

MINUTES

Project Team Meeting
KY 32 – Rowan and Elliott Counties – Item 9-192.00
Gateway Area Development District
Morehead, Kentucky
November 19, 2008
10:00 a.m.

A project team meeting for the KY 32 Alternatives Study in Rowan and Elliott Counties was held at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 19, 2008, at the Gateway Area Development District Office in Morehead, Kentucky. The purpose of the meeting was to provide information on progress to date, present proposed improvement alternatives and a Level 2 evaluation of those alternatives, present detailed information on proposed spot improvements along existing KY 32, and discuss the second public meeting for the project. 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 Wilbur Smith Associates (WSA). Attendees included the following:

Joy Mullins	Gateway Area Development District
Russ Brannon	FIVCO Area Development District
Thomas Witt	KYTC Central Office, Planning
David Martin	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Darrin Eldridge	KYTC District 9, Project Development
Phil Mauney	KYTC District 9, Planning
Brent Wells	KYTC District 9, Planning
Brian S. Gillum	KYTC District 9, Project Delivery & Preservation
Randy Stull	KYTC District 9, Project Delivery & Preservation
Carl D. Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Amanda R. Spencer	Wilbur Smith Associates
Len Harper	Wilbur Smith Associates

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 by welcoming the participants. Attendees then introduced themselves.

2. Purpose of Meeting

Thomas Witt briefly explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss proposed improvement alternatives, a Level 2 screening of the alternatives, proposed spot improvements, and preparations for the second public meeting.

3. Project Update

Carl Dixon briefly reviewed the tasks completed since the last project team meeting, including: 1) revision of the purpose and need statement to remove scenic byway reference, as agreed upon at the last project team meeting; 2) modifications to the eastern portion of former corridor concept 7 to be included in alternative 2 and 3; 3) development of a practical solution (Alternative 1P); 4) traffic forecasts for the proposed improvement alternatives; 5) development of a Level 2 screening matrix; 6) further development of proposed spot improvements and 7) development of detailed cost estimates.

Carl then turned the floor over to Len Harper to expand on the cost estimating and spot improvement work. Len discussed the differences between the Level 1 and Level 2 cost estimates. The Level 1 cost estimates were based on historical per mile costs from similar road construction in the region. The Level 2 cost estimates looked at each Level 2 alternative in more detail, using site specific information to calculate each cost estimate. Ken Sperry with HMB provided the QC/QA for the cost estimates.

The project team discussed several design parameters to use for the purpose of estimating the costs of each alternative. The project team agreed on a typical section with 12-foot driving lanes, 8-foot graded shoulders (6-foot paved) and 12-foot recoverable ditch or fill slopes for all alternatives except for Alternative 1P. For Alternative 1P, the practical solution alternative, the shoulder width would be reduced by two feet leaving 6-foot paved and graded shoulders. An improved KY 32 would have two driving lanes with turn lanes at major intersections. KY 32 is a Rural Major Collector with mountainous terrain. The design speed will be 55 mph except on Alternative 1P, where a 25 mph design speed is used along a few sections. The project team discussed the 25 mph design speed for Alternative 1P and agreed it was appropriate for the practical solution. If a design speed of 35 mph is used; 59 horizontal curves and 61 vertical curves would have to be reconstructed. This compared to the 8 horizontal curves and 15 vertical curves that must be reconstructed with the 25 mph design speed. It will be noted in the study report that these assumptions were made for cost estimation purposes only. Traffic volumes and variations between cut and fill sections will change the typical section. The final typical section will be decided during design.

Len also discussed the spot improvements. Project team members were asked to review the cost estimates and spot improvements and provide comments by December 3, 2008. Len said that he would provide project sheets for the proposed spot improvements by the end of the week. [NOTE: These were e-mailed to the District on November 21st, as promised.]

4. Level 2 Screening

Amanda Spencer provided an overview of the Level 2 screening process for the five alternatives, including the No Build. She explained the reason for the relative rankings

of low, medium and high assigned to each alternative for the various evaluation measures related to purpose and need, potential impacts, and cost. The group agreed with the results based on the cursory review.

The project team members were asked to take a closer look internally and advise Wilbur Smith Associates of any questions or concerns by December 3, 2008. Amanda explained that the goal was not to draw conclusions from the evaluation, but to ensure it accurately reflects each of the alternatives. Conclusions will be drawn when all of the information is in hand, specifically public and resource agency input.

The group agreed that an evaluation measure related to constructability (phasing and scheduling) should be added to the level 2 screening matrix for determining the final recommendations.

5. Second Round of Public Involvement

Carl Dixon summarized several ideas and options for the second public meeting to be held in February or March 2009, citing the Sandy Hook Performing Arts Center and the Sandy Hook High School Gymnasium as potential locations. The group discussed the pros and cons of each location and decided the school gymnasium or a school cafeteria in Sandy Hook would be most suitable for the large group expected.

The group also agreed that there would be no need for a formal presentation. Instead, small groups of attendees will be escorted through display boards by staff members who will explain the information, particularly the proposed alternatives, and answer any questions. Wilbur Smith Associates will provide talking points for staff members to ensure all attendees receive consistent information. A welcome station will be staffed with project team members to explain meeting logistics. After attendees visit the display boards with their escorts they will have the opportunity to vote for their preferred alternative and spot improvements at a voting station at the meeting and on their survey forms. A background information station will be available with two environmental professionals to answer any questions about the initial work done, particularly to minimize potential impacts to the environment.

The group agreed that the local police should be invited to the meeting. This should be addressed at the local officials/stakeholders meeting.

6. Next Steps/Schedule

Meetings for local officials and local stakeholders are scheduled on December 11, 2008, at 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. in Morehead and Sandy Hook, respectively. The same information planned for the public meeting will be presented at the local officials and stakeholders meetings, but in a typical round-table format, suitable for a smaller group.

7. Q & A

With no further questions, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:00 p.m.



AGENDA

**Project Team Meeting
KY 32 Alternatives Study
Rowan and Elliott Counties
KYTC Item No. 9-192.00**

**November 19, 2008 – 10:00 a.m.
Gateway Area Development District Office
Morehead, Kentucky**

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | KYTC |
| 2. Purpose of Meeting | KYTC |
| 3. Project Update | WSA |
| a. Revised Purpose and Need | |
| b. Revised Alternatives | |
| c. Traffic Forecasts | |
| d. Revised Cost Estimates | |
| e. Spot Improvements with Cost Estimates | |
| f. Level 2 Screening: Input and Evaluation | |
| 4. Level 2 Screening: Presentation/Discussion | WSA/KYTC |
| a. Purpose and Need | |
| b. Environmental | |
| c. Historic/Archeological | |
| d. Geotechnical | |
| e. Socioeconomic | |
| i. Environmental Justice | |
| f. Traffic Forecasts | |
| g. Cost Estimates | |
| 5. Second Round of Public Involvement: Discussion | WSA/KYTC |
| a. Local Officials and Local Stakeholders Meetings | |
| b. Resource Agency Coordination | |
| c. Public Meeting | |
| i. Place, Time, Format | |
| ii. Meeting Materials | |
| 6. Next Steps/Schedule | |
| 7. Q & A | Group |
| ADJOURN | KYTC |