

MINUTES

Project Team Meeting KY 32 – Rowan and Elliott Counties – Item 9-192.00

KYTC District 9 Office
Flemingsburg, Kentucky
May 7, 2008
10:00 a.m. EST

A project team meeting for the KY 32 Alternatives Study in Rowan and Elliott Counties was held at 10:00 a.m. EST on Wednesday, May 7, at the Highway District 9 office in Flemingsburg, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the project purpose and history, the scope of work, the preliminary data collected, relevant project issues, and public input strategies. A copy of the agenda is attached.

Participants in the meeting represented the Gateway Area Development District, FIVCO Area Development District, Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) District 9 and Central Office, and the consultants, Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA) and HMB Professional Engineers. Attendees included the following:

Sandy Meadows	Gateway Area Development District
Russ Brannon	FIVCO Area Development District
Bart Bryant	KYTC District 9, Chief District Engineer
Thomas Witt	KYTC Central Office, Planning
David Martin	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Deanna Miller	KYTC District 9, Planning
Brent Wells	KYTC District 9, Planning
Daran Razor	KYTC District 9, Traffic
Brian Gillum	KYTC District 9, Construction
Robert Brown	KYTC Central Office, Traffic
Karen Mynhier	KYTC District 9, Environmental
Jack Litton	KYTC District 9, Right-of-Way
James Simpson	KYTC Central Office, Design
Rachel Catchings	KYTC District 9, Design
Robyn Ramey	KYTC District 9, Right-of-Way
Samantha Wright	Wilbur Smith Associates
Carl D. Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Amanda R. Spencer	Wilbur Smith Associates
Rich Dutton	HMB Consultants

A summary of the key components and discussion items for this meeting is provided below, following the agenda outline.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Thomas Witt began the meeting, welcoming the participants and asking for formal introductions from all attendees.

2. Purpose of Meeting

Thomas Witt briefly explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the purpose and history, scope of work, preliminary data, project issues, and public involvement approach for the KY 32 Alternatives Study. He explained that Wilbur Smith Associates had been retained through the statewide planning contract as the consultant for this project.

3. Project History

Samantha Wright provided an overview of the KY 645 study completed by KYTC in April 2006. The KY 645 study resulted in two recommended corridors, one which included the study portion of KY 32 in Rowan and Elliott Counties.

The group agreed that the KY 32 Alternatives Study was completely independent of the KY 645 effort and should be treated as such.

For the benefit of attendees involved with the Ashland Connector Study, Deanna Miller explained that the KY 32 Alternatives Study would be a more detailed analysis than the Ashland Connector Study. She stated that the KY 32 Alternatives Study was moving closer to the design phase.

4. Scope of Work

Carl Dixon reviewed the tasks in Wilbur Smith Associate's scope of work, referencing a handout with the major tasks and subtasks outlined. Carl noted that HMB Consultants would be the subconsultant handling a portion of the environmental overview.

Samantha Wright added a brief explanation of public involvement and the alternatives evaluation process.

Carl explained that the study would take approximately 12 months to complete. He referenced a handout with key project milestones and projected dates for completion. He noted that this schedule should be considered as a guide that would have to be updated as the project progresses. He said it was unlikely that all estimated dates could be met, largely depending on the time needed to set up meetings and review materials and documents.

5. Preliminary Data/Exhibits

Amanda Spencer presented an overview of the preliminary data and exhibits, including the following:

- Study Area Map;
- Route Log, Systems, and Roadway Geometry Tables;
- Study Area Photos;
- ADT and LOS Map and Table;
- Adequacy Rating Map and Table;
- Highway Crash Maps; and
- Environmental Footprint Map.

The project team agreed that the study area boundary should be slightly modified, as shown on the study area map in proximity to the previously approved study boundary, to ensure adequate room for all possible off-alignment alternatives while minimizing impacts to Caney Creek and karst.

Russ Brannon shared that the FIVCO ADD had begun a study of environmental justice issues in the area and he had already completed a preliminary report. He noted that a minority population existed north of KY 32 and would be encompassed by the revised study area. He also stated that 30% of persons in Elliott County are disabled and 30% are below the poverty level. It was mentioned that the ADD would have an opportunity to review and comment on proposed improvement alternatives as part of this study.

Deanna Miller asked that the features (oil wells, gas wells and abandoned mines) identified by Clatis Walker, an active participant in the KY 645 study, be added to the KY 32 environmental map.

One attendee asked what the EPA site identified on the environmental map was. No further details were available at the time of the meeting.

It was mentioned that the yellow circles on the environmental map should be brown as shown in the legend, or vice versa.

Carl Dixon noted that the discovery of other potential historic structures along the route was anticipated.

Samantha Wright mentioned that both Big Caney and Laurel Creeks are "Exceptional Waters".

6. Project Issues

The group agreed that the primary purpose of the project appears to be improving safety and geometrics, including improving sight distance at school bus stops. Other considerations and potential project goals mentioned include:

- Improving travel time, including response time for EMT services
- Improving access to Morehead State University, St. Claire Hospital, retail stores, and other facilities and services in Morehead
- Addressing truck traffic, primarily delivery and box trucks that use the route, as well as log trucks and semis (it was noted that there was not much coal trucking on the route)
- Improving access for traffic to and from the prison, primarily for delivery trucks, commuters, and visitors
- Improving access for tourism to the Laurel Gorge Cultural Heritage Center located near the Newfoundland end of the corridor
- Addressing the use of the existing route by recreational motorcycle traffic, i.e., trying to maintain the character of the roadway that makes it attractive for motorcyclists (it was noted that a story on the KY 32 route had been included in a major motorcycling magazine)

- Providing an alternate route for tourism and recreational trips from the west to Grayson Lake
- Providing an improved route for people in Newfoundland and Sandy Hook to get to I-64 and go west toward Lexington

Concerns and other considerations identified include:

- The Marathon/Ashland pipeline could be a concern – this should be identified on the environmental map.
- Utilities are primarily along the existing route.
- The northern terminus of the study corridor will direct traffic into Elliottville – will this be a problem?
- It may be useful to limit the access points to current businesses in Elliottville.
- The intersection at KY 504 needs to be reconfigured to a right angle. KY 32 should be the through route, with KY 504 as a “T” intersection.

7. Public Involvement

Although the study schedule identified May 20 as a target date for the first local officials and local stakeholders meeting, it was agreed to avoid this date, since it is Election Day. The Area Development Districts agreed to make meeting arrangements with the goal of having one combined local officials/stakeholder meeting in each county on the same day. The meetings will likely take place in Sandy Hook and Morehead, if possible. Invitations will be extended to Representative Rocky Adkins, local city and county officials, Little Sandy Correctional Complex staff, local emergency service personnel, and utility professionals, as well as others to be identified later. Deanna Miller agreed to review the list of stakeholders involved with the Ashland Connector Study as a starting point for identifying appropriate participants. Thomas Witt asked WSA to prepare a PowerPoint presentation and handouts for the local officials meeting.

There was some discussion about possible public meeting locations on and near the study corridor, including churches, a fire station, and Sandy Hook Elementary. The group agreed to solicit local official and local stakeholder input on this issue.

Carl Dixon mentioned that the BP station at the KY 32/KY 7 intersection and McBrayer’s grocery store located at KY 32/KY 173 are willing to distribute public meeting flyers.

KYTC will place a variable message board at the meeting location, if possible.

8. Q & A

Carl Dixon requested as-built plans for KY 32 from KYTC. Deanna Miller agreed to attempt to obtain those plans.

Carl noted that WSA would request per-mile cost estimates from KYTC later in the study process, and possibly some input on R/W costs.

The meeting was adjourned just before 11:30 a.m. EST.



AGENDA

Project Team Meeting 1

KY 32 Alternatives Study, Rowan and Elliott Counties

KYTC Item No. 9-192.00

Highway District 9 Conference Room, Flemingsburg, Kentucky

10 a.m., May 7, 2008

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC |
| 3. Project History | KYTC/WSA |
| a. Origin | |
| b. KY 645 Study | |
| c. Purpose | |
| d. Group Discussion | |
| 4. Scope of Work | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Tasks | |
| b. Responsible Parties | |
| c. Schedule | |
| 5. Preliminary Data/Exhibits | Wilbur Smith Associates |
| a. Study Area | |
| b. Route Log, Systems, and Geometry | |
| c. Adequacy Ratings | |
| d. Existing and Future ADT and LOS | |
| e. Highway Crashes | |
| f. Environmental Footprint | |
| 6. Project Issues | Group Discussion |
| a. Study Area | |
| b. Project Purpose/Goals | |
| c. Local Issues | |
| d. Environmental Justice | |
| 7. Public Involvement | Group Discussion |
| a. Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting | |
| i. Stakeholders/Special Groups | |
| ii. Meeting Location and Time | |
| b. Public Meeting | |
| i. Meeting Format | |
| ii. Meeting Location and Time | |
| c. Public Involvement Tasks and Schedule | |
| 8. Q & A | Group Discussion |
| ADJOURN | KYTC |