

**MINUTES**  
**Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting**  
**KY 32 – Rowan and Elliott Counties -- KYTC Item # 9-192.00**  
Morehead City Hall -- Morehead, Kentucky  
December 11, 2008

The first of two second-round Local Officials/Stakeholders Meetings for the KY 32 Alternatives Study in Rowan and Elliott counties was held at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, December 11, 2008, at City Hall in Morehead, Kentucky. The purposes of the meeting were to present project activities conducted to date and to discuss the development and evaluation of the proposed improvement alternatives. Attendees included the following:

Jim Nickell	Rowan County Judge Executive
Doug Doerrfeld	Kentuckians for the Commonwealth
Roger Russell	Saint Claire Regional Hospital
Ted Trent	Rowan County Board of Education
David Perkins	Mayor, City of Morehead
Allen Gillum	Mountain Telephone
Jackie Thomas	Elliottville Fire Department
Mike Adams	Morehead Police Department
Bruce Adkins	Morehead City Council
Tim Gibbs	Trooper, Kentucky State Police
Michael Walters	Morehead State University
Rodney Fugett	Morehead City Council
Joy Mullins	Gateway ADD
Russell Brannon	FIVCO ADD
Darrin Eldridge	KYTC District 9, Project Development
Phil Mauney	KYTC District 9, Planning
Brent Wells	KYTC District 9, Planning
Rachel Catchings	KYTC District 9, Design
Karen Mynhier	KYTC District 9, Environmental
Allen Blair	KYTC District 9, Public Information
Thomas Witt	KYTC Central Office, Planning
Carl Dixon	Wilbur Smith Associates
Amanda Spencer	Wilbur Smith Associates

Following the agenda outline (attached), a summary of the key components and discussion items for this meeting is provided below.

**1. Welcome and Introduction**

Thomas Witt convened the meeting at approximately 10:00 a.m. by welcoming all participants.

**2. Purpose of Meeting**

Thomas Witt indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the proposed improvement alternatives developed using study findings to date and to prepare for the next public meeting.

### **3. Project Update**

Carl Dixon summarized the project activities conducted since the last meeting with local officials and stakeholders (June 6, 2008), including: 1) holding the first public meeting; 2) coordinating with approximately 100 resource agencies; 3) completing environmental, geotechnical, environmental justice, and archaeological-historic overviews; 4) developing initial improvement concepts; 5) conducting a Level 1 screening to select alternatives to move forward for further consideration; and 6) conducting a more detailed Level 2 screening to present throughout the second round of public involvement and ultimately to use with public and agency input to select a recommendation for KY 32.

### **4. Proposed Alternatives & Level 2 Screening**

Amanda Spencer explained the development of initial improvement concepts, dismissal of concepts using the Level 1 screening, the resulting proposed improvement alternatives, and the Level 2 screening. She presented handouts that illustrated this information.

Carl Dixon then explained each of the proposed alternatives (1, 1P, 2, 3, and the No Build alternative) in more detail, including traffic projections depicted on the maps distributed to attendees.

Phil Mauney asked Carl to explain the traffic forecasting methodology. Carl explained that a 2% growth rate was used to estimate the traffic along KY 32 in the future (2030) if no improvements were made (the “no build” alternative). He added that the statewide travel demand model was used to compare the build alternatives. The travel demand model has a network of state highways and a fairly large number of traffic analysis zones (TAZs) that contain socioeconomic data, especially current and estimated future population and jobs for commuter trips, as well as characteristics that address other trip purposes. The model determines how many trips will be attracted from one zone to another due to generation factors (e.g., number of workers) and attractors (e.g., number of jobs). It then assigns trips based primarily on travel time (a function of speed and distance). The model is best used for long-distance trips.

One attendee asked why traffic would be higher on Alternative 2 or 3 (a new road) than on Alternative 1 (an improvement along the existing alignment). Carl reiterated that trips are based on travel time, so it may depend on the distance and assumed speed. He explained that a model used to derive the traffic estimates is not perfect, but it does give an idea of the relative difference between alternatives. He added that a brand new road could possibly attract new trips to or from new sources. Someone added that some of the trips could be diverted from other roads, and the number of those trips could depend on the location of the road.

Another attendee asked what the EPA site noted on the maps within the Alternative 2 corridor was. WSA agreed to investigate and include details in the study documentation.

Another attendee asked if local (KY 32) traffic would have access to Alternatives 2 or 3. Carl explained that because Alternative 2 crosses KY 32 it would offer

access at that point. Alternative 3, as shown, does not include any access for local traffic; however, including a connection to an existing road is possible.

Darrin Eldridge added that the District had talked about how a new road, such as Alternative 3, might not help the people living along the existing road.

One attendee asked if a toll road was an option. Carl explained that funding was a KYTC decision that would not be addressed during this study.

Doug Doerrfeld, Kentuckians for the Commonwealth, shared his disappointment that improving KY 173 wasn't considered. Carl explained that the KYTC had initiated a study of KY 32; therefore, a policy decision would have to be made to study another route. Carl pointed out that one alternative in the extreme west of the study area had been considered to try to address interest in the KY 173 corridor. However, this alternative was dismissed in the Level 1 screening.

## **5. Proposed Spot Improvements**

Carl explained that locations with a 25 mph design speed and a high crash history were used to identify the 10 proposed spot improvement locations. He pointed out some of the locations on a large plot showing crash history along KY 32. He added that a proposal to improve all the curves with a 35 mph or less design speed would require approximately 60 curves to be improved.

Jackie Thomas, Ellittoville Fire Department, explained that "Hogtown Hill" was the biggest problem for emergency responders. The biggest issue was icy, snowy, and other slick conditions when drivers had a hard time with some of the curves because of the superelevation.

Trooper Tim Gibbs with the Kentucky State Police (KSP) inquired as to the dates of the crash history displayed. Carl explained that the data was from March 2004 to December 2007.

Jackie Thomas said that there had recently been a fatality at the foot of Hogtown Hill. He expressed concern that the spot improvements would not address all of Hogtown Hill, as some of the problem was between proposed spot improvements 1b and 2a.

Trooper Gibbs provided some recent data indicating that there had been few incidents and no fatalities in the past year along KY 32. There was some discussion about the differences between the data Trooper Gibbs had found and the historic study data presented in the study.

Judge Nickell stated that there were 10 times as many crashes along KY 32 north of KY 504.

Jackie Thomas added that crashes had increased since the prison opened because people unfamiliar with the area are traveling KY 32 to make visits to the prison.

Phil Mauney explained that spot improvements could be made one at a time as funding becomes available.

## **6. Next Steps**

Carl explained that the second public meeting for the KY 32 Alternatives Study would be held in February or March 2009 in Sandy Hook. He added that the meeting would be an open-house format with staff on hand to provide guided tours of exhibits and to answer questions.

Darrin explained that the study team would like to have a police presence. Trooper Gibbs suggested that the KYTC contact the Sheriff with the request.

Carl also mentioned that the KYTC is sending coordination letters to approximately 100 resource agencies to solicit input on the alternatives. After receiving this input and input from the public meeting, the project team will review all the local official, local stakeholder, public, and resource agency input to make a final recommendation regarding KY 32. He estimated that this would occur in April 2009. After decisions are made, the consultant will submit a draft report for KYTC review in May 2009. The final report will probably be finished in July 2009.

## **7. Q. & A.**

With no further questions, Carl asked attendees to complete a survey form. The form included the KYTC address so attendees could mail the completed surveys later, if desired. Once the survey forms are received, they will be summarized and included as part of the project records.

The meeting was adjourned at about 11:45 p.m.



## **AGENDA**

**Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting  
KY 32 Alternatives Study, Rowan and Elliott Counties  
KYTC Item No. 9-192.00  
Rowan County – Morehead City Hall  
December 11, 2008 10:00 AM**

- 1. Welcome and Introductions** **KYTC**
  
- 2. Purpose of Meeting** **KYTC**
  
- 3. Project Update** **WSA**
  - a. Progress Report**
  - b. Development of Proposed Concepts**
  - c. Level 1 Screening**
  - d. Resulting Alternatives**
  
- 4. Proposed Alternatives & Level 2 Screening** **WSA/Group Discussion**
  - a. Alternative 1** **Improve KY 32 along the existing roadway**
  - b. Alternative 1P** **Improve KY 32 along the existing roadway using “practical design” standards**
  - c. Alternative 2** **New route from KY 32/KY 7 to KY 32/KY 504 that initially runs south of KY 32 then crosses over and runs north of KY 32**
  - d. Alternative 3** **New route south of KY 32 from KY 32/KY 7 to KY 32 near KY 173, includes improvement of existing KY 32 from KY 173 to KY 504**
  - e. No Build** **No Build Alternative (i.e., no improvements to KY 32)**
  
- 5. Proposed Spot Improvements** **WSA**
  
- 6. Next Steps** **KYTC/WSA**
  - a. Public Meeting (Place/Time/Format)**
  - b. Recommendations**
  - c. Study Documentation/Report**
  
- 7. Q & A** **Group Discussion**
  
- ADJOURN** **KYTC**