

**MINUTES**  
**Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting**  
**KY 32 –Rowan and Elliott Counties - KYTC Item # 9-192.00**  
Laurel George Cultural Heritage Center – Sandy Hook, Kentucky  
December 11, 2008

The second of two second-round Local Officials/Stakeholders Meetings for the KY 32 Alternatives Study in Rowan and Elliott counties was held at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, December 11, 2008, at the Laurel George Cultural Heritage Center in Sandy Hook, 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:

Allen Gillum	Mountain Telephone
John M. Clevenger	VFW
Kyle Clevenger	Grayson RECC
Doug Doerrfeld	Kentuckians for the Commonwealth
Ted Withrow	KY Division of Water
Joe Montgomery	Sandy Hook City Council
Glen Creech	VFW
Flo Whitley	Sandy Hook Resident
Debbie Stephens	Elliott County Board of Education
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
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 2:00 p.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.

In reference to the cost estimates displayed in the Level 2 screening matrix distributed to attendees, one attendee asked if the right of way costs associated with a new alignment would “cancel out” the maintenance of traffic costs associated with improvements to the existing alignment. Carl explained that the costs shown include these considerations.

Ted Withrow, Division of Water, asked how WSA and KYTC came up with the traffic forecasts and questioned the validity of the numbers. 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. He added that traffic modeling isn’t an exact science, but it does give a good idea of the relative differences among various improvement alternatives.

Ted Withrow added that traversing the head water streams of Laurel Creek or Big Caney Creek is a high impact. Darrin Eldridge answered that KYTC was aware that impacting the headwaters could be worse than crossing. Carl Dixon added that this important consideration would be well documented in the study report.

Ted Withrow advised the group that Rocky Adkins had asked him to study how KY 32 could be developed as a scenic route by protecting and/or enhancing the natural resources and aesthetics along the route. As a result, the University of Kentucky landscape architecture department has begun a project to look at this issue. The study will take another year. Carl Dixon expressed his concern that this would be a parallel study and was assured that it was not. It will take the results of the current KY 32 Alternatives Study and try to identify potential context-sensitive design options. Carl suggested that the KYTC be invited to participate in or be kept informed of the study process. After discussion of the effort, Darrin Eldridge stated that the University of Kentucky study will be relevant in the next phase after the planning study is complete and a location has been selected.

One attendee asked if the KYTC was going to take out small curves and put in larger and more dangerous curves. Darrin Eldridge replied that flatter curves would be part of the design. The same attendee asked if the KY 7/KY 32 intersection would be replaced, noting it is fairly new and was very expensive. Carl Dixon replied that he felt that the KYTC would try to use it if they can.

Another attendee asked if Improvement Alternative 2 or 3 would help anyone living along KY 32. Phil Mauney replied that, because Alternative 2 crosses KY 32, it would offer access at those points. Alternative 3 does not include any access for local traffic, but a connection is possible.

There was some discussion about maintenance of KY 32. One attendee asked if traffic volumes dictate priority for maintenance service. Darrin Eldridge said that traffic volumes do dictate priority and that KY 32 is currently a high priority route for maintenance.

Darrin added that, if a new alignment was constructed without connectivity to the old road (KY 32), the old road (KY 32) could go to the locals, a step down. But those going between Sandy Hook and Morehead would see a huge improvement.

Ted Withrow remarked that you could use an airplane to transport patients from Sandy Hook to the hospital for less than it would take to construct a new road.

Allen Gillum suggested that because Alternative 3 comes close to KY 32, it should provide a connection. Allen Gillum said that if enough money to rebuild the entire route isn't available, KY 32 should be improved between KY 173 and KY 504.

Ted Withrow asked if improvements to KY 173 were examined. 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. He noted that one of the initial alternatives was located close to the KY 173 corridor, but it 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 a huge difference. In that case, the "spot improvements" would improve practically the entire route.

One attendee asked when the rest of KY 7 "going to Carter County" would be improved. Darrin Eldridge stated that it is in Phase 2 design and was getting close to right of way plans. He added that money was currently available only for design.

## **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. One attendee suggested the KYTC contact the Sheriff, Ronnie Stevens. She added that two state troopers live in Elliott County.

Carl also mentioned that the KYTC will send 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 3:30 p.m.



**AGENDA**  
**Local Officials/Stakeholders Meeting**  
**KY 32 Alternatives Study, Rowan and Elliott Counties**  
**KYTC Item No. 9-192.00**  
**Elliott County – Laurel Gorge Heritage Center, Newfoundland, KY**  
**December 11, 2008 2:00 PM**

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