

7.0 FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A Project Team Meeting was held on November 21, 2001. At this meeting, the alternates were discussed and a recommended alternate was selected using the information found in **Table 7**.

No overwhelming environmental or geotechnical bases were present to differentiate between the alternatives. Therefore, the geotechnical and environmental impacts were not critical decision factors. The no-build alternative (Alternate 1) was evaluated to the same degree as the build alternates (Alternates 2, 3, and 4) but it did not meet the study goals nor did it receive support from the stakeholders. Design Year 2025 traffic would operate at an LOS of E or F for the entire corridor. Sight distance, intersection safety, and speed differential problems would remain. It was decided that Alternate 3 (4-lane highway with partial control of access) would be recommended as the preferred improvement to be carried forth. Alternate 3 received the most public support and has less potential impact to right-of-way, environmental, cultural historic and archaeological resources. This alternate will allow the roadway to maintain a rural feel by allowing access points, yet controlling their spacing for safety and traffic control purposes.

Alternate 4, the only other alternate that meets all the project goals, was also recommended to be carried forth in the next phase, if any, of the project. However, this alternate, with a estimated cost of \$478,662,000, is far above the estimated \$178,098,000 for Alternate 3 and did not receive as much public support as Alternate 3. Therefore, Alternate 4 was not considered to be the preferred alternate.

Considering the substantial cost of implementing either Alternate 3 or 4, it was also agreed at the team meeting that the implementation of many elements of Alternate 2 (Safety and Operational Improvements) would be beneficial as cost-effective, interim measures. Though truck traffic may be reduced by the addition of weigh stations, that option was not recommended. It was agreed that a rest area would be valuable, since the rural, isolated nature of the area tends to induce driver fatigue. The majority of the points outlined in Alternate 2 can be accomplished through maintenance and minor construction activities, including improving signage and intersection lighting throughout the corridor. The lengthening of truck climbing lanes and addition of turn lanes should also be considered as funding allows.

At the Final Team Meeting on March 19, 2002, it was recommended that Alternate 3 be phased in over time using priority sections. The recommended priority sections, shown graphically in **Figure 9**, are as follows:

- Priority One – KY 10 in Mason County to KY 19 in Bracken County
- Priority Two – KY 1109 in Bracken County to 0.5 miles north of the Campbell-Pendleton County Line
- Priority Three – West of KY 19 in Bracken County to KY 1109 in Bracken County

Given that all three sections are predicted to operate at low levels of service by Year 2025 and crash rates were low for this type of facility (two land rural roads) in all sections, the priorities were based on local support. Strong support for and interest in the widening was conveyed in both Mason and Bracken Counties. Little immediate support or interest in the project was offered in Pendleton and Campbell Counties.



FIGURE 9 - PRIORITY SECTIONS

The approximate costs of the Preferred Recommended Alternate, a 4-lane limited access highway, including costs for each of the Priority Sections, are listed below.

TABLE 8 – PREFERRED ALTERNATE COSTS BY PRIORITY SECTION

	4-Lane Partially Controlled Depressed Median	Priority Section One (KY 10 to KY 19)	Priority Section Two (KY 1109 to 0.5 Miles North of Campbell Co. Line)	Priority Section Three (KY 19 to KY 1109)
Section Termini	N/A	Mason Co. MP 13.99 to Bracken Co. MP 5.55	Bracken Co. MP 13.59 to Campbell Co. MP 0.5	Bracken Co. MP 5.55 to Bracken Co. MP 13.59
Length	28.11 Miles	8.96 Miles	11.11 Miles	8.04 Miles
Design	\$12,887,000	\$4,112,000	\$5,091,000	\$3,684,000
Right of Way	\$3,589,000	\$1,096,000	\$1,343,000	\$1,150,000
Utilities	\$540,000	\$160,000	\$280,000	\$100,000
Construction	\$161,082,000	\$51,399,000	\$63,639,000	\$46,044,000
TOTAL	\$178,098,000	\$56,767,000	\$70,353,000	\$50,978,000

*Note: Due to rounding, the total cost for all the priority sections does not necessarily equal the total cost indicated for the entire project.