection.

After presenting the routes on the map, the estimated cost and ADT determined based on KYTC statewide model output were shown to the PDT for comments. A general discussion began about the expected cost for this type of construction and overall the \$8 million per mile was determined to be acceptable for these types of routes through this terrain. What was requested was that in the report the methodology for where the costs came from need to be clearly defined so that future readers can identify what is included in that dollar figure.

Some comments were also provided on the alternatives map. The following suggestions were made:

- Label the interchanges along I-75 and the Mountain Parkway
- Label the alternatives
- Thicken the county boundaries
- Add a dashed line to the existing KY 52 / KY 82 routes that connect with the KY 499 and KY 89 bypass option to show it as a full route from I-75 to the Mountain Parkway
- Create a second version of the map which provides a visual of I-64 and the Winchester area for reference

Existing Route Alternatives

Lindsay continued with presenting proposed improvements along the existing routes. She began with the KY 52 and KY 499 improvement map. An overall comment received was to consider adding a project in Madison County which would increase the shoulder width section of KY 52 where it is narrower so that it is matching the wider shoulder sections for a consistent width along the corridor. Individual project sheets comments received can be seen below:

- 1) 52-A: Eastern Bypass at KY 52
 - a. KYTC Central Office requested an investigation by KYTC District 7 to see if any recent turning movement counts exist. Central office would like to make sure that there is adequate need before suggesting the addition of a dual left turn lane.
- 2) 52-B: KY 52 at KY 374
 - a. Further investigate the crash history and see if crashes happened at night. If not remove the recommendation to install intersection lighting.
- 3) 52-C: KY 52 at KY 977
 - a. Further investigate the crash history and see if crashes happened at night. If not remove the recommendation to install intersection lighting.
- 4) 52-D: KY 52 at Brassfield-Bybee
 - a. Further investigate the crash history and see if crashes happened at night. If not remove the recommendation to install intersection lighting.
- 5) 499-A: KY 499 at KY 52

- a. Discussion was mixed initially on whether or not to include this one, but it was determined that it would be better for the planning process to keep it in and document the response of the locals, removing it if there was not support for it.
- 6) 499-B: KY499 at KY 89
 - a. Discussion was mixed initially on whether or not to include this one as well, but it was determined to also include for now.
 - b. It was also noted that an existing widening project (3 lane curb and gutter + sidewalk) is happening just south of this intersection along KY 89.

Following this a short break was taken before shifting to the KY 89 and KY 82 corridor improvements. Jason commented they need more work done throughout this part of the corridor. To begin Lindsay presented the overall KY 82 and KY 89 improvement projects map and talked about the general philosophy of how the team identified projects. It was commented that there were fewer projects shown along the corridors due to the expectation that the improved typical section will address all but one of the horizontal deficiencies along the corridor. Additionally the discussion moved towards the vertical deficiencies and District 10 mentioned that they would like to include cost associated with those deficiencies so that the corridor has a plan to address all issues. Additionally, it was requested that all vertical and horizontal deficiencies be identified on the overall KY 82 and KY 89 map.

- 1) 89-A: KY 89 Corridor
 - a. Improve typical section to match the existing section (10' shoulder with 8' paved) in front of the Estill County High School. Do not show the option for the 8' shoulder as the cost difference is minimal and would be inconsistent with existing sections.
 - b. Add the structural cost to maintaining the full typical section.
- 2) 89-B: KY 89 at KY 82
 - a. An improvement has been investigated at this location before but it was noted that the property owners have been unsupportive of improvements that affect their property.
 - b. Option B3 was the preferred alternative but concern was brought up about the small white building which is believed to be old enough to be eligible for historic preservation.
 - c. Both KYTC Central office and District 10 asked for a list of impacts to be placed on this sheet for each alternative.
- 3) 82-A: KY 82 Corridor
 - a. Improve typical section to match the existing section (10' shoulder with 8' paved) in front of the Estill County High School. Do not show the option for the 8' shoulder as the cost difference is minimal and would be inconsistent with existing sections
 - b. Add the structural cost to maintaining the full typical section.
- 4) 82-B: KY 82 Curve
 - a. The discussion on this sheet was focused on the conversation about the high number of observed trucks. It was confirmed that a coal plant opened in Irvine and as a result more trucks were utilizing KY 82 and KY 89.

Next Steps

The next meeting will be with the stakeholders and is tentatively planned for September 23, 2014 at the KYTC District 7 office in Lexington. In this meeting the stakeholders will review the project sheets and provide input about priorities along the corridor. After the stakeholder meeting the PDT will convene again that same day to discuss the comments provided and discuss possible project recommendations / prioritizations.

The meeting was then adjourned at approximately 3:30 PM.

TO: Jason Blackburn, PE
Randy Turner, PE
Srinivasa Gutti, PE
Project Manager(s), KYTC

www.pbworld.com

FROM: Parsons Brinckerhoff

DATE: September 23, 2014

SUBJECT: I-75 to Mountain Parkway Corridor Study
Minutes of 3rd Project Development Team Meeting

The third meeting with the Project Development Team (PDT) for the I-75 to Mountain Parkway Corridor Study was held at 1:30 PM (EST) on Tuesday, September 23, 2014, at KYTC District 7 Office in Lexington, Kentucky. The following people were in attendance:

NAME	AGENCY/COMPANY	E-MAIL ADDRESS
Mikael Pelfrey	KYTC – C.O. Planning	mikael.pelfrey@ky.gov
Srinivasa Gutti	KYTC – C.O. Planning	srinivasa.gutti@ky.gov
Deanna Mills	KYTC – C.O. Planning	deanna.mills@ky.gov
Jason Blackburn	KYTC – D-10	jason.blackburn@ky.gov
Bob Nunley	KYTC – D-7	robert.nunley@ky.gov
Randy Turner	KYTC – D-7	randy.turner@ky.gov
Derek Adams	KYTC-DEA	derek.adams@ky.gov
Chris Chaney	BGADD	cchaney@bgadd.org
Arlen Sandlin	Parsons Brinckerhoff	sandlin@pbworld.com
Chris Barrow	Parsons Brinckerhoff	barrowcp@pbworld.com
Lindsay Walker	Parsons Brinckerhoff	walkerli@pbworld.com
Mac Rice	Parsons Brinckerhoff	ricem@pbworld.com
Shawn Dikes	Parsons Brinckerhoff	dikes@pbworld.com

This third meeting with the PDT was held following a meeting with the local officials and stakeholders (LO/S) at 10:00 AM the same day. The purpose of this PDT meeting was to review the input from the LO/S meeting and discuss any issues / notes related to the completion of this study.

Local Officials / Stakeholders (LO/S) Meeting Review

Survey forms that were distributed at the LO/S meeting were reviewed quickly between meetings with the responses related to project ranking tallied. The results are shown in the following tables.

Spot Improvement	High	Medium	Low
52-A: 2 nd Southbound Left Turn Lane	4	9	3
52-B: Left Turn Lanes on KY 52	10	2	4
52-C: Modify Access	11	5	0
52-D: Left Turn Lanes on KY 52 & Approach Road Realignment	4	9	3
499-A: Intersection Reconfiguration	7	3	4
499-B: Intersection Reconfiguration	7	4	3
89-B: Curve Realignment	8	5	1
82-B: Curve Realignment	8	5	2

	89-B1	89-B2	89-B3
# of Responses	2	1	7

Corridor Improvement	High	Medium	Low
52-E: Increase Shoulder Width	12	3	3
89-A: Roadway Improvement	7	7	3
82-A: Roadway Improvement	9	3	5

New Route	High	Medium	Low
Route #1: KY 89 at KY 82 to near KY 977	12	2	1
Route #2: Mountain Pkwy (Clay City) to I-75 (White Hall)	3	10	2
Route #3: Mountain Pkwy (Kiddville Rd) to KY 627 (Boonesboro Rd)	1	0	14

For the spot improvements, there was a mix of responses with Projects 52-B and 52-C rated as having the highest priority. Unless otherwise noted, these rankings will form the basis for relative project ranking for the study.

The three 89-B projects were presented and respondents were asked to identify which project they liked best. Alternative 89-B3 received the most response. In identifying the preferred option for this study, Parsons Brinckerhoff will document the issues / benefits associated with each option, taking into consideration the rankings provided. A recommended project will be provided in the final report. In addition, the figure on this project sheet will be adjusted to make the roadway orientation more clear with the north arrow coloring darkened to help with this.

As shown by the distribution of responses for the new route, Route #1 received the highest response, while Route #3 had the lowest level of interest / priority.

Purpose and Need Concurrence

As the project has evolved, the purpose and need statement for this study has been slightly modified to make sure it is specific and has documentable needs that can be addressed by study alternatives. The following changes were noted at this meeting:

- Add in a need for emergency management as KY 52 / KY 499 / KY 89 / KY 82 is an evacuation route for incidents related to the Bluegrass Depot. A map of the evacuation route should be provided in the report.
- Adjust the need related to “connectivity” to read as follows: Provide an improved connection between I-75 and the Mountain Parkway.

Spot Improvement Projects

A review of comments by the LO/S related to the spot improvement projects was made next. The one discussed in detail was Project 52-B. An attendee at the LO/S meeting noted that the angle of the approach road is skewed and does not give the driver the impression they are approaching a major intersection. It was requested to look into re-alignment of the road. PDT members agreed that Parsons Brinckerhoff could consider any options to improve the approach road and note in the report if additional work is warranted.

Detailed Evaluation Matrices

Next three detailed matrices were shown to provide the PDT the process used to arrive at the Comparison of Alternatives table which was shown to the LO/S in the meeting. Comments provided for each matrix can be seen below:

1. The first matrix covered the Traffic and Operational Analysis. The PDT heavily emphasized the desire to remove the Route #1 row from the report as this alternative is not a standalone improvement. Further comments on this matrix included the removal of the “Travel Time at 45 mph” column for the final report. Also, the year 2040 should be added to the column title for V/C to make it “2040 V/C”.
2. The second matrix was the Environmental Overview / Geotechnical Evaluation. The same comment was made to remove Route #1 from this table. Also it was noted that all shown railroad crossings are crossing rail lines that travel north / south through the study area and are most likely unavoidable by shifting the corridor.
3. The final matrix was the Planning-Level Cost Estimate matrix. This had all cost components broken out as well as the cost per mile. The column headings will be changed to include the component initials in order (D for Design, R for Right-of-Way, U for Utilities, and C for Construction). Also, the total cost will be moved to the end of the table. In addition, per mile costs will not be shown in the report as these are not truly representative given that they are the per mile cost for the entire corridor. Some parts of the corridor for the existing are not being improved so the cost is spread out over a longer section that does not truly represent the section being improved and may be misleading. A note was also made that the cost for No Build is not necessarily zero dollars as there is some cost associated with maintenance and dealing with sections that may have rockslides, etc. While this was agreed upon that there is a cost for No Build, it was

decided to leave the cost shown as zero in the matrix as the matrix includes new construction costs only, not maintenance costs. This can be added as a footnote to the table in the report.

Corridor Phasing

An initial corridor phasing scheme was presented for KY 89 / KY 82. At the previous PDT meeting, it was requested to consider ways to break these corridor projects into manageable construction sections. No comment was made on the specific breakdown of these sections; however, it was requested that detail be provided that would note why a section has higher priority compared to another one (i.e. a crash rate issue, highest number of geometric deficiencies, etc.).

Further discussion was given what the end result of the study should be. It was decided that all information for all projects and alternatives would be in the report, but the final section should provide a study recommendation based on which alternative best meets the identified purpose and need for this study. Additionally, this alternative should be evaluated with a phased approach and this included in the recommendation.

Next Steps

Parsons Brinckerhoff will review and summarize all LO/S comments and incorporate into the project sheets accordingly. Based on the technical analysis and LO/S input, Parsons Brinckerhoff will provide a study recommendation along with project phasing to conclude the study.

All information will be documented in a draft report due to KYTC by October 20, 2014.

The meeting was then adjourned at approximately 3:15 PM.